Matt. 27:2a "him" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter (Diatessaron formatting). The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron *prima facie* supports the variant here at Matt. 27:2 (Latin Diatessaron chapter cxcii). However, the Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, and the Vulgate also lacks "*eum* (him)" at Mark 15:1. Since this may therefore be a semi-assimilation with Mark 15:1 as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

The Second Matter. Here at Matt. 27:2 we are again reminded of the issue of damaged manuscripts. Outside the closed class of sources, the Western text's Codex D 05 is unreadable at Matt. 27:2a and Matt. 27:2b.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 27:2 the TR's Greek "*auton* (him)," in the wider words, "and delivered him (*auton*) to Pontius Pilate" (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), M 021 (9th century) and X 033 (10th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, thrice in three different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is also supported in a minority of Latin Vulgate Codices of Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century); and supported as Latin "*eum* (him)," in the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Peter of Alexandria (d. 311); and the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

However, a variant omitting word 1, and so simply reading, "and delivered *him*" (showing italics for added word), is a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., Codex K 017 (9th century); and Minuscules 476 (11th century), 660 (11th century), and 1604 (13th 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), 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 also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. The origins of the variant are speculative; however, it looks like it may well have originated with Origen.

Was the variant an accidental omission? As he read, "*paredokan* (delivered)

auton (him)," did the eye of a scribe jump from the final "n" (nu) of "*pared<u>o</u>kan*" to the final "n" of "*auton*," thereby accidentally omitting the "*auton* (him)"?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, make a semi-assimilation of Matt. 27:2a to Mark 15:1 which also lacks the "*auton* (him)"? If so, is this connected to a related thinking of a semi-assimilation to Mark 15:1 and / or Luke 23:1 and / or John 18:28-29 with regard to the further omission at Matt. 27:2b, *infra*?

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be sure; although it looks like it could well have been a deliberate semi-assimilation by Origen. But we can be sure that it was an omission to the text of Scripture as here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR's reading has rock sold support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine text reading, over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. It also has some minimal support in the Latin, and further enjoys the ancient support of Bishop Peter of Alexandria. The Anglican clergyman, John Foxe (d. 1587), in the great Protestant hagiology, Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* (1st English edition, 1563), makes reference to the "Tenth General Persecution, under the Roman Emperors" that started in "A.D. 303," and thereafter sporadically came and went for 10 years. An imprisonment of "ten days" (Rev. 2:10) seems fairly light for a church in Asia Minor at Smyrna in 96 A.D., which was under a persecution in which Christians were being martyred; whereas if a period of ten years are meant on the prophetic day-year principle (Num. 14:34; Ezek. 4:6) then this makes more sense. The "ten days" of Rev. 2:10 are thus a contextual indicator pointing to the fact that in its greater fulfillment, the Smyrna Church Age (Rev. 2:8-11) occurred under Imperial Rome and includes the period of Diocletian's ten years of persecution. One of those martyred for their Christian faith during these "ten days" of Rev. 2:10 was Bishop Peter of Alexandria in 311. We thank God that one of the witnesses to the reading of the *Textus Receptus* here at Matt. 27:2a is this holy martyr.

The variant has weak support in the Greek, but strong support in the Latin where it is the near monolithic reading. But the variant looks like a semi-assimilation with Mark 15:1, and 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. 27:2a 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. 27:2a, "him," in the wider words, "and delivered him," is found in (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*; 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; as well as the Syriac Harclean Version (616) with a critical mark indicating that this is a suspect reading.

However, the variant which omits "him" and so reads, "and delivered *him*" (showing italics for added word), 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 Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type).   It is also found in the Armenian Version (5th century); as well as the Syriac Harclean Version (616) with a critical mark indicating that this is a suspect reading.

At Matt. 27:2a the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al*.   The ASV and NASB are meant to use italics for added words, yet we here find neither have done so.   Thus e.g., the ASV reads at Matt. 27:2a, "and led him away."   But at Mark 15:1, where the NU Text *et al* agrees with the TR on the absence of the "*auton* (him)," we find that whereas the AV correctly reads, "delivered *him*" (AV, showing italics for added word); by contrast, neither the ASV nor NASB use italics for the added word, and thus e.g., the ASV reads at Mark 15:1, "delivered him" (ASV, not using italics for added word).   This diminution in the standard of italics accuracy evident in both the ASV and NASB at Mark 15:1, has serious consequences in terms of what is happening at Matt. 27:2a.   It means, we simply do not know if they are here exercising their non-Alexandrian pincer arm on the basis of "the wide support" for the reading in e.g., the Bohairic Version and Families 1 & 13 "Pre-Caesarean" Text and "Caesarean Proper" text of Theta 058, 565, and 700 (cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.); or if they are using their concomitant Alexandrian text pincer arm.

This same problem here found in the ASV and NASB necessarily also exists with the other neo-Alexandrian versions which do not even make a pretence at using italics for added words.   The readers of these "modern" versions are thus left confused and uncertain as to what to make of the rendering at Matt. 27:2a which *prima facie* supports the TR's reading, but which may in fact be following the variant, in the RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, TCNT, NEB, REB, and Moffatt Bible and Papists' JB and NJB. This same confusion found in the new neo-Alexandrian Papists' JB and NJB, was earlier found in the old Latin Papists' Douay-Rheims which reads at Matt. 27:2a, "delivered him," and so might be following the minority Latin reading of the TR, or the majority Latin reading of the variant.

The translators of the Syriac Harclean Version were evidently uncertain as to which of the two readings they should here follow at Matt. 27:2a, and their confusion has a modern day sequel with the confusion of neo-Alexandrian translators. Did the afore mentioned neo-Alexandrian translators here conclude that the Alexandrian texts "were firing blanks," with the consequence that they used their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm to adopt the TR's reading? Or did neo-Alexandrian translators here conclude that for the purposes of English translation they had to "fill in the missing blanks" from their Alexandrian texts? The inconsistent usage of italics at Matt. 27:2a and Mark 15:1 in the neo-Alexandrians' ASV and NASB, and the non-usage of italics by the other neo-Alexandrian translators, means that when devotees of these confusing "modern" versions are asked such questions they can only respond with "blank faces."

Matt. 27:2b "Pontius Pilate" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek "*Pontio* ('to Pontius,' word 1) *Pilato* ('to Pilate,' word 2)," i.e., "to Pontius Pilate" in the wider words, "and delivered him to Pontius (*Pontio*) Pilate (*Pilato*) the governor" (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), and H 013 (9th century); Minuscules 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation), 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels), 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, thrice in three different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is also supported as Latin, "*Pontio* ('to Pontius,' word 1) *Pilato* ('to Pilate,' word 2)," i.e., "to Pontius Pilate," 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., word 2, variant spelling, "*Pylato*") 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, Pseudo-Justin (d. 4th / 5th century); the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

However, a variant omitting word 1 and so reading simply, "*Pilato* ('to Pilate,' word 2)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Peter of Alexandria (d. 311); and ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are conjectural; however, it looks like it may well have originated with Origen.

Was the variant an accidental omission?   As the scribe read "*Pontio* (to Pontius) *Pilato* (Pilate)," did his eye jump from the "*P*" beginning and "*o*" ending of "*Pontio*" to the "*P*" beginning and "*o*" ending of "*Pilato*," thus accidentally omitting "*Pontio* (to Pontius)"?

Was the variant a deliberate omission?   Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, make a semi-assimilation of Matt. 27:2b to Mark 15:1 and / or Luke 23:1 and / or John 18:28-29 where the "*Pontio* (to Pontius)" is lacking?   If so, is this connected to a related thinking of a semi-assimilation to Mark 15:1 with regard to the further omission at Matt. 27:2a, *supra*?   If so, probably both Matt. 27:2a and Matt. 27:2b are semi-assimilations to the same reading of Mark 15:1.

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission?   We cannot be sure; but it looks like it could well have been a deliberate semi-assimilation by Origen to Mark 15:1. Nevertheless, we can be sure that it was an omission to the Received Text 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.   It also has rock solid support in the Latin as the near monolithic Latin reading.   It enjoys the further ancient support of the church fathers and doctors, St. Jerome and St. Augustine.   By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek and Latin, and looks like it may well be a semi-assimilation to Mark 15:1 at the hand of Origen.   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 27:2b 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. 27:2b, "Pontius Pilate," in the wider words, "and delivered him to Pontius Pilate the governor," 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), 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 Harclean h Version (616); some manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version; Gothic

Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); some manuscripts of the Slavic Version; and Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which omits "Pontius" and so simply reads, "Pilate," 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 Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions, and a manuscript of the Syriac Palestinian Version; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Georgian Version (5th century); and some manuscripts of the Slavic Version.

At Matt. 27:2b the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al*[1]. Hence the ASV reads, "and delivered him up to Pilate the governor." So too, the incorrect variant is found at Matt. 27:2b in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

However, in the NT the Moffatt Bible's starting point is the main text of von Soden (1913), which in general is not a good text, but on this occasion correctly follows the TR in reading, "*Pontio* (to Pontius) *Pilato* (Pilate)." This fact, and the strength of the TR's reading in e.g., the Latin, the "Caeasarean Text" ("Pre-Caesarean": Families 1 & 13; "Caesarean Proper": Theta, 565, 700, Armenian Version, & Origen in part), and the Syriac (Harclean); no doubt coupled with the fact that the variant at Matt. 27:2b looks like a fairly typical type of assimilation with Mark 15:1, evidently gave the semi neo-Alexandrian, Moffatt, some thought to pause. On this occasion, partly for the right reasons (an obvious assimilation to Mark 15:1), and partly for the wrong reasons, Moffatt "guessed" rightly, and hence the Moffatt Bible reads at Matt. 27:2b, "and handed him over to Pontius Pilate the governor."

The overwhelming strength of the TR's reading in the Latin, also meant that on this occasion, once again, partly for the right reasons (the Latin textual tradition was the recipient of Divine Preservation), and partly for the wrong reasons (they elevated the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek* over the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*), the correct reading was adopted by the old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II Council times. Hence it is found in both the Clementine Vulgate and the Douay-Rheims Version, the latter of which reads at Matt. 27:2b, "and delivered him to Pontius Pilate the governor." By contrast, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-

---

[1] There is a Greek spelling variant of "Pilate," with Codex Sinaiticus reading, "*Peilato*," which is the spelling found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Westcott-Hort (1881); and Codex Vaticanus reading, "*Pilato*," which is the spelling found in Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). But either way, the rendering into English will still be, "Pilate."

Vatican II Council times adopted the erroneous variant in their Jerusalem Bible and New Jerusalem Bible, although both have footnotes referring to the TR's correct reading.

On this occasion, the NKJV's very inadequate system of footnotes relative to its Burgonite Majority Text claims, also has a footnote at Matt. 27:2b, stating that the NU Text here follows the variant.

Matt. 27:4a "innocent blood" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. I would not usually consider the issue of a variant arising independently in the Latin, since in most instances, *including this one*, the most likely explanation for it is that it arose in the Greek, and was then translated into the Latin. But I am doing so on this occasion, very largely because it raises some issues which in turn become very relevant to my later discussion of the rendering of the Douay-Rheims Version at Matt. 27:4a. For while it is true that the present fight against the neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus* comes from the neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites, it is also true that for many centuries we neo-Byzantines battled against the old Latin Papists. In all this our fight is essentially the same, as by the grace of God we defend the solemn and joyous truth, found in the words of Psalm 100:5 of the Authorized Version as, "his truth endureth to all generations;" and in the words of the *Jubilate Deo*[2], found at Mattins (Morning Prayer) and in the Psalter of the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 as, "his truth endureth from generation to generation."

The Second Matter. Some reference is made in the "Principal Textual Discussion" to the Latin word, "*sanguinem* ('blood,' masculine singular accusative noun, from *sanguis*)." Our English word, "consanguinity," is from Latin, "*consanguineus*," from "*con* (a form of *com*, 'together')" + "*sanguis* (blood)" i.e., sharing together the same blood. This term is sometimes used in connection with the *Prohibited Degrees of Consanguinity and Affinity* found in the Anglican Archbishop Matthew Parker's Table (printed at the back of the 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* till 1946). The basic idea is also found the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 24:4, which with regard to such passages as "Lev. 18," "Lev. 20:19," "Mark 6:18," and "I Cor. 5:1," says, "The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred nearer in blood than he may of his own; nor the woman of her husband's kindred nearer in blood than of her own."

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 27:4a the TR's Greek, "*haima* (blood) *ath__oon* (innocent)," i.e., "innocent blood," in the wider words of Judas Iscariot, "I have betrayed the innocent blood," is

---

[2] Latin title, "*Jubilate* (O be joyful) *Deo* (in the Lord)." The 1662 Anglican prayer book uses a number of Latin titles e.g., they are used in the Psalter which is largely the work of Miles Coverdale as drawn from the Great Bible.

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 Y 034 (9th 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, thrice in three different readings[3]) and 1968 (1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386), Epiphanius (d. 403), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Hesychius of Jerusalem (d. after 450); and ancient church Latin writer, Maximus of Turin (d. 4th / 5th century).

However a variant, Greek, "*haima* (blood) *dikaion* (righteous)," i.e., "righteous blood," is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).   It is further found as Latin, "*sanguinem* (blood) *justum* (righteous)," i.e., "righteous blood," 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.) 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, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 258), Ambroisiaster (Pseudo-Ambrose) (d. after 384), Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370), Ambrose (d. 397), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which is therefore the correct reading.   The origins of the variant are conjectural; but it looks like it may well have originated with Origen who refers to the TR's reading in the Greek, and the variant in both the Greek and a Latin translation.

Before considering any possible reasons for the rise of the variant, it is first necessary to compare some of the relevant terminology of Matt. 27:4a both with some other passages of Matthean Greek in both the Greek and Latin, and also with the antecedent usage of relevant terminology in the Old Testament of both the Greek Septuagint and Latin Vulgate.   (Unless otherwise stated, my OT quotes from St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate are from the Weber-Gryson 5th edition[4].)

---

[3]   In Lectionary 2378's first reading (p. 82b, column 2) and third reading (p. 94a, column 1), this follows the TR's spelling; but at the second reading (p. 86b, column 2) this is revowelled in accordance with a local Greek dialect as "*athoon*."

[4]   Robert Weber & Roger Gryson, *Biblia Sacra*, *Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, 1969, 5th edition, 2007, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft / German Bible Society (in the United Bible Societies), Stuttgart, Germany.

In Matt. 27:3,4, "condemned" in verse 3 which says Jesus "was condemned (*katekrithe* from *katakrino* = *kata* / 'against' + *krino* / 'judge' = to 'judge against' = to 'condemn')," contrasts with the words of verse 4 in which Judas Iscariot says, "I have betrayed the innocent (*athoon* from *athoos*) blood (*aima* / *haima*)." There is thus a contrast between Greek *krino* in "condemnation (*katakrino*)," and Greek *athoos* in "innocent (*athoos*) blood (*haima*)." At Matt. 27:24, "Pilate saith," "I am innocent (*athoos* from *athoos*) of the blood (*haimatos* from *aima* / *haima*) of this just (*dikaiou* from *dikaios*) person." We thus here find a similar nexus between "innocent (*athoos*)" "blood (*haima*)" and a "just (*dikaios*) person." And in Matt. 23:35 we further read of, "the righteous (*dikaion* from *dikaios*) blood (*aima* / *haima*)" of various martyrs.

The Matthean Greek of these passages in Matt. 23:35; 27:3,4; 27:24; is strikingly similar to the parallel usage in the Greek Septuagint (LXX) in which the "innocent (*athoos*)" and "just (*dikaios*)" are sometimes used as interchangeable terms. In Exod. 23:6,7 (LXX) we read of "judgement (*krisei*, feminine singular dative noun, from *krisis* – from *krino* / 'judge')" for the "innocent (*athoon* from *athoos*)" and "just (*dikaion* from *dikaios*)." And in Ps. 94:21 (93:21, LXX) there is a poetical parallelism made between "the righteous (*dikaiou* from *dikaios*)" and "innocent (*athoon* from *athoos*) blood (*aima* / *haima*)," in the words, "They will hunt for the soul of the righteous, and condemn innocent blood."

A similar linguistic pattern emerges in the Latin Vulgate in which we once again see how the "innocent (*innocens*)" and "just (*justus*)" are likewise sometimes used as interchangeable terms. In Matt. 27:5 the Vulgate refers to "just" or "righteous (*justum* from *justus*)" "blood (*sanguinem* from *sanguis*)." At Matt. 27:24, Pilate says, "I am innocent (*innocens* from *innocens*) of the blood (*sanguine* from *sanguis*) of this just (*justi* from *justus*) man." And in Matt. 23:35, we read of "the righteous (*justus* from *justus*) blood (*sanguis* from *sanguis*)" of various martyrs.

These renderings of the Latin Vulgate at Matt. 23:35; 27:3,4; 27:24; are once again strikingly similar to the parallel usage in the Vulgate's OT. At Exod. 23:6,7 we read in the Vulgate of "judgment (*judicio*)" with regard to "the innocent (*insontem* from *insons*)" and "just (*justum*)." And at both Job 17:8 and Job 22:19 there is a poetical parallelism made between "the just" or "the righteous (*justi* from *justus*)" and "the innocent (*innocens* from *innocens*);" and likewise at Ps. 94:21 (93:21, Latin Vulgate) we again find a poetical parallelism between "the just" or "the righteous (*justi* from *justus*)" and "innocent (*innocentem* from *innocens*)" "blood (*sanguinem* from *sanguis*)."

The practical consequence of this is that at Matt. 27:4a, either wittingly or unwittingly, a Greek scribe might wrongly conclude that the reading of the TR's Greek "*athoon* (innocent)" and the variant's "*dikaion* (righteous)" were "interchangeable" as "synonymous" or "near synonymous terms." And likewise, either wittingly or unwittingly, a Latin scribe might wrongly conclude that at Matt. 27:4a the reading of the TR's Latin "*innocentem* (innocent)" or "*insontem* (innocent)" (see next paragraph,) and the variant's "*justum* (righteous)," were "interchangeable" as "synonymous" or "near

synonymous terms."   Hence on the one hand, at Matt. 27:4a the Latin "*justum* (righteous)," is diligently rendered by John Wycliffe as "rightful (righteous)" (Wycliffe, 1380); but on the other hand, at Matt. 27:4a the Latin is rendered in a slipshod manner by both the Popish Douay-Rheims and the Romish Monsignor Ronald Knox as, "innocent" (Rheims NT, 1582; & Mgr. Knox's Translation, 1945).

The TR's reading is found in the Latin of Maximus of Turin[5].   Though I have not directly consulted his writings, I shall stipulate for my purposes that the TR's Latin reading is either "*sanguinem* (blood) *innocentem* (innocent)" or "*sanguinem* (blood) *insontem* (innocent)."   I base this conclusion on the fact that I have no reason to believe the noun "*sanguinem* ('blood,' masculine accusative singular noun, from *sanguis*)" would be different to that of the Vulgate and old Latin Versions at Matt. 27:4a.   Therefore, for my immediate purposes, I shall stipulate that the matching adjective might be either "*innocentem* ('innocent,' masculine accusative singular adjective, from *innocens*)" or "*insontem* ('innocent,' masculine accusative singular adjective, from *insons*)."   In doing so, I am conscious of the fact that in selecting these two more obvious linguistic candidates, I might be using either the same or a different Latin form to that found in Maximus's writings.   But whatever form was used by Maximus will not effect the broad macro speculation I put for the variant's origins, *infra*, but merely modify the micro-details of it with specific regard to Maximus.   Therefore my basic argument will stand irrespective of the Latin form found in the writings of Maximus of Turin.

Was the variant an accidental alteration?   Due to a paper fade, did the TR's Greek, "*athoon* (innocent)" come to look something like "*:::on*"?   Was this then "reconstructed from context" as "*dikaion* (righteous)"?   If so, did the Greek scribe "take comfort" in his conclusion through some reference to Matt. 23:35 and / or Matt. 27:24 and / or more generally the fact that the variant's type of terminology may be found in the Greek Septuagint Old Testament?

In a given manuscript line, did the TR's "*innocentem* (innocent)" or "*insontem* (innocent)" come to look something like, "*:::::::t:m*" or "*:::::t:m*"?   Was this then "reconstructed from context" as "*justum* (righteous)"?   If so, did the Latin scribe "take comfort" in his conclusion through some reference to Matt. 23:35 and / or Matt. 27:24 and / or more generally the fact that the variant's type of terminology was found in some earlier Latin manuscripts with the same Latin forms later found in the Latin Vulgate's Old Testament?   Or did Latin scribes simply copy out the variant from an originating Greek manuscript line probably originating from Origen reading Greek, "*dikaion* (righteous)"?

Was the variant a deliberate alteration?   Did a Greek scribe, if so, probably Origen, familiar with the Matthean passages of Matt. 23:35 and / or Matt. 27:24; and possessing a background knowledge in the similar parallel usage of "innocent (*athoos*)" and "just (*dikaios*)" in such Greek Septuagint passages as Exod. 23:6,7 (LXX) and Ps. 94:21 (93:21, LXX), first draw the conclusion that the TR's Greek "*athoon* (innocent)"

---

[5]   Textual apparatus of UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

and "*dikaion* (righteous)" were "interchangeable" as "synonymous" or "near synonymous terms"?   Did he then alter the TR's reading to that of the variant as "a stylistic improvement" in the desire to "highlight a nexus" between Matt. 27:4a and Matt. 23:35 and / or Matt. 27:24?

Did Latin scribes simply copy out the variant from an originating Greek manuscript line reading Greek, "*dikaion* (righteous)"?   Its probable origins and thus antiquity with Origen means this is the most likely scenario.   Alternatively, did a Latin scribe, familiar with the Matthean passages of Matt. 23:35 and / or Matt. 27:24; and possessing a background knowledge in a similar parallel usage in Latin manuscripts now lost to us, but similar at the relevant points to the type of thing we now find in the Vulgate, in such Latin passages as Exod. 23:6,7; Job 17:8; 22:19; Ps. 94:21, first draw the conclusion that the TR's Latin "*innocentem* (innocent)" or "*insontem* (innocent)" and "*justum* (righteous)," were "interchangeable" as "synonymous" or "near synonymous terms"?   Did he then alter the TR's reading to that of the variant as "a stylistic improvement" in the desire to "highlight a nexus" between Matt. 27:4a and / or Matt. 23:35 and / or Matt. 27:24?

I shall return to this issue of Latin scribes wrongly considering "*innocentem* (innocent)" or "*insontem* (innocent)" and "*justum* (righteous)," were "interchangeable" as "synonymous" or "near synonymous terms," *infra*.   (See my discussion of the Latin text based Douay-Rheims Version, *infra*.)

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.   It also enjoys the support of such ancient church Greek writers as the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom of Constantinople.

The TR's reading further enjoys the Latin support of Maximus of Turin.   I was privileged to visit Turin in north-west Italy in Sept. 2001.   Among other things I saw the Savoy Palace of King Victor Emmanuel II (Regnal Years: King of Piedmont, Savoy, & Sardinia 1849-1861; King of the Kingdom of Italy 1861-1878, though the boundaries of the Kingdom of Italy varied during the period of 1861 to 1870[6]), and the Piazza which leads into both the Palace and a Museum I looked through.   The Piazza also contains a memorial plaque to Victor Emmanuel II who was king of Sardinia-Piedmont, and then first king of the Kingdom of Italy.   After Garibaldi's conquest of Sicily and Naples, Victor Emmanuel II led his Piedmontese army into Papal States' territory in order to link up with Garibaldi against Pius IX (Pope: 1846-1878).   He acquired Venetia by war on the side of Bismarck of Prussia in 1866, and entered Rome after the French garrison

---

[6]   The Kingdom of Italy was first established in 1861, so that Victor Emmanuel II was the first king of this Kingdom.   But its borders varied in an ever expanding direction until the unification of Italy in 1870.   A matter of some possible confusion lies in the fact that he chose to retain the title of "the Second" i.e., King Victor Emmauel the Second of Italy, rather than King Victor Emmanuel the First of Italy, even though he was the first king of this Kingdom.

withdrew in 1870.   He is thus an important figure for understanding God's judgement on the Papal States at the end of the 1260 day-year prophecy (Num. 14:34; Ezek. 4:6) of Dan. 7, which expired on inclusive reckoning, 1260 years after the 607 A.D. formation of the Roman Papacy in 1866, with the judgment marked by the fall of the Papal States throughout the 1860s, culminating in the fall of Rome in 1870 following the "blasphemy" (Rev. 13:1) of the Pope in claiming "Papal Infallibility" at the *Vatican I Council* (1869-70).   My fond memories of the sun-shining bright Piazza of Turin, with a water fountain and stately buildings, thus also reminds me of the absolute authority of God's holy Word as seen in the remarkable fulfilment of the 1260 year prophecy.   Let us thank God that a witness to the reading of the *Textus Receptus* here at Matt. 27:4a also comes from Turin, in the Latin writings of Maximus of Turin.

By contrast, the variant has very weak support in the Greek, though very strong support in the Latin as the near monolithic Latin reading.   But it looks like the kind of silly thing that Origen would do, and most probably originated with Origen who refers to both readings.   Weighing up these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 27:4a 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. 27:4a, "innocent blood," in the wider words of Judas Iscariot, "I have betrayed the innocent blood," 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) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as 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 Version (first half 5th century), and the Harclean h (616) Version in both its main Syriac text and also in a Greek marginal qualification; a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version, and a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Gothic Version (4th century); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the variant which reads, "righteous blood," is found as a marginal reading in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (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 Syriac Palestinian Version (*c.* 6th century); 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); Ethiopic Versions (the Takla Haymanot, *c.* 500; & Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), as Latin, "*sanguinem* (blood) *iustum* (righteous)."

On the one hand, the presence of the TR's reading in both Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus meant that for the wrong reasons, the correct reading was adopted in the main text of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993); and referred to in a footnote reading of Westcott-Hort (1881).   But on the other hand, the marginal reading in Codex Vaticanus referring to the variant's reading, together with "external support" from such sources as e.g., L 019, Theta 038, the Bohairic, the "Caesarean Text" (Armenian Version), and for older neo-Alexandrians, the Arabic Diatessaron of Ciasca caused some concern for some neo-Alexandrians.   Though for Westcott & Hort who unlike other neo-Alexandrians, did not look much to such "external support," the primary issue appears to have been the fact that because "*haima* (blood) *dikaion* (righteous)" is a less common expression relative to "*haima* (blood) *ath<u>oo</u>n* (innocent)," it is therefore a more incongruent reading, and so on perverse neo-Alexandrian principles more likely to be the correct reading (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 66; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 55).   Thus the variant was adopted in the main text of Westcott-Hort (1881); and is also found in a footnote reading in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

The presence of the marginal reading in Codex Vaticanus for the variant's reading, seems to have caused some consternation and confusion among some of the neo-Alexandrian translators.   Both the *Twentieth Century New Testament* (2nd ed. 1904) and the *American Standard Version* (1901) are based on the Westcott & Hort text (1881). The *Twentieth Century New Testament* followed the Westcott-Hort main text reading in its main text which thus renders "*dikaion* (righteous)" as "good," and so at Matt. 27:4a has Judas Iscariot referring to, "betraying a good man" (TNCT).   The ASV opted for "the Codex Vaticanus solution," so that its main text reads at Matt. 27:4a, "I betrayed innocent blood" (ASV), but a footnote says at "innocent," "Many ancient authorities read 'righteous'" (ASV ftn.).   Like the ASV, "the Codex Vaticanus solution" is also found at Matt. 27:4a in the *New Revised Standard Version*, as well as in the post Vatican II new neo-Alexandrian Papists' *Jerusalem Bible* and *New Jerusalem*.

But despite the claims of the ASV footnote that "<u>Many</u> ancient authorities read 'righteous'" (ASV ftn.); in fact, very few so follow this variant.   Hence at Matt. 27:4a,

most neo-Alexandrian translators preferred "the comfort zone" of the main text of Codex Vaticanus as well as Codex Sinaiticus, and the greater preponderance of "external support."   Hence for the wrong reasons, the correct reading of the TR is found at Matt. 27:4a in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NIV, and TEV.

The Roman Church effectively closed down Roman Catholic neo-Byzantines such as Erasmus and the Complutensians as an outgrowth of the *Council of Trent* (1545-63).   But it is notable that shortly after this time the Roman Catholic publisher, Christopher Plantin (*c.* 1520-1589), a French Roman Catholic who founded an important publishing house at Antwerp in Belgium, published a Greek neo-Byzantine text in the *Antwerp Polyglot Bible* (or *Biblia Regia*) in eight volumes from 1569 to 1572.   Platin's Popish patron was the politically powerful King of Spain, Philip II (Regnal Years: 1556-1598), a fact that meant Plantin could publish this work against the backdrop of Popish clerical opposition to it (and likewise he could, within certain limits, publish other works either disliked, or not approved by, the Roman Church).   But this was ultimately "a last gasp" from an essentially independent Roman Catholic publisher using material that only shortly before this time of 1545-63 was still able to be produced by Roman Catholic scholars such as Erasmus (d. 1536).   Thus in the post *Council of Trent* (1545-63) and pre *Vatican II Council* (1962-5) era, the Roman Church fostered the Latin textual based theory underpinning the Sixtinam Vulgate (1590) and Clementine Vulgate (1592); as well as the Latin based English translation of the Douay-Rheims Version (NT, 1582; & OT, 1610).

I have already discussed the issue of Latin scribes wrongly considering "*innocentem* (innocent)" or "*insontem* (innocent)" and "*justum* (righteous)," are "interchangeable" as "synonymous" or "near synonymous terms," *supra*.   Manifesting the variant's near monolithic support in the Latin textual tradition, it was somewhat predictably adopted by the old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II Council times in the Clementine Vulgate of 1592.   Yet the old Latin Papists of the Douay-Rheims Version rendered Matt. 27:4a as, "I have sinned in betraying <u>innocent</u> blood."   This necessarily raises the question, "How could they justify such a rendering from the Latin, "*justum* (righteous)"?   The answer appears to lie in the matter formerly discussed, of a lower quality Latin scribe wrongly considering "*innocentem* (innocent)" or "*insontem* (innocent)" and "*justum* (righteous)," are "interchangeable" as "synonymous" or "near synonymous terms," *supra*.

Matt. 27:5 "in the temple" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reads, "*en* ('in,' word 1a, preposition + accusative) *t<u>o</u>* ('the,' word 2a, masculine singular <u>dative</u>, definite article from *o* / *'o* / *ho*) *na<u>o</u>* ('temple,' word 3a, masculine singular <u>dative</u> noun, from *naos*)," i.e., in the wider words describing the action of Judas Iscariot as standing "in the temple" when "he cast down the pieces of silver <u>in the temple</u>" (AV & TR).   In the Greek NT "*en*" can be used as an equivalent for "*eis* (into)" in broad-brush terms with verbs of motion i.e., "*en*" + verb[7], but the TR's

---

[7]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 372.

construction here of "*en*" + participle ('he cast down,' *ripsas / rhipsas*, masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *ripto / rhipto*)," makes the TR's natural rendering, "in the temple."   The TR's Greek reading 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 2 (12th century), 1010 (12th century), and 1242 (13th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, thrice in three different readings[8]) and 1968 (1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings).

The TR's reading at Matt. 27:5 is also supported as Latin, "*in* ('in,' preposition + ablative) *templo* ('the temple,' neuter singular <u>ablative</u>, from *templum*)."   In the Latin, "*in*" + accusative can mean "into," but the grammatical construction here of "*in*" + ablative cannot mean "into", and here most naturally means "in" (Woodhouse's *Latin Dictionary*, 1913[9]).   The TR's Latin reading is supported by 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 he Book of Armagh (812 A.D., written as a compound word, "*intemplo*") and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386); and the ancient church Latin writer, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370).

However, a variant reads Greek, "*eis* ('in' or 'into,' word 1b, preposition + accusative) *ton* ('the,' word 2b, masculine singular <u>accusative</u>, definite article from *o*) *naon* ('temple,' word 3b, masculine singular <u>accusative</u> noun, from *naos*)."   In the Greek NT, "*eis*" is often used to replace "*en*" and hence has a locative meaning of "*in*"[10]. Therefore, the variant's "*eis*" could mean in the wider words describing the action of Judas Iscariot, that he was standing "in the temple" when "he cast down the pieces of silver <u>in the temple</u>."   But the variant's "*eis*" could also mean that Judas Iscariot was standing outside of the temple in the temple's inner court and casting "the pieces of silver

---

[8]   While Lectionary 2378's first reading (p. 82b, column 2) and third reading (p. 94a, column 1) is written out in full on the line, at its second reading (p. 86b, column 2), the definite article is written with a closed omega on the line something like "∞" and the tau, "τ" is above the line in the middle of the closed omega.

[9]   Woodhouse, S.C., (M.A. [Master of Arts], Late Scholar of Christ Church, Oxford University,) *The Englishman's Pocket Latin-English & English-Latin Dictionary*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, UK, 1913; reprint 1983, p. 82.

[10]   Whittaker's *New Testament Greek Grammar*, SCM, London, England, UK, 1969, 1975, pp. 122-123.

into the temple" (cf. Matt. 23:35 & Luke 1:9). This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 547 (13th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), and Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which thus must stand. The origins of the variant are speculative. However, it looks like it may well have originated with Origen who refers in the Greek to both the TR's reading and the variant. Its likely origins with Origen also increases the probability that it was a deliberate alteration from the hands of this notorious textual corrupter.

Bearing in mind the fact that only the Jewish priests went into the sanctuary or temple, the TR's reading "in the temple" should be understood in the wider NT context in which "the temple" was sometimes used as a general designation that included the courts of the temple. E.g., in Matt. 21:12 "Jesus went into (*eis*) the (*to*) temple (*'ieron / hieron*) of God; and cast out all those that sought and bought in (*en*) the (*to*) temple (*'iero* from *'ieron / hieron*)," i.e., meaning Christ was in the temple's *outer courts* which included the Court of Gentiles. Hence the propriety of citing the Isa. 56:7 reference to the "house of prayer" in Matt. 21:13, since Isaiah says this was "an house of prayer for all people" (Isa. 56:7) i.e., both Jews and Gentiles. (Gentiles in this context should be understood as *God-fearer Gentiles* i.e., Gentiles who were not Jews and so not e.g., circumcised, but who like the Ethiopian eunuch might "come to Jerusalem for to worship" in the temple's Court of Gentiles, Acts 8:27 cf. Deut. 23:1; and who likewise might attend Jewish synagogues without becoming Jews, see Acts 13:16 "Men of Israel" = Jews, "and ye that fear God" = Gentile God-fearers; & Acts 13:42-48; 14:1; 17:1-4; 18:4). Or in John 2:20 we read of Herod's Temple, which included the temple's inner court containing the altar (Matt. 23:35), and outer courts with the Court of Gentiles and Court of Women, "Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple (*naos* from *naos*) in building" etc. .

However, in the words of a well known maxim, "A little knowledge can be a dangerous thing." Did an inferior quality scribe, if so, probably Origen, who knew enough about the Bible to know that only priests could enter into the Temple Proper; but not enough to know that the NT sometimes uses "temple" in a more general way to include the temple's courts, wrongly conclude that "*en* (in) *to* (the) *nao* (temple)," could "not possibly be correct" since it would mean that Judas Iscariot was standing in the prohibited area where only Jewish priests were permitted? Did he conclude that "the correct reading" at Matt. 27:5 "just had to be" therefore "*eis* (into) *ton* (the) *naon* (temple)"? If so, was this an accidental "reconstruction" following a paper fade / loss of the "*en* (in)," or a deliberate "stylistic improvement" by "a corrector" scribe? With Origen, probably the latter, but possibly the former.

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. It also enjoys the support of both ancient Greek and Latin church writers; and further has rock solid support in the Latin as the monolithic reading of the Latin textual tradition, including the Latin Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome. By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, and no support in the Latin, although it is followed by a few

ancient Greek writers. Moreover, the fact that both readings are cited by Origen in the Greek, makes it look very much like he was the probable originator of this variant. Weighing up these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 27:5 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. 27:5, "in (Greek *en*) the temple," in the wider words describing the action of Judas Iscariot when, "he cast down the pieces of silver <u>in the temple</u>," is 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), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1071 (12th century, independent), 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels), and 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, where the 12th-14th centuries Arabic is rendered in Ciasca's 19th century Latin translation as "*in* (in) *templo* (the temple)."

However, the variant which could be rendered either "in" or "into (Greek *eis*) the temple," and so in the wider words describing the action of Judas Iscariot, could mean either that he was standing "in the temple" when "he cast down the pieces of silver <u>in the temple</u>;" or that Judas Iscariot was standing outside of the temple in the temple's inner court and casting "the pieces of silver <u>into the temple</u>;" 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); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 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; Gothic Version (4th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

On the one hand, the variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* But on the other hand, the idea that the TR's reading "*en* (in) *to* (the) *nao* (temple)," purportedly "seems to imply that Judas was present in the Holy Place, entrance to which was forbidden to any except priests," meant that the NU Text Committee of the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions considered this would be *the harder reading*, and so on perverse neo-Alexandrian principles which have a *low* view of the literary skills of Bible

writers, and a correspondingly *high* view of the literary skills of corrupter scribes; this *harder reading* is *the more likely reading*, and hence the variant "with *eis* may be an Alexandrian refinement."   But against this, the NU Text Committee also realized that in the NT the terminology of *the temple* could be used as a general designation that included the courts of the temple, in which instance, this would not then be *the harder and so more likely reading*.   In this context the NU Text Committee also made the bizarre claim that the variant's "*eis* ('in' or 'into') *ton* (the) *naon* (temple)" "seems to be more appropriate to the context, which implies strong emotion and physical exertion."   This is clearly quite a ludicrous claim since the presence of any such "strong emotion and physical exertion" could also be just as readily met in the TR's reading.   But for the baffled NU Text Committee, this all meant that there were "conflicting considerations" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 66).   They thus placed the variant found in the two main Alexandrian texts in their main text, and gave a footnote alternative in the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions (retained in the contemporary edition of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition of 1993).   In doing so they said "that there is a very high degree of doubt concerning the reading selected for the text."

A number of neo-Alexandrian Versions followed the same rendering as the AV's and TR's "*en* (in) *to* (the) *nao* (temple)."   This is found in RSV, NRSV, TEV, TCNT, NEB, REB, Moffatt Bible, and the Papists' JB & NJB.   Was this because the type of factors that baffled the NU Text Committee, coupled with "strong external support" from e.g., the Latin and Syriac, some neo-Alexandrians (or in the case of Moffatt, a semi neo-Alexandrian,) exercised their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, and so for the wrong reasons followed the correct reading of the TR?   If so, they are something like the old Latin Papists, who for the wrong reasons, also got the correct reading here found in the Douay-Rheims as, "in the temple."   (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.)   Or was this because they followed the variant, but in doing so, made the English rendering the same as the TR's "*en* (in) *to* (the) *nao* (temple)," i.e., taking the variant's "*eis*" to mean "in," and hence "*eis* (in) *ton* (the) *naon* (temple)"?   Or did one or more do one thing, and one or more do the other thing?   Whatever here occurred, the practical consequence is that these versions have the correct rendering at Matt. 27:5, so that they exhibit no difference in their English with the TR i.e., they describe the action of Judas Iscariot as standing "in the temple" when "he cast down the pieces of silver <u>in the temple</u>" (AV & TR, emphasis mine).

But on the other hand, I have not placed Matt. 27:5 in Appendix 3 of this Textual Commentary Vol. 3 because a number of other neo-Alexandrian translators took the variant's "*eis*" to mean "into," i.e., "*eis* (into) *ton* (the) *naon* (temple)," thus making a difference between the meaning of the TR and variant i.e., describing the action of Judas Iscariot as standing outside of the temple in the temple's inner court and casting "the pieces of silver <u>into the temple</u>."   This usage of the variant's "*eis*" is found in the ASV, NASB, ESV, and NIV.   E.g., the ASV reads, "he cast down the pieces of silver <u>into the sanctuary</u>" (emphasis mine).

Matt. 27:9,10 "they took … they gave" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter.　　At Matt. 27:9, in the wider words, "and they took the thirty pieces of silver," the words "they took (Greek, *elabon*, indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural, from *lambano*)" in the TR are understood as 3rd person plural, i.e., "they took," in accordance with the wider context of the Matt. 27:10, Greek, "*edokan* (they gave)." However, Greek "*elabon*" is a homograph and homophone, and can also mean, "I took (*elabon*, indicative active aorist, 1st person singular, from *lambano*)."　　The issue of whether one follows the TR's reading or the variant in Matt. 27:10, thus affects how one renders the earlier "*elabon*" in Matt. 27:9.　　Hence while there is no textual dispute with regard to the word "*elabon*" in Matt. 27:9, there is a connected translation dispute that hinges on whether one follows the TR's or variant's reading at Matt. 27:10.

The Second Matter.　　In my copy of *Manuscript London* (A 02, *Codex Alexandrinus*, British Museum, now British Library, 1879 facsimile, photocopy from copy at Flinders University, Adelaide, South Australia), A 02 here follows the TR's reading with "*edokan* (they gave)."　　However, Nestle-Aland (1993) says this is the reading of a later corrector scribe, and Tischendorf (1869-72), Nestle-Aland (1993), and Swanson (1995) all say that A 02 originally read, "*edoken*."　　Though my copy is not good enough to detect this, I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of these textual apparatuses here at Matt. 27:10.

Does A 02's "*edoken*" mean "he gave (indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *didomi*)"?　　Or was this a local dialect revowelling of the "a" (alpha) to "e" (epsilon)?　　Or was this just an accidental scribal mistake in which "e" rather than "a" was written?　　The earlier presence in A 02 of "*elabon*" (3rd person plural or 1st person singular verb,) *prima facie* seems to rule out the possibility that the "*edoken*" is a 3rd person singular verb, and so one of the other two possibilities seems the most likely. This being so, A 02 might be said to support the TR's reading.　　But a corrupter scribe may have also seen some kind of transition from a plural to singular entity.　　Given the lack of clarity on the matter, I shall make no reference to A 02, *infra*.

The Third Matter.　　Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) says that the variant is followed by *Codex Harleianus* i.e., Vulgate Codex Z.　　While no specific Latin reading is provided, I would guess it is probably, "*dedi* ('I gave,' indicative active perfect, 1st person singular verb, from *do*)."　　But due to this uncertainty, I shall simply say that the variant is followed by this codex, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 27:10 the TR's Greek, "*edokan* ('they gave' = 'gave,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *didomi*)," in the wider words of Matt. 27:9,10, "And they took (*elabon*) the thirty pieces of silver, … and gave (*edokan*) them for the potter's field" (AV & TR), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th century), and X 033 (10th century); Minuscules 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation), 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the

Gospels), 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts), 1010 (12th century), 597 (13th century), 1242 (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, thrice in three different readings), 524 (12th century, in one of two different readings), and 866 (1174 A.D., in two of three different readings), and 1968 (1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings[11]). It is also supported as Latin, "*dederunt* ('they gave' = 'gave,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *do*)," in the wider words of Matt. 27:9,10, "And they took (*acceperunt*, indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *accipio*) the thirty pieces of silver, … and gave (*dederunt*) them" etc., 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 Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386) and Chrysostom (d. 407); the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

However, a variant reading Greek "*edoka* ('I gave,' indicative active aorist, 1st person singular verb, from *didomi*)," in the wider words of Matt. 27:9,10, "And I took (*elabon*) the thirty pieces of silver, … and I gave (*edoka*) them for the potter's field," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionaries 24 (10th century), 1599 (10th / 11th century), 31 (12th century), 76 (12th century), 524 (12th century, in one of two different readings), and 866 (1174 A.D., in one of three different readings). It is further found in Latin Vulgate Codex Z (6th / 7th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339).

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 alteration? Due to a paper fade of the final "n" (nu), did the original "*edokan* (they gave)" come to look something like "*edoka* "? Was this then wrongly taken by a scribal copyist to be "*edoka* (I gave)"?

Was the variant a deliberate alteration? As further discussed at "Meditation," *infra*, the word "*moi* ('unto me' = 'me')," is a quotation from "Jeremy" (Matt. 27:10) in Jer. 32:6 where we read, "And Jeremiah said, The word of the Lord came unto me,

---

[11] At Lectionary 1968's first reading (p. 180a) the "*Kai* (And)" before the associated "*elabon* (they took)" is absent at Matt. 27:9; original checked at Sydney University as there is a space with a dot in the middle ("·") after "*legontes* (saying)" and before "*elabon* (they took)" that might have fitted in "*Kai*" or an abbreviation for "*Kai*", but this is not the case at this first reading. But the "*Kai*" is present at the second (pp. 187b-188a) and third (p. 195a) readings.

saying" etc. . Did a scribe not properly understand this citation from the OT prophets Jeremy (Jer. 32:6-10,43,44) and Zacharias (Zech 11:12,13) (II Peter 1:20,21)? Did he thus confuse this singular "*moi* (me)" element of Matt. 27:10 from Jeremy, with the plural action of "the chief priests" (Matt. 27:6) when "they gave them for the potter's 'field'" (Matt. 27:10; citing "field" in Jer. 32:7-9,44)? Lacking "the Spirit of Christ" (Rom. 8:9), did such a "corrector scribe" then deliberately and most incorrectly alter the plural "*ed<u>o</u>kan* (they gave)" to the singular "*ed<u>o</u>ka* (I gave)"?

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

The TR's reading has rock solid support in the Greek and Latin textual traditions, over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. It further enjoys the support of such ancient church writers as the church fathers and doctors, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and St. Austin. By contrast the variant has weak textual support. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 27:10 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. 27:10, "they gave" or "gave" (AV) in the wider words, of Matt. 27:9,10, "And <u>they took</u> (*elabon*) the thirty pieces of silver, … and <u>gave</u> (*ed<u>o</u>kan*) them" etc., is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is 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 some manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Gothic Version (4th century); the Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the variant "I gave," in the wider words of Matt. 27:9,10, "And <u>I took</u>

(*elabon*) the thirty pieces of silver, … and I gave (*edoka*) them for the potter's field," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and it is the most probable reading of a "corrector" scribe of one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus, although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is also found in Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions, as well as a manuscript of the Syriac Palestinian Version.

Metzger considered "It is difficult to decide" which of the two readings to adopt here at Matt. 27:10, and says the NU Text "Committee" ultimately placed the TR's reading in their main text, "On the strength of the diversity of external evidence" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 67; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 55), e.g., the Egyptian Versions, Armenian Version, and Ethiopic Version, *supra*. On the one hand, for the wrong reasons, the correct reading of the TR was adopted in the NU Text *et al*; but on the other hand, footnote alternatives referring to the incorrect variant are also to be found in the NU Text *et al*.

What were the neo-Alexandrian translators to make of all this? On the one hand, for the wrong reasons, the correct reading of the TR as found in Codex Vaticanus with various "external" support, was adopted at Matt. 27:10 in the main text of the ASV, NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, TCNT, & Papists' JB & NJB. Thus e.g., the ASV reads at Matt. 27:9, "they took," and at Matt. 27:10, "they gave."

But on the other hand, the variant is referred to in footnote readings at both Matt. 27:9 and Matt. 27:10 in the ASV, NASB (1st ed. 1960-71), and NRSV. E.g., an ASV footnote at Matt. 27:9 reads, "Or, 'I took,'" and an ASV footnote at Matt. 27:10 reads, "some ancient authorities read 'I gave'." Doing the same thing in a different way, at Matt. 27:9 the NEB and REB main texts follow the TR's meaning of "*elabon* (they gave)," but both have one footnote referring to the alternative meaning of "*elabon* (I gave)," and contextually this qualifies their rendering of Matt. 27:10 so as to once again follow the TR's reading in the main text, but refer to the variant meaning of Matt. 27:10 via their Matt. 27:9 footnotes.

But the semi neo-Alexandrian "mad Scotsman," James Moffatt, evidently impressed by Codex Sinaiticus with the "external" support of the Syriac Versions, *supra*, follows the variant with no footnote reference to the TR's reading. Thus Moffatt reads at Matt. 27:9,10, "and I took the thirty silver pieces, … and I gave them for the potter's field …" (Moffatt Bible).

Meditation. The reading of Matt. 27:10 is contextually part of a larger portion dealing with the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy as found in Jeremy (Jer. 32:6-10,43,44) with some further contextual reference to Zacharias (Zech 11:12,13). To highlight this, unlike the AV, I shall put quotations marks around the relevant portions in the AV as found in Matt. 27:6-10, and also supply brackets for the parenthetical elucidation in verse 9 following the words, "Jeremy the prophet, saying." "And the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, It is not lawful for to put them into the treasury,

because it is the price of blood.   And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's 'field,' to bury strangers in.   Wherefore that 'field' was called, The field of blood, unto this day.   Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, (and they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value;) and gave them for the potter's 'field,' as 'the Lord' appointed 'me'."

The "chief priests" here "took counsel" (Matt. 27:6,7), i.e., they did not accept the money back (Matt. 27:4,5), but were acting as somewhat reluctant trustees for Judas Iscariot's money.   Therefore, in a legal sense, it would also be accurate to say that Judas Iscariot himself "purchased" this "field" (Acts 1:18), since these trustees were acting in his name, and so would have put his name on the deed of ownership.

The prophesy from Jeremy (or Jeremiah) is focused on the word "field" which is mentioned thrice in Jer. 32:7-10, and a fourth time in the plural as "fields" in Jer. 32:43,44.   I.e., in Jer. 32:43,44, the Lord foretold of a time after the Babylonian Captivity, when "men shall buy fields for money" (Jer. 32:44) in which the rendering "money" in the Authorized Version (1611) at Jer. 32:9,10,44 (AV) is Hebrew *keceph / kesep* meaning "silver," and hence it is rendered "silver" in the Geneva Bible (1560). This prophecy in which "men shall buy fields for money" (AV) or "silver" (Geneva Bible) (Jer. 32:44) around Jerusalem and elsewhere in ancient Israel; thus had a prophetic type in which the Lord directed "me," Jeremiah (or Jeremy), to buy a "field" in Jer. 32:6-9.   Therefore this prophecy of Jer. 32:43,44, "And fields shall be bought in this land" of Israel, "men shall buy fields for money" (AV) or "silver" (Geneva Bible), was repetitively fulfilled every time that a post exilic Jew bought a "field" in Israel, such as happened here in Matt. 27:6-10.   That this is the chief prophetic focus here in Matt. 27:6-10, is not only evident in St. Matthew's triple reference to "field" (Matt. 27:7,8,10), but also in his specific statement that, "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet" (Matt. 27:9).

Nevertheless, St. Matthew also makes a parenthetical reference to another prophecy in between his references to Jeremiah's "fields" (Jer. 32:7,8,9,44; Matt. 27:7,8,10).   This is a stylistic feature of Matthean Greek and certain Old Testament citations (see Textual Commentary, Vol. 3, at Matt. 21:5b, "Preliminary Remarks;" & cf. Christ in Matt. 4:10 quoting Deut. 6:13 with some reference to the teaching of, e.g., II Kgs 17:36 that to "fear" God includes "worship" of God).   This is relevant because the sum of "silver" was "thirty pieces" (Matt. 27:9).   In Zech 11:12,13, Zechariah was said to be only worth "thirty pieces of silver," and this is contextually the price that a potter's services were valued at. That Zechariah is here a messianic type pointing forward to the Messiah is evident in the fact that Zechariah throws the money *to the potter* who is in the Lord's house.   I.e., *firstly,* the Messiah was to be somehow priced at thirty pieces of silver; *secondly*, this money was to somehow be associated with a "potter;" and *thirdly*, this connection was through the conduit of the Lord's house.   If Zech 11:12,13 is not recognized as a Messianic prophecy, then it makes no sense, since a man did not pay for a potter at the temple.   Hence the ancient Syriac "translators" of the OT, lacking the Holy Spirit of God (II Peter 1:20,21), performed an act of violence on God's holy word

by pummeling it so that Hebrew, "to the potter," in "cast them to the potter," became "into the treasury" (Moffatt Bible *et al*), but by this dreadful deed, they perversely demonstrated the basic point that if Zech. 11:12,13 is not recognized as a Messianic prophecy, it makes no sense.

Though I have previously discussed this amazing prophecy (see Textual Commentary Vol. 1, at Matt. 13:35), I do so again here, since like the pummeling of God's Word at Zech. 11:12,13 by e.g., the religiously liberal Moffatt Bible, so likewise, the Word of God here at Matt. 27:6-10 has been pummeled by religious liberals who fail to understand the meaning of this prophecy. E.g., the Papists' *Jerusalem Bible* and *New Jerusalem Bible* both have a footnote purportedly "correcting" St. Matthew here, claiming that his words about "Jeremy" means he is wrongly attributing Zech. 11:12,13 to Jeremiah. The JB and NJB translators here are milder than some religious liberals since they then try to say that St. Matthew is *approximately* correct because the quote does include some elements from the Book of Jeremiah as well. In fact, St. Matthew is not *approximately* correct, but *absolutely* correct if one understands both the Matthean Greek stylistic feature of sometimes making a parenthetical reference to another prophecy; and the focus of this prophecy on "field" in Jeremiah.

Another "solution" is hinted at by the religiously liberal *New Revised Standard Version*, which has a footnote at Matt. 27:9 giving an alternative to "Jeremy" (Matt. 27:9, AV) or "Jeremiah" (NRSV), by saying, "Other ancient authorities read 'Zechariah' or 'Isaiah'" (NRSV ftn). Were one to attribute this to Zacharias (Zechariah) then this would indicate incompetence on St. Matthew's part since this would turn a parenthetical comment into the main focus, and omit reference to the main focus which is on Jeremy's "fields." And if one were to attribute this to Esaias (Isaiah) then this would indicate gross incompetence on St. Matthew's part since none of this is from the OT Book of Isaiah. Little wonder then that the NRSV includes reference to these two corrupt readings in its Matt. 27:9 footnote. Both of these readings have very poor attestation even by low neo-Alexandrian standards, and so the artificial elevation of them to a point of giving them a reference in an NRSV footnote can only be designed to cast further aspersions upon God's Word by the religiously liberal *New Revised Standard Version*.

Why then does God permit these type of attacks upon his holy Word? The answer to that question is found in I Corinthians 11:9, where the holy Apostle, St. Paul, says, that is to say, the Holy Ghost speaking through the holy Apostle, St. Paul (II Tim. 3:16), says, "For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you."

Matt. 27:11b "unto him" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The textual apparatuses of both Wordsworth & White's *Novum Testamentum Latine* (1911) and Weber & Gryson's *Biblia Sacra Vulgata* (2007), as well as the text of Tweedale's Electronic Internet Edition (2005 & 2010), all show the

Clementine Vulgate here reading, "*illi* (unto that [one])." On the one hand, this is the same basic meaning as the TR's Latin reading, "*ei* (unto him)," *infra*. But on the other hand, while the Clementine Vulgate is very useful for *manifesting* Latin readings, one must first show the Latin textual basis for a reading, since the Clementine Vulgate does not stand as a Latin textual witness in its own right. It is possible that there is such a Latin textual basis for the Clementine's reading. However, none is specifically mentioned in the textual apparatuses I use, nor in the old Latin Versions whose scripts I have in Julicher (1938-63), and the matter lacks sufficient importance for me to spend the time seeking to track down any such Latin textual reference. Therefore no reference is made to the Clementine Vulgate, *infra*.

The Second Matter. Outside the closed class of sources, Nestle-Aland (1993) says all extant Syriac Versions follow the TR's reading; whereas Tischendorf (1869-72) says the Syriac Curetonian follows the variant. I have no knowledge of the Allophylian language of Syriac, nor do I have any specific interest in it. The issue of what the Syriac says has a zero impact on a neo-Byzantine text, whereas it exerts a more significant influence on neo-Alexandrian texts. Under the circumstances, I shall simply say that the TR's reading is "generally found in the Syriac," *infra*; and make no specific reference to the issue of which of these two readings is followed by any, or all, manuscripts of the Syriac Curetonian Version.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 27:11b the TR's Greek, "*auto* (unto him)," in the wider words, "And Jesus said unto him" (AV), are 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); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, thrice in three different readings[12]) and 1968 (1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings[13]). It is also supported as Latin, "*ei* (unto him)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), in both the Greek and also a Latin translation.

---

[12]   At Lectionary 2378's first reading (p. 83a, column 1), this is written with a closed omega something like "αυ∞" with the "τ" midway over the "∞"; at the second reading (p. 87a, column 1), this is written with an open omega something like, "αυτω"; and at the third reading (p. 94a, column 2), this is written with a closed omega something like, "αυτ∞". Such is the diversity one may find in a handwritten script even *on the same reading*. Cf. next footnote.

[13]   At Lectionary 1968's first reading (p. 180a), second reading (p. 188a), and the third reading (p. 195a), this is written with an open omega something like, "αυτω". Such is the uniformity one may find in a handwritten script. Cf. previous footnote.

However, a variant omitting Greek, "*auto* (unto him)," and thus reading simply, "And Jesus said," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 485 (12th century). It is further found in old Latin Versions a (4th century) and d (5th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

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

Was the variant an accidental omission? Coming at the end of a line, and possibly abbreviated, was the "*auto* (unto him)" lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? Was the "*auto* (unto him)" omitted by a prunist scribe on the basis that it was "unnecessarily wordy" and "redundant"?

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that it was an omission to the Received Text here 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 in both the Greek and Latin. This support includes the Latin Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome. 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. 27:11b 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. 27:11b, "unto him" (AV) in the wider words, "And Jesus said unto him," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is further found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found 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 "generally found in the Syriac;" and also found in the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century).

However, the variant which omits "unto him," and so reads simply, "And Jesus said," 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); and Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent). It is

also the most probable reading of Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Armenian Version (5th century).

Notwithstanding the split between the two major Alexandrian texts, on this occasion at Matt. 27:11b, the pull of the Neo-Alexandrian School rule that "the shorter reading is the better reading," resulted in the adoption of the variant by the NU Text *et al*; although Westcott-Hort (1881) included the TR's reading as found in Codex Vaticanus as an alternative reading in one of their relatively rare sidenotes.

But the neo-Alexandrian translators were unsure as to what to do. For the wrong reasons, the right reading of the TR was adopted at Matt. 27:11b in the ASV, NASB, and RSV. E.g., the ASV reads, "And Jesus said unto him." After all, "Does not Codex Vaticanus have 'good external support' with e.g., the 'Caesarean Text' ('Pre-Caesarean': Family 13) and the Egyptian Coptic (Middle Egyptian Version)?"

By contrast, the incorrect reading of the variant was adopted at Matt. 27:11b in the ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, TCNT, NEB, REB and Moffatt. E.g., Moffatt reads, "Jesus replied" (Moffatt Bible). After all, "Does not Codex Sinaiticus have 'good external support' with e.g., the 'Caesarean Text' ('Caesarean Proper': Armenian Version) and the Egyptian Coptic (Sahidic & Bohairic Versions)?"

The old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II Council times, for the wrong reason (i.e., its strong support in the Latin without any deference to the Byzantine Greek or Greek church writers), supported the right reading in their Douay-Rheims Version which here reads at Matt. 27:11b, "Jesus saith to him." By contrast, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II Council times were attracted by the "the magnetism of the shorter reading" and so followed the variant in their JB and NJB.

Matt. 27:16,17 "Barabbas" (twice) (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Since I am the first person itemizing readings in Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 and 1968, I sometimes refer to some matters in them that I would not do so if they were more generally known manuscripts with e.g., photolithic copies of them in general circulation. I thus not the following with regard to "*Barabban* (Barabbas)," in Lectionary 2378.

Lectionary 2378 at its first reading (p. 83a, column 1), uses for beta ("b") which in standard seminary Greek looks like "β", a letter shape similar to the standard seminary Greek mu ("m") of "μ" but without the downward protruding left hand side stoke, i.e., something like "u" for Matt. 27:16. Thus Matt. 27:16 looks something like, "υαραυυαμ" (the final nu, "n" here looks like a standard seminary Greek mu but without the downward protruding right hand side stoke). But then four lines down the same name is

written slightly differently and looks something like, "υαραυβαν" (the final nu, "n" here looks like a standard seminary Greek nu).

At Lectionary 2378's second reading (p. 87a, column 1), the reading for Matt. 27:16 looks something like "υαραυυαν" (written over two lines with the first two letters on the first line); whereas the reading for Matt. 27:17 looks something like, "υαραββαν" (written over two lines with the first four letters on the first line). At Lectionary 2378's third reading (p. 94b, column 1), the reading for Matt. 27:16 looks something like "βαραββdμ" (with the second last letter, an alpha, written something like a "d" although with the line on this letter sloping backwards something like "\", without the final right hand bar on the final nu); whereas the reading for Matt. 27:17 looks something like, "υαραυυdμ" (without the final right hand bar on the final nu).

Why at the first reading (p. 83a, column 1) does the Matt. 27:17 form use one "u" and one "β" for beta, and a final "ν" looking nu (υαραυβαν), whereas four lines above the Matt. 27:16 form uses "uu" for the double beta, and ends with a "μ" (without the right hand bar) looking nu (υαραυυαμ)? Why at the second reading (p. 87a, column 1), does the Matt. 27:16 form use "uu" for the double beta (υαραυυαν), and the Matt. 27:17 form use "ββ" for the double beta (υαραββαν)? Why at the third reading (p. 94b, column 1), does the Matt. 27:16 form use only "β" for beta (βαραββdμ), and then the Matt. 27:17 form use only "u" for beta (υαραυυdμ)?

Looking at all six together i.e., "υαραυυαμ" (without the downward protruding right hand side stoke on the final "μ"), "υαραυβαν", "υαραυυαν", "υαραββαν", "βαραββdμ", and "υαραυυdμ"; none are the same! This acts to show the potential diversity that may occur within handwritten manuscripts; which may be written somewhat differently to standard seminary Greek. Such are the variations one may have to acclimatize to when working through the peculiarities of writing style in a particular manuscript.

In Lectionary 1968, at the first reading (p. 189b) the Matt. 27:16 form is something like, "υαρduuαμ" (without the final right hand bar on the final letter which is a nu) and the Matt. 17:17 form is like, "υαραυuαμ" (without the final right hand bar on the final nu). At the second reading (p. 188a) the same basic stylistic writing form of something like, "υαραυυαμ" (without the final right hand bar on the final nu) is found at both Matt. 27:16 and Matt. 27:17; as it is at the third reading (p. 195b) for Matt. 27:16.

But at Lectionary 1968's third reading the Matt. 27:17 reference to "Barabbas" was initially left out, seemingly lost on ellipsis with the last letter "nu" in (with myself supplying as per normal transliterated English letters) "*umin* (unto you?) *Barabban* (Barabbas)," etc., as the eye of the scribe jumped from the final "*n*" of "*umin*" to the final "*n*" of "*Barabban*." But a corrector scribe, possibly the same scribe later realizing his mistake, then inserted three triangular shaped dots after the "*umin*", and the same pattern of three dots in the right-hand side margin, after which he wrote something like "υαραυυdμ" (without the final right hand bar on the final nu). This Lectionary thus reminds us of how even a large word like "*Barabban* (Barabbas)" might be lost by such

ellipsis; and also reminds us that while an adroit scribe might pick up the error in time to correct it, due to the frailties of fallen human nature, another may not.

The Second Matter.   Similar to the TR's "*Barabban* (Barabbas)," i.e., "Barabbas, the poorly attested to reading "*ton* ('the,' redundant in English translation) *Barabban* (Barabbas)," i.e., "Barabbas" is found at Matt. 27:17 both inside the closed class of sources (Minuscule 1010) and outside at Matt. 27:17 (B 03 - Codex Vaticanus). Notably, both of these manuscripts follow the TR's reading at Matt. 27:17.   This variant appears to have originated with Origen.   I consider the most natural construction is to read it as "Barabbas" in Matt. 27:17, since the usage of a definite article which is redundant in English translation is a feature of numerous Greek proper nouns.

But Metzger says, "A majority of the" NU Text "Committee was of the opinion that" the variant should be adopted as the "text," i.e., "*Iesoun* (Jesus) *ton* (-) *Barabban* (Barabbas)."   He also says he considers "the reading of" both Minuscule "1010" and "B" (Codex Vaticanus) "appears to presuppose … an ancestor presence of" the variant, "*Iesoun* (Jesus) *ton* (-) *Barabban* (Barabbas)" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, pp. 67-8; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 56).   *This ungrounded claim is pure neo-Alexandrian supposition.* It is "grasping at straws" to try and further bolster the variant.   I certainly do not accept it.   I think there is absolutely no evidence whatsoever that this in any way, shape, or form, "appears to presuppose … an ancestor presence of" the variant.   The reality is, that this is a very similar reading to that of the TR, in which a corrupter scribe, probably Origen, has added the definite article "*ton* ('the,' redundant in English translation)" before "*Barabban* (Barabbas)," as a standardizing device since this is commonly found with Greek proper nouns e.g., twice in Matt. 27:11, "*o* (-) … *Iesous* (Jesus), or here at Matt. 27:17, "*o* (-) *Pilatos* (Pilate)".   Therefore I show this reading supporting the TR's reading, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

The TR's Greek, "*Barabban* (Barabbas)," i.e., "Barabbas" (AV), is twice found at Matt. 27:16,17, and 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 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), 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, thrice in three different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings).   It is further supported as Latin, "*Barabbas* (Barabbas)" at Matt. 27:16 and Latin, "*Barrabban* (Barabbas)" at Matt. 27:17 in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century, alternative spelling "*Barabbam*" at Matt. 27:17), h (5th century, alternative spelling "*Barabbam*" at Matt. 27:17), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century, alternative spelling "*Barabba*" at Matt.

27:17), 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, alternative spelling "*Barabbam*" at Matt. 27:17).

The TR's Matt. 27:16 reading is further supported by Minuscule 1010 (12th century); and the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).   The TR's Matt. 27:17 reading is further supported in the similar Greek reading of "*ton* ('the,' redundant in English translation) *Barabban* (Barabbas)," i.e., "Barabbas" in Minuscule 1010 (12th century); and the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (254).

However, a variant reading at Matt. 27:16, "*Iesoun* (Jesus) *Barabban* (Barabbas)," i.e., "Jesus Barabbas," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 924 (12th century); and the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (254) in manuscripts according to the early mediaeval church Greek writer, Peter of Laodicea (d. 6th century).   A similar reading at Matt. 27:16 is also found in Minuscule 1062 (14th century).   And a variant reading at Matt. 27:17, "*Iesoun* (Jesus) *ton* (-) *Barabban* (Barabbas)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 924 (12th century); and the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.   A similar reading at Matt. 27:17 is also found in Minuscule 1062 (14th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text reading which is therefore correct.   The origins of the variant are conjectural.   Origen refers to, though does not agree with, these textual corruptions.

Were these accidental additions?   As a scribe wrote out Matt. 27:17, when he came to the words, "*umin* (unto you) *Barabban* (Barabbas)," possibly written in capital letters (uncials) as something like, "*YMINBAPABBON*," did he first write, "*YMIN*" before being momentarily distracted by an external stimulus?   Without thinking, did he then repeat the last two letters of "*YMIN*" i.e., the "*IN*" and then keep writing, so that Matt. 27:17 thus came to look something like, "*YMININBAPABBON*"?   Did a second scribe looking at this when he copied it out think, "The bar on top of the "*IN*" after "*YMIN*" must have faded, so this must be an abbreviation for "*IHCOYN* (= *Iesoun*, 'Jesus')"?   Did he then supply such a bar to create the reading at Matt. 27:17, "*Iesoun* (Jesus) *Barabban* (Barabbas)"?   Did either this scribe, or a later scribe copying this out, looking at this think, "That should be '*ton* (the) *Barabban* (Barabbas),' the '*ton* (-)' was probably lost" on ellipsis with "the nu ('n') of the preceding, *IN* (Jesus)"?   Did he then supply the "*ton*" to give the Matt. 27:17 reading, "*Iesoun* (Jesus) *ton* (-) *Barabban* (Barabbas)"?   Did either this scribe, or a later one, looking at Matt. 27:16,17 then "conclude" that "for the purposes of stylistic balance," if Matt. 27:17 reads, "*Iesoun* (Jesus) *ton* (-) *Barabban* (Barabbas)," then "really Matt. 27:16 should likewise read, "*Iesoun* (Jesus) *Barabban* (Barabbas)"?   Did he thus add in "*IN*" with a bar on top at Matt. 27:16 as a "reconstruction" of the text?

Were these deliberate additions?   The supplying of a name is a well known form

of textual corrupter embellishment in the events covered in Matt. 26 & 27.   E.g., at Matt. 27:38, the "two thieves crucified with" Christ are given the names of "Zoatham" and "Camma" respectively in old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century).   Likewise we find this in the embellishment of "Veronica," artistically featured in the Roman Catholic's fourteen "Stations of the Cross," in which the Romanists and some semi-Romanist Puseyites claim at number 6 that, "Veronica wiped the brow of Christ with her handkerchief."   Here at Matt. 27:16,17, was a textual corrupter, attracted to the idea of "supplying such additional information," and thereby also creating "a more poignant contrast in 'the bad Jesus' or 'the good Jesus'," with a choice between "Jesus Barabbas" or "Jesus which is called Christ" respectively?   Did he thus embellish this account by adding in these words to form "*Iēsoun* (Jesus) *Barabban* (Barabbas)" at Matt. 27:16 and "*Iēsoun* (Jesus) *ton* (-) *Barabban* (Barabbas)" at Matt. 27:17?

Were these deliberate or accidental additions?   We cannot be sure.   But we can be sure that these were additions to the text of Scripture here Divinely 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 in both.   This support includes, for instance, the Latin Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome.   By contrast, the variants at Matt. 27:16,17 both have weak support in the Greek, Matt. 27:17 has weak support in the Latin, and Matt. 27:16 has no support in the Latin.   Taking into account these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at both Matt. 27:16 and Matt. 27:17 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. 27:16,17, "Barabbas" (twice), is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century, at Matt. 27:17, "*ton Barabban*") and London Sinaiticus (4th century, at Matt. 27:17, the TR's "*Barabban*"); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century, at Matt. 27:17, the TR's "*Barabban*").   It is further found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as 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), 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 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 some manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd

century) Versions; Gothic Version (4th century); Georgian "1" Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500); Slavic Version (9th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century; spelling variant in the Latin translation for Matt. 27:17 as "*Barabbam*").

However, at Matt. 27:16,17 the variant, "Jesus Barabbas," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century, at Matt. 27:17, "*Iesoun Barabban*"), Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent, at Matt. 27:17, "*Iesoun Barabban*"), the *Family 1 Manuscripts* (at Matt. 27:17, "*Iesoun ton Barabban*"), 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 Version (3rd / 4th century), and some manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version; Armenian Version (5th century); and Georgian "2" Version (5th century).

The variant is found in the main text with the "*Iesoun* (Jesus)" (Matt. 27:16) or "*Iesoun* (Jesus) *ton* (-)" (Matt. 27:17) in square brackets before "*Barabban* (Barabbas)," in the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). By contrast, the TR's correct reading, very largely found in both major Alexandrian Texts and the Western Text, was for the wrong reasons, adopted at Matt. 27:16,17 in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), who in following the reading of his beloved Codex Sinaiticus got exactly the right reading. The TR was also very largely adopted by Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle (1952), although Westcott-Hort (1881) placed the "*ton*" before "*Barabban*" found in their beloved Codex Vaticanus in square brackets at Matt. 27:17; and in Nestle's 21st edition (1952), Erwin Nestle reluctant to disagree too much with Westcott & Hort, also placed the "*ton*" before "*Barabban*" in square brackets at Matt. 27:17.

Metzger says that, "A majority of the" NU Text "Committee was of the opinion that the original text of Matthew had the double named in both verses and that" it "was deliberately suppressed in most witness for reverential considerations" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 68; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 56). Metzger makes no reference to Col. 4:11,12 where we read of "Jesus (*Iesous*), which is called Justus," who was one of St. Paul's "fellowworkers" "of the circumcision" i.e., a Jewish Christian who laboured with Paul; and the fact that scribes here did not feel that "Jesus (*Iesous*)" "was" to be "deliberately suppressed" "for reverential considerations."

The NU Text put the variant in their main text in square brackets, with the NU Text Committee of the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions saying, "there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text or the apparatus contains the superior reading;" and the NU Text Committee of the UBS 4th revised edition (1993) saying, "the Committee had difficulty in deciding which" reading "to place in the text." When *even from the perspective of the Neo-Alexandrian paradigm*, one considers the poor attestation for the variants at Matt. 27:16,17, i.e., "Jesus Barabbas," one is left to ask if there might be some other factor here at play? It seems that a number of neo-Alexandrians have felt a "magnetic appeal" to the idea of a stylistic dichotomy between "a bad Jesus" in "Jesus

Barabbas," and "a good Jesus" in "Jesus … Christ," to the point where some of them are evidently "falling over each other" in the rush to adopt this variant. By contrast, other neo-Alexandrians, realizing its poor attestation, and the tendency for such embellishments, have not wanted to adopt it.

A *New King James Version* (1982) footnote says at Matt. 27:16, "NU-Text reads 'Jesus Barabbas'" (NKJV ftn). This footnote is misleading for three reasons. Firstly, in general, the NKJV footnotes are very selective, and give the impression of a much higher level of agreement between the Received Text and both the NU Text and Majority Text than actually exists. Secondly, in this specific context, no such NKJV footnote exits for Matt. 27:17, and so the impression given is that while the NU Text at Matt. 27:16 adds "Jesus" before "Barabbas," it does not do so at Matt. 27:17, when in fact both Matt. 27:16 and Matt. 27:17 are treated the same in the main text of the NU Text. Thirdly, it fails to recognize that neo-Alexandrians in general, and the NU Text Committee in particular, are unclear and divided upon this matter, so that the footnote should read for *both* Matt. 27:16 and Matt. 27:17, "NU Text reads '[Jesus] Barabbas'."

In the neo-Alexandrian versions, the neo-Alexandrian split here at Matt. 27:16,17, with some using their minor non-Alexandrian text pincer arm to adopt the variant (cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 27:17a), and others using their major Alexandrian text pincer arm to adopt the TR's reading (or the similar reading with "*ton*" before "*Barabban*" at Matt. 27:17). Hence four views emerged among the neo-Alexandrians and in the case of Moffatt, the semi-Alexandrian, as to what to do at Matt. 27:16,17.

View 1. For partly the right reasons (the variant looks like a typical embellishment, being the type of thing found at e.g., at Matt. 27:38 in old Latin Version c), and partly the wrong reasons (the TR's reading is found in the Alexandrian texts of Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, with "external support" in e.g., the Western text of D 05), the correct English rendering is placed in the main text (bearing in mind that such neo-Alexandrians might wrongly consider there is a "*ton*" before "*Barabban*" at Matt. 27:17). This was the position adopted by the ASV which correctly reads "Barabbas" at both Matt. 27:16,17. So likewise, this is the view found in the NASB, ESV, NIV (1st ed. 1978 & 2nd ed. 1984), and TCNT.

View 2. The correct English rendering is placed in the main text (bearing in mind that such neo-Alexandrians might wrongly consider there is a "*ton*" before "*Barabban*" at Matt. 27:17), but a footnote refers to the variant. This was the position adopted by the RSV, and Papists' JB and NJB (although the JB & NJB footnote is dismissive of the variant).

View 3. The variant is placed in the main text, but a footnote refers to the correct English rendering (bearing in mind that such neo-Alexandrians might wrongly consider there is a "*ton*" before "*Barabban*" at Matt. 27:17). This was the position adopted by

"Metzger's baby," the NRSV (1989)[14], whose main text reads at Matt. 26,17, "Jesus Barabbas" (NRSV, with a footnote saying, "other ancient authorities lack 'Jesus'" (NRSV ftn). So likewise this format was followed in the NIV (3rd ed. 2011), NEB, and REB.

View 4. The variant is placed in the main text, with no reference to the TR's reading in any footnote. This was the position adopted by the TEV and Moffatt Bible. E.g., Moffatt reads in the main text at Matt. 27:16,17, "Jesus Bar-Abbas," and he has a footnote saying, "Adding here … *Iesoun* [Jesus] with [Codex] Theta [038] and the Sinaitic (and Palestinian) Syriac version, some good minuscules, and manuscripts known to Origen …" (Moffatt Bible ftn). But what e.g., Moffatt's footnote calls "good minuscules" are mainly a small number outside of the closed class of sources; and the proposition that one would use manuscripts outside the closed class of sources, such as the "Syriac" (in which Moffatt conceals the Palestinian is actually split) or Codex Theta 038, shows how far from true principles of textual analysis and composition of the NT text Moffatt really is. Little wonder then that he made such egregious errors, both here and elsewhere!

Matt. 27:22 "unto him" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The AV following the TR here uses italics for, "*They* all say unto him," (AV, showing italics for added word); whereas the ASV following the variant does not, reading, "They all say" (ASV). The AV and TR's neo-Byzantine Greek reads, "*legousin* ('they say,' indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *lego*) *auto* (unto him) *pantas* (all);" whereas the ASV's Westcott-Hort neo-Alexandrian Greek reads, "*legousin* ('they say,' indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *lego*) *pantas* (all)." Since a 3rd person plural verb is here used, I would on this occasion agree with the ASV that the AV's italics are unnecessary for "They" in, "They all say."

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron *prima facie* follows the variant in its reading, "*Dicunt* (they say) *omnes* (all)," i.e., "They all say," etc. . However, the Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex, and the Vulgate lacks the words, "*ei* (unto him)," at not only Matt. 27:22; but also at Mark 15:13-15; Luke 23:18-23; & John 19:6. Hence this omission may be part of Diatessaron formatting, and so no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 27:22 the TR's Greek, "*auto* (unto him)," in the wider words spoken by

---

[14] For this sobriquet, see commentary at Matt. 22:35a.

"the multitude" to "Pilate" concerning "Christ," "They all say <u>unto him</u>, Let him be crucified," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), S 028 (10th century), Gamma 036 (10th century); Minuscule 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, in two of three different readings, p. 87a column 2 & p. 94b column 2) and 1968 (1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings).   It is further supported as Latin, "*ei* (unto him)," in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and c (12th / 13th century).

However, a variant omitting Greek, "*aut<u>o</u>* (unto him)," and so reading simply, "They all say," 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), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and K 017 (9th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century, in one of three different readings, p. 83a column 2).   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), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

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

Was the variant an accidental omission?   Perhaps coming at the end of a line, and possibly also in an abbreviated form, was the "*aut<u>o</u>* (unto him)" lost in an undetected paper fade, or accidentally passed over by a scribe because it was a short word that he missed?

Was the variant a deliberate omission?   Did a scribe, if so, possibly Origen, regard the "*aut<u>o</u>* (unto him)" as "redundant," and then prune it away as being "unnecessarily wordy"?   If so, was this done in connection with a semi-assimilation to the account in Mark 15:13-15; Luke 23:18-23; & John 19:6 which also lacks "*aut<u>o</u>* (unto him)"?

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

The TR's reading at Matt. 27:22 has some strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine text.   It also enjoys some support in the Latin dating from early mediaeval times (old Latin f).   By contrast, the variant has relatively weak support in the Greek, albeit some notable ancient support as a minority Byzantine reading; and strong support in the Latin.   The neo-Byzantine desire to show a reading over time and through times from ancient times is not always met in the manuscripts we have left to us; and at least on this occasion, there is no ancient manuscript support for the TR's reading that I

know of in the closed class of sources. Hence the rating of the TR must suffer accordingly, so that on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 27:2 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. 27:22, "unto him," in the wider words, "They all say unto him" etc., is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); as well as Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (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 Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant omitting "unto him," and so reading simply, "They all say" 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 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), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (12th century, independent), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), and 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Armenian Version (5th century).

At Matt. 27:22 the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Hence the ASV reads simply, "They all say," etc. . So too the incorrect variant was adopted at Matt. 27:22 in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

The old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II Council times here followed the variant in both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Hence at Matt. 27:22 the Douay-Rheims reads in somewhat awkward English, that makes it looks like a Frenchman, Spaniard, Italian, or some combination thereof was behind it, "They say all," etc. (Douay-Rheims). So too the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post Vatican II Council times followed this same erroneous variant in their Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB.

Matt. 27:23 "governor" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*o* (the) … *egemon* (governor) *ephe* ('he said' = 'said,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *phemi*)," i.e., "the governor said," (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 K 017 (9th century); Minuscule 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, thrice in three different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings).   It is further supported as Latin, "*Ait* (said) … *praeses* (the governor)," 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), 1 (7th / 8th 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, with variant spelling, "*preses*").   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

Variant 1 reads Latin, "*Dicit* (said) … *Pilatus* (Pilatus)" i.e., "Pilate said," in Vulgate Codex mm (10th -11th century, British Library, London); or Latin, "*Ait* (said) … *Pilatus* (Pilatus)" i.e., "Pilate said," in old Latin Version aur (7th century).

Variant 2 omitting Greek, "*egemon* (governor)," and so reading simply, "*o* ('the [one]' = 'he,' redundant in English translation) … *ephe* (he said)," i.e., "he said," is a minority Byzantine reading found in S 028 (10th century).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental alteration?   Was the TR's Greek "*egemon* (governor)" in the form of Latin "*praeses*" first largely lost in a paper loss or other damage, so that it was clear to a Latin scribe that something was missing from the text which had come to look something like "*p████s*"?   With reference to the Latin "*Pilatus* (Pilate)" of Mark 15:14 and / or John 19:6 in e.g., the Vulgate, did he then "reconstruct this from context" as "*Pilatus* (Pilatus)" at Matt. 27:23?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate alteration?   Did a Latin scribe here make a semi-assimilation with the "*Pilatus* (Pilate)" of Mark 15:14 and / or John 19:6 in e.g., the Vulgate, in "the interests" of a "more standard Gospel text"?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental omission?   Was the "*egemon* (governor)," "squeezed in" at the end of a line (such as sometimes occurs with words in Manuscript London, A 02), to look something like, "ΗΓΕΜωΝ"?   Was it then lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate omission?   Did a Greek scribe here make a semi-assimilation with the "*eipe* (he said)" of Luke 23:22 in "the interests" of a "more standard Gospel text"?

Were these a deliberate or accidental alteration (*Variant 1*) and omission (*Variant 2*)?   We cannot be sure.   But we can be sure these were an alteration (*Variant 1*) and

omission (*Variant 2*) 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; and rock solid support in the Latin over time and through time, dating from ancient times. This support includes the Latin Vulgate of the church father, St. Jerome, who is one of the four doctors of the Western Church. By contrast, *Variant 1* has weak support in the Latin and no support in the Greek; and *Variant 2* has weak support in the Greek, and no support in the Latin. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 27:23 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 27:23, "the governor," in the wider words, "the governor said," 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 L 019 (8th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as 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), 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.* It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 1 which omits "the governor" in the words, "the governor said," and reads instead, "Pilate said," is found in the Syriac Version (1708, Schaafius).

Variant 2 omitting "the governor," and so reading simply, "he said," 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 Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); and Armenian Version (5th century).

The strength of the Latin witnesses meant that for the wrong reasons, the right reading was adopted by the old Latin Papists in the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Hence the Douay-Rheims reads at Matt. 27:23, "The governor said."

This strong attestation in the Latin is also one reason, though not the only reason, relevant to understanding the reading of the Moffatt Bible at Matt. 27:23. The semi neo-Alexandrian, James Moffatt, had a much higher view of the Western Greek text than do neo-Alexandrians Proper. The fact that here at Matt. 27:23 the Western Text follows the TR's reading, coupled with the "external support" of e.g., the Syriac (Pesitto & Harclean), together with the Latin, meant that for largely the wrong reasons, Moffatt here adopted the correct reading of the TR. Hence the Moffatt Bible reads at Matt. 27:23, "said the governor."

However, the erroneous *Variant 2* was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence at Matt. 27:23 the ASV reads, "he said." So too, the incorrect *Variant 2* is found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, TCNT, and Papists' JB and NJB.

Moreover, in all three editions, the *New International Version* reads "Pilate" in harmony with *Variant 1* at Matt. 27:23 e.g., "'Why? What crime has he committed?' asked Pilate" (NIV 3rd ed.). So too this *Variant 1* rendering is found at Matt. 27:23 in the *Today's English Version*, *New English Bible*, and *Revised English Bible*. Are these instances of the NIV, TEV, NEB, and REB translators, using their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm to adopt *Variant 1*? (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.) Or are these examples of the loose'n'liberal dynamic equivalents of the NIV, TEV, NEB, and REB, in which the "translators" just freely added in "Pilate" because it took their fancy? Is one or more of these four versions deliberately adopting *Variant 1*, while one or more of these four versions is simultaneously simply adding in "Pilate" as part of their loose'n'liberal dynamic equivalents? While on general neo-Alexandrian principles one would have to say *probably* at least most of these versions are simply manifesting their loose'n'liberal dynamic equivalents; given the wild and unpredictable nature of the neo-Alexandrian's non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, which when used is more commonly a "one-off" or less commonly a "few-off" view of a minority of neo-Alexandrians, the possibility remains that one or more of these versions were deliberately adopting *Variant 1*. Therefore, in the final analysis, we simply do not know what is happening at a textual level in these neo-Alexandrian versions, and nor do any of the misguided devotees of the NIV, TEV, NEB, and REB.

Matt. 27:24 "of this just person" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

While e.g., UBS (1993) distinguish between the TR in word order 1,2,3, and the same reading in word order 3,1,2, I regard them as both fundamentally the TR's reading. With regard to the Greek word order I think it probably came about due to a scribal accident, *infra*; and with regard to the Latin readings in word order 3,1,2, (in which Greek words 1,2 are conveyed by one Latin word,) I consider they could just as easily have come from a Greek reading in word order 1,2,3, in which the Latin scribe altered this to word order 3,1,2, as part of Latin translation.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 27:24 the TR's Greek, "*tou* ('of the,' word 1, redundant in English translation) *dikaiou* ('of just,' word 2) *toutou* ('this [one]' = 'this person,' AV, word 3)," i.e., "of this just person" in the wider words of Pilate said of Christ, "I am innocent of the blood of this just person," 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; in word order 3,1,2), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), E 07 (8th century), and M 021 (9th 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), 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, thrice in three different readings[15]) and 1968 (1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings).   It is also supported as Latin, "*iusti* ('of just' = Greek words 1 & 2) *huius* ('this [one]' = 'this person,' word 3)," i.e., "of this just person," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions h (5th century, in word order 3,1,2), f (6th century, in word order 3,1,2), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century, in word order 3,1,2), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592 with variant usage of "j" for "i" as "*justi hujus*").   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers of the Apostolic Constitutions (3rd or 4th century), Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and ancient church Latin writers, Ambrose (d. 397), Petilianus (d. 4th / 5th century, in word order 3,1,2), Maximus of Turin (d. 4th / 5th century, in word order 3,1,2), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

However, a variant omitting words 1 & 2, and so reading simply word 3, "of this person," is found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), and ff2 (5th century).   It is also found in 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 writers, Pseudo-Cyprian (d. 4th century), Juvencus (d. 4th century), and Ambrosiaster (also known as Pseudo-Ambrose, d. after 384).

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

Was the variant an accidental loss?   Manuscript London (A 02) uses word order 3,1,2.   This looks like a scribe came to copy out, "*tou* (-, word 1) *dikaiou* ('of just,' word 2) *toutou* ('this [one],' word 3)," but after writing the "*tou*" of word 1, his eye jumped by ellipsis to the same first three letters of word 3, and he then wrote "*toutou*"?   But being a

_____

[15]   While word 3 is written out in full as "τουτου" at Lectionary 2378's first reading (p. 83b, column 1) and third reading (p. 94b, column 2); at the second reading (p. 87a, column 1) this is found at the end of a line and abbreviated to "του" with a "τ" above the line over the "υ".

more adroit scribe, he realized his error and so added back in words 1 and 2 on the basis that "the word order doesn't matter"? Did something similar happen with the manuscript line of the variant, but with a less adroit scribe who failed to recognize his error, and so failed to add back in words 1 and 2?

Was the variant a deliberate loss? The orthodox Christological teaching is that Christ had both the sinless human nature of Adam *before the fall* and so no original sin in him, and also committed no actual sin (II Cor. 5:21; Heb. 4:15; 7:26; I Peter 1:19). Hence as the Second Adam (Rom. 5:12-21; I Cor. 15:22,45,49) he overcame where the First Adam failed and fell in the Garden of Eden; NOT where fallen men constantly fall into sin. Thus Christ proved that the First Adam who had original righteousness ("God made man upright," Eccl. 7:29, ASV) need not have sinned, NOT as the sinless perfectionists wrongly claim, that fallen men need not sin (I Kgs 8:46; Ps. 51:5; Rom. 7:15-25; I John 1:8). Hence e.g., the third General Council, the *General Council of Ephesus*, in 431 dealt with matters of both Christology and Pelagianism since Christology and soteriology are indissolubly linked[16].

Therefore did a heretical scribe, perhaps influenced by Manichean type thinking that regarded the flesh as intrinsically evil, but unlike the Manicheans of Carthage referred to by St. Augustine who correspondingly denied Christ had a real human body, conclude that Christ did have a real human body and so "Christ was therefore sinful"?[17] Did such a heretical scribe then deliberately prune away the words, "*tou* (-) *dikaiou* (of just)" at Matt. 27:24 on the erroneous and heretical basis that "flesh is intrinsically evil" and "so because Christ was sinful," he "could not be called, '*tou* (-) *dikaiou* (of just)'"?

Was the variant a deliberate omission by a heretical scribe, or an accidental omission by an absent-minded scribe? So much is lost to us in the dark ages of unrecorded history of textual transmission, that we simply do not know. But we do know that the correct reading has here been Providentially preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

---

[16] See Article 21 of the Anglican 39 Article on "General Councils." In 1558 Reformation Anglicanism defined "heresy" as teaching contrary to: (1) "the words of the canonical Scriptures," (2) "the first four General Councils, or such others as have only used the words of the Holy Scriptures," or (3) whatever is "hereafter ... so declared by the Parliament, with the assent of the clergy in convocation" (Sir William Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Vol. 4, p. 48).

[17] For a discussion on Austin and the Manicheans of Carthage in North Africa, see my work *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006, 2nd edition 2010); available on the internet via Yahoo and Google at "Gavin McGrath Books," or direct at http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com, "Part 1: Prefatory remarks and principles," "Doctrinal principles used in this commentary (optional reading)," at "6) Federalist Reform."

The TR's reading has rock solid support in the Greek over time and through time, dating from ancient times.   It also has strong support in the Latin over time and through time, dating from ancient times.   It further enjoys the support of a number of ancient church writers, e.g., the church father, St. Cyril of Alexandria; and the church fathers and doctors, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Austin.   By contrast, the variant has very weak support in the Greek; and though better support in the Latin, this is still a good deal less impressive that the TR's Latin support.   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 27:24 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. 27:24, "of this just person," 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), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century; in Greek word order 3,1,2); as well as 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 Harclean h Version (616); 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 Version (9th century); Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the variant's reading, "of this person," 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); and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).   It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); and Georgian "2" Version (5th century).   A similar reading is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version.

The split in the two major Alexandrian texts was resolved in favour of the variant

on the basis that "the shorter reading is the better reading" by the NU Text *et al*, notwithstanding what on neo-Alexandrian principles would be its general lack of "external support." Nevertheless, such neo-Alexandrians could still argue for some such "external support" in the Alexandrian Text (some Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Versions, although others here follow the TR); Western Text (D 05); Syriac (Sinaitic Version, although the Syriac Harclean here follows the TR), and for those who (unlike myself) argue for a "Caesarean Text," in Theta 038 and the Georgian "2" Version (although the "Caesarean Text's" Georgian "1" Version, Armenian Version, 565, 700, and Family 1 & 13 manuscripts all follow the TR's reading).

However, at Matt. 27:24 the split in the two major Alexandrian texts caused more of a correlating split in the neo-Alexandrian versions. The correct reading of the TR, was followed for the wrong reasons of its presence in Codex Sinaiticus by the ASV which reads, "of this righteous man." The correct reading is also found at Matt. 27:24 in the Moffatt Bible as "this good man" in "this good man's blood." By contrast, at Matt. 27:24 the erroneous variant of Codex Vaticanus was followed by the NASB, RSV (with a footnote referring to the TR's reading), ESV (with a footnote referring to the TR's reading), NRSV (with a footnote referring to the TR's reading), NIV, TEV, TCNT, NEB, and REB.

Following the stronger Latin reading, the old Latin Papist of pre-Vatican II Council times adopted the correct reading for the wrong reasons in the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims. Hence at Matt. 27:24 the Douay-Rheims reads, "of this just man." But the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II Council times split over this reading. The Roman *Catholic RSV* here varies from the RSV in that the Roman *Catholic RSV* places the TR's reading in its main text, and then in a footnote refers to the variant. But then both the Papists' JB and NJB reverses this again by going back to the RSV's views by putting the variant in the main text and having a footnote referring to the TR's reading.

Such are the splitters and splatters of neo-Alexandrians when the two main Alexandrian texts are in disagreement; and they are left with a series of crude "hacker's rules" to be applied by neo-Alexandrian "textual analysts" which read more like a bush-mechanic's simple-Simon's rules than those of a genuine textual analyst. When we consider the present popularity of the Neo-Alexandrian School we are lead to proclaim, *Mundus vult decipi*[18]; but as those of the Neo-Byzantine School we are called upon by God to go beyond this, and by the grace of God to further declare, *Fiat lux*[19].

Matt. 27:34a "vinegar" (TR & AV) {A}

---

[18] Latin, "The world wants to be deceived" (from James Brach Cabell's *Figures of Earth*, 1921).

[19] Latin, "Let there be light" (Gen. 1:3, St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate); cf. II Cor. 4:6.

Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Our English word, "vinegar," is derived for the Latin words, "*vinum*" meaning "wine" and "*acer*" meaning "bitter" or "sour;" etymologically coming via the Latin language of French in the Old French words, "*vyn*" meaning "wine" and "*egre*" meaning "sour" (found in the modern French words, "*vin*" + "*aigre*").

Thus "vinegar" is a "sour wine," and hence has a broader meaning than simply one form of "vinegar," to wit, the common form sold under the name of "vinegar" and used for flavouring or preserving certain foods. E.g., so used as a dressing on vegetable salads, or in salt'n'vinegar chips (or as they say in England, "crisps"[20]).

Our English word "wine" is also derived from Latin, "*vinum*." However its etymological derivation first passes through e.g., the Old English, "win," *et al*. Thus our English words, "vinegar" and "wine" share a common origin in Latin, "*vinum*."

The Second Matter. At the third reading for Matt. 27:34 in Lectionary 1968 (p. 196b), when the scribe came to, "*memigmenon* ('mingled,' neuter singular accusative, perfect passive participle, from *mignumi*)," he first wrote "*memigmen*" and then his eye jumped by ellipsis from this "*n*" ending of "*memigmen*" or the "*n*" ending of the "*non*" on "*memigmenon*," over to the "*n*" ending of "*piein* ('to drink' = 'drink,' infinitive active aorist, from *pino*)." He then quickly glanced back at the infinitive suffix of "*ein*" on the "*piein*," and added this so as to read "*memigmenein*". He then kept writing with the next words in verse 35, "*staurosantes* (they crucified) *de* (And)," and then suddenly realizing his error, he crossed out "*staurosantes de*" which has a line through it in Lectionary 1968. He then went back and wrote out the text from the next word after "*memigmenon* (mingled)," writing out, "*kai* (and) *geusamenos* (when he had tasted) *ouk* (not) *ethele* ('he would,' see Matt. 27:34b in Textual Commentary Vol. 3, Appendix 3) *piein* (drink). "*staurosantes* (they crucified) *de* (And)," etc. .

Because it is modifying, "*oxos* ('vinegar,' <u>neuter</u> singular accusative noun, from *oxos*)," the TR's word "*memigmenon* (mingled)," is a <u>neuter</u> gender participle; but if it is read with the variant, "*oinon* ('wine,' <u>masculine</u> singular accusative noun, from *oinos*),"

---

[20]   On my first trip to London (April 2001-April 2002) I spent up to about a quarter of an hour in a West Croyden shop (near where I was living), trying to buy a packet of chips. The shopkeeper brought out potato chips of the type one eats hot e.g., with fish'n'chips, and when I said I wanted cold chips, he then brought out frozen ones of this type. Eventually, we both gave up in despair of trying to understand what each other meant, and the shopkeeper decided he did not have this unheard of, and strange unknown Australian food, that I wanted. I had been warned that the English did not know about pavlova, and also told they do not sell Vegemite (which I found to be incorrect as though it can be difficult to get, Vegemite is sold in some shops), but I thought those in England would surely have potato chips! When I later found them on the shelves of this same shop, the shopkeeper said that in England these are called "crisps." Such are the difficulties of speaking a "common" language in England and Australia!

then it is a <u>masculine</u> gender participle; both of which are homophones and homographs in the Greek. We know from the previous TR's reading in Lectionary 1968 of "*oxos* (vinegar)," that this should here be a neuter participle. However, the scribe forgot to cross our the "*ein*" ending he had put on it so as to correct it to "*memigmenon* (mingled)," and so Lectionary 1968 here reads, "*memigmenein*." This is "a nonsense word," which has a participle-infinitive hybrid suffix. Thus Lectionary 1968 here presents us with an interesting example of "an accident scene," and an example of the type of thing that can happen in textual transmission history. (Cf. Lectionary 1968 at Matt. 27:33a in Appendix 3.)

The Third Matter. The reading of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, Latin, "*vinum* (wine)" (Latin Diatessaron, chapter CCII), *prima facie* follows the variant at Matt. 27:34a. But the Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex, and the Vulgate also reads "*vinum* (wine)" at Mark 15:23. Therefore it may have been adopted as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting, and so no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

The Fourth Matter. The variant, "*oinon* (wine)," is derived from the root Greek word, "*oinos*[21]." This reminds me of how back in my College days of studying standard seminary Greek in the late 1970s and early 1980s, we were told that standard seminary Greek has Anglicized pronunciations, and so differs from modern Greek or Greek as it would have been spoken in ancient times. In this context, I recall that "*oinos*" was used as an example, in which we were taught to say the "*oi*" like the "oy" of "boy," as "*oinos*;" although we were told the modern Greeks pronounced it quite differently. (Modern Greek pronounces this "oi" as "e" i.e., "enos.")

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 27:34a the TR's "*oxos* (vinegar)," 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; London, UK), *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53; Washington, D.C., USA), the purple parchment, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century; Rossano, Italy), the purple parchment, *Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus* (N 022, 6th century; St. Petersburg, Russia; London, UK; New York, USA; Patmos & Thessalonica, Greece; Vienna, Austria; Lerma, Italy; & Rome, Vatican City State), *Codex Campianus* (M 021, 9th century; Paris, France), *Codex Nanianus* (U 030, 9th century; Venice, Austria), and *Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus* (Gamma 036, 10th century; Oxford, England, UK); Minuscule 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, namely, Lectionary 2378 (*Sidneiensis Universitatis*, sent to Bulgaria from Constantinople, 11th century, thrice in three different readings; Sydney, Australia[22])

---

[21] A masculine singular accusative noun, from *oinos*.

[22] The TR's and majority Byzantine text's word order is, "*piein* ('to drink,' word 1) *oxos* ('vinegar,' word 2)". While at Lectionary 2378's second reading (p. 87b,

and Lectionary 1968 (*Sidneiensis Universitatis*, from Cyprus, 1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings; Sydney, Australia).

It is also supported as Latin, "*acetum* (vinegar)," in old Latin Versions h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

However, a variant, "*oinon* (wine)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., Codices K 017 (9th century) and Pi 041 (9th century). It is further found as Latin, "*vinum* (wine)" in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (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 found in the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367); and the early mediaeval church Greek writer, John of Damascus (d. before 754).

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 change? Due to a paper fade, did the original "*oxos* (vinegar)," come to look something like, "*o:::*"? Did a scribe then "reconstruct" this "from context" as "*oinon* (wine)" from Mark 15:23.

Was the variant a deliberate change? Did a "corrector" scribe deliberately "correct" Matt. 27:34a from Mark 15:23? Before further considering such a possible "correction," let us first consider a matter of sequencing.

In Old Testament times, in Psalm 69 King David gave some Messianic prophecies in which some of the things described fit David, e.g., "O God, thou knowest my foolishness" (Ps. 69:5); but others go beyond David and point to the Messiah and his rejection by the Jews. (See Ps. 69:4 // John 15:25; Ps. 69:8 & John 7:5; Ps. 69:9a // John 2:17; Ps. 69:9b // Rom. 15:3; Ps. 69:19 & Heb. 12:2; Ps. 69:23 & II Cor. 3:14; Ps. 69:25 & Matt. 23:38; Ps. 69:26 & Isa. 53:4 & Matt. 26:68; Ps. 69:27 & Rom. 9:31.) One such Messianic prophecy is Ps. 69:21, "They gave me also <u>gall</u> for my meat; and in my <u>thirst</u> they gave me <u>vinegar</u> to drink" (emphasis mine). In the Greek Septuagint translation of the OT, "vinegar" is Greek "*oxos*" (LXX)[23], which is the same word found at Matt. 27:34a and John 19:30; and "gall" is Greek "*chol<u>e</u>n*" (LXX)[24], which is the same root

---

column 2) and third reading (p. 95a, column 1), it is the TR's word order 1,2; at its first reading (p. 84a, column 1), the word order is 2,1.

[23]   A neuter singular accusative noun, from *oxos*.

[24]   A feminine singular accusative noun, from *chol<u>e</u>*.

word of "*chol<u>e</u>*" found in Matt. 27:34a as "*chol<u>es</u>*"[25].

This prophecy in Ps. 69:21 depicts the scene of the suffering Messiah, and in the Greek Septuagint reference is made by the Messiah to, "*t<u>e</u>n* (the) *dipsan* ('thirst,' from *dipsa*[26]) *mou* (of me)," i.e., "my thirst" (LXX). Hence in John 19:28 we read "that the Scripture might be fulfilled," "Jesus" "saith, <u>I thirst</u> (*dips<u>o</u>*, from *dipsa<u>o</u>*[27])." Thirst in such a depiction evidently covers a prolonged time, for we read, "I am weary of my crying: <u>my throat is dried</u>: mine eyes fail <u>while I wait</u> for my God" (Ps. 69:3); and therefore the prophecy, "They gave me … gall … and in my thirst … vinegar to drink" (Ps. 69:21), might be fulfilled multiple times over some hours during the Messiah's agony at Calvary, "while" it was said he was to "wait for" "God" (cf. Ps. 22:1 // Matt. 27:46). And indeed, we know of two such instances in the one general scene at Calvary, the first time in Matt. 27:34 and Mark 15:23; the second time in John 19:28-30.

With respect to Matt. 27:34 and Mark 15:23, if the "vinegar" and "gall" of Matt. 27:34a is different to the "wine" and "myrrh" of Mark 15:23; then it would mean that in close proximity to each other, Christ was offered two different drinks, first rejecting one of them, and then rejecting the other of them. Nevertheless, I consider the more natural construction is that the Matthean and Marcan accounts are referring to the same event. Therefore, in terms of sequence, firstly, just after Christ arrived at Golgotha (Matt. 27:33), before "they crucified him" (Matt. 27:35), in harmony with Ps. 69:21, at Matt. 27:34 St. Matthew says, "They gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall: and when he had tasted thereof, he would not drink." I consider this same event is referred to in Mark 15:23, where the "gall" of Matt. 27:34 which simply means something "bitter," is more specifically identified as the pain killing drug of "myrrh" in Mark 15:23. St. Mark says, "and they gave him to drink wine (*oinon*) mingled with myrrh: but he received it not." Since "vinegar (*oxos*)" (Matt. 27:34a) is a sour wine, St. Mark is not wrong to refer to it as "wine (*oinon*)." We thus find that in Matt. 27:34 and Mark 15:23, the two accounts of St. Matthew and St. Mark complement each other, with St. Matthew giving the extra detail that the "wine (*oinon*)" (Mark 15:23) was in fact "sour wine" or "vinegar (*oxos*)" (Matt. 27:34a); and St. Mark giving the extra detail that the bitter agent or "gall" (Matt. 27:34) was in fact "myrrh" (Mark 15:23).

Secondly, at a later point in time, just before Christ "said, It is finished; and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost" (John 19:29); also in harmony with Ps. 69:21, "that the Scripture might be fulfilled," Christ "saith, I thirst. Now there was set a vessel

---

[25] A feminine singular genitive noun, from *chol<u>e</u>*.

[26] LXX Greek, a feminine singular accusative noun, from *dipsa*. The NT Greek uses the neuter noun, *dipsos* (II Cor. 11:27); and as such a neuter singular accusative noun, from *dipsos* (neuter singular nominative form), *ous* (neuter singular genitive suffix), *to* (neuter singular nominative definite article), this would be, "*to* (the) *dipsos* (thirst) *mou* (of me)" (Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT*, pp. 8 & 150).

[27] Indicative active present, 1st person singular verb.

full of vinegar: and they filled a spunge with vinegar, and put it upon hyssop, and put it to his mouth.   When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished" etc. (John 19:28-30).   Hyssop is a herb with a bitter taste, and so once again, the usage of "gall" in Ps. 69:21 simply refers to something "bitter," and so in its second prophetic fulfillment in John 19:29 "gall" is identified with the "hyssop" herb.

Did a scribe miss the point that the "thirst" of Ps. 69:21 covers a prolonged period of time ranging over some hours at Calvary during which the Messiah's "throat is dried" and he is said to "<u>wait</u> for … God" (Ps. 69:3), so that there may be multiple instances during this time of the Messiah being given "gall" and "vinegar to drink" for his "thirst"? And / or, did a scribe wrongly think that the Mark 15:23 reference to "wine (*oinon*)" was different to the Matt. 27:34a reference to "vinegar (*oxos*)"?   Did the scribe then assimilate Matt. 27:34a to Mark 15:23 by making Matt. 27:34a also read "*oinon* (wine)"? Did he thereby consider that he was "correcting" the Word of God so that "the inconsistency" between "vinegar (*oxos*)" (Matt. 27:34a) and "wine (*oinon*)" (Mark 15:23) was removed, and / or the Ps. 69:21 fulfillment would "only be to" the John 19:28-30 passage?

Was this a deliberate or accidental change?   We do not know.   We cannot now know.   But we can know that this was a change to the text of Holy Writ here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine reading.

The TR's reading has strong support in the Byzantine Greek textual tradition, over time, and through time, dating from ancient times.   It also has some support in the Latin textual tradition, over time, and through time, dating from ancient times.   It further enjoys the support of the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom.   By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, but stronger 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. 27:34a 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. 27:34a, "vinegar," is found in (the independent) Codex 0250 (8th century, *Codex Climaci rescriptus*, Westminster College, Cambridge University, UK) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century, *Codex Sangallensis*, St. Gallen, Switzerland); 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), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text).   It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century), and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

However, the variant, "wine," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts,

Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 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 Version (3rd / 4th century), and the Syriac Harclean Version (616) in an asterisk marked out text (indicating it is not the representative reading of the Harclean Version); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 27:34a the erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al*. Hence the ASV reads "wine." So too, the incorrect variant is found at Matt. 27:34a in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

Due to its strength in the Latin, the old Latin Papists of post Trent Council and pre-Vatican II Council times adopted the variant in both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Hence at Matt. 27:34a the Douay-Rheims reads, "wine (Latin, *vinum*)." So too, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post Vatican II Council times have adopted the variant in their Roman *Catholic* RSV, JB, and NJB. *Let the reader note that while the form of the Papists has changed from the textual theory of the old Latin Papists to that of the new neo-Alexandrian Papists, the substance, which is an attack on the Received Text, has remained the same. The Papists "got their fingers badly burnt" when the Textus Receptus was unleashed in pre-Trent Council times from the early 16th century on with e.g., the neo-Byzantine Roman Catholic Complutensians and neo-Byzantine Roman Catholic Erasmus; and they determined in connection with their Council of Trent focused Counter-Reformation to "shut the lid" on the neo-Byzantine Textus Receptus since it had been an integral component in God's actions of producing the Protestant Reformation. We understand the Papists discomfort at the neo-Byzantine Received Text, but we do not sympathize with them in their various associated attempts to suppress the pure Word of God.*

Matt. 27:35b "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet,
they parted my garments among them, and upon
my vesture did they cast lots" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Von Soden says the majority Byzantine text reading has the residual support of his K group of *c.* 1000 manuscripts i.e., *c.* 90% plus of it, and so on any reasonable statistical projections, *c.* 90% + of the several thousands of Byzantine

texts containing this Gospel reading. But as to where in the range of figures below 1% and up to *c.* 10%, the combined strength of *Minority Byzantine Readings 1a, 1b, and 1c* are, or what the comparative strength of the combined *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* is *vis-à-vis* the *Minority Byzantine Reading 2*, is anybody's guess. Von Soden's generalist group figures, and selective process for illustrating textual readings, means his data is simply not good enough for us to know such detail. But the fact that the combined strength of *Byzantine Readings 1 & 2* is in the range of below 1% up to *c.* 10%, gives us "the big picture" that these are clearly minority Byzantine Greek readings with less than *c.* 10% support, and possibly less than 1% support, in the several thousands of Byzantine Greek manuscripts.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex and contains the Ps. 22:18 quote before the Vulgate's words of Matt. 27:36 (Latin Diatessaron, chapter CCIII). But it is clear from its preamble and structure that it is the same as that of the Vulgate at John 19:24. Hence it was either derived entirely from the Latin Vulgate reading of John 19:24, or from the Vulgate reading of John 19:24 after consulting the similar reading at Matt. 27:35. Either way, no reference may be safely made, or is made, to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra.*

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 27:35b, there is some internal variation within the TR's reading of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* which does not affect its basic meaning. Showing in bold print the words that vary in different forms of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*, this reads in *Minority Byzantine Reading 1a* found in Scrivener's Text, Greek, "*ina* (that) *plerothe* (it might be fulfilled) *to* ('the [thing]' = 'which') *rethen* (was spoken) **upo** (by) *tou* (the) *prophetou* (prophet), **Diemerisanto** ('They parted,' indicative <u>middle</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diamerizo*), *ta* ('the,' redundant in English translation) *imatia* (garments) *mou* ('of me' = 'my') *eautois* (among them), *kai* (and) *epi* (upon) *ton* ('the,' redundant in English translation) *imatismon* (vesture) *mou* ('of me' = 'my') *ebalon* (did they cast) *kleron* (lots[28])," i.e., "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, they parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots" (AV). *Minority Byzantine Reading 1a* with "*upo* (by)" + "*diemerisanto* ('They parted,' indicative <u>middle</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diamerizo*)," is a minority Byzantine reading supported in Minuscule 924 (12th century, Athos, Greece). It is further supported by the early mediaeval church Greek writer, Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century)[29]. It is manifested in the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions

---

[28] The Greek "*kleron* (masculine <u>singular</u> accusative noun, from *kleros*)," like the Latin "*sortem* (feminine <u>singular</u> accusative noun, from *sors*)," is in the singular. It may carry the idea of a decision by lot (singular) or the drawing of lots (plural), and has been traditionally rendered into English here from both the Greek and Latin as "lots."

[29] This can be found in both Greek & Latin. See Pseudo-Athanasius in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1887 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 28 ("*In Passionem et crucem Domini*" = "About the passion and crucifixion of the Lord"), p. 185 (Greek) p. 186 (Latin).

of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

Minority Byzantine Reading 1b with "***dia*** (by)" + "***diemerisanto*** ('They parted,' indicative <u>middle</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diameriz<u>o</u>*)," is a minority Byzantine reading supported in the purple parchment, *Codex Beratinus* (Phi 043, 6th century, Tirana, Albania); and Lectionaries 547 (13th century, in one of two different readings, Rome, Vatican City State) and 1074 (1290 A.D., in one of two different readings, Athos, Greece).

Minority Byzantine Reading 1c with "***dia*** (by)" + "***diemerisan*** ('They parted,' indicative <u>active</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diameriz<u>o</u>*)," is a minority Byzantine reading supported in Minuscules 262 (10th century; Paris, France), 1187 (11th century; St. Catherine's Greek Orthodox Monastery, Mt. Sinai, Arabia), and 1188 (11th / 12th century; St. Catherine's Greek Orthodox Monastery, Mt. Sinai, Arabia).

Minority Byzantine Reading 1 as supported in the above ten Greek manuscripts, is further supported in the Latin as, "*ut* (that) *impleretur* (it might be fulfilled[30]) *quod* (which) *dictum est* ('it being spoken' = 'was spoken') *per* (by) *prophetam* (the prophet[31])[32], *Diviserunt* ('They parted,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *divido*) *sibi* ('unto them' = 'among them'[33]) *vestimenta* (garments) *mea* (my[34]) *et* (and) *super* (upon) *vestem* (vesture) *meam* (my[35]) *miserunt* (did they cast) *sortem* (lots)." This is the reading (with minor variations), supported by Vulgate Codices *Codex Harleianus* (Z, 6th / 7th century, London, UK), *Codex Illyricianus* (P, 6th / 7th century, The Split, Croatia[36]), *Codex Amiatinus* (A, 7th / 8th century, Florence, Italy), and Codex Phi (8th / 9th century)[37]; together with old Latin Versions, *Codex Vercellensis* (old Latin

---

[30] In Latin Vulgate Codex P, "*adimpleretur* (it might be fulfilled); & old Latin aur & c, "*impleatur* (it may be fulfilled)".

[31] In old Latin q, variant spelling, "*profetam* (the prophet)".

[32] In Latin Vulgate Codices Z, P, Phi, & old Latin b, adding here, "*dicentem* (saying);" which is then manifested in the Clementine Vulgate.

[33] Omitted in Latin Vulgate Codex Z.

[34] In old Latin q, aur, & c, & Donato's Latin translation of Eusebius, "*sibi* ('among them,' word 1) *vestimenta* ('garments,' word 2) *mea* ('my,' word 3), is in word order 2,3,1.

[35] Rather than "*vestem* (vesture) *meam* (my)," Latin Vulgate Codex P and old Latin h read, "*vestimentum* (vesture) *meum* (my)".

[36] On the name of this manuscript, see Textual Commentary Vol. 4 (Matt. 26-28), Preface, "Codex Illyricianus (Latin Codex P in Weber-Gryson) is named."

Version a, 4th century), *Codex Veronensis* (old Latin Version b, 5th century), *Codex Claromontanus* (old Latin Version h, 5th century), *Codex Monacensis* (old Latin Version q, 6th / 7th century), *Codex Aureus* (old Latin Version aur, 7th century), *Codex Usserianus I* (old Latin r1, 7th century)*, and *Codex Colbertinus* (old Latin Version c, 12th / 13th century). It is further found in a late 15th / 16th century Latin translation of the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339)[38]. From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

Minority Byzantine Reading 2 omits the TR's words of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* and in their place reads, "*ep'* (= "*epi*," 'for' or 'upon') *auta* (them)" i.e., "casting lots for (*ep'*) them (*auta*)." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and Lectionary 858 (12th century, in one of two different readings).

The Majority Byzantine Reading omits the TR's words of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*, and so at Matt. 27:35 and Matt. 27:36 reads, "[verse 35] *staurosantes* ('they crucified,' <u>aorist participle</u>[39]) *de* (And) *auton* (him), *diemerisanto* ('[and] they parted,' = 'and parted,' <u>aorist verb</u>[40]) *ta* (the) *imatia* (garments) *autou* (of him), *ballontes* ('casting,' <u>present participle</u>[41]) *kleron* (lots). [verse 36] *Kai* (And) *kathemenoi* (sitting down) *eterpoun* (they watched) *auton* (him) *ekei* (there);" etc. . It is found in e.g., Codices A

---

[37]   Alcuin of York (b. *c.* 732, Yorkshire, England; d. 1804, Tours, France), was first the head of the Cathedral School at York in England, and then he moved to France where he and his English monks resided at the Abbey of St. Martin's in Tours. From here was produced the Carolingian minuscule, which in calligraphy is an easy to read script that was used for producing copies of St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate. Weber-Gryson (2007) say that the TR's reading is here also supported by the consensus of Latin codices close to the typical Alcuini standard text (Weber-Gryson's Phi / "Φ"), which for the Gospels is the average of three Latin manuscripts: Codices Phi-T (8th / 9th century), Phi-G (9th century), and Phi-V (9th century) (Weber-Gryson, pp. xlv, xlvi, & 1572).

[38]   Eusebius in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1857 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 22 ("Eusebii Caesareiensis Opp. Pars II – Apologetica," "Demonstrationis Evangelicae Lib. X," section 505), p. 783 (Latin). The Latin translation by Bernadino Donato (1480/90-1543) of Verona, Italy, is quite different to the Greek here (at p. 784 of Migne, *op. cit.*), which unlike the Latin could be from either Matt. 27:35 or John 19:24 (cf. Greek Migne 22:532,781). This disparity raises questions about the accuracy of the Latin translation. But for my immediate purposes these questions are a secondary matter, since either way, this late 15th / 16th century Latin is *just inside* the closed class of sources.

[39]   Masculine plural nominative, active <u>aorist participle</u>, from *stauroo*.

[40]   Indicative middle <u>aorist</u>, 3rd person plural <u>verb</u>, from *diamerizo*.

[41]   Masculine plural nominative, active <u>present participle</u>, from *ballo*.

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); 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, thrice in three different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings). The omission of the TR's reading at Matt. 27:35b is further found in the Latin of Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

There is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine text here at Matt. 27:35b. However, before considering the textual problem at Matt. 27:35b, it is first necessary to better understand the way Matthean Greek uses the combination of *an aorist participle* with *an aorist verb* in general, as compared and contrasted with how Matthean Greek uses the combination of *an aorist participle* with *an aorist verb* in connection with *a present participle* such as occurs here at Matt. 27:35.

St. Matthew may use *aorist participles* or *aorist verbs* separately from each other (and in doing so, he may use, e.g., two aorist verbs without an aorist participle, see Matt. 17:25)[42]. However, the usage of *an aorist participle* with *an aorist verb* is quite common in Matthean Greek[43]. E.g., "*akousas* ('hearing' = 'When had heard,' aorist

---

[42] See Matt. 1:20(2); 2:1,2,4,15,19,22; 3:7; 5:2,24; 8:2,8,28; 9:10,18a,22(2); 10:4,22,39(2),40; 12:25(2),44,45,49; 13:1,19,20,22,23,24,39,46(2),47(2),52,54; 14:8,23b; 15:12,25,29b; 16:1,3; 17:24,25; 18:12,24,26,28b,29,31a,32; 19:15,25,28; 20:2,5,8(2),11,12,30; 21:12,23,37,44; 22:11,12,33; 23:20,22,31; 24:1,13,46; 25:40; 26:6,20,63,52,58,71; 27:24,33,44,48(4); & 28:8.

[43] Some discretion exists in some of these classifications, and with regard to the issue of whether or not to multiple count some relatively small number as belonging to more than one category, and so I have chosen to simplify matters by not doing so. E.g., would Matt. 21:45 be better classified as a simple example of *an aorist participle* with *an aorist verb* (as I have done, *infra*), or as an example of terminating a sentence? Or would Matt. 26:44 be better classified as an example of an aorist preamble to a quote, rather than as an example of a succession of aorist participles and verbs (as I have done, *infra*), or better placed in both categories? Should Matt. 28:8 be included; or is the semantic distinction of separation between the grammatical constructs containing "*exelthousai* ('departing' = 'they departed,' aorist participle)" and "*edramon* ('they did run' = 'did run,' aorist verb)," such that it ought not to be included? (Cf. Matt. 14:13a & Matt. 14:13b.) However one resolves such matters, the big Matthean Greek classification picture I here isolate still holds up. On this occasion, due to the comprehensive scope of St. Matthew's Gospel that must be considered, in order to

participle) *de* (-) *Hrodes* (Herod) *o* (the) *basileus* (king) *etarachthe* ('he was troubled,' aorist verb)" (Matt. 2:3)[44].

St. Matthew will sometimes use *an aorist participle* and *an aorist verb*, with *an aorist infinitive*. E.g., "*idontes* ('seeing [it]' = 'when ye had seen [it],' aorist participle) *ou* (not) *metemelethete* ('ye repented' = 'repented,' aorist verb) *usteron* (afterward) *tou* (-) *pisteusai* ('to believe' = 'that [ye] might believe,' aorist infinitive) *auto* (him)" (Matt. 21:32); or "*o* ('the [one] = 'he') *de* (And) *eipen* ('he said,' aorist verb) *Elthe* ('Come,' aorist verb). *Kai* (And) *katabas* ('coming down' = 'was come down,' aorist participle) *apo* (out of) *tou* (the) *ploiou* (ship), *o* (-) *Petros* (Peter) *periepatesen* ('he walked,' aorist verb) *epi* (on) *ta* (the) *udata* (water) *elthein* ('to go,' aorist infinitive) *pros* (to) *ton* (-) *Iesoun* (Jesus)" (Matt. 14:29)[45].

In Matthean Greek, an *aorist participle* is quite often, though not always, followed by a second *aorist verb* e.g., "*zume* (leaven), *en* (which) *labousa* ('taking' = 'took,' aorist participle) *gune* (a woman) *ekrupsen* ('[and] she hid' = '[and] hid,' aorist verb) … *eos* (until) … *ezumothe* ('was leavened,' aorist verb) *olon* (the whole)" (Matt. 13:33); or "*o* (-) *gar* (For) *Hrodes* (Herod) *kratesas* ('laying hold on,' aorist participle) *ton* (-) *Ioannen* (John) *edesen* ('[and] bound,' aorist verb) *auton* (him), *kai* (and) *etheto* ('put [him],' aorist verb) *en* (in) *phulake* (prison)" (Matt. 14:3)[46]. Less commonly, St.

---

promote the neo-Byzantine pure Word, I have deliberately selected some of the following examples in the main text to be those of the TR at points where it disagrees with the neo-Alexandrians' NU Text (Matt. 6:6; 8:1; Matt. 8:5,6; 12:2; 13:33; 14:3; 11:23; 14:29; 17:14; 20:10; 21:6; 22:25; 24:15; & 26:26, *infra* & Matt. 28:8, *supra*) or Scrivener's Text (Matt. 13:33) or the Burgonites' Majority Text (Matt. 13:28). Having gone through St. Matthew's Gospel "with a fine tooth comb" in order to itemize relevant citations here at Matt. 27:35a, (and being fortunate in that as this comes near the end of the Gospel I have some relevant notes and pencil markings on the differences between the TR and both the NU Text and Majority Text,) I further advise the interested reader that he may wish to consider the differences with the neo-Byzantine TR and the corrupt neo-Alexandrian NU Text in my citations at other places, *infra*, for instance, Matt. 3:16; 11:23; 13:10; 14:32; 15:36; 17:6; 17:27; 19:4; 21:27; 22:22; 22:25; 25:16; 25:18; 26:39; 26:43; 26:61; 26:66; 27:3; or the neo-Byzantine TR and the corrupt Burgonites' Majority Text of Hodges & Farstad at Matt. 15:39; or both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont at Matt. 26:26.

[44]   See Matt. 2:22; 4:1; 4:4; 4:9; 4:21a; 9:7; 9:19; 9:20; 11:2-3; 13:31; 14:13a, 14:13b; 14:34; 17:8; 19:22; 20:9; 21:45; 22:5; 22:13; 25:1; 25:3; 26:8; 26:30; 26:62; 27:1; 27:7; 27:27; 27:28; 27:57; & 27:59-60a.

[45]   See Matt. 2:12; 8:18; 14:23a; 16:5; 16:22; 26:12; & 27:58.

[46]   See Matt. 1:24; 2:8a; 2:9; 2:14; 3:16; 4:12; 4:13; 8:26; 8:34; 9:1; 9:25; 12:15; 13:6; 13:27; 15:24; 15:36; 15:39; 17:6; 17:10; 18:27; 18:30; 21:17; 21:19; 21:39; 22:6; 22:7; 22:10; 22:15; 22:34; 25:20; 26:49; 26:50; 26:57; 27:2; 27:26; 27:53; 28:9; 28:15; & 28:17.

Matthew has an *aorist participle* followed by three *aorist verbs*[47].

St. Matthew might sometimes use an *aorist participle* with *an aorist verb* to terminate a sentence e.g., "*kai* (and) *straphentes* ('turn [again],' aorist participle) *rexosin* ('[and] rend,' aorist verb) *umas* (you)" (Matt. 7:6), or "*Katabanti* ('coming down' = 'When was come down,' aorist participle) *de* (-) *auto* (he) *apo* (from) *tou* (the) *orous* (mountain), *ekolouthesan* ('they followed' = 'followed,' aorist verb) *auto* (him) *ochloi* (multitudes) *polloi* (great)" (Matt. 8:1)[48]. Or in a similar way he may use an *aorist participle* with *an aorist verb* to terminate an internal section of a sentence[49].

In Matthean Greek there may be a succession of aorist participles and verbs e.g., "*ei* (if) …*egeneonto* ('had been done,' aorist verb) *ai* (the) *dunameis* (mighty works) *ai* ('the [ones]' = 'which') *genomenai* ('were done,' aorist participle) *en* (in) *umin* (you), ... *an* (would) *metenonsan* ('they would have repented,' aorist verb) …" (Matt. 11:21); or "*ei* (if) …*egeneonto* ('had been done,' aorist verb) *ai* (the) *dunameis* (mighty works) *ai* ('the [ones]' = 'which') *genomenai* ('were done,' aorist participle) *en* (in) *soi* (thee), *emeinan* ('they remained' = 'remained,' aorist verb) *an* (would have) *mechri* (until) *tes* (-) *semeron* ('today' = 'this day')" (Matt. 11:23); or "*Poreuthentes* ('going' = 'went,' aorist participle) *de* (And) *oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples), *kai* (and) *poiesantes* ('doing' = 'did,' aorist participle) *kathos* (as) *prosetaxen* ('he commanded' = 'commanded,' aorist verb) *autois* (them) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)" (Matt. 21:6)[50].

---

[47] See Matt. 8:32; 14:14; 19:27; 20:34; 21:35; 25:22; & 27:64.

[48] See Matt. 2:8b; 2:10; 4:20; 9:9; 9:31; 9:33; 13:36; 14:10; 14:32; 15:12; 15:21; 15:29a; 16:4; 18:2; 20:24; 21:2; 22:18; 26:56; 26:60a; 26:75; 27:50; & 27:60b.

[49] See Matt. 27:29 (aorist participle + aorist verb; before starting the internal section at "*kai*" / "and" "*gonupetesantes*" / "bowing down" = they bowed the knee" an aorist participle, etc.).

[50] See Matt. 2:11 (aorist participle + aorist verb; thrice) 2:16 (aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist verb; twice); 4:21-22 (aorist participle + aorist verb; thrice); 5:1 (aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle); 9:8 (aorist participle + aorist verb; aorist verb + aorist participle); 10:5 (aorist verb + aorist participle + 2 aorist verbs); 11:4 (aorist participle + aorist verb; twice); 11:21 (aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb); 11:23 (aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb); 12:14 (aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb); 13:48 (aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist participle + 2 aorist verbs); 14:12 (aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb); 14:13 (aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb); 14:19 (aorist participle + aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle); 18:37 (3 aorist verbs + aorist participle); 17:27 (aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb); 18:31b (aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle); 21:29 (aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb); 21:30 (aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb); 22:22 (aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb); 25:16 (aorist participle + aorist participle + aorist verb); 25:18 (aorist participle + aorist participle + aorist verb); 25:24 (aorist

Yet to this must be made the qualification that St. Matthew may also sometime use an *aorist participle* and *an aorist verb* with something else.   Hence he may use an *aorist participle* and *an aorist verb* with *a present verb* e.g., "*theleis* ('Wilt thou,' present verb) *sun* (then) *apelthontes* ('[that] going' = '[that] we go,' aorist participle) *sullexomen* ('[and] we gather up,' aorist verb) *auta* (them)?" (Matt. 13:28)[51].   Or an *aorist participle* and *an aorist verb* with *a present infinitive*[52].   Or an *aorist participle* and *an aorist verb* with *a future verb* e.g., "*elthontes* ('coming' = 'when came,' aorist participle) *de* (But) *oi* (the) *protoi* (first) *enomisan* ('they supposed,' aorist verb) *oti* (that) *pleiona* (more) *lepsontai* ('they should have received,' future verb) ..." (Matt. 20:10)[53].   Or an *aorist participle* and *an aorist verb* with a *perfect participle*[54].   Or an *aorist participle* and *an aorist verb* with *an imperfect verb* e.g., "*labon* ('taking' = 'took,' aorist participle) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus) *ton* (the) *arton* (bread), *kai* (and) *eulogesas* ('blessing [it]' = 'blessed [it],' aorist participle), *eklase* ('[and] he brake it' = '[and] brake it,' aorist verb) *kai* (and) *edidou* ('gave [it],' imperfect verb) *tois* (to the) *mathetais* (disciples)" (Matt. 26:26)[55].

Certainly there are times when St. Matthew uses an *aorist participle* with *an aorist verb* as something other than a preamble to a quote[56].   However, St. Matthew sometimes uses an *aorist participle* with *an aorist verb* as the preamble to a quote, and if so, the quote may then take various grammatical forms.   E.g., "*oi* (the) *de* (But) *Pharisaioi* (Pharisees) *idontes* ('seeing [it]' = 'when … saw [it],' aorist participle) *eipon*

---

participle + aorist verb + aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist participle + aorist verb); 26:36 (aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb); 26:44 (aorist participle + aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle); 26:51 (aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb); 27:3 (aorist participle + aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb); 27:5 (aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb); 27:66 (aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle); 28:2 (aorist participle + aorist participle + aorist verb); & 28:11 (aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle).

[51]   See Matt. 2:13; 13:44 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present verb + present verb); 14:15b (Quote: present verb + 2 aorist verbs + aorist participle + aorist verb); 20:13; 20:22; 27:21; & 28:7.

[52]   See Matt. 9:6 & Matt. 10:1 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present infinitive + present infinitive).

[53]   See Matt. 9:18b.

[54]   See Matt. 9:36 (aorist participle + aorist verb + perfect participle + perfect participle); 20:3; & 20:6.

[55]   See Matt. 18:28a & 27:30.

[56]   See other examples I have discussed of using an *aorist participle* with *an aorist verb*, *supra*; cf. Matt. 27:29a; 28:8.

('they said,' aorist verb) *auto* (unto him), [Quote:] *Idou* (Behold), *oi* ('the,' redundant in English translation) *mathetai* (disciples) *sou* ('of thee' = 'thy') *poiousin* ('they do' = 'do,' present verb) *o* (which) *ouk* (not) *exesti* ('it is lawful' = 'is lawful,' present verb) *poiein* ('to do,' present infinitive) *en* (upon) *sabbato* (the sabbath day)" (Matt. 12:2)[57].

This preamble to a quote of *an aorist participle* with *an aorist verb* may also

---

[57] For my immediate purposes, the issue of the verbs in the quote is of secondary significance to the main point, except if the quote contains a present participle. I here show at least the beginning verbal form of the quote, e.g., the Matt. 25:26-27 quote is much longer than shown, *infra*. See Matt. 8:19 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: future verb + present verb); 9:11 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb); 12:24 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb); 12:39 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb + future verb); 12:48 (aorist participle + aorist verb + aorist participle + Quote: present verb, etc.); 13:10 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb); 14:28 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb + aorist verb + aorist infinitive); 15:10,11 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: 6 present verbs); 15:13 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: aorist verb + future verb + aorist verb + 2 present verbs + future verb); 15:15 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: aorist verb); 15:26 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb + aorist infinitive + aorist verb); 15:28 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: aorist verb + present verb); Matt. 15:32 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: 3 present verbs + aorist verb + aorist infinitive + present verb + aorist verb); 16:2-4 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: aorist participle + 5 present verbs + present infinitive + 2 present verbs + future verb + 2 aorist verbs); 16:8 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: aorist verb etc.); 16:17-19 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb etc.); 17:4 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb + present infinitive + present verb + aorist verb); 17:7 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: aorist verb + present verb); 17:11-12 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb + future verb etc.); 17:17 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: 2 future verbs + present verb); 18:21 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: 2 future verbs); 19:4-6 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: 2 aorist verbs etc.); 19:16 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: aorist verb + present verb); 19:26 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb); 20:25-28 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: perfect verb + 2 present verbs etc.); 20:32 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb + aorist verb); 21:24-25 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: future verb + aorist verb etc.); 21:27-31 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: perfect verb etc., and internally at 21:28 an aorist participle + aorist verb + subquote: present verb); 21:38 aorist participle + aorist verb + subquote: 2 present verbs + aorist verb); 25:12-13 (aorist participle + aorist verb + subquote: present verb etc.); 25:26-27 (aorist participle + aorist verb + subquote: pluperfect verb + present verb + aorist verb etc.); 26:10-13 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb + aorist verb etc.); 26:60b-61 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: imperfect verb + present verb + 2 aorist verbs); 26:66 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb); 26:73 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: 2 present verbs); 27:25 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote); 28:5 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb + 2 perfect verbs + present verb).

include *a present verb*[58], in some instances this present verb is "*legei* (said)" and so to some extent this resembles the usage of the *present participles "legontes"* / "*legon* (saying)," *infra*[59], or *a present infinitive* with *a present verb*[60]. When such a grammatical construction is used; with specific regard to the *present participle*, this is sometimes found in the following quote, so that in such instances the *present participle* acts to disjunctively distinguish the quote from the preamble of *an aorist participle* with *an aorist verb*. E.g., "*Apokritheis* ('answering,' aorist participle) *de* (And) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus) *eipe* ('he said' = 'said,' aorist verb) *pros* (unto) *auton* (him), [Quote:] *Aphes* ('Thou suffer' = 'Suffer [it to be so],' aorist verb) *arti* (now): *outo* (thus) *gar* (for) *prepon estin* (*prepon* - 'becoming' present participle + *estin* - 'it is,' present verb = 'it becometh') *emin* (us) *plerosai* ('to fulfill,' aorist infinitive) *pasan* (all) *dikaiosunen* (righteousness)" (Matt. 3:15a)[61].

In this wider context, it is notable that St. Matthew may also use an *aorist participle* with *an aorist verb* and a *present participle* as the preamble to a quote. If so, this is often from *lego*, e.g., "*legontes* ('saying,' present participle)" or "*legon* ('saying,' present participle)" Sometimes this is as a general quote e.g., "*Kai* (And) *ekteinas* ('putting forth' = 'put forth,' aorist participle) *ten* ('the,' redundant in English translation)

---

[58]   See Matt. 9:13 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present verb + Quote: present verb + aorist verb + aorist infinitive); Matt. 26:14,15 (aorist participle + present verb + aorist verb + Quote: present verb, etc.); & Matt. 26:66 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present verb "*eipon*" / "they said" again showing similarity to "*legei*," *infra* + Quote: imperfect verb).

[59]   See Matt. 9:28 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present verb "*legei*" + Quote: 3 present verbs); 14:31 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present verb "*legei*" + Quote: aorist verb); 26:37,38 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present verb "*legei*" + Quote: present verb + aorist verb + present verb); 26:71 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present verb "*legei*" + Quote: imperfect verb);

[60]   See 16:22 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present infinitive + present verb + Quote: future verb).

[61]   See Matt. 6:6 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present participle + future verb); 9:12 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present participle + present verb); 13:11-17 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: perfect verb, etc., + 2 present participles in vs. 13, present participle in vs. 14, etc.); 13:37-43 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present participle, etc., + 2 present participles in vss. 41 & 43); 15:3-9 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb etc. in a long quote including 2 present participles in vss. 4 & 9); 16:16 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb + present participle); 21:21-22 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb + aorist verb + future verb + 3 aorist verbs + future verb + aorist verb + present participle + future verb); 22:29-32 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb etc. to vs. 32 present participle); & 24:4 (aorist participle + aorist verb + Quote: present verb + aorist verb etc. with present participle in vss. 9 *et al*).

cheira ([his] hand), *epsato* ('[and] he touched' = '[and] touched,' aorist verb) *autou* (him), ... *legon* ('saying,' present participle), *Thelo* ('I will,' present verb)" etc. (Matt. 8:3); or "*Elthonti* ('entering' = 'when was entered,' aorist participle) *de* (And) *to* (-) *Iesou* (Jesus) *eis* (into) *Kapernaoum* (Capernaum), *proselthen* ('there came,' aorist verb) *auto* (unto him) *ekatontarchos* (a centurion) *parakalon* ('beseeching,' present participle) *auton* (him), *kai* (and) *legon* ('saying,' present participle), *Kurie* (Lord)" etc. (Matt. 8:5,6)[62]. Once again, this may also include the addition of *a present verb*, and so to some extent resemble to some extent the present verb with "*legei* (said)," *supra*[63].   And at other times, as further discussed, *infra*, this is as a specific quote from Old Testament Scripture e.g., "*ina* (that) *plerothe* ('it might be fulfilled,' aorist verb) *to* ('the [thing]' = 'which') *rethen* ('being spoken' = 'spoken,' aorist participle) *dia* (by) *Hsaiou* (Esais) *tou* (the) *prophetou* (prophet), *legontos* ('saying,' present participle), *Ge* (the land) *Zaboulon* (of Zabulon)" etc. (Matt. 4:14,15)[64].

However, the *present participle* may also be something besides a *present participle* from *lego*, e.g., "*legon* ('saying,' present participle)" or *legousa* ('saying,' present participle)" before such a quote.   E.g., Christ "*elthon* ('coming' = 'he came,' aorist participle) *katokesen* ('[and] he dwelt' = '[and] dwelt,] aorist verb) *eis* (in) *polin* (a city) *legomenen* ('being called' = 'called,' present participle) *Nazaret* (Nazareth): *opos* (that) *plerothe* ('it might be fulfilled,' aorist verb) *to* ('the [thing]' = 'which') *rethen* ('being spoken' = 'spoken,' aorist participle) *dia* (by) *ton* (the) *propheton* (prophets) *oti*

---

[62]   See Matt. 8:25 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle *legontes* + Quote); 14:15a (aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle *legontes* + Quote); 14:26 (aorist participle + aorist participle + aorist verb + *legontes* + Quote); Matt. 14:30 (after conjunction "*kai*" / "and," aorist participle + present infinitive + aorist verb + present participle *legon* + Quote); 21:10 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle *legousa* + Quote); 21:20 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle *legontes* + Quote); 22:1 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle *legon* + Quote); 26:27 (2 aorist participles + aorist verb + present participle *legon* + Quote); 26:42 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle *legon* + Quote); 27:24b (starting at "*labon*" / "he took" an aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle *legon* + Quote); 27:54 (present participle + 2 aorist participles + aorist verb + *legontes* + Quote); 28:12,13a (2 aorist participles + aorist verb + *legontes* + Quote); & Matt. 28:18 aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle *legon* + Quote).

[63]   See Matt. 26:39 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present verb + *legon* + Quote).

[64]   See Matt. 1:22 (aorist verb + aorist participle + *legontes* + OT Quote); 2:17 (aorist verb + aorist participle + *legontes* + OT Quote); 8:17 (aorist verb + aorist participle + *legontes* + OT Quote); 12:17 (aorist verb + aorist participle + *legontes* + OT Quote); 13:35 (aorist verb + aorist participle + *legontes* + OT Quote); 21:4 ([following a perfect verb,] aorist verb + aorist participle + *legontes* + OT Quote); & 27:9 (aorist verb + aorist participle + *legontes* + OT Quote).

('that,' redundant in English translation[65]) *Naz_oraios* (a Nazarene) *kl_eth_esetai* ('He shall be called,' future verb) " (Matt. 2:23[66]).   Or "*Kai* (And) *proselth_on* ('coming' = 'when came,' aorist participle) *aut_o* (to him) *o* (the) *peiraz_on* ('tempting [one]' = 'tempter,' present participle) *eipen* ('he said,' aorist verb), *Ei* (If) *uios* (Son) *ei* ('thou be,' present verb) *tou* (of) *Theou* (God)," etc. (Matt. 4:3).

Both of the last two mentioned grammatical constructs may be simultaneously present in Matthean Greek i.e., both an *aorist participle* with *an aorist verb* and a *present participle* from *leg_o*, e.g., "*legontes* ('saying,' present participle)" or "*legontas*" ('saying,' present participle)," as the preamble to a quote; and also usage of the *present participle* as something besides a *present participle* from *leg_o*.   E.g., at Matt. 17:14 we read, "*Kai* (And) *elthont_on* ('coming' = 'when … were come,' aorist participle) *aut_on* (they) *pros* (to) *ton* (the) *ochlon* (multitude) *pros_elthen* ('he came' = 'there came,' aorist verb) *aut_o* (to him) *anthr_opos* (a [certain] man) *gonupet_on* ('kneeling down,' present participle) *aut_o* (to him) *kai* (and) *leg_on* ('saying,' present participle)" etc.[67].

---

[65]   Under the rule of *oti recitativum*, "*oti* (that)" is never translated when it introduces a *direct discourse*.   See Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Appendix 3, section: "Introduction," sub-section: "The conjunctions, for instance, 'de' (and) and 'oti' (that);" & Young's *Greek*, p. 190.

[66]   Some may classify the words of Matt. 2:23 as the quote of otherwise unknown prophets who arose in early NT times and so foretold of the Messiah (cf. Luke 2:34-38). But I think this is in fact an OT quote from the section of the OT known as "the prophets" (cf. Matt. 5:17).   Matt. 2:23: "He shall be called a Nazarene (Greek, *Naz_oraios*)" (AV) = "He shall be called the Prince" or "He shall be called a Prince."   See Hebrew *nazir* with the idea of "separated" one in e.g., Num. 6:2, but here in Matt. 2:23 also with the idea of a consecrated "prince" per Lam. 4:7, where "Nazarites" (AV) is in the Greek Septuagint, "*naziraioi*," and here has the idea of "nobles" (ASV) or "princes."   I.e., Christ's geographical separation "in a city called Nazareth" (Matt. 2:23), was a geographical separation into a relatively isolated and separate area from the more populous areas (Matt. 2:22,23; John 1:45,46), a fact manifested in the very name of this "city called Nazareth" (Matt. 2:23).   And though to outward human perceptions it may appear it was simply to escape the dangers of Matt. 2:22 that Christ was taken to his foster-father's hometown (Luke 2:4), in fact, God did here make "the wrath of man" to "praise" him" (Ps. 76:10), since this geographical separation was simultaneously an act of God to *separate* (Hebrew *nazir* & *nazar*) Christ as "The Prince of Peace" (Isa. 9:6) before the time of his public Ministry.   And so in God's overview this *separation* occurred because Christ was the *separated* and *consecrated* prophesied child of Isa. 7:14 & 9:6 (Matt. 1:23), and therefore this was done in fulfillment of the prophesy of Isa. 9:6, "and his name shall be called … The Prince … ."   "O Lord," "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law" (Ps. 119:12,18).

[67]   See Matt. 21:15 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle + "*legontas*" / "saying" + Quote: aorist verb etc.).

Alternatively, St. Matthew may use the *present participle* with an *aorist participle* and *an aorist verb*, as the *conjunctive preamble* to *a new connected action* usually, though not always (Matt. 22:25; Matt. 28:18), starting with a conjunction (e.g., "*kai*" / "and"), and always of a sufficient size to contain at least one more verb, *flowing out of* the section with the *aorist participle*, *aorist verb*, and *present participle*. E.g., unusually for Matthean Greek not having a conjunction before *a new connected action*, we nevertheless still see this basic format when (following an earlier imperfect verb,) we read, "*kai* (and) *o* (the) *protos* (first) *gamesas* ('having married' = 'when he had married,' aorist participle) *eteleutese* ('he died' = 'deceased,' aorist verb), *kai* (and) *me* ('not' = 'no') *echon* ('having,' present participle) *sperma* (issue), [with no conjunction but still *a new connected action*] *apheke* ('he left' = 'left,' aorist verb) *ten* (-) *gunaika* (wife) *autou* ('of him' = 'his') *to* (unto) *adelpho* (brothers) *autou* ('of him' = 'his')" (Matt. 22:25)[68]. Or St. Matthew may use the *present participle* just before or just after a subsection, starting with a conjunction (e.g., "*de*" / "and"), as part of a *disjunctive section* of sufficient size to contain another verb, giving some elucidation on *what has been said* in the section with the *aorist participle* and *aorist verb* e.g., "*kai* (and) *kleisas* ('shutting' = 'when thou hast shut,' aorist participle) *ten* (-) *thuran* (door) *sou* ('of thee' = 'thy'), *proseuchomenoi* ('pray,' aorist verb) *to* (to) *Patri* (Father) *sou* ('of thee' = 'thy'), *to* ('the [one]' = 'which [is]') *en* (in) *to* (-) *krupto* (secret); *kai* ('and' = subsection marking

---

[68] See Matt. 2:7 (aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle) + Matt. 2:8 (new connected action) "*Kai* ('And,' conjunction)" + aorist verb, etc.; Matt. 2:20 in quote: (aorist participle + aorist verb + present verb + perfect verb + present participle) + Matt. 2:21 (new connected action) "*de* ('And,' conjunction)" + aorist verb, etc.; Matt. 8:14 (aorist participle + aorist verb + perfect participle + present participle) + Matt. 8:15 (new connected action) "*Kai* ('And,' conjunction)" + aorist verb, etc.; 8:16a (aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle of "*daimonizomenous*" / "that were possessed with devils") + 8:16b (new connected action) "*Kai* ('And,' conjunction)" + "*exebale*" / "he cast out," aorist verb, etc.; Matt. 8:33 (aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle) + Matt. 8:34 (new connected action) "*Kai* ('And,' conjunction)" + aorist verb, etc.; Matt. 12:9,10 (aorist participle + 2 aorist verbs + imperfect verb + present participle in "*echon*" / "having" = "had") + "*Kai* ('And,' conjunction)" + "*eperotesan*" / "they asked (aorist verb)" etc.; 14:35 (aorist participle + 2 aorist verbs + present participle in "*echontas*" / "having" = "that were") + Matt. 14:36 (new connected action) "*Kai* ('And,' conjunction)" + imperfect verb, etc.; Matt. 28:13b (starting at Quote: aorist verb + aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle of "*koimomenon*" / "sleeping" = "while … slept") + Matt. 28:14 (new connected action) "*Kai* ('And,' conjunction)" + aorist verb, etc.; Matt. 28:19 (aorist participle + aorist verb + [with no conjunction but still *a new connected action*] present participle of "*baptizontes*" / "baptizing") + Matt. 28:20 [with no conjunction but still *a new connected action*] present participle of "*didaskontes*" / "teaching" + present verb, etc. . (Though the slicing up of an aorist participle and aorist verb with a present participle in between them is not something I am generally considering for my relevant purposes of a sequential aorist participle and aorist verb, the interested reader my wish to compare and contrast a similar, though not identical stylistic grammatical format at Matt. 16:1 of aorist participle + present participle + a new connected action with an aorist verb + aorist infinitive).

conjunction of "*kai*") *o* (-) *Pater* (Father) *sou* ('of thee' = 'thy') *o* ('the [one]' = 'which') *blepon* ('seeing' = 'seeth,' present participle) *en* (in) *to* (-) *krupto* (secret) *apodosei* ('he shall reward' = 'shall reward,' future verb) *soi* (thee) *en* (in) *to* (-) *phanero* (openly)" (Matt. 6:6)[69].

The textual problem with the majority Byzantine text at Matt. 27:35b and Matt. 27:36 is now readily apparent, since it reads, "[verse 35] *staurosantes* ('they crucified,' aorist participle) *de* (And) *auton* (him), *diemerisanto* ('[and] they parted,' = 'and parted,' aorist verb) *ta* (the) *imatia* (garments) *autou* (of him), *ballontes* ('casting,' present participle) *kleron* (lots). [verse 36] *Kai* (And) *kathemenoi* (sitting down) *eterpoun* (they watched) *auton* (him) *ekei* (there);" etc. .

Does the majority Byzantine text's grammatical syntax of the Matt. 27:35b aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle "*ballontes* (casting)," here act as a *conjunctive preamble* to *a new connected action*, of a sufficient size to contain at least one more verb, *flowing out of* the section with the *aorist participle*, *aorist verb*, and *present participle*? Clearly it does not, for the action of verse 36 is not an action about the dividing of Christ's vesture, or associated casting of lots. And nor do *Minority Byzantine Reading 2's* additional words, "*ep'* ('for' or 'upon') *auta* (them)," since it is not *a new connected action*, of a sufficient size to contain at least one more verb.

Does the majority Byzantine text's grammatical syntax of the Matt. 27:35b aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle "*ballontes* (casting)," here use the present participle as part of a subsection, which is a *disjunctive section* of sufficient size to contain another verb, giving some elucidation on *what has been said* in the section with the *aorist participle* and *aorist verb*? Once again, clearly it does not, for the action of verse 36 is not an action about the dividing of Christ's vesture, or associated casting of lots. And nor do *Minority Byzantine Reading 2's* additional words, "*ep'* ('for' or 'upon') *auta* (them)," since it is not a *disjunctive section* of sufficient size to contain another verb.

Does the majority Byzantine text's grammatical syntax of the Matt. 27:35b aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle "*ballontes* (casting)," here act as the preamble to a quote, whether a general quote or a specific quote from Old Testament Scripture? Once again, clearly it does not. And once against, clearly *Minority Byzantine Reading 2's* additional words, "*ep'* ('for' or 'upon') *auta* (them)," do not constitute such a quote either.

Therefore the grammatical syntax of the Matt. 27:35b aorist participle + aorist verb + present participle "*ballontes* (casting)," here *falls flat* in both *Minority Byzantine Reading 2* and *The Majority Byzantine Reading*. Coming in grammatical connection with an aorist participle and aorist verb, this "*ballontes*" is very much the proverbially "lead balloon." This is simply not the way St. Matthew writes. *This is clearly not*

---

[69] See 18:34 (aorist participle + 2 aorist verbs + present participle) + 18:35 (subsection marking conjunction of "*outo kai*" / "So likewise" + future verb + aorist verb).

Matthean Greek!   Something is missing!   But what?   It seems we are looking for some missing text which deals *with an action about the dividing of Christ's vesture, or associated casting of lots* and / or is a quote.   But since there is no contextual dialogue going on here, if it is a missing quote, then it most likely will be a specific quote from Old Testament Scripture.

At this juncture we find that *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* fits the requirements like the missing slipper put by the prince on Cinderella's foot.   *It is exactly what we are looking for!   It is a PERFECT FIT!*   Therefore *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* must be the correct reading.

However, this now presents us with a second concomitant textual issue, since there is some internal variation within *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* which does not affect its basic meaning.   *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* reads Greek, "*ina* (that) *ple̱ro̱the̲* (it might be fulfilled) *to* (which) *re̲then* (was spoken) **upo** (by) **/** **dia** (by)   *tou* (the) *prophe̲tou* (prophet), **Diemerisanto** ('They parted,' indicative <u>middle</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diamerizo̲*) / **Diemerisan** ('They parted,' indicative <u>active</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diamerizo̲*), *ta* (-) *imatia* (garments) *mou* (my) *eautois* (among them), *kai* (and) *epi* (upon) *ton* (-) *imatismon* (vesture) *mou* (my) *ebalon* (did they cast) *kle̲ron* (lots)," i.e., "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, they parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots" (AV).

Minority Byzantine Reading 1a uses "**upo** ('by,' internal component 1)" + "**Diemerisanto** ('They parted,' internal component 2, indicative <u>middle</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diamerizo̲*)."

Minority Byzantine Reading 1b uses "**dia** ('by,' internal component 1)" + "**diemerisanto** ('They parted,' internal component 2, indicative <u>middle</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diamerizo̲*)."

Minority Byzantine Reading 1c uses "**dia** ('by,' internal component 1)" + "**diemerisan** ('They parted,' internal component 2, indicative <u>active</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diamerizo̲*)."

Before considering the issues posed by internal component 1 in *Minority Byzantine Readings 1a, 1b, & 1c*, let us first consider the wider issue of OT quotes in Matthean Greek with respect to the first component, namely, the usage of "*upo* (by)" or "*dia* (by)" in the preamble to the OT quote.   This shall be done through reference to those passages already isolated, *supra*, where the preamble has broad grammatical similarities to that of Matt. 27:35b.   The words in bold in the following stylistically similar preambles to OT quotes in St. Matthew's Gospel are the same as those in the Matt. 27:35b quote, and the "**upo** (by)" / "**dia** (by)" is placed in both bold and italics.

Type A) Having in common with Matt. 27:35b: "***ina*** (that) ***pl<u>e</u>r<u>o</u>th<u>e</u>*** ('it might be fulfilled') ***to*** ('the [thing]' = 'which') ***r<u>e</u>then*** ('being spoken' = 'spoken')" + "***DIA*** (by) ***tou*** (the) ***proph<u>e</u>tou*** (prophet)":	Type B) Having in common with Matt. 27:35b: "***pl<u>e</u>r<u>o</u>th<u>e</u>*** ('it might be fulfilled') ***to*** ('the [thing]' = 'which') ***r<u>e</u>then*** ('being spoken' = 'spoken')" + "***DIA*** (by)" + "***tou*** (the) ***proph<u>e</u>tou*** (prophet)":

At Matt. 1:22, "***ina*** (that) ***pl<u>e</u>r<u>o</u>th<u>e</u>*** ('it might be fulfilled') ***to*** ('the [thing]' = 'which') ***r<u>e</u>then*** ('being spoken' = 'spoken') *upo* ('by,' redundant in English translation if like the AV translators one renders the 'of' in following genitive) *tou* ('of the' if rendering the genitive, or 'the' if regarding the genitive as redundant as translating the previous 'by,') *Kuriou* (Lord) ***DIA*** (by) ***tou*** (the) ***proph<u>e</u>tou*** (prophet), *legontos* (saying)," etc. .
 	
     At Matt. 4:14,15, "***ina*** (that) ***pl<u>e</u>r<u>o</u>th<u>e</u>*** ('it might be fulfilled') ***to*** ('the [thing]' = 'which') ***r<u>e</u>then*** ('being spoken' = 'spoken') ***DIA*** (by) *Hsaiou* (Esais) ***tou*** (the) ***proph<u>e</u>tou*** (prophet), *legontos* (saying)," etc. .
 	
     At Matt. 21:4, "***ina*** (that) ***pl<u>e</u>r<u>o</u>th<u>e</u>*** ('it might be fulfilled') ***to*** ('the [thing]' = 'which') ***r<u>e</u>then*** ('being spoken' = 'spoken') ***DIA*** (by) ***tou*** (the) ***proph<u>e</u>tou*** (prophet), *legontos* (saying)," etc. .
	At Matt. 8:17 & Matt. 12:17, "*Op<u>o</u>s* (that) ***pl<u>e</u>r<u>o</u>th<u>e</u>*** ('it might be fulfilled') ***to*** ('the [thing]' = 'which') ***r<u>e</u>then*** ('being spoken' = 'was spoken') ***DIA*** (by) *Hsaiou* (Esais) ***tou*** (the) ***proph<u>e</u>tou*** (prophet), *legontos* (saying)," etc. .
	
	At Matt. 13:35 "*Op<u>o</u>s* (that) ***pl<u>e</u>r<u>o</u>th<u>e</u>*** ('it might be fulfilled') ***to*** ('the [thing]' = 'which') ***r<u>e</u>then*** ('being spoken' = 'was spoken') ***DIA*** (by) ***tou*** (the) ***proph<u>e</u>tou*** (prophet), *legontos* (saying)," etc.

Type C) Having in common with Matt. 27:35b: "***to*** ('the [thing]' = 'which') ***r<u>e</u>then*** ('being spoken' = 'spoken')" + "***DIA*** (by)" + "***tou*** (the) ***proph<u>e</u>tou*** (prophet)":	Type D) Having in common with Matt. 27:35b: "***to*** ('the [thing]' = 'which') ***r<u>e</u>then*** ('being spoken' = 'spoken')" + "***tou*** (the) ***proph<u>e</u>tou*** (prophet)":
At Matt. 27:9 "*Tote* (then) *epl<u>e</u>r<u>o</u>th<u>e</u>* (was fulfilled) ***to*** ('the [thing]' = 'that which') ***r<u>e</u>then*** ('being spoken' = 'was spoken') ***DIA*** (by) *Ieremiou* (Jeremy) ***tou*** (the) ***proph<u>e</u>tou*** (prophet), *legontos* (saying)," etc. .	At Matt. 2:17, "*Tote* (then) *epl<u>e</u>r<u>o</u>th<u>e</u>* (was fulfilled) ***to*** ('the [thing]' = 'that') ***r<u>e</u>then*** ('being spoken' = 'was spoken') ***UPO*** (by) *Ieremiou* (Jeremy) ***tou*** (the) ***proph<u>e</u>tou*** (prophet), *legontos* (saying)," etc. .

On the one hand, it is clear that none of these preambles to the OT quotes are identical with that at Matt. 27:35b, since more widely while St. Matthew generally uses "*legontos* (saying)" before an OT quote, this a general, not absolute rule (e.g., Matt. 2:23, *supra*).   Thus in Matt. 24:15, Christ refers to "the abomination of desolation" (see, "the abomination that maketh desolate" in Dan. 11:31; cf. Luke 21:20) of the Roman armies involved in the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., "*re̲then* ('being spoken' = 'spoken of') **DIA** (by) *Daniel* (Daniel) **tou** (the) **prophe̲tou** (prophet), *esto̲s* ('standing' = 'stand') *en* (in) *topo̲* (place) *'agio̲ / hagio̲* (holy)" (Dan. 11:31, see "arms *shall stand* … and they shall pollute *the sanctuary*").   (Cf. Matt. 2:5.)

But on the other hand, it is also clear that St. Matthew has a general preference for "*dia* (by)" over "*upo* (by)" in such quotes; and that when all the constituent elements of Matt. 27:35b are present (Type A quotes, *supra*), or most are present (Type B quotes, *supra*), St. Matthew always uses "*dia* (by)" rather than "*upo* (by)."   Therefore, on this stylistic basis, I consider the "*dia* (by)" of *Minority Byzantine Readings 1b & 1c* is to be preferred over the "*upo* (by)" of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1a*.

The origins of internal component 1 as found in *Minority Byzantine Reading 1a* are conjectural.   Was the replacement of the "*dia* (by)" by "*upo* (by)" in *Minority Byzantine Reading 1a* an accidental alteration following a paper fade / loss, or a deliberate alteration?   Either way, it was probably made after a scribe's superficial glance at the "*upo*" of Matt. 1:22 (whose eye stopped once he spotted the "*upo*" before "*Kuriou*" / "Lord," without recognizing that the following "*dia* (by)" forms part of the relevant grammatical section, *supra*) and / or Matt. 2:17 (in which the scribe failed to see the difference in this Type D OT quote of Matt. 2:17 relative to the Type A & B OT quotes, amidst the admitted stylistic similarity of the Types A, B, C, & D, OT quotes, *supra*).

Was the replacement of the "*dia* (by)" by "*upo* (by)" a deliberate or accidental alteration?   We cannot be sure.   But either way, it seems that Erasmus of Rotterdam, "always after a good textual trademark," located and found this difference of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1a* where it varied from the *Minority Byzantine Reading 1b*.   As to where Erasmus might found this "textual trademark," I do not know, but this acts to raise "a kite" I sometimes like to "fly[70]," namely, given both their *relative* abundance and cost, and Erasmus's usage of a cursive script in e.g., his editions of 1516 & 1522 which *might* have been at least to some extent influenced by the cursive scripts of some Greek Lectionaries, raises the question of whether or not Erasmus (and indeed other neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries), might have used a *relatively small number* of Byzantine Greek Lectionaries in their private libraries?   Certainly there has never been any positive proof for such a conjecture ever found, and possibly it is wrong; but possibly it is right.   This means that one *speculative* possibility is that Erasmus found this

---

[70]   See Textual Commentary Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, section "*Determining the representative Byzantine Text*;" & my comments at Matt. 27:45,46a (Vol. 4, Matt. 26-28, Appendix 1).

Minority Byzantine Reading 1a in a Greek Lectionary he held in his private library.

While the issue of where Erasmus may have found this *Minority Byzantine Reading 1a* remains *uncertain* and *conjectural*, what is certain is that he evidently adopted the reading "*upo* (by)" in the place of "*dia* (by)," as a "textual trademark." Then, as a mark of respect to Erasmus, this "textual trademark" which in combination with other such instances that do not affect meaning or translation acted to identify "an Erasmian text," was later also followed by subsequent neo-Byzantines in e.g., Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633). But my opposition to such "textual trademarks" is unequivocal, and hence I maintain that Scrivener's Text (1894 & 1902) should here be altered from "*upo* (by)" to "*dia* (by)."

This now brings us to the second component.

Minority Byzantine Reading 1a uses "**upo** ('by,' internal component 1)" + **Diemerisanto** ('They parted,' internal component 2, indicative <u>middle</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diameriz<u>o</u>*)."

Minority Byzantine Reading 1b uses "**dia** ('by,' internal component 1)" + "*diemerisanto* ('They parted,' internal component 2, indicative <u>middle</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diameriz<u>o</u>*)."

Minority Byzantine Reading 1c uses "**dia** ('by,' internal component 1)" + "*diemerisan* ('They parted,' internal component 2, indicative <u>active</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diameriz<u>o</u>*)."

The Latin translation of the word at internal component 2, is "*Diviserunt* ('They parted,' indicative <u>active</u> perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *divido*)." On the one hand, there is no middle voice in Latin which only has an active or a passive voice, but in broad terms Gildersleeve says, "The Latin passive corresponds to the Greek middle[71]." Hence on this basis it might be argued that the Latin here is supporting *Minority Byzantine Reading 1c*, Greek "*diemerisan* ('They parted,' indicative <u>active</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diameriz<u>o</u>*)." But on the other hand, in NT Koine Greek the middle voice was increasingly redundant and carried an active meaning, i.e., a deponent, *infra*. Therefore, given that a Latin scribe may have considered the Greek middle voice here was a deponent Greek middle with an active meaning, it might also be argued that the Latin here was translated from *Minority Byzantine Readings 1a or 1b*, Greek "*diemerisanto* ('They parted,' indicative <u>middle</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diameriz<u>o</u>*)." Hence the Latin does not help us resolve this internal component 2 issue, any more than the Latin "*per* (by)" helps us resolve the internal component 1 issue. Therefore the most that can be said about the Latin readings in Latin Vulgate Codices Z, P, A, & Phi, and old Latin a, b, h, q, aur, r1, & c, *supra*, is that they support *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*.

---

[71] Basil Gildersleeve's *Latin Grammar* (1st ed. 1867, 2nd ed. 1872, 3rd ed. 1895), *op. cit.*, p. 150, section 212.

Before considering the issues posed by internal component 2 in *Minority Byzantine Readings 1a, 1b, & 1c*, let us first consider the wider issue of OT quotes with special reference to the Septuagint (LXX) in Matthean Greek. With regard to the Septuagint, St. Matthew uses three types of Old Testament quotes. Firstly, those which are a precision Septuagint quote (e.g., Matt. 4:4 // Deut. 8:3, LXX[72]; Matt. 4:7 // Deut. 6:16, LXX). Secondly, those which are a modified Septuagint quote which partly uses the Septuagint and partly changes the Septuagint (e.g., Matt. 1:22 // Isa. 7:14, changing the LXX's "*kaleseis*" / "thou shalt call," indicative active future, 2nd person singular verb, from *kaleo*, to "*kalesousi*" / "they shall call," indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *kaleo*[73]; Matt. 3:3 // Isa. 40:3, changing the LXX's "*tou Theou emon*" / "of our God," to "*autou*" / "of him" = "his," AV). And thirdly, OT quotes that use a source other than the Septuagint, and while it is possible that they are coming from some source(s) known in NT times but now lost to us, as far as we presently know, these are fresh translations of the Hebrew into Greek by St. Matthew (e.g., Matt. 2:6 // Micah 5:2; Matt. 2:18 // Jer. 31:15[74]).

As I have previously discussed, St. Matthew is happy to use precision Septuagint quotes where they are accurate renderings. E.g., he uses some precise Septuagint quotes from The Ten Commandments at Matt. 19:18,19[75]. This now brings us to the issue of internal component 2 in *Minority Byzantine Readings 1a, 1b, & 1c*, because the rendering found in *Minority Byzantine Readings 1a & 1b* is a precise Septuagint quote from Ps. 22:18 (LXX), "*Diemerisanto* ('They parted,' indicative middle aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diamerizo*), *ta* (-) *imatia* (garments) *mou* (my) *eautois* (among them), *kai* (and) *epi* (upon) *ton* (-) *imatismon* (vesture) *mou* (my) *ebalon* (did they cast) *kleron* (lots)" (Ps. 22:18, LXX[76]), i.e., "they parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots" (Matt. 27:35b, AV).

It is significant that here at Matt. 27:35b the difference between the "*diemerisanto*

---

[72] Although St. Matthew twice removes the LXX's definite articles i.e., "*o* ('the,' redundant in English translation) *anthropos* (man)" (LXX) becomes "*anthropos* (man)" (Matt. 4:4), and "*to* ('the [one],' redundant in English translation) *ekporeuomeno* ('proceeding' = 'that proceedeth')" (LXX) becomes "*ekporeuomeno* ('proceeding' = 'that proceedeth');" I still regard this as a precision LXX quote since the Koine Greek of NT times lacked anything equivalent to e.g., our dots "…" for a left out word, which is basically what is happening here.

[73] See Textual Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), at Matt. 1:23.

[74] In its different Septuagint form, this verse is found at Jer. 38:15 (LXX).

[75] See Textual Commentary Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), at Matt. 19:19.

[76] In its Septuagint form, this verse is found at Ps. 21, and there numbered variously as verse 18 (Brenton) or 19 (Rahlfs-Hanhart).

('They parted,' indicative <u>middle</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diamerizo*)" of *Minority Byzantine Readings 1a & 1b* and the "*diemerisan* ('They parted,' indicative <u>active</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *diamerizo*)" of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1c*, is the difference between a middle voice (*Minority Byzantine Readings 1a & 1b*) and an active voice (*Minority Byzantine Reading 1c*). The middle voice conveys the idea that a subject was doing or getting something done in his own interests, or intimately participating in the action's results. But it was falling into disuse in NT Koine Greek, and thus is often a deponent i.e., a middle form with an active meaning[77].

We cannot doubt that St. Matthew reflects this same trend since his Gospel contains many such instances of a deponent usage of the middle voice (e.g., Matt. 2:1, "*paregenonto*" / "they came" = "there came," AV, indicative <u>middle</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *paraginomai*). Although to this must be made the qualification that with both OT quotes and elsewhere, he seems to reflect a higher usage of the older sense of the middle than other NT writers (e.g. it is said of the Christ at Matt. 2:6 // Micah 5:2, "*exeleusetai*" / "he shall come" = "shall come," AV, indicative <u>middle</u> future, 3rd person singular verb, from *exerchomai*; or it is said of Judas Iscariot at Matt. 27:5, "*apegzato*" / "he hanged himself" = "hanged himself," AV, indicative <u>middle</u> aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apagcho*[78]). It might also be remarked that whether or not some such instances of the middle voice, especially in St. Matthew's Gospel, are or are not deponents, may be disputed between different persons.

On the one hand, this means that here at Matt. 27:35b, since St. Matthew is at least generally following the Septuagint form of Ps. 22:18, if he here used a middle voice, he would be more likely to be attributing to it the older Septuagint sense of the word than would other NT writers, and so less likely to change it to the active voice on the basis that the middle was a deponent. But on the other hand, if he did favour an active meaning, the fact that the middle could be understood as a deponent would mean that he could still leave it as a middle. Given that in general terms St. Matthew, that is, the Holy Ghost speaking through St. Matthew, only starts with a Septuagint quote and then changes the Septuagint quote when he has *a very good reason to*, and given that no such good reason appears to exist here at Matt. 27:35b in which the rest of this quote is from the Septuagint form of Ps. 22:18, I think it reasonable to conclude that *on the balance of probabilities* the correct Matthean reading here at internal component 2 of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* at Matt. 27:35b, is the middle voice of *Minority Byzantine Readings 1a & 1b*, rather than the active voice of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1c*.

---

[77] Whittaker's *New Testament Greek Grammar*, *op. cit.*, p. 34; Young's *Greek*, pp. 134-5.

[78] By standard seminary Greek convention, Greek "γ" ("g" / gamma) would here be rendered by an "n," i.e., Greek "απηγξατο" would be transliterated, "*apenzato*," and the root word, Greek, "απαγχω" would be transliterated, "*apancho*." While I sometimes follow such conventions, I think a more literal form of transliteration is often preferable. But I am not dogmatic on such matters. *Ad libitum!* (Latin, "toward pleasure," meaning that on a given issue, let a man may do, "As you wish!").

This means that the full quote of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* is most accurately preserved in its Matthean Greek form in *Minority Byzantine Reading 1b*.   This is the Greek form used by e.g., Codex Phi 043 (6th century).

The origins of internal component 2 as found in *Minority Byzantine Reading 1c* are speculative.   Was the replacement of the "*diemerisanto* ('They parted,' middle voice)" found in *Minority Byzantine Readings 1a & 1b* by "*diemerisan* ('They parted,' active voice)" found in *Minority Byzantine Reading 1c* an accidental alteration?   Due to a paper fade, did the original "*diemerisanto*," come to look something like, "*diemerisan::*"?   Was this paper fade, possibly coming at the end of a line, missed by a scribe, who copied it out as "*diemerisan*," thus giving rise to this internal component 2 variant (*Minority Byzantine Reading 1c*)?

Was the replacement of the "*diemerisanto* ('They parted,' middle voice)" found in *Minority Byzantine Readings 1a & 1b* by "*diemerisan* ('They parted,' active voice)" found in *Minority Byzantine Reading 1c* a deliberate alteration?   Did a scribe, knowing that many middle voice words in NT Greek are deponents with the sense of an active voice, think it "a stylistic improvement" in "the interests of clarity" to specifically change the middle voice "*diemerisanto*" to the active voice "*diemerisan*"?[79]

Was this internal component 2 variant of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1c* departure from the correct reading of internal component 2 in *Minority Byzantine Readings 1a & 1b* a deliberate or accidental alteration?   We do not now know.   But we do know that *on the balance of probabilities* it was a change to the original text here preserved for us at Matt. 27:35b in the internal component 2 readings of *Minority Byzantine Readings 1a & 1b*.

Having now discovered that within *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* the correct reading of the *Textus Receptus* in the Greek is found in its pure form of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1b* now further raises the issue of the origins of both *Minority Byzantine Reading* the *Majority Byzantine Reading*.

Minority Byzantine Reading 2 omits the same words as the *Majority Byzantine Reading*, but then adds in their place at the end of Matt. 27:35b, "*ep'* (= '*epi*,' 'for' or 'upon') *auta* (them)" i.e., "casting lots for (*ep'*) them (*auta*)."   The origins of *Minority Byzantine Reading 2* are conjectural.   But these words appear to be a semi-assimilation with Mark 15:24 which reads, "*ballontes* (casting) *klēron* (lots) *ep'* ('for' / 'upon') *auta* (them)."

Was *Minority Byzantine Reading 2* an accidental addition?   Did a scribe with either a side-note on his manuscripts saying something was lost here due to an earlier damaged manuscript, or simply with enough feel for Matthean Greek to know that something was missing here at Matt. 27:35b, but not enough feel for Matthean Greek to

---

[79]   Cf. Textual Commentary, Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), at Matt. 19:20.

know what it was that was missing, adopt the words "*ep'* (upon) *auta* (them)" from the Marcan Greek of Mark 15:24 as "a reconstruction" of the missing section?

Was *Minority Byzantine Reading 2* a deliberate addition? Did a scribe possibly working from a corrupt manuscript with the *Majority Byzantine Reading*, make a semi-assimilation with Mark 15:24 by adding in "*ep'* (upon) *auta* (them)" in order to create "a more standard Gospel text" between Matt. 27:35 and Mark 15:24?

The Majority Byzantine Reading at Matt. 27:35b is, "*staurosantes* (they crucified) *de* (And) *auton* (him), *diemerisanto* ([and] parted) *ta* (the) *imatia* (garments) *autou* (of him), *ballontes* (casting) *kleron* (lots)." By contrast, the Received Text additionally reads, "*ina* (that) *plerothe* (it might be fulfilled) *to* (which) *rethen* (was spoken) *dia* (by) *tou* (the) *prophetou* (prophet), *Diemerisanto* (They parted), *ta* (-) *imatia* (garments) *mou* (my) *eautois* (among them), *kai* (and) *epi* (upon) *ton* (-) *imatismon* (vesture) *mou* (my) *ebalon* (did they cast) *kleron* (lots)."

Was the *Majority Byzantine Reading* an accidental loss? We know from Manuscript Washington (W 032), that there were sometimes paper defects in manuscripts that required the scribe "to dodge around" them (see *Codex Freerianus* at p. 75 on Matt. 20:30-21:6 & p. 76 on Matt. 21:6-15). Highlighting in bold the relevant letters and words, did the page of a scribe look something like the following (albeit in Greek letters, rather than these transliterated English letters), perhaps with a paper defect running across lines 2 & 3 that I shall symbolize by "(***)" (line 2) and "(****)" (line 3), requiring that it be skirted around by the scribe.

> *... ... ... staurosant*
> *es de* (***) *auton diemerisanto ta imatia autou* **ballon**tes **kleron**
> *ina* (****) *plerothe to rethen dia tou prophetou Diemerisant*
> *o ta imatia mou eautois kai epi ton imatismon mou e***balon kleron**

Did the scribe first write down "*autou* (of him), *ballontes* (casting) *kleron* (lots)"? In a somewhat vague moment, did his eye then jump from "*ballontes* (casting) *kleron* (lots)" down to "*ebalon* (did they cast) *kleron* (lots)," and mixing up in his mind these two instances of "*kleron*," (possibly also with a common "*sant*" ending on the previous line about the "*kleron*,") did he then start quickly writing on with the words of Matt. 27:36, thus accidentally omitting this portion of the TR's text? (Cf. Matt. 27:40, "Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion," on Lectionary 1968 at p. 197a, *infra*.)

Was the *Majority Byzantine Reading* a deliberate loss? Did a prunist assimilationist scribe remove these words as a semi-assimilation with Mark 15:24,25 and / or Luke 23:34,35 in order to produce a "more standard Gospel text"? Alternatively, did a Marcionite heretic who disliked the Old Testament deliberately prune away this OT quote and its preamble in order to produce the reading of the majority Byzantine text?

Were all these departures from the Received Text of Matt. 27:35b, *supra*, deliberate or accidental changes? Or were some deliberate, and other accidental? We

do not now know for sure.   We cannot now know for sure.   But we can be sure that they were changes to the *Textus Receptus* here Providentially preserved for us.

As stated in "Preliminary Textual Discussion," *supra*, the combined strength of *Byzantine Readings 1 & 2* is in the range of below 1% up to *c.* 10%, so that while we do not know the full Greek manuscript strength of the TR's *Minority Byzantine Readings 1b*, it might be a figure as high as *c.* 10%, or as low as below 1%, or something in between these two limits.   But on the Greek manuscript strength that at present we can definitely itemize, it is certainly below 1% of the Byzantine manuscripts, since at least to date the TR's *Minority Byzantine Readings 1b* has only been specifically documented in four Greek textual manuscripts.   (Although there is also the secondary support of a further five Greek manuscripts following either *Minority Byzantine Reading 1a* or *1c*).   Therefore, it is to be noted that the oldest Greek witness which preserves any form of *Minority Byzantine Readings 1* at Matt. 27:35b is that of Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century).

On the one hand, we have some relatively strong textual support for *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* in the Latin textual tradition, with e.g., seven or about half of the old Latin Versions.   But on the other hand, while the Greek manuscript support for the TR's reading is an uncertain figure of something in the range of below 1% up to *c.* 10%, in terms of what we can presently definitively show, it is less than 1%; for in the Greek we have but four known textual manuscripts showing the perfectly correct reading of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1b*; although to this must be coupled the secondary support in the Greek for *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* that comes from one Greek manuscript for *Minority Byzantine Reading 1a*, and three Greek manuscripts for *Minority Byzantine Reading 1c*.   Thus with respect to the Greek reading of the *Textus Receptus* at Matt. 27:35b, a special place of honour must be accorded to its preservation in the near word perfect *Minority Byzantine Reading 1a* found in the early mediaeval writings of Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century), *supra*.

The TR's reading at Matt. 27:35b is clearly supported by textual analysis.   As *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* it is preserved in its Greek form over time with Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century) in early mediaeval times, and then Lectionary 1074 in the late 13th century; and through time with Codex Phi 043 (6th century) in early mediaeval times, Minuscules 262 (10th century), 1187 (11th century), 1188 (11th / 12th century), and 924 (12th century), and Lectionaries 547 (13th century) and 1074 (1290 A.D.) in later mediaeval times.   The TR's reading has further impressive support in the Latin textual tradition over time with e.g., old Latin a (4th century) in ancient times, and Bernadino Donato's Latin translation of Eusebius (late 15th / 16th century); and through time with old Latin b (5th century) and h (5th century) in ancient times, and then old Latin q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), and r1 (7th century); together with Latin Vulgate Codices Z (6th / 7th century), P (6th / 7th century), A (7th / 8th century), and Phi (8th / 9th century); and old Latin c in latter mediaeval times (12th / 13th century). Indeed, in recognition of this Latin support, Codex P (6th / 7th century, The Split, Croatia), has been honoured in these commentaries with the Latin name of *Codex*

Illyricianus from Matt. 27:35b onwards[80].   This combination of the Greek and Latin means that this reading was always clearly present and accessible in the Greek and Latin textual traditions.

Nevertheless, the adoption of internal component 2 of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* as the middle voice of *Minority Byzantine Readings 1a & 1b*, rather than the active voice of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1c*, has only been determined on the lower standard of evidence which is *on the balance of probabilities*, rather than on the higher standard of evidence which is *beyond a reasonable shadow of doubt*.   Furthermore, in its absolute Greek textual purity of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1b*, it is only found in four Greek mansucripts, the earliest of which is from early mediaeval times, to wit, the purple parchment, *Codex Beratinus* (Phi 043, 6th century).   Moreover, there is some relatively small textual support for *Minority Byzantine Reading 2*; and the *Majority Byzantine Reading* has the support of *c.* 90% + of the Greek manuscripts, and in the Latin, the Vulgate and about half the old Latin Versions, together with a few ancient church writers in the Latin.

Here at Matt. 27:35b we see a good example of the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, working humbly with the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*; since on the one hand, the textual analysis in favour of the TR's reading is *on the Greek* and *not on the Latin*; but on the other hand, the textual support for the TR's reading is far more strongly present in the Latin than the Greek.   Weighing up all these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 27:35b 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. 27:35b, is *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, they parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots" (AV).   In its entirely pure form it is found in *Minority Byzantine Reading 1b*.

Minority Byzantine Reading 1a with Greek, "*upo* (by)" + "*diemerisanto* (They parted)," is found outside the Byzantine textual tradition and outside the closed class of sources in Minuscule 205 (15th century, independent in the Gospels & Revelation); 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*.

Minority Byzantine Reading 1b which is the TR's reading in its complete purity, with Greek, "*dia* (by)" + "*diemerisanto* (They parted)," is found outside the Byzantine

---

[80]   See Textual Commentary Vol. 4 (Matt. 26-28), Preface, "Codex Illyricianus (Latin Codex P in Weber-Gryson) is named."

textual tradition and outside the closed class of sources in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere; here spelling the TR's penultimate word, "*ebalon*" / "did they cast" as the spelling variant, "*eballon*"), 1243 (11th century, independent outside of the General Epistles), and 1071 (12th century, independent). 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*.

Minority Byzantine Reading 1b is also largely found outside the Byzantine textual tradition and outside the closed class of sources in the similar reading of (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century) which changes "*eautois* (among them)" to "*autois* ('unto them' = 'among them')."

Minority Byzantine Reading 1c with Greek, "*dia* (by)" + "*diemerisan* (They parted)," is found outside the Byzantine textual tradition and outside the closed class of sources in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).

Minority Byzantine Reading 1 is further found outside the Byzantine textual tradition and outside the closed class of sources in the Syriac Harclean h Version (616); Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Anglo-Saxon Version (8th to 10th centuries). A similar reading is also found in some manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version; as well as the Ethiopic Version (Takla Haymanot, *c.* 500).

Minority Byzantine Reading 2 which omits the TR's words of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* and in there place reads, "for / upon them" i.e., "casting lots upon them," is found outside the Byzantine textual tradition and outside the closed class of sources in Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type); as well as the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century).

The Majority Byzantine Reading which omits the TR's words of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*, is found outside the Byzantine textual tradition and outside the closed class of sources 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), 565 (9th century, independent), a "corrector" scribe of 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (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), and 579 (13th century, mixed text). It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); Ethiopic Versions (Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9); and Slavic Version (9th century). A similar reading is also found in a manuscript of the Syriac Palestinian Version.

At Matt. 27:35b, the incorrect *Majority Byzantine Reading* as found outside the Byzantine textual tradition and outside the closed class of sources in the two leading Alexandrian texts, and leading representative of the Western text, *et al*, was adopted by the Burgonites Majority Texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). This erroneous reading was also adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Hence at Matt. 27:35b the ASV omits verse 35b, joining this to verse 36 and so reading, "…they parted his garments among them, casting lots; and they sat and watched him there" (Matt. 27:35b-36, ASV). So too, the incorrect reading is found at Matt. 27:35b in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV (with a footnote referring to the TR's reading), NIV (with a footnote referring to the TR's reading in the 1st & 2nd editions, but no such footnote in the 3rd edition), TEV, TCNT, NEB, REB, and Moffatt Bible.

A footnote in the Burgonites' *New King James Version* says at Matt. 27:35b, "NU-Text and M[ajority]-Text omit the rest of this verse." When this footnote is read with the NKJV's claims in its "Preface," 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 in their round about and elongated manner, as one jumps between Preface and footnote, the NKJV translators are here saying that the Majority Text reading "corrects" the TR.

Interestingly, the NIV here shows us how the consciences of its translators came to be increasingly seared over time. For while the NIV's 1st edition (1978) & 2nd edition (1984) each had a footnote at least referring to the TR's reading, its new "politically correct" sex role pervert feminist language 3rd edition (2011) has no such footnote. A similar spiritual decline is also evident with Papists going from bad to worse, as they first denied the Divine Preservation of the (Byzantine) Greek textual tradition following the Council of Trent, and then denied the Divine Preservation of both the (Byzantine) Greek and Latin textual traditions following the Vatican II Council.

As a consequence of its undoubted strength in the Latin textual tradition, where the TR's reading has the support of about half the old Latin Versions dating from ancient times on, together with several Vulgate Codices e.g., *Codex Harleianus* (6th / 7th century) and *Codex Illyricianus* (6th / 7th century), the correct reading of the *Textus Receptus* was adopted here at Matt. 27:35b by the old Latin Papists of the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Thus the Douay-Rheims reads at Matt. 27:35b, "that is might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying: They divided my garments among them; and upon my vesture they cast lots." However, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post Vatican II Council times here omitted Matt. 27:35b in the Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB. Indeed, both the JB and NJB translators contain a footnote wickedly claiming that the TR's reading here is "a gloss taken from Jn 19:24."

Hence the *Book of the Chronicles of Neo-Byzantine Battles* records that here at Matt. 27:35b, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists *lunged with a knife into the back of the old Latin Papists whom their "father," the Pope, had decided were "no longer useful to him."* And as a blood-drenched old Latin Papist near death looked up at one of his new

neo-Alexandrian successors and exclaimed, "In the words of that Protestant playwright in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, '*Et tu, Brute!*'[81]; the new neo-Alexandrian Papist was heard to unsympathetically reply, "Shut ya' face.   We don't want to hear any of ya' Latin!"

This same type of thing is found in the rational of the NU Text Committee for adopting the erroneous reading at Matt. 27:35b, bearing in mind that under the neo-Alexandrians' circular logic, they generally consider "the shorter reading is the better reading, because the better reading is the shorter reading."   Thus the 1993 NU Text Committee made the bizarre claim of this erroneous reading of their NU Text, that "the text is certain" (UBS 4th revised edition, 1993, pp. 3 & 111).   Metzger says the NU Text "Committee was impressed by the absence of the passage from early witnesses of the Alexandrian and the Western types of the text … and the likelihood that copyists were influenced by the parallel passage in Jn. 19:24 …" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 2nd ed., 1994, p. 57).

We thus see a very great contrast here between both "the hackers" rules of so called "textual analysis" which characterize the Neo-Alexandrian School, together with the crude "let's take a vote of the Greek manuscripts irrespective of whether or not there is a textual problem with that majority" rule of the Burgonites on the one hand; and on the other hand, the refined and diligent form of true textual analysis as found in the Neo-Byzantine School of such learned luminaries as Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and Elzevir. The textual problem here at Matt. 27:35b "leapt out of the page" at the learnèd Erasmus, whose intellectual sense and feel for Matthean Greek meant that by the grace of God he could perceive a clear and obvious textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading.   And such neo-Byzantines as Stephanus, Beza, and Elzevir, were then all heard to cry in response to Erasmus's text here at Matt. 27:35b, "Aye!", "Aye!", "Aye!"

Matt. 27:40 "… save thyself.   If thou be the Son of God,
come down from the cross." (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion.

The First Matter.   In Lectionary 1968 the third reading of Matt. 27:40 is part of Matt. 27:39-54 (pp. 197a-198a), which in turn is contextually part of an eclectic Gospel reading made up of Matt. 27:1-38 (pp. 194b-196b) plus Luke 23:39-43 (pp. 196b-197a) plus Matt. 27:39-54 (pp. 197a-198a) plus John 19:31-37 (pp. 198a-198b) plus Matt. 27:55-61 (p. 198b).   This same long reading is also found in Lectionary 2378 (Matt. 27:1-38, pp. 94a column 1 to p. 95a column 2; + Luke 23:39-43, p. 95a column 2 to p. 95b, column 1; + Matt. 27:39-54, p. 95b, column 1 to p. 96a column 1; + John 19:31-37, p. 96a column 1 to p. 96a column 2; + Matt. 27:55-61, p. 96a column 2 to p. 96b column 1).

---

[81]   Latin, "*Et* (Also) *tu* (thou), *Brute!* (O Brutus!)" (Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, Act 3, Scene 1, Line 77).

Here in Lectionary 1968 at the start of the Matt. 27:39-54 reading on p. 197a, after the scribe wrote from Matt. 27:39 Greek, "*eblasphemoun* (reviled) *auton* (him)," instead of writing the next word, "*kinountes* (wagging)," his eye dropped one line from the "*ki*" of "*kinountes* (wagging)" down to the Matt. 27:40 "*kai*" of "*kai* (and) *legontes* (saying)," and so he wrote "*kai legontes*." But then suddenly realizing his mistake, he crossed out "*kai legontes*," and wrote back in the correct "*kinountes*," and then kept on writing.

We thus have preserved for us here at Lectionary 1968's p. 197a, "the snap shot" of "a scribal accident." This "accident scene" shows us how a considerable amount of text, here one line, can be lost in error, and of course, it may not always be recovered the way that this more adroit scribe of Lectionary 1968 recovered it. (Cf. "Was the *Majority Byzantine Reading* an accidental loss?" at Matt. 27:35b, "Principal Textual Discussion," *supra*.)

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex and *prima facie* follows the Vulgate's reading of Matt. 27:40 (Latin Diatessaron, chapter ccv). However, at Mark 15:30 the Vulgate lacks the TR's "and (Greek, *kai*; Latin, *et*)," and so it is possible that the Sangallensis Diatessaron is here making a semi-assimilation with the Vulgate's reading at Mark 15:30 as part of Diatessaron formatting. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron *prima facie* follows the variant's reading found in Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic as "*et* (and)" (Arabic Diatessaron, chapter li). But similar issues of a semi-assimilation as part of Diatessaron formatting with the TR's reading of Mark 15:30 which contains the word, "and (Greek, *kai*; Latin, *et*)," means that likewise no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 27:40 the TR's Greek reads, "*Ei* ('If,' word 1) *Yios* ('the Son,' word 2) *ei* ('thou be,' word 3) *tou* ('the,' word 4, redundant in English translation) *Theou* ('of God,' word 5), *katabethi* ('come down,' word 6) *apo* ('from,' word 7) *tou* ('the,' word 8) *staurou* ('cross,' word 9)," in the wider words of those "that passed by" and "reviled" Christ, "wagging their heads," (Matt. 27:39), "and saying, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God (*tou Theou*, words 4 & 5), come down (*katabethi*, word 6) from the cross" (Matt. 27:40) (AV & TR). The TR's Greek, "*tou* (-, word 4) *Theou* ('of God,' word 5), *katabethi* ('come down,' word 6)" 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, revowelling word 3 to "*katabethei*"), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and K 017 (9th 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), 1242 (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, thrice in three different readings[82]) and 1968 (1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings).

The TR's reading is also found in the Vulgate as Latin, "*Si* ('If,' word 1) *Filius* ('the Son,' word 2) *Dei* ('of God,' words 4 & 5) *es* ('thou be,' word 3) *descende* ('come down,' word 6) *de* ('from,' word 7) *cruce* ('the cross,' words 8 & 9)." The TR's Latin, "*Dei* ('of God,' words 4 & 5) *es* ('thou be,' word 3) *descende* ('come down,' word 6)," is supported in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century, after word order 3, 4 & 5), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.). 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, Eusebius (d. 339), Didymus (d. 398), Chrysostom (d. 407), Marcus of Eremita (d. after 430), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Greek writer, Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century). It is also the most probable reading of a manuscript by the ancient church Greek writer, Asterius of Amasea (d. after 341), where stylistic and contextual factors do not permit complete certainty.

However, a variant inserting Greek "*Kai* (And)," in between words 5 & 6, i.e., "and saying, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself if thou be the Son <u>of God</u> (*tou Theou*, words 4 & 5). And (*Kai*) <u>come down</u> (*katab<u>e</u>thi*, word 6) from the cross," is a minority Byzantine reading. It is 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), and Lectionary 387 (11th century, in one of two readings). It is also found inserting Latin, "*Et* (And)," before word 6, in old Latin Versions a (4th century, also adding what in English translation is a redundant "*tu*" / "thou" after "*es*" / "thou be" i.e., still reading in English "thou be"), b (5th century), d (5th century, after word order 3, 4 & 5), h (5th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also 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 thus must stand. The origins of the variant are conjectural, although it looks like it is a semi-assimilation with Mark 15:30 which reads, "Save thyself, and (*kai*) come down from the cross."

Was the variant an accidental addition? In a given manuscript, did a scribe first write the "*ka*" of "*katab<u>e</u>thi* ('come down,' word 6)" at the end of a line on a page? Did he then turn the page? Was he then momentarily distracted by an external stimulus?

---

[82] At Lectionary 2378's first (p. 84a, column 2) and third (p. 95b, column 1) readings, word 3 follows the TR's spelling; but at the second reading (p. 88a, column 1) word 3 is revowelled to "*katab<u>e</u>thei*."

Without thinking, and remembering in his head that he was up to "*katabethi*," did he then write out "*katabethi*" and keep going? Did a later scribe, looking at the "*ka*" on the first page, then conclude on the basis of Mark 15:30 that "this must be a '*kai*'"? Did he then "reconstruct" this as such a "*kai* (and)" at Matt. 27:40?

Was the variant a deliberate addition? Did an assimilationist scribe, seeking a "more standard Gospel text," deliberately add in the "*kai* (and)" as a semi-assimilation from Mark 15:30?

Was this a deliberate or accidental addition? We do not know. We cannot now know. But we can know that it was an addition to the 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, over time and through time, dating from ancient times. It also has good support in the Latin textual tradition with about half of the old Latin Versions dating from ancient times, together with the Latin Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome. It further enjoys the support of such ancient church writers as e.g., the church father and doctor, St. Augustine. By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, though some better 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. 27:40 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 27:40, "of God, come down," in the wider words, "Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is also 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). 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 Harclean h Version (616); a manuscript of the Syriac Palestinian Version; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the variant which adds "And" in between "of God" and "come down," thus reading, "Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself if thou be the Son of God. And (*Kai*) come down from the cross," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); and the Ethiopic Version (Takla Haymanot, *c.* 500). A similar reading is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); and some manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version.

The split in the two major Alexandrian texts caused a splitting headache for the neo-Alexandrians, who lacking any appreciable gifts or skills of textual analysis, are often "at sixes'n'sevens" as to what to do when these two flimsy and highly unreliable manuscripts disagree with one another. In "the pain'n'strain of it all," Tischendorf somewhat predictably fell back on his "trusty" Codex Sinaiticus, which having found in a dark'n'dirty corner on the Arabian Peninsula, he thereafter held an overly fond and quirky attachment to, and so he adopted the variant's reading in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). So too, Westcott & Hort, two semi-Romanist Puseyites who held the bizarre belief that when Codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus agreed they had "a neutral text," and that when they disagreed, generally speaking Codex Vaticanus was to be preferred, somewhat predictably fell back on their "trusty" Codex Vaticanus, and so for the wrong reasons adopted the correct reading of the TR here in Westcott-Hort (1881). Erwin Nestle, who generally liked to follow Westcott & Hort, but who from time to time disagreed with them "just to prove he wasn't really their puppet," on this occasion jumped over to follow the variant of Codex Sinaiticus in Nestle's 21st edition (1952).

Successive NU Text Committees were thoroughly baffled by it all. Their "brilliant" solution? To put the "*Kai* (And)" in square brackets as totally optional, which is what they did in the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). In doing so, the 1975 and 1983 NU Text Committee said, "there is a considerable degree of doubt" as to which is "the superior reading" here. The 1993 NU Text Committee said, "the Committee had difficulty in deciding which" of these two readings "to place in the text;" so that the variant "may be regarded as part of the text, but" in the present state of" neo-Alexandrian "scholarship" (I hear you say, "'scholarship'? Are these guys serious?") "this cannot be taken as completely certain."

What were the neo-Alexandrian translators, and in Moffatt's case, a semi neo-Alexandrian translator, to make of this messy and murky business? The ASV translators decided to follow Westcott & Hort's preference of Codex Vaticanus. "After all," on neo-Alexandrian rules "is not the shorter reading the better reading?" "Might not the

'*kai*' have been assimilated from Mark 15:30?" "And is there not external support for this reading" in e.g., the Syriac (Harclean) and Ethiopic Version? Thus at Matt. 27:40 the ASV reads, "… Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself: if thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross." So too, for the wrong reasons, the right reading of the TR was followed at Matt. 27:40 in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and Papists' JB.

But others decided to follow Tischendorf's preference of Codex Sinaiticus. "After all," on neo-Alexandrian rules "is not this the harder reading, and so the more likely reading?" "Might not the '*kai*' have been lost on a '*ka*' ellipsis of '*kai*'-'*katabethi*'?" "And is there not external support for this reading" in e.g., the Syriac (Pesitto) and Ethiopic Version (Takla Haymanot)? Thus the variant was followed in the TEV, Moffatt, and Papists' NJB. E.g., though Moffatt is not literal enough to specifically translate the "*Kai*" as "And" before "come down," he is clearly following the variant in his reading, "You were to destroy the temple and build it in three days! Save yourself, if you are God's Son! Come down from the cross!" (Moffatt Bible).

Matt. 27:41a "Likewise also" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Tischendorf (1869-72), von Soden (1913), and Nestle-Aland (1993), all consider that the Latin "*et* (also)" of the Vulgate and all old Latin Versions other than ff1, follows *Variant 1*, whereas the Latin, "*autem* (and) *et* (also)," of old Latin ff1 follows the TR's reading. I shall not now enter the issue of whether or not it might be reasonably argued that in fact the Vulgate *et al* are following the Greek "*de* ('and,' word 2)" by *et* (also)" rather that the Greek "*kai* ('also,' word 3)." More to the point, I think it might here be reasonably argued that as part of the act of translation from Greek into Latin, the two conjunctions of Greek "*de* ('and,' word 2)" and "*kai* ('also,' word 3)" were reduced to the one of Latin, "*et* (also)" on the basis that one of them was "redundant" given the presence of Greek "*omoios* ('Likewise,' word 1)" being rendered by Latin, "*Similiter* (Likewise)."

Therefore while I agree with Tischendorf (1869-72), von Soden (1913), and Nestle-Aland (1993), that old Latin ff1 here supports the TR's reading, *infra*; I consider that on this occasion it would be unsafe to hazard a guess at what the underpinning Greek text was here in the Latin of the Vulgate *et al*. Hence I do not itemize the readings of the Latin of the Vulgate *et al*, *infra*, although I do consider them when determining the TR's rating, *infra*.

Similar issues would affect *Variant 1* at those versions in various languages e.g., Armenian, generally itemized in these textual commentaries outside the closed class of sources. But because manuscripts outside the closed class of sources have no impact on the neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus*, I have decided to itemize them as given in Tischendorf (1869-72) and Nestle-Aland (1993). While the reader should therefore be aware that these non-Greek and non-Latin versions cited at *Variant 1* outside the closed class of sources may be wrong, their citation is nevertheless useful for showing how the

neo-Alexandrians think in the construction of their highly unreliable and very faulty neo-Alexandrian texts of the NT.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 27:41a the TR's Greek, "*omoi<u>o</u>s* ('Likewise,' word 1) *de* ('and,' word 2, regarded as redundant in English translation by AV translators) *kai* ('also,' word 3) *oi* (the) *archiereis* (chief priests)" i.e., "Likewise also the chief priests" etc. (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), M 021 (9th century), and Gamma 036 (10th century); Minuscule 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, thrice in three different readings[83]) and 1968 (1544 A.D., in two of three readings[84]). It is also supported as Latin, "*Similiter* ('Likewise,' word 1) *autem* ('and,' word 2) *et* ('also,' word 3) *principes* (the chief) *sacerdotum* ('of the priests' = 'priests')," in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339).

Variant 1, omitting word 2 and so reading, "*omoi<u>o</u>s* ('Likewise,' word 1) *kai* ('also,' word 3)," is a minority Byzantine reading. It is found in Codex K 017 (9th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., in one of three readings[85]). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339).

Variant 2, omitting words 2 & 3 and so reading, "Likewise (*omoi<u>o</u>s*) the chief priests" etc., is a minority Byzantine reading. 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-21:25), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), and Pi 041 (9th century).

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

Were *Variants 1 & 2* accidental omissions due to paper fades?

---

[83]   At Lectionary 2378's first (p. 84a, column 2) and second (p. 88a, column 1) readings, the kappa ("*k*") of word 3 is written as in standard seminary Greek as, "κ". But at the third reading (p. 95b, column 1), it is written as a "C." Thus in addition to this letter shape *sometimes* being used in this lectionary for an epsilon ("*e*", in standard seminary Greek, "ε" or as a capital letter, "E") or *sometimes* sigma ("*s*", in standard seminary Greek, "σ" or at the end of a word, "ς," or as a capital letter, "Σ"), it may *sometimes* also be used for a kappa. This type of calligraphy variation highlights some of the difficulties that may attend a hand-written manuscript.

[84]   The second (p. 189b) and third (p. 197a) readings.

[85]   The first reading (p. 183a).

Were *Variants 1 & 2* deliberate omissions exhibiting a common desire to prune down the text, with a number of prunist scribes considering these conjunctions made it "too wordy"?

Was one of these two variants an accidental omission, and the other a deliberate omission?

On the one hand, it would be possible to translate the TR's Greek, "*de* (word 2)" as "and," i.e., "And likewise also the chief priests" etc. .   But on the other hand, given the presence of both "*omoios* ('Likewise,' word 1)" and "*kai* ('also,' word 3)" at Matt. 27:41a, the "*de* (word 2)" was regarded as redundant in English translation by the AV translators who rendered this as "Likewise also the chief priests" etc. (AV).   So too, it was rendered "Likewise also the" etc. by Tyndale (1526 & 1534), Cranmer (1539), and the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560)[86].   Therefore, there is no necessary difference of translation between the reading of the TR and that of *Variant 1* at Matt. 27:41a.

However, with regard to *Variant 2*, the translation will necessarily be different to that of the TR i.e., "Likewise the chief priests" etc. .

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek over time, and through time, dating from ancient times with Eusebius, although the fact that Eusebius also refers to *Variant 1* means that his citation is not unequivocal.   The TR is supported by *c.* 90% plus of several thousand Byzantine manuscripts and has no good textual argument against it[87]. By contrast, *Variants 1 & 2* have relatively weak textual support in the Greek, and no good textual argument to commend them.   Eusebius refers to both the TR's reading and *Variant 1*, and he may well have been the originator of *Variant 1*.   Other than old Latin ff1 which follows the TR's reading, the issue of what to make of the Latin readings here at Matt. 27:41a is *in dubio*.   Weighing up these factors, giving full credence to the possibility that the *in dubio* Latin readings *might* have come from *Variant 1* Greek manuscripts, 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. 27:41a 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. 27:41a, "*de* ('and,' word 2, regarded as redundant in English translation by AV translators) *kai* ('also,' word

---

[86]   Compare e.g., the non-translation of the "*de* (and)" in "While the Pharisees" etc at Matt. 22:41 in Tyndale (1526 & 1534), Cranmer (1539), the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560), and the Authorized Version (1611).

[87]   The TR here has the support of von Soden's K group of about 1,000 manuscripts i.e., *c.* 90%+ of them, and so on any reasonable statistical projections, *c.* 90%+ of the overall Byzantine manuscript count of several thousand Gospel readings.

3),” in the wider words, “Likewise also the chief priests” (AV), is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is also found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 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).   It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h Version (616); Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 1, omitting word 2 (“*de*,” either redundant in translation or “and”) and so reading, “*omoios* (‘Likewise,’ word 1) *kai* (‘also,’ word 3),” i.e., (depending on how the TR is translated, being rendered into English the same as the TR,) “Likewise also the chief priests,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 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*; 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 (subject to the comments at “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” *supra*,) also found in: the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and Armenian Version (5th century).

Variant 2, omitting words 2 (“*de*,” either redundant in translation or “and”) and 3 (“*kai*” / “also”) and so reading, “Likewise the chief priests” etc., is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century).   It is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

For Tischendorf the split in the two main Alexandrian text was easy enough to resolve, since it was simply a case of following his beloved Codex Sinaiticus and thus *Variant 2* in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72).   By contrast, the split between the two main Alexandrian texts was resolved in favour of Codex Vaticanus’s *Variant 1* which from the general neo-Alexandrian paradigm has “better external support” than *Variant 2* in the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993).   But Westcott & Hort did not much believe in the more general neo-Alexandrian paradigm’s rule of “better external support,” and considered that when the two main Alexandrian texts agree they generally had “a neutral text,” and when they did not agree, Codex Vaticanus was generally to be preferred.   But another neo-Alexandrian rule here seems to have made them wonder if Codex Sinaiticus’s *Variant 2* should on this occasion be preferred over Codex Vaticanus’s *Variant 1*, namely, “the shorter reading is the better reading.”   Baffled by the data as fed through their circular neo-Alexandrian rules, on this occasion, Westcott-Hort (1881) placed the “*kai* (and)” of

Codex Vaticanus's *Variant 1* in their main text, but placed square brackets around it thus making it entirely optional so as to also represent the possibility that Codex Sinaiticus's *Variant 2* was "the better reading."   Erwin Nestle, who was loathe to disagree *too much* with Westcott & Hort, then followed the same Westcott-Hort "solution" in Nestle's 21st edition (1952).

The split in the two main Alexandrian texts also caused a corresponding 7:7 split in the neo-Alexandrian Versions considered in this commentary (*ASV-NASB-RSV-ESV-NRSV-NEB-Moffatt verses NASB-NIV-TEV-TCNT-REB-JB-NJB*).   Some neo-Alexandrians (or in the case of Moffatt, a semi neo-Alexandrian) preferred the neo-Alexandrian "comfort zone" of the "better external support" for Codex Vaticanus's *Variant 1*, and thus produced a translation the same as that of the TR in the AV *et al* where the "*de* ('and,' word 2)" is regarded as redundant in English translation.   Thus following *Variant 1* at Matt. 27:41a, the American Standard Version reads, "In like manner also the chief priests" etc. (ASV).   So too, *Variant 1* was followed in the NASB (2nd ed., 1977 & 3rd ed., 1995), RSV, ESV, NRSV, NEB, and Moffatt Bible.

However, at Matt. 27:41a, other neo-Alexandrians preferred the neo-Alexandrian "comfort zone" of "the shorter reading is the better reading," and thus Codex Sinaiticus's *Variant 2*.   Hence *Variant 2* was followed in the NASB (1st ed., 1960-1971), NIV, TEV, TCNT, and REB.   E.g., the New International Version (3rd ed., 2011) reads, "In the same way the chief priests" etc. (NIV).

The old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II Council times had "*et* (also)" in the Clementine Vulgate; and their Douay-Rheims read at Matt. 27:41a, "In like manner also the chief priests" etc. (Douay-Rheims).   But the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II times preferred "the shorter reading as the better reading," and thus *Variant 2* in the Papists' JB & NJB.

Matt. 27:41b "the chief priests … the scribes and elders, said" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*oi* (the) *archiereis* (chief priests) … *ton* (the) *grammateon* (scribes) *kai* (and) *presbyteron* (elders), *elegon* ('they said' = 'said')," etc., i.e., "the chief priests … the scribes and elders, said" (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading (*Minority Byzantine Reading 1*).   *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* is supported by *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); Minuscules 924 (12th century, Athos, Greece), and 1604 (13th century, Athos, Greece).   It is also supported as Latin, "*principes* (chief) *sacerdotum* (priests) … *scribis* (scribes) *et* (and) *senioribus* (elders) *dicebant* ('they said' = 'said')," in *Versio Vulgata Hieronymi* (Jerome's Vulgate Version, 4th / 5th centuries), and *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, reading instead of "*dicebant*" / "they said" = "said," "*dicentes*" / "saying" = "said"), *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff1, 10th / 11th century, reading instead of "*dicebant*" / "they said" = "said," "*dicentes*" / "saying" = "said"); as well as *Codex Ardmachanus* (Book of Armagh, 812 A.D.) and *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 further supported in the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 379). It is also manifested in both the Greek and Latin *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of Erasmus (1516 & 1522); and the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of e.g., Stephanus (1550).

Minority Byzantine Reading 2 is Greek, "*oi* (the) *archiereis* (chief priests) … *ton* (the) *grammateon* (scribes) *kai* (and) *Pharisaion* (Pharisees), *elegon* ('they said' = 'said')" etc. . It is found in Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, spelling "*Pharisaion*" without the final "*n*"); and Minuscule 1188 (11th / 12th century). It is also found as Latin, "*principes* (chief) *sacerdotum* (priests) … *scribis* (scribes) *et* (and) *Pharisaeis* (Pharisees) *dicebant* (said)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century, spelling "*Pharisaeis*" as "*Farisaeis*"), q (6th / 7th century, spelling "*Pharisaeis*" as "*Farisaeis*"), and c (12th / 13th century).

The *Majority Byzantine Reading* is Greek, "*oi* (the) *archiereis* (chief priests) … *ton* (the) *grammateon* ('scribes,' from *grammateus*) *kai* (and) *presbyteron* ('elders,' from *presbuteros* / *presbyteros*) *kai* (and) *Pharisaion* ('Pharisees,' from *Pharisaios*), *elegon* ('they said' = 'said')," etc. . It is found in e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and E 07 (8th century); Minuscule 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, thrice in three different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings[88]). It is further found as Latin, "*principes* (chief) *sacerdotum* (priests) … *scribis* (scribes) *et* (and) *senioribus* (elders) *et* (and) *Pharisaeis* (Pharisees) *dicebant* (said)," in old Latin Version f (6th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the mediaeval church Greek writer, Theophylact of Ochrida (d. 1109).

There is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine text here at Matt. 27:41b. However, before considering the textual problem at Matt. 27:41b, it is first necessary to better understand the categories of thought and connected semantic forms of Matthean Greek that St. Matthew uses for the Jewish clergy.

St. Matthew sometimes refers to the "chief priests" (Greek, *archiereus*) by themselves (Matt. 26:14; 27:6); or in a duo with: "scribes" (Greek, *grammateus*) (Matt. 2:4; 20:18; 21:15), or "elders" (Greek, *presbyteros*) (Matt. 21:23; 26:47,59[89]; 27:12,20;

---

[88] In Lectionary 1968, "*presbyteron* (elders)" is spelt as in the TR at the first (p. 183a) and third (p. 197a) readings. But at the second reading (pp. 189b-190a), this reads on the first page (p. 189b), "*presby*" and then continued on the second page (p. 190a) with "*tairon*", but over the "*a*" of "*ai*" is written an "*e*" i.e., indicating that it can be either revowelled to a local dialect and spelt "*presbytairon*", or spelt (as in the TR) as "*presbyteron*". We thus here see a textual apparatus in Lectionary 1968.

[89] Though there is a trio reference to "chief priests, and elders, and all the council," for my purposes of isolating the Jewish clergy, there is a duo of "chief priests, and elders," since "elders" is here made to work double-time in a generic as the

28:11,12), or "Pharisees" (Greek, *Pharisaios*) (Matt. 21:45; 27:62); or in a trio with: "scribes" (Greek, *grammateus*) and "elders" (Greek, *presbyteros*) (Matt. 16:21; 26:3; 27:41).

St. Matthew sometimes refers to a "scribe" or the "scribes" (Greek, *grammateus*) by himself (Matt. 8:19; 13:52) or by themselves (Matt. 7:29; 9:3; 17:10), respectively; or in a duo with: "chief priests" (Greek, *archiereus*) (Matt. 2:4; 20:18; 21:15), or "elders" (Greek, *presbyteros*) (Matt. 26:57), or "Pharisees" (Greek, *Pharisaios*) (Matt. 5:20; 12:38; 15:1; 23:2,13,14,15,23,25,27,29,34); or in a trio with: "chief priests" (Greek, *archiereus*) and "elders" (Greek, *presbyteros*) (Matt. 16:21; 26:3; 27:41).

St. Matthew sometimes refers to "elders" (Greek, *presbyteros*) in a duo with: "chief priests" (Greek, *archiereus*) (Matt. 21:23; 26:47,59; 27:1,3,12,20; 28:11,12), or "scribes" (Greek, *grammateus*) (Matt. 26:57); or in a trio with: "chief priests" (Greek, *archiereus*) and "scribes" (Greek, *grammateus*) (Matt. 16:21; 26:3).

St. Matthew sometimes refers to a "Pharisee" or the "Pharisees" (Greek, *Pharisaios*) by himself (Matt. 23:26) or by themselves (Matt. 9:11,14,34; 12:2,14,24,38; 15:12; 19:3; 22:15; 22:41), respectively; or in a duo with: "chief priests" (Greek, *archiereus*) (Matt. 21:45; 27:62), or "scribes" (Greek, *grammateus*) (Matt. 5:20; 15:1; 23:2,13,14,15,23,25,27,29), or "Sadducees" (Greek, *Saddoukaios*)[90] (Matt. 3:7; 16:1,6; 22:34).

The textual problem with the majority Byzantine reading at Matt. 27:41b is now readily apparent in, "*oi* (the) *archiereis* ('chief priests,' from *archiereus*) … *ton* (the) *grammateon* ('scribes,' from *grammateus*) *kai* (and) *presbyteron* ('elders,' from *presbuteros* / *presbyteros*) *kai* (and) *Pharisaion* ('Pharisees,' from *Pharisaios*), *elegon* (said)," etc. .

Firstly, in Matthean Greek, the Jewish clergy are always conceptualized in a category of thought taxonomy that is a singular group i.e., a cleric by himself or a cleric group by themselves, or in a duo or a trio.   Yet here at Matt. 27:41b we find in the majority Byzantine text reading there is a fourfold conceptualization of (1) "chief priests" (Greek, *archiereus*) + (2) "scribes" (Greek, *grammateus*) + (3) "elders" (Greek, *presbyteros*) + (4) "Pharisees" (Greek, *Pharisaios*).

---

designation for the name of all the others not itemized as "chief priests" who were in "all the council."

[90]   The religiously liberal Sadducees denied the "resurrection," and existence of any "angel" / "spirit," whereas the religiously conservative Pharisees accepted the undoubted reality of "both" (Acts 23:8; cf. on resurrection & eternal life: Job 19:25-27; Pss. 23:4,6; 133:3; Prov. 14:27,32; Eccl. 12:7,13,14; Isa. 11:5-10 & 25:8; Dan. 12:2,3; on angels / spirits: Gen. 3:24; Exod. 25:17-22; Ezek. 1:4-14; Dan. 9:21,22; 10:10-13).   To some extent, these two groups disliked each other (Acts 23:7-9).

Secondly, St. Matthew gives a priority in his Jewish clergy categories of thought taxonomies to "chief priests" (Greek, *archiereus*) and "scribes" (Greek, *grammateus*), so that if two or more of the groups are present, the generic "elders" (Greek, *presbyteros*) may be used to preserve this priority.

Thirdly, as a consequence of this second factor, St. Matthew NEVER uses "elders" (Greek, *presbyteros*) and "Pharisees" (Greek, *Pharisaios*) together in describing the Jewish clergy. Thus if three or more of these groups are present then St. Matthew will refer to a generic group of "elders" (Greek, *presbyteros*) in order to cover the field in his category of thought taxonomy for the Jewish clergy. Yet here at Matt. 27:41b we find in the majority Byzantine text reading that we have the combination of "elders" (Greek, *presbyteros*) and "Pharisees" (Greek, *Pharisaios*).

Clearly something is very wrong with the majority Byzantine reading here at Matt. 27:41b relative to Matthean Greek. *This is simply not the sort of thing that St. Matthew would say! It clangs on the ears as bad Matthean Greek!* In the first place St. Matthew does not use a fourfold category of thought taxonomy for the Jewish clergy, but one that refers to a singular group of clerics, a duo, or a trio. And in the second place, he gives a priority in his Jewish clergy categories of thought taxonomies to "chief priests" (Greek, *archiereus*) and "scribes" (Greek, *grammateus*), so that if three or more are present such as here at Matt. 27:41b, he uses the generic "elders" (Greek, *presbyteros*) as his third category to cover the field. *Hence the majority Byzantine reading at Matt. 27:41b SCREAMS OUT in pain as a textual problem requiring relief and remedy.*

It is clear that *Minority Byzantine Reading 2* cannot be correct i.e., Greek "*oi* (the) *archiereis* ('chief priests,' from *archiereus*) … *ton* (the) *grammateon* (scribes) *kai* (and) *Pharisaion* (Pharisees)." That is because St. Matthew never uses the "Pharisees" (Greek, *Pharisaios*) as a third category, but due to his priority system in his category of thought taxonomy for the Jewish clergy, instead goes to the generic "elders" (Greek, *presbyteros*) in such instances.

The same textual factor that excludes *Minority Byzantine Reading 2* simultaneously isolates *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* as the only possible correct reading. Thus it is clear that the textual problem of the majority Byzantine text can only be satisfactorily relieved and cured by the adoption of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*, Greek "*oi* (the) *archiereis* ('chief priests,' from *archiereus*) … *ton* (the) *grammateon* (scribes) *kai* (and) *presbyteron* (elders), *elegon* ('they said' = 'said')." Therefore *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* is the correct reading as found in the *Textus Receptus*.

The origins of the variants (*Minority Byzantine Reading 2* & the *Majority Byzantine Reading*) are conjectural. (Cf. Matt. 7:29, Variant 2; 19:3; 26:3.)

Was *Minority Byzantine Reading 2* an accidental alteration? In a given manuscript line of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*, did the "*presbyteron* (elders)" undergo a paper fade or other damage, so that it came to look something like "*:::::::::on*"? Was this then "reconstructed" by a scribe who did not understand the intricacies of Matthean

Greek style, as "*Pharisai<u>o</u>n* (Pharisees)," possibly with some reference to the "*oi* (the) *archiereis* (chief priests) *kai* (and) *oi* (-) *Pharisaioi* (Pharisees)" of Matt. 27:62?

Was *Minority Byzantine Reading 2* a deliberate alteration?   Did a scribe who did not understand the intricacies of Matthean Greek style, consider that with reference to the "*oi* (the) *archiereis* (chief priests) *kai* (and) *oi* (-) *Pharisaioi* (Pharisees)" of Matt. 27:62, that it would be "a stylistic clarification" to alter the "*presbyter<u>o</u>n* (elders)" of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* to the "*Pharisai<u>o</u>n* (Pharisees)" of *Minority Byzantine Reading 2*?

Was the *Majority Byzantine Reading* an accidental addition?   In a given manuscript line, did a scribe writing out *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* then write something that he crossed out, so that his manuscript looked something like, "*presbyter<u>o</u>n* (elders) <u>********</u> *elegon* ('they said' = 'said')"?   Did a second later scribe then "scratch" this out?   Did a third later scribe then think "something has been lost here"? Not understanding the intricacies of Matthean Greek style, did he then "reconstruct" this "missing word" as "*Pharisai<u>o</u>n* (Pharisees)," possibly with some reference to the "*oi* (the) *archiereis* (chief priests) *kai* (and) *oi* (-) *Pharisaioi* (Pharisees)" of Matt. 27:62?

Was the *Majority Byzantine Reading* a conflation of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* and *Minority Byzantine Reading 2*?   Did a scribe who had access to both *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* and *Minority Byzantine Reading 2* deliberately conflate these two readings?   If so, did he do so as an accidental addition, thinking that they both preserved different parts of "the original" reading; or was is a deliberate addition in which he thought one was right and the other wrong, but it would be "a stylistic clarification by amplification" to have both in?

Were these deliberate of accidental changes?   Alas, so much is lost to us in the dark ages of textual transmission history that we are left to speculate, and while these are educated conjectures, they may still be wrong since we simply do not know exactly why the changes happened.   But we do know exactly what changes did occur, and that they are corruptions of the text, here Providentially preserved for us at Matt. 27:41b in the Received Text reading of *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*.

The earliest support for *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* is from Eusebius.   What might be said about this man?

On the down-side, Eusebius of Caesarea showed sympathy to the Arian heretic, Arius, leading to Eusebius's excommunication e.g., Eusebius had also taken part in a Synod of Syrian bishops which had sort to restore Arius to his position; and after being exiled from Alexandria, Arius was welcomed at Caesarea where he claimed the bishop, Eusebius, supported him.   At the *General Council of Nicea* (325 A.D.), Eusebius sought the adoption of a creed, known as, "The Creed of Caesarea," which made no reference to the Father and Son being "of one substance (Greek, *homoousion*);" and which was rightly rejected by the council fathers in favour of "The Creed of Nicea" which contained these,

and other, important words, *infra*[91].

On the one hand, Eusebius was restored at the Council of Nicea after he seemingly repudiated the Arian heresy.   But on the other hand, the quality of this repentance may be reasonably questioned on the basis of subsequent events, since he was not thereafter prepared to robustly support the orthodox anti-Arian creed that came from the *General Council of Nicea*.   In this context, following the Council of Nicea, the bishop of Antioch, Eustathius, alleged that Eusebius had departed from the orthodox Trinitarian teachings of that Council.   In 331, Eusebius then took part in the Synod of Antioch which deposed Eustathius from his bishopric.   Then in the Synod of Caesarea (334) and Synod of Tyre (335), Eusebius took part in the expulsion of St. Athanasius of Alexandria (d. 373), an orthodox Trinitarian champion against the Arian heresy. Eusebius further took part in the 336 Constantinople condemnation of Marcellus of Ancyra.   Athanasius of Alexandria, Eustathius of Antioch, and Marcellus of Ancyra, were well known defenders of the orthodox Trinitarian teachings upheld by the Council of Nicea (325), e.g., that the Father and the Son were of the same "substance" or "Being" (John 10:30; I John 5:7,8), for "the Son of God" is "true God of true God, begotten not made, of one substance (Greek, *homoousion*) with the Father" ("The Creed of Nicea," *Council of Nicea*)[92].   Given that Arius did "not" "bring" "the doctrine of Christ," and Eusebius clearly was prepared to "bid" "him God speed," he thus became a "partaker of his evil deeds" (II John 9-11).

Thus in summary of Eusebius's down-side, before the Council of Nicea in 325, Eusebius took part in actions seeking to restore the heretic Arius whom he welcomed at Caesarea following his expulsion from Alexandria.   At the Council of Nicea, Eusebius unsuccessfully sought the adoption of a creedal formulae that made no reference to the Father and Son being of one "substance" or "Being;" although at that time he appears to have begrudgingly made a commitment to accept the orthodox Biblically sound formulae of that council found in "The Creed of Nicea," and hence he was restored by that Council.   But "as soon as walked out the door" of the Council of Nicea, Eusebius was found to "be dragging his feet" over his earlier commitment to "The Creed of Nicea," as in concert with others, he acted to condemn, depose, and expel, the orthodox Trinitarians: Athanasius of Alexandria, Eustathius of Antioch, and Marcellus of Ancyra.   Thus while we do not know the full extent to which the anti-Trinitarian theology of Eusebius and Arius intersected; we do know that for all but a brief time at Nicea in 325, Eusebius was in some way allied with, and so sympathetic to, Arius's cause; and he acted to "bid" Arius "God speed," even though Arius did "not" "bring" with him the orthodox "doctrine of Christ," so that Eusebius became a "partaker of his evil deeds" (II John 9-11). Eusebius was clearly in some way a long-standing ally of Arius, and Christ says, "He that is not with me is against me" (Matt. 12:30).   Thus Eusebius is rightly looked upon with theological disfavour by Biblically sound orthodox Trinitarians.

---

[91]   Bettenson's *Documents*, pp. 24-5.

[92]   *Ibid*.

But on the up-side, among some other works, Eusebius of Caesarea produced a landmark Church History, giving an account of church history in its early centuries, known as, *Ecclesiastical History*.   The value of this work means that he is rightly looked upon with some favour *as a historian* by orthodox Trinitarians who disagree with Eusebius's Trinitarian views.   In this sense, Eusebius to some extent resembles the Nestorian heretic and Bishop of Cyrus, Theodoret (d. 460), who likewise supported Trinitarian heresy in his *Ecclesiastical History* which was rightly condemned by St. Gregory the Great (d. 604) as "audacious madness;" but whose writings still contain some useful material that the careful and diligent student of church history may extract as gold from the surrounding dross of Theodoret of Cyrus's heresy[93].

It is thus with these important qualifications that we consider Eusebius.   His name comes from the Greek, "*Eusebios*" meaning "pious" (from "*eu*" / "well" + "*sebein*" / "to respect"), although if unqualified, this is an admittedly inappropriate name for Eusebius of Caesarea.   In studying the Greek New Testament I have also come across the etymologically related noun, "*eusebeia*," e.g., at II Tim. 3:2,5 we read of the "unholy" who are like Eusebius of Caesarea in "having a form of godliness (*eusebias*, feminine singular genitive noun, from *eusebeia*), but denying the power thereof: from such turn away."   Most assuredly, we do "turn away" from the heresies of "unholy" Eusebius (II Tim. 3:2,5).   Nevertheless, our God is so big, so strong, and so mighty, that he is able to make "the wrath of man" to "praise" him (Ps. 76:10); and in this context, we are still able to benefit from selected parts of Eusebius, as here seen in the correct citation of Matt. 27:41b as *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* in Eusebius's writings.   Thus we thank God for this valuable citation of the TR's Matt. 27:41b reading by the church historian, Eusebius of Caesarea (d. 339), who in ancient times preserves the basic form of this important piece of text from Matt. 27:41b in its Greek textual purity.

The TR's *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* has relatively weak Greek textual support in the Byzantine texts of between *c.* 10% and a figure less than 1%[94], with the only known and documented support for this reading being less than 1% of the Byzantine Greek manuscripts, and this might constitute its full Greek support, or near full Greek support.   However, *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* has notable and impressive ancient support in both *Codex Alexandrinus* (A 02, 5th century) and Eusebius of Caesarea (d. 379), as well as support in the Greek over time, and through time, when one further considers its witness in Minuscules 924 (12th century), and 1604 (13th century). Moreover, *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* has some impressive support in the Latin

---

[93]   See Textual Commentary, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, section "3) Church Writers."

[94]   The Majority Byzantine reading here has the support of von Soden's K group i.e., *c.* 90%+ of *c.* 1,000 manuscripts, and so on any reasonable statistical projections *c.* 90%+ of several thousands of Byzantine Gospel manuscripts.   Thus between them *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* and *Minority Byzantine Reading 2* have *c.* 10% or less of the Byzantine manuscript support, though where between *c.* 10% and a figure less than 1% for both, either of them fall, is on von Soden's generalist group figures, really anybody's guess.

textual tradition with the Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome; as well as the support of about one-third of the old Latin Versions. It is strongly supported by textual analysis of the Greek as the only possible reading at Matt. 27:41b.

Minority Byzantine Reading 2 has relatively weak Greek textual support in the Byzantine texts of between *c.* 10% and a figure less than 1%, with the only known and documented support for this reading being less than 1% of the Byzantine Greek manuscripts, and this might constitute its full Greek support, or near full Greek support. But it has some correspondingly strong textual support in the Latin textual tradition with about two-thirds of the old Latin Versions. However, it has no good textual argument to commend it, and it is ruled out on the basis of textual analysis of the Greek.

The *Majority Byzantine Reading* has strong Greek textual support in the Byzantine texts of at least *c.* 90% plus of the manuscripts, and possibly as many as over 99% of them. However, it has correspondingly weak support in the Latin. Most importantly, it is ruled out as a viable reading on the basis of textual analysis of the Greek, which clearly favours *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*.

The TR's *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* weak attestation in the Greek means that for their textual base, Erasmus of Rotterdam and the subsequent great neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries, no doubt rested heavily here on a combination of the church historian Eusebius in the Greek, coupled with the church father and doctor St. Jerome in the Latin Vulgate. This undoubted reliance on the *Vulgata* here at Matt. 27:41b is thus a good example of the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, bowing down low in humble submission to the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, since the textual analysis in support of the *Vulgata* reading is on the Greek, not (as with the old Latin Papists') on the Latin. Weighing up these factors, the clear-cut impossibility of either *Minority Byzantine Reading 2* or the *Majority Byzantine Reading* being correct, together with the clarity of the Latin's impressive textual support, as well as the notable Greek textual support for *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*, on this occasion is sufficient to bring the TR's reading at Matt. 27:41b "over the line" of a high level "B" in the range of 71-74%, and into the range of a low level 75-76% "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. 27:41b, is the TR's *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*, "the chief priests … the scribes and elders, said," etc. (AV). *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* is found outside the Byzantine textual tradition and outside the closed class of sources in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century, reversing the order of "the scribes and elders" to "the elders and the scribes," possibly after first accidentally omitting "*grammat<u>eo</u>n kai*" / "scribes and," and then having first writing down "*t<u>on</u> presbyter<u>on</u>*" / "the elders," and realizing the error, then adding back in "*kai grammat<u>eo</u>n*" / "and scribes," on the basis that "the exact word order did not matter"). 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 Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and 700 (11th 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 some manuscripts of the Syriac Harclean Version; the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century), some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Minority Byzantine Reading 2, "the chief priests … the scribes and Pharisees, said," etc., is found outside the Byzantine textual tradition and outside the closed class of sources in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and Minuscule 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere). It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century).

The *Majority Byzantine Reading*, "the chief priests … the scribes, and elders, and Pharisees, said," etc., is found outside the Byzantine textual tradition and outside the closed class of sources in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (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 Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century), and some manuscripts of the Syriac Harclean Version; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Slavic Version (9th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

We cannot believe that the slipshod buffoons of the Alexandrian School would have been able to determine the correct text by textual analysis, and so it seems that on this occasion, by a fluke, they happened to have preserved the correct reading of the TR in their line of manuscripts. At Matt. 27:41b, the presence of the TR's reading in both main Alexandrian texts (though in a different word order in Codex Sinaiticus), meant that for the wrong reasons, the correct reading was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Hence the correct reading is found in the ASV which reads, "the chief priests … the scribes and elders, said," etc. (ASV). So too, for incorrect reasons, the correct reading is found at Matt. 27:41b in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

On the one hand, the semi neo-Alexandrian Moffatt Bible *prima facie* follows the correct text, in the sense that it starts with the correct textual reading, here at Matt. 27:41b with Moffatt's reading, "… the high priests …. scribes and the elders of the people … ." But on the other hand, we then must ask, Where did Moffatt get the "of the people" after "the elders" from? While it is true that St. Matthew sometimes refers to "*oi* (the)

presbyteroi (elders) *tou* (of the) *laou* (people)" (Matt. 21:23; 26:3; 27:1) or "*presbyter<u>on</u>* (elders) *tou* (of the) *laou* (people)" (Matt. 26:47); it is also the case that he sometimes simply refers to "*oi* ('the,' sometimes redundant in English translation) *presbyteroi* (elders)" (Matt. 26:57,59; 27:20) or "*tois* (-) *presbyterois* (elders)" (Matt. 27:3), or "*t<u>on</u>* (literally 'of the' may = 'the,' sometimes redundant in English translation) *presbyter<u>on</u>* (elders)" (Matt. 16:21; 27:12; 28:12). There is no good textual reason here at Matt. 27:41b to indicate that "*tou* (of the) *laou* (people)" has dropped out of the text, and any such variant is not referred to as existing in any Greek, Latin, or other manuscript itemized in the textual apparatuses I use. Moffatt thus appears to have "reconstructed" the addition of "*tou* (of the) *laou* (people)" here at Matt. 27:41b from e.g., Matt. 27:12 and / or Matt. 28:12. Alas, the religiously liberal James Moffatt gave new levels of meaning to *gross incompetence in textual analysis* in his Moffatt Bible of 1926 & 1935, and this absurd "reconstruction" which adds "of the people" after "the elders" here at Matt. 27:41b is just one such example of many Moffatt examples.

Here at Matt. 27:41b the New King James Version of 1982 follows the correct reading in its main text. But rather than "the scribes and elders" after "the chief priests" (KJV main text), it says in a footnote that the "M[ajority]-Text reads 'with the scribes, the Pharisees, and the elders';" and in its Preface 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." Thus the NKJV here supports the erroneous Majority Byzantine Text reading (which is also the Majority Text reading), over the *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* of the TR.

In the nineteenth century, the Anglican Church experienced the sad and bad rise of the Puseyites who sought to strike down, and render ineffectual the wonderful advances and deliverances wrought by God through the Reformation. This entailed various forms of attack upon the pure Word of God as found in the *Textus Receptus* which was so integral to the Reformation, both with respect to its Divine authority (II Tim. 3:16) and Divine Preservation (I Peter 1:25). One group of anti-Protestant Puseyites, Westcott & Hort, sought to strike down the *Textus Receptus* via the Neo-Alexandrian School; and another anti-Protestant Puseyite, John Burgon, sought to strike down the *Textus Receptus* via his Majority Text Burgonite School. Together, they thus formed a semi-Romanist Puseyite pincer movement against "the much hated" Received Text, through which God had liberated men from Rome at the time of the Reformation.

Here at Matt. 27:41b we see one such instance of the Majority Text Burgonites seeking to strike down the Word of God. Burgon's great Puseyite 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 authorities[95]." Yet again and again, such as here at Matt. 27:41b, we of the Neo-Byzantine School have had occasion to point out that the *Textus Receptus* needs no such correction or revision. For we stand in the glorious Biblical truth, "The Word of

---

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

the Lord Endureth Forever," which when put in the Latin of St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate at I Peter 1:25 formed the Motto of the Lutheran Reformation, and whose initials of "V.D.M.I.AE" (or "V.D.M.I.A.") were used as an abbreviation.   Indeed this abbreviation was sewn onto the right sleeve of court officials under the Lutheran Protestant Christian, Frederick the Wise (Regnal Years: 1486-1525), that godly Protestant German prince and Elector of Saxony who was Luther's earthly protector in the early years of the Reformation, following the nailing of Luther's 95 Theses to the Chapel Door of Wittenberg Castle on the Eve of All Saints' Day, 1517.   Yea, we stand by these words, *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!*

Matt. 27:42a "If" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron *prima facie* supports the TR's reading here at Matt. 27:42a (Latin Diatessaron, chapter CCV).   However, the Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, and it is possible that the Latin "*Si* (if)," was introduced as a semi-assimilation with the Vulgate's "*Si* (if)" at Luke 23:35 as part of Diatessaron formatting. Therefore, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 27:42a, the TR's Greek, "*Ei* (If)," in the wider words, "If (*ei*) he be the King of Israel" 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), E 07 (8th century), and H 014 (9th 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), 1242 (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, thrice in three different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings[96]).   It is also supported as Latin, "*Si* (if)," 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), 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 supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339), Chrysostom

---

[96]   At Lectionary 1968's first (p. 183a) and second (p. 190a) readings, this is written as in standard seminary Greek as "ει".   But at the third reading (p. 197a), the epsilon ("*e*," Greek ε) is written as "c" and the iota ("i," Greek ι) as something like a "j" without the dot on top of it, and the two letters are then joined together so as to look something like "ﭗ".

(d. 407), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; the ancient church Latin writers, Ambrose (d. 397) and Augustine (d. 430); the early mediaeval church Greek writer, Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a variant omits "If (Greek, *ei*; Latin, *si*)," i.e., "He is the King of Israel" etc. .   This is a minority Latin reading found in old Latin Version d (5th 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 loss?   Was the Greek "*ei*" or Latin "*si*" lost in an undetected paper fade?   Or was it lost as the eye of a Greek scribe jumped from the final iota ("i") of the previous word, "*sosai* (save)" over to the final iota ("i") of "*ei*"?

Was the variant a deliberate loss?   Was the Greek "*ei*" or Latin "*si*" pruned away by a Greek or Latin scribe respectively, seeking to produce a "more standard Gospel text" by a semi-assimilation with Mark 15:32?   If so, he might have done well to consider also Luke 23:35.   He would also have done well to consider that St. Mark refers to a situation where "the chief priests" were "mocking" (Mark 15:31,32); and while these are similar words to those of Matt. 27:39-43 and Luke 23:35, these words in the three Gospels were all said at different times, albeit in some relative proximity to each other, and evidently by persons who had heard the others words, so that the words of all three Gospels indicate the repeated use of similar words to form an ongoing harassment of Christ as he hung on the cross.   What simple minded fool would seek to "harmonize" these three Gospel accounts into one?   Christ hung on the cross for some time, and these three instances, (possibly, though not definitely, also together with some other instances of similar words not recorded in any of the Gospels,) all occurred.   Alas, the church is often plagued by simple-minded Bible critics who paradoxically think themselves "very smart" or "very intelligent," when in a circular manner they first claim that such things "had to come from just one event," and then claim that "therefore they are embellishments on the one event."   Thus these Bible critics laugh at these Bible writers, as arrogantly "professing themselves to be wise, they" become "fools" (Rom. 1:22).   "For as the crackling of thorns under a pot, so is the laughter of the fool" (Eccl. 7:6).

Was the variant a deliberate or accidental loss?   We do not now know.   But we do know that the correct reading of the Received Text was here preserved in the representative Byzantine text's reading, against which there is no good textual argument.

The TR's reading has rock solid support in the Greek Byzantine textual tradition, over time, and through time, dating from ancient times.   It likewise has rock solid support in the Latin textual tradition, over time, and through time, dating from ancient times.   The TR's Latin support includes that of the Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome.   The TR's support among ancient writers includes that of the church father, St. Cyril; together with the ancient church fathers and doctors, St. John Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustine; and the early mediaeval church doctor, St.

Gregory the Great.   By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Latin, and no support in the Greek.   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 27:42a 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. 27:42a, "If," in the wider words, "If (Greek, *ei*) he be the King of Israel" etc. (AV), is found in (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), 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; the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Georgian Version (5th century); Armenian Version (5th century); Slavic Version (9th century); and Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant, "He is the King of Israel" 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); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 892 (9th century, mixed text type).   It is also found in a manuscript of the Syriac Palestinian Version; and Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century).

Though within the paradigm of the Neo-Alexandrian School there is very little "external support" beyond the two main Alexandrian texts for the variant here at Matt. 27:42a, the erroneous variant was still adopted by the NU Text *et al*.   This shows that the neo-Alexandrians really are very reliant upon their two main Alexandrian texts, so that when they agree with each other such as here, they are unlikely to disagree with them. Hence the ASV reads, "He is the King of Israel" etc. .   So too, at Matt. 27:42a the incorrect variant is also found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV (turning this into a question, "Isn't he the king of Israel?").

The TR's strong attestation in the Latin, meant that for the wrong reasons, the right reading was selected at Matt. 27:42a by the old Latin Papists in both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Hence the Douay-Rheims reads, "If (Latin, *si*) he be the king of Israel" etc. . But at Matt. 27:42a the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post Vatican II Council times followed the two main Alexandrian texts, and hence the erroneous variant in the Papists' Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, & NJB.

Matt. 27:42b "him" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The TR's reading is made with some notable reference to A 02. In terms of the basic reading at issue, the distinction is between "*auto* (him)" (*Minority Byzantine Reading 1*), "*ep'* (on) *auton* (him)" (*Minority Byzantine Reading 3*), and "*ep'* (on) him (*auto*)" (*Majority Byzantine Reading*). However, for the purposes of textual analysis, the previous word becomes relevant. This in turn raises the issue of some minor variants which would not normally be considered in these commentaries because one of them is found in *Manuscript London* (A 02), which here at Matt. 27:42b is an important manuscript for the relevant part of the TR's reading being considered, *infra*.

The TR's reading of "*kai* (and) *pisteusomen* ('we will believe,' indicative active future, 1st person plural verb, from *pisteuo*)" is majority Byzantine text (e.g., G 011, K 017, Y 034; Eusebius & Cyril of Alexandria)[97]; and also supported in Latin "*et* (and) *credemus* ('we will believe,' indicative active future, 1st person plural verb, from *credo*)," of old Latin d, and the Book of Armagh[98]. However, a minority Byzantine reading, "*kai* (then) *pisteuomen* ('we believe,' indicative active present, 1st person plural verb, from *pisteuo*)," is found in A 02 *et al*; and the Latin of the Vulgate and most old Latin Versions as, "*et* (then) *credimus* ('we believe,' indicative active present, 1st person plural verb, from *credo*) *ei* (him)." Another minority Byzantine reading, "*kai* (and)

---

[97] It is supported by von Soden's K group, i.e., *c*. 90%+ of *c*. 1,000 K group manuscripts, and so on any reasonable statistical projections about *c*. 90% plus of several thousands of Byzantine Gospel manuscripts. (Swanson wrongly shows the Majority Text here following "*pisteusomen*.")

[98] Though "*pisteusomen*" is the reading of Lectionaries 2378 (thrice in three different readings) & 1968 (thrice in three different readings), the fact these Lectionaries may *sometimes*, *but not always*, exchange omicrons and omegas as part of revowelling (see e.g., omicron to omega for Lectionary 2378 at Matt. 26:69 in Appendix 3 of Vol. 4; or at Matt. 10:42 in Matt. 21:41 discussion in Appendix 1 of Vol. 3), means the issue of what these Lectionary here means is *in dubio*. It also raises the question, Did such a revowelling of the majority Byzantine text reading first give rise to what was then wrongly taken by later manuscript readers to be a subjunctive? (See the subjunctive, *infra*.) In Lectionary 1968, unlike at the first (p. 183a) and third (p. 197a) readings, at the second reading (p. 190a), the first two letters of this word are written above the line after the preceding "*kai*" and the remaining "*steusomen*".

pisteusomen ('we may believe,' <u>subjunctive</u> active <u>aorist</u>, 1st person plural verb, from *pisteuo*)" is found in W 032, Sigma 042, *et al*[99]; and the Latin, "*et* (and) *credamus* ('we may believe,' <u>subjunctive</u> active <u>present</u>, 1st person plural verb, from *credo*)," of old Latin f (& possibly the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, which at Latin Diatessaron chapter ccv, also possibly brought the subjunctive form over from the Vulgate's Mark 15:32 as part of Diatessaron formatting). But there is no good textual argument against the majority Byzantine text's reading which is thus correct.

On the one hand, this element is a minor variant. But on the other hand, one of these two minority Byzantine readings is found in A 02, and the other is found in W 032. Hence I have here raised the issue because of the connected textual analysis on the root word of *pisteuo*, *infra*; since both A 02 and W 032 are cited as part of a select group of manuscripts that have the correct reading of the TR at the relevant point of consideration here at Matt. 27:42b, *infra*. Of course, it might also be remarked that the readings of both A 02 and W 032 maintain a connection to this root word of *pisteuo* in their respective variants of it, *supra*.

The Second Matter. The majority Byzantine reading at Matt. 27:42b, "*ep'* (on) *auto* (him)," is followed by von Soden's K group, i.e., *c.* 90%+ of *c.* 1,000 K group manuscripts, and so on any reasonable statistical projections about *c.* 90% plus of several thousands of Byzantine Gospel manuscripts. This means that between them *Minority Byzantine Readings 1, 2 & 3,* have the support of between *c.* 10% and less than 1% of the Byzantine manuscripts[100]. Thus with only 13 itemized Greek Byzantine Manuscripts for TR's *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*, *infra*, it is certainly possible, though by no means certain, that the TR's manuscript Greek support is less than 1%. Alas, we are limited in what we can say based on von Soden's generalist group figures, which though very good and useful for getting the broad overview, are not specific enough for the detailed percentage breakups that we would also like to have.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 27:42b, the TR's *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* Greek, "*auto* ('him,'

---

[99] Outside the closed class of sources, this erroneous subjunctive aorist reading is also found in Codex Sinaiticus, *et al*. But the NU Text *et al* follow the TR's reading of "*pisteusomen*" as found in Codex Vaticanus; since the obvious inappropriateness of the subjunctive here in the context of their response if Christ were to "come down from the cross," as "we <u>may</u> believe," raises a sufficiently obvious textual problem that not even the neo-Alexandrians, including Tischendorf who generally favoured Codex Sinaiticus, wanted "to take ownership" of the reading found in Codex Sinaiticus here at Matt. 27:42.

[100] Von Soden also refers to a fourth minority reading, "*en* (in) *auto* (him)," for which he itemizes one manuscript (although there may be more), Minuscule 990 (12th century, von Soden's ε 1260 in his Iφc group), and a similar reading in Minuscule 1606 (14th century, von Soden's ε 1441 in his Iφb group). Both of these manuscripts are outside of his K group, and both are unclassified outside of von Soden's system.

masculine singular <u>dative</u>, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*),” in the wider words said mockingly by the Jewish clergymen of Christ, “If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe <u>him</u> (*auto*)” (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading. *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* is supported by *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) and the purple parchment *Codex Beratinus* (Phi 043, St. Matthew’s & St. Mark’s Gospels; Tirana, Albania); and Minuscules 399 (9th / 10th century; St. Petersburg, Russia), 23 (11th century; Paris, France), 1207 (11th century, St. Catherine’s Greek Orthodox Monastery, Mt. Sinai, Arabia), 924 (12th century; Athos, Greece), 1010 (12th century; Athos, Greece), 1085 (12th century; Athos, Greece), 477 (13th century; Trinity College, Cambridge, England, UK), 945 (Byzantine outside of Acts & General Epistles, 13th century, Edinburgh University, Scotland, UK, 11th century), 1441 (13th century; Athos, Greece), and 2093 (13th century; Serrai, Macedonia in northern Greece).

The TR’s reading at Matt. 27:42b is further supported as Latin, “*ei* (‘him,’ masculine singular <u>dative</u>, demonstrative pronoun from *is-ea-id*[101]),” in the *Versio Vulgata Hieronymi* (Jerome’s Vulgate Version, 4th / 5th centuries), and *Codex Vercellensis* (old Latin Version a, 4th century), *Codex Veronensis* (old Latin Version b, 5th century), *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (old Latin Version d, 5th century), *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff2, 5th century), *Codex Claromontanus* (old Latin Version h, 5th century), *Codex Brixianus* (old Latin Version f, 6th century), *Codex 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.) and *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, “*illi* (‘that [one]’ = ‘him,’ masculine singular <u>dative</u>, demonstrative pronoun from *ille*)” in *Codex Monacensis* (old Latin Version q, 6th / 7th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339); the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the early mediaeval church Greek writer, Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century)[102].

---

[101] In discussing “Personal Pronouns of the Third Person,” Gildersleeve says that, “Its place is taken” “in Latin,” “in the oblique cases” such as the dative case here (“*ei*,” dative from *is*), “by the Determinative” (or Demonstrative) “*is*.” Basil Gildersleeve’s *Latin Grammar* (1st ed. 1867, 2nd ed. 1872, 3rd ed. 1895), *op. cit.*, pp. 56-57, sections 102 & 103. The Latin here is thus the same as the Greek TR, and not, as Tischendorf (1869-72) claims, merely similar.

[102] Pseudo-Athanasius (“Athanasius – Dubia”) in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1887 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 28, pp. 225 & 226 (Greek, “*auto*;” & Latin, “*ei*”) (*De Passione et cruce Domini*, “Concerning the passion and crucifixion of the Lord”).

Minority Byzantine Reading 2 is Greek, "*eis* (preposition *eis* + accusative = 'on' / 'upon' / 'in') *auton* ('him,' masculine singular <u>accusative</u>, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*)," i.e., "in (*eis*) him (*auton*)." It is found in Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and 047 (8th century).

Minority Byzantine Reading 3 is Greek, "*ep'* (preposition *epi* + accusative = 'on' / 'upon' / 'in') *auton* ('him,' masculine singular <u>accusative</u>, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*)," i.e., "on (*ep'*) him (*auton*)." It is found in Minuscules 1188 (11th / 12th century) and 1355 (12th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

The *Majority Byzantine Reading* is Greek, "*ep'* (preposition *epi* + dative = 'on' / 'upon' / 'in') *auto* (him)," i.e., "on (*ep'*) him (*auto*)." It is found in e.g., Codices E 07 (8th century), G 011 (8th century), K 017 (9th century), and S 028 (10th century); Minuscule 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, thrice in three different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings).

There is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine text here at Matt. 27:42b. However, before considering the textual problem at Matt. 27:42b, it is first necessary to better understand some relevant matters to do with how the root word of "*pisteuo* (believe)" is used in Matthean Greek, Johannean Greek, and Pauline Greek.

The holy Apostle, St. Matthew, sometimes uses a form of "*pisteuo* (believe)" without a personal pronoun e.g., at Matt. 9:28 Christ asked, "<u>Believe ye</u> (*pisteuete*, from *pisteuo*) that I am able to do this?" (See also Matt. 8:13; 21:22; 24:23; 24:26.) On the one hand, St. Matthew uses "*pisteuo* (believe)" with a personal pronoun, to wit, a singular personal pronoun preceded with "*eis* (in)." Hence Christ refers in Matt. 18:6 to, "these little ones which <u>believe</u> (*pisteuonton*, from *pisteuo*) *eis* ('in,' preposition *eis* + accusative) *eme* ('me,' accusative, 1st person singular, personal pronoun from *ego*)." But on the other hand, when St. Matthew uses "*pisteuo* (believe)" in the sense of "believe him," it is always without a preposition followed by "*auto* ('him,' masculine singular <u>dative</u>, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*)" i.e., "*pisteuo* (believe)" + "*auto* (him)." E.g., at Matt. 21:32 Christ says, "*tou* ('of the [thing]') *pisteusai* (to believe) *auto* (him)," i.e., "that ye might believe him" in the wider words, "and ye, when ye had seen *it*, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him." (See also Matt. 21:25; 32 – twice.)

The holy Apostle, St. John, generally uses "*pisteuo* (believe)" + "*eis* (preposition *eis* + accusative = 'on' / 'upon' / 'in')" + "*auton* ('him,' masculine singular <u>accusative</u>, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*)," i.e., "believe (some form of *pisteuo*) in (*eis*) him (*auton*)." E.g., Christ says in John 6:40, "*pisteuon* ('believing' = 'believeth,' from *pisteuo*) *eis* (on) *auton* (him)," in the wider words, "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and <u>believeth</u> (*pisteuon*, participle from *pisteuo*) on (*eis*) him (*auton*), may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day." (See also John 2:11; 3:15,18; 4:39; 7:5,39,48; 8:30; 9:36; 10:42; 11:45,48; 12:37,42. Cf. with an implied "*auton*" / "him" at John 6:29.)

St. John only breaks with this general normativity for the purposes of poetical parallelism. Hence at John 8:30,31 he first says of Jesus, "As he spake these words, many <u>believed</u> ('they believed' = 'believed,' *episteusan*, from *pisteu<u>o</u>*) <u>on</u> (*eis*) <u>him</u> (*auton*)." Then in a climatic poetical parallelism that climaxes verse 30 by completing it with the fact that the "many believed" (vs. 30) was said of certain "Jews" (vs. 31), and which also uses an internal synonymous poetical parallelism between "*episteusan* (believed) *eis* (on) *auton* (him)" (John 8:30) and "*pepisteukotas* ('believing' = 'believed) *aut<u>o</u>* (on him)" (John 8:31), St. John says in John 8:31, "Then said Jesus to those Jews <u>which believed</u> ('the [ones] believing' = 'which believed,' '*tous*' / 'the [ones]' + *pepisteukotas*, participle from *pisteu<u>o</u>*) <u>on him</u> (*aut<u>o</u>*), [+ further elucidation] If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed" etc.[103].

The holy Apostle, St. Paul, in his *magnum opus*, The Book of Romans, uses "*pisteu<u>o</u>* (believe)" + "*epi* (preposition *epi* + dative = 'on' / 'upon' / 'in')" + *aut<u>o</u>* ('him,' masculine singular <u>dative</u>, personal pronoun from *autos-<u>e</u>-o*)" i.e., "believe (some form of *pisteu<u>o</u>*) on (*epi*) him (*aut<u>o</u>*)." E.g., we read of Christ at Rom. 10:11, "Whosoever <u>believeth</u> (*pisteu<u>o</u>n*, participle from *pisteu<u>o</u>*) on (*ep'*) him (*aut<u>o</u>*) shall not be ashamed." (See also Rom. 9:33.)

The textual problem with the majority Byzantine text's reading at Matt. 27:42b is now abundantly apparent. The terminology of "*pisteusomen* ('we will believe,' from *pisteu<u>o</u>*) *ep'* (on) *aut<u>o</u>* (him)" is simply not Matthean Greek. Whenever St. Matthew wishes to convey this type of idea he uses "*pisteu<u>o</u>* (believe)" + "*aut<u>o</u>* (him)," e.g., "Why <u>did ye</u> not then <u>believe</u> (*episteusate*, from *pisteu<u>o</u>*) <u>him</u> (*aut<u>o</u>*)?" (Matt. 21:25). Therefore the textual turbulence caused by the representative Byzantine reading can only be calmed and quieted by *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*, which with the preceding TR's (and majority Byzantine text's) word, "*pisteusomen* (we will believe)," means that, "*pisteusomen* (we will believe) *aut<u>o</u>* (him)" is the correct reading.

The origins of *Minority Byzantine Readings 2 & 3* and the *Majority Byzantine Reading* at Matt. 27:42b are speculative. However, the *Minority Byzantine Reading 2* of "*pisteu<u>o</u>* (believe)" + "*eis* (in) *auton* (him)," looks like it was brought over by a scribe from Johannean Greek. The *Majority Byzantine Reading* of "*pisteu<u>o</u>* (believe)" + "*ep'* (on) *aut<u>o</u>* (him)," looks like it was brought over by a scribe from Pauline Greek. And in

---

[103] Such climactic poetical parallelism is more commonly associated with the Hebrew OT e.g., Ps. 29:1,2 "[a] <u>Give unto the Lord</u>, O ye mighty, [a + climactic] <u>give unto the Lord</u> glory and strength. [a + climactic] <u>Give unto the Lord</u> the glory due unto his name; [+ further elucidation] worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness." Yet because of the OT influence, various Hebraic literary forms sometimes come into the NT. E.g., we also find this type of climactic poetical parallelism at Matt. 6:6, "[a] <u>pray to thy Father which is in secret</u>; [a – also using an internal antithetical parallelism of "pray" and "seeth" to show a two-way process between man and God in prayer, + climactic] <u>and thy Father which seeth in secret</u> shall reward thee openly" (also using an antithetical parallelism to form a contrast between "in secret" and "openly").

the context of Matthean Greek, the *Minority Byzantine Reading 3* "*pisteuo* (believe)" + "*ep'* (on) *auton* (him)," is "a very strange linguistic creature" indeed, it is "a terminological half-caste" that looks like it was brought over "in bits'n'pieces," with the "*ep'* (on)" coming from Pauline Greek and the "*auton* (him)" coming from Johannean Greek.

Were *Minority Byzantine Readings 2 & 3* and the *Majority Byzantine Reading* accidental changes?   In various manuscript lines, did the TR's *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* of "*auto* (him)" come at the end of a line?   Was it lost in various paper fades or paper damages?   Did a scribe of the *Minority Byzantine Reading 2* manuscript line then "reconstruct" this as "*eis* (in) *auton* (him)" after referring "for assistance" to Johannean Greek?   Did a scribe of the *Minority Byzantine Reading 3* manuscript line then "reconstruct" this as "*ep'* (on) *auton* (him)" after referring "for assistance" to Pauline Greek?   And did a scribe of the *Majority Byzantine Reading* manuscript line then "reconstruct" this as "*ep'* (on) *auto* (him)" after referring "for assistance" to both Johannean Greek and Pauline Greek?

Were *Minority Byzantine Readings 2 & 3* and the *Majority Byzantine Reading* deliberate changes?   Did various scribes wish to make some kind of "theological point" that acted to "more easily" cross-reference the TR's words of Matt. 27:42b to other NT passages, so as "to form a more succinct contrast" between the bad example of those in Matt. 27:42b and the good example of those following these other NT passages?   Did a scribe of the *Minority Byzantine Reading 2* manuscript line thus change the reading to "*eis* (in) *auton* (him)" as "an easy cross-reference" to Johannean Greek?   Did a scribe of the *Minority Byzantine Reading 3* manuscript line thus change the reading to "*ep'* (on) *auton* (him)" as "an easy cross-reference" to Pauline Greek?   And did a scribe of the *Majority Byzantine Reading* manuscript line thus change the reading to "*ep'* (on) *auto* (him)" as "a cross-reference" to both Johannean Greek and Pauline Greek?

Were these changes deliberate or accidental?   Or was one or more deliberate and one or more accidental?   We do not now know.   We cannot now know.   But we can know that these were all changes to the original reading of the Received Text here Providentially preserved for us in *Minority Byzantine Reading 1.*

The exact manuscript strength of the TR's *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* is unknown, although in conjunction with *Minority Byzantine Readings 1, 2 & 3,* it is somewhere between *c.* 10% and less than 1% of the Byzantine manuscripts; and in terms of what we can presently itemize, there are 13 Greek Byzantine Manuscripts, which is less than 1%, and so it is possible, though by no means certain, that in fact its full support is less than 1% of the Greek manuscripts.   The TR's reading also has the support of one further ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius; and one further early mediaeval church Greek writer, Pseudo-Athanasius.   However, the TR's reading has very strong support as the monolithic reading of the Latin textual tradition, over time and through time, dating from ancient times, and this therefore includes the Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome.   Since the textual analysis at Matt. 27:42b is on the Greek, full credence is given to the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves*

the Latin.   Thus in the impressive support for the TR's reading that we find in the Latin textual tradition, we once again see a good example of the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, bowing down low, as well it might, in showing itself to be a most humble, dutiful, and obedient servant.   In recognition of which, we honour the Latin, and thank God for its faithful witness here at Matt. 27:42b.

Minority Byzantine Readings 2 & 3 have weak textual support in the Greek, no textual support in the Latin, and no good textual argument to commend them.   They may thus be safely dismissed.   The *Majority Byzantine Reading* is lacking in any ancient support, lacking in any Latin support, and has a good textual argument against it which is remedied by *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* and ONLY *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*.

Weighing up these factors, bearing in mind that the TR's *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* has Greek support over time, and through time, dating from ancient times; giving full credence to the fact that the clear and obvious textual problem with the *Majority Byzantine Reading* can be remedied by *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* and ONLY *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*; and considering the strength of monolithic Latin support for the TR's reading at Matt. 27:42b; on this occasion is sufficient to 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 low level 75-76% "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. 27:42b, is the TR's *Minority Byzantine Reading 1*, "him (*auto*)," in the wider words, "If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him (*auto*)," (AV). *Minority Byzantine Reading 1* is found outside the Byzantine textual tradition and outside the closed class of sources in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent) and 157 (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 Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) as Latin, "*ei* (him)[104]."   A similar reading is also found in the Gothic Version (4th century); and Armenian Version (5th century).

---

[104]   In Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic, "*et* (and) *credamus* ('we may believe,' subjunctive active present, 1st person plural verb, from *credo*) *ei* (him)."   On "*credamus*," see "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The First Matter," *supra*.

Minority Byzantine Reading 2, "in (*eis* = 'on' / 'upon' / 'in') him (*auton*)," i.e., "in him," is also found in a couple of von Soden's Io group Minuscules, which are otherwise not presently classified with regard to text type outside of von Soden's system (and which therefore may be either Byzantine or non-Byzantine text).

Minority Byzantine Reading 3, "(*ep'* = 'on' / 'upon' / 'in') him (*auton*)," i.e., "on him," is found outside the Byzantine textual tradition and outside the closed class of sources in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); 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).

The *Majority Byzantine Reading*, "on (*ep'* = 'on' / 'upon' / 'in') him (*aut<u>o</u>*)," is found outside the Byzantine textual tradition and outside the closed class of sources in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text).

At Matt. 27:42b, the erroneous *Minority Byzantine Reading 3* as found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, "*ep'* (= *epi*, 'on' / 'upon' / 'in') *auton* (him)," was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the *American Standard Version* of 1901 reads, "on him" (ASV) in the wider words, "let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe <u>on him</u>" (ASV, emphasis mine); and the *English Standard Version* of 2001 reads, "in him" (ESV) in the wider words "let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe <u>in him</u>" (ESV, emphasis mine). So too, at Matt. 27:42b this incorrect variant is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

The monolithic support for the TR's reading in the Latin textual tradition, meant that for the wrong reasons, the right reading was adopted by the old Latin Papists of post Trent Council (1545-63) and pre-Vatican II Council (1962-5) times in both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Hence at Matt. 27:42b, the Douay-Rheims reads, "him (Latin, *ei*)," in the wider words "let him now come down from the cross: and we will believe <u>him</u>" (Douay-Rheims, emphasis mine). But the post-Vatican II Council (1962-5) new neo-Alexandrian Papists would have none of the Received Text here at Matt. 27:42b, and so adopted the erroneous *Minority Byzantine Reading 3* as found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, in their Papists' Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB.

Meditation: In Matt. 27:27-51, he whose hands had made atoms, stars, and planets, were now nailed to a cross. He whose voice had commanded of the Edenic world in Gen. 1:2b-2:3, "Let there be light" (Gen. 1:3), now cried, "Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matt. 27:46). He who when he "created the heaven and the earth" (Gen. 1:1) was surrounded by angels who "sang together" and "shouted for joy" (Job 38:7), now heard men as they "passed by" who "reviled him, wagging their heads, and saying, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God come down

from the cross.   Likewise also the chief priests mocking him with the scribes and elders, said, He saved others; himself he cannot save.   If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him.   He trusted in God; let him save him: for he said, I am the Son of God" (Matt. 27:39-43).

Scripture tells us that such "revilers" "shall not inherit the kingdom of God" (I Cor. 6:9,10).   But Scripture also says, "And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God" (I Cor. 6:11).   It is only when by God's grace that a man is "washed" and "sanctified" and "justified," that he can put away such reviling of Christ as "the Son of God" and instead "believe him" (Matt. 27:42,43).   We find such an example in this same passage, as by God's grace "the centurion" who stood by "watching Jesus" was brought to saving faith, "saying, Truly this was the Son of God" (Matt. 27:54).   We are thus presented with two very different alternatives here in Matt. 27:27-54 i.e., that of those who foolishly "reviled" Christ for saying, "I am the Son of God" (Matt. 27:39,43); and the centurion who wisely declared of Christ, "Truly this was the Son of God" (Matt. 27:54).

As we come the end part of St. Matthew's Gospel, we realize that this Gospel teaches us of the work of Christ who by "the Holy Ghost" will "baptize" people (Matt. 3:11), i.e., regeneration.   But they must first recognize their sinfulness and inability to keep God's law as most especially found in the Ten Commandment (Matt. 19:16-22); they must "repent" of such sins (Matt. 4:17); in order to have their "sins" "forgiven" (Matt. 9:2,5), as with saving "faith" they look to Christ who gives them spiritual sight (Matt. 9:29).   They must "be converted" (Matt. 13:15; 18:3), confessing Jesus as "the Son of God" (Matt. 27:54) and "Lord" (Matt. 8:6,8); that is, the virgin born (Matt. 1:18-25) God incarnate Lord (Matt. 3:3; 19:17), who died in their place and for their sins (Matt. 20:28; 26:26-28), rose again the third day (Matt. 28), and is returning to judge the quick and the dead (Matt. 25).   For Christ came "to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28), giving his "body" and "blood" on the cross "for the remission of sins" (Matt. 26:27,28); and he says, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, for I am … come to call … sinners to repentance" (Matt. 9:13).   And of this Gospel he says, "Go" tell it to the world!   (Matt. 28:18-20).

What a Gospel!   What a Saviour!   What a God!

Matt. 27:43 "deliver him now" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*auton* (him)" of "*rusastho* ('let him deliver,' word 1) *nun* ('now,' word 2) *auton* ('him,' word 3)," i.e., "let him deliver <u>him</u> (*auton*, word 3) now," in the wider words said mockingly of Christ, "He trusted in God; let him deliver him now," 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[105]), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53,

---

[105]   In my photocopy of a facsimile of A 02, Manuscript London appears to omit

coming at the end of a line, the final "*n*" of word 3 is abbreviated with a bar something like "⁻"), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and K 017 (9th century); Minuscules 2 (12th century), 1010 (12th century, omitting word 2), and 1242 (13th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, thrice in three different readings; omitting word 2 in one of the three readings[106]) and 1968 (1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings).   It is also found as the Latin, "*eum* (him)" of "*liberet* ('let him deliver,' word 1) *nunc* ('now,' word 2) *eum* ('him,' word 3)," i.e., "let him deliver him (*auton*, word 3) now," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century, omitting word 2), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   It is further found in the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339); and the ancient church Latin writer, Tertullian (d. after 220)[107].

However, a variant omitting word 3, "him (Greek *auton*; Latin *eum*)," is a minority Latin reading.   It is found in old Latin Version r2 (8th / 9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

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

Was the variant an accidental omission?   Lectionary 1968 presents us with an interesting example of how the eye of a scribe might sometimes jump by ellipsis from the "*n*" ending of one word to the "*n*" ending of the next word.   (See Matt. 27:16,17**,**

word 2, and Swanson (1995) also says this is the reading of A 02; as does von Soden (see "om[it] νυν [= *nun*] … I k exc[ept] a 71" (von Soden's ε 71 = K 017), as A 02 = von Soden's δ 4 which for the Gospels is in his I ka group).   However, the textual apparatus of the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions say that A 02 gives "apparent support for" the "reading" which includes word 2 "in a manuscript whose state of preservation makes complete verification impossible," and that the reading which omits word 2 comes from the hand of a "corrector" (corrupter) scribe.   These UBS editions may well be right, but given this disagreement I would need to inspect the original to potentially form a firm opinion on the matter; and the fact that UBS do not go beyond a view of "apparent support" for a reading including word 2, indicates to me to me some level of obscurity in the manuscript, so that even if I were to see the original manuscript, I too might only be able to go so far as "apparent support" for whatever view I formed.

[106]   Lectionary 2378 has words 1, 2, & 3 at its first (p. 84a, column 2) and second (p. 88a, column 1) readings; but omits word 2 at its third reading (p. 95b, column 1).

[107]   Roensch, H. (Editor), *Das Neue Testament Tertullian's*, Fues's Verlag (R. Reisland), Leipzig, Germany, 1871, p. 141.   Though this is a selective quote of Matt. 27:43 by Tertullian which omits word 2 and other parts of this verse, it nevertheless includes the words, "*liberet* ('let him deliver,' word 1) *eum* ('him,' word 3)."

"Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion," "The First Matter;" & Matt. 27:34a**,** **"**Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion," "The Second Matter," *supra*).   Did a Greek scribe first write, "*nun* ('now,' word 2)"?   Did his eye then jump by ellipsis to the final "*n*" of the next word, "*auton* ('him,' word 3)"?   Did he then just keep writing, thereby accidentally omitting word 3?   Alternatively, in a line of Latin manuscripts, was the "*eum* ('him,' word 3)" lost in an undetected paper fade in a Latin manuscript?

Was the variant a deliberate omission?   The variant is also found at the hand of a "corrector" / corrupter scribe of Latin Vulgate Codex X[108].   Was the variant found in old Latin r2 likewise the work of such a so called "corrector scribe," who might be better called a "corrupter scribe"?   More widely the reading is Greek, "*rusasth__o_ ('let him deliver,' word 1) *nun* ('now,' word 2) *auton* ('him,' word 3) *ei* (if) *thelei* ('he wishes [to have]' = 'he will have,' AV) *auton* (him);" or Latin, "*liberet* ('let him deliver,' word 1) *nunc* ('now,' word 2) *eum* ('him,' word 3) *si* (if) *vult* ('he wishes [to have]' = 'he will have') *eum* (him)" i.e., "let him deliver him (Greek *auton*; Latin *eum*) now, if he will have him (Greek *auton*; Latin *eum*)[109]."   Did a Greek scribe deliberately remove Greek "*auton* (him)," and / or a Latin scribe deliberately remove Latin "*eum* (him)," on the basis that "it was redundant" since one could make the following Greek "*auton* (him)" of "*ei* (if) *thelei* (he will have) *auton* (him)," and / or the following Latin "*eum* (him)" of "*si* (if) *vult* (he will have) *eum* (him)," work "double-time," and so "on the basis of context" imply such an earlier Greek "*auton* (him)" and / or a Latin "*eum* (him)," respectively?

Was this variant a deliberate or accidental omission?   We do not know.   We cannot now know.   But we can know that it was an omission of the correct text here preserved for us in the majority Byzantine reading.

The TR's reading has rock solid support in both the Greek and Latin, over time, and through time, dating from ancient times.   This includes the support of the Vulgate by

---

[108]   The original of Latin Vulgate *Codex Cantabrigiensis* (X, Cambridge, UK) is from the 7th century.

[109]   This is the Latin of the Vulgate (Wordsworth & White) and most old Latin Versions.   Was the omission of the second "*eum* (him)" in old Latin aur & ff1 also motivated from similar views of "redundancy"?   Did such Latin scribes consider one could "simply imply" the latter "*eum* (him)" by making the earlier "*eum* ('him,' word 3)" work "double-time"?   Wordsworth & White's Vulgate here includes the second "*eum* (him)" (e.g., Vulgate Codices: M, 6th century, *Mediolanensis*, Milan, Italy; Y, 8th century, *Lindisfarnensis*, London, UK; & B, 9th century, *Bambergensis*, Bamberg, Germany); whereas Weber-Gryson's Vulgate omits the second "*eum* (him)" and their textual apparatus refers to the fact that this reading is manifested in the Clementine; and Merk says this Clementine reading is followed by all but 4 of his 28 relevant Vulgate Codices.   (The Weber-Gryson "Prefaces" p. xxxv claim that, "for the New Testament" "we have leaned heavily on" "the Oxford edition of J. Wordsworth and H.J. White," "but their text has always been carefully controlled by the evidence of the manuscripts and not infrequently … improved.")

the church father and doctor, St. Jerome.   By contrast, the variant has no support in the Greek, and weak support in the Latin.   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 27:43 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. 27:43, "him," in the wider words, "let him deliver (word 1) <u>him</u> (*auton*, word 3) now (word 2)" (AV), is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is also found in (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, omitting word 2), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere, omitting word 2), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent, omitting word 2), 1071 (12th century, independent), 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels), 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: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century, omitting word 2) Versions; Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian "1" Version (5th century) & Georgian "2" Version (5th century, omitting word 2); Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the variant, "him," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 892 (9th century, mixed text type).

Notwithstanding the absence of what from the Neo-Alexandrian School's perspective is the "lack of external support" for the variant, here at Matt. 27:43 the erroneous variant as found in the two main Alexandrian texts was adopted by the NU Text *et al*.   Once again this shows us that not withstanding the attempts of later neo-Alexandrians to distance themselves from the views of Westcott & Hort that when the two main Alexandrian texts agree they have "a neutral text," (which not even Westcott & Hort entirely believed, although generally they did[110],) the reality is that like Westcott &

---

[110]   See e.g., my comments on Westcott & Hort in Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14) at Matt. 13:33; Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25) at Matt. 21:24a; Vol. 4 (Matt. 26-28), at Matt. 26:70 & Matt. 28:6b.

Hort, they are very much beholden to these two faulty manuscripts connected with the African School of Alexandria, and tend to use citations of "external support" for them when possible simply as "a padding out" for their preconceived belief in the reading of these two wild African connected texts.

Another associated problem presents itself at this point in the neo-Alexandrian versions, namely, the non-usage of italics for added words in most of them, and the inconsistent usage of italics that may occur in those that do use italics.   At Matt. 27:43, the *New American Standard Bible* used italics in its 1st edition (1960-1971), 2nd edition (1977), and 3rd ed. (1995), to show it is following the variant.   E.g., notwithstanding some other changes made in the NASB's Third Edition at this verse relative to its First & Second Editions, at Matt. 27:43 the *New American Standard Bible* still uses italics to show that it is following the variant here in its reading, "LET GOD RESCUE *Him* now" (NASB 3rd ed. 1995, showing italics for added word).

At Matt. 27:43, though the NASB's father, the *American Standard Version* (1901), uses Westcott & Hort's text which follows the variant, the *American Standard Version* reads without italics, "let him deliver him now" etc. (ASV).   Is this because the ASV translators considered that they could make the following "*auton* (him)" here work "double-time" so as to imply it here and so italics were then not used?   (See "Was the variant a deliberate omission?," *supra*.)   Or was this simply an inconsistency on their part in not using italics?   Or less probably, might this be an example of their usage of a non-Alexandria text pincer arm on the basis of its loss by ellipsis on the final "n" coupled with the lack of "external support" for the variant on neo-Alexandrian principles?   (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.)

A similar unresolved issue of whether or not one or more other neo-Alexandrian Versions might here be using a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm presents itself in their lack of clarity resulting from their non-usage of italics.   Into this confusion is also thrown the uncertain readings at Matt. 27:43 of the RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, and Papists' JB and NJB.   Though the monolithic support of the NU Text *et al* for the variant means that *probably* most, if not all of these neo-Alexandrian versions, are following the variant, one cannot be sure of this.   E.g., Moffatt reads at Matt. 27:43, "Let God deliver him now" (Moffatt Bible).   Given both the fact that the TR's reading is here followed by e.g., the Western Text, all extant Syriac Versions, and most Latin manuscripts, means that this semi neo-Alexandrian may well have here followed the TR's right reading for the wrong reasons.   We simply do not know, nor do any of his sadly misguided readers.

Of course, none of this is new to we neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus* and Authorized Version.   The old Latin Papists' *Douay-Rheims Version* did not use italics for added words either, and this reads at Matt. 27:43, "let him now deliver <u>him</u>" (emphasis mine).   On the one hand, it might be *prima facie* argued that the overwhelming textual support for the TR's reading in the Latin textual tradition means that the Douay-Rheims was here following the TR's reading in the form of the Latin,

"*eum* (him)." But on the other hand, to the extent that the obscure Latin variant which omits the "*eum* (him)" is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate, it might also be argued that the Douay-Rheims translators may well have held the same view, and if so, they were therefore simply adding in the "him" as part of the act of translation from the Latin. Which is the correct view here of the Douay-Rheims? Why? How can one know?

Matt. 27:46b & Mark 15:34c "*lama*" (AV) {-}

Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. At Matt. 27:46b the TR reads after the Aramaic words of Christ, "*tout'* (= "*touto*," that [to say]) *esti* (is), *Thee* (God) *mou* (my), *Thee* (God) *mou* (my)," etc. . But when the scribe of Manuscript Washington (W 032) wrote this out (Matt. 27:38-50, p. 108), he first wrote the "*esti* (is), *Thee* (God) *mou* (my)," (with the optional "*n*" at the end of "*esti*") in continuous script with capital letters (or unicals) as, "ECTINθEMOY", and then realized he had left out an "E" before "MOY." He thus inserted an "E" above the line which starts after the "θE" and before the "MOY." We this see an interesting "snap-shot" of "an accident scene" here in *Codex Freerianus*, that reminds us that letters or short words could sometimes be lost inadvertently, and, of course, unlike the scribe of W 032 here at Matt. 27:46b, the scribe was not always sufficiently adroit to realize the error he had made. (Cf. W 032 at Matt. 27:47 in Appendix 3.)

The Second Matter. Von Soden takes the view that at Matt. 27:46b the "*ma*" of W 032 is sufficient to say it here follows *Transliteration 4's* "*lama*"[111]. While I think he has a valid point in arguing that the "*ma*" is most likely a copyist's error for "*lama*," I do not like him think that this can be said in an unqualified way. Hence I say it is "a similar reading … which probably is a scribal corruption of '*lama*'," *infra*.

The Third Matter. With regard to the transliteration at Mark 15:34c as *Transliteration 4's* "*lama*" with the variant spelling "*lamma*," I am unable to itemize any specific manuscripts. Tischendorf (1869-72) says that this "*lamma*" reading is here followed by "a few minuscules" and a Vulgate edition in the Latin, but gives no further details. In its Latin form it is found in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

The Fourth Matter (Diatessaron formatting). The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron reads, "*lama*" (Latin Diatessaron, ccvii). But the Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, and the Vulgate reads, "*lema*" at Matt. 27:46b and "*lama*" at Mark 15:34c. Were this the end of the matter, then on the balance of probabilities I would say it had here have gotten the "*lama*" from the Vulgate's Mark 15:34c as part of Diatessaron formatting. But that is not the end of the matter, since a number of Vulgate Codices also have "*lama*" at Matt. 27:46b, *infra*. Therefore I make no reference to the Sangallensis

---

[111] Von Soden reads, "λαμα Ια δ5f". Von Soden's δ5f in his Ια group = von Soden's δ5 / D 05 (Western Text) + von Soden's 014 / W 032 only in Matthew (where it is Byzantine Text).

Diatessaron at either Matt. 27:46b or Mark 15:34c, *infra*.

The Fifth Matter. The good Christian reader is again reminded that Divine Preservation of Hoy Scripture, and those manuscripts inside the closed class of sources, depends not on man's frailties and imperfections, but on God's sovereignty (Matt. 5:17,18; 24:35; I Peter 1:25). For these purposes, it does not matter that the Jews are in apostasy for having rejected the Messiah (II Cor. 3:13-15), it matter only that "unto them were committed the" OT "oracles of God" (Rom. 3:2), and so they played an important and essential role in preserving not only the Hebrew & Aramaic Masoretic text, but other Hebrew and Aramaic works containing OT quotes such as the Talmud. Likewise, for these purposes it does not matter that the Eastern Orthodox Churches are in apostasy, e.g., the Greek Orthodox Church, it only matters that under God these Gentiles preserved Greek manuscripts; and likewise, for these purposes, it does not matter that the Roman Church is in apostasy, only that under God these Gentiles preserved (mainly) Latin manuscripts.

An example of this is found below in one of the Vulgate Codices used in both Wordsworth & White's *Novum Testamentum Latine* (1911) and Merk's *Novum Testamentum: Graece et Latine* (1964). It is cited here at Matt. 27:46b by Wordsworth & White for *Transliteration 4*, "*lama*," to wit, *Codex Vallicellanus* (V, 9th century). This Codex V is housed at Chiesa Nuova, at Rome, Italy. This is a Roman Catholic Church on the main thoroughfare of the Corso Vittorio Emanuel in Italian Rome. This church was founded by Papists in 1561 and reflects a Counter-Reformation design and theology which sought to deny and subvert the wonderful truths of the Protestant Reformation. Yet God can still use those in such apostasy who deny the gospel of "grace" and "faith" (Gal. 1:6; 3:11) in Romanism to preserve such Latin manuscripts; just like he can use those in apostasy who deny the gospel of "grace" and "faith" (Gal. 1:6; 3:11) in Greek Orthodoxy to preserve Greek manuscripts; or he can use those apostasy who deny the gospel of "grace" and "faith" (Gal. 1:6; 3:11) in Judaism to preserve Hebrew and Aramaic manuscripts. For "the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men" (Dan. 4:17), and he works his will, even when this is not always immediately apparent unto men.

Principal Textual Discussion.

Psalm 22 which is cited at both Matt. 27:46 and Mark 15:34 is known in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* by the Latin title, "*Deus, Deus meus*[112]." The issues considered here with regard to Matt. 27:46b and Mark 15:34c are not the normative ones generally considered at a given reading, since the outcome is affected by the issue of transliteration and connected ideological views of transliteration. Before a section looking at some relevant matters *Outside the Closed Class of Sources*, the discussion here at Matt. 27:46b & Mark 15:34c in the "Principal Textual Discussion" will be under following subheadings:

---

[112] Latin, "*Deus* ('O God,' vocative)*, Deus* (God) *meus* (my)" = "O God my God."

Introduction.
The Hebraic "lama."
The Aramaic "lama" / "lema" / "leima" / "lima."
The Hebraic Matthean "Eli" or Aramaic Marcan "Eloi."
Best available present data: Hebraic Matthean "Eli" & Aramaic Marcan
    "Eloi;" "lama" either Hebraic or Aramaic; "lima," "leima," &
    "lema," are Aramaic.
Wider Issue of NT transliterations.
Wider issue of a translator's English (or other language) transliterations from
    the Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek.
Specific issue of a translator's English (or other language) transliterations
    at Matt. 27:46b and Mark 15:34c.

    Introduction. At Matt. 27:46b, the Aramaic word rendered "*lama*" in the Authorized Version had multiple local oral vocalizations and corresponding written vowellings in both ancient and later times. These include the following four transliterations[113].

    Transliterations 1 & 2 are Greek and Latin, "*lima*" (*Transliteration 1*) or Greek "*leima*" (*Transliteration 2*). At Matt. 27:46b, with one of these two alternative vowellings of "*i*" or "*ei*," this reading in its two vowelling forms is the majority Byzantine text reading[114]. It is supported 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, as "*lima*"), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century, as "*lima*"), 090 (6th century, Matt. 26:59-70; 27:44-56; Mark 1:34-2:12, as "*lima*"), E 07 (8th century, as "*leima*"), H 014 (9th century, as "*leima*"), K 017 (9th century, as "*lima*"), M 021 (9th century, as "*leima*"), U 030 (9th century, as "*lima*"), S 028 (10th century, as "*leima*"), and Gamma 036 (10th century, as "*lima*"); Minuscule 2 (12th century, as "*leima*"); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, as "*lima*" thrice in three different readings, in one of these three instances possibly, though not definitely, altered as a correction from "*lema*"[115]) and 1968 (1544 A.D., as "*lima*"

---

    [113] I exclude reference here to any less significant form, such as the Greek "*l<u>e</u>ma*" of Epiphanius (d. 403).

    [114] Von Soden says his K group of *c.* 1,000 manuscripts reads "*lima* or *leima*," and so we only know that *c.* 90% + of K group, and so on any reasonable statistical projections, *c.* 90% plus of several thousands of Byzantine text Gospel manuscripts, have one of these two readings.

    [115] At reading 1 (p. 84b, column 1) the photocopy of the two microfilm forms is not clear, but it looks to me like *Transliteration 3*, "*lema*." However, upon inspection of the original at Sydney University, it is clear that this is "*lima*." The original shows that the iotas of both "Ηλι Ηλι" and then the "λιμα" are surrounded by small dark oblongs, indicating that they may have been scratched out and rewritten as iotas. However, other such markings also appear elsewhere on this same page, and as best I can tell, if they

thrice in three different readings[116]).   It is also supported as Latin, "*lima*" (*Transliteration 1*), in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century).   It is further supported as "*lima*" (*Transliteration 1*) by the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339), Basil the Great (d. 379), and Chrysostom (d. 407); and as "*leima*" (*Transliteration 2*) by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379).

Transliteration 3 is Greek and Latin, "*lema*."   It is found as Latin, "*lema*," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339).

Transliteration 4 is Greek and Latin, "*lama*," or the variant Greek and Latin spelling "*lamma*."   At Matt. 27:46b it is found as Latin, "*lama*," in a minority of Vulgate Codices with Codices Ma (8th century, Tours, France), T (8th century, Madrid, Spain), Ep (9th century, Paris, France), K (9th century, London, UK), V (9th century, Rome, Italy), and W (1245 A.D., London, UK); as well as old Latin Versions b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), aur (7th century); and the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.).   It is further found as the variant spelling, Latin, "*lamma*," in old Latin Version g2 (10th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592) as "*lamma*."   It is also found as Greek, "*lama*," in the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339); with the variant Greek spelling "*lamma*," in the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379); and as Latin "*lama*," in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.   It is also found in a similar reading, Greek "*ma*," as a minority Byzantine reading in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), which probably is a scribal corruption of Greek, "*lama*."   The transliteration, "*lama*," is also manifested in both the Greek and Latin *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of Erasmus (1516 & 1522); and the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of Stephanus (1550) and Scrivener (1894 & 1902).

At Mark 15:34c, the Aramaic word rendered "*lama*" in the Authorized Version had multiple local oral vocalizations and corresponding written vowellings in both ancient and later times.   These include the following four transliterations[117].

---

were corrections then they were quite possibly done by the original scribe.   But a better technology than is available to me is necessary to scrutinize both these markings and the ink in order to be entirely certain about the matter; e.g., I am open to the possibility that the photocopy of the microfilm form in both its positive and negative forms that looks like "λεμα", may be photographically picking up an underpinning etching of a scratched out epsilon that is not apparent to the naked eye.   The "*lima*" is followed by "*sabachthane*" (reading 1, p. 84, column 1; & reading 3, p. 95b, column 1), & "*sabachthani*" (reading 2, p. 88a, column 2).

[116]   Followed by "*sabachthani*" in all three readings.

[117]   I exclude reference here to less significant forms, such as the Latin translation transliterations "*lamanai*" (old Latin i, 5th century) or "*leaba*" (old Latin aur, 7th

Transliteration 1 is Greek "*lima*" (*Transliteration 1*). At Mark 15:34c this is the majority Byzantine text reading of *c.* 90% of Byzantine manuscripts[118]. 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), K 017 (9th century), Gamma 036 (10th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century[119]). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Athanasius (d. 373).

Transliteration 2 is Greek "*leima*." At Mark 15:34c this is a minority Byzantine reading found in *c.* 5% of Byzantine manuscripts[120]. It is found in e.g., Codices E 07 (8th century), S 028 (10th century); and Minuscule 2 (12th century).

Transliteration 3 is Greek and Latin "*lema*." At Mark 15:34c it is found as Latin, "*lema*," in a minority of Vulgate Codices with Codices M (6th century, Milan, Italy), U (6th century, Rome, Vatican City State), J (6th / 7th century, Cividale, Italy), and C (9th century, La cava, Italy); as well as in old Latin Versions 1 (7th / 8th century) and c (12th / 13th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339).

Transliteration 4 is Greek and Latin "*lama*." At Mark 15:34c it is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is further found as Latin, "*lama*," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions d (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), and the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339); and the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258)[121].

---

century).

[118] This has the support of von Soden's K group other than his K1 & Ki groups (see next footnote), i.e., *c.* 90% of K group's *c.* 1,000 manuscripts, and so on any reasonable statistical projections, *c.* 90% of several thousands of Byzantine text Gospel manuscripts.

[119] Followed by "*sabachthane*" (p. 90b, column 1).

[120] At Mark 15:34, out of *c.* 860 K group Gospel manuscripts, "λειμα (leima)" is followed by von Soden's K1 group of 37 Gospel Byzantine manuscripts and Ki group of 7 Gospel Byzantine manuscripts i.e., 44 / 860 = *c.* 5%. (These are conservative estimates as there are also *c.* 15 manuscripts in K1 unclassified outside of von Soden's system most of which would, on statistical analysis of the known manuscripts in this group, have to be Byzantine.) But even if this were twice this figure i.e., *c.* 10%, this is still clearly a small minority reading.

[121] Hans Freiherr von Soden's *Das Lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur zeit Cyprians*, in Harnack, A, & Schmidt, C., *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur*, J.C. Hinrich's sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, Germany, 1909, p. 448 (Latin, "*lama*").

The transliteration, "*lama*," is also manifested in both the Greek and Latin *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of Erasmus (1516 & 1522). This transliteration with the variant spelling, "*lamma*," is also found in the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of Stephanus (1550) and Scrivener (1894 & 1902).

The Hebraic "lama." In the Hebrew Masoretic Text of the *Deus, Deus meus*, Ps. 22:1 has the prefixed preposition, "*la* (לְ)" in which the vowel under the "*l*" (Hebrew, לֹ) is qamats (ָ) which has an "are" sound, plus "*ma*" or "*mah* (Hebrew, מָה)" in which the vowel under the "*m*" (Hebrew, מ) is once again qamats (ָ), and so the pronunciation of "*lama*" / לָמָה, is "*larmar*," meaning "Why ("*la*" / "for" + "*ma*" / "what")?"

The Aramaic "lama" / "lema" / "leima" / "lima." The OT also contains some Aramaic (Ezra 7:12-26; Jer. 10:11; Dan. 2:4b-7:28). Aramaic is very similar to, though not the same as, Hebrew. The Hebrew speakers of Biblical times who had to learn Aramaic in order to understand parts of the OT, were in broad terms in the same boat as those who since 1611 through to contemporary times have had to learn the difference between their contemporary English and King James Bible English. In the Aramaic of Ezra 7:23 the Hebrew "*lama*" becomes the Aramaic "*lema*." In the Aramaic of Ezra 7:23, the prefixed preposition "*le* (לְ)" has under the "*l*" (Aramaic, לֹ) a sheva / shewa which looks like a small colon ": (ְ)." Thus the Aramaic "Why?" is "*lema*" / לְמָא. Though in some contexts it is silent, it is here vocalized in different pronunciation traditions as either "*a*" as in "*allow*," and hence pronounced as "*lamar*[122];" or as "*e*" as in "*let*," and hence pronounced as "*lemar*[123]."

The issue of local dialects "opens the lid on a can of worms," since we can never be sure what the full range of local dialect variations may have been for a word like this. We are thus left to ask, Is the "*lama*" an Aramaic or a Hebraic vocalization? And since the only way to entirely resolve any such dispute is to hear it pronounced to find out if the first "*a*" is pronounced like the "are" sound of "Father" i.e., "*larmar*" (Hebraic vocalization, as in the Hebrew of Ps. 22:1), or like the "a" of "above," i.e., "*la-mar*" (Aramaic vocalization, as in one dialect way of vocalizing Ezra 7:23), while our *Father above*[124] knows the answer, we do not.

---

[122] Pratico, G.D., & Van Pelt, M.V., *Basic of Biblical Hebrew Grammar*, Zondervan, Michigan, USA, 2001, p. 11.

[123] Mansoor, M., *Biblical Hebrew*, 1978, 2nd ed. 1979, Baker Book House, Michigan, USA, 1993, pp. 29 & 33.

[124] For the terminology of "our Father" (Matt. 6:9; Heb. 1:5) "above" (John 19:11), see Dan. 7:13; Matt. 6:9; 26:64; Mark 16:19; John 19:11; Heb. 1:5,13.

Thus a connected issue of local dialects in this "can of worms" that we "have now opened," is the issue of the vocalization or pronunciation of given letters. This has even wider ramifications than the "*larmar*" (Hebraic vocalization) or "*la-mar*" (one possible Aramaic vocalization) issue of the Matt. 27:46b "*lama*" (Transliteration 4).

E.g., this also includes the issue of vocalization raised by old Latin f & q, which use the transliteration, "*lima*." How is the "i" to here be pronounced?

If one looks at the Latin word, "*gratia*" which is the "grace" of "grace alone" in the Reformation's "*sola* (alone) *gratia* (grace)," then we Anglophone Protestants would traditionally pronounce the "*gratia*" with the first "*a*" as the "*a*" in the "F<u>a</u>ther" of the Lord's Prayer, "Our F<u>a</u>ther;" and the "*t*" as in the "*t*" of the "<u>T</u>en Commandmen<u>t</u>s;" and the "*i*" as in the "*i*" of "which" and "in" in the Lord's Prayer, "Our Father wh<u>i</u>ch art <u>i</u>n heaven" i.e., "*sola grar-t-ia*." Yet we find that there are some Popish persons around, who being far gone in Romanism, for ideological reasons want to favour and promote Romish Italy which surrounds both Italian Rome and Papal Rome, and which is a predominately Roman Catholic country. These Popish persons wish to "speak Latin like the Italians;" and so in their very "Italiano" way would, perhaps with a flourish of the hands rolling around in circles as they spoke, say something like, "*sola gratsia*."

Likewise, if one looks at the Latin word, "*fide*" which is the "faith" of "faith alone" in the Reformation's "*sola* (alone) *fide* (faith)," then we Anglophone Protestants would traditionally pronounce the "*fide*" with the "*i*" of "*fide*" as in "*lit*" e.g., "in 1517 Luther lit the Reformation," and the "*e*" of "*fide*" as the "*a*" of "flame" e.g., "the glorious flame of Luther's Protestant torch still burns brightly" i.e., "*sola fi-day*." Yet when I studied legal Latin in connection with my studies of law at the Sydney University Law School, the "*fide*" of the legal term "*bona fide*" meaning "good (*bona*) faith (*fide*)," was pronounced in the local dialect of English Common Law Latin, so that the "*i*" of "*fide*" was pronounced like the "*i*" of "light" e.g., "the light of the Gospel shone brightly when it was proclaimed by the Protestants," and the "*e*" of "*fide*" was pronounced like the "*e*" of "he" e.g., "As a good Protestant, h<u>e</u> believes in '*sola Scriptura*' or 'Scripture alone'," i.e., "*sola F-I-dee*."

All this is very relevant because when we look at something like the "i" of old Latin f & q's transliteration, "*lima*," we are left to ask, How was it vocalized? E.g., in Latin, an "i" can further have a long sound like the "*i*" of "machine," and so "*lima*" might have been pronounced as, "*leema*." If so, this might simply have been a locally accented vocalization of the "*e*" sound of the "*lema*" found in e.g., the Vulgate and old Latin a.

Given that in the Greek "*ei*" and "*i*" are sometimes interchanged as vowellings[125], Transliterations 1, 2 & 3 appear to reflect the same source. We thus find that the ancient

---

[125] See Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Appendix 1, at "CONCERNING MATT. 10:25c AND MATT. 10:36."

Greek and Latin transliterations we have, to wit, "*lima*" (Transliteration 1, from Aramaic), "*leima*" (Transliteration 2, from Aramaic), "*lema*" (Transliteration 3, from Aramaic), and "*lama*" (Transliteration 4, depending on pronunciation accent, either from Hebrew, or an Aramaic dialect), do not provide us with hard and fast provable vocalizations, even if they do give us some clues as to what various vocalizations *may* have been.

The Hebraic Matthean "Eli" or Aramaic Marcan "Eloi." This "can of worms" that we "have now opened" here with the "*lima*" / "*leima*" / "*lema*" / "*lama*" of Matt. 27:46 and Mark 15:34, contains "yet more worms." That is because it is clear that in transliterating the opening verse of the *Deus, Deus meus*, both St. Matthew at Matt. 27:46, and also St. Mark at Mark 15:34, have employed different local dialect Greek transliterations of the Aramaic in their Hellenized forms of the Aramaic of Ps. 22:1.

At Matt. 27:46b, St. Matthew uses what appears to be a Hellenistic Hebraic influenced transliteration of "*Hli*" which in Greek letters is "Ηλι," meaning "My God," i.e., English transliterated "*Hli*" / "*Eli*" or Greek transliterated "Ηλ" / "God," from Hebrew *'el* / אֵל + English transliterated "*i*" or Greek transliterated "ι"/ "my" from Hebrew *'aniy* / אֲנִי , which is the form one finds in the Hebrew of Ps. 22:1 as אֵל + י = אֵלִי. By contrast, at Mark 15:34, St. Mark appears to be using a Hellenistic Aramaic transliteration, of "*Eloi*" which in Greek letters is "Ελωι," meaning "My God," i.e., English transliterated "*Elo*" or Greek transliterated "Ελω" / "God," from Aramaic "*'elahh*" / אֱלָה (e.g., Ezra 7:28; Dan. 4:8; 6:22), corresponding to, and here at Mark 15:34 possibly influenced by, Hebrew "*'eloahh*" / אֱלֹהַ + Aramaic pronoun suffix English transliterated "*i*" or Greek transliterated "ι"/ "my," corresponding to the Hebrew form, *supra*.

But it must be said that a number of uncertainties exist about the precise etymological route of both the Matthean and Marcan Hellenistic transliterations of the Aramaic at Matt. 27:46 and Mark 15:34 respectively.

E.g., is it possible that the Marcan "Eloi" also reflects a Hellenized Hebraic transliteration, that in fact reflects some localized Hebrew dialect which sometimes employed "Eloi"? This gives rise to a number of esoteric speculative questions. For instance, what if anything, is the interrelationship between the "Ελωι (*Eloi*)" of Mark 15:34 and the "Ελωι (*Eloi*)" of *one* Septuagint form at Judges 5:5 where the Hebrew YHWH / YHVH which we Anglicize as "Jehovah," is rendered as "κυριου (Lord) Ελωι"[126]? Does this Septuagint line mean at Judges 5:5 "Lord (κυριου = *Kuriou*) my God (Ελωι = *Eloi*)," or does it mean something else? Did this rival Septuagint reading at Judges 5:5 arise before or after NT times?

---

[126] So found in Brenton's LXX, and Rahlfs-Hanhart's LXX for the Codex Vaticanus LXX.

This in turn further connects with other speculative questions. E.g., the common Hebrew *'elohiym* / אֱלֹ הִים, starts with "*elo*" (e.g., Gen. 1:1,2), as does also *'elowahh* / אֱלֹוֹהַ (e.g., Deut. 32:15,17). Did an abbreviated form of this "*elo*" suffix give rise to, or is in anyway related to, a local dialect of the Hebrew and / or the Aramaic suffix, "*Elo*" for "God" in Mark 15:34? The "god" of "his god" in Hab. 1:11 is Hebrew "*loh*" / אֱלֹ הֹ, and in the Septuagint this is not "his god" (Hebrew) but "my god ('*to* [the] *theo* [god] *mou* ['of me' = 'my'])" (LXX). Then in Hab. 1:12 the Hebrew reads, "'*elohay* ('my God,' *eloha* or אֱלֹ הַ / 'God' + *y* / י / 'my')." What, if anything, is the interrelationship with this type of Hebraic construction, either with or without any specific reference to Hab. 1:11,12, as a speculatively theorized but unproven local dialect of the Hebrew with the transliteration "*Elo*" of "*Eloi*," thus being the same as the Aramaic, אֱלָהִי meaning, "My God," as found in the Marcan transliteration of the Aramaic at Mark 15:34? In short, is it Hebraic from a local dialect (an unproven speculative theory), or Aramaic?

Other uncertainties exist at present with regard to the whole issue of relevant local dialects of Hebrew and / or Aramaic in NT times. Was there any such local dialects or not? If so, how many were there, and to what extent did they differ from standard Hebrew and / or Aramaic, and do such differences here account for the different Hellenistic transliterations of the Aramaic as Matt. 27:46 and /or Mark 15:34?[127] Do Matt. 27:46 and /or Mark 15:34 in fact reflect different local dialects of Hebrew and / or Aramaic? If so, do the speculative etymological origins for "Eloi" as a theoretically possible, but entirely unproven, local Hebrew dialect *supra* (which of course, might be never have existed and so be very wrong,) help us better understand the matter or not?

Best available present data: Hebraic Matthean "Eli" & Aramaic Marcan "Eloi;" "lama" either Hebraic or Aramaic; "lima," "leima," & "lema," are Aramaic. At least on the presently available evidence of what we definitely know about Hebrew and Aramaic, in the absence of any clear evidence for the existence of any possible additional local dialects of Hebrew and / or Aramaic in NT times which specifically throw further light on these words in question, we would have to say at Matt. 27:46 and Mark 15:34, that the Matthean "*Eli* (My God)" is transliterated with reference to the Hebrew, whereas the Marcan "*Eloi* (My God)" is transliterated with reference to the Aramaic. And likewise, we would have to say that the "*lama*" ('Why?,' Transliteration 4) is, depending

---

[127] Some incomplete and fragmentary answers to these type of questions may be found in Michael Sokoloff's *A Dictionary of Judean Aramaic*, Bar Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel, 2003. Of some further interest to the student of local Aramaic dialects are Sokoloff's *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic* (Bar Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel, & John Hopkins University, Maryland, USA, 2002), & *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Bar Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel, & John Hopkins University, Maryland, USA, 1990, 2nd edition 2002).

on pronunciation accent i.e., vocalization, transliterated with reference to either Hebrew, or an Aramaic dialect; whereas "*leima* ('Why?,' Transliteration 2)," "*lema* ('Why?,' Transliteration 3)," and "*lima*" ('Why?,' Transliteration 1), are transliterated with reference to the Aramaic. (With regard to the final word, "*sabachthani*, Gr. σαβαχθανι, 'hast thou forsaken me?'," this is transliterated from the Aramaic *sabachthani / sabachtani*, not the Hebrew *'azabtani*[128].)

Therefore in the majority Byzantine reading of Matt. 27:46 we have a Hebraic transliteration ("Ηλι, Ηλι" = "My God, My God") + an Aramaic transliteration ("λιμα" = "Why?") + an Aramaic transliteration ("σαβαχθανι" = "hast thou forsaken me?"); whereas in the majority Byzantine reading of Mark 15:34 we have an Aramaic transliteration ("Ελωι, Ελωι" = "My God, My God") + an Aramaic transliteration ("λιμα" = "Why?") + an Aramaic transliteration ("σαβαχθανι" = "hast thou forsaken me?").

A most significant fact therefore emerges in the comparison and contrast of Matt. 27:46 and Mark 15:34. It is perfectly clear from the "*Hli / Eli* (Ηλι)" of Matt. 27:46 and "*Eloi* (Ελωι)" of Mark 15:34, that different Hellenistic transliterations of the Aramaic words of Christ are here being used by St. Matthew and St. Mark, since the context of solemnity and the timing of this at "about the ninth hour" (Matt. 27:46; Mark 15:34), the misunderstanding of this as calling out for "Elias" (Matt. 27:47; Mark 15:35); the man running up with the "spunge" of "vinegar" (Matt. 27:48; Mark 15:36), and then Jesus giving up the ghost (Matt. 27:50; Mark 15:37), all indicate this was a one-off utterance of Christ, rather than a repeated utterance in which Christ employed slightly different words on multiple occasions. Thus we can with reasonable confidence say that different Hellenistic transliterations are being used by both St. Matthew and St. Mark. And that these are transliterations, is of course, also evident in the fact that Greek letters, rather than Aramaic ones, are used at Matt. 27:46 and Mark 15:34.

Wider Issue of NT transliterations. This issue of transliterations at Matt. 27:46 and Mark 15:34 should also be put in the wider NT context in which a number of Hellenistic transliterations are used. (See Matt. 5:22; 21:9 – twice; 15; Mark 5:41; 7:34; 10:51 "Lord" = "Rabboni;" 11:9,10; 14:36; John 12:13; 20:16; Acts 1:19; Rom. 8:15; I Cor. 16:22; Gal. 4:6.) E.g., the OT Hebraic "*Yehowshuwa* ('Jehoshua,' 'Jehoshuah,' or 'Joshua')" becomes the NT Greek, "*Iesous* (Gr. Ιησους)," which in term we then transliterate as the Anglicized form, "Jesus." Or the Hebrew root words *halal* (praise) + *Yah / Jah* = "*halleluyah*" / "*hallelujah*" give rise to our "Hallelujah," which is a direct transliteration from the Hebrew. But it also gives rise to the Hellenized form, "*Allelouia* (Gr. Αλληλουια)" of the Septuagint (e.g., Psalm titles of Pss. 146 & 147, LXX) and NT (Rev. 19:1,3,4,6); which as transliterated through the Latin, "*Alleluia*," in turn becomes our English transliterated, "Alleluia."

For the purposes of English translation, it does not matter that the Hebrew reads, "YHWH," it only matters that by transliteration convention this becomes our "Jehovah"

---

[128] At Matt. 27:46 and Mark 15:34, the majority Byzantine text's "*sabachthani*" has no good textual argument against it and so is correct.

(in harmony with the vocalization of the Hebrew Masoretic Text).   It does not matter that the Greek reads, "*Ie̱sous*," it only matters that by transliteration convention this becomes our "Jesus."   And it does not matter that the Hebrew is "*Halleluyah*," the Greek is "*Allelouia*," and the Latin is "*Alleluia*;" it only matters that by transliteration convention this becomes our "Alleluia" (Rev. 19:1, AV) or "Hallelujah" (Rev. 19:1, ASV).

Wider issue of a translator's English (or other language) transliterations from the Hebrew, Aramaic, or Greek.   This in turn now brings us to turn up "yet more worms" in this proverbial "can of worms" that we "have opened," to wit, the whole issue of transliteration.   This is seen in our own day and age in the stubborn refusal of so many Bible translators to follow the KJV's tradition of the modest sevenfold usage of the transliteration, "Jehovah," in the OT.   Not that we want to go to the other extreme of the ASV's OT always using "Jehovah," since the NT balance is one of generally using "God" / "Lord" for this or another OT form (e.g., Matt. 1:23, Isa. 7:14 & 8:18 "El" of transliterated "Emmanuel" = "God;" Matt. 3:3, Isa. 40:3 Heb. YHWH = Gr. *Kurios* / "Lord" applied to Christ as God; Rom. 2:24, Isa. 52:5, Heb. YHWH = Gr. *Theos* / "God;" though occasionally transliterating it as seen in the "Jah" / "Ia" of the fourfold "Alleluia" of Rev. 19).   The AV thus has the right type of balance for YHWH in its sevenfold OT usage of "Jehovah" and its normative OT usage of "Lᴏʀᴅ."   In turn this YHWH transliteration issue to some extent also reflects the attack on the OT Neo-Masoretic *Textus Receptus* which has come under various attacks from a number of quarters, including the long lost, and then suddenly rediscovered, corrupt Codex Leningrad.   But "Jehovah" is a well established English form which is in harmony with the vowel vocalization in the Hebrew Masoretic Text at e.g., Exod. 6:3 of "YeHoWaH"[129].

Specific issue of a translator's English (or other language) transliterations at Matt. 27:46 and Mark 15:34.   And this now leads us to the relevant *translation* transliterations *into English* (or another tongue,) at Matt. 27:46 and Mark 15:34.   At Matt. 27:46 the majority Byzantine text reads either, "Ηλι, Ηλι, λιμα," which would be in a comparable letter for letter English transliteration, "Eli, Eli, lima" etc. (Transliteration 1, from Aramaic); or "Ηλι, Ηλι, λειμα," which would be in English transliteration, "Eli, Eli, leima" etc. (Transliteration 2, from Aramaic); and at Mark 15:34 the majority Byzantine text reads, "Ελωι, Ελωι, λιμα" etc., which would be in a comparable letter for letter English transliteration, "Eloi, Eloi, lima" etc. .   There is no good textual argument against this two majority Byzantine readings, and so these are the correct TR readings.

At Matt. 27:46b Erasmus used in his Greek-English New Testaments of both 1516 & 1522, Greek, "Ηλει Ηλει λαμα" etc., which would be in English in a comparable letter for letter transliteration, "Elei, Elei, lama" etc., and in his parallel Latin column,

---

[129]   See e.g., the *Hebrew Old Testament*, 1894, Trinitarian Bible Society, London, UK, 1998 (using for the Pentateuch e.g., the Complutensian Polyglot of 1514-17, Spain, published 1521/2; Hebrew OT of Bomberg, Venice, Italy, 1517 & 1521; & Hebrew OT of Jacob ben Chayim, Venice, Italy, 1524-5).   This is different to the vocalization at Exod. 6:3 in Codex Leningrad, as "YeHWaH," used in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS), Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, Germany, 1967 / 77, 1984.

"*Eli eli lama*" etc., and at Mark 15:34 he used Greek, "ελωι ελωι λαμα" etc., which would be in a comparable letter for letter English transliteration, "Eloi, Eloi, lama" etc., and in his parallel Latin column, "*Eloi, eloi lama*" etc. .   At Matt. 27:46b, Stephanus (1550) and Scrivener (1894 & 1902) used "Ηλι, Ηλι λαμα" etc., which would be in a comparable letter for letter English transliteration, "Eli, Eli, lama" etc., and at Mark 15:34 Stephanus (1550) and Scrivener (1894 & 1902) used Greek, "Ελωι, Ελωι λαμμα" etc., which would be in a comparable letter for letter English transliteration, "Eloi, Eloi, lamma" etc. .

The uncertainty as to the majority Byzantine text reading at Matt. 27:46b of "λιμα (lima)" (Transliteration 1) or "λειμα (leima)" (Transliteration 2), is also reflected in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624), since of his eight Gospel manuscripts, he shows three reading "λιμα (lima)" and three reading λειμα (leima)" (and another reading "λημα" / "l*e*ma," which is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Epiphanius, d. 403). However, at Mark 15:34c it is clear that the majority Byzantine text reading is "λιμα (lima)," even though a minority of *c.* 5% of manuscripts have "λειμα (leima)."   And Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) shows four of his eight Gospel manuscripts with λιμα (lima)," and three with λειμα (leima)" (with one, "λημα" / "l*e*ma").

In an abstract construct, it would be theoretically possible to *translate* the majority Byzantine text's Matt. 27:46b "λιμα (lima)" (Transliteration 1) or "λειμα (leima)" (Transliteration 2), and Mark 15:34c's "λιμα (lima)," in a variety of different ways.   Given that a number of English words come to us through Greek and / or Latin, one could certainly decide to make an Anglicized (or other tongue's) transliteration of the majority Byzantine text's "λιμα (lima)" or "λειμα (leima)" at Matt. 27:46b as: "*lima*" via the Greek and old Latin f & q; or "*leima*" via the Greek; or "*lema*" via e.g., the Greek of Eusebius and Latin of the Vulgate; or "*lama*" via e.g., the Greek of Eusebius and Latin of old Latin b & h; or "*lamma*" via the Greek of Basil the Great.   Likewise, one could make an Anglicized (or other tongue's) transliteration of Mark 15:34c e.g., as: "*lima*" via the Greek; or "*leima*" via the Greek; or "*lema*" via the Greek and e.g., old Latin c; or "*lama*" via the Greek and e.g., the Latin of the Vulgate.

Such matters are essentially in the hands of the translator.   But we here have a very unusual "textual trademark" that comes to us through the hands of first Wycliffe, and thereafter two past masters of the Neo-Byzantine School, Erasmus and Stephanus. John Wycliffe (*c.* 1330-1384), known as *the Morning Star of the Reformation*, produced an English translation of the Scriptures based on the Latin (although he did so with the help of others).   Wycliffe's Bible (1380) reads at Matt. 27:46, "Heli, Heli, lama zabathanye," and at Mark 15:34, "Heloy, Heloy, lama zabatanye."[130]   Thus in

---

[130]   I generally modernize spellings and punctuations from the older versions sometimes cited in these commentaries (Wycliffe 1380, Tyndale 1534, The Great Bible or Cranmer 1539, Geneva 1557 & 1560, or Rheims 1582; and indeed the AV as we now have it).   But I here note that other than the Geneva Bible (1560) at Mark 15:34 and Douay-Rheims at both Matt. 27:46 and Mark 15:34, which all used the hyphenated form, "lamma-sabacthani;" these later editions, including the AV, originally joined the "lama"

continuation of Wycliffe's English translation transliteration of "lama," Erasmus (1516 & 1522) did "a double textual trademark" at Matt. 27:46 with his Greek, "Ηλει Ηλει λαμα" etc., in which his parallel Latin column, "*Eli eli lama*" etc., indicates a reliance on the Latin textual tradition for his Greek transliteration of "*lama*;" and a single "textual trademark" at Mark 15:34 with his "ελωι ελωι λαμα" etc., in which his parallel Latin column, "*Eloi, eloi lama*" etc., once again indicates a reliance on the Latin textual tradition for his Greek transliteration of "*lama*." Stephanus (1550) as later followed by Scrivener (1894 & 1902), jettisoned Erasmus's "double textual trademark" at Matt. 27:46 by reverting to the majority Byzantine reading of "Ηλι, Ηλι," but then retained Wycliffe's and Erasmus's "λαμα" ("*lama*") as a single "textual trademark;" and at Mark 15:34 modified Wycliffe's and Erasmus's "λαμα" ("*lama*") to the variant spelling of "λαμμα" ("*lamma*").

The Wycliffe-Erasmus-Stephanus derived Stephanus "textual trademark" of Matt. 27:46 found in Stephanus (1550) of "Ηλι, Ηλι, λαμα," is evident in the Matt. 27:46 English reading of, "Eli, Eli, lama" etc. in Tyndale (1526 & 1534), Cranmer (1539), the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560), and the Authorized Version (1611). And the Erasmus "textual trademark" of Mark 15:34 found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522) of "ελωι ελωι λαμα," is evident in the Mark 15:34 English reading of, "Eloi, Eloi, lama" etc. in Tyndale (1526 & 1534), Cranmer (1539), and the Authorized Version (1611); or the "Eloi, Eloi, lamma" etc. of the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560).

This means that the English translation transliterated form of "*lama*" at both Matt. 27:46b and Mark 15:34c in a number of English translations up to, and including the AV, can thus be traced to English translation transliteration from the Latin of Wycliffe (1380), and the "textual trademark" skills of Erasmus (1516 & 1522), with some reference to how Stephanus (1550) reverted back to the majority Byzantine reading's "Ηλι, Ηλι" ("Eli, Eli") at Matt. 27:46. *But these were no ordinary "textual trademarks" by Erasmus and Stephanus*. For in a normal "textual trademark" there is no impact on English (or other language) translation. The matter was simply "a secret of the trade" among neo-Byzantines that helped identify this or that text as coming from the hand of this or that neo-Byzantine textual composer (see Appendix 1 in all Textual Commentary Volumes). *But these "textual trademarks" here at Matt. 27:46 and Mark 15:34 are different!* Here we find that Erasmus and Stephanus have created "textual trademarks" in which they have crossed the bridge of being neo-Byzantine textual composers and "gone over the waters" to become *translators like Wycliffe*. That is because at Matt. 27:46 and Mark 15:34 *they have essentially acted as translator transliterators*, in selecting what would be *one* possible translation transliteration into English, French, German, etc., and made it *the* transliteration to use as one of their "textual trademarks."

Is their foray into the domain of translation transliteration into English etc. a legitimate action? This is clearly an ideological question about proper limits *inter se* i.e., as to where the proper domains of a textual composer as opposed to a textual translator

---

and "sabbacthani" as one word in translation transliteration, rather than having them as the two separate words with which we are familiar.

lie.   On the one hand, I would personally have preferred that my neo-Byzantine seniors and betters in Erasmus and Stephanus had kept the clear majority Byzantine reading of "λιμα (lima)" at Mark 15:34c; and on the basis of the wider textual support of "λιμα (lima)" at Matt. 27:46b among ancient church Greek writers (Eusebius, Basil, & Chrysostom) over "λειμα (leima)" (Basil), and the presence of "*lima*" in the Latin (old Latin f & q) but not "leima;" put "λιμα (lima)" in the main text at Matt. 27:46b with a footnote reading, "or λειμα."   But on the other hand, while Erasmus and Stephanus have here sought to discourage any such middle step of choice for a translator by favouring Wycliffe's translation transliteration of "lama" (Matt. 27:46b, Erasmus & Stephanus; Mark 15:34c, Erasmus) or the variant spelling "lamma" (Mark 15:34c, Stephanus), I would accept that at the point of translation transliteration into Latin, English, or another tongue, a translator might reasonably give a translation transliteration of this Greek "λιμα (lima)" at Matt. 27:46b and Mark 15:34c as e.g., "lima," "lema," or "lama," *supra*.

Furthermore, it must be said that at the point of translation transliteration, the assonance of the "are" sound in the "*la*" of "*lama*" (i.e., the Hebraic vocalization with qamats / ָ under the "*l*" / ל of לָמָה), and the "*tha*" of "*sabbachthani*" (i.e., the Aramaic vocalization with patah / ַ under the "t" / ת of שְׁבַקְתַּנִי), makes for what to the ear of e.g., an Anglophone, is an excellent literary echo in "*lama sabbachthani*."   Therefore, in the context of the King James Version being *a great piece of English literature*, I would consider the translation transliteration of "*lama*" is clearly the superior one.   To the extent that this translation transliteration comes to us from Erasmus and Stephanus, as found in the earlier Latin based English translation of Wycliffe, it might thus be remarked that the two great neo-Byzantine textual analysts of Erasmus and Stephanus thereby sent a message in their NT texts to us, namely, that one should produce a translation of Scripture that is also a great piece of literature.   That message was also read and understood by the King James Version translators.

Thus on the one hand, since there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which at both Matt. 27:46b and Mark 15:34c represents one possible Greek transliteration of the Aramaic "*lema* (why?)," I consider that Scrivener's Text should here be amended, so that at Matt. 27:46b instead of reading "λαμα" ("lama") it reads, "λιμα" ("lima") in the main text with a footnote / sidenote saying, "or λειμα" ("leima"); and at Mark 15:34c instead of reading "λαμμα" ("lamma") it reads, "λιμα" ("lima").   But on the other hand, I consider the translation transliteration of "lama" found at Matt. 27:46b and Mark 15:34c in e.g., Tyndale (1526 & 1534; in the 1534 edition Mark 15:34c reads "lamaa"), The Great Bible / Cranmer (1539), the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560; in the 1557 edition Mark 15:34c reads, "lamma"[131]), and the Authorized Version (1611), is a perfectly legitimate translation transliteration of the Greek "λιμα" ("lima") or "λειμα" ("leima") into English, Latin, or another tongue, and therefore it requires no change, since it is *one* possible legitimate translation transliteration among several

---

[131]   From the Latin, the Douay-Rheims also reads "lamma" at both Matt. 27:46b and Mark 15:34c.

legitimate possibilities.   Moreover, at the point of recognizing the great literary qualities of the AV, the assonance of "*lama*" with "*sabbachthani*" clearly makes it the better form to use.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources at Matt. 27:46b, the Aramaic word rendered "*lama*" in the Authorized Version includes the following four transliterations[132].

Transliteration 1, "*lima*" at Matt. 27:46b.   This 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).   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 Gothic Version (4th century).

Transliteration 2, "*leima*" at Matt. 27:46b.   This is found in Minuscule 1071 (12th century, independent).

Transliteration 3, "*lema*" at Matt. 27:46b.   This is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type).   It is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

Transliteration 4, "*lama*" at Matt. 27:46b.   This is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).   It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.

At Mark 15:34c, the Aramaic word rendered "*lama*" in the Authorized Version includes the following four transliterations[133].

---

[132]   I exclude reference here to any less significant forms such as "*elemo*" (some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version), or "*lemono*" (Syriac Version, 1708, Schaafius).   I also make no reference to 700 (11th century, independent) since Swanson (1995) says it follows "*lima*" (Transliteration 1), whereas Nestle-Aland (1993) says it follows "*lema*" (Transliteration 3).

[133]   I here exclude reference here to any less significant form, such as the Latin "*cur* (why?)" of Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (which not only does not tell us what the underpinning Arabic reads, but which also might be influenced by Matt. 27:46).

Transliteration 1, "*lima*" at Mark 15:34c. This is found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 33 (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 *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 Gothic Version (4th century).

Transliteration 2, "*leima*" at Mark 15:34c. This is found in Minuscules 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text).

Transliteration 3, "*lema*" at Mark 15:34c. This is found in found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, 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), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Anglo-Saxon Version (8th to 10th centuries).

Transliteration 4, "*lama*" at Mark 15:34c. This 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 Minuscule 565 (9th century, independent); and 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 also found in the Armenian Version (5th century).

In following the relevant Alexandrian texts, with a normative Tischendorf bias to Codex Sinaiticus, *Transliteration 3*, "*lema*" was adopted at both Matt. 27:46b and Mark 15:34c in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). On this occasion, bearing in mind the "external support" of, for instance, Codex L 019 and the Coptic Bohairic, this combination was also followed in the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

And in following the relevant Alexandrian texts, with a normative Westcott-Hort bias to Codex Vaticanus, *Transliteration 3*, "*lema*" was adopted at Matt. 27:46b and *Transliteration 4*, "*lama*" at Mark 15:34c in Westcott-Hort (1881). And in a normative desire not to disagree *too much* with Westcott & Hort, this combination was also followed by Nestle's 21st edition (1952).

The ASV reads "lama" at both Matt. 27:46b and Mark 15:34c. This combination of translation transliteration was also followed in the NASB, RSV, NIV (1st & 2nd

editions), and Papists' JB & NJB. Employing the variant spelling form, the old Latin Papists' Douay-Rheims also reads, "lamma" at both Matt. 27:46b and Mark 15:34c.

In a higgledy-piggledy Codex Vaticanus solution, that would please Westcott & Hort and their generally obliging lackey, Erwin-boy Nestle, the TCNT reads "lema" at Matt. 27:46b, and "lama" at Mark 15:34c.

With as much appreciation for "the fine artistic glassware" of the literary form "lama sabbachthani" as "a bull in a china shop," the "sour lemon" translation transliteration of "lema" at Matt. 27:46b and Mark 15:34c was adopted by the ESV, NRSV, NIV (3rd edition), TEV, NEB, REB, and Moffatt. E.g., the religiously liberal apostate Protestant, James Moffatt, who was "as mad as a cut snake," reads "Eli, eli, lema sabacthani" at Matt. 27:46, and "Elôi, Elôi, lema sabacthanei" at Mark 15:34 (Moffatt Bible).

On the one hand, in an abstract vacuum there is no such thing as a "right" or "wrong" translation transliteration of "*lima*" into English here at Matt. 27:46 or Matt. 15:34, but simply "diverse" possibilities. That is because a number of different forms all fall within the permissible boundaries of a translation transliteration via the Greek and / or Latin into English (or another tongue). But on the other hand, in harmony with Wycliffe's 14th century English translation transliteration of "*lama*," with the 16th century neo-Byzantine New Testament texts of Erasmus and Stephanus, the translation transliteration of "*lama*" is the time honoured form at both Matt. 27:46b and Mark 15:34c among Protestant translators up to, and including, the Authorized Version of 1611. Moreover, the assonance it creates with a "larmar sabactharni" vocalization gives an oral reading with greater internal echo. While this is not a necessary element of such vocalization and so ultimately "an optional extra," it is more widely consistent with the type of literary style found in the AV. Thus in the context of seeking to produce an English translation of the Word of God which is also a great piece of English literature, this is surely a valid transliteration option to adopt, albeit not a necessary or required one.

Therefore I see no reason to change from the translation transliteration of "*lama*" found in the AV at both Matt. 27:46b and Mark 15:34c, and indeed I consider movement away from this is an unwarranted break with Protestant church tradition. Thus let us thank God for, and enjoy the great literary assonance of these AV readings from the *Deus, Deus meus* in the "are" sound echo of "*lama*" with "*sabbachthani*" at these verses, which then complements the echo of the "Eli, Eli" (Matt. 27:46) or "Eloi, Eloi" (Mark 15:34), to produce a thunderous sounding literary form which resonates from Calvary down to our own day, and on into the future. At Matt. 27:46, "And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabacthani? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?;" and at Mark 15:34, "And at the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eloi, Eloi, lama sabacthani? which is, being interpreted, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

Matt. 27:49: verse ends with "let us see whether Elias
                              will come to save him" (TR & AV) {A}

At Matt. 27:49, the TR's verse which ends with the words, Greek, "*id<u>o</u>men* (let us see) *ei* ('if' = 'whether') *erchetai* ('he will come' = 'will come') *Hlias* (Elias) *s<u>o</u>s<u>o</u>n* ('saving' = 'to save') *auton* (him)," i.e., "let us see whether Elias will come to save 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), E 07 (8th century), H 013 (9th century), S 028 (10th 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), 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts), 597 (13th century), 1242 (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, thrice in three different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., thrice in three different readings).   It likewise ends here with e.g., the words of Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), "*videamus* (let us see) *an* (whether) *veniat* ('he will come' = 'will come') *Helias* (Elias) *liberans* ('liberating' or 'releasing' = 'to release') *eum* (him)."   In a variety of similar Latin words, it is also found in 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 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, Hesychius of Jerusalem (d. after 450); the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

However, a variant adding, Greek "*allos* (another) *de* (And) *lab<u>on</u>* ('taking' = 'took') *logch<u>e</u>n* (by transliteration convention, *lonchen*, 'a spear') *enuxen* ('[and] he pierced' = '[and] pierced') *autou* (of him) *t<u>e</u>n* (the) *pleuran* (side), *kai* (and) *ex<u>e</u>lthen* ('it came out' = 'there came out') *ud<u>o</u>r* (water) *kai* (and) *aima* (or *'aima / haima*, 'blood')" i.e., "And another took a spear and pierced his side, and there came out water and blood," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 1010 (12th century).   It is also found as Latin, "*alius* (another) *autem* (And) *accepta* ('taking' = 'took') *lancea* ('a lance' or 'a spear') *pupugit* ('[and] he pierced' = '[and] pierced') *latus* ('the side' = 'side') *eius* ('of him' = 'his') *et* (and) *exiit* ('it exited' or 'it came out' = 'there came out') *aqua* (water) *et* (and) *sanguis* (blood)," in a marginal reading of Vulgate Codex Ep (Epternacensis, 8th / 9th century, London, UK); as well as old Latin Versions w4 (Wirceburg, 8th century, Wurzburg, Germany) and r2 (Usserianus II, 9th century, St. Matthew's Gospel, Dublin, southern Ireland); and the Book of Armagh (812 A.D., spelling "*pupugit*" as "*pupunguit*").

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct.   The origins of the variant are conjectural although it is clearly some kind of semi-assimilation with John 19:34.   However, it is a factually erroneous conflation since the piercing of Jesus occurred *after* Christ's death in John 19:31-34; whereas the insertion of it here is *before* Christ's death in Matt. 27:50.

Was the variant an accidental addition?   Did a scribe copy parts of John 19:34 into the margin of a text to give his "Gospel harmony" view of where John 19:34 would be relative to Matt. 27:49?   Did another scribe, misunderstanding this marginal note and thinking it was a piece of the text first accidentally left out, and then added back in by his predecessor scribe, then insert it into the main body of the text?

Was the variant a deliberate addition?   Did a scribe, seeking "a more standard" Gospel text, deliberately conflate Matt. 27:49 with John 19:34?

Was this a deliberate or accidental addition and conflation with John 19:34?   We cannot be sure.   But we can be sure that it was an addition and conflation to the true text of Scripture here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR's reading has rock solid support in the Byzantine Greek textual tradition over time, and through time, dating from ancient times.   It likewise has rock solid support in the Latin textual tradition over time, and through time, dating from ancient times.   It further enjoys the support of a number of ancient church writers, including the church fathers and doctors, St. Jerome and St. Augustine.   By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek; and some better, but still relatively weak support, in the Latin. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 27:49 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. 27:49, which ends the verse with the words, "let us see whether Elias will come to save him," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is further found in (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), 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*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is further found in the Syriac: 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; Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Versions (the Takla Haymanot, *c.* 500; & Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the variant which adds the words, "And another took a spear and pierced his side, and there came out water and blood," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century). It is further found in some manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version; the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); a manuscript of the Ethiopic Version; and Slavic Version (9th century). It is also referred to by the early mediaeval Syriac church writer, Severus of Antioch (d. *c.* 540).

As previously noted in these commentaries, the ancient Alexandrian School of scribes more commonly pruned the NT text, and less commonly added to the text[134]. Here at Matt. 27:49, the neo-Alexandrians generally saw a conflict between their generally misplaced trust in these two Alexandrian texts, and the neo-Alexandrian School's general rule, "the shorter reading is the better reading;" and in the case of later neo-Alexandrians after Westcott & Hort, the presence of "wider external support" for the shorter reading. Hence for the wrong reasons, the correct reading of the TR was adopted in the main text of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993); although all of these contain footnotes referring to the variant.

In the case of Westcott-Hort (1881) who generally considered that when the two Alexandrian Texts agreed they represented a "neutral" text, the variant was placed in the main text; but on this occasion, their commitment to the neo-Alexandrian School's general rule, "the shorter reading is the better reading," meant that they encased the variant in double square-brackets. In Volume 2 of their work (1881), in the section entitled, "Appendix 1. Notes on Select Readings" (pp. 1-140) at Matt. 27:49 (pp. 21-22), they refer to the variant's support in e.g., "Severus" "in Syriac." They conclude that, "Two suppositions alone are compatible with the … evidence. First, the words" of the variant "may belong to the genuine text … of Mt [Matthew], and have been early omitted … on account of the obvious difficulty" i.e., the variant at Matt. 27:49 is placed before Christ's death, whereas John 19:34 is placed after Christ's death. "Or, secondly, they may be a very early interpolation … . The *prima facie* difficulty of the second supposition is lightened by the absence of the words from all the earlier versions … . We have thought it on the whole right to give expression to this view by including the words within double brackets, though we did not feel justified in removing them from the text, and are not prepared to reject altogether the alternative supposition" i.e., that the variant is correct.

---

[134] See Textual Commentaries Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14) at Matt. 7:22 & Matt. 7:29; Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Appendix 3 at Matt. 20:10d; and Vol. 4 (Matt. 26-28) at Matt. 26:44b, & Matt. 26:53b on *Variant 3*.

It is instructive to note, that from the Neo-Alexandrian paradigm, *the strength of the case for the variant* is grounded on the basis that if it is correct, it shows a so called, "Bible blunder" by "one of those stupid Bible writers" who "contradicts another of those stupid Bible writers."   What does this tell us about the doctrine of the Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture (II Tim. 3:16) in the teachings of the Neo-Alexandrian School?   Would you buy a Bible from a person who recommended it because he said that if an obscure variant introduced contradictions into it, then he would think highly of that variant?

Three views emerged among the neo-Alexandrian and semi neo-Alexandrian translators at Matt. 27:49.

View 1: The variant is wrong.   At Matt. 27:49 no reference is made to the erroneous variant in the ESV, NIV, TEV, NEB, and REB.   This view was also adopted by the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the JB and NJB, in continuation of the same view of the old Latin Papists in the Clementine and Douay-Rheims.

View 2: Westcott & Hort's view favouring the TR's reading, but simultaneously considering that the variant might be right, and so placing it in a footnote or square brackets.   At Matt. 27:49, the Westcott-Hort text (1881) based American Standard Version (1901), ends verse 49 in harmony with the Received Text; but a footnote at the end of verse 49 says, "Many ancient authorities add, 'And another took a spear and pierced his side, and there came out water and blood.'   See Jn. 19.34" (ASV ftn.).   Also reflecting this type of Westcott & Hort uncertainty about the variant, a similar format at Matt. 27:49 with the TR's verse ending in the main text, and a footnote reference to the incorrect variant, is found in the NASB, RSV, and NRSV.   The TCNT places the words of the variant in square brackets in the main text.

View 3: The variant is correct.   At Matt. 27:49 the semi neo-Alexandrian, James Moffatt reads, "But the others said, 'Stop, let us see if Elijah does come to save him!' (Seizing a lance, another pricked his side, and out came water and blood.)" (Moffatt Bible).

Meditation on the fact that heretical bishops are nothing new.   We live in a day and age of some sad apostasy, where we know of heretical bishops who in the spiritual sphere, e.g., deny the virgin birth of Christ (Isa. 7:14; Matt. 1:18-25; Luke 1:26-38; Article 3, *Apostles' Creed*), or bodily resurrection of Christ (Ps. 16:8-10; Luke 24:3-6; Acts 2:22-32; Articles 4 & 5, *Apostles' Creed*); or in the moral sphere, e.g., condone various forms of sexual immorality and vice such as homosexuality (Rom. 1:18-27; I Cor. 6:9-11; I Tim. 1:10; being a violation of the sanctity of the heterosexual Christian institution of holy matrimony upheld in the 7th and 10th commandments of the *Ten Commandments*, Exod. 20:14,17 and by our Lord in Matt. 19:9, in specific condemnation of sodomy in Matt. 10:15; 11:23,24; cf. Gen. 19:5).   But the story of Severus of Antioch acts to remind us that heretical bishops are nothing new.

This erroneous variant at Matt. 27:49 is referred to by Severus, who was a leader

of the monophysitist heretics at Antioch in Syria. The monphysitists deny the humanity of Christ (John 1:14; I Tim. 3:16; I John 4:1-3). *Reminding us that heretical bishops which we tragically find in the church today are nothing new,* he was appointed bishop / patriarch of Antioch by the Byzantine Emperor, Anastasius (Regnal Years: 491-518). Also reminding us that if men in authority put themselves under God's directive will, then "inquiry" will be "be made of evil Ministers, and that they" will "be accused by those that have knowledge of their offences; and finally being found guilty, by just judgment" they will "be deposed" (Article 26, Anglican 39 Articles); under the Byzantine Emperor Justin (Regnal Years: 518-527) Severus was so deposed. But he then fled to the hornet's nest of monophysitist heresy at Alexandria in Egypt, where the monophysitist patriarch, Timothy IV, welcomed him as a fellow heretic. Severus sadly regained his bishopric at the beginning of the reign of Justinian (Regnal Years: 527-565), but in 535 he again fled to Egypt. Severus is thus remembered with favour by monophysitist heretics in the Egyptian based and derived Coptic Orthodox Church, and the Syrian based and derived Syrian Orthodox Church (also sometimes known as Jacobites). We thus find that heretical bishops are nothing new; for "there is no new thing under the sun" (Eccl. 1:9).

Matt. 27:56 "Joses" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The issues raised here at Matt. 27:56 touch upon certain controverted points. Some would argue that the English "Joses" from the Greek, "*Ioses*," is a Hellenistic form of "Joseph" from the Greek, "*Ioseph*," and so these are the same basic names, being comparable to e.g., the French "Pierre" and English "Peter," or an English abbreviation like "Joe" for "Joseph." Others would say that they are possibly or perhaps the same basic name; but they are possibly diverse names. In this context, what, if anything, is the etymological relationship between "Joses" from the Greek, "*Ioses*," and "Jose" from the Greek, "*Iose*" (Luke 3:29), which some prefer to render "Joshua" rather than "Jose"?

Without now entering into this debate, and various spins-offs from it, even if the distinction between "Joses (Gr. *Ioses*)" and "Joseph (Gr. *Ioseph*)" is the same as that between, "Pierre" and "Peter," or "Joe" and "Joseph," it is clearly a distinction made within the NT text of Scripture. Since the NT makes a distinction between "Joses" and "Joseph," it is surely right for our English translations to manifest that distinction, irrespective of what we think is, or is not, the relationship between these two names.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the reading of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron as "*Ioseph* (Joseph)" (Latin Diatessaron, chapter CCX), could be from the Latin Vulgate at either Matt. 27:56 or Mark 15:40. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron reads, "*Iusa* (Jusa)" (Arabic Diatessaron, chapter LII). The issue of whether this Latin, "*Iusa*"

does or does not equate "Joses" does not here matter.   That is because, once again, issues of uncertainty as to whether this is drawn from Matt. 27:56 and / or Mark 15:40, mean that no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 27:56 the TR's Greek, "*Iose* (Joses)," i.e., "Joses" in the wider words referring to "Mary the mother of James and Joses," 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), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th 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[135]).   It is further found in the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant reading, Greek "*Ioseph* (Joseph)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53).   It is further found as Latin, "*Ioseph* (Joseph)," 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 also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339); 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 must thus stand.   The origins of the variant are speculative.

Was the variant an accidental change?   In a given manuscript, did the "*Iose* (Joses)," come at the end of a line?   Did a scribe wrongly conclude that a phi (Greek, φ = "ph") "must be missing," and so then "add it back in" as his "reconstruction" of the text?

Was the variant a deliberate change?   Did a scribe, seeking "a more standard" form of names, and considering that "*Ioses* (Joses)" was "simply another form of '*Ioseph* (Joseph)'," deliberately change the text to "*Ioseph* (Joseph)"?   (Cf. Textual Commentary Vol. 1, at Matt. 13:55.)

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

---

[135]   At its first reading (p. 190b), Lectionary 1968 omits the following words, "*kai* (and) *e* (the) *meter* (mother)," but then retains, "*ton* ('of the' = 'of') *uion* (children) *Zebedaiou* ('of Zebedee' = 'Zebedee's')."   But at its second reading (p. 198b), there is no such omission.

The TR's reading has rock solid support in the Byzantine Greek textual tradition over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. Though it has no support in the Latin; it also enjoys support from a couple of ancient church Greek writers, including the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople. By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, but correspondingly strong support in the Latin as the monolithic Latin reading. Weighing up these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 27:56 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. 27:56, "Joses," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); 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), 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*; 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 main text of the Syriac Harclean Version (616); some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; Gothic Version (4th century); and Armenian Version (5th century).

However, the variant, "Joseph," 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 L 019 (8th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscule 157 (12th century, independent). It is also found in the Syriac Harclean Version (616) as a marginal reading; the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 27:56 the variant was adopted in former times by the old Latin Papists in the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version; a tradition now carried on by the new neo-Alexandrian Papists who also follow the variant in the Papists' Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, & NJB

At Matt. 27:56, the variant was adopted by neo-Alexandrians in the NU Text *et*

al; although Westcott-Hort give one of their relatively rare sidenote alternatives showing the reading of the TR as found in their beloved Codex Vaticanus.

At Matt. 27:56 the main text of the Majority Text Burgonites' NKJV reads, "Joses;" but a footnote says, "NU-Text reads 'Joseph'" (NKJV ftn).

But the split between the two main Alexandrian texts caused some difficulties among neo-Alexandrian translators.

View 1: The Reading of Codex Vaticanus and thus the TR should be followed. At Matt. 27:56 the Westcott-Hort based *American Standard Version* reads "Joses" (ASV). So too, the TR's reading is found in the NIV (2nd ed., 1984).

View 2: The Reading of Codex Sinaiticus and thus the variant should be followed. At Matt. 27:56 the Westcott-Hort based *Twentieth Century New Testament* reads "Joseph" (TCNT). So too, the variant is found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV (1st ed., 1978), TEV, NEB, REB, and Moffatt Bible.

View 3: Put the variant reading of Codex Sinaiticus in the main text, and the TR's reading of Codex Vaticanus in a footnote. At Matt. 27:56, the NIV (3rd ed., 2011) reads "Joseph" in the main text, and a footnote reads, "Greek 'Joses,' a variant of 'Joseph'" (NIV ftn.). A complicating factor here is that the NIV evidently understands "Joseph" to be one way to translate the Greek, "*Joses*," so that it is following *Codex Vaticanus* but translating this in accordance with *Codex Sinaiticus*.

We thus find that the *New International Version* has adopted three different "solutions" in three successive editions in 1978 (1st ed.), 1984 (2nd ed.) and 2011 (3rd ed.). Does this mean that in a future NIV 4th edition they will adopt yet another view e.g., putting "Joses" in their main text, and then saying in a footnote, "Greek 'Joseph,' a variant of 'Joses'"? We do not know. But we do know that our trusty and reliable neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus* Authorized Versions will not be changing. They will continue to read "Joses" at Matt. 27:56 both today and tomorrow, just like they did yesterday. Let us thank God for our King James Bibles!

Matt. 27:57 "was Jesus' disciple" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion.

Unlike Greek, there is no middle voice in Latin which only has an active or a passive voice. However, because the Latin verb "to be," *sum-esse*, is an intransitive linking verb, it only has active voice forms but these are not regarded as conveying either active or passive voice[136]. Thus the Matt. 25:57 reading of the Vulgate *et al* as, "*discipulus* (a disciple) *erat* ('he was' = 'was' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person

---

[136]   Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, pp. 2 & 26.

singular verb, from *sum-esse*)," i.e., Joseph of Armithaea "was a disciple," could be derived from either the TR's Greek active voice verb, or the variant's passive voice verb. Therefore no reference is made to the Latin, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 25:57 the TR's Greek, "*emath<u>e</u>teuse* ('he was a disciple' = 'was a disciple,' indicative <u>active</u> aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *math<u>e</u>teuo*[137])," i.e., Joseph of Armithaea "<u>was</u> Jesus' <u>disciple</u>" (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; with the optional "*n*" on the end), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53; with the optional "*n*" on the end), Y 034 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century; with the optional "*n*" on the end) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).

However, a variant, "*emath<u>e</u>teuthe* ('he had become a disciple' = 'had become a disciple,' indicative <u>passive</u> aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *math<u>e</u>teuo*[138])," i.e., Joseph of Armithaea "had <u>become</u> Jesus' <u>disciple</u>," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and Minuscule 924 (12th century).

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

Was the variant an accidental alteration? Did the original "*emath<u>e</u>teuse* (he was a disciple)" experience a paper fade / loss, so that it looked something like, "*emath<u>e</u>teu* "? Was this then "reconstructed from context" as "*emath<u>e</u>teuthe* (he had become a disciple)"?

Was the variant a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe regard it as "a theological improvement" to change the voice to "*emath<u>e</u>teuthe* (he had become a disciple)" as an "evangelistic message" that "others should also become Christ's disciples"? Alas, there are "many which corrupt the Word of God" (II Cor. 2:17), and they may perceive themselves to be "well intentioned." But they are wrong, for they do not like the religiously conservative Protestants of our day, humbly *put themselves UNDER God's Word*, but rather, like the religious liberals of our day, arrogantly seek to *put themselves*

---

[137] The TR's reading is in <u>active</u> voice, and as a simple active *the subject* (here Joseph of Arimithaea) *experiences the action* i.e., he "was a disciple" (Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 411).

[138] The variant is in passive voice, and as a simple passive *the subject* (here Joseph of Arimithaea) *receives the action* i.e., he "had become a disciple" (Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 439-440).

OVER God's Word.   What saith "the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy"?   He saith this, "I dwell … with him … that is of a contrite and humble spirit" (Isa. 57:15).

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

As the representative Byzantine text, the TR's reading has rock solid support in the Greek over time, and through time, dating from ancient times.   By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek and no good textual argument to commend it.   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 25:57 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. 27:57, "was a disciple (*emath<u>e</u>teuse*, active voice)," in the wider words, "was Jesus' disciple," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (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), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text).   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, "had become a disciple (*emath<u>e</u>teuthe*, passive voice)," in the wider words, "had become Jesus' disciple," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is also found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.*

At Matt. 27:57, the variant was adopted by neo-Alexandrians in the NU Text *et al.*   However, Westcott & Hort give one of their relatively rare sidenote alternatives showing the reading of the TR as found in their beloved Codex Vaticanus.

This split in the two leading Alexandrian texts caused some corresponding splits in the neo-Alexandrian versions.

At Matt. 27:57, the TR's reading as found in Codex Vaticanus was adopted in the

Westcott-Hort based *American Standard Version* as "was" in the wider words, "was Jesus' disciple" (ASV).   The TR's reading is likewise found in the RSV, ESV, NRSV, and TEV.

By contrast, at Matt. 27:57 the variant's reading as found in Codex Sinaiticus was adopted in the Westcott-Hort based *Twentieth Century New Testament* as "had ... become" in the wider words, "had … become a disciple of Jesus" (TCNT).   The variant's reading is likewise found in the NASB, NIV, NEB, REB, and Moffatt Bible.

The new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II Council times jumped both ways.   They adopted the TR's reading as found in Codex Vaticanus in their Roman *Catholic RSV*; but they adopted the variant's reading as found in Codex Sinaiticus in the Papists' JB & NJB.

Such are the confusions generally caused among the neo-Alexandrians when their two main Alexandrian texts disagree.   This fact reminds us that even though *in theory* neo-Alexandrians have in general rejected the claim of their fellow neo-Alexandrians Westcott & Hort that where these two manuscripts agree one generally has a "neutral" text; *in practice* they are not far removed from this thinking, but have simply "tinkered around the edges" with it.   And given that not even Westcott & Hort always took this view, but rather had a *general* view of such a "neutral text," it might be said, "they've hardly moved away from the Westcott & Hort position at all."   Despite all their "huffing and puffing" about eternal support and so on, *in practice* they are most unlikely to not adopt a reading that is followed by these two main Alexandrian texts (although occasionally they do), and where these two main Alexandrian texts disagree, they generally, (though not always), split and divide over which one to follow.   *Thus under strict scrutiny the general neo-Alexandrian position is not different in any major way from that of Westcott & Hort.*

Matt. 27:58 "the body" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, the usage of Latin, "*corpus* (the body)," in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (Latin Diatessaron, chapter ccxii), may *prima facie* seem to support the TR's reading here.   But the Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex, and so it is also possible that the "*corpus* (the body)" came across from the Vulgate at Mark 15:45 and / or John 19:38.   Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca's translation of the Arabic as Latin, "*corpus* (the body)" (Arabic Diatessaron, chapter lii), may likewise *prima facie* seem to support the TR's reading here.   But for similar reasons of Diatessaron formatting relative to Mark 15:45 and / or John 19:38, we cannot be sure of the source of this reading in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron.   Therefore no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 27:58 the TR's Greek, "*to* (the) *soma* (body)," i.e., "the body," in the wider words, "Then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered" to Joseph of Arimathaea, are 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[139]) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*corpus* (the body)," 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 supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

However, a variant omitting Greek, "*to* (the) *soma* (body)," and thus reading, "Then Pilate commanded *it* to be delivered" (shewing / showing italics for added word), is a minority Byzantine reading. It is found in Minuscules 40 (11th century) and 924 (12th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading 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 "*to* (the) *soma* (body)" lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? Did a prunist scribe regard "*to* (the) *soma* (body)" as "unnecessarily wordy," and so prune it away to form "a more succinct" text?

Was the variant a deliberate or accidental omission? We do not now know. But we do know that it was an omission to the text of Scripture Providentially preserved for us here 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 rock solid support in the Latin, as the monolithic Latin reading over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. This Latin support includes the Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome. By contrast, the variant

---

[139] With no difference in English translation at Matt. 27:58, Lectionary 2378 (p. 96a, column 2), places the "*o* (-) *Pilatos* (Pilate)," immediately after, rather than as in the TR immediately before, the "*ekeleusen* ('he commanded' = 'commanded,' AV)." To the best of my knowledge, this is the first time this variant has been documented.

has weak support in the Greek and no support in the Latin. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 27:58 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. 27:58, "the body," in the wider words, "Then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered," 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). 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), 157 (12th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which omits "the body," and so reads simply, "Then Pilate commanded *it* to be delivered" (showing italics for added word), 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); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 892 (9th century, mixed text type); 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 some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

At Matt. 27:58 the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Hence the ASV reads, "Then Pilate commanded it to be given up" (ASV failing to show italics for added word "it"). So likewise at Matt. 27:58, the incorrect variant is also found in the NASB (unlike NASB 1st ed. 1960-71 & 2nd ed. 1977, the NASB 3rd ed. 1995 fails to show italics for added word "it"), RSV, ESV, NRSV, and NIV.

Both the TEV and Moffatt *prima facie* follow the TR's reading here. Thus at Matt. 27:58 the *Today's English Version* reads, "Pilate gave orders for the body to be given to Joseph" (TEV); and Moffatt reads, "Pilate then ordered the body to be handed over to him" (Moffatt Bible). Are these instances of the translators of these two versions using their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm? (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.)

What Greek reading is the TEV using at Matt. 27:58? On the one hand, the monolithic support for the variant in the neo-Alexandrian texts and neo-Alexandrian School general rule, "the shorter reading is the better reading," indicate that the TEV translators would here consider that they were "adding in" the words "the body" as part of their "dynamic equivalence." But on the other hand, the lower levels of "external support" for the variant outside the two main Alexandrian texts, mean that it is *just possible*, albeit far less likely, that the TEV translators are here following the TR's reading. Therefore, the TEV is *probably* here following the variant, and as its translators would see the matter, then "adding in" these words as part of their "dynamic equivalence" translation style. But due to the loose and liberal form of "translation" used in the TEV, we simply do not know for sure what is going on here in the TEV's underpinning text.

What Greek reading is Moffatt using at Matt. 27:58? The fact that the TR's reading is here following by a combination of the Latin, the leading representative of the Western text (D 05), and the Syriac (Pesitto & Harclean), means that the semi neo-Alexandrian, Moffatt, is *probably* here following the TR's reading for the wrong reasons. But once again, we cannot be sure as to whether or not Moffatt is simply not "adding it in" as part of his "translation" style.

Following the monolithic reading of the Latin textual tradition in the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims, the old Latin Papists of post-Trent Council and pre-Vatican II Council times here adopted the TR's reading. Hence the Douay-Rheims reads at Matt. 27:58, "Then Pilate commanded that the body should be delivered." By contrast the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II Council times here adopted the variant's reading in their Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB.

Matt. 27:64 "by night" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Hodges & Farstad's I and K group von Soden based majority text (1985) says the text is "seriously divided" in a three-way split between "*nuktos* ('by night,' word 1) *klepsosin* ([and] steal [away]) *auton* (him)" i.e., "by night, and steal him away" (*Reading 1*), "*klepsosin* ([and] steal [away]) *auton* (him) *nuktos* ('by night,' word 1)" i.e., "and steal him away by night" (*Reading 2*), and "*klepsosin* ([and] steal [away]) *auton* (him)" i.e., "steal him away" (*Reading 3*)[140]. By contrast, Robinson & Pierpont's K group von Soden based majority text (2005) considers the majority Byzantine text reading is "*nuktos* ('by night,' word 1) *klepsosin* ([and] steal [away]) *auton* (him)" i.e., "by night, and steal him away" (*Reading 1*), and does not consider there is a sufficient split in the Byzantine text to warrant a sidenote referring to any other reading. Under the circumstances I must consult the common source book of von Soden (1913) myself, and in doing so, I remind the reader that for Matthew to Jude, I generally prefer the simple K

---

[140] Hodges & Farstad, pp. xxi & 101.

group methodology of Robinson & Pierpont, since K group consists of *c.* 1,000 manuscripts, of which more than 90% are Byzantine text. Thus a valid statistical projection for the overall Byzantine text can clearly be fairly made from K group.

Von Soden says "by night, and steal him away" (*Reading 1*, TR reading) has the support of K group; other than the support for "*kleps_osin* ([and] steal [away]) *auton* (him) *nuktos* ('by night,' word 1)" i.e., "and steal him away by night" (*Reading 2*) in one manuscript from K1 subgroup, and two manuscripts in his Ki group; and "*kleps_osin* ([and] steal [away]) *auton* (him)" i.e., "steal him away" (*Reading 3*) in all but one of his K1 subgroup manuscripts.

Inside von Soden's larger "K" group of 983 manuscripts, there are *c.* 860 Gospel manuscripts. Von Soden's Ki group consists of seven manuscripts, all Byzantine text, so 5 of these 7 manuscripts support *Reading 1*, and 2 of these 7 manuscripts support *Reading 2*. Von Soden's K1 group consists of 55 manuscripts (of which *c.* 50, or *c.* 91% are Byzantine). Therefore the Gospel K group manuscript support for *Reading 1* is 860 minus 3 K group manuscripts that support *Reading 2* minus 55 manuscripts that support *Reading 3* = 802 out of 860 or *c.* 93% of the Gospel manuscripts. *Reading 2* is supported by 3 out of 860 or *c.* 0.35% of manuscripts. *Reading 3* is supported by 55 out of 860 or *c.* 6.4% of manuscripts. One must factor in a relativistic 10% error bar for each of these three figures on the basis of von Soden's generalist groups. Bearing in mind that one can only confidently calculate *c.* 90% of K group means that one can only say that with regard to this *c.* 90% of K group, that overall *c.* 84% (93% - 9.3% = 83.7% = 84%) support *Reading 1*; *c.* 0.3% support *Reading 2* (0.35 minus 0.035 = 0.315 = *c.* 0.3%); and *c.* 6% support *Reading 3* (6.4% minus 0.64% = 5.76% = *c.* 6%). As to what the remaining 10% of manuscripts read is anybody's guess. But even if, e.g., all or most of them supported *Reading 3*, it would still only have *c.* 16% support. Therefore it is manifestly apparent that the TR's *Reading 1* is clearly the majority Byzantine reading by a very handsome margin. Thus the TR's reading is clearly the majority Byzantine text, and these other two readings are not even "in the race" for such a claim.

Though I generally do not consider the I group, given Hodges & Farstad's usage of it, and their claims here, *on this occasion* I will also consider it. In doing so it should be noted that I simply add I group into a general calculation in the same way I calculate the K group, which is not exactly the same as Hodges & Farstad who prefer more obtuse calculations (Hodges & Farstad's "Introduction," pp. xiff). Combining both I and K groups gives us *c.* 1,500 manuscripts (of which *c.* 1,360 are Byzantine text including those that are Byzantine text only in parts, or *c.* 1,300 are completely Byzantine text), i.e., more than 85% of the combined I and K groups are Byzantine Text. Von Soden lists only two further manuscripts from I group for *Reading 2*. Thus 3 K group manuscripts plus 2 I group manuscript = 6 manuscripts out of 1,500 = 0.4%, which is a slightly higher figure than the K group's *c.* 0.35%. For *Reading 3* von Soden list about a further 70 manuscripts, and so this gives a total of about 125 manuscripts out of about 1500 manuscripts or *c.* 8.3% which is a bit higher than the K group figure of *c.* 6%, although inside the K group error bars, *supra*. This means that of the further *c.* 500 manuscript in I group, *c.* 430 of them or *c.* 86% follow *Reading 1*.

Allowing *c*. 10% error bars for von Soden's generalist groups, if one were to theorize that all or most of this 10% went to *Reading 3*, then *prima facie* it might have *c*. 18% support, which could in turn be reasonably called something like, "a strong minority Byzantine reading with about one-fifth of the manuscripts." But while on von Soden's generalist group figures this is *one* possibility, it is *by no means* the only possibility. It would e.g., also be possible that all or most of this 10% went to either *Reading 1* or *Reading 2*; or that various proportions of this *c*. 10% error went to the three readings in roughly even proportions. The reality is that *we just do not know*. Those who try to get too much specificity out of von Soden's generalist methodology will necessarily run amuck. The way von Soden did his calculation is not the way I would do it, but in the end we must understand von Soden's mind to understand how to best use his data.

Therefore on this occasion the most we can broadly say is that using as our base von Soden's K group which is more than 90% Byzantine text and so broadly speaking representative of the Byzantine text; and then refining these base figures by taking into account von Soden's I group, bearing in mind that his combined I and K groups are more than 85% Byzantine text and so broadly speaking representative of the Byzantine text; we arrive at the following approximate figures, which due to von Soden's generalist groups are necessarily "rubbery," but which still are good enough to give us enough clarity to get "the big picture." For these broad-brush purposes, I shall not further refine the combined I and K group figures so as to leave an uncounted *c*. 10% of manuscripts, but instead provide the raw upper figures, *supra*, thus leaving overall unaccounted margins of *c*. 10% on the lower figures and *c*. 5% on the upper figures. Though these upper figures do not conform to the methodology I endorse, i.e., I regard these raw upper figures of 86% (*Reading 1*), 0.4% (*Reading 2*), and 8.3% (*Reading 3*) as unsafe (since they should be subject to an overall possible 10% error margin); nevertheless, on this occasion I shall so show them in their raw form as the highest possible figures in order to see if *even on these unsafe upper figures* one might say with Hodges & Farstad that the "support" for *Readings 2 & 3* is sufficiently high to conclude that the text is "seriously divided," *supra*. *Reading 1* has the support of at least *c*. 84% to 86% of manuscripts; *Reading 2* has the support of at least *c*. 0.3% to *c*. 0.4% of manuscripts; and *Reading 3* has the support of at least *c*. 6% to *c*. 8.3% of manuscripts.

In the first place, it seems to me that the presently available data as found in von Soden, does not support Hodges & Farstad's basic claim of a "seriously divided" text here at Matt. 27:64. And in the second place, it seems to me that this excursion into the combined I and K groups, only goes to prove that to get our basic figures in both a highly reliable and also quicker manner, we generally only need to look at the K group. (Of course, I also prefer the more than 90% Byzantine K group methodology because K group has a slightly higher Byzantine text component, and so less textual impurities than the more than 85% Byzantine combined I and K groups methodology; even though the Byzantine component is so high in both methodologies that either can be used to determine the representative Byzantine text.) Therefore on this occasion I would conclude that in fact Robinson & Pierpont are correct to say that the TR's reading is that of the majority Byzantine text, which is not significantly divided on this reading.

The Second Matter. Due to time constraints, I generally have to accept the citations of church writers such as I find them in textual apparatuses. E.g., this is what I have done for Origen and John of Damascus, *infra*, both of which are referred to in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions. But on this occasion I have looked at some other Greek citations in Migne first hand, and given the relevant references, *infra*. This involved quite literally blowing the dust off the top of a number of Migne volumes in the Sydney library I used, a fact that should remind us that just because certain books are not looked at by anyone for a long period of time does not mean that they are not important and valuable, they are, and should be accordingly preserved.

Indeed, it is the failure to understand this basic fact that led to me changing my policy of sending the third of three legal deposit copies of these textual commentaries to not only the New South Wales State Library in Sydney and also the National Library in Canberra, but also one other library, which was formerly Sydney University (where I sent Volumes 1 & 2), but is now Moore Theological College (where I sent Volume 3 and will do so for future volumes). This followed a public announcement in 2011 by the Library of Sydney University, reported in the *Sydney Morning Herald* under the headline, "You can judge a book by its 'dust test' as university library cuts its … stock." Library spokesman, Mr. John Shipp, said that the Library was going to "remove 500,000 books and journals," and "reduce the main stack" collection "by almost half." Why? Among other things to make room for "an indoor … coffee shop." How were they to make their outrageous decisions? "Items not borrowed for five years would be targeted;" a fact that fails to recognize that members of the general public such as myself use books in a library and NEVER borrow them! How could they therefore be sure that a book had not been used for 5 years? Library spokesman, "Mr. Shipp said …, 'We do the dust test'[141]."

The proposition that "the dust test" should be used to determine a book's worth is puerile and utter stupidity! Many less worthy books are more widely read by shallow persons, and various better books may be read by relatively few deeper thinkers. Many good books are not appreciated by large numbers of people, and may only be looked at by select individuals over long periods of time. E.g., I photocopied my copy of Gwynn's edition of the *Book of Armagh* (1913) from a copy at Sydney University, and this work which sits on the shelves of Sydney University might well "fail" this ridiculous "dust test." Likewise, in London I have examined a number of works at Lambeth Palace Library, the Library of King's College London University, and the British Library, which would no doubt "fail" this absurd "dust test."

I have often had to *blow the dust of the top of books* I have used e.g., some Latin

---

[141] "You can judge a book by its 'dust test' as university library cuts its staff & stock," *Sydney Morning Herald*, Thursday 12 May 2011. (Copy presently available at http://www.smh.com.au/national/education/you-can-judge-a-book-by-its-dust-test-as-university-library-cuts-its-staff-and-stock-20110511-1ej0z.html .)

grammars which I have looked at from time to time at Sydney University, and which may now be under threat, or some excellent works I thank God for seeing at *The Evangelical Library* in London[142].   And as with so many of the books I looked at in *The Evangelical Library* of London, so also with the Migne volumes consulted for this reading at Matt. 27:64, I had to wash my hands after pulling them from the shelves because the covers of the books are so old that they mark and stain the hands.   Such are the realities of "a gold digger" searching "for the gold amidst the dross he must wash away" in some of these older works.   Thus I entirely repudiate "the dust test" concept now being used at the Sydney University Library, and thank God for access to, e.g., these excellent volumes of Migne that I had to blow the dust off the top of, and wash my hands after pulling from the shelves.   (This is not entirely surprising since I have been told by library staff that I am the only one who ever uses their Migne volumes; and I myself do not always use them since on other occasions I use the Migne volumes at other libraries where the covers are newer and so do not stain the hands in the same way.)

But in "thumbing through" these Greek volumes of Migne, I also looked at Chrysostom who is regarded in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, as following the variant.   The relevant section of Matt. 27:64 reads in the TR, "*mepote* (lest) *elthontes* ('coming' = 'come') *oi* (-) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* ('of him' = 'his') *nuktos* (by night) *klepsosin* ([and] steal [away]) *auton* (him)," i.e., "lest his disciples come by night and steal him away."   But in Chrysostom the relevant section reads, "*mepote* (lest) *klepsosin* ([and] steal [away]) *auton* (him) *oi* (-) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* ('of him' = 'his')," i.e., "lest his disciples steal him away."[143]

It is notable that Chrysostom has here also left out, "*elthontes* (come)," and further rearranged the words of the sentence, so that "*oi* (-) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (his)" comes after, rather than before, "*klepsosin* ([and] steal [away]) *auton* (him)." Therefore it is clear to me that he Chrysostom is using both an abbreviation, and a somewhat free quote.   Under the circumstances, I consider it would be unwarranted to say that he was following the variant, since he may well have been following the TR's reading, and left out "*nuktos* (by night)" in the same way he left out "*elthontes* (come)." Therefore no reference is made to Chrysostom, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

---

[142]   I used to go to *The Evangelical Library* over my five trips to London between 2001 and 2009 at 78A Chiltern St., W1N 5HB (from Bakerloo Station near the Sherlock Holmes Museum).   But the interested reader seeking to locate this excellent library (which when I went to had at best only a few other readers present, and often none there besides myself,) has since moved to 5/6 Gateway Mews, Ringway, Bounds Green, London, N11 2UT, England, UK.

[143]   Chrysostom in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1862 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 58, ("In Matthaeum Homil. LXXXV. al. LXXXVI," "According to Matthew's Homilies, 86-7",) p. 760.

At Matt. 27:64 the TR's Greek, "*nuktos* (by night)," in the wider words, "lest his disciples come <u>by night</u> (*nuktos*), and steal him away" (AV), are supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), F 09 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), S 028 (10th century, *Reading 2*, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," *supra*), and Gamma 036 (10th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark; *Reading 2*, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," *supra*), and 1242 (13th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is further supported by the early mediaeval church Greek writer, Andrew of Crete (d. first half 8th century)[144]; and mediaeval church Greek writers, Euthymius Zigabenis (d. after *c.* 1118)[145] and Theophanous of Sicily (d. after 1140)[146].

However, a variant omitting Greek "*nuktos* (by night)," and so reading simply, "lest his disciples come and steal him away," 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 Minuscules 2 (12th century) and 1010 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 211 (12th 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), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; the early mediaeval church Greek writer, John of Damascus (d. before 754); and mediaeval church Greek writers, Leo VI (d. 912)[147] and John Cantacuzenus (d. 1383)[148].

---

[144]   Andrew of Crete in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1865 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 97, ("In exulatationem S. Crucis. I," "About exultation of the holy cross, I",) p. 1015 (Latin, *nocte*) & p. 1016 (Greek, *nuktos*).

[145]   Euthymius Zigabenis was a 12th century monk and friend of the Byzantine Emperor, Alexius I Comnenus (Regnal Years: 1081-1118), in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1864 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 128, ("Comment. In Psalmos," "Commentary on Psalms",) p. 188 (Greek, *nuktos*).

[146]   Theophanous was a 12th century Archbishop of Taormina in Sicily, Italy, in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1864 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 132, ("Homilia XXIX," "Homily 29",) p. 624 (Greek, *nuktos*).

[147]   Leo VI, Byzantine Emperor (Regnal Years: coemperor 870-886, emperor 886-912), Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1863 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 107, ("Oratio VIII," 8th Oration) p. 81 (Latin) & p. 82 (Greek).

[148]   John Cantacuzenus (Joannis Cantacuzeni) in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1866 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 154, ("Contra Mahometem Apologia II," "Against the Mohammedan Apology II",) p. 469.   John VI Cantacuzenus (1292-1383)

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

Was the variant an accidental omission? In e.g., Codex S 028 and Minuscule 28, the "*nuktos* (by night)," comes after, rather than before, the "*kleps<u>o</u>sin* ([and] steal [away]) *auton* (him)" (*Reading 2*, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," *supra*). Does this indicate that because it was a short word, it was sometimes accidentally left out, and then the scribe, realizing his mistake, added it back in after the "*kleps<u>o</u>sin* ([and] steal [away]) *auton* (him)"? If so, might a similar scenario with a less adroit scribe, have likewise lead to its loss? Alternatively, was the "*nuktos* (by night)," perhaps coming at the end of a line in a given manuscript, lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? Did an arrogant scribe consider that it would "intensify the drama and action" to remove "*nuktos* (by night)," here at Matt. 27:64? If so, was his thinking that when one comes to Matt. 28:13, when the Jewish clergy say, "say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept;" it "then looks like they are further embellishing the story as an after thought"?

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission? Was it brought about at the hand of Origen or another? We simply do not know. But we do know that it was an omission to the text of Scripture here Providentially preserved for us in the representative Byzantine reading.

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading; although it has no support in the Latin. By contrast, the variant has relatively weak support in the Greek, but the monolithic support of the Latin textual tradition. Bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, in the absence of any good textual argument to commend the variant, we cannot doubt that the representative Byzantine Greek reading is correct. However, ideally, we neo-Byzantines like to show a reading over time, and through time, *dating from ancient times*. Here the only possible ancient support for it comes from Codex Sigma 042, which dates from either the late 5th century and thus ancient times, or from the 6th century and thus early mediaeval times. Further support from early mediaeval times is also found in Andrew of Crete (d. first half 8th century). Taking into account both the absence of any Latin support, and the lack of definite manuscript support from ancient times, must on this occasion reduce the rating from an "A," so that on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 27:64 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Andrew of Crete. The important support for this reading by Andrew of Crete (d. first half 8th century), raises the question, Who was he? He was an eighth century bishop of Crete. Though his exact date of death inside the first half of the eighth century

---

was a Byzantine Emperor (Regnal Years: 1347-1354).

is disputed (712, 726, or 740?), he was born *c.* 650 in Damascus, Syria, of Christian parentage; and Migne dates his relevant Greek writings to "675-680" A.D. .   As a 7th century Archdeacon, he was sent as the representative of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Theodore, to the Sixth General Council of Constantinople III in 680 to 681 A.D. .

Article 21 of the Anglican 39 Articles says that "General Councils," "when they be gathered together, (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof not all be governed with the Spirit and Word of God,) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God.   Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture."   In harmony with this teaching, Anglicans have historically accepted the Trinitarian and anti-Pelagian teachings of the first four General Councils, Nicea (325), Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431), and Chalcedon (451)[149].   With regard to the fifth and sixth General Councils, Constantinople II (553) and Constantinople III (680-1), there is a greater qualification.   On the one hand, the fifth and sixth general councils incorporated error in the condemnatory "anathema" of Constantinople II (553) against those who correctly repudiated the teaching of an "ever-virgin Mary" (e.g., Ps. 69:8; Matt. 1:25; 12:46,47; Luke 2:7; 8:19,20; Gal. 1:19); or the unBiblical claim of Constantinople III (681) to Divine "inspiration" for general councils as possessing "God-inspired fathers" (Greek *Theopneuston pateron*), contrary to the Biblical teaching that prophets existed only in Bible times (e.g., Luke 11:49-51; Eph. 2:20).   Therefore these are examples of what Article 21 refers to as "when" "General Councils" "be gathered together, … they may err, and sometimes have erred … ."   But on the other hand, the fifth and sixth general councils upheld Biblically correct and orthodox Trinitarian teaching.   Thus Constantinople II (553) rightly condemned Nestorians or semi-Nestorians such as e.g., Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret of Cyrus; and likewise Constantinople III (681) rightly condemned the Monothelites in its clarifications on monophysitism condemned at Chalcedon (451).   Hence these orthodox Trinitarian teachings of the fifth (553) and sixth (681) general councils are an example of what Article 21 refers to as "when" "General Councils" have "strength" and "authority" as "it may be declared that" what they have said was "taken out of holy Scripture."

The monothelites denied that Christ was both fully God and fully man by denying his full humanity in their claim that Christ had only "one Divine-human operation or will." If Christ was not fully man then he could not be the Second Adam and Saviour of the world (Rom. 5:14; I Cor. 15:45).   Let the good Christian reader consider the questions, How could he who was both fully God and fully man be said to have "learned" (Heb. 5:8)? Or as he aged, to have "increased in wisdom" and "favour with God" (Luke 2:52)? The only satisfactory answer is by recognizing that Christ had a human will or "will of the flesh" which he "subjected to the Divine will," that is, he had "two natural wills in him and two natural operations, without division, without change, without separation, without partition, without confusion," with "his human will following his Divine and omnipotent will, not resisting it nor striving against it, but rather subject to it."

---

[149]   Sir William Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Vol. 4, p. 48.

For Christ "himself says, 'I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of the Father that sent me' (John 6:38)." (*Council of Constantinople III*).   Christ's subjection of his human to the Divine will is also taught in such passages as Luke 22:42 and John 12:27.   Concerning the condemnation of the monothelite heresy by e.g., the Sixth General Council of Constantinople III (680-1), which Andrew of Crete attended; it might be further noted that Homily 2, Book 2, (Part 2), of Article 35 of the Anglican *39 Articles*, says, "Constantine, Bishop of Rome [708-715 A.D.], assembled a Council of bishops in the West Church, and did condemn … the heresy of the Monothelites, not without a cause indeed, and very justly."

Following the Council of Constantinople III (680-1), Andrew of Crete served as Archdeacon at the Church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople; which some centuries later was closed due to the spread of Mohammedanism by the sword of Islam, and associated fall of Constantinople to infidel Mohammedan hordes in 1453.   From Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, Andrew then became the Bishop of Gortyna in Crete, and in a moment of ill-thought through weakness, he was part of a meeting in 712 which unqualifiedly repealed the anti-monothelite decrees of Constantinople III (680-1), thus giving succour and comfort to the monothelites.   But in the following year of 713, he then returned to the Trinitarian Christological orthodoxy of being anti-monothelite.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 27:64, "by night," in the wider words, "lest his disciples come <u>by night</u>, and steal him away," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels).   It is also found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Pesitto (first half 5th century, *Reading 2*, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," *supra*) Versions, Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian "1" Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries; in both instances *Reading 2*, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," *supra*).   It is further found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), as Latin, "*et* (and) *furentur* (steal [away]) *eum* (him) *noctu* (by night)" (Arabic Diatessaron, chapter 52; *Reading 2*, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," *supra*).

However, the variant which omits "by night," and so reads simply, "lest his disciples come and steal him away," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well 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 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text).   It is further found in the *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 Syriac Palestinian (*c.* 6th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Gothic Version (4th century); and Georgian "2" Version (5th century).

At Matt. 27:64 the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al*.   Hence the ASV reads simply, "lest haply his disciples come and steal him away."   So too, the incorrect variant is found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

At Matt. 27:64 the old Latin Papists followed the erroneous variant in the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version, the latter of which reads, "lest perhaps his disciples come and steal him away."   So too, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists followed this incorrect reading in their Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB.

Matt. 28:2b "from the door" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion.

The First Matter.   Both Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) subdivide the readings at Matt. 28:2b into those which read Greek, "*apo* (from) t*es* (the) *thuras* (door)" (TR), and those which add to this a semi-assimilation derived from Mark 16:3, "*ek* (from) t*es* (the) *thuras* (door) *tou* (of the) *mnemeiou* (sepulchre)" and / or Luke 24:2, "*apo* (from) *tou* (the) *mnemeiou* (sepulchre)" and / or John 20:1 "*ek* (from) (the) *mnemeiou* (sepulchre);" so as to read at Matt. 28:2b, "*apo* (from) t*es* (the) *thuras* (door) *tou* (of the) *mnemeiou* (sepulchre)."   Because from the Neo-Alexandrian School's paradigm they consider the variant which omits "*apo* (from) t*es* (the) *thuras* (door)" should be adopted, they regard both of these as being derived from Mark 16:3 and / or Luke 24:2 and / or John 20:1, and hence list them separately. By contrast, from the Neo-Byzantine School's paradigm the original reading of "*apo* (from) t*es* (the) *thuras* (door)" was corrupted by semi-assimilation to Mark 16:3 and / or Luke 24:2 and / or John 20:1 in the reading adding the "*tou* (of the) *mnemeiou* (sepulchre)," and corrupted by loss of text in the variant.

The practical consequence of this here at Matt. 28:2b, is that I include under the listing of support for the TR's reading e.g., Eusebius and Chrysostom, *infra*, even though their citation also includes the additional semi-assimilation from Mark 16:3 and / or Luke 24:2 and / or John 20:1, "*tou* (of the) *mnemeiou* (sepulchre)."   I regard this semi-assimilation as one of the many minor variants I would not normally specifically discuss in these textual commentaries.   But I make some passing reference to it here, both to remind the reader of the much larger number of minor variants that exist, and also to highlight the way the same basic data may be conceptualized differently by neo-Alexandrians and neo-Byzantines.

The Second Matter. The TR's Latin reading is "*ab* (from) *osteo* (the door)." Latin "*osteo* (neuter singular ablative noun)" is from "*osteum*," and is a variant spelling form of "*ostio*" from "*ostium*." This spelling form is also found at Mark 16:3 in the "*ab* (from) *osteo* (the door)" of old Latin k, paralleling the "*ab* (from) *ostio* (the door)" of the Vulgate and old Latin d, ff2, n, q, & l; or at John 20:1 in the "*ab* (from) *osteo* (the door)" of old Latin d, paralleling the "*ab* (from) *ostio* (the door)" of the Vulgate and old Latin f & r1.

Given that old Latin k (Mark 16:3, *osteo*) is from North Africa, and old Latin d (John 20:1, *osteo*) is Western European, this variant spelling form which revowelled the "*ostio*" to "*osteo*," seems to have had a wide geographical spread among a number of Latin scribes. But to this must be made the qualification that the Latin scribes of old Latin d had a proclivity to use rare and abstruse Latin forms, seemingly thereby seeking to design their work for "the advanced Latin scholar," in contradistinction to the common and simple Latin forms of St. Jerome's Vulgate. Thus old Latin d is academic elitist Latin and so was never more popularly received among Latin readers, whereas the Vulgate is common Latin and so was popularly received among Latin readers. Hence the usage of "*osteo*" in old Latin d at John 20:1 may reflect an academic elitist usage in the West, found only among a small and insular group of Western Latin scribes.

The root Latin noun, "*osteum*," looks something like, though *should not be confused with*, the Greek noun, "*osteon*," meaning a "bone" (e.g., Matt. 23:27, "bones" / "*osteon*" from "*osteon*"), which gives rise to our English word, "osteoporosis," referring to a certain medical condition of brittle bones. The Greek "*osteon*," is found in the Latin noun, "*os*," meaning a bone (e.g., Matt. 23:27, Vulgate, "bones" / "*ossibus*" from "*os*") or "*ossum*" meaning a "bone" (Gen. 50:25 = 50:24 Vulgate, "bones" / "*ossibus*" from *ossum*). The Latin noun, "*os*" (*os*, singular genitive - *ossis*), gives rise to our English word, "ossuary," meaning a box (or receptacle) used for housing a dead man's bones; and should not be confused with the Latin noun, "*os*" (*os*, singular genitive – *oris*), meaning "mouth," which gives rise to our English word, "oral."

The Third Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron ends a section from Matt. 28:2 at the point of the TR's words, and then immediately goes to a section from Mark 16:4 (Latin Diatessaron, chapter ccxvii). Therefore the issue of which reading its underpinning text might support is *in dubio*, and so no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, in his 19th century Latin translation of the 12th-14th centuries Arabic, Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron reads, "*ab* (from) *ostio* (the door)" (Arabic Diatessaron, chapter lii). However, while this is *prima facie* from a wider section derived from Matt. 28:2, this section is immediately preceded by another section derived from Mark 16:3. Thus as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting, we cannot be sure if these words are coming from Matt. 28:2b and / or Mark 16:3. Therefore no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 28:2b the TR's Greek, "*apo* (from) *t<u>e</u>s* (the) *thuras* (door)," in the wider words, "the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone <u>from the door</u>" (AV), are 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 G 011 (9th century); Minuscule 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is also supported by Latin, "*ab* (from) *osteo* (the door)," in old Latin Versions h (5th century), f (6th century), and q (6th / 7th century).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339) and Chrysostom (d. 407).   It is also found in the similar reading, Greek "*ek* (from) *t<u>e</u>s* (the) *thuras* (door)," in Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339).

However, a variant omitting Greek, "*apo* (from) *t<u>e</u>s* (the) *thuras* (door)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscules 84 (12th century) and 60 (13th 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), 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 writers, Origen (d. 254) and Dionysius of Alexandria (d. *c.* 264).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which is thus correct.

The origins of the similar reading to that of the TR which changes "*apo* (from)" to "*ek* (from)" are conjectural.   Was this an accidental alteration?   Was the "*apo* (from)" lost in a paper fade, and then "reconstructed from context" as "*ek* (from)" with some reference to the "*ek* (from)" of Mark 16:3 and / or John 20:1?   Was this a deliberate alteration?   Did an assimilationist scribe, seeking a more "standard gospel text," deliberately change the "*apo* (from)" to "*ek* (from)"?

The origins of the variant are speculative.   However, it looks like it may well have originated with Origen, whose mood swings led him to vacillate between highly constructive dispassionate thinking and intellectual brilliance at one end of the spectrum, utter folly and stupidity at the other end of the spectrum, and depending on his mood, everything and anything in between.   On this occasion here at Matt. 28:2, it looks like he may well have had the type of negative and destructive mood swing that led him to be a notorious castrator of both himself and the text of Scripture[150].

---

[150]   Eusebius's (d. 339) *Church History*, Life of Constantine, Oration in Praise of Constantine, chapter 8, says "while Origen was … at Alexandria, … he took the words, 'there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake' [Matt. 12:12] in too literal and extreme a sense.   And … he carried out in action the word of the Saviour."

Was the variant an accidental omission?   In Manuscript Washington (W 032) we find that at the end of a page, part of a word may be "squeezed in" under the last line (p. 44, Matt. 13:10, the "*tois*" of "*autois*" / "unto them"), or a full word (p. 6, Matt. 3:3, "*autou*" / "of him" = "his").   In similar fashion, in a given manuscript might a scribe have "squeezed in" the "*apo* (from) *tes* (the) *thuras* (door)" under the last line of a page? Might it then have been lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was the variant a deliberate omission?   Did a prunist scribe, if so, probably Origen, consider the words "*apo* (from) *tes* (the) *thuras* (door)" were "unnecessarily wordy"?   Did he then prune them away?

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission?   If derived from the originating hand of Origen, probably the latter, but since we cannot be sure, possibly also the former. However, we can be sure that the correct reading has here been preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR's reading has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine Greek reading over time, and through time, with no good textual argument against it.   It clearly dates from ancient times in the Byzantine Greek textual tradition, and likewise is found in ancient times in the Latin textual tradition; and also from early mediaeval times in the Latin textual tradition.   It is also testified to in a similar Greek reading to that of the TR dating from ancient times.   The TR's reading further enjoys the support of the ancient Greek writing church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom of Constantinople.   By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, but strong support in the Latin.   However, it looks like the type of silly prunist thing Origen was capable of doing.   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. 28:2b 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. 28:2b, "from the door," in the wider words, "and came and rolled back the stone from the door," 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), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in 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 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 the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Armenian Version (5th century).

However, the variant omitting "from the door," 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 700 (11th century, independent).   It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 28:2b the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.*   Hence the ASV reads, "and came and rolled away the stone" etc. .   So too the incorrect variant is found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.   A footnote in the NKJV refers to this omission in the NU Text.

The old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II Council times, followed the majority Latin textual tradition in both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version.   Hence at Matt. 28:2b the Douay-Rheims reads, "and coming rolled back the stone" etc. .   We thus find there is nothing new about this attack on the *Textus Receptus* here at Matt. 28:2b, and that it historically formed a battle-line between the old Latin Papists and Protestant neo-Byzantines of the King James Version.   It is thus notable then that the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II Council times have likewise adopted this variant in their Roman *Catholic RSV*, Jerusalem Bible, and New Jerusalem Bible.   Thus the *Book of the Chronicles of Neo-Byzantine Defence of the Received Text* records that here at Matt. 28:2b, "the battle is joined between Protestant neo-Byzantines with the new neo-Alexandrian Papists at precisely the same spot that it was formerly joined with the old Latin Papists.   In both instances, the Papists were here attracted to 'a castration mentality' in what appears to be Origen's castration of the text."

Matt. 28:6a "Come, see" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks.

The lack of interest in this reading in the textual apparatuses I usually consult, means I do not give as much textual information on this reading.   This is especially so in the section "Outside the Closed Class of Sources," *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 28:6a the TR's Greek, "*Deute* (Come), *idete* (see)," i.e., "Come, see" (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, revowelling "*idete*" to "*eidetai*"), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century, revowelling "*idete*" to "*eidete*"), and K 017 (9th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century[151]) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*venite* (come[152]) *videte* (see)," i.e., "Come, see," in most Latin Vulgate Codices of Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century).

However, a Latin variant adds "*et* (and)," and thus reads, "*venite* (come) *et* (and) *videte* (see)." This is found in a minority of Latin Vulgate Codices, for instance, Codices F (*Codex Fuldensis*, 6th century, Fulda, Germany), P (6th / 7th century, *Codex Illyricianus* The Split, Croatia)[153], C (9th century, *Codex Cavensis*, produced in Spain, now at La Cava, Salerno, southern Italy), H (9th / 10th century, *Codex Hubertianus*, London, UK); as well as old Latin Versions d (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century[154]). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church

---

[151]   In Lectionary 2378 this is written something like, "δευτει ΔGε" (p. 96b, column 2). Here the "G" is an epsilon ("C") + tau ("τ"). The space between the "ι" and "Δ" (of δευτει ΔGε) in this continuous script manuscript is simply a stylistic paper space. The fact that the first delta is something like a lower case standard seminary Greek "δ" (although in the cursive script of this Lectionary it actually joins in running writing down to the "ε"), whereas the second delta is something like an upper case standard seminary Greek "Δ" (though not as precisely formed with slight protrusions at the three points of this triangle shape), and that three epsilons are something like the lower case standard seminary Greek "ε," but one of them is a "C" which joins with a "τ" to form a "G" shape, reminds us that in these handwritten manuscripts, letter variations can occur in a way that those who are only accustomed to standard seminary Greek may find surprising, and possibly even confusing. Such are the realties of dealing with "the real thing" of the manuscripts!

[152]   Latin, "*venite* ('come,' imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *video*)," is the first word of Psalm 95:1 in the Latin. Hence at Mattins (Matins), the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) entitles Ps. 95 as "*Venite* (O come), *exultemus* (let us sing) *Domino* (unto the Lord)," though it is more commonly referred to in Anglican tradition as simply, "The Venite."

[153]   Latin Codex P as designated in Weber-Gryson (2007) rather than Merk (1964). On the name of this manuscript, see Textual Commentary Vol. 4 (Matt. 26-28), Preface, "Codex Illyricianus (Latin Codex P in Weber-Gryson) is named."

[154]   It is wrongly attributed in my copy to Mark 16:6 (Latin Diatessaron, chapter ccxvii). See my comments at Matt. 28:6b, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," *infra*.

Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258)[155].

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Did the variant originate in the Greek, and was then copied to the Latin, or did it originate in the Latin?

The Latin terminology of "*venite* (come) *et* (and) *videte* (see)" is the standard reading found at John 1:39 in the Vulgate and old Latin Versions a, e, b, ff2, q, aur, & c; and a minority Latin reading at John 4:29[156]. At Matt. 28:6a, was a Latin scribe influenced by the Latin Johannian reading at John 1:39 and / or the John 4:29 variant?

Was the variant an accidental addition? Did a Latin scribe translating from the Greek "*Deute* (Come), *idete* (see)," consider that an "*et* (and)" could be added in "as part of the act of translation," thus producing the variant, "*venite* (come) *et* (and) *videte* (see)"?

Alternatively, did a Greek or Latin scribe leave a larger than normal paper space between the Greek, "*Deute* (Come)," and "*idete* (see)," or Latin, "*venite* (come)" and "*videte* (see)"? Did a copyist scribe wrongly conclude that "something must have been lost is a paper fade"? Did he then add in either a Greek "*kai* (and)" or a Latin "*et* (and)" respectively? If this was the work of a Latin scribe, to what extent, if any, was he influenced by this wording at John 1:39 and / or the John 4:29 variant?

Was the variant a deliberate addition? Did a Greek or Latin scribe think it some kind of "stylistic improvement" to here add in either a Greek "*kai* (and)" or a Latin "*et* (and)" respectively? If the work of a Latin scribe, to what extent, if any, was he influenced by this wording at John 1:39 and / or the John 4:29 variant?

Was the variant a deliberate or accidental addition? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that it was an addition to the text of Scripture, here Providentially preserved for us in the representative Byzantine Greek 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. It also has strong support in the Latin as the majority reading in the Latin textual tradition. By contrast, the variant has no support in the Greek; though some better support as a stronger minority Latin reading. Weighing up these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual

---

[155] Hans Freiherr von Soden's *Das Lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur zeit Cyprians*, in Harnack, A, & Schmidt, C., *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur*, *op. cit.*, at p. 421.

[156] At John 4:29 most Vulgate Codices & old Latin a, e, d, ff2, q, aur, & c, read, "*venite* (come) *videte* (see);" whereas a minority of Vulgate Codices (e.g., Weber-Gryson's F, 6th century; M, 6th century; P, 6th / 7th century; A, 8th century,) and old Latin b & l, read "*venite* (come) *et* (and) *videte* (see)."

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. 28:6a 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. 28:6a, "Come, see," 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) 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), 700 (11th century, independent), 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);

However, the variant which reads, "Come and see," is found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron. This reads in Ciasca's 19th century Latin translation of the 12th-14th centuries Arabic, Latin, "*venite* (come), *et* (and) *videte* (see)" (Arabic Diatessaron, chapter lii).

At Matt. 28:6a, the presence of the TR's reading in the two main Alexandrian texts, meant that for the wrong reasons, the right reading was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Hence for incorrect reasons, the correct reading is found in the *American Standard Version* as, "Come, see" (ASV) So too, for the wrong reasons, the right reading is found in the *New American Standard Bible*, *Revised Standard Version*, *English Standard Version*, and *New Revised Standard Version*.

However, the variant is *prima facie* followed by the *Today's English Version*, *New International Version*, *Twentieth Century New Testament*, *New English Bible*, *Revised English Bible*, and Papists' *Jerusalem Bible* and *New Jerusalem Bible*. Thus e.g., at Matt. 28:6a the NIV reads, "Come and see," or the TCNT reads, "Come, and see." Is this an exercise on a non-Alexandrian pincer arm by the NIV translators? (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.) Or is this an example of the TEV, NIV, TCNT, NEB, REB, JB, and NJB translators adding in "and" as part of their loose'n'liberal techniques of "dynamic equivalence"? Probably the latter, but possibly the former, alas, the sloppy form of translation used by these neo-Alexandrian versions means one can never be sure of such things. Paradoxically then, these "new" versions claim to "be making the Word of God clearer."

But when it comes to the old Latin Papists we can be surer, since the variant reading at Matt. 28:6a was "a favourite" of the old Latin Papists. Here at Matt. 28:6a the

Clementine Vulgate follows the variant's, "*et* (and)." So too the Douay-Rheims reads, "Come, and see" etc. .

Matt. 28:6b "the Lord" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron copy that I use (Siever's 1892 edition[157]) contains the TR's reading as "*ubi* (where) *positus* (laid) *erat* ('he was' = 'was') *Dominus* (the Lord)," but attributes it to "Mc 16 6" i.e., Mark 16:6 (Latin Diatessaron, chapter ccxvii). The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex. Though similar words occur in neither St. Luke's Gospel nor St. John's Gospel, the Vulgate reads at Matt. 28:6b, "*ubi* (where) *positus* (laid) *erat* ('<u>he</u> was' = 'was,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person <u>singular</u> verb, from *sum-esse*) *Dominus* (the Lord);" and at Mark 16:6, "*ubi* (where) *posuereunt* ('<u>they</u> laid,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person <u>plural</u> verb, from *pono*) *eum* (him)." Clearly then, the attribution of this reading to "Mc 16 6" is incorrect, and we can safely say that it was taken from Matt. 28:6b as part of Diatessaron formatting. Hence I show the Sangallensis Diatessaron supporting the TR's reading, *infra*. (It makes the same error for Matt. 28:6a, *supra*, to which it is joined.)

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 28:6b the TR's Greek, "*opou* (where) *ekeito* ('he lay' = 'lay') *o* (the) *Kurios* (Lord)," i.e., "where the Lord lay" (AV), 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, abbreviating "*Kurios*" as "Ks" with a bar on top), W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, abbreviating "*Kurios*" as "Ks" with a bar on top), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and M 021 (9th century, abbreviating "*Kurios*" as "Ks" with a bar on top); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark, abbreviating "*Kurios*" as "Ks" with a bar on top) and 2 (12th century, abbreviating "*Kurios*" as "Ks" with a bar on top); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, abbreviating "*Kurios*" as "Ks" with a bar on top[158]) and 1968 (1544 A.D. [159]). It is also found as Latin, "*ubi* (where) *positus* (laid) *erat* ('he was' = 'was') *Dominus* (the Lord)," i.e., "where the Lord was laid," 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.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Philo of Carpasia (d. 4th century),

---

[157] Edward (Eduard) Sievers' *Tatian Lateinish und altedeutsch*, Druck & Verlag, Paderborn, Germany, 1892 (http://users.belgacom.net/chardic/html/tatien.html).

[158] The Lectionary 2378 script here (p. 96b) is "κσ".

[159] The Lectionary 1968 script here (p. 200b) is "κc".

Chrysostom (d. 407), and Theoderet of Cyrus (d. 460); and ancient church Latin writers, Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

However, a variant omitting Greek, "*o* (the) *Kurios* (Lord)," and so reading simply, "*opou* (where) *ekeito* (he lay)," i.e., "where he lay," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 1604 (13th century), and Lectionary 253 (1020 A.D.). It is further found as Latin, "*ubi* (where) *iacebat* ('he was laying = 'he was laid')," in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Chrysostom (d. 407) and Cyril of Alexandrian (d. 444); the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. The origins of the variant are speculative; however, it may well have originated with Origen.

Was the variant an accidental omission? In the "*o* (the) *Kurios* (Lord)" or "O KUPIOC," was the "KUPIOC" abbreviated to "KC" with a bar on top; and in a continuous script manuscript written as three letters, "OKC"? Did it also come at the end of a line? Was it then lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was the variant a deliberate omission? Did this variant originate with Origen? Origen held unorthodox views, including a Trinitarian heresy which denies the Divine equality of the Father and the Son. The orthodox position is that with regard to their Deity, the Father and the Son are "equal" (John 5:17,18; Philp. 2:5,6), and thus are given equal "honour" i.e., "all men should honour the Son, <u>even as</u> they honour the Father (John 5:23, emphasis mine), being of equal "authority" (Greek *exousia*[160], John 5:27) since Christ says, "All <u>power</u> (Greek *exousia*[161]) is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (Matt. 28:18); for "as touching his Godhead," "our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God," is "equal to the Father" (*Athanasian Creed*, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662). But Origen denied this Biblical teaching, heretically claiming instead that as touching his Godhead, the Son was inferior to the Father. Therefore, was Origen concerned that the reference to "the Lord" in "the angel of <u>the Lord</u>" in Matt. 28:2 would be taken as a reference to God the Father, and the connected reference to Jesus as "the Lord " in Matt. 28:6, "might create an overall impression of equality between 'God the Lord' and 'Jesus the Lord'"? Did he thus decide to prune away "the Lord" from Matt. 28:6b "to diminish the 'Lord' emphasis and thus the Deity emphasis on Christ," who is identified at the start of St. Matthew's Gospel as the Old Testament "Lord" of "the prophet Esaias" (Matt. 3:3) i.e., the OT "Jehovah" of Isa. 40:3? By contrast, let us declare, "the Father is Lord, the Son Lord: and the Holy Ghost Lord. And yet not three Lords: but one Lord. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity: to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord; so we are forbidden by the Catholick Religion: to say there be three Gods, or three Lords" (*Athanasian Creed*, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662).

---

[160] Greek "*exousian* (feminine singular accusative noun, from *exousia*)."

[161] Greek "*exousia* (feminine singular nominative noun, from *exousia*)."

Was the variant a deliberate omission or an accidental omission? We do not know. But we do know that it was an omission to the text Providentially preserved for us here at Matt. 28:6b in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR's reading has rock solid support in both the Greek and Latin as the near monolithic reading of the Byzantine Greek textual tradition over time, and through time, dating from ancient times; and the near monolithic reading of the Latin textual tradition over time, and through time, dating from ancient times. It is further supported by Philo of Carpasia in Cyprus, whose piety led to his consecration as Bishop of Carpasia under Bishop Epiphanius, and whose remaining works include an epistle and a Commentary on the Song of Solomon; Theoderet, an unorthodox bishop of Cyrus; and Chromatius, a bishop of Aquileia, north-west of Trieste in Italy, who was a friend of Jerome, a supporter of John Chrysostom, and also a defender of orthodox Trinitarian doctrine against the Arian heresy. It further enjoys the support of the church fathers and doctors, John Chrysostom in the Greek, Jerome in the Latin, and Austin in the Latin.

By contrast, the variant has relatively weak support in both the Greek and Latin textual traditions, although it has the support of several ancient church writers. However, it looks like it may well have originated with Origen, who is more generally reckoned among the "many which corrupt the Word of God" (II Cor. 2:17). Weighing up these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 28:6b 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. 28:6b, "where the Lord lay," is found in leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (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), 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 Harclean h Version (616), and some manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version; and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th

centuries; Latin 19th century)[162].

However, the variant reading, "where he lay," 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 Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); and some manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The NU Text Committee member, Bruce Metzger (d. 2007), makes the claim that the TR's reading is not correct since, "In Matthew the word *kurios* [Lord] is never applied to Jesus except in his reported sayings" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 71; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 59). But as already noted, *supra*, we find at Matt. 3:3 St. John the Baptist citing Isa. 40:3 with reference to Christ, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord (*Kuriou*, masculine singular genitive noun, from *Kurios*)."

Furthermore, there is an equality between the Divine Persons of Father and Son taught in the words of Matt. 22:44,45 with regard to Ps. 110:1, "The Lord (*Kurios*, masculine singular nominative noun, from *Kurios*) said unto my Lord (*Kurio*, masculine singular dative noun, from *Kurios*)," and "If David then call him Lord (*Kurion*, masculine singular accusative noun, from *Kurios*), how is he his son?" This equality of Divine Persons seen in this contextual equality of title as "the Lord" in St. Matthew's Gospel, means that if Matthew 28:2 refers to "the angel of the Lord (*Kuriou*, masculine singular genitive noun, from *Kurios*)," then it is both stylistically and theologically inside the parameters of Matthean Greek to also refer in Matt. 28:6b to "the place where the Lord (*Kurios*, masculine singular nominative noun, from *Kurios*) lay." This is a natural outgrowth of the teaching of Matt. 22:44,45; for "the Father is Lord, the Son Lord: and the Holy Ghost Lord, and yet not three Lords: but one Lord. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity: to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord; so we are forbidden by the Catholick Religion: to say there be three Gods, or three Lords" (*Athanasian Creed*, Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*).

Hence I consider Metzger makes a distinction without merit in his claims about Matthean Greek. For if St. Matthew can record that "there came a leper and worshipped him, saying, Lord (*Kurie*, masculine singular vocative noun, from *Kurios*), if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean" (Matt. 8:2); or "there came unto" "Jesus" "a centurion," "saying, Lord (*Kurie*, masculine singular vocative noun, from *Kurios*)" (Matt. 8:5,6); and if St. Matthew can record Christ's words teaching men to call him, "the (*o*) Lord (*Kurios*,

---

[162] Some would argue that because Minuscule 1424 reads, Greek "*to* (the) *soma* (body) *tou* (of the) *Kuriou* (Lord);" or the Latin-Arabic Diatessaron reads, Latin, "*Dominus* (Lord) *noster* (our)," that these are similar but different readings. But I have taken the view that suchlike follow the TR's readings, and the differences are additional minor variants that I am not really interested with for my purposes.

masculine singular nominative noun, from *Kurios*)" (Matt. 21:3); then it surely beggars belief to suggest that St. Matthew could not, or would not record the words of "the angel of the Lord" (Matt. 28:2) who said, "Come see the place where the (*o*) Lord (*Kurios*, masculine singular nominative noun, from *Kurios*) lay" (Matt. 28:6).

But the absurd argument of such neo-Alexandrian "glamour boys" as Bruce Metzger evidently won the day with those of the Neo-Alexandrian School. After all, on another supercilious claim of the neo-Alexandrians, "Is not the variant the shorter reading? … And is not the shorter reading the better reading?" Thus at Matt. 28:6b the erroneous variant which omits these words was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. However, with a wide "external support" from e.g., the Western Text, Westcott & Hort who more commonly considered that where the two main Alexandrian texts agreed there was "a neutral text," on this relatively rare occasion were evidently worried. "After all," Hort might have snorted to Westcott, "Does not the Latin, the Western Text, and the Syriac all support the TR's reading here?"

Four "solutions" were here adopted by the neo-Alexandrian Versions.

Solution 1: Follow Westcott & Hort in placing the erroneous variant in the main text, and give a footnote referring to the TR's reading. At Matt. 28:6b, the incorrect variant is found with a footnote reference to the TR's reading, in the RSV, ESV, and NRSV. *Solution 1* was also followed by the new neo-Alexandrian Papists' in their JB and NJB; at which point they thus departed from the old Latin Papists who for the wrong reasons, followed the correct reading of the Latin in the Clementine and Douay-Rheims.

Solution 2: Rather than exercising the normative Alexandrian text pincer arm, instead, exercise a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm; i.e., place the TR's reading in the main text, and give a footnote reading referring to the erroneous variant. The fact that Westcott & Hort balked here at Matt. 28:6b by giving the TR's reading in one of their relatively rare sidenotes, evidently had a major impact on the thinking of the ASV translators, and one which Westcott & Hort would no doubt have considered was disproportionately favorable to the TR. For unlike Westcott & Hort who put the variant in their main text, and gave the TR's reading as a sidenote; by contrast, at Matt. 28:6b, the ASV translators put the TR's reading in their main text as, "Come, see the place where the Lord lay" (ASV), and then said in a footnote, "Many authorities read 'where he lay'" (ASV ftn.). (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.)

Solution 3: Rather than exercising the normative Alexandrian text pincer arm, instead, exercise a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm; i.e., place the TR's reading in the main text, but make no reference to the erroneous variant. The semi neo-Alexandrian, James Moffatt (d. 1944), appears to have been here greatly impressed by the "external support" of the Latin, the Western Text, and the Syriac, and probably used the Western Text as his "decider" i.e., "to clinch the argument" in favour of the TR's reading. Thus without any footnote alternative, for the wrong reasons, Moffatt here got the right reading at Matt. 28:6b with, "See … the place where the Lord lay" (Moffatt Bible). (Cf. my

comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.)

Solution 4: Follow Metzger & the NU Text Committee in adopting the erroneous variant in a manner entirely dismissive of the TR's reading. At Matt. 28:6b the incorrect variant is found without any footnote reference to the TR's reading in the NASB, NIV, TEV, TCNT, NEB, & REB.

Matt. 28:7 "from the dead" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*apo* (from) *ton* (the) *nekron* (dead)," in the wider words spoken by the angel of Christ, "he is risen (*egerthe*) from (*apo*) the (*ton*) dead (*nekron*)" (AV), are 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, coming at the end of a line, the final "*n*" of "*ton*" is abbreviated with a bar something like "‾"), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and Pi 041 (9th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 1010 (12th century), and 1242 (13th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*a* (from) *mortuis* (the dead)," in a minority of Latin Vulgate Codices, for instance, *Codex Fuldensis* (6th century, Fulda, Germany), *Codex Foroiuliensis* (6th / 7th century, Cividale, Italy), *Codex Lichfildensis* (7th / 8th century, St. Matthew to St. Luke, Lichfield, England, UK), and *Codex Gatianus* (8th / 9th century, Paris, France); and old Latin Versions ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D., written as a compound word, "*amortuis*") and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

However, a variant omits these words, and so reads simply, "he is risen (Greek, *egerthe*; Latin, *surrexit*)." It is found in most Latin Vulgate Codices of Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th 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, Origen (d. 254), in both the Greek and also a Latin translation; and the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are conjectural. However, the variant quite probably originated with Origen, a fact increasing the probability that it was a deliberate omission; and it is also quite likely that it is some kind of semi-assimilation with the "*egerthe* (he is risen)" of Matt. 28:6 and / or Mark 16:6 and / or Luke 24:6.

Was the variant an accidental omission? In a given manuscript, did a scribe write in the side margin for comparison the reading "*egerthe* (he is risen)" with some reference to the Marcan (Mark 16:6) and Lucan (Luke 24:6) accounts? Were this earlier scribe's abbreviations then somehow misunderstood by a subsequent copyist scribe, who took this

to be "an alternative reading," and in his "opinion, the better reading"?   Were the words "*apo* (from) *ton* (the) *nekron* (dead)," thus pruned away from the text?

Was the variant a deliberate omission?   Did a prunist scribe, perhaps noting that in the previous verse 6, the angel says simply, "*egerthe* (he is risen)" without these additional words, "*apo* (from) *ton* (the) *nekron* (dead);" and also influenced by their absence at Mark 16:6 and / or Luke 24:6, conclude that "they are redundant"?   Did he then prune them away as some kind of semi-assimilation with Matt. 28:6 and / or Mark 16:6 and / or Luke 24:6?

Was the variant a deliberate or accidental omission?   We do not now know.   We cannot with certainty now know.   But we can know that this was an omission to the text of Scripture Providentially here preserved for us in the majority 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.   It also has impressive support in the Latin from ancient times, with about one-quarter of the old Latin Versions, and also some Vulgate Codices.   It further enjoys the support of an old and holy doctor in the church father, St. Cyril (Latin, "Cyrillus").   By contrast, though the variant has strong support in the Latin, it has extremely weak support in the Greek, and looks like it may well have originated with Origen, who is notorious for being counted among the "many which corrupt the Word of God" (II Cor. 2:17).   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. 28:7 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. 28:7, "from the dead," in the wider words, "he is risen from the dead," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex 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), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels).   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), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd

century) Versions; Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the variant which omits "from the dead," and so reads simply, "he is risen," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); as well as Minuscule 565 (9th century, independent). It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Georgian Version (5th century).

The neo-Alexandrian rule, "The shorter reading is generally the better reading," coupled with the variant's presence in the Latin (Vulgate *et al*), Western text (D 05), "Caesarean" Text (Armenian & Georgian Versions), and Syriac (Sinaitic Version), caused "some heart-burn" for the neo-Alexandrian NU Text compilers. Thus the NU Text Committee of the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions took the view that here at Matt. 28:7, "there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text" i.e., the TR, "or the apparatus" i.e., the variant, "contains the superior reading."

However, in general the neo-Alexandrian translators did not register any comparable concerns at Matt. 28:7, so that because it is followed by the two main Alexandrian texts, and has "external support" in e.g., the Byzantine text, Syriac (Pesitto, Palestinian, & Harclean Versions), Coptic (Sahidic & Bohairic), and in the case of some of the older neo-Alexandrians, the Arabic (Arabic Diatessaron), the TR's correct reading was followed for largely incorrect reasons. E.g., the ASV reads, "He is risen from the dead" etc. . So too, for the wrong reasons, the right reading was followed in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV main text with footnote *infra*, NIV, TEV, NEB, REB, TCNT, Moffatt, and Papists' Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB and NJB.

However, an NRSV footnote refers to the variant, saying, "Other ancient authorities lack 'from the dead'" (NRSV ftn.). While among the neo-Alexandrian Versions used in these textual commentaries, the "considerable degree of doubt" about this reading expressed in the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions only finds expression in this one footnote in the NRSV, we need to "watch this spot" in future neo-Alexandrian versions or revisions, since the latent potential clearly exists for the variant to be more robustly followed in a future neo-Alexandrian version, even though it is not a forgone conclusion that in fact this will occur.

Moreover, this variant is of some interest to us because it was much liked by the old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II Council times. Hence at Matt. 28:7 the variant is found in both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version, the latter of which reads simply, "he is risen" (Douay-Rheims).

The last great work produced by the old Latin Papists was Augustine Merk's *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine* whose 9th edition came out in 1964 from the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome. I have held a copy of this work in my library for

some years[163].   It includes a Preface dated 1 January 1964 by "Carolus M. Martini S.J." (b. 1927) who from 1962 had held the Chair of Textual Criticism at the Pontifical Biblical Institute (and later became its Rector from 1969 to 1978).   In English, "Carolus Maria Martini," is "Charles Mary Martini" and the "S.J" signifies he is a Jesuit.   This same man is known as a Member of the neo-Alexandrian NU Text Committee since the UBS Third Edition of 1975 as "Carlo M. Martini" with no specific indicator that he is a Jesuit.   He was made a Romish Cardinal in 1983, although no reference is made to this on the 1993 UBS 4th revised edition title page or elsewhere in that edition.

The Jesuit Cardinal Martini is thus a transitional figure for Roman Catholic textual theoretics.   He was at the forefront of the old Latin Papists before the 1965 conclusion of Vatican II Council, as seen by his Preface to Merk's 1964 9th edition; but then went to being at the forefront of the new neo-Alexandrian Papists after the Vatican II Council, as seen by his membership of the neo-Alexandrian NU Text Committee from the 1975 edition on.   Like Bruce Metzger and Kurt Aland, he is one of three out of five names to remain on NU Text Committees from the 1975 edition through to the present 1993 NU Text edition; and since both Kurt Aland (d. 1994) and Metzger (d. 2007) are now dead, Martini is the last surviving member in "the Gang of Three."

Martini shows continuity amidst change from the time of the old Latin Papists to the time of the new neo-Alexandrian Papists.   That is because in both positions he was opposed to the pure Word of God as found in the *Textus Receptus*.   Thus when he was "given new marching orders" by the Vatican II Council, he merely sought to attack the Received Text in a different way.   The Papists had failed during about 400 years to successfully destroy the much hated Received Text, which in broad terms, was paradoxically first formally compiled by Roman Catholics in the 16th century with the Complutenisans of Spain and Erasmus of Rotterdam.   But when the Roman Church saw how the Received Text was integral to unleashing the Protestant Reformation, they moved in conjunction with the Council of Trent "to put the lid on it."   This thus gave birth to the old Latin Papists of post- Trent Council and pre-Vatican II Council times.

But the Papists of Vatican II Council times perceived that if they joined up with the apostate Protestants of the neo-Alexandrian text, then together, in a united effort, they might at last succeed in destroying, or at least seriously wounding, the much hated Received Text.   For the devils behind Romanism (Rev. 27:9; 18:2), this was too strong a temptation to resist.   Thus they whispered in the ears of their captive minions in Popery, who thought that they were just "getting" certain "bright ideas," and Martini was called upon to use all his crafty arts of Jesuitry to ditch the old Latin Papists in favour of the new neo-Alexandrian Papists.   So pleased was the Roman Church with the success of his Jesuitry, that in 1978 he became Chancellor of the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome.   This is the oldest and most prestigious Jesuit university in the world.   It was founded in 1551 by the founder of Jesuitry, "Saint" Ignatius Loyola; and the majority of its academic staff are Jesuits.

---

[163]   This is a photocopy I made and had bound, rather than an original print.

With these thoughts in mind, we now return to the fact that the variant here at Matt. 28:7 was much liked by the old Latin Papists.

The *Book of the Chronicles of Neo-Byzantine Defence of the Received Text* records that here at Matt. 28:7, "the old Latin Papists dug their heels in hard as for centuries they fought against Protestant neo-Byzantines of the Received Text and King James Bible in their claim that Matt. 28:7 should omit "from the dead" as it does in a number of Latin manuscripts and the Clementine Vulgate, so that this should be rendered as it is in the Douay-Rheims Version. Following the *Vatican II Council* from 1962 to 1965, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists said to the old Latin Papists at this old front-line battleground of Matt. 28:7, 'It's okay, we'll stand behind you on this one. Dig your heels in even harder!' 'You can trust me' said Charles Mary Martini, 'after all, I'm the guy who did the Preface to Merk's 1964 edition'."

"And as the old Latin Papists moved their bodies back further as they started to dig their heels in even harder, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists standing behind them, moved forward, and with a sharp jab of their knives struck the old Latin Papists in the back, leaving their neo-Alexandrian knives in as the old Latin Papists fell to ground. As the old Latin Papists lay-a-dying here at Matt. 28:7, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists declared, 'When we said, <We'll stand behind you on this one,> what me meant, is that we'd physically stand behind you so as to more effectively knife you in the back. … Sucko Joe![164]' As some of the dying Latin Papists turned they caught Martini's eye, hoping for some support from him. Martini responded, 'We Jesuits do whatever the Pope tells us to do. Whether that's trying to blow up the Protestant King James I in 1605 after he commissioned the King James Bible based on the Received Text which came out in 1611; or now trying to blow up the Protestant King James Bible based on the Received Text by becoming neo-Alexandrians. … So Sucko Joe!!'"

"As the dying Latin Papists turned they caught the Pope's eye, hoping for some support from him in antithesis to what Martini had just said. The response of the Pope, which of course, was really the response of Lucifer who has personally Devil-possessed every Pope of Rome since the first Pope, Boniface III, in 607 A.D., was unequivocal. He said, 'My minions are useful to me, only so long as they are useful to me. … Sucko Joe!!' And with that thought in their minds, here at the textual battleground of Matt. 28:7, the old Latin Papists expired in exacerbated agony. Watching on, the Pope, Martini who was heading to become a Cardinal, and the other new neo-Alexandrian Papists, all smiled: ☻ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☺ ☻; and exclaimed in unison, 'Sucko Joe!!!'"

Matt. 28:9a "And as they went to tell his disciples, behold," (TR & AV) {A}

---

[164] "Sucko Joe" is an Australian colloquialism. It derives from "suck" in the sense of drawing something in by suction, and has the same connotation as "sucked in" or calling a person "a sucker" i.e., a person who is drawn in and deceived, or imposed upon, or duped.

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter.   The UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions say that Lectionary 185 here has both readings, but they do not specify if there are only two readings in the Lectionary, or more than two.   Hence I show this in both instances as Lectionary 185 "in one of its readings;" although in doing so, the reader should be aware that there may be more than two readings in this Lectionary, and so at least one of these might have the support of more than one Lectionary 185 reading; although there may also only be two readings.   Unfortunately, the UBS textual apparatus simply lacks this detail. I also note that as at other readings, the UBS 4th revised edition (1993) generally removes citations of specific Lectionaries, and this is a much to be regretted element of the 1993 edition.   Like Codices and Minuscules, Lectionaries are important manuscripts, and in my opinion should be given a lot more attention, not less attention.

In this context, I note that Sydney University Lectionary 1968 (p. 200b) here follows the variant which is a small minority Byzantine reading.   This once again shows the value of getting more work done on the Lectionaries!

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting).   Inside the closed class of sources, the Vulgate Codex of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron starts a section with the words of Matt. 28:9a as found in the Vulgate (although as elsewhere, spelling Latin, "*Iesus*" / "Jesus" as "*Ihesus*").   This follows a section from John 20:18 in the Vulgate (Latin Diatessaron, chapter ccxxiii).   Since it is not possible to know if the TR's words were thus removed as a part of Diatessaron formatting, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra.*

Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron moves from parts of Matt. 28:8 to parts of Matt. 28:9, and lacks the words of Matt. 28:9a (Arabic Diatessaron, chapter liii).   (The USB 3rd and 3rd corrected editions erroneously say that the Arabic Diatessaron here follows the TR's reading[165].)   But once again, it is not possible to tell if Matt. 28:9a has or has not been omitted as part of Diatessaron formatting, and so no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra.*

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 28:9a the TR's Greek, "<u>os</u> (as) *de* (And) *eporeuonto* (they went) *apageilai* (to tell) *tois* (the) *math<u>e</u>tais* (disciples) *autou* (of him), *kai* ('and,' redundant in English translation) *idou* (behold)," i.e., "And as they went to tell his disciples, behold," (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),

---

[165]   Assuming, that is, as for my purposes I always do, that Ciasca's Latin is an accurate rendering of the Arabic.   But if perchance it is not, it does not ultimately mater, since manuscripts outside the closed class of sources, such as the Arabic Diatessaron, have no impact on discovering and composing the *Textus Receptus.*

Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and K 017 (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), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionaries 185 (11th century, in one of its readings) and 2378 (11th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*ut* (as) *autem* (And) *abierent* (they went) *nuntiare* (to tell) *discipulis* (the disciples) *eius* (of him), *et* (-) *ecce* (behold)," i.e., "And as they went to tell his disciples, behold," in old Latin Version f (6th century); and as Latin, "*Cum* (as soon as) *autem* (And) *abierent* (= ? *abirent*, 'they were to go'[166]) *nuntiare* (to tell) *discipulis* (the disciples), *et* (-) *ecce* (behold)," i.e., "as soon as they were to go to tell the disciples, behold," in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century).

However, a variant omitting Greek, "*<u>os</u>* (as) *de* (And) *eporeuonto* (they went) *apageilai* (to tell) *tois* (the) *math<u>e</u>tais* (disciples) *autou* (of him)," and so reading simply, "*kai* (And) *idou* (behold)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionaries 32 (11th century), 185 (11th century, in one of its readings), 76 (12th century), 211 (12th century), 299 (13th century), 1642 (13th century), 950 (1289 / 1290 A.D.), 184 (1319 A.D.), and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), 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 writers, Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

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? The words of Matt. 29:8 which immediately precede the TR's reading of "*<u>os</u>* (as) *de* (And) *eporeuonto* (they went) *apageilai* (to tell) *tois* (the) *math<u>e</u>tais* (disciples) *autou* (of him)," are "*megal<u>e</u>s* (great), *edramon* ([and] did run) *apaggeilai* (to bring word) *tois* (the) *math<u>e</u>tais* (disciples) *autou*

---

[166] I am not dogmatic on the meaning of "*abierent*" here, but have simply supplied one of the possibilities. Is "*abierent*" a local dialect spelling form of "*abirent* (subjunctive active imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *abeo*)," in which the subjunctive element of contingency or potential is conveyed by the fact they "were to go" when stopped by Jesus' appearance to them? (See Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, pp. 186 & 195.) Or rather than syncopating "*abiverunt*" to "*abierunt* ('they went,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *abeo*)" (old Latin f), in a given local dialect did a scribe syncopate it to "*abierunt*," but did he then make a spelling mistake and write this as "*abierent*" (old Latin q)? However one may resolve this matter, it is clear that in broad terms old Latin q supports the TR's reading.

(of him)."   In a given manuscript, were these words aligned something like the following?

> *megales edramon apaggeilai tois mathetais autou*
> *os de eporeuonto apageilai tois mathetais autou*

After writing the first line, did the eye of a scribe jump down in ellipsis from "*tois mathetais autou*" to "*tois mathetais autou*" due to this similarity of ending (known as "homoeoteleuton"); and did he then keep witting, thus accidentally omitting "*os de eporeuonto apageilai tois mathetais autou*"?   Might this mistake have been made multiple times by multiple scribes, so that there is no necessary direct textual lineage between different Greek manuscripts containing the variant's reading.

Was the variant a deliberate omission?   It probable origins with Origen increases this likelihood, though by no means make its certain.   Did a prunist scribe, if so, probably Origen, consider that because the previous verse tells of how "Mary Magdalene and the other Mary" (Matt. 28:1) "departed quickly from the sepulchre …; and did run to bring his disciples word" (Matt. 28:8), that the immediately following words, "And as they went to tell his disciples" (Matt. 28:9a) were therefore "redundant and unnecessary"?   Did he thus arrogantly prune these words away as some kind of "stylistic improvement" to produce "a more succinct text"?   Alas, from New Testament times onwards there have been "many which corrupt the Word of God" (II Cor. 2:17), for which reason only a fool would argue "older manuscripts are necessarily better;" since especially if one were dealing with a relatively small number of such manuscripts, it may simply be that one had the text of some ancient corrupters!

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

The TR's text has rock solid support in the Greek, over time, and through time, dating from ancient times.   It also has support in the Latin from early mediaeval times in a couple of old Latin Versions.   By contrast, the variant has relatively weak support in the Greek, though correspondingly strong 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. 28:9a 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. 28:9a, "And as they went to tell his disciples, behold," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex 0148 (8th century, Matt. 28:5-19), (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), 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels), 579 (13th century, mixed text), and 205 (15th century, independent in the Gospels & Revelation); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h Version (616); and Ethiopic Versions (Roman edition of Rome 1548-9; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which reads simply, "And behold," 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 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Palestinian (*c.* 6th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Slavic Version (9th century); and Ethiopic Version (Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9).

At Matt. 28:9a the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Thus it is found in the ASV which reads simply, "And behold." So too at Matt. 28:9a the incorrect variant is found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.

The old Latin Papists of post Trent Council and pre-Vatican II Council times adopted the variant in both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Hence the Douay-Rheims reads at Matt. 28:9a, "And behold." So too the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post Vatican II Council times adopted the variant in the Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB. *So long as the Textus Receptus is attacked, the Papists are happy! In fairness to them, they and their Church of Antichrist have much to fear from the pure Word of God, which strikes down and demolishes the heretical doctrines of their church, such as: their denial of justification by faith (Gal. 1:6-9; 3:11; II Thess. 2:7); their elevation of tradition over the authority of Scripture (Matt. 15:6-8; Mark 7:13; II Tim. 3:16); their sin of idolatry (Gal. 5:20; II Thess. 2:3) seen in e.g. Mariolatry and the idolatrous adoration of the Roman Mass; and their denial of the humanity of Christ (I John 4:2,3; II John 7) in the transubstantiation heresy, for "the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one"* (Final Rubric, The Communion Service, 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*) (Matt. 26:11; John 16:28; Acts 3:21; I Cor. 11:26).

Matt. 28:14 "him" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*auton* (him)," in the wider words, "we will persuade him" (AV), are 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), Pi 041 (9th century), and Gamma 036 (10th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is also supported as Latin, "*ei* (him)," 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.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386), and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant omits Greek, "*auton* (him)," and so reading, "we will persuade *him*" (showing italics for added word).   It is found in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century); and the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

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

Was the variant an accidental omission?   Was it lost in an undetected paper fade? Or in the sequence of words, "*peisomen* (we will persuade) *auton* (him)," did a scribe's eye jump from the "n" (nu) ending of "*peisomen*" to the "n" ending of "*auton* (him)," thus accidentally omitting the "*auton* (him)" in this ellipsis?

Was the variant a deliberate omission?   Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, consider that the earlier presence of "*tou* (the) *egemonos* (governor)," "was sufficient to infer the contextual meaning of '*auton* (him),' so that it might be removed as redundant"? Did such a prunist scribe then arrogantly remove the "*auton* (him)" 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 from the text of Scripture which is here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading 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, over time, and through time, dating from ancient times; including the Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome.   It further has the support of a number of ancient church Greek writers, including the church father and doctor, St. Chrysostom.   By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek and Latin, and looks like the type of thing Origen would do.   Weighing up these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I

would give the TR's reading at Matt. 28:14 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. 28:14, "him," in the wider words, "we will persuade him," 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 mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex 0148 (8th century, Matt. 28:5-19), (the mixed text type) Codex 0234 (8th century, Matt. 28:11-15; & John 1:4-8,20-24), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscule 579 (13th century, mixed text); 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), *et al*. It is further found in all extant Syriac Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) as Latin, "*eum* (him)" (Arabic Diatessaron, chapter liii).

However, the variant which omits "him" and so reads, "we will persuade *him*" (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 mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century) and Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type).

On the one hand, the variant was adopted by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). But on the other hand, with the lack of much "external support" beyond the two main Alexandrian texts, the NU Text Committee neo-Alexandrians "started to get cold feet" on this reading, and hence there was then a strong proclivity to exercise the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm. (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.) But being neo-Alexandrians, then came "the nagging doubt." "Could both of the main Alexandrian texts really be wrong? Especially when they are both following the shorter reading, and 'the shorter reading is generally the better reading,' isn't it?" To resolve "this crisis," the "*auton* (him)" was placed in square brackets and so made optional in the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

At Matt. 28:14 the ASV reads, "we will persuade him;" and so too the NASB follows the TR's reading. This same reading is also *prima facie* found at Matt. 28:14 in the RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, and Moffatt. E.g., the Moffatt Bible reads, "We will satisfy him" etc. . Were these instances an exercise of the Alexandrian pincer arm, in which the "him" was regarded as absent in the underpinning text as in Codices Vaticanus

and Sinaiticus, but then added in as part of English translation?   Or was this an exercise of non-Alexandrian pincer arm, in which the "him" was regarded as part of the underpinning text as found in various "external support" beyond the two main Alexandrian texts?   In the case of the ASV and NASB which *generally* use italics, we can *probably* say the former.   With regard to Moffatt, the fact that von Soden's main text puts the "*auton* (him)" in square brackets like the contemporary NU Text, and the fact that the TR's reading is found in the Western Text, Syriac, and Latin, means there is a very reasonable chance, though not a definite certainty, that he here followed the TR's reading for the wrong reasons.   But with regard to the bulk of neo-Alexandrian versions, due to their non-usage of italics for added words we simply do not know, and nor do any of their misguided devotees.   Such are some of the realities of those claiming to make the Word of God "clearer" in their so called "modern versions."

Matt. 28:17 "him" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

At the relevant section of Matt. 28:17 Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) reads exactly the same in Ciasca's 19th century Latin translation as the Vulgate (Arabic Diatessaron, chapter lv).   However, the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, both show the Arabic Diatessaron following the TR's reading.

This raises the following question.   Does the underpinning Arabic follow the TR's reading or the variant?   As one who does not read or have any interest in the Arabic tongue, I am unable to answer this question.   But Diatessaron studies were greatly enhanced by Ciasca's work which has the distinction of acting to arouse much of the modern interest in this and other Diatessarons.   Therefore, for my purposes, I determine the reading of the Arabic from Ciasca's Latin.

What if on this, or another occasion I am wrong, and Ciasca has badly rendered the Arabic into Latin?   It does not ultimately matter, since manuscripts outside the closed class of sources, such as the Arabic Diatessaron, the Western Greek text, the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, or Dillmann's Ethiopic Version, are not used to compose the NT text.   Therefore, I shall here follow the Latin reading of Ciasca to determine the reading of the Arabic Diatessaron, and if Ciasca got it wrong, so be it. After all, only a fool would use manuscripts outside the closed class of sources to compose or influence his view on the New Testament text.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 28:17 *Reading 1a*, the TR's Greek, "*aut<u>o</u>* ('him,' masculine singular <u>dative</u>, personal pronoun, from *autos-<u>e</u>-o*)," in the wider words referring to the risen Christ, "they worshipped him (*aut<u>o</u>*)," are 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 2 (12th century), 1010 (12th century), and 1242 (13th century); and Lectionaries 185 (11th century, twice in two different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is further found in the ancient church Greek writer, Didymus (d. 398).

Reading 1b, the similar reading Greek, "*auton* ('him,' masculine singular <u>accusative</u>, personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*)," which is translated the same into English, is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex Gamma 036 (10th century); Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionaries 183 (10th century), 1231 (10th century), 32 (11th century), 2378 (11th century, twice in two different readings), 303 (12th century), 1634 (12th century), 950 (1289 / 1290 A.D.), and 184 (1319 A.D.).

Reading 1 i.e., *Readings 1a* or *1b* is further supported as Latin, "*eum* ('him,' masculine singular <u>accusative</u>, personal pronoun, from *is-ea-id*)[167]," in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century).

However, a variant omits Greek, "*auto* (him)," and so reads "they worshipped *him*" (showing italics for added word). It is found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Book of Armagh (812 A.D.) and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

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

Was *Reading 1b* an accidental alteration? Due to a paper fade, and perhaps coming at the end of a line, or just before a stylistic paper space, did the "*auto* (him)" (*Reading 1a*) come to look something like "*aut* "? Was this then "reconstructed from context" as "*auton* (him)" (*Reading 1b*)? If so, was this gotten from the earlier "*auto* (him)" of this verse, *infra*?

Was *Reading 1b* a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe consider it "as a stylistic improvement," possibly in connection with his own normative forms of Greek (as possibly further influenced by a local dialect of Greek), to alter the "*auto* (him)" (*Reading 1a*) to "*auton* (him)" (*Reading 1b*)?

Was the variant an accidental alteration? Was the "*auto* (him)" (*Reading 1a*), probably coming at the end of a line in a given manuscript, lost in an undetected paper

---

[167] Though the Latin is in the accusative, it could have been so translated from either the Greek dative (*Reading 1a*) or Greek accusative (*Reading 1b*).

fade?

Was the variant a deliberate alteration?   In the wider words, "*Kai* (And) *idontes* ('seeing' = 'when they saw') *auton* (him) *prosekunesan* (they worshipped) *auto* (him);" did a prunist scribe consider that it would be "a stylistic improvement" to "make the '*auton* (him)' work double-time," and since one could "tell from context that "*prosekunesan* (they worshipped)" referred to this earlier "*auton* (him)," therefore prune away the "*auto* (him)" on the basis of "redundancy"?

Were these deliberate or accidental alterations?   Or was one deliberate and the other accidental?   We cannot be sure.   But we can be sure that the correct reading has been here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine reading.

The TR's reading (*Reading 1a*) has rock solid support in the Greek over time, and through time, dating from ancient times.   It further enjoys the early mediaeval support of an old Latin Version.   It also receives some secondary support from *Reading 1b* which looks like a corrupted form of *Reading 1a* which retains the basic meaning of *Reading 1a*.   By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, though correspondingly 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 testimony of the early mediaeval Latin and an ancient church Greek writer, is sufficient to bring the TR's reading "over the line" from a high level "B" in the range of 71-74%, and into the range of a low level 75-76% "A."   Thus on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 28:17 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 1a* at Matt. 28:17, "him (*auto*)," in the wider words, "they worshipped him," is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1071 (12th century, independent).   It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

The similar *Reading 1b* of "him (*auton*)," is also found in Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), and 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels).

The TR's correct *Reading 1* of "him" is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first

half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions, and some manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500).

However, the variant which omits "him" and so reads, "they worshipped *him*" (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); and Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in a manuscript of the Syriac Palestinian Version; and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

At Matt. 28:17 the incorrect variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Hence the ASV reads, "they worshipped *him*" (showing ASV italics for added word). So too, the usage of italics means we know that the NASB also adopted the erroneous variant. The translation of the REB shows it too adopted the incorrect variant; and in this sense it resembles the old Latin Papists' Douay-Rheims Version, which reads at Matt. 28:17, "And seeing him they adored: but some doubted."

What are we to make of what is *prima facie* the following of the TR's reading in the RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, TCNT, NEB, Moffatt, and Papists' JB and NJB. E.g., at Matt. 28:17 the *Twentieth Century New Testament* reads, "they bowed to the ground before him" (TCNT); or Moffatt reads, "they worshipped him" (Moffatt Bible). Are one or all of these versions exercising their non-Alexandrian pincer arm on the basis of the weak external support" beyond the two main Alexandrian texts? (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.) Or are one or more supplying it as part of English translation? Given the monolithic support of the neo-Alexandrian texts for the variant, at least in most instance, probably the latter. But given the issue of "external support," possibly a small number of them are following the TR's reading for the wrong reasons. Ultimately, their lack of italics for added words means we simply do not know, and nor do any of their benighted devotees.

Matt. 28:19 "therefore" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Von Soden (1913) says that the majority Byzantine reading here at Matt. 28:19 has the support of his K group, i.e., *c.* 90% plus of the *c.* 1,000 manuscripts in his K group, and thus on any reasonable statistical projections, *c.* 90%+ of the Byzantine manuscripts overall that contain this Gospel reading. Therefore, the remaining readings of the TR's *Reading 1* and the variant, *Reading 2*, have between them *c.* 10% or less of the Byzantine Greek manuscript support (von Soden itemizes only one Greek manuscript for *Reading 2*, but it is the Western Greek Text's D 05, and so outside the closed class of sources). But as to where within the range of something less than 1%, or something as high as *c.* 10%, the Byzantine Greek manuscript support lies for *Reading*

1 and /or *Reading 2* is anybody's guess.   Von Soden's very good and useful work is simply not good enough for us to make such precision statistical calculations.

Here at Matt. 28:19, once again, I am indebted to Kurt Aland's *Kurzgefasste Liste* (1963) and classification of manuscript work in Aland *et unum*, *The Text of the NT* (1989), together with von Soden's amazing textual apparatus (1913).   Though I do not think much of the textual analytical abilities of men such as Kurt Aland (d. 1994) or Hermann von Soden (d. 1911) to compose a NT Greek text, I nevertheless do think highly of their excellent work in collating information on the manuscripts, and I thank God for their labours in this area.   These works, together with my own charts of von Soden's groups that I have built up over the years, mean that I am, by the grace of God, able to give the itemization of a number of readings that I otherwise would not be able to cite in support of the TR's *Reading 1*, *infra*.   GLORY BE TO GOD!

The Second Matter.   Inside the closed class of sources, the Book of Armagh here has a conflation of *Readings 1 & 2* as Latin, "*ergo* (therefore) *nunc* (now)."   I thus take this opportunity to remind the reader that like this conflation, a large number of minor variants are simply not discussed in these textual commentaries.   Thus no reference is made to the Book of Armagh, *infra*.

Likewise, inside the closed class of sources, as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, a conflation between the Vulgate's Mark 16:15 and Matt. 28:19,20, means that reference is omitted to the relevant section of Matt. 28:19 (Latin Diatessaron, chapter ccxlii).   I thus take this opportunity to remind the reader that in such instances I usually make no reference to the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron; and hence no reference is made to it, *infra*.

And outside the closed class of sources, similar difficulties in the Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic Diatessaron chapter lv), mean that no reference is made to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

The Third Matter.   While I generally accept the citations of church writers as found in various textual apparatuses, having on this occasion "thumbed through" some of the volumes of Migne and *Corpus Christianorum*, I am again confronted with the problem that what may appear to be the shorter quote of a variant, may simply be that writer abbreviating it for his immediate purposes.   E.g., a number of times Cyprian follows the TR's reading, but in the same volume of *Corpus Christianorum* that we find one such citation (Series Latina III E, Pars III, 4, 2004, Sententiae Episcoporum LXXXVII, p. 23), we also find that his normative reading of Latin, "*ergo* (therefore) *et* (and)," on one occasion lacks the "*ergo* (therefore)" (Sententiae Episcoporum LXXXVII, p. 29), and on another occasion the "*ergo* (therefore)" and "*et* (and)" (Sententiae Episcoporum LXXXVII, p. 51).   I consider the most natural conclusion to draw from this is that he sometimes abbreviates Matt. 28:19 for his citation purposes, and so I do not use these as examples of Cyprian following *Reading 3*, *infra*.   But it necessarily raises the question of how many other church writers cited at *Reading 3* might in fact be likewise simply abbreviating the Matt. 28:19 citation for their immediate purposes, rather than

actually following *Reading 3*?

For example, Eusebius (d. 339) is itemized as citing *Reading 3* in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). This may well be a correct perception since generally this is the reading found in his writings (Greek Migne 20:221, 22:40,44,68,233,1692; 23:653,720,900; 23:653,569,720,900; & 24:716,989). Nevertheless, we find that on one occasion, Eusebius reads instead of "*oun* (therefore)" (*Reading 1*), "*goun* (at least then*[168]*)" (Greek Migne 20:1425). The Greek "*goun*" is found nowhere in the NT, let alone in St. Matthew's Gospel, and its usage here by Eusebius is one of the many minor variants not generally discussed in these commentaries. But it acts to raise the issue of whether Eusebius's other citations of the verse are his abbreviation of this longer reading, or whether he simply cited two different manuscripts lines on different occasions? Though on this occasion I think the frequency of Eusebius's usage of *Reading 3* makes the latter more probable than the former, and I have so itemized him, *infra*, I nevertheless leave this vexed matter for the good Christian reader to think over for himself. Moreover, the reading of "*goun*" also raises the issue of whether or not there is a relationship between this reading and the TR's "*oun*"? Specifically, whether or not Eusebius or the manuscript line he got this reading from had a mark on it which he wrongly took to be a "*g*" (gamma) before the TR's "*oun*" i.e., an accidental corruption of "*oun*" to "*goun*"; or whether or not Eusebius or the manuscript line he got this reading from had the TR's "*oun*" to which a "*g*" (gamma) was then added i.e., a deliberate corruption of "*oun*" to "*goun*"?

This issue of minor variants not generally discussed in this commentary is also relevant to by citation of John Cantacuzenus (d. 1383), *infra*. He reads, "*Poreuthentes* (go ye) *oun* (Therefore) **didaskete** ([and] teach) *panta* (all) *ta* (-) *ethne* (nations)," etc. (Greek Migne 154:1161), rather than "*Poreuthentes* (go ye) *oun* (Therefore) **math<u>e</u>teusate** ([and] teach) *panta* (all) *ta* (-) *ethne* (nations)," etc. (TR). But once again, for my immediate purposes such minor variants are not important.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 28:19 the TR's Greek, "*oun* (therefore)" (*Reading 1*) in the wider words of Christ, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations" etc. (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading. *Reading 1* is supported by *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 magnificently illuminated purple parchment, *Codex Beratinus* (Phi 043, 6th century, Tirana, Albania), and *Codex Petropolitanus* (Pi 041, 9th century, St. Petersburg, Russia); Minuscules 1187 (11th century; St. Catherine's Greek Orthodox Monastery, Mt. Sinai, Arabia), 280 (12th century; Paris, France), 924 (12th century; Athos, Greece), 1010 (12th century; Athos, Greece), 1355 (12th century; Jerusalem, Israel); and 1604 (13th century; Athos, Greece). It is further supported as

---

[168]   See Liddell & Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 358 (*goun* or *g' oun*).

Latin, "*ergo* (therefore)," in the *Versio Vulgata Hieronymi* (Jerome's Vulgate Version, 4th / 5th centuries), and *Codex Palatinus* (old Latin Version e, 4th / 5th century), *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff2, 5th century), *Codex Brixianus* (old Latin Version f, 6th century), *Codex Monacensis* (old Latin Version q, 6th / 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). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the *Vulgata Clementina* (Clementine Vulgate, 1592). It is also supported as Latin, "*ergo* (therefore)," in the Latin Lectionary, *Liber Comicus* (7th to 9th centuries, Iberian Peninsula, Western Europe[169]). It is further supported as Latin, "*ergo* (therefore) *et* (and)," i.e., adding the "*et*" as part of Latin translation in the same way it is added as part of English translation in the AV, by the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258)[170]; and also by the late mediaeval church Greek writer, John Cantacuzenus (d. 1383)[171].

Reading 2, is Greek, "*nun* (now)" i.e., "Go ye now (*nun*), and teach all nations." It is found as Latin, "*nunc* (now)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), and aur (7th century). It is also found in the ancient church Latin writers, Victorinus of Pettau (d. 304) and Hilary (d. 367)[172]; and the late mediaeval church Greek writer, Gregory Palamas (d. 1359)[173].

---

[169]   Morin, D.G. (Editor), *Liber Comicus*, Maredsoli in Monasterio S. Benedicti, 1893, p. 179 (Matthew 28:10-19).

[170]   Hans Freiherr von Soden's *Das Lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur zeit Cyprians*, in Harnack, A, & Schmidt, C., *op. cit.*, p. 421; Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera, *Corpus Christianorum*, Brepols, Turnholti [Turnholt, Brepols, Belgium], (Brepols Editores Pontificii,) Series Latina III, Pars I, (1972), Ad Quirinum II, XXVI, p. 64; (Brepols Editores Pontificii,) Series Latina III C, Pars III, 2, (1996), Epistula 73, p. 534; Series Latina III E, Pars III, 4 (2004), Sententiae Episcoporum LXXXVII, p. 23.

[171]   John Cantacuzenus (Greek: *Ioannēs Kantakouzenos*; Latin: Joannis Cantacuzeni) in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1866 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 154, ("Contra Mahometem," "Against the Mohammedan,") p. 1161.

[172]   Sancti Hilarii Pictaviensis Episcopi, *Corpus Christianorum*, Brepols, Turnholti [Turnholt, Brepols, Belgium], (Brepols Editores Pontificii,) Series Latina LXI, Pars I, 1 (1997), Tractatus super Psalmos, Instructio Psalmorum in Psalmos 1-XCI, pp. 58 (In Ps. II, 29-31 at 30:13) & 242 (In Ps. LXV, 12-13 at 12:5).

[173]   Gregory Palamas (Gregorii Palamae) in Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1865 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 151, p. 480 (Homily 38) (Greek & Latin). Gregory Palamas (1296-1359) was born in Constantinople, the capital of the Byzantine Empire, where his father was a courtier of the Byzantine Emperor, Andronicus II Palaeologus (Regnal Years: 1282-1328). Gregory's father died while he was still young, and the Emperor kindly undertook to raise and educate him. He became a monk at Mount Athos in Greece, and later the Greek Orthodox Archbishop of Thessalonica in Greece. His

Reading 3, omitting Greek "*oun* (therefore)," i.e., "Go ye and teach all nations," is the majority Byzantine reading. 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), K 017 (9th century), 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 readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings[174]). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Hippolytus (d. 235), Origen (d. 254), Apostolic Constitutions (3rd or 4th century), Eusebius (d. 339), Athanasius (d. 373), Basil the Great (d. 379), Amphilochius (d. 394), Epiphannius (d. 403), Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394), Chrysostom (d. 407), Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (*c.* 395); the ancient church Latin writer, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

---

citation reads, "'*Poreuthentes* (go ye) *nun* (now),' *phesi* (he said), '*matheteusate* ([and] teach) *panta* (all) *ta* (-) *ethne* (nations)'," etc. . This type of usage of "*phesi* ('he said,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *phemi*)" or "*gar* (for) *phesi* (he said)," to break up a Scriptural quote, is a stylistic technique used more widely with different Scriptures by other church writers. E.g., here at Matt. 28:19, on one occasion, Basil the Great (d. 379) reads, "'*Poreuthentes* (go ye),' *gar* (for) *phesi* (he said)" (Greek Migne 29:289), and on another occasion, "'*Poreuthentes* (go ye),' *phesi* ('he said' = said) *o* (the) *Kurios* (Lord), '*matheteusate* ([and] teach) *panta* (all) *ta* (-) *ethne* (nations)" etc. (*Reading 3*) (Greek Migne 31:893). Or on one occasion Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394) says, "'*Poreuthentes* (go ye),' *gar* (for) *phesi* (he said) '*matheteusate* (teach) *panta* (all) *ta* (-) *ethne* (nations)" etc. (*Reading 3*) (Greek Migne 46:649), and on another occasion, "'*Poreuthentes* (go ye),' *phesi* (he said) '*matheteusate* ([and] teach) *panta* (all) *ta* (-) *ethne* (nations)" etc. (*Reading 3*) (Greek Migne 45:881). So too, one finds this type of usage at Matt. 28:19 with *Reading 3* for Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444) using, "*gar* (for) *phesi* (he said)" (Greek Migne 74:743-4; 75:1077,1176,1469), or "*ephe* ('he was saying' = 'he said,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *phemi*)" (Greek Migne 75:861), or "*phesi* (he said)" (Greek Migne 68:661), although he may also simply quote Matt. 28:19 without such an added stylistic breaker (Greek Migne 75:1017).

[174] At Lectionary 1968's first reading (p. 201b), the preceding word, "*poreuthentes* (Go)," which in standard seminary Greek would look like, "πορευθέντες", has as its last three letters what *prima facie* looks something like "τ∞" with a slight protrusion above the line on the left hand bar of the "∞" (or as transliterated in these commentaries, "*to*"). In fact, this is "τ" + "C" + "σ" (or as transliterated in these commentaries, "*tes*"), run together, in which the top bar of the "τ" has been extended across to the right in "a scribal flourish." Such are the hazards that one must negotiate when dealing with "the real thing" of the handwritten manuscripts, rather than neatly typed transcripts of them written out in standard seminary Greek. (By contrast, at this Lectionary's second reading, p. 202b, these last three letters appear with immediate clarity as "τεc".)

There is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading (*Reading 3*). However, before considering the specific issue here at Matt. 28:19, it is necessary to first consider more widely certain grammatical features of Matthean Greek with respect to St. Matthew's usage of imperative second person plural verbs. The imperative is a mood of intention, and deals with imposing one person's will on another, or giving another person a direction. In broad terms, its most common use is as the *imperative of command*; though this is not its only usage, e.g., there is also the *imperative of greeting*[175]. In NT Greek, the imperative is always either a *present* verb or an *aorist* verb.

In the following stylistic analysis it should be understood that more than one of these factors may be in operation at the same time. I shall sometimes divide up such instances, but I may sometimes select a Matthean quote to illustrate just one of these multiple syntactical elements. E.g., when discussing *a succession of imperative second person plural verbs* at Matt. 14:16,18, it would also have been possible to categorize Matt. 14:18 (*Pherete* / "Bring") as an example of *an imperative second person plural verb to commence a quote*.

Matthean Greek sometimes uses an imperative second person plural verb to commence a quote. E.g., at Matt. 3:2 in Greek, as in English, the first word of the quote is, "*Metanoeite* (Repent ye[176])," in the words of St. John the Baptist, "Repent ye (*Metanoeite*): for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." See also Matt. 4:17 (*Metanoeite* / "Repent"); 8:32 (*Ypagete* / "Go[177]"); 9:24 (*Anachoreite* / "Leave" or "Give place[178]," AV); 9:30 (*'Orate* / "See[179]"); 24:4 (*Blepete* / "Take heed[180]"); & 26:36 (*Kathisate* / "Sit ye[181]"). This may also occur with an internal quotation of a larger quote. E.g., at Matt. 20:4, Christ is speaking about "the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 20:1) and he says in a parable, "And he said unto them; Go ye (*Ypagete*[182]) also into the vineyard" etc. . See also Matt. 3:3 (*Etoimasate* / "Prepare ye[183]," quoting Isa. 40:3, LXX); 20:7 (*Ypagete* / "Go ye"); & 22:4 (*Eipate* / "Tell[184]").

---

[175] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 485-493; Young's *Greek*, pp. 141-145.

[176] Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *metanoeo*.

[177] Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *'upago*.

[178] Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *anachoreo*.

[179] Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *'orao* / *horao*.

[180] Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *blepo*.

[181] Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *kathizo*.

[182] Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *'upago*.

[183] Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *'etoimazo*.

[184] Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *eipon*.

In a way that sometimes additionally falls within this start of quotation form, *supra*, *Matthean Greek sometimes uses an imperative second person plural verb to answer a question.*   Hence at Matt. 26:17,18, the question is put to Christ by his disciples, "Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?"   Then the answer is given, "And he said, "Go (*Ypagete*[185]) into the city to such a man" etc. .   This stylistic form may apply even if the question is articulated by the person answering. E.g., at Matt. 22:18,19, Christ first asks, "Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites?"; and then says, "Shew (*Epideixate*[186]) me the tribute money."   See also Matt. 6:26 (*Emblepsate* / "Behold[187]"); 6:28 (*Katamathete* / "Consider[188]"); & 17:17 (*Pherete* / "Bring[189]").

In a similar way, though not the same way, *Matthean Greek sometimes uses an imperative second person plural verb as an internal section marker for a new section in the longer quotation of the same person.*   E.g., in Christ's wider *Sermon on the Mount* of Matt. 5-7, at Matt. 6:1 our Lord says, "Take heed (*Prosechete*[190])" etc. .   See also Matt. 6:19 (*me* / "not" *thesaurizete* / "Lay up[191]"); 7:1 (*me* / "not" *krinete* / "judge[192]"); 7:13 (*Eislethete* / "Enter ye[193]"); 7:15 (*Prosechete* / "Beware[194]"); 18:10 (*Orate* / "Take heed[195]"); & 21:33 (*akousate* / "Hear[196]").   This Matthean nuance may also be used for a

---

[185]   Imperative active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *'upago*.

[186]   Imperative active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *epideiknumi*.

[187]   Imperative active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *emblepo*.

[188]   Imperative active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *katamanthano*.

[189]   Imperative active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *phero*.

[190]   Imperative active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *prosecho*.   Thus at Matt. 6:1a the variant, "*Prosechete* (Take heed that ye) *de* (but / and)," gratuitously adds an unnecessary conjunction.   See Textual Commentaries Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14) at Matt. 6:1a (cf. Matt. 7:15).

[191]   Imperative active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *thesaurizo*.

[192]   Imperative active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *krino*.

[193]   Imperative active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *eiserchomai*.   See Matt. 7:13 in Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Appendix 3.

[194]   Imperative active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *prosecho*.   Thus at Matt. 7:15 the variant, "*Prosechete* (Beware) *de* (but / and)," gratuitously adds an unnecessary conjunction.   See Textual Commentaries Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14) at Matt. 7:15 (cf. Matt. 6:1a).

[195]   Imperative active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *'orao*.

further internal sub-section to produce a crescendo in a quotation, for instance, the internal quote of Matt. 7:23 (*apochoreite* / "depart[197]," this introducing a new sub-section idea of "depart from me" as a flow on from the earlier, "I never knew you").

Matthean Greek sometimes uses a succession of imperative second person plural verbs, or in a rare instance a succession of imperative second person plural and singular verbs, and if close together without any stated joining conjunction in the Greek (although such a conjunction may have to be supplied as part of English translation). E.g., at Matt. 10:8 (which is also stylistically connected in this matter with the preceding Matt. 10:7 referred to at the conjunction, "*de*," *infra*), "Heal (*therapeuete*[198]) the sick, cleanse (*katharizete*[199]) the lepers, raise (*egeirete*[200]) the dead, cast out (*ekballete*[201]) devils, freely ye have received, freely give (*dote*[202])."

An interesting rare Matthean usage of a succession of imperative verbs, which connects an imperative second person <u>plural</u> verb with an imperative second person <u>singular</u> verb, but which for our immediate purposes broadly exhibits the same stylistic feature since it is *a succession of imperative second person verbs*, is found in connection with the betrayal of Jesus by Judas Iscariot with *the kiss of death*. In Matt. 26:48 Judas says, "Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he, <u>hold</u> him <u>fast</u> (*kratesate*, <u>imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *krateo*)." But in the associated succession of imperatives, this Matt. 26:48 *imperative of command* in the plural is then followed in Matt. 26:49 with a connected *imperative of greeting* in the singular when we read of Iscariot, "And forthwith he came to Jesus, and said, <u>Hail</u> (*Chaire*, <u>imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person singular verb</u>, from *chairo*), master; and kissed him."

The Matthean usage of *a succession of imperative second person plural verbs* may simultaneously embrace certain poetical qualities, for instance, the triplet at Matt. 7:7, "Ask (*Aiteite*[203]), and it shall be given you; seek (*zeteite*[204]), and ye shall find; knock

---

[196] <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *akouo*.

[197] <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *apochoreo*.

[198] <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *therapeuo*.

[199] <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *katharizo*.

[200] <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *egeiro*. See Matt. 10:8 in Textual Commentaries, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14).

[201] <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *ekballo*.

[202] <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *didomi*.

[203] <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *aiteo*.

[204] <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *zeteo*.

(*krouete*[205]), and it shall be opened unto you."   Although in the wider section of Matt. 7:7-12 this succession of Matt. 7:7 also contextually continues to Matt. 7:12 (*poieite* / "do[206]").   Or the antithetical parallelism at Matt. 12:33 (which also illustrates conjunctions, *infra*), "Either (*e*, conjunction, 'or' = 'either') make (*poiesate*[207]) the tree good, and his fruit good; or else (*e*, conjunction, 'or' = 'or else') make (*poiesate*) the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt."   Likewise the broad antithetical parallelism of the Matt. 25:31-46 *Judgment of all Nations* which poetically contrasts, "inherit the kingdom (*kleronomesate*[208])" in, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world (Matt. 25:34); with, "Depart (*Poreuesthe*[209])," in, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matt. 25:41).

But such poetical qualities are by no means always present.   See also Matt. 10:27,28 (which for 10:28 also illustrates conjunctions, *infra*: *eipate* / "speak ye[210]" + conjunction *kai* / "and" + *me* / "not" *phobethete* / "fear" + *phobethete* / "fear"[211] + conjunction *de* / "but"); 13:30 (*Aphete* / "Let[212]" + *Sullexate* / "Gather ye together[213]" + *sunagagete* / "gather[214]"); 14:16,18 (*dote* / "give ye[215]" + *Pherete* / "Bring[216]"); 14:27

---

[205]   <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *krouo*.

[206]   <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *poieo*.

[207]   <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *poieo*.

[208]   <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *kleronomeo*.

[209]   <u>Imperative</u> middle / passive present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *poreuomai*. This declension is the same for either middle or passive voice; cf. e.g., Matt. 14:27, 17:7; 24:6, 25:9; 26:45,46.

[210]   <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *eipon*.

[211]   <u>Imperative</u> passive present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *phobeo*.   See comments on *phobeo* at Matt. 14:27, *infra*.   See Textual Commentaries, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), App. 3, at Matt. 10:28a.

[212]   <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *aphiemi*.

[213]   <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *sullego*.

[214]   <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *sunago* / *synago* (cf. "synagogue").   See Textual Commentaries, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), App. 3, at Matt. 13:30.

[215]   <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *didomi*.

[216]   <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *phero*.

(*Tharaseite* / "Be of good cheer[217]" + *me* / "not" *Phobeisthe* / "be afraid[218]"); 15:10,14 (which for 15:10 also illustrates conjunctions, *infra*; *Akouete* / "Hear[219]" + conjunction *kai* / "and" + *suniete* / "understand[220]" + *Aphete* / "Let … alone[221]"); 24:6 (*Orate* / "See[222]" + *me* / "not" *throeisthe* / "ye … be troubled[223]"); 25:6,8,9 (a series of back and forth related commands, which for 25:9 also illustrates conjunctions, *infra*: *exerchesthe* / "go ye out[224]" + *dote* / "Give[225]" + *Poreuesthe* / "go ye[226]" + conjunction *kai* / "and" + *agorasate* / "buy[227]"); & 26:45,46 (which for 26:45 also illustrates conjunctions, *infra*;

---

[217]   Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *tharseo*.

[218]   Imperative middle / passive present, 2nd person plural verb, from *phobeo*. This declension is the same for either middle or passive voice; and on the basis of the parallelism with *tharseo* it is clearly a deponent with an active voice meaning.   Though in such contexts I generally just select one of the possibilities, since we are here considering Matthean usage of imperative second person plural verbs in greater detail than normal, I shall give some elucidation.   On the one hand, it could be argued that *phobeo* is here a deponent middle verb, since in general middle voice verbs of the NT are deponents (Young's *Greek*, p. 135).   But on the other hand, it could be argued that *phobeo* is here a deponent passive verb, since this is one of the passive voice verbs of the NT that can be deponents (Young's *Greek*, p. 136; Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT*, p. 473 at *phobeomai*).   So the question is: At Matt. 14:27, is "*Phobeisthe* (be afraid)," a deponent middle or a deponent passive?   Cf. e.g., Matt. 17:7; 24:6; 25:6,9,41; 26:45,46.

[219]   Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *akouo*.

[220]   Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *suniemi*.

[221]   Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *aphiemi*.

[222]   Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *'orao* / *horao*.

[223]   Imperative middle / passive present, 2nd person plural verb, from *phobeo*. This declension is the same for either middle or passive voice, and raises the same conundrum as e.g., Matt. 14:27; 25:6,9,41.

[224]   Imperative middle / passive present, 2nd person plural verb, from *poreuomai*. This declension is the same for either middle or passive voice, cf. e.g., Matt. 14:27, 17:7; 24:6; 25:9,41; 26:45,46.

[225]   Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *didomi*.

[226]   Imperative middle / passive present, 2nd person plural verb, from *poreuomai*. This declension is the same for either middle or passive voice, cf. e.g., Matt. 14:27, 17:7; 24:6, 25:9,41; 26:45,46.

[227]   Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *agorazo*.

conjunction *kai* / "and" + *anapauesthe* / "take [your] rest[228]" + *egeiresthe* / "Rise[229]").

Matthean Greek stylistic succession of imperative second person plural verbs may also help us to better understand certain elements of St. Matthew's Gospel. This is seen in the institution of the "Lord's Supper" as one of the "two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel[230]." Here we find a series of connected imperatives which are commands, i.e., this is the institution of a Gospel sacrament. Thus our Lord says at Matt. 26:26,27, "Take (*labete*[231]), eat (*phagete*[232])." This succession of two distinct commands prohibits the Romish practice, also found among some Puseyites, of placing the consecrated bread on the Communicant's tongue, since Christ specifically commands Communicants to "take" it i.e., in one's hand, before then placing it in one's mouth to then "eat" it. It also prohibits the views of anti-sacramentalists such as those in the Salvation Army, known as Salvationists or Salvos (singular, "a Salvo"), who refuse to recognize the Lord's Supper as a sacrament (and likewise they do not recognize Baptism as a sacrament). Our Lord then continues, "this is my body." Since Christ was physically standing before them in the body when he said this, it follows that he is clearly teaching that the "bread" is thus *a symbol* of his "body" (Matt. 26:26). This context acts to strike down both the Roman Catholic teaching of transubstantiation, and also the Lutheran and Puseyite Anglican teaching of consubstantiation.

Our Lord then further says of "the cup," "Drink ye (*piete*[233]) all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." This specific command prohibits both the Romish practice, made optional since the Vatican II Council, but still generally practiced, of denying the cup to laymen. For "The cup of the

---

[228] Imperative middle present, 2nd person plural verb, from *anapauo*. In the middle voice this means *to cause to rest* (Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT*, pp. 71-72).

[229] Imperative middle present, 2nd person plural verb, from *egeiro*. This could *prima facie* be either middle or passive voice. But I regard this as a middle voice, since this makes it the same as verse 45 with which it forms a contextual contrast. Cf. e.g., Matt. 14:27, 17:7; 24:6, 25:9,41; 26:45,46.

[230] "… There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, [Religious] Orders, Matrimony, and extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, … yet have [they] not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God" (Article 25, Anglican 39 Articles).

[231] Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *lambano*.

[232] Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *esthio*.

[233] Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *pino*.

Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-people: for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike" (Article 30, Anglican 39 Articles).   It also prohibits the views of anti-sacramentalists such as those in the Salvation Army, who refuse to recognize the Lord's Supper as a sacrament.   Since Christ was physically standing before them in the body when he said this, it follows that he is clearly teaching that the "fruit of the vine" "cup" is thus *a symbol* of his "blood" (Matt. 26:27,29).   This context acts to strike down both the Roman Catholic teaching of transubstantiation, and also the Lutheran and Puseyite Anglican teaching of consubstantiation.   It further results in the usage of red-wine as a symbol of this blood, and not white-wine as is the bizarre practice of some gratuitously anti-traditionalists.

There may also be a certain theological pregnancy in such a *Matthean Greek stylistic succession of imperative second person plural verbs*, which may not be immediately apparent to a reader, but which may be understood by the spiritually discerning reader through the unction of God (I Cor. 2:13; Col. 1:9; 2:8,9; I John 2:20,27).   This is also apparent with the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in St. Matthew's Gospel, *infra*.

St. Matthew unmistakably upholds the Deity of Christ, e.g., in Matt. 3:3 the words of Isa. 40:3 as quoted by St. John the Baptist with reference to Christ, "Prepare ye the way of the LORD, make his paths straight."   Here the Greek, *Kurios* is used for "LORD," to render the Hebrew *YHWH* which we Anglicize in transliteration translation as "Jehovah" from Isa. 40:3.   Thus Matt. 3:3 teaches that the OT "Jehovah" is the NT "Lord" Jesus Christ.   (This teaching condemns the Arian heretics, *Council of Nicea* in 325.)   For it is written Mary "shall bring forth" (AV) or bear he who is "God with us" (Matt. 1:23). (The Matt. 1:23 *Theotokos* / "God-bearer" teaching condemns the Nestorian heretics, *Council of Ephesus* 431 & *Council of Chalcedon* 451; "I believe in … one Lord Jesus Christ, … Very God, …who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man," *Nicene Creed*, 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*.)   St. Matthew clearly teaches the double procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father (Matt. 3:16,17) and the Son (Matt. 3:11). (This teaching condemns the Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox heretics, *Athanasian Creed*.)   And St. Matthew also teaches that as touching upon his Divinity, Christ is able to be at multiple places at once (Matt. 18:20); but that as touching upon his humanity, his natural body can only be at one time in one place (Matt. 28:6,7,9,10,16,17). (This teaching condemns the transubstantiation heresy of the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches which denies the humanity of Christ; Final Rubric, *The Communion Service*, 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*; I John 4:2,3; II John 7.) The unity and equality of the Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity is also taught in the holy Gospel of Saint Matthew, chapter 28 and verse 19, where our Lord does not use the plural, "the (*ta*) names (*onomata*[234])," but rather the singular, "the (*to*) name (*onoma*[235]),"

---

[234]   Neuter plural accusative noun, from *onoma*.

[235]   Neuter singular accusative noun, from *onoma*.

for the three Divine Persons i.e., "the (*to*) name (*onoma*) of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."   (E.g., this teaching of "one God in Trinity and Trinity in unity; neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the Substance," condemns the Modal / Sabellian heretics, *Athanasian Creed*, 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*.)

Notably then the unity and equality of the Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity is also taught in this *Matthean Greek stylistic succession of imperative second person plural verbs*.   St. Matthew records the Transfiguration in Matt. 17:1-8, annually remembered on 6 August in the 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* Calendar with a black letter day as, "Transfiguration of our Lord."   In Matt. 17:5,7 (which for Matt. 17:7 also illustrates conjunctions, *infra*), we find this notable succession of imperative second person plural verbs.   Firstly, in Matt. 17:5, "a bright cloud overshadowed" Jesus, Moses, and Elias (Elijah), and God the Father says of God the Son, in "a voice out of the cloud," "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: <u>hear ye</u> (*akouete*, <u>imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *akouo*) him."   Then in Matt. 17:6,7 we read, "And when the disciples heard it, they fell on their face, and were sore afraid.   And Jesus came and touched them and said, <u>Arise</u> (*egerthete*[236]), and (*kai*) <u>be not afraid</u> (*me* / 'not' *phobeisthe* / 'be afraid[237]')."

Why are the words of two different persons placed in such a succession?   The most natural answer relates to the fact that they are two Divine Persons, the Father (Matt. 17:5) and the Son (Matt. 17:7), who are of one "substance" or "Being" (Greek, *homoousios*), i.e., in the one Supreme "Being" of Almighty God.   Specifically, this is an example of the fact that the human will of "Jesus" who "came and touched them" (Matt. 17:7), was perfectly subject to the Divine will, and so Christ's imperative commands here are stylistically connected with the imperative command of the Father (Matt. 17:5). This Trinitarian teaching (e.g., Luke 2:52; 24:42; John 6:38; 12:27; Heb. 5:8) was rightly upheld against the monothelite heretics in the *Council of Constantinople III* (680-1), which held that Christ had a human will or "will of the flesh" which he "subjected to the Divine will," that is, he had "two natural wills in him and two natural operations, without division, without change, without separation, without partition, without confusion," with "his human will following his Divine and omnipotent will, not resisting it nor striving against it, but rather subject to it."   For Christ "himself says, 'I came down from heaven,

---

[236]   <u>Imperative</u> middle present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *egeiro*.   This could *prima facie* be either middle or passive voice.   In the middle voice this means *to awake* or *to rise up* (Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT*, p. 158); although it has the same sense in the passive voice (Young's *Greek*, p. 136).   But in harmony with my normative practice, I here select one of these options (and here show my bias towards the "middle" solution).

[237]   <u>Imperative</u> middle present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *phobeo*.   This could *prima facie* be either middle or passive voice; but I have deemed this to be middle voice as a stylistic match with "*egerthete* (Arise)."   (Of course, one might do it the other way around, i.e., regard them both as passive.   Cf. e.g., Matt. 14:27, 24:6, 25:9, 41; 26:45,46.)

not to do mine own will, but the will of the Father that sent me' (John 6:38)[238]." Moreover, the Anglican 39 Articles rightly say, "the West Church, … did condemn … the heresy of the Monothelites, not without a cause indeed, and very justly" (Homily 2, Book 2, Part 2, Article 35).

Furthermore, in Matt. 21:1-11 St. Matthew records Christ's entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday. St. John dates this to the Sunday before the resurrection on Easter Sunday[239], which he thus sandwiches between Palm Sunday (John 12:1,12-15) and the church service first Sunday after Easter (John 20:26-29). In the double *entendre* of the Greek, Christ rose on "the first of the <u>week</u> (*sabbaton*)" or "the first of the <u>sabbaths</u> (*sabbaton*)" (John 20:1), so that by this act he made that Easter Sunday the first of the Christian sabbaths of Sunday, and he held a church service later on that Sunday (John 20:19-23). The citation of Ps. 118:25,26 on Palm Sunday (Matt. 21:9; Mark 11:9; Luke 19:38; John 12:13) is significant, as is the NT usage of Ps. 118:22 in connection with the resurrection (Acts 4:10,11); because the connected words of Ps. 118:24, "This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it," thus prophesy this change of sabbath day to Sunday, and give rise to its designation as, "the Lord's day" (Rev. 1:10; cf. Acts 2:1; 20:7; I Cor. 16:2). Palm Sunday is remembered in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) with one of the Lessons at Evensong being Luke 19:28-48.

In the Matthean account of Palm Sunday, at Matt. 21:2,5 Christ first says at Matt. 21:2, "Go into the village over against you, and straightway ye shall find an ass tied, and a colt with her: loose them, and <u>bring</u> (*agapete*[240]) them unto me." Then the series of imperatives continues in Matt. 21:4,5 where we read, "All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, <u>Tell ye</u> (*Eipate*[241]) the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the

---

[238] Though the Trinitarian doctrine of the *Council of Constantinople III* which refined certain elements of the monophysitist heresy as if had been developed by the monothelites has "strength" and "authority," as "it may be declared that" it was "taken out of holy Scripture;" by contrast, those elements of this council which contrary to Scripture, claimed "inspiration" for "general" councils i.e., giving them the status of a prophet, and so putting themselves over the Word of God rather than under it (II Tim. 3:16), are an example of how "General Councils … may err, and sometimes have erred," and how such "things … have neither strength nor authority," since they are not "taken out of holy Scripture" (Article 21, Anglican 39 Articles).

[239] St. John covers the feast of unleavened bread under the generic title of "passover." Jewish days went from sunset to sunset, and were counted on inclusive reckoning. Thus "six days before Passover" (John 12:1) means, Thursday = Day 1; Wed. = Day 2; Tues. = Day 3; Mon. = Day 4; Sun. = Day 5; Sat. = Day 6; making "the next day" (John 12:12-15) Palm Sunday.

[240] <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *esthio*.

[241] <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *eipon*.

foal of an ass" (Isa. 62:11; Zech. 9:9)[242].

This places the command of Christ, "bring (*agapete*) them," in a contextual succession with the command of Scripture, "Tell ye (*Eipate*)." This thus acts to manifest the equality of the Divine Person of God the Son (Matt. 21:2) with the Divine Person of God the Holy Ghost (Matt. 21:5) who inspired the Scriptures (II Tim. 3:16). The Divine equality of the three Persons of the Trinity is also taught in I John 5:7,8; and was upheld in the *Council of Nicea* (325) against Arian heretics denying Christ's full Divinity; and *Council of Constantinople* (360) against Macedonius and the Pneumatomachi ("fighters against the Spirit") who denied the full Divinity of the Holy Ghost. For "the Catholick Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity; neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the Substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son: and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one: the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal" (*Athanasian Creed*, 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*).

Let us now consider the Matthean Greek usage of *second person plural imperative verbs with a conjunction.* I here remind the reader that *some of the Matthean stylistic categories may overlap and thus show reduplication.*

Matthean Greek sometimes uses an imperative second person plural verb both to commence a quote and also as part of a series of two or more second person imperative verbs joined with a conjunction. Thus at Matt. 5:44 Christ says, "But I say unto you, Love (*agapate*[243]) your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and (*kai*, conjunction) pray (*proseuchesthe*[244]) for them" etc. . Or at Matt. 11:29 we read, "Take (*Arate*[245]) my yoke upon you, and (*kai*, conjunction) learn (*mathete*[246]) of

---

[242] St. Matthew sometimes makes a parenthetical reference to another Scripture in between his introductory words and his ultimate OT Scripture citation. Thus supplying parenthesis here that the AV does not, this reads, "All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, (Tell ye the daughter of Sion,) Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass." With regard to this Matthean literary style, see "Preliminary Remarks," in Textual Commentaries Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25) at Matt. 21:5b; & "Meditation" on Matt. 27:10 in Textual Commentaries Vol. 4 (Matt. 26-28), at Matt. 27:9,10.

[243] Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *agapao*. We see examples of this Christian love in the forgiveness given to their enemies by the holy martyr, St. Stephen in Acts 7:60, or the holy martyr, King Charles I in 1649.

[244] Imperative middle / passive present, 2nd person plural verb, from *proseuchomai*.

[245] Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *airo*.

[246] Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *manthano*.

me" etc. .   See also Matt. 5:12 (*Chairete* / "Rejoice[247]" + *kai* / "and" + *agalliasthe* / "be exceeding glad[248]").

However, *Matthean Greek sometimes simply uses an imperative second person plural verb with a conjunction*.   For instance, the conjunction "*e* (or)" at Matt. 12:33, *supra*.   Or the conjunction "*kai* (and)," as referred to at Matt. 10:28 (at 10:27,28); 15:10 (at 15:10,14); 17:7 (at 17:5,7); 25:9 (at 25:6,8,9); 26:45 (at 26:45,46), *supra*.   E.g., at Matt. 16:6 (which also illustrates commencing a quote, *supra*), "Take heed (*Horate* / '*Orate* / Orate[249]) and (*kai*) beware (*prosechete*[250])" etc. .   See also Matt. 19:14 (which also illustrates commencing a quote, *supra*: *Aphete* / "Let" or "Suffer[251]," AV + *kai* / "and" + *me* / 'not' *koluete* / "forbid[252]"); 22:13 (*kai* / "and" + *ekbalete* / "cast[253]"); 23:3 (which also illustrates a succession of imperative second person plural verbs, *supra*: *tereite* / "observe[254]" + *kai* / "and" + *poieite* / "do[255]" + *me* / 'not' *poieite* / "do"); 23:32 (*kai* / regarded as redundant in English translation in AV + *plerosate* / "Fill ye up[256]"); 25:30 (*kai* / "and" + *ekbalete* / "cast ye[257]"); 26:38 (which also illustrates a succession of imperative second person plural verbs, *supra*: *meinate* / "tarry ye[258]" + *kai* / "and" + *gregoreite* / "watch[259]"); & 26:41 (which also illustrates a succession of imperative

---

[247]   Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *chairo*.

[248]   Imperative middle / passive present, 2nd person plural verb, from *agalliao*.

[249]   Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from '*orao*.

[250]   Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *prosecho*.

[251]   Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *aphiemi*.

[252]   Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *koluo*.

[253]   Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *ekballo*.   See my comments on Matt. 21:13b, *infra*.

[254]   Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *tereo*.

[255]   Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *poieo*.   See Textual Commentaries, Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25), at Matt. 23:3c.

[256]   Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *pleroo*.   The Greek also has "*umeis* (ye)" between the "*kai* (-)" and "*plerosate* (Fill ye up);" see Textual Commentaries, Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25), at Matt. 23:32.

[257]   Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *ekballo*; see Textual Commentaries, Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25), Appendix 1, at Matt. 25:30.

[258]   Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *meno*.

[259]   Imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *gregoreo*.

second person plural verbs, *supra*: *gr*e*goreite* / "watch[260]" + *kai* / "and" + *proseuchesthe* / "pray[261]").

Likewise, the conjunction "*de* (but)," is referred to at Matt. 10:28 (at Matt. 10:27,28), *supra*. In Matthean Greek, this conjunction may be placed either before or after the imperative second person plural verb. E.g., at Matt. 6:20 "*th*e*saurizete* (lay up[262]) *de* ("But"), is rendered in English, "But lay up" etc. . See also Matt. 6:33 (*z*e*teite* / "Seek ye[263]" + *de* / "But"); 10:6,7 (which also illustrates a succession of imperative second person plural verbs, *supra*; *poreuesthe* / "go[264]" + *de* / "But" + *de* / "And" *k*e*russete* / "preach[265]"); 10:23 (*de* / "But" + *pheugete* / "flee[266]"); 24:20 (*proseuchesthe* / "pray ye[267]" + *de* / "But"); & 24:32 (*de* / "Now" + *mathete* / "learn[268]").

Matthean Greek, may also have multiple conjunctions placed with the imperative second person plural verb. Hence we find at Matt. 6:16 (which also illustrates an internal section marker for a new section in the longer quotation of the same person, *supra*), "*otan* ('when' a conjunction) *de* ('Moreover,' a conjunction)" = "Moreover (*de*) when (*otan*) ye fast, be (*ginesthe*[269]) not, as the hypocrites."

Matthean Greek sometimes uses an imperative second person plural verb which is linked as a consequence with "Therefore," which is stylistically created by something other than a conjunction. For instance at Matt. 6:25 we find, "*dia* ('through,' a preposition + accusative) *touto* ('this,' an accusative pronoun[270])" = "Therefore (*dia*

---

[260] <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *gr*e*gore*o*.

[261] <u>Imperative</u> middle / passive present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *proseuchomai*.

[262] <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *th*e*suriz*o*.

[263] <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *z*e*te*o*.

[264] <u>Imperative</u> middle / passive present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *poreuomai*.

[265] <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *k*e*russ*o*.

[266] <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *pheug*o*.

[267] <u>Imperative</u> middle / passive present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *proseuchomai*.

[268] <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *manthan*o*.

[269] <u>Imperative</u> middle / passive present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *ginomai*.

[270] Neuter singular <u>accusative</u>, demonstrative pronoun from *'outos-aut*e*-touto*.

touto) I say unto you, Take (*merimnate*[271]) no thought for your life" etc. .

Matthean Greek sometimes uses an imperative second person plural verb which is linked as a consequence with "Therefore," which is stylistically created by the conjunction "oun." E.g., at Matt. 25:13, "*Gregoreite* (Watch[272]) *oun* (therefore)." This Greek word, *gregoreite*, meaning, *to be watchful*, gives rise to the Christian name, "Gregory," held by e.g., one of the four great ancient doctors of the Eastern Church, St. Gregory Nazianzus (d. *c.* 390), and one of the four great ancient and early mediaeval doctors of the Western Church, St. Gregory the Great (d. 604). Or at Matt. 22:21 Christ says, "*Apodote* (Render[273]) *oun* (therefore)," in his wider words, "<u>Render</u> (*Apodote*) therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Thus these words of our Lord in the *imperative* are *a command* to Christians. They are part of the wider Gospel reading of Matt. 22:16-22 from the Authorized Version traditionally in the *Accession Service*, and so found in the present *Accession Service* for Queen Elizabeth II (6 Feb.), as part of the red-letter day Anglican Office for *Accession Day*. This service is attached to the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 by successive Royal Warrants of successive Sovereigns, presently (as at 2012 A.D.), the Royal Warrant of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, dated 26 July 1958 (revoking the Queen's earlier Royal Warrant of 9 June 1953).

See also Matt. 3:8 (*poiesate* / "Bring forth[274]" + *oun* / "therefore"); 6:9 (*oun* / "therefore" + *proseuchesthe* / "pray[275]"); 9:38 (*deethete* / "pray ye[276]"+ *oun* / "therefore"); 10:16 (*ginesthe* / "be ye[277] + *oun* / "therefore"); Matt. 10:31 (*me* / "not" + *oun* / "therefore" + *phobethete* / "Fear ye[278]"); 13:18 (which also illustrates an internal section marker for a new section in the longer quotation of the same person, *supra*: *oun* /

---

[271]   <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *merimnao*.

[272]   <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *gregoreo*.

[273]   <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *apodidomi*.

[274]   <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *poieo*.

[275]   <u>Imperative</u> middle / passive present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *proseuchomai*.

[276]   <u>Imperative</u> passive aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *deomai*.

[277]   <u>Imperative</u> middle / passive present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *ginomai*.

[278]   <u>Imperative</u> passive aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *phobeo*. An erroneous variant which is also a 2nd person plural imperative, "*phobeisthe* ('fear ye,' <u>imperative</u> middle / passive present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *phobeo*)," is found in e.g., Origen. See Textual Commentaries, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), App. 3 at Matt. 10:31.

"therefore" + *akousate* / "Hear ye[279]"); 22:9 (which also illustrates a succession of imperative second person plural verbs, *supra*: *poreuesthe*[280] + *oun* / "therefore" + *kalesate* / "bid[281]"); & 27:64 (*keleuson* / "Command[282]" + *oun* / "therefore").

Matthean Greek sometimes uses a succession of conjunctions in connection with a succession of imperative second person plural verbs. E.g., at Matt. 10:11,12,14 we read, "and into whatsoever city or town ye shall enter, <u>inquire</u> (*exetasate*[283]) who in it is worthy; <u>and there</u> (*kakei* = conjunction *kai* / "and" + adverb *ekei* / "there") <u>abide</u> (*meinate*[284]) till ye go out thence. And (conjunction *de*) when ye come into an house, <u>salute</u> (*aspasasthe*[285]) it. … And whosoever shall not receive you, … when ye depart, <u>shake off</u> (*ektinaxate*[286]) the dust of your feet."   See also Matt. 24:42-44 (*gregoreite* / "watch[287]" + *oun* / "therefore" + *de* / "But" + *ginoskete* / "know[288]"? + *ginesthe* / "be[289]"); & 25:28 (*Arate* / "Take[290]" + *oun* / "therefore" … + *kai* / "and" + *dote* /

---

[279] <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *akouo*.

[280] <u>Imperative</u> middle / passive present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *poreuomai*.

[281] <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *kaleo*.

[282] <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *keleuo*.

[283] <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *exetazo*.

[284] <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *meno*.

[285] <u>Imperative</u> middle aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *aspazomai*.

[286] <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *ektinasso*.

[287] <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *gregoreo*.

[288]   Is the *ginoskete* of verse 43 an <u>indicative</u> active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *ginosko*; or an <u>imperative</u> active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *ginosko*? (For the *ete* suffix of this homograph and homophone, see *luete* in Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT*, pp. 21 & 39). On the one hand, the overall style of Matt. 24:42-44 in which *ginoskete* has both an immediately preceding conjunction of *de* / "But," and is also sandwiched between a succession of imperative second person plural verbs with the preceding imperative of "*gregoreite* (watch)" in verse 42, and then following imperative of "*ginesthe* (be)" in verse 44; means that in the wider context of Matthean Greek the "*ginoskete* (know)" of verse 43 might be an <u>imperative</u> active present verb.   But on the other hand, the overall style of Matt. 24:42-44 in which verses 42 and 44 are a succession of imperative second person plural verbs, means that in the wider context of Matthean Greek the "*ginoskete* (know)" of verse 43 might be an indicative active <u>present</u> verb.   So which of the two is it?

[289] <u>Imperative</u> middle / passive present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *ginomai*.

"give[291]").

Having established these broad general stylistic features of Matthean Greek with regard to his usage of the imperative second person plural verb, let us now consider two specific applications of them, before we turn to consider Matt. 28:19.   Firstly, let us consider a succession of them in some verses immediately preceding Matt. 28:19, to wit, Matt. 27:65; 28:5-7,9,10,13.   And secondly, we will consider the specific issue of the Matthean usage of an imperative second person plural verb with "Go (*poreuthentes*)," which is how it is found at Matt. 28:19.

In Matt. 27:65 we read, "*upagete* (go your way[292]) *asphalisasthe* (make [it] as sure[293])," in the wider words, "go your way, make *it* a sure as ye can" (showing AV's italics for added word).   This is clearly an example of *a succession of imperative second person plural verbs*, *supra*.

In Matt. 28:5 we read that "the angel … said unto the women," "*Me* (not) *phobeisthe* (fear[294])."   Then in verse 6 the angel says to them, "*idete* (see[295])," and in verse 7, "*eipate* (tell[296])."   Matt. 28:5 is clearly an example of how *Matthean Greek sometimes uses an imperative second person plural verb to commence a quote*, *supra*. And when looked at corporately as the angel's words, Matt. 28:5-7 is clearly an example of *a succession of imperative second person plural verbs*, *supra*.

In Matt. 28:9 we read, "Jesus met them, saying, <u>All hail</u> ('[All] hail,' *Chairete*[297])."   This is clearly an example of the imperative of greeting with *Matthean Greek using an imperative second person plural verb to commence a quote*, *supra*.

In Matt. 28:10, Then said Jesus unto them, <u>Be</u> not <u>afraid</u> (*phobeisthe*[298]): <u>go</u> (*upagete*[299]) tell my brethren that they go into Galilee" etc. .   This is clearly an example

---

[290]   <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *airo*.

[291]   <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *didomi*.

[292]   <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *hupago*.

[293]   <u>Imperative</u> middle aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *asphalizo*.

[294]   <u>Imperative</u> middle / passive present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *phobeo*.

[295]   <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *eidon*.

[296]   <u>Imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *eipon*.

[297]   <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *chairo*.

[298]   <u>Imperative</u> middle / passive present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *phobeo*.

[299]   <u>Imperative</u> active present, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *'upago*.

of both *using an imperative second person plural verb to commence a quote*, *supra*, and also *a succession of imperative second person plural verbs*, *supra*.

And in Matt. 28:13 we read, the Jewish "chief priests" and "elders" spoke to the soldiers, "saying, Say ye (*Eipate*[300]), His disciples came by night" etc. . This is clearly an example of the imperative of greeting with *Matthean Greek using an imperative second person plural verb to commence a quote*, *supra*.

We thus find that in the lead up to Matt. 28:19, Matthean Greek perfectly conforms with its normative stylistic patterns as found more widely in the Holy Gospel of Saint Matthew.

But before making specific application of these syntactical principles of Matthean Greek to the majority Byzantine text's reading at Matt. 28:19, it is to be noted that the relevant section of Matt. 28:19 uses "Go (*poreuthentes*)." In this form, as a masculine plural nominative, passive aorist participle, from *poreuomai* as a deponent, or from *poreuo*[301], we find it has half a dozen other usages in St. Matthew's Gospel. Three of these are not in connection with an imperative second person plural verb, and so for our immediate purposes we shall not consider them further (Matt. 21:6; 22:15; 27:55).

However, let us now consider the other three Matthean instances in which "*poreuthentes*" is used in connection with an imperative second person plural verb. At Matt. 2:8 we read of the wise men, that Herod "sent them to Bethlehem, and said," "*Poreuthentes* (Go) *akribos* ('diligently,' an adverb) *exetasate* ([and] search[302])" i.e., "Go and search diligently" etc. . This is clearly an example how *Matthean Greek sometimes uses an imperative second person plural verb to commence a quote*, *supra*.

At Matt. 9:13 our Lord first says in verse 12, "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." Then in verse 13 he continues, "*Poreuthentes* (go ye) *de* ('But,' a conjunction) *mathete* ([and] learn[303])" etc. . This is clearly an example how *Matthean Greek sometimes uses an imperative second person plural verb with a conjunction*.

And at Matt. 11:4 reference is made to our Lord speaking to two disciples of John Baptist, "Jesus answered and said unto them," "*Poreuthentes* (Go) *apaggeilate* ([and] shew[304])" etc. . This is clearly an example how *Matthean Greek sometimes uses an*

---

[300]   Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *eipon*.

[301]   Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), pp. 43 & 385.

[302]   Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *exetazo*.

[303]   Imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *manthano*.

[304]   In standard transliteration which I do not always use, "*apangeilate*," imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *apaggello* (in standard

imperative second person plural verb to commence a quote, *supra*.

We thus find that when we consider the specific issue of the Matthean usage of an imperative second person plural verb with "Go (*poreuthentes*)," that as one would expect, the normative syntactical principles of Matthean Greek continue to apply.

Let us now consider Matt. 28:18,19.   This is part of the wider section of Matt. 28:16-20.   In verse 18 we read, "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth."   Then with the only *imperative second person plural verb* in the Matt. 28:16-20 section, at verse 19, the representative Byzantine text reads, "*Poreuthentes* (go ye) *math<u>e</u>teusate* ('[and] teach,' <u>imperative</u> active aorist, <u>2nd person plural verb</u>, from *math<u>e</u>teu<u>o</u>*) *panta* (all) *ta* ('the,' redundant in English translation) *ethn<u>e</u>* (nations)," etc. .

The textual problem with the representative Byzantine text at Matt. 28:19 is now glaringly apparent to the reader!   Is this imperative second person plural verb being used to commence a quote?   Clearly not.   Is this imperative second person plural verb being used to answer a question?   Certainly not.   Is this imperative second person plural verb being used as an internal section marker for a new section in the longer quotation of the same person?   Most assuredly not, as the propriety of these words flow on as a derivative consequence from the fact that in verse 18 Christ says, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth."   Is this imperative second person plural verb being used as part of a succession of imperative second person plural verbs (or as in a rare instance as part of a succession of imperative second person plural and singular verbs), either with or without any joining conjunction?   By no means, for this is the only imperative verb in the wider section of Matt. 28:16-20.   Is this imperative second person plural verb being used either with a "therefore" created from, for instance, "*dia touto* ('through' + 'this' = 'therefore'), or with one or more conjunctions, such as "*<u>e</u>* (or)," "*de* (but)," "*oun* (therefore)"?   Clearly and definitely not.

Therefore the representative Byzantine reading at Matt. 29:19, *Reading 3*, simply cannot be correct. *This is simply not the way Matthean Greek uses an imperative second person plural verb!   This is not Matthean Greek style!   Something is textually wrong!*

Of the two other possible readings we have, *Reading 1* is to be preferred over *Reading 2*, first and foremost, because of its better attestation in the Greek manuscripts. As far as we know, *Reading 2*'s Latin, "*nunc* (now)," which may be reconstructed as, Greek "*nun* (now)," has no weak support in the Greek textual tradition.   Of course, the generalist nature of von Soden's apparatus, and the presence of unchecked variants in the Greek Lectionaries, means that it is possible that we may one day learn of some more Greek manuscripts with *Reading 2* in it.   But even if we do, it is clear that the stronger Greek support we have is for *Reading 1's* "*oun* (therefore)."

Moreover, in the second instance, it is clear that even where Matthean Greek uses

---

transliteration, *apangell<u>o</u>*).

an adverb with an imperative second person plural verb (see Matt. 2:8 & 10:11,12,14, *supra*), that this compliments and does not interrupt the established stylistic features of Matthean Greek, *supra*. Thus *Reading 2*'s adverb, Latin "*nunc* (now)" or Greek "*nun* (now)," also presents a textual problem crying out for remedy.

Therefore, since the textual turbulence caused by the majority Byzantine text's reading (*Reading 3*), is alleviated by *Reading 1's* "*oun* (therefore)," and ONLY *Reading 1's* "*oun* (therefore)," it follows that this is the correct reading of the *Textus Receptus*.

The origins of the two variants, i.e., *Readings 2 & 3* are speculative.

Was *Reading 2* an accidental alteration? Is the Greek and Latin support for this reading related, or are they autonomous textual corruptions? In a given manuscript line, was *Reading 1's* Greek "*oun* (therefore)" or Latin, "*ergo* (therefore)," lost in a paper fade or damaged? If in a Greek manuscript line, was the last letter still showing? Was this then "reconstructed from context" by a Latin or Greek scribe as either Latin "*nunc* (now)" or Greek "*nun* (now)" respectively? If so, what part, if any, did other Matthean usage of Greek "*nun* (now)" (at Matt. 24:21; 26:65; 27:42) have on the mind of a Greek scribe, or Latin "*nunc* (now)" (at Matt. 11:12; 26:65; 27:42,43, Vulgate) have on the mind of a Latin scribe?

Was *Reading 2* a deliberate alteration? Is the Greek and Latin support for this reading related, or are they autonomous textual corruptions? Did an arrogant Greek or Latin scribe consider it was some kind of "stylistic improvement" to alter the Greek "*oun* (therefore)" or Latin, "*ergo* (therefore)" to the Greek "*nun* (now)" or Latin "*nunc* (now)" respectively?

Was *Reading 3* an accidental omission? Was *Reading 1's* Greek "*oun* (therefore)," in a given manuscript perhaps coming at the end of a line, lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was *Reading 3* a deliberate omission? Did a prunist scribe consider *Reading 1's* Greek "*oun* (therefore)" was "unnecessary and redundant"? Did he therefore arrogantly set about to deliberately prune it away?

Were *Readings 2 & 3* deliberate or accidental changes, or was one of them deliberate and the other of them accidental? We do not know. But we do know that they were changes to the text of Matt. 28:19, here Providentially preserved for us in the Greek and Latin witnesses of *Reading 1*.

Of fundamentally conclusive importance, the TR's reading, "*oun* (therefore)" (*Reading 1*), is strongly supported by textual analysis. The TR's reading has the support of a dozen Greek manuscripts that we know about, and possibly, though by no means necessarily, a larger number up to *c.* 10%. However, on the presently available data that we have the TR's manuscript support in the Byzantine Greek textual tradition does not go beyond a dozen manuscripts. It thus has relatively weak manuscript support in the

Byzantine Greek textual tradition, although it is notable that what support there is clearly occurs over time between the 5th century (W 032) and 13th century (Minuscule 1604), and through time (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century; Phi 043, 6th century; Pi 041, 9th century; Minuscules 1187, 11th century; 280, 12th century; 924, 12th century; 1010, 12th century; 1355, 12th century; & 1604, 13th century), dating from ancient times (W 032, and possibly Sigma 042).   It also has the support of the late mediaeval church Greek writer, John VI Cantacuzenus (1292-1383), a Byzantine Emperor (Regnal Years: 1347-1354).   From the neo-Byzantine perspective, its attestation in the Greek is thus more than adequate.

The TR's position in the Latin is much stronger.   It has the support of a majority of old Latin Versions (eight for the TR's *Reading 1*, as opposed to six for the variant *Reading 2*, and none for the variant *Reading 3*), as well as enjoying the support of the Latin Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome.   Thus to the question, "Where was this reading over time, and through time, from ancient times?," in part the answer is, "It was in the *Vulgata*!"   The TR's reading further enjoys the ancient support of the holy church father, Cyprian (d. 258).   An Archbishop of Carthage, St. Cyprian upheld the dignity and authority of his Archbishopric against encroaching claims from Rome, and he died for his embrace of the Christian faith as a holy martyr of God.   Persecutions against Christians occurred under the pagan Roman Emperor, Valerian (Regnal Years: 253-260); and the martyrdom of Cyprian in 258 is recorded in the great Protestant hagiology, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, at John Foxe's (1516-1587) "Account of the Eighth General Persecution under the Roman Emperors[305]."   St. Cyprian refused to renounce the Christian religion in favour of pagan Rome's heathenism, and was ultimately executed by being beheaded.   He is remembered with a black letter day on the Calendar of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 on 26 September.

Reading 2, has fairly strong support in the Latin, but weak support in the Greek. *Reading 3* has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading; and it has the further support of about a dozen ancient church Greek writers.   However, its support in the Latin is relatively weak, being absent from the Vulgate and old Latin Versions, although it is found in the Latin in a few ancient and early mediaeval church writers.   Importantly, both *Readings 2 & 3* are ruled out by textual analysis as not being Matthean Greek, and this factor is decisive against them and in favour of *Reading 1*.

Since the textual analysis in favour of *Reading 1* at Matt. 28:19 is on the Greek, full credence is thereby given to the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*.   But to the extent that the manuscript support for the TR's reading at Matt. 28:19 is far more strongly in the Latin than the Greek, we here see an example of the dutiful and valued support of the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*.   Weighing up these factors, recognizing that textual analysis of the Greek strongly favours *Reading 1*, giving full credence to its ancient attestation by St. Cyprian (d. 258), and its transmission over time

---

[305]   Bramley-Moore, W., *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, 1563, revised folio edition, 1684, 3rd edition, Cassell, Patter, and Galpin, London, 1867, pp. 23-27 (Eighth General Persecution), at pp. 24 & 26 (Cyprian).

and through time in St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, on this occasion is sufficient to pull the TR's reading "over the line" from 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. 28:19 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 TR's correct reading at Matt. 28:19, *Reading 1*, "therefore," in the wider words of Christ, "Go ye <u>therefore</u>, and teach all nations" etc., is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h Version (616); the Syriac Harclean h Version (616); the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

Reading 2, "now," i.e., "Go ye <u>now</u>, and teach all nations" etc. is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).

Reading 3, omitting "therefore," i.e., "Go ye and teach all nations," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in Minuscules 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 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 the most probable reading of (the independent) Codex 0148 (8th century, Matt. 28:5-19), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

Do the neo-Alexandrians understand what is happening here at Matt. 28:19 with regard to the Matthean usage of an imperative second person plural verb? We can answer this question through reference to Matt. 22:13 (*kai* / "and" + *ekbalete* / "cast") in the textual analysis with regard to how *Matthean Greek sometimes simply uses an imperative second person plural verb with a conjunction*, *supra*. That is because at Matt. 22:13b we find that the NU Text *et al* adopted a reading, *Variant 2*, which omits the "*kai*

(and)" and keeps the "*ekbalete* (cast)[306]."   This reading is found in the two main Alexandrian Texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.   But this *Variant 2* does not fit within the stylistic patterns of Matthean Greek, *supra*, and so is clearly non-Matthean Greek!   Therefore, what does this tell us about the textual analytical skills, or lack thereof, in both the ancient Alexandrian School and the modern neo-Alexandrian School? If an artist may fairly depict the scribes of the ancient Alexandrian School as wearing "dunce caps," how might an artist depict the "textual critics" of the modern neo-Alexandrian School?

Among the neo-Alexandrians, with the two main Alexandrian texts split, at Matt. 28:19 for the wrong type of reasons of Codex Vaticanus following *Reading 1* in the case of Westcott & Hort, and to a lesser extent Erwin Nestle; and in the case of the NU Text Committee, and to some extent Erwin Nestle, the "better external support" beyond the one main Alexandrian text that follows *Reading 1*, the correct *Reading 1* was adopted by Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).   However, on the basis that Codex Sinaiticus follows *Reading 3*, this was adopted in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72).   Among the Majority Text Burgonites, with *c.* 90%+ of all Greek manuscripts following *Reading 3*, at Matt. 28:19 the erroneous *Reading 3* was adopted by Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005).

Thus at Matt. 28:19, for the wrong reasons, the right *Reading 1* is found in the ASV as, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples" etc. .   Likewise, for incorrect reasons, the correct reading of Codex Vaticanus is found at Matt. 28:19 in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV.   After all, "Does not Codex Vaticanus follow this reading?   "Is not the Codex Vaticanus reading followed by about half of the old Latin Versions, as well as, for example, the Family 1 manuscripts, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version?"

Likewise, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists followed the correct reading for such incorrect reasons here at Matt. 28:19 in their Roman *Catholic RSV*, JB, and NJB. To some extent they had "a precedent," for this, in that the old Latin Papists also here followed the right reading in the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version for the wrong reasons, in their instance, its strength in the Latin textual tradition.   Hence the Douay-Rheims here reads, "Going therefore, teach ye all nations" etc. .

But for the semi neo-Alexandrian, James Moffatt (d. 1944), the matter of the split between the main Alexandrian texts was resolved differently.   After all, "Is not the shorter reading the better reading?"   Does not such a view of *Reading 3* create an

---

[306]   See Textual Commentaries Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25) at Matt. 22:13b, where the TR's "*kai* ('and,' word 8) *ekbalete* ('ye cast' = 'cast,' word 9a)," is altered so as to omit word 8, but not so as to omit word 9, in *Variant 2* i.e., both *Variant 2a* (which uses word 9a) and *Variant 2b* (which uses in place of word 9a, word 9b, *balete* / 'ye cast' = 'cast).

equality between the Alexandrian Text's *Reading 1* in Codex Vaticanus and the Western Text's *Reading 2*, since *both* are rejected in favour of *the shorter reading* of the Alexandrian Text's *Reading 3* in Codex Sinaiticus?" (This type of "equality" argument for the Western Text would not find the same level of sympathy among Neo-Alexandrians Proper, though is the type of thing that on *some* occasions might appeal to the Semi Neo-Alexandrian mind of Moffatt.) "Is not the Codex Sinaiticus reading followed by about half of the old Latin Versions, as well as, for example, the Family 13 manuscripts, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version?" Thus at Matt. 28:19 the Moffatt Bible reads, "go, and make disciples" etc. .

The Majority Text Burgonites here found themselves attracted to the same reading as the semi neo-Alexandrian Moffatt, albeit for different reasons. Hence while at Matt. 28:19 the main text of the NKJV reads "therefore," a footnote in the Burgonites' *New King James Version* says, "M[ajority]-Text omits 'therefore'" (KJV ftn). The "Preface" of the NKJV claims that, "The Majority Text is similar to the Textus Receptus, but it corrects those readings which have little or no support in the Greek manuscript tradition," so that this NKJV Majority Text footnote therefore purportedly acts to "correct" the TR. Thus do the Burgonites smile at the erroneous *Reading 3*, for their leader and mentor, the Puseyite Burgon's great 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 authorities[307]."

Meditation: We find that at Matt. 28:19 the *imperative second person plural verb* is an *imperative of command*. The words, "Go ye therefore, and teach (*math̲eteusate*, an imperative verb, from *math̲eteuo̲*) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," means that the sacrament of baptism is here established as one of two Gospel sacraments *by command* of Christ. On the one hand, the fact that we are told that Christ "shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire" (Matt. 3:11), means that this sacrament of water baptism is *a symbol*. But on the other hand, the fact that its institution is *by command* of Christ means that it should not be set aside by anti-sacramentalists (such as the Salvos,) who refuse to recognize baptism as an ordinance of the New Testament. *It is not enough to simply have the Word of God physically in our midst, for example, on a bookshelf, or in the lectern of a church; we must, by the grace of God, spiritually put ourselves UNDER the authority of that Word, and so be careful to obey ALL his commandments.*

Matt. 28:20 "Amen" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. My photocopy of a facsimile for A 02 reads in a protrusion to the right hand side of the column in smaller letters than the main line, with a faded "*A*,"

---

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

something like, "*AHM⁻*" i.e., abbreviating the last letter of the line, "*N*," with a bar.   So "squeezing in" a word at the end occurs elsewhere in Manuscript London (A 02).   However, the textual apparatuses I use consider this was the addition of a "corrector" scribe.   Without the benefit of being able to inspect the original of this manuscript, I can only accept that this is a correct assessment, and so I show Manuscript London following the variant, *infra*.

By contrast, the presence of the variant in Manuscript Washington (W 032) is very clear.   But I remind the reader that we now say, "Au revoir," to Manuscript Washington as its Byzantine text ends here, and does not resume till *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, from chapter 8, verse 13, to chapter 24, verse 53; and likewise we say, "Au revoir," to Minuscule 28 as its Byzantine text ends here, and does not resume till *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, chapter 1, verse 1.

The Second Matter.   The issue referred to at Matt. 28:19, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The Third Matter," again confronts us here at Matt. 28:20 with respect to the citation from Gregory of Matt. 28:20.   On half a dozen occasions he cites Matt. 28:19 as Latin, "*Ecce* (lo) *ego* (I) *vobiscum* (with you) *sum* ('I am' = 'am') *omnibus* (all) *diebus* ('days' or 'times') *usque* ('up to' = 'up') *ad* ('until' or 'til') *consummationem* (the end) *saeculi* (of the world)" (Latin Migne 76:1221; 79:40,153,289,625,674) i.e., "lo, I am with you all times, up til the end of the world."   In the first place, this is clearly an abbreviation of the longer words of Christ here.   But in the second place, we find that Gregory twice further omits the words, "*omnibus* (all) *diebus* ('days' or 'times')," and so reads, Latin, "*Ecce* (lo) *ego* (I) *vobiscum* (with you) *sum* ('I am' = 'am') *usque* ('up to' = 'up') *ad* ('until' or 'til' *consummationem* (the end) *saeculi* (of the world)" (Latin Migne 79:72,255) i.e., "lo, I am with you up til the end of the world."

The fact that Gregory is clearly is making some kind of abbreviations raises the question, Is the omission of the "Amen" here part of that abbreviation process? Sometimes this is possible because he is making specific reference to Christ's words (Migne 79:40), and so for this reason he might omit the Matthean "Amen."   Yet elsewhere he is more broadly referring to the Gospel (Migne 79:255).   Weighing up these factors, in my opinion the fact that he quotes this part of Matt. 28:20 some eight times, and never ends it with "*Amen*," strongly suggests that he is contextually following the reading of the variant.   Therefore, I show him so following the variant, *infra*.

The Third Matter (Diatessaron formatting).   Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron which is a Vulgate Codex, *prima facie* follows the reading of the variant.   But it is immediately followed by a citation from Mark 16:16 in the Vulgate (Latin Diatessaron, chapter ccxlii), and this necessarily raises the issue of whether or not the "*Amen*" was removed as part of Diatessaron formatting.   Hence no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, similar issues with the Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic Diatessaron, chapter lv), of the "Amen" possibly being removed because of the following words of the Diatessaron (also from Mark 16:16), mean that no reference is

made to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 28:20 the TR's Greek, "*Am<u>e</u>n* (Amen)," at the close of *The Gospel According To St. Matthew*, is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century), and Gamma 036 (10th 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), 1242 (13th century), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionaries 185 (11th century, twice in two different readings), 2378 (11th century, twice in two different readings), and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings).   It is also supported as Latin, "*Amen* (Amen)," in a minority of Latin Vulgate Codices, for instance, *Codex Foroiuliensis* (6th / 7th century, Cividale, Italy), *Codex Amiatinus* (7th / 8th century, Florence, Italy), *Codex Kenanensis* (7th / 8th century, Dublin, southern Ireland) *Codex Oxoniensis* (7th century, Oxford, England, UK), and *Codex Hubertianus* (9th / 10th century, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland); and old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), and c (12th / 13th century).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers of the Apostolic Constitutions (3rd or 4th century).

However, a variant omitting Greek, "*Am<u>e</u>n* (Amen)," 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 074 (6th century, Matt. 25,26, & 29, Mark 1,2, & 5; from the same manuscript as 064 & 090).   It is also found in most Latin Vulgate Codices of Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), q (6th / 7th 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 further found in the ancient church Greek writers, Chrysostom (d. 407) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).   It is also the most probable reading of the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Severian (d. after 408), where stylistic and contextual factors do not permit complete certainty.

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

Was the variant an accidental omission?   Was the "*Am<u>e</u>n* (Amen)," lost in an undetected paper fade?

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

church in a more advanced age, which no longer used this Gospel in the same evangelistic way as it was used in earlier days, no longer needed the evangelistic call for assent of 'Amen' at the end of the Gospel?"   If so, he was quite wrong to corrupt Scripture, and quite wrong to attempt to conceal from his contemporaries the manner in which the Gospel had been used and in some way no doubt was still used by his orthodox contemporaries, who would be understandably horrified at his prunist attitudes.   Alas, as seen by the need for the Evangelical movement which arose in historically modern times as an inter-denominational or inter-sectarian movement amongst religiously conservative Protestant Churches and Christians, the church has repeatedly had the problem of people seeking to move away from a verbally inspired and authoritative Bible, with an associated move away from a Gospel emphasis both in the church and outside the church in evangelism.   See, "Meditation," *infra*.

Was the variant a deliberate or accidental omission?   We cannot be sure.   But we can be sure that the correct reading of the Received Text was 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 ancient times in the Apostolic Constitutions (3rd or 4th century).   It also has good support in the Latin with several Vulgate Codices coupled with about one-third of the old Latin Versions, thus being in the Latin over time and through time, dating from ancient times.   By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, though much stronger 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. 28:20 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. 28:20, "Amen," is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).   It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 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); 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 a manuscript of the Syriac Palestinian Version; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Georgian "A" Version (5th century); Anglo-Saxon Version (8th to 10th centuries); a manuscript of the Ethiopic Version, as well as Dillmann's Ethiopic Version (18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which omits, "Amen," 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 Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in some manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions, some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian "1" Version (5th century) & Georgian "B" (5th century) Version; and Ethiopic Versions (the Takla Haymanot, *c.* 500; & Roman edition 1548-9; Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9).

At Matt. 28:20 the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the "Amen" is omitted at the end of the Gospel of St. Matthew by the ASV, NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV (with a footnote referring to the TR's reading), NIV, TEV, NEB, REB, TCNT, and Moffatt Bible. So too the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post Vatican II Council times omit the "Amen' in their Roman *Catholic* RSV, JB, and NJB; and in this sense resemble the old Latin Papists of post-Trent Council and pre-Vatican II Council times who likewise omitted the "Amen" at the end of the Gospel in both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. In fairness to the Romanists, it must be said that there would be much in St. Matthew's Gospel that they would not want to say "Amen" to, e.g., the presentation of Christ as man's *only* redeemer from sin (Matt. 20:28; 26:26-28) in antithesis to the Romish teaching of Mary as "co-redeemer;" or the Matthean teaching of saving "faith" *alone* in Christ (Matt. 9:2,5-7,22) as opposed to the Romish teaching of salvation through a combination of faith *and works*; or the teaching of marital dissolubility with remarriage (Matt. 19:9) in antithesis to their teaching of "forbidding to marry" Biblically sound divorcees (I Tim. 4:3).

Meditation: Christ says in the *Sermon on the Mount* (Matt. 5-7), "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where theives break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where theives do not break through nor steal: for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also" (Matt. 6:19-21). The "Amen" at the end of the *Holy Gospel According To Saint Matthew* is an affirmation or assent meaning, "Verily," or "Truly," or "In truth," or "So be it," or "Most certainly." It is placed by St. Matthew, that is to say, the Holy Ghost speaking though St. Matthew (II Tim. 3:16), at the end of this Gospel in order to both state and elicit faith, that the things contained in this Holy Gospel are correct and true; so that to remove it is both an attack upon the truthfulness of this Holy Gospel, and also a subversion of an apex element of its evangelistic technique.

In the Gospel of St. Matthew, we learn of man's sinful nature due to Adam's fall, for our Lord says that men now have "hardness of … hearts," which did not exist when

man was in original righteousness at the time he created Adam and Eve (Matt. 19:4-8). This "hardness of … hearts" (Matt. 19:8) means that due to the Fall, "out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies," and "these … things … defile a man" (Matt. 15:19,20). But the good news is that "Jesus" as the "virgin" born Son of God who is "God with us," has come into the world to "save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21,23). Man is lost in his sins as chiefly isolated through the Ten Commandments, such as, "Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness," or "Honour thy father and thy mother" (Matt. 19:18,19).

But Christ saith, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance" (Matt. 9:13). Thus a man must "Repent" or turn away from his sins (Matt. 4:18), and look in saving faith to Jesus Christ, seeking his "mercy" (Matt. 20:32). For Christ's physical healings recorded in the Gospel of Matthew are object lessons pointing to his power of spiritual healing, wherefore he saith, "thy faith hath made thee whole" (Matt. 9:22); and "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee." "For whether is easier to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed, and go to thine house. And he arose, and departed to his house" (Matt. 9:2,5-7).

For "the Son of man came … to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28). He is thus man's redeemer, who buys man back from his captivity to sin and death. This he did through his sacrifice on the cross at Calvary (Matt. 27:27-53). For Jesus "gave" his body as symbolized by the bread of the Lord's Supper, and said his "blood of the new testament" as symbolized by the Communion wine, "is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. 26:26-28). Therefore it is through faith in his sacrificial blood of atonement that we must declare, "Truly this was the Son of God" (Matt. 27:54); believing that he rose again from the dead on the third day (Matt. 28:1-8), and is now "sitting on the right hand of power, and coming" again at the Second Advent "in the clouds of heaven" (Matt. 26:64). He is the fully Divine (Matt. 1:23; 3:3) Second Person of the Trinity (Matt. 22:41-45), so that the Third Person of the Trinity, the Holy Ghost, proceeds from the Father (Matt. 3:16,17), and the Son, who doth spiritually "baptize … with the Holy Ghost, and with fire" (Matt. 3:11) i.e., regeneration, in which men receive a new and "pure" "heart" (Matt. 5:8).

For "all power is given unto" Christ "in heaven and in earth." And so he says, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (Matt. 28:18-20). Dost thou believe these things? Dost thou have the assurance of the believer, "lo, I am with you alway"? Canst thou then with faith say, "I believe"? Canst thou with faith say that final climactic word of St. Matthew's Gospel? Canst thou say the Matthew 28:20 "Amen" of saving faith?