

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

Being the Greek Text used in the
AUTHORIZED VERSION

also known as the

AUTHORIZED (KING JAMES) VERSION

also known as the

KING JAMES BIBLE

also known as the

SAINT JAMES VERSION

by

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

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

Textual Commentary, Volume: 1 (Revised)

**St. Matthew's Gospel
Chapters 1-14.**

Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum

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

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

*A Textual Commentary on the Greek Received Text of the
New Testament, Volume 1 (Matthew 1-14), 2008.
Revised Volume 1 (Matthew 1-14), 2010*

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

Published & Printed in Sydney, New South Wales.

Copyright © 2008 (Volume 1) & © 2010 (Revised Volume 1) by Gavin Basil McGrath.
P.O. Box 834, Nowra, N.S.W., 2541, Australia.

Revised Volume 1 Dedication Sermon, preached at Mangrove Mountain Union Church,
Mangrove Mountain, N.S.W., 2250, Australia, on Saturday 30 January, 2010.

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

Printed by Officeworks in Parramatta, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia, 2010.

This copy of the Revised Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) incorporates corrigenda changes from Appendix 6 of Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) © 2011 by Gavin Basil McGrath; Appendix 6 of Volume 4 (Matt. 26-28) © 2012 by Gavin Basil McGrath; Appendix 6 of Volume 5 (Mark 1-3) © 2015 by Gavin Basil McGrath; and Appendix 6 of Volume 6 (Mark 4 & 5) © 2016 by Gavin Basil McGrath. This copy of Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) incorporates corrigenda changes © 2021 by Gavin Basil McGrath.

First edition of Volume 1 dedicated to Almighty God on *King Charles the Martyr's Day*,

Wednesday 30 January, 2008. Being the 30th anniversary year

since the revival in 1978 on the Anglican Calendar in Australia

of this holy day remembering Blessed Charles, which day was most

regrettably removed from the Anglican Calendar about 120 years afore in 1859.

Revised edition of Volume 1 dedicated to Almighty God on *King Charles the Martyr's Day*,

Saturday 30 January, 2010. Being the 30th anniversary year

since the revival in 1980 on the Anglican Calendar in England

of this holy day remembering King Charles I,

& also the 350th anniversary year of the Restoration under King Charles II in 1660.

Remembering and giving special thanks to God on this holy day,

which is found in the Book of Common Prayer (1662-1859), for the grace given to

the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland*,

King Charles the First (1600-1649), to die a martyr's death

at the hands of Oliver Cromwell's Puritan Republican Revolutionaries.

“ ... ‘Correct us, O Lord, but with judgment: not in thine anger,
lest thou bring us to nothing’ Jer. 19:24

O most mighty God, ... who ... didst suffer the life of ... King Charles
the First, to be ... taken away by the hands of cruel and bloody men: ...
we magnify thy name for the abundant grace bestowed upon our martyred
Sovereign; by which he was enabled so cheerfully to follow the steps of his
blessed Master and Saviour, in ... praying for his murderers. ... Let his
memory, O Lord, be ever blessed among us ... for Jesus Christ his sake,
our only mediator and advocate. Amen.”

“O Almighty Lord God, ... permitting cruel men, sons of Belial, ... to imbrue
their hands in the blood of ... King Charles the First, ... [who was] given up
to the violent outrages of wicked men, ... who by that barbarous murder ...,
hast taught us, that neither the greatest of Kings, nor the best of men, are
more secure from violence than from natural death: teach us also hereby so
to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom ... for thy
Son our Lord Jesus Christ his sake; to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost
be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.”

“O Lord, ... though for our many and great provocations, though didst suffer thine anointed
... King Charles the First ... barbarously to be murdered ..., yet thou ... didst miraculously
preserve the ... heir ... Charles the Second, from his bloody enemies, hiding him under the
shadow of thy wings, until their tyranny was overpast; and didst bring him back ... to sit upon
the throne ..., we render to thee our ... thanks; beseeching thee, still to continue thy gracious
protection over the whole royal family, ... through Jesus Christ our Lord Amen.”

Office for King Charles the Martyr,
Anglican Book of Common Prayer (1662).

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

* **Displaying Some Byzantine Text Diamonds.**

* **More common Abbreviations.**

* **The Articles of the Creed.**

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

*Selections potentially relevant to Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14) from
 Sydney University Greek Lectionaries 2378 & 1968.*

Scripture Citations of Bishop Gregory the Great in Matt. 1-14.

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

Background Story to Commentary.

1) *Textual Commentary Principles*

a) *The "AV only" history;*

* **b) The Received Text (Latin, Textus Receptus).**

* **i) General; *ii) New Testament; iii) Old Testament.**

2) *The Diatessaron.*

3) *Church Writers.*

4) *O Oh, the Burgonites are coming!*

5) *Greek and Latin Texts.*

6) *The Motto of the Lutheran Reformation.*

7) *Degrees of degradation in some of the modern revisions.*

8) *AV stylistic matters: Anglicization of Words, formal & dynamic equivalence.*

9) *Usage of ASV, RSV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NKJV,*

NIV & Moffatt Bible in this commentary.

10) *Miscellaneous Matters*

a) *Christians: Professed Christians and True Christians.*

b) *Commentary principles of simplicity.*

c) *The die has been cast.*

Dedication: The Anglican Calendar.

a) *Preliminary Qualifications & Remarks.*

b) *William Laud.*

c) *i) Charles the First's Day (30 Jan), Charles the Second's Day (or Royal Oak Day) (29 May), & Papists' Conspiracy Day (5 Nov).*

c) ii) Removal of these three holy days from the BCP (1662) in 1859.

d) *Defending King James the First.*

***e) Charles I's Day sometimes kept on Monday 31 January.**

***f) King Charles the First's Day: with Dedication of Volume 1 in 2008.**

***g) King Charles the First's Day: with Dedication of Revised Volume 1 in 2010.**

TEXTUAL COMMENTARY Matt. 1-14.

Appendices. Introduction; Primary & Secondary Rules of Neo-Byzantine Textual Analysis.

Appendix 1: A Table of some instances where Scrivener's Text does not represent the

properly composed Received Text; Appendix 2: Minor variants between Scrivener's Text and

the Majority Byzantine Text (MBT) etc. ; Appendix 3: Minor variants between the NU Text

and Textus Receptus ...not affecting, or not necessarily affecting, the English translation.

Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E. Appendix 5: Dedication

Sermon (Mangrove Mountain Union Church, 30 Jan. 2010). Appendix 6: Corrigenda to

Former Volume.

****Displaying Some Byzantine Text Diamonds.***

The rich storehouse of neo-Byzantine textual jewels includes the beauties of the Greek Byzantine textual tradition and the glories of the Latin textual tradition. There are several thousand Greek Byzantine texts that lie behind the representative or majority Byzantine Text. Everyone of them has some beauty in its own unique way. The four Gospels constitute about half of the New Testament. For the purposes of this commentary, six priceless diamonds have been selected for special citation reference purposes in the volumes dealing with the four gospels.

Two of these are fifth century Byzantine Texts which between them cover most of the Gospels. These are Codex W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Codex A 02 (*Codex Alexandrinus*, 5th century, which though missing a number of folios is Byzantine in its incomplete Gospels which cover Matt. 25:6-28:20, Mark, Luke, John 1:1-6:50a; 8:52b-21:25). I was able to obtain a photocopy of a facsimile of *Codex Freerianus* from Sydney University in New South Wales (Sanders, H.A., *Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection*, Michigan University, USA, 1912, No 158 of 435 copies). This manuscript derives its name from the fact that it is kept at the Freer Gallery of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., USA. I was privileged to see this original manuscript in March 2009.

I also obtained a photocopy of a facsimile of *Codex Alexandrinus* from Adelaide University in South Australia (*Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus*, British Museum, London, UK, 1879). *Codex Alexandrinus* reminds us that while Alexandria had an unorthodox school of scribes who gave rise to the Alexandrian Text, this ancient city of North Africa also had an orthodox school of scribes who maintained the general textual traditions of the Byzantine Text. My capacity to access not simply copies, but facsimiles of these Byzantine jewels, is a great bonus for this commentary. This manuscript is held in the British Library, London, UK. In 1628, it was presented by the Greek Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril Lucar, to the Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Church of Ireland, King Charles the Martyr. I have been privileged to see this original manuscript in a glass cabinet at the British Library in London on a number of occasions.

The remaining two Byzantine Texts are both rare and beautiful purple parchments. These are Codex Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century) and Codex N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century). The purple parchment, *Codex Rossanensis* (late 5th / 6th century), comes from Rossano Cathedral in Italy, and reminds us that while most Byzantine texts were preserved in the Greek speaking east rather than the Latin speaking west, nevertheless, the Byzantine Text is not just an eastern text that circulated in the Eastern (Byzantine) Roman Empire, but also a western text that circulated in the Western Roman Empire. This colourful and vibrant manuscript contains attractive Gospel pictures throughout, and covers all of St. Matthew's Gospel (Matt. 1-28) and most of St. Mark's Gospel (Mark 1:1-16:14b, where it contains up to the first two letters of *auton* / "their" and thereafter ceases due to loss). I have used a printed

copy of the text of this manuscript (Adolf von Harnack's 1882/3 print; reprinted 1991). Between them, *Codex Rossanensis* (late 5th / 6th century) and *Codex Alexandrinus* (5th century) could also be used to cover most of the four gospels.

The purple parchment, *Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus* (6th century) has suffered a great deal of damage in its history. Though fragmentary, it still includes a good deal of the four gospels. It contains Matt. 1:24b-2:7a; 2:20b-3:4b; 6:24b-7:15a; 8:1b-24a; 8:31b-10:28b; 11:4b-12:40a; 13:4b-33b (partial at 13:7-11,16-19,22,29,30); 13:41b-14:6a; 14:31-15:14a; 15:31-38a; 18:5-25; 19:6-13; 20:6-21:19a (partial at 20:23-26); 26:57-65; 27:26-34; Mark 5:20-7:4 (partial at 5:23-26), 7:20-8:32; 9:1-10:43; 11:7-12:19; 14:25-15:42; Luke 2:23-4:3a (partial at 3:7-8), 4:19-26;36-42; 5:12-33; 9:9-20,28-34; 9:58-10:4,12-34a; 11:14-23; 12:12-20; 11:29-18:32 (partial at 12:54-55,59; 13:2,7-10); 19:17-20:30a; 21:22-22:49a; 22:57-23:41; 24:13-21,39-49; and John 1:21b-39; 2:6-3:14a,22-30a; 4:5-5:2,10b-19a; 5:26b-6:31,39-49a; 6:57-7:52; 8:12-9:32; 14:2-10; 15:5-22; 16:15-21:20a (partial at 20:23-31). I have used a printed copy of the text of this manuscript (J.A. Robinson & H.S. Cronin's 1899 print). Notwithstanding its incompleteness, this purple parchment still makes an important and valuable contribution.

Since the Biblical promise, "The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever" (I Peter 1:25), means that the Received Text apographs could be accurately composed at any time after the first writing of the Bible writers' autographs, it follows that one could just as validly do this exercise featuring some Byzantine jewels from a later era. For example, Stephanus's 1550 Paris edition showed Erasmus's Greek NT with variants from over a dozen manuscripts. None of these were earlier than the 12th century A.D., yet this in no way impaired the basic technique of first determining the representative Byzantine text, and then only moving away from it if there is a good textual reason to do so, with support inside the Byzantine Greek textual tradition, Latin textual tradition, ancient church writers, or less commonly mediaeval church writers e.g., St. Gregory the Great (6th / 7th century). Thus, for instance, one might just as validly have selected for special display, Codex E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century), Codex F 09 (*Codex Boreelianus*, 9th century), Codex G 011 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century), and Codex Gamma 036 (*Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus*, 10th century). Certainly these and some other Byzantine jewels will sometimes be referred to in this commentary.

Moreover, starting in Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20) of 2009, and now incorporated into this revised Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) (2008, revised, 2010), the two Sydney University Lectionaries are also being used. Written in brown ink with colourful bright red illumination of key letters and section markers, Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) are two great Byzantine text jewels. Only 100-200 Lectionaries have been studied in greater detail, and so, like about 2,000 other Lectionaries, the details of these two Lectionaries have never before been collated. Indeed, it is primarily this factor that has led to the publication of the revised Volume 1; which also incorporates the New Testament Latin citations of St. Gregory (d. 604).

Thus from the rich storehouse of so many excellent Byzantine text manuscripts in

the volumes dealing with the Gospels, the Byzantine text of these six Byzantine diamonds shall be specially featured. My access to two facsimiles, W 032 and A 02, allows a higher level of textual scrutiny of these manuscripts than would otherwise be possible. It is to be hoped that the reader will share in the enjoyment of some of the benefits of this (e.g., see commentary at Matt. 6:34). Thus in the Gospels I shall most especially display, *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century), *Codex Alexandrinus* (A 02, 5th century), *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century), *Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus* (N 022, 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). It is to be hoped the reader will greatly enjoy this special display, and join with me in humbly thanking Almighty God for this very special treat.

* *More Common Abbreviations* (More details at section 5, *Greek and Latin Texts*.)

Allen's <i>Latin Grammar</i>	Allen, J.B., <i>An Elementary Latin Grammar</i> , 1874, 1898 4th edition corrected, 1930, reprint 1962, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, UK.
AV	<i>The Authorized (King James) Version</i> , 1611. Being the version revised by His Majesty, King James' special command (KJV), and being the Authorized Version (AV), that is, the only version authorized to be read in Anglican <i>Church of England Churches</i> by the <i>Act of Uniformity</i> , 1662.
ASV	<i>American Standard Version</i> , 1901 (also known as the <i>American Revised Version</i>). Being a revision of the Revised Version (1881-5).
Brown, Driver, & Briggs	Brown, F., Driver, S.R., & Briggs, C.A., <i>The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon</i> , 1906 edition, reprint: Hendrickson Publishers, Massachusetts, USA, 11th printing, July 2007.
Burgon & Miller	Burgon, J.W. & Miller, E., <i>A Textual Commentary Upon the Holy Gospels</i> , Largely from the use of materials, and mainly on the text, left by the late John W. Burgon, Dean of Chichester, Part I, St. Matthew, Division I, 1-14 [Matt. 1:6–14:19], by Edward Miller, Bursalis Prebendary in Chichester Cathedral, George Bell & Sons, London, England, & Deighton Bell & Co. Cambridge, UK, 1899. [“Part I” on “ST. MATTHEW” “I. i-xiv” is all that was ever published, and so there are no further parts.]
ESV	<i>English Standard Version</i> , being a revision of the Revised Standard Version (1952 & 1971). Scripture quotations are from The Holy Bible, English Standard Version, copyright © 2001 by Crossway Bible, a publishing ministry of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved.
Green's Textual Apparatus	Pierpont, W.G. (of Robinson & Pierpont, <i>infra</i>), in: Green, J., <i>The Interlinear Bible</i> , Hendrickson, Massachusetts, USA, 2nd edition 1986, pp. 967-974.
Hodges & Farstad	Hodges, Z. & Farstad, A., <i>The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text</i> , Thomas Nelson, Nashville, Tennessee, USA, 1982, 2nd edition, 1985;

- JB
Jerusalem Bible, [Roman Catholic] Imprimatur: Cardinal Heenan, Westminster, 4 July 1966; Darton, Longman, & Todd, London, 1966.
- Liddell & Scott or
Liddell & Scott's
*Greek-English
Lexicon*
Henry Liddell and Robert Scott's *A Greek-English Lexicon* 1843, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, UK, new ninth edition, 1940, with Supplement, 1996.
- Migne
(pronounced,
"Marnya")
Paul Migne's (1800-1875) *Patrologiae Curses Completus*, Series Graeca (Greek Writers Series), and Series Latina (Latin Writers Series).
- Metzger's *Textual
Commentary*, 1971
& Metzger's *Textual
Commentary*,
2nd ed., 1994.
Metzger, B.M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, first edition 1971 (A companion to the UBS Greek NT, 3rd ed.), second edition 1994 (A companion to the UBS Greek NT, 4th revised edition), United Bible Societies, Bibelgesellschaft / German Bible Society, Stuttgart, Germany.
- Migne
(pronounced,
"Marnya")
Paul Migne's (1800-1875) *Patrologiae Curses Completus*, Series Graeca (Greek Writers Series), and Series Latina (Latin Writers Series).
- Moffatt Bible
or Moffatt
The Moffatt Translation of the Bible, 1926, Revised edition, 1935, by James Moffatt.
- Moulton's *Grammar
of NT Greek*
James H. Moulton's *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* Vol. 1, 1906, 3rd ed. 1908; Vol. 2, J.H. Moulton & W.F. Howard, 1919-29; Vol. 3, N. Turner, 1963; Vol. 4, N. Turner, 1976; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK.

Mounce's *Analytical
Lexicon to the
Greek NT*

Mounce, W.D., *The Analytical Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*, Zondervan (Harper-Collins), Grand Rapids, Michigan, USA, 1993.

NASB

New American Standard Bible, being a revision of the American Standard Version (1901). First edition, 1960-1971, second edition, 1977, third edition, 1995 (also known as the *New American Standard Version*). Scripture taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE (R), Copyright ©1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by the Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.

NIV

New International Version, 1st edition, 1978, first published in Great Britain in 1979; 2nd edition, 1984. Scripture taken from The HOLY BIBLE, NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION. Copyright 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved.

NJB

New Jerusalem Bible, [Roman Catholic] Imprimatur: Cardinal Hume, Westminster, 18 June 1985; Darton, Longman, & Todd, London, 1985.

NKJV

New King James Version. [Being a Burgonite (Majority Text) revision of the Authorized (King James) Version of 1611.] Scripture taken from the New King James Version. Copyright © 1979, 1980, 1982 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by Permission. All rights reserved.

NRSV

New Revised Standard Version, being a revision of the Revised Standard Version (1952 & 1971). The Scripture quotations contained herein are from the New Revised Standard Version Bible, copyright © 1989, by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., and are used by Permission. All rights reserved.

NU Text

The text found in "N" i.e., Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) & "U" i.e., United Bible Societies' (UBS) 4th revised edition (1993).

NU Text *et al*

The NU Text as well as the text in Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Graece* (8th edition, 1869-72); Westcott & Hort's Greek NT (1881); Nestle's 21st edition (1952); the UBS 3rd (1975) & 3rd corrected (1983) editions.

- Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968-82) Editors P.G.W. Glare *et al*, *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, UK, 1968-82.
- Robinson & Pierpont Robinson, M.A., & Pierpont, W.G., *The New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform*, Original Word Publishers, Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 1991 (for Matt. 1-19); Robinson, M.A., & Pierpont, W.G., *The New Testament in the ... the Byzantine Textform*, Chilton Book Publishers, Southborough, Massachusetts, USA, 2005 (for Preface & Matt. 20 onwards; unless otherwise stated).
- RSV *Revised Standard Version*, being a revision of the American Standard Version. 1st edition 1946 & 1952, Collins, Great Britain, UK; 2nd edition, 1971, Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Oxford University Press, 1977.
- RV *Revised Version*, 1881-1885 (also known as the *English Revised Version*). [Being a neo-Alexandrian revision of the Authorized (King James) Version of 1611.]
- Septuagint or LXX Brenton, L.C.L. (Editor & English translator), *The Septuagint With Apocrypha: Greek and English*, Samuel Bagster & Sons, London, UK, 1851; Reprint: Hendrickson, USA, 1986, fifth printing, 1995. Unless otherwise stated, all Septuagint quotes in either Greek or English are from this edition.
- TEV *Today's English Version* (or *Good News Bible*), 1961, 1971, 4th edition, 1976. British usage text first published 1976. The British & Foreign Bible Society, London, UK, 1976.
- TR *Textus Receptus* (Latin, Received Text). TR of NT generally, though not always, as found in Frederick H.A. Scrivener's, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* 1894 & 1902; Reprinted by the Trinitarian Bible Society, London, England, UK. (See Appendix 1 in each Volume of this Textual Commentary.)
- TCNT *The Twentieth Century New Testament*, A Translation into Modern English Made from ... Westcott & Hort's Text ... , 1898-1901, Revised Edition 1904, The Sunday School Union, London, UK, & Fleming H. Revell Co., New York & Chicago, USA.

- Von Soden or
Von Soden (1913) Hermann Freiherr von Soden's *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in inhrer altesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, Gottingen, Germany, 1911-1913. Four volumes, Vol. I, I [= Vol. 1]; Vol. I, II A [= Vol. 2]; Vol. I, III B [= Vol. 3]; & Vol. II [= Vol. 4].
- Wallace's
Greek Grammar Daniel Wallace's *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 1996, Galaxie Software, Garland, Texas, USA.
- Wheelock's *Latin Grammar* or
Wheelock's *Latin* Frederick Wheelock's *Latin Grammar* 1956 (1st ed., Barnes & Noble, New York, USA), Revised by Richard LaFleur, as Wheelock's *Latin* (6th edition, revised, Harper-Collins, New York, USA, 2005).
- Young's *Greek* Richard Young's *Intermediate New Testament Greek* 1994, Broadman & Holman, Nashville, Tennessee, USA.

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

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

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

* *Transliterations of Greek letters into English letters.*

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

English letters used for the Greek alphabet.

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

(pronounced z
as in xenelasia)

**Lectionary readings potentially relevant to Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14) from
Sydney University (Latin, Sidneiensi Universitatis)
Greek Lectionaries 2378 & 1968.**

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

<i>St. Matthew</i>	<i>Pages</i>	<i>St. Matthew</i>	<i>Pages</i>		
1	1-25	103a-104a	2	1-9,11b-12 13-23	105a-105b 105b-106a
3	1-6 13-17	106a-106b 108a-108b	4	1-11 12-17 18-23	108b-109a 109a-109b 26b-27a
4-5	4:25-5:12	109b	5	14-19 42-48	109b 25b-26a
6	1 (in rubric) 1-13 15 (in rubric) 15-21 22-33	56b 55b-56b 56b 56b 27b-28a	7	1-8 7-8 7-11	26b 57a 57a
7-8	7:24-8:4	27a-27b	8	5-13 14-23 23-27	28b-29a 28a-28b 102a
8-9	8:28-9:1	29a-29b	9	1-8 9-13 18-26 27-35	30a-30b 29a 29b-30a 31a
10	1,5-8 16-22	102a 117b	10&11	10:37-11:1	30b-31a
10&19	10:32-33, 37-38 & 19:27-30	26a-26b	11	2-15	111a
12	15-21 30-37	105b 31a-31b	14	14-22 22-34	31b-32a 32b-33a

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

<i>St. Matthew</i>	<i>Pages</i>	<i>St. Matthew</i>	<i>Pages</i>
1	1-25	2	1-12 13-23
3	1-6 13-17	4	1-11 12-17 18-23
5	14-17 42-48	6	1-13 14-21 22-33
7	1-8 7-8 12-21	7-8	7:24-8:4
8	5-13 14-23 23-27	8-9	8:28-9:1
9	1-8 9-13 18-26 27-35	10	(“Luke” <i>sic</i>): 1-7,14-15 1,5-8 16-20 (“Mark” <i>sic</i>): 17-31
10-11	10:32-11:1 10:37-11:1	11	27-30
12	15-21 30-37	13	44-54
14	14-21 22-34		

Scripture Citations of Bishop Gregory the Great in Matt. 1-14.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Scripture:	Migne reference
Matt. 1:25	75:856
Matt. 2:11	76:1110
Matt. 3:8	79:247*, 439*, 1157
Matt. 3:10	76:11; 79:51
Matt. 3:11	79:591*, 529
Matt. 3:12	76:17*
Matt. 4:10	76:1135
Matt. 4:18	76:1092
Matt. 5:11a	77:1158
Matt. 5:11b	77:1158
Matt. 5:13	79:141
Matt. 5:22	76:194, 966; 79:1145
Matt. 5:27	75:628; 76:471, 943; 79:209
Matt. 5:37	79:394
Matt. 5:39b	76:446
Matt. 5:44a	75:1262, 1284; 76:472; 79:34, 334, 1206
Matt. 5:44b	75:873, 1262

Matt. 5:48a	79:1357
Matt. 5:48b	79:1357
Matt. 6:1a	75:853; 76:120; 77:87,120; 79:1145, 1147
Matt. 6:1b	75:853; 76:120; 77:87,120; 79:1145, 1147
Matt. 6:4a	79:818
Matt. 6:6	79:1148
Matt. 6:12	75:1210; 79:737, 781, 927, 1152
Matt. 6:15	75:937; 79:1152
Matt. 6:21	79:78,218*
Matt. 6:33	75:1208; 76:141; 79:1153, 1259
Matt. 7:2	77:1107
Matt. 7:13 }	75:1118; 77:40; 79:698,877
Matt. 7:14b }	75:1287; 79:731, 698, 1410
Matt. 7:14a	77:388; 79:698 (footnote reference only), 731 (footnote reference only), 1410
Matt. 7:15	79:1151
Matt. 7:22	75:1216; 76:511, 679, 690, 997; 77:1141; 79:1254
Matt. 7:29	75:265; 79:592
Matt. 8:7	79:1154
Matt. 8:12	75:839; 79:71
Matt. 8:29	75:680
Matt. 8:31	75:563, 667, 690; 77:273; 79:795
Matt. 9:13	79:462
Matt. 10:8	76:1089
Matt. 10:10a	76:1089
Matt. 10:10b	76:1089
Matt. 10:23	79:479
Matt. 10:25	77:1120,1158
Matt. 11:2	75:1995
Matt. 11:5	75:1995
Matt. 11:8	75:877,1995; 77:1157
Matt. 11:9	75:1995
Matt. 11:10	75:1995
Matt. 12:35	79:590
Matt. 12:47	75:1086
Matt. 12:49	75:1086
Matt. 13:25	75:882
Matt. 13:44a	75:1114
Matt. 13:44b	75:1114
Matt. 13:45	75:1114
Matt. 13:46	75:1114; 79:127
Matt. 13:48a	75:1114
Matt. 13:51a	75:1114
Matt. 13:51b	75:1114
Matt. 13:55	75:968; 79:1262
Matt. 14:24	79:1162

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

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

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

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

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

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

“E” means a reading in the KJV's underpinning text is wrong (0-49% likelihood) and does not represent the true TR. I.e., an alternative reading should be adopted. This is the only KJV textual fail grade.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The results are summarized at the end of the volume in Appendix 4: *Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E*. In Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), all of the TR's readings have been found to be in the A to C range. Therefore the *Textus Receptus* of the King James Version (1611) requires no changes in Matt. 1-14. Nevertheless, I have itemized in the first appendix some changes that need to be made to Scrivener's Text in order for it to properly reflect the TR of the AV.

Background Story to Commentary.

General; Anglican background to 15 years old; Cult capture & escape (15-20 years old); Return to Anglicanism (at 20 years old and later); The need for this commentary.

General

Different Christian people have different religious stories to tell. Some come to Christ from an evangelistic meeting where they accept a gospel invitation to repentance and faith in Christ. Such were the converts on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2). Some come as escapees from a system of false religion, such as Roman Catholicism. Such were Martin Luther, John Calvin, and Thomas Cranmer, coming out of Popery (Rev. 18:2,4). Some come from a very dramatic experience, possibly having committed extremely serious sins, such as murder. Such was the Apostle Paul coming out of Judaism on the Damascus Road (Acts 9:1-31). Some come in a quieter way. Such was St. Timothy (II Tim. 1:5). Some are known by God even from their mother's womb, such as Jeremiah (Jer. 1:5).

But ultimately all people come only one way. They come through "the everlasting covenant" (Heb. 13:20), the "covenant" (Gen. 6:18) of "grace" (Gen. 6:8) e.g., "Noah" "became heir of the righteousness which is by faith" (Heb. 11:7). They recognize that they are sinners in violation of God's law (Exod. 20:1-17), being bound with both original sin and guilt (Ps. 51:5; Rom. 5:12-14), and then actual sins they commit (Ps. 51:3,4; Rom. 5:20; 7:7; 13:9). They "acknowledge" their "sin" (Ps. 51:3), and need to be "converted" (Ps. 51:13), and so repenting as those who have "done" "evil" (Ps. 51:4), they ask God to "purge" them so they "shall be clean" (Ps. 51:7). They are forgiven through the blood of the one who was typed in the OT by "sacrifices" and "burnt offerings" (Ps. 51:19), and receiving the benefits of his blood atonement, they are regenerated by the power of the Holy Ghost (Ps. 51:10,11). For though the covenant of grace is a covenant within a covenant, and has been administered under different covenants, it operated as much in the OT as the NT. For "even" "David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto who God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin" (Rom. 4:6-8; citing Ps. 32:1,2).

So too Ezekiel refers to the sacrifices that typified the One who was to die for men's sins (Ezek. 40:39-43). He speaks of what St. Paul does when he says he "hath quickened us together with Christ (by grace ye are saved)" (Eph. 2:5), for of the still-born and dead, still in their blood-birth, he records the Lord said this, "when I passed by thee, and saw thee polluted in thine own blood, I said unto thee when thou wast in thy blood, Live; yea, I said unto thee when thou wast in thy blood, Live" (Ezek. 16:6). Thus we come to life from death, being enabled, for as St. Paul says, "when we were dead in sins," then he "hath quickened" or made alive "us together with Christ" (Eph. 2:5).

Ezekiel speaks of regeneration and justification, for through him God says, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean, and from all you filthiness,

and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh” (Ezek. 36:25,26). Thus Ezekiel taught that “a man must be born of water and of the Spirit” (John 3:5; cf. Isa. 52:15; Matt. 3:11; Titus 3:5); just like St. Paul who also referred to “idolaters” and other filthiness, saying, “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. 6:9,11). And Ezekiel also taught sanctification (i.e., in the sense of “holiness of living,” for in some contexts sanctification means “setting apart,”), saying, “I will put my Spirit within you and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them” (Ezek. 36:27). “Then shall ye remember your own evil ways, and your doings that were not good, and shall loathe yourselves in your sight for your iniquities and for your abominations” (Ezek. 36:31; cf. Rom. 6:21). Thus as touching upon the way of salvation, our Lord’s teaching in John 3 contained no new doctrine, but was an elucidation on the covenant of grace operating from OT times. Hence the propriety of Jesus saying to Nicodemus, “Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?” (John 3:10).

“For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith” (Rom. 1:16,17). That this is a work of grace from start to finish is evident, “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast” (Eph. 2:8,9). Wherefore our salvation is through the atoning merits of the Lord Jesus Christ, who said he came “to give his life a ransom for many” (Matt. 20:28); that his “body” was “brake” and his “blood” “shed for many for the remission of sins” (Matt. 26:28). He said, “I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me” (John 14:6). Of him, John the Baptist testified, saying, “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world” (John 1:29). “Neither is there salvation in any other” than “Jesus Christ of Nazareth” who was “crucified,” and “whom God raised from the dead.” “For there is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts 4:10,12).

Anglican background to 15 years old

I am the son of an army officer, and by birth a Victorian, from the Australian State of Victoria, although I have lived most of my life in the Australian State of New South Wales. I was conceived in the 1950s and born in the 1960s. I was known by God, even from my mother’s womb. Though my spiritual life has at times moved further from God’s revealed will than it should, so that at times I have lived under God’s permissive will rather than his directive will, doing that which is not right; yet in his goodness and grace, God has always brought me back.

Both of my parents were baptized as Anglicans when they were babies, and I too was baptized as a baby. When exactly eleven months of age, I was baptized on the Fourth Sunday in Advent, exactly one week before Christmas day, at St. Martin’s Anglican Army Chapel, School of Signals, Balcombe (Diocese of Melbourne). My

Godparents (Phyllis & Graham Jenkins) gave me an *Authorized King James Version* as a baptismal gift, which I greatly treasured as both a boy, and in later life.

I was baptized with the names, “Gavin Basil.” My given name by which I am called is “Gavin.” My middle name, Basil, was named after an uncle. One of my father’s younger brothers, Basil Williams McGrath (1922-1943), was lost in action as a member of the *Royal Australian Air Force* (R.A.A.F.) during World War Two (1939-1945), about five months short of his 21st birthday (born 22 October 1922; enlisted in air force 30 Jan 1941; based at Coomalie Creek air force base, Northern Territory; lost in action in night-time air operations in the Darwin to Fenton area, about 1.30 am on 13 May 1943, later presumed dead). Uncle Basil was awarded four medals: 1) the 1939/45 Star; 2) Pacific Star; 3) War Medal 1939/45; and 4) Australian Service Medal 1939/45.

The name “Basil” is derived from such Greek New Testament words as, *Basileus*, meaning “king,” or *Basileios*, meaning “royal.” Though the name is found in England from the end of the 12th century, *it has historically been far more common in the Greek speaking areas of the old Byzantine Empire*, (nowadays mainly Greece, although including Greek Orthodox enclaves and ethnic communities such as those at e.g., Constantinople / Istanbul,) and other predominately Eastern Orthodox parts, than it has been in the West, e.g., St. Basil’s Russian Orthodox Cathedral, Moscow was named after St. Basil the Great, *infra*. There were also two Byzantine Emperors of this name, Basil the First (Emperor 866-886) and Basil the Second (Emperor 976-1025). Thus for one who like myself, in time became a neo-Byzantine textual analyst, it must be said that to have the name of “Basil” as a second name, is very appropriate.

The name “Basil” experienced temporary small scale increased popularity in the West, especially among Anglicans, in the mid to latter 19th and earlier 20th centuries, which is when my Uncle Basil received it. E.g., during this time the English historian, Basil Williams (1867-1950), produced his biography on *William Pitt* (1913), a Prime Minister of the UK (1766-1768)¹. Or this is the era of building and consecrating St. Basil’s Anglican Church, Artarmon (in Sydney), named after St. Basil the Great, *infra*, whose foundation stone was laid by the Archbishop of Sydney and Anglican Primate of Australia, His Grace John Wright, in 1912. However, by the time I received “Basil” as a family name for my second name at baptism, it was once again a far more uncommon Christian name among Caucasians of Western European descent such as myself.

Thus in the first instance, Basil became my second baptismal name as a legacy of my family history, from my Uncle Basil, killed in World War Two (WWII). In WWII, northern Australia was bombed by the Japanese. Of about 100 air bombing raids, about

¹ Williams, A.F.B. (known by his third name), *The Life of William Pitt Earl of Chatham*, in two volumes, Longmans, Green, & Co., London, UK, 1913. (N.b., it is just a quaint coincidence that Uncle Basil’s middle name was Williams, i.e., the name *Basil Williams* McGrath was not derived from the historian Basil Williams, but rather, Williams came as a family name from his matrilineal grandmother, Mary Jane McGrath nee Williams, 1861-1936, who in 1886 married Thomas Lush, 1864-1943.)

one-third of them were in such places as Townsville, Queensland; Wyndham, Western Australia (W.A.); Derby, W.A.; Port Hedland, W.A.; Broome, W.A.; and Katherine, Northern Territory. E.g., the air force base at Coomalie Creek, Northern Territory (about 4 miles or 6 kilometres south along the Stuart Highway), was bombed by the Japanese on 23 Nov. 1942; 27 Nov. 1942; 2 March 1943; 13 Aug 1943 *together with Fenton air force base*; 21 Aug. 1943 *together with Fenton air force base*; and 10 Nov. 1943. The air force base at Fenton, Northern Territory, (north-west of Pine Creek & about 90 miles or 150 kilometres south-east of Darwin,) was also bombed on 6 July 1943, 15 Sept. 1943, and 18 Sept. 1943. Uncle Basil was based at the Coomalie Creek RAAF base², south-east of Darwin and about midway between Darwin and Fenton RAAF base. Fenton (about 15 miles or 24 kilometres west of Brock's Creek,) was used as a landmark when Uncle Basil's plane went missing. Official war records from the time said, he "is reported missing as a result of the loss of aircraft ... near FENTON, Northern Territory, on the 12th May, 1943 [upon receipt of further information modified to c. 1.30 am 13th May]."

The capital of the Northern Territory (a Commonwealth / Federal territory, not a State), Darwin, received about two-thirds of the approximately 100 bombing raids on northern Australia. These started before Basil was lost. The first ones were on 19 February, 1942, when 188 Japanese planes from both land bases and aircraft carriers launched two lightning assaults. This resulted in about 250 casualties, 400 wounded, the loss of 20 military aircraft, and 8 ships. Of ten Allied fighter planes quickly scrambled, nine were shot down. Though smaller in scale and importance to Australia than Pearl Harbour was to America, this first aerial assault on Darwin has sometimes been compared and contrasted, as a mini-Pearl Harbour type of attack. Darwin was important both as a port, and a strategic symbolic target because it is a capital city. Aerial bombing raids continued on Darwin till November 1943.

This means that when Uncle Basil was in the Northern Territory as part of the RAAF's 31 Squadron Beaufighters³, he was flying into what was known to be the front-line aerial defence of Australia, since not only was the Territory's capital city of Darwin aerial bombed a number of times before and after he was lost, but Coomalie air force base where Basil was stationed was aerial bombed by the Japanese thrice before he was lost, and thrice after he was lost. It was also one of the front-line points of aerial advance against the Japanese in those parts of south-east Asia and Melanesia relatively

² This is located at modern day Coomalie Farm (privately owned). In Australia's bicentennial year of 1988, RAAF veterans of 31 Squadron placed a memorial plaque at Coomalie Farm. Veterans also returned 50 years after the end of the war in 1995, among other things exhibiting a replica of their Coomalie Creek Squadron Chapel.

³ Before being stationed at Coomalie Creek, Northern Territory, with the 31st RAAF Squadron, Basil was with the 25th RAAF Squadron of Pearce (at Bullsbrook about 30 miles or 50 kilometres north of Perth), Western Australia. He was sent to Pearce after his initial training, and there flew in Wirraways, a two-seat low wing monoplane used during the war for both training purposes and patrol work.

close to Darwin. The Beaufighter was known as the “whispering death” because it sometimes flew low over tree tops, thus quietly sneaking up on the Japanese enemy, and would then machine-gun Japanese on the ground before the enemy knew what was happening (a technique known as “strafing”). E.g., (before Basil arrived) the first mission of 31 Squadron Beaufighters from Coomalie Creek on 17 Nov. 1942, involved half a dozen Beaufighters making strafing attacks in Timor (at Moabissi & Bobanaro). One of Uncle Basil’s four medals is the Pacific Star.

The Beaufighter was a twin (propeller) engine, two crew, fighter aircraft, that carried the pilot and wireless air observer. Basil did not hold the so called, “glamour” role of being a fighter pilot, but rather was the wireless air observer. The reality of course, is that everyone in a broader military team is important, whether ground crew or air crew, whether canteen workers, mechanics, refuelers, or others.

Uncle Basil was lost in night operations in the area of Darwin to Fenton in the Northern Territory. A letter to my grandfather, Norman McGrath (1896-1993), was written to him shortly afterwards while Basil was still missing in action, but there was still some hope that he might be found alive. It was written by the lone survivor, the pilot, Flying Officer J.D. Brannley (Des), who gives a number of relevant details about the loss of the aircraft and wireless air observer, Flight Sergeant B.W. McGrath (Basil).

Brannley says “the primary cause of the trouble was wireless failure.” This led to a situation where they had to “abandon [the] aircraft” after finding they “hadn’t enough petrol to make base.” Basil “broke out the emergency rations which” they both “shared,” “which meant they each had enough food for a fortnight and double in a pinch.” After Basil had bailed out, there was “a jamming of” the pilot’s escape “hatch,” resulting in a delayed departure so that the two went down “about 6 miles” (or 10 kilometres) “apart.” (Beaufighter crew sometimes sat with their parachutes on, and sometimes had their parachutes next to them. They then slipped down an emergency escape hatch.) Due to the “jamming” of the pilot’s escape hatch, the two of them were now separated by a great distance. The pilot estimated that they had “abandoned aircraft about 15 miles” (or 24 kilometres) “from the coast inland.”

The pilot “landed in very bad country,” with “bamboo grass about twelve feet” (or 3.7 metres) “high” in “about 4 feet” (or 1.2 metres) “of water” in “a large swamp.” After “inflating” a “rubber dingy,” and having “shouted out” without success for Basil, he then stayed there the night. He then followed the “swamp,” and “by the sun headed for the coast. The area was “literally alive with crocodiles, several of which took an unwelcome interest in” the pilot. After eight days he “was pretty desperate and decided to chance the crocks and to straddle a log.” But then his “luck changed as in searching for a log,” he “found an old native canoe” abandoned by Northern Territory Aborigines, “which” he then “patched up with” his “clothing and some mud.” On it, he then “floated and” “drifted,” till finally he “ran into a small Army outpost,” and “safety.”

Uncle Basil was lost in an area where there were two types of black Aborigines, i.e., both half-naked, semi-barbarians, who lived on government reserves and who still

clung to some elements of a backward, debased, primitive, pagan, hunter's culture; and also some other Aborigines who had been Christianized, were civilized, and who worked as stockmen for their white masters. It was a region of intense bamboo grass and swamps. It was an area infested with lots of crocodiles in remote, isolated, outback Australia's Northern Territory. It was clearly a swine of a place to go down in. In time, Basil was presumed dead.

Whereas one type of Northern Territory Aborigine might hold a heathen corroboree and invoke devils impersonating the spirits of departed dead Aborigines; another type of Northern Territory Aborigine might go to a Christian Church on Sunday and invoke the true and living Trinitarian God. Aborigines generally have better vision than other races, and an excellent visual recognition of, and memory for, shapes. These racial traits mean that those who understand racial diversity can profitably work with them as excellent trackers, and indeed, they are the best trackers in the world. Thus full-blooded Aborigines have historically been so used for such purposes by e.g., the Police.

It was an Aboriginal stockman, (Archy Crosby,) who located the wreckage of Uncle Basil's plane. He reported the matter to his white station master at Victoria Downs, who in turn notified the Police. The subsequent search in this inhospitable terrain located the wreckage of the R.A.A.F. fighter plane in November 1943. It was found 43 miles (or 68 kilometres) almost due west of Fenton, at Billawock Hill (about 90 miles or 150 kilometres south-west of Darwin), on the Daly River off Anson Bay. Inside the plane wreckage was found a map case with the name, "B.W. McGrath," in Basil's handwriting.

Basil's personal items at Coomalie Creek air force base included a handgun that my grandfather had given to Uncle Basil. It was a small, hand-sized, silver coloured 32 calibre pistol, with a black handle. The reason why Basil left his revolver at the RAAF base is conjectural. Perhaps the base had to scramble the fighter planes very quickly and unexpectedly for some reason, and Basil just did not have enough time to grab his gun. We cannot be sure as to why he did not have it on him that fateful day. However it happened, it was certainly unfortunate that Uncle Basil did not have his handgun with him when he emergency parachute landed into what turned out to be a crocodile infested area. Uncle Basil's bodily remains were never found.

A memorial tree was planted to his honour in the New South Wales country town of Wolumla. This was one of the country towns Basil grew up in as a boy, and the place where he initially enlisted for the air force. And his name was inscribed at the place, where the names of all war dead are writ, even on the wall of the *National War Memorial* in the national capital of Canberra. Here he is listed and remembered as one of the glorious dead, on a World War Two plaque which also bears the names of all his dead fellow comrades in arms, from the *Royal Australian Air Force's* No. 31 Squadron.

As a boy, Basil attended Anglican Sunday School. In the R.A.A.F. he would have attended *Church of England Church Parades*. His official military records refer to his religion as "C. of E." i.e., *Church of England in Australia* (Anglican). They also

include a character reference given to him before joining the R.A.A.F., by his local Anglican clergyman, the Reverend John Rose. Reverend Rose describes him as “a young man of very good character,” “honest and reliable.” The Latin motto of the *Royal Australian Air Force* is, “*Per Ardua ad Astra*,” meaning, “Through Struggle to the Stars,” and Uncle Basil exhibited these noble qualities in his military service⁴.

However, in the second instance, my second baptismal name, “Basil,” also served as a recognizable *Christian name*, through reference to St. Basil the Great (c. 329-379). St. Basil was a bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Asia Minor (modern Turkey). He is remembered by Reformed Anglicans particularly for his defence of the Holy Trinity. St. Basil’s chief opponents were Arian heretics who denied the full Divinity of the Son, Macedonian (or Pneumatomachi) heretics who denied the full Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and Sabellian (or Modalist) heretics who denied the three Divine Persons in the one Supreme Being by claiming there was only one Divine Person in the one Supreme Being. Some two years after St. Basil’s death, his Trinitarian orthodoxy was upheld by the *General Council of Constantinople* (381).

Article 11 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* says, “We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the *Homily of Justification*.” The “Homily of Justification” here referred to is Homily 3, Book 1, of Article 35. Notably, St. Basil the Great is also referred to in this *Homily of Justification*, where we read, “And ... to be justified, only by ... true and lively faith in Christ, speaketh ... St. Basil, a Greek author, [who] writeth thus: ‘This is a perfect and a whole rejoicing in God, when a man advanceth not himself for his own righteousness, but [ac]knowledgeth himself to lack true justice and righteousness, and to be justified by the only faith in Christ. And Paul,’ saith he, ‘doth glory in the contempt of his own righteousness, and that he looketh for *the righteousness of God by faith*’ [Philp. 3:9]. These be the very words of St. Basil.”⁵ He is also referred to in Book 2, Homily 9, of Article 35 with the Latin name, “*Basilus Magnus*,” meaning, “Basil the Great.”

Since my father, Norman Keith De Mainson McGrath (called “Keith” or “Mac”), was in the army (*Royal Australian Corps of Signals*), I enjoyed a highly mobile lifestyle, attending nine different schools over thirteen years. My first school was St. Anne’s Pre-School, and thereafter I attended eight state schools⁶, some of which facilitated Scripture

⁴ The RAAF adopted this motto in 1929. It was the motto of the *Royal Flying Corps* from 1913 and its successor since 1918, the *Royal Air Force*; as well as being the motto of the *Royal New Zealand Air Force* and *Royal Canadian Air Force*.

⁵ Quoting St. Basil’s Homily 20, *De Humilitate*, 3; Opp. II, 158 E (ed. Benedict. Paris 1721 &c.). Cf. Knox, D.B., *Thirty-Nine Articles*, 1964, revised 1976, Anglican Information Office (A.I.O.), Sydney, Australia, 1976 (ISBN 0 909827 62 1), p. 22.

⁶ The nine schools were: 1) St. Anne’s Pre-School, Top Ryde (Sydney, 1964); 2) Melrose Park Public School, West Ryde (Sydney, 1965, Kindergarten); 3) Kapooka

classes by an independent teacher from outside the school, some of which did not. St. Anne's Pre-School was in the Church Hall of St. Anne's Anglican Church, Top Ryde (Sydney). Photographs of myself in the church yard on my first day in 1964, show the large white Christian cross of this beautifully built sandstone church clearly visible in the background. I thank God that my school days started in a church yard under the symbol of a very large and public Christian cross.

I learnt to say the *Lord's Prayer* as a young child. I heard it each night from as early as I can remember, by kneeling down next to my bed at night before I went to sleep, and turning the pages of a children's book containing this prayer (in the form found in the Anglican prayer book of 1662). My mother, (Betty Grace McGrath nee Davis,) read the *Lord's Prayer* as I turned the pages, until I had learnt it myself⁷. As I got older, though still a boy, I simply said the *Lord's Prayer* out loud (without the book), and this was then followed by silent prayer each night. This was supervised each night before bed by my mother till I was about 11 or 12.

I greatly enjoyed *Church of England* Sunday Schools⁸. We were taught to wear our "Sunday best," and so a 1966 photo I have shows my brother, Peter, and I going to Sunday School at Kapooka, wearing what we used to call, our "Sunday School ties." I won Sunday School prizes at St. Columb's *Church of England*, West Ryde (Sydney) (1st prize, c. 1964; 1st prize, c. 1965), Kapooka C. of E. Sunday School (Wagga) (2nd prize, 1965; prize, 1966); St. Stephen's C. of E., Penrith (Second Class, 2nd prize, 1967; Third Class, 1st prize, 1968); and St. Philip's *Church of England*, Eastwood (Sydney) (2nd prize, 1971; prize, 1972⁹). These prizes consisted of books, some of which were

Primary School (Wagga, rural N.S.W., 1966, Year 1); 4) Kingswood Park Public School (1967-8, Sydney, Years 2 & 3); 5) Watsonia Heights School (1969-70, Melbourne, Years 4 & 5); 6) Ermington West Public School (1970-1, Sydney, Years 5 & 6); 7) Macquarie Boys' High School (1972, Sydney, Year 7); 8) Belconnen High School (end of 1972-5, Canberra, Years 7-10); and 9) Cumberland High School (1976-7, Sydney, Years 11 & 12; these 2 years are called "Senior High School," as opposed to Years 7 to 10 known as "Junior High School").

⁷ Tempest, M., *The Lord's Prayer for Children*, Collins, London & Glasgow, UK, 1943.

⁸ The churches itemized in this section are part of the *Anglican Church of Australia*, formerly known throughout my boyhood as the *Church of England in Australia*, or more commonly, simply the *Church of England* or *C. of E.* .

⁹ This 1972 prize, the book, *Bridge Over the River Kwai*, was mailed to me after I moved to Canberra, and being the only Sunday School book prize I ever lost, I am not sure of the details i.e., 1st, 2nd, or 3rd prize. The other non-specified prizes, were not specifically rated by the Sunday Schools.

children's Bible books and one of which was an adult Bible¹⁰. As a child I greatly enjoyed looking through these books and seeing pictures of Biblical scenes, especially of Jesus in different Gospel stories, together with photographs of Biblical locations in the adult Bible.

My mother had also given my brother and I our own copies of Paul Hamlyn's *Children's Bible* which I also used to look through. Pictures of particular interest to me in this work included one of Noah's Flood, and one of Christ being crucified on a cross bearing the inscription, "INRI¹¹." As I learnt in later life, these are the Latin initials for "*Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudaeorum*," being the words found at John 19:19 in St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, and meaning in the translation of the St. James Bible, "JESUS OF NAZARETH, THE KING OF THE JEWS."

The only Sunday School I attended where I did not get a prize was All Saints' Anglican Church, Greensborough (Melbourne), which I attended while we were living at Watsonia. But that was because the Sunday School there had an unfortunate policy against giving Sunday School prizes to anyone. But a compensation for this regrettable policy, came, when my mother bought both my brother and I, our own copies of two large Bibles (10½ inches by 8¼ inches, and 2¾ inches thick; or 27 cm by 21 cm, and 7 cm thick). Known as the *Clarified Edition*, this contained the main text of the Authorized King James Version (1611), but showed in parallel readings in *some* verses, the AV as compared to the American Standard Version (1901) or the Revised Standard Version (1952). Among other Bible Aids, this edition contained a table at the front showing the same words in the KJV, ASV, and RSV, which was of some use in helping me to better understand the KJV. It also contained some interesting reproductions of masterpieces of fine Biblical Art¹².

¹⁰ Lock, W. & Cloke, R., *Bible Stories from the New Testament*. Ward, Lock, & Co., UK, 1961 (from St. Columb's Sunday School); Jones, M.A. & Kennedy, J.R., *Friends of Jesus*, Rand McNally & Co., Chicago, Illinois, USA, 1964 (from St. Columb's Sunday School); Stone, E. & Faorzi, F., *The Story of Jesus*, Ward Lock & Co., London & Melbourne, 1966 (Kapooka Sunday School); *The Holy Bible*, Revised Standard Version, 1952, with colour photographs of Biblical places by Alistair Duncan, Collins, New York & Glasgow, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland (Kapooka Sunday School). The Minister at Kapooka, Chaplain McElveney, was an Evangelical Anglican from the Diocese of Sydney.

¹¹ Hamlyn, P., *The Children's Bible*, In colour, The Old Testament & the New Testament, Paul Hamlyn Ltd., London, 1964, pp. 26-7 (Noah's Flood), 460-1 (Christ's crucifixion).

¹² *The Holy Bible*, Clarified Edition, The Complete Text of the Authorized King James Version to which are added approximately 9,000 parallel readings from the American Standard Version and Revised Standard Version edited by Dr. Fleming James, Consolidated Books, Chicago, Illinois, USA, 1961.

A section on The Family Tree contained in the *Clarified Edition* was also important. My mother was, and remains, an enthusiastic genealogist, who would tell me various stories of family history; and I also came to draw the conclusion from Biblical passages such as I Chron. 1-4; Matt. 1 *et al*, that the Bible taught genealogies were of some importance. My matrilineal grandfather, known as “Pop” or “Grandpa,” filled out some sections of it in beautiful copper-plate writing, which as a child greatly impressed me for its stylistic attractiveness and elegance. But he then left some sections of it for me to fill out. This was a long term-goal, since to accomplish this I would need to learn to write in copper-plate. Grandpa was born in 1890, in an era and cultural environment where to be “a gentleman,” required that one could write in copper-plate with black ink and an ink nib pen. He undertook to teach me this important ability (which my brother was not interested in). Thus over the years, under Pop’s private tutelage, and my own efforts, I came to learn how to write in copper-plate running writing; a script that since childhood I have always regarded as very graceful and picturesque to behold.

On the one hand, the bad news from All Saints’ Greensborough was that they did not believe in Sunday School prizes. But on the other hand, there was some good news from All Saints’ Greensborough as well. The church was Evangelical Anglican, and it was here that I joined the *Church of England Boys’ Society* (C.E.B.S.). I was admitted as a “Page” in 1970, after passing such “Admission Tests” as being able to say e.g., *The Lord’s Prayer*, the Page’s “Rule of Life,” “I promise by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, to pray to God daily, to read his Word carefully, to worship him joyfully, and to obey all who have the right to command me.” The “Page Motto” was “Obedience.” When we moved back to Sydney I remained in C.E.B.S., first as a Page, then from age 12 in 1972 as an Esquire, at St. Philip’s Eastwood. This included passing such “tests” as being able to say, *The Lord’s Prayer*, the *Apostles’ Creed*, and the Esquire Motto, which was “Truth.”

I won a C.E.B.S. prize at St. Philip’s, which was a polished wooden trophy bearing my name on a piece of metal, that I was very proud of. C.E.B.S. as it then existed was something like Boy Scouts, except that it was more focused on an Anglican context. The uniforms we wore were military in appearance, and the names, “page,” “esquire,” and then “knight,” were named after the three stages that a boy and then young man would formerly pass through in England in training to be a knight. This also reflected certain Anglican values, since knights are part of a wider social order supporting the monarch, and the monarch is *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith* (although since the 19th century these have largely become ceremonial and titular titles and positions of the monarch).

In 1972 I was in my first year at High School (at Macquarie Boys’ High School¹³) and the Gideons visited our school and gave all First Formers (now called Year 7), a red Gideon’s Bible of the New Testament, Psalms, and Proverbs. This was of great interest to me, regarded as one of my treasures, and I remember reading and discussing parts of it

¹³ This Sydney school on the Corner of James Ruse Drive & Kissing Point Rd, North Parramatta, was closed at the end of 2009.

with a fellow student.

Cult capture & escape (15-20 years old).

At the end of 1972, my father was transferred to the Australian Capital Territory (A.C.T.), which is the territory surrounding the capital city of Canberra. We moved into a married quarters house at Flynn, in what was then an outer lying suburb of Canberra. It was on the frontier of expansion. A photograph I have dated February 1973, shows sheep crossing our front yard, since the border between the surrounding rural areas and this new urban suburb were still somewhat blurred.

Photographs I have from the time show Christmas Trees we had celebrating this great Christian festival in December 1973 and December 1974. However, to a very large extent, the move to Canberra had cut me off from church contacts. There were very few churches in Canberra, although the Roman Catholics were using the local primary school hall, and at one stage the Roman Catholic priest went door-to-door throughout the area introducing himself to the new residents. With regret I must say that no Protestant clergyman ever did the same. On the one hand, I still had Christian children's books, three complete adult Bibles, and the Gideon's NT, Psalms & Proverbs. But on the other hand, what little there was of the Anglican Church in Canberra was Puseyite, and we had nothing to do with it. The absence of any accessible Evangelical Anglican Church also meant the cessation of C.E.B.S. . Unlike where I had come from in Sydney, there were no Scripture classes in school (at Belconnen High School).

In this spiritual void, I was led astray by a fellow school student into the Seventh-day Adventist (SDA) cult¹⁴. As one who had lacked any church fellowship for two or three years, it seemed to me a great boon at the time, to be formally studying the Bible and going to church again. On one level it was. But on another level, it entailed my seduction into various doctrinal errors of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, which I formally joined at the tender age of 15 in 1975. I would stay with this cult for about five years.

When we moved back to Sydney at the end of 1975, I had already taken the SDA bait and was hooked by them. I attended the Dundas Church¹⁵. However, in school (at Cumberland High School) I came back into contact with some Evangelical Anglican friends, and also some lunch-time Scripture Union classes, and in the longer term these revitalized church contacts would prove to be a helpful component in easing my departure from Seventh-day Adventism. I used to carry my Gideons NT, Psalms & Proverbs around in my shirt pocket (and some old practices evidently die hard, since I still carry around a KJV NT & Psalms in my shirt pocket).

¹⁴ For a penetrating analysis of Seventh-day Adventism, see Anthony Hoekema's *The Four Major Cults*, Eerdmans, Michigan, 1963, pp. 89-169,388-403.

¹⁵ The Dundas Church on the Corner of Kissing Point Rd & Bell's Rd, has in more recent years been designated an ethnic church for SDAs of Croatian descent. But this was not its ethnic character when I attended it.

When 18 in 1978, I went to the SDA's Avondale College in Cooranbong, N.S.W. (between Sydney and Newcastle). Avondale College professes to be a "Christian" College, and in this sense is similar to a number of Christian (tertiary) Colleges professing and calling themselves "Christian" in the United States of America. It is thus what is sometimes called, "a Christian College"¹⁶. Morning and Evening Chapel services during the week in the Boys' Chapel and Girls' Chapel, together with a combined students' mid-week Chapel service in the College Chapel, and also once a week morning "Sabbath Services," were an integral part of College life. The girls were in most instances modestly dressed, generally wearing a skirt or dress below the knee and above the breast line (they look far more pleasant to my eyes, than women in immodest or unisex clothing), and were only rarely seen in slacks¹⁷.

Entrance admission tests at the time for degree courses required that one had matriculated or gained entrance to undertake a degree into any one of the State accredited Australian tertiary institutions. I had met this requirement and so I was enrolled as a Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) student at Avondale College. In 1978 there were between 550 and 600 students, of which about 20% were Ministerial (Theology) students, about 60% were School Teaching (Educational) students, and about 20% other students of which just

¹⁶ The annual College book, prepared by students, is called the *Jacaranda* or "Jac" (pronounced, "Jack"). With regard to the College's "Christian" element, see e.g., *Jacaranda* (1979), p. 2, referring to the fact that at one stage the College was known as "Avondale School for Christian Workers." Or *Jacaranda* (1978), p. 34, says, "At Avondale, the importance of a Christ-oriented academic approach is stressed." On my usage of the term, "Christian," see section 10a, *infra*.

¹⁷ *Jacaranda* 1978, e.g., pp. 15,57,58 & 1979, pp. 24,49,52,57 (Typical pictures of the girls in long dresses or skirts); and *Jacaranda* 1978 p. 46 & 1979 p. 6 (unusual scenes of girls in loose fitting slacks in order to go bushwalking). The Dean of Women, a widow, Mrs. Fox, did an excellent job in helping to keep the girls' standards up. She was prepared, if necessary, to be unpopular in order to do the right thing, and I only wish there were more people like her. The *Student Handbook* for Avondale College in 1978 (Printed by the Sanitarium Health Food Company, Cooranbong, pp. 12-13), says e.g., under "Men," "Male students at Avondale College must be well groomed at all times. Modish and exaggerated styles are out of place on campus. Flamboyant and drooping moustaches are not permitted and should not extend either below or beyond the upper lip. ... The College considers ... jeans and T-shirts ... are ... not to be worn Bare feet or thongs are out of place" Under "Women," "Young women are asked to apply that principle of modesty which has been defined as freedom from drawing attention to oneself or one's person either by extremes, exaggerations or extravagances. ... Short shirt blouses over slacks and eastern-type clothing and the like are inappropriate. Jeans, thongs, and sundresses are not acceptable Bikinis may not be worn at anytime. Sheer, tight-fitting, or low-necked, low-backed clothing and men's style T-shirts are never appropriate Casual wear is not appropriate in the worship rooms" With these selected examples, *supra*, I am in complete agreement.

over half were Secretarial Certificate girls. In 1979, there were between 550 and 600 students, of which about 20% were Ministerial (Theology) students, just over 50% were School Teaching (Educational) students, and about 30% other students of which about one-third were Secretarial Certificate women.

On one level, Avondale College was “an Australian College.” At the time there were a number of Colleges of Advanced Education (or CAEs)¹⁸, and also a number of church theological colleges in Australia. At one level, Avondale College looked like, and functioned like, a cross between these two types of better known tertiary colleges. Hence Avondale College issued its own one year Certificates (e.g., Commercial Studies Certificate, Secretarial Certificate, General Studies Certificate), as well as Diplomas (e.g., Diploma of Education, Diploma of Applied Science, Diploma of Business).

Indeed, Avondale College expanded its orbit of issuing Diplomas near the end of my time there in 1980. The Sydney Adventist Hospital at Wahroonga in Sydney, is one of the most respected and best known private church hospitals in Sydney. It is commonly called, “the San” as an abbreviation for “Sanatorium” (from Late Latin, *sanatorium, sanatorii*, cf. *sano*, to make healthy). But it also acts to make it sound like many other church hospitals with a saint’s name, particularly for those familiar with American place names (and the SDA cult is derived from the USA), e.g., the San Andreas Fault of California (related to earthquakes), San Francisco, California, or San Antonio, Texas. This type of thing appeals to the SDA psyche and *modus operandi*¹⁹.

The San had previously issued Nursing Certificates from the Hospital, in accordance with normative New South Wales practice. But there was a general

¹⁸ These CAEs later amalgamated to form universities e.g., the old Penrith Teacher’s College joined with others to form the University of Western Sydney. My father is a graduate of the *Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology* (RMIT), and wanting to retain its royal patronage from Queen Elizabeth II under its established name, the RMIT did not join this trend and formally start calling itself a “university.” (But in 1992 it merged with the Phillip Institute of Technology, and was given university status.)

¹⁹ E.g., SDA proselytism frequently attempts to present itself in the first instance, as nothing obviously SDA. E.g., as a series of lectures on Archaeology, which then becomes Biblical Archaeology, and which then becomes SDA teachings. Or as one or more lectures on the evidence for the resurrection, presented around Easter time (which they do not actually believe in keeping), which then becomes a series of lectures or Bible studies, which over time then becomes SDA teaching. Or as a “video on health” given out by a SDA work-mate, and in the first instance not dealing with unique SDA matters. Or SDA colporteurs working under a name such as, “Home Health Education Service,” *infra* (although this may involve the sale of some children’s and teenager’s books, especially at the hands of College students, which it must be admitted are not specifically SDA in content). In this context, a name like “San,” which sounds like a Saint’s name, but which if asked to justify is said to simply be an abbreviation of “Sanatorium,” a “Christian hospital,” is the type of more subtle approach that SDAs are past masters of.

movement in the 1970s and 1980s for nursing to become tertiary institution based, rather than hospital based. As part of this, the old hospital nurse training facilities at the San, which included e.g., a number of established lecture theatres, were made into a new Department of Avondale College. At a practical level, the change was in many ways cosmetic. Nevertheless, it meant that Avondale College had expanded to include a Department of Nursing at a Sydney campus of the College located at the San, and Avondale College Diplomas were issued to nursing graduates. I remember the College Principal, Dr. Magnusson, speaking with enthusiasm in a midweek Chapel service about this expansion of Avondale College which was to start in 1980. This expansion was thus a win-win situation for both the hospital wanting nurses to have a tertiary qualification, and Avondale College wanting to expand (with an extra two or three dozen nursing students per annum).

But on another level, Avondale College was “an American College.” It must be remembered that the SDA Church is derived from the USA. It is an American spun, an American sponsored, and in the final analysis, an American administered, religion. E.g., at one stage when I was at College, it was visited by Pastor George Vandeman (d. 2000, aged 84). At the time, George Vandeman was the host of a weekly half-hour SDA American television broadcast he had started in 1956 called, “It Is Written.” Its claim to fame was that it was the first religious broadcast on TV in colour. It was being aired on American television, and in those days also on Australian TV. Though I watched little TV, I sometimes watched his programme. I recall Pastor Vandeman saying in one programme that he went looking for “truth” in the telephone book’s yellow / pink pages, and found no entry for it under the letter “T.” Both then and now, I found his quest for “truth” an honourable one. *Quid est veritas?*²⁰

I saw Pastor Vandeman walking through the College Chapel & Hall (where we also had the midweek Chapel Services, *supra*), when I was sitting there in one of Pastor Williams’ classes. We were in the Chapel because its pulpit was sometimes used by us; and in classes we were working through a book on evangelism entitled, *What’s Gone Wrong With the Harvest?*²¹ Under normal circumstances I would have said something to Pastor Vandeman. (Personally, I thought he should have been invited to briefly say something to the class.) But we College students were under strict instructions. Pastor Williams had said that *we were not to approach or talk to Pastor Vandeman under any circumstances*, because the idea was that he was to walk around and see how the College operated *as though he was not there*. Notwithstanding these restrictions, the visit of this prominent American SDA evangelist to Avondale College, highlights and reminds us of the fact that Seventh-day Adventism originated in, and maintains its core heartlands in, the United States of America.

²⁰ The Latin Vulgate words of Pilate to Jesus, “What is truth?” (John 18:38).

²¹ Engel, J.F. & Norton, H.W., *What’s Gone Wrong With the Harvest?* Zondervan, Michigan, USA, 1975, reprint 1977. This was a non-examinable component on evangelism, connected with externship for Theology students (from memory, I think it was part of the subject Theology I for Theology students but not Education students in the class).

Avondale College was established in 1897 (under a succession of different names), with Bethel Hall being built for both classroom teaching and student accommodation in 1897, and other parts of the College built later. The present name, “Avondale College,” was not adopted till 1964, and Avondale College simply continued the prior established practice of granting degrees (as opposed to certificates and diplomas, *supra*) as an affiliate of the SDA’s *Pacific Union College*, at Angwin (near San Francisco), in California, USA. On the one hand, Avondale College had an Australian structural administrative autonomy from Pacific Union College (PUC); but on the other hand, degrees issued bore the exclusive name of PUC on the testamur. Thus e.g., a Bachelor of Arts graduate would be called a “B.A. (Pacific Union College)” or “B.A. (P.U.C.),” *not* a “B.A. (Avondale College).”

As further discussed with respect to Dr. Des Ford and Pastor Balharrie, *infra*, as a consequence of this affiliation, college teacher exchanges occurred between *Pacific Union College* in America and *Avondale College* in Australia. Thus there is sense in which Pacific Union College stretched from New South Wales on east coast Australia, to California on west coast America. It must be stressed that this confederal association between Avondale College and Pacific Union College was an entirely voluntary arrangement. Avondale College could, if it had wanted to, cut ties with P.U.C. and issued its own degrees. I recall the College Principal, Dr. Magnusson, in a midweek Chapel service referring to some who wanted the link with P.U.C. cut, and then defending his view that the link with P.U.C. was a desirable thing. Amidst some disagreements as to Avondale College’s future with respect to whether or not it should be a campus of P.U.C., or an autonomous College, the annual 1979 *Jacaranda* made reference to the fact that, “By 1954 bachelor degree programmes were available ... through affiliation with Pacific Union College in California²².” (In the end, Avondale College remained an affiliate of PUC till 1990, but since that time has been an autonomous College²³.)

I attended Avondale College from 1978 to 1980 at the ages of 18 to 20, leaving both it and the SDA Church in the early part of 1980. The fees were about \$4,000 to \$5,000 per annum, which was a generous reduction, since the SDA Church paid a pro-rata proportion of College fees, from memory, about a dollar for a dollar, i.e., if my memory serves me correctly (and I am not entirely certain about it), reducing the fees from an original *prima facie* \$8,000-\$10,000 per annum. The fees for my first College year in 1978, and my second College year in 1979, were gotten through vacation employment in the preceding end of year and beginning of year holidays before each academic year, working as a colporteur for the SDA’s *Home Health Education Service*. This also included a kindly bonus payment on sales of books by College students that I

²² *Jacaranda* 1979, p. 2.

²³ Hook, M., *Avondale: Experiment on the Dora [Creek]*, Avondale Academic Press, Cooranbong, NSW, Australia, 1998 (Copy held at Avondale College Library), p. 315.

benefited from, and by the grace of God, I was able to get the fees paid before going to College in 1978 and 1979 by colporteur.

I was the *Home Health Education Service's* top-selling student colporteur, and was accordingly featured in one of their promotional brochure-flyers²⁴. (I undertook different vacation employment in the end of year 1979 and beginning of year 1980 holidays, this time being the top door-to-door salesman of a fruit-juice company's sales promotion which only went to Christmas 1979; thereafter pursuing other vacation door-to-door vacation employment at the beginning of 1980.) The books I sold door-to-door for the *Home Health Education Service* were not specifically focused on the Seventh-day Adventist's unique or near unique teachings²⁵. Looking back at their sale after more than a quarter of a century, I still regard them as worthwhile books for children or teenagers to have, and I still think God blessed me in my work as a student colporteur during this time. (I think a good God may sometimes deal with us where we are at a given point in time, which is not necessarily where by his grace we must ultimately get to.)

I also received about the same amount of money again per annum from my parents. I thus went through College on a combination of my parent's generosity and my vacation employment labours.

Avondale College is located on the same grounds as the SDA's *Sanitarium Health Food Company*. Among other things, this company makes the well-known, "Weet-Bix," and the smell of such wheat is often found in the close vicinity of the factory. The *Sanitarium* factory provided optional work for College students. Though most College students, including myself, did not ever work there; nevertheless, there were a number of other students who helped work their way through College by part-time employment at this factory.

²⁴ An eight page recruitment or promotional flyer entitled, "The Literature Evangelist," Signs Print, Victoria [undated, c. 1978/9], the front cover contains a picture of Pastor Campbell and two others, the back-cover contains "A message from Pastor K.J. Bullock, President, Greater Sydney Conference," on "Colporteur Ministry." Page 7 shows photos of five Colporteurs, including myself, next to which is a statement with my name in which I say: "The Literature Ministry is an institution ... through which the saving message of the love of God is shed into the minds of people who otherwise may not have learned of 'His precious and very great promises'" (II Peter 1:4, RSV). After this is a box with a stick-figure man with an arrow pointing to it and saying, "This is where you fit!" i.e., this flyer was used for both promotional and recruitment purposes.

²⁵ A small five-pack of *Uncle Arthur's Bedtime Stories*; A Tiny Tots three-pack (Charles L. Paddock's *Bible ABC's*, 1955, *Boys & Girls of the Bible*, 1962; & *Bible Firsts*, 1956 & 1963); together with *Everything A Teenage Boy Should Know* (1975) and *Everything a Teenage Girl Should Know* (1975) by Dr. Wright (the media name known by a number of customers for John F. Knight). (The books sold came from the SDA's Signs Publishing Company, Warburton, Victoria.)

Although I recall e.g., a single male theology student who was unusual in that he was a day student who lived with his parents at Cooranbong, in general, the single College students were boarders in the sex segregated residential halls. However, there was also accommodation in married flats which were located a long way off from the boarders and main College campus, up near the College entrance, and about one-fifth of the students were married. If a single boy and girl at College got engaged to each other, or got engaged to someone outside of College, they were not allowed to announce it at College till the end of year, and if it was not their final year, they could then move to the married flats the following year. For the slightly more than two years I was at College, I was a boarder in Watson Hall. College rules required chumming for boarders in the first year i.e., sharing a room with another boarder (a small number of rooms had more than one chum). Over the course of four years, one could then apply to get a room without a chum i.e., a room to oneself, although one was not *usually* successful in such an application till the third or fourth year.

The residential Halls were sex segregated, with a Dean of Men and a Dean of Women in charge of the different Halls. There was one male hall, and a number of female halls. Women students were prohibited from entering Men's rooms or going in the upper corridors of the men's hall, and *vice versa*. Persons of the opposite sex could only enter the foyer of the other's hall, to have someone called for. However, there was an open public lounge off the foyer in Watson Hall where a male student could bring a female student. *With these rules I am in hearty agreement.* We were rightly taught in a mid-week Chapel service I recall, to "*Abstain from*" even the "*appearance of evil*" (II Thess. 5:22).

On one occasion, some boys, including myself, were asked to carry some furniture out of Preston Hall (one of the girls' halls). The girls had been forewarned of our coming, and the Dean of Women, Mrs. Fox, was moving around to make sure nothing untoward happened. I was friends with a couple of girls (school teaching students, one primary and one secondary,) whose door was open, and they greeted me as I was carrying a bed out the back door in the rear section of the Hall. Thus I got a quick look at their room which they shared. (By College standards, a most unusual event for a boy.) But they then urged me to move on, because they were worried Mrs. Fox would come, and we'd all be in serious trouble. There was also a large lounge room in the front of Preston Hall, where I once went with a number of other College students in order to give blood to the Red Cross²⁶.

²⁶ The rear section of Preston Hall (that I had carried furniture out of) was the original section, built in 1897, to which the front section (where I had given blood), was added in 1903. Preston Hall was the second oldest residential Hall, but after I left College it was demolished. For many years the College sold small pieces of wood cut from the timber of Preston Hall (about 5 inches by 4 inches or 13 centimeters by 10 centimeters), with a photograph of Preston Hall glued on the front. I learnt of, and acquired one of these mementos, which I have retained as a memento of my old College days at Avondale.

During my first year at Avondale in 1978, the euphoria of being at College was such, that I simply accepted the status quo of having a chum. But by the time I got into my second year, the idea of chummary was starting to wear a bit thin. But I was *very fortunate* in that while my second year in Watson Hall started with a chum in the room, he moved out fairly soon to be with a friend of his in another room. Since the general room allocations for that year had already been done, and no-one else was in need of my room, *unusually for a second year student*, after some um-ing and ah-ing, the Dean of Watson Hall, Pastor Croft, accepted my application to have my own room i.e., I just stayed in the same room but without a chum. *I was very happy about it.* I was very pleased to e.g., be able to study Greek, or just relax, in the privacy of my own room. Since the rule was that having gotten one's own room, one could keep it, and there was an emphasis put on helping third or fourth year students who wanted their own room to get one, the Dean then agreed that going into my third year in 1980, I could just keep the room I had been in by myself for most of 1979.

On the one hand, there are some military contexts I have been in where this type of thing is done. E.g., some years later, when I was on tactical operations with *Sydney University Regiment*, we would sleep in pairs with a nearby "buddy;" and when on non-tactical operations, we would sleep in barracks with far more than two in the hut. But on the other hand, I do not think this is a model generally appropriate in a civilian context.

As one who lived in chummary with one chum in my first College year, and another chum at the beginning of my second College year, and who has known many at College who were also chumming, I personally regard the practice of males having a compulsory chum as a very bad practice indeed. I think it is bad for study, e.g., one's chum chatting with friends in the room while one is *trying to study*; a reasonable level of privacy e.g., one's mouth cannot so much as burp without it being known; and general rest and quietness, e.g., lights staying on at night when one is *trying to sleep* in bed, but one's chum is awake, and then being in the invidious situation of awakening one's chum as one puts on the lights in the morning while one's chum is *still asleep in his bed*. For some, having a chum can be an absolute nightmare! E.g., one might be a relatively tidy person, and keep one's side of the room neat and tidy, but the chum's side of the room may not be as tidy. Or one chum may be a relatively light sleeper, and his chum may snore, thus frequently awakening him at night.

Things are not always chummy with one's chum. Tension between chums is at its ugliest worst when the two chums do not particularly like each other. In such circumstances, one's room can become *a hell on earth*. While some of the male students liked chummary, a number of them did not, but *endured* rather than *enjoyed* it, as a part College life. Even in marriage, many men e.g., have their own study, or go fishing, or do something else to get some required solitude. I think adequate rooms should always be built at a College with boarders, to ensure that if anyone does live with one or more chums, they do so from genuine choice, not compulsion. From what I can tell, if given the choice, far more male than female College students would have chosen not to have had a chum in their room, i.e., a greater number of the female College students seemed to

like this type of thing²⁷.

Although the B.A. I undertook at College was with a major in Theology (at that time being a ministerial student), for the first two years of this four year Arts degree, the degree was more general, and included a mix of theology subjects and more general liberal arts subjects e.g., *Psychology I*, with Mr. Hughes of the Education Department in 1978. Since I left the college in the early part of my third year in 1980, most of the subjects I undertook (English, Psychology, History, NT Greek, and Human Biology) would be very similar to what one could find at other non-SDA colleges, (although the subject Human Biology was, for its many defects, not specifically atheistic as in secular colleges,) and the more specific subjects such as, *New Testament I*, which involved going through a “harmony” of the Gospels with Pastor Balharrie, or the subject *Theology I* with Pastor Tolhurst, which was a broad general course with relatively little specifically SDA theology in it, were not very different to what one might find at a Christian liberal arts college or religiously conservative theological college elsewhere. The only two subjects I undertook in the first two years with a strong emphasis on SDA theology was an externship with an SDA Pastor, which was part of a non-examinable component on evangelism with Pastor Williams for Theology students in 1978/9; and *Biblical Apocalyptic* in 1979, in which Pastor Tolhurst argued for the classic SDA pseudo-historicist view. However, my tutorials for *Biblical Apocalyptic* were with Dr. Young, who rejected this traditional SDA view, and made reference to the Multi-Fulfilments School (followed by Dr. Ford), while Dr. Young himself endorsed the Preterist School, *infra*.

Avondale College was a mix of religiously conservative college teachers and religiously liberal college teachers. On the one hand, one could hear a religiously conservative college teacher like Pastor Tolhurst of the Theology Department, arguing for a sixth century B.C. dating of the OT Book of Daniel, creation not macroevolution, and speaking in favour of using the Authorized King James Version. But on the other hand, one could hear a religiously liberal college teacher like Dr. Young of the Theology Department, arguing for a second century B.C. dating of Daniel and a preterist interpretation applying it primarily to Antiochus Epiphanes in the 160s B.C. (although official SDA teaching is for a sixth century B.C. dating and a pseudo-historicist interpretation per Pastor Tolhurst’s view).

²⁷ (In conjunction with, and moderated by, a discretion of the Dean of Men and Dean of Women, a points system was operative for room allocations, largely based on years at College, but in Watson Hall with a bias favouring Theology students. Extra points were also given for a small number of voluntary positions e.g., fire wardens.) E.g., while many male students were trying to get a room of their own, some girls I knew were more interested in getting into either Preston Hall (the second oldest residential Hall, whose oldest section dated from 1897,) or Bethel Hall (the oldest Hall, built in 1897, but very small and not holding very many). The girls did not seem unhappy about sharing a room, indeed some girls were happy to have an increased number in their room *if that meant getting into Bethel Hall*.

One could also hear the religiously liberal college teacher, Dr. Hosken, the Chairman of the Science Department, say that there was no evidence for creation as opposed to macroevolution, with the exception of the fact that the very smallest creatures at the beginning of any ‘evolutionary trek’ were quite complex and so appear to have been created. This position was not discernibly different to the statements of Charles Darwin in *Origin of Species* (1859), where he claims in his closing pages that “the Creator” “originally breathed into a few forms or into one,” and then from this form or forms, life “evolved” “due to secondary causes” from “the laws impressed on matter by the Creator.” I discussed these matters in greater detail with Dr. Hosken outside of the subject, *Human Biology*, which he taught in my second year at College. Though he said he was non-committal on issues of creation or macroevolution (although official SDA teaching is young earth creationist²⁸), he certainly regarded Darwinian macroevolutionary theory, or any theistic macroevolutionary theory, as perfectly reasonable positions to hold to. He discussed with me in greater detail issues of mutation theory. When I asked him how this could be reconciled with the Bible, he said that such reconciliation had already been made, and for these purposes he recommended that I read the works of the Roman Catholic theistic macroevolutionist, Pierre (Peter) de Chardin (1881-1955). (In time, I came to adopt an erroneous theory of theistic macroevolution, *infra*.)

Unlike religious conservatives such as Pastor Tolhurst, religious liberals also strongly promoted the Revised Standard Version (RSV) of the Bible. E.g., it was promoted in the subject, *English I*, that I undertook with Dr. Cox of the Humanities Department, in 1978. It was promoted by Dr. Young of the Theology Department in various subjects e.g., *Biblical Apocalyptic*, which I undertook in 1979. It was promoted by Dr. Clapham, the Chairman of the Humanities Department, with whom I undertook various *History* subjects in 1978 and 1979. In general, Dr. Clapham was a religious conservative, and sometimes respectfully called, “the old white stallion” of College (he was a white Caucasian with white hair). However, he sadly held some religiously liberal views on the RSV. E.g., I remember Dr. Clapham saying in a mid-week Chapel service that the RSV was “the most accurate” translation.

I also studied Greek with the religiously liberal Dr. Young. We used Whittaker’s *New Testament Greek Grammar* (1975). On the down side, like Dr. Young, this text endorsed the errors of the neo-Alexandrian text. It used examples of English translation from the Revised Version (1881-5), Revised Standard Version (1946 & 1971), and New English Bible (1961-70)²⁹. In classes we generally used the RSV to consider English

²⁸ As documented by the most prominent contemporary Seventh-day Adventist historian, Ronald Numbers (a former SDA) in *The Creationists* (California University, USA, 1992), SDA “prophetess” Ellen White’s “visions” gave rise to SDA George McCready Price’s young earth creationist “flood geology,” (*Ibid.*, pp. 73-81), which in turn gave rise to Whitcomb & Morris’s “creation science” (*Id.*, pp. 184-213; 241-3).

²⁹ Whittaker, M., *New Testament Greek Grammar*, SCM, UK, 1969, 1975, pp. 27 (neo-Alexandrian text, RV, RSV, NEB), 34 (RV & NEB), 37 (RV & NEB), 86 (RV), 98 (RV & NEB), 141 (RV & NEB), 142 (RV & NEB), 144 (RV), 146 (NEB), 150 (RV & NEB).

translations of the Greek. Like all tertiary students studying NT Greek at that time, we all received a free copy from the United Bible Societies of their neo-Alexandrian UBS *Greek New Testament*, 3rd edition (1975).

But on the up side, it must be said that the basics of Greek that we studied would not have been qualitative different in any major way even if we had used the Greek *Textus Receptus* and the AV. Moreover, even though defective, our text had the sterling advantage of making some contrasts and comparisons with the Latin³⁰. Though the classes were in Greek not Latin, some related Latin issues were sometimes raised by fellow student, Mike Brownhill in class, and sometimes discussed outside of class as well. E.g., when discussing the usage of the Greek, *kata*, our text made reference to among other things, the usage of *kath' olen* in Luke 8:39³¹. I remember what great excitement I experienced, when in conjunction with a discussion with Mike Brownhill, we realized that the Greek *kath / kata* (through / throughout) and *oles / olen* (all, *olos*.) meaning “throughout the whole” (Luke 8:39) indicated that from *kata* (*kat' / kath*) and *olos* (*holos*) must come the Latin and English, “Catholic,” which must mean something like, “throughout all” i.e., “universal.” Though further study later indicated we had jumped over some steps of etymology in reaching this conclusion, nevertheless, in broad terms this was a correct deduction³².

³⁰ *Ibid.*, e.g., p. 12 (2nd declension nouns Greek & Latin comparison), 37 (comparison of Greek instrument by the dative and Latin ablative), 69 (comparison of the Greek genitive absolute and Latin ablative), 74 (Greek *tis* and Latin *quidam*) *et al.*

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 124.

³² Via the French word, “*catholique*,” the English word “catholic” comes from the Greek *katholikos*, meaning “universal.” Its meaning as “general,” is found in the AV’s stylized designation of the NT Epistles of James, I & II Peter, I John, and Jude, as “General (Greek *Katholike*; Latin *Catholica*)” Epistles. Although all of Scripture is for all Christians, these epistles were “catholic” or “general” in that they were not addressed to a specific church at a given location (although in the first instance, James 1:1 and I Peter 1:1 addresses Jewish Christians of the Dispersion, though no specific locations are itemized). The Greek *katholikos* (universal / general) comes from *katholou*; which in turn comes from *kata* (*kat' / kath*) and *olos* (*holos*). The combination of *kath* (i.e., *kata*, through / throughout) and *oles / olen* (i.e., *olos*, all) is Lucan terminology. It is found in Luke 4:13 (“throughout all”); 8:39 (“throughout the whole”); 23:5 (“throughout all”); Acts 13:49 (“throughout all”). In Acts 4:18 “at all” is Greek *katholou*, where the Jewish Council “commanded” the apostles “not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus.” But because “We ought to obey God rather than men” (Acts 5:29), the apostolic preaching went forth, with its racially catholic or universal message. Then in Acts 9:31 we read of “the churches” “throughout (*kath*) all (*oles*) Judea and Galilee and Samaria” i.e., the *kath* (*kata*)-*ol* (*olos*)-*ic* (English suffix derived from the French) / *catholic* churches created from the command of Acts 1:8, to be “witnesses” “in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria.” The fact that the one spiritual “church” of Christ (Eph. 5:31,32; n.b., if there was not one spiritual or invisible church, then the imagery of Eph. 5:23-33 would have to be polygamous i.e., with Christ married to many churches, not *one*

Mike was a mate of mine, and we had a number of discussions. He was a convert from Roman Catholicism and had studied Latin at school. I remember how on one occasion while we were waiting for Dr. Clapham to arrive in a History tutorial, Mike threw a newspaper in front of me that told of a woman who had self-emulated herself in Germany. ‘That’s my old girlfriend that I’ve told you about,’ he said. He was disturbed by her suicide, and considered that if he had not become an SDA, he might have ended up where she was, prematurely dead. He had better luck with another woman. We drove down to Sydney on one occasion and visited his girlfriend, a white South African nurse at the San. She spoke in favour of racial segregation as “natural,” and I thought she was a good type. When they later married, I attended their wedding up in north-eastern New South Wales.

Thus the good (religious conservatism and those elements of SDA theology that are orthodox), the bad (some elements of SDA theology), and the ugly (religious liberalism, and some elements of SDA theology), were all intertwined in a curious patchwork quilt at Avondale College. In this broad context, to my shame, over time I was enticed into a number of the types of religiously liberal errors being promulgated by some College teachers, *supra*.

But man is sometimes inconsistent. And while on the one hand I ultimately fell prey to these kind of religiously liberal errors; on the other hand, I was working through a number of issues of religiously conservative Protestant orthodoxy on the meaning of the threefold Reformation Motto, “*sola fide, sola gratia, sola Scriptura*” (Latin, “faith alone, grace alone, Scripture alone”)³³. These studies led me to reject the unique and near unique teachings of Seventh-day Adventism during my second and third years at College in 1979 and early 1980. But this was a gradual process, as I slowly worked over a number of issues during a period of about 12 to 18 months. While the SDA cult seeks converts from any source, nevertheless, historically, it was set up in such a way as to make a special appeal to those with a background knowledge of Protestantism, but an inadequate or fuzzy understanding of the greater details of Protestant Christianity. As a 15 year old school boy cut off from my Evangelical Anglican contacts for over two years, this type of approach appealed to me. But as a 19 and 20 year old young college man, the unique and near unique teachings of Seventh-day Adventism no longer seemed credible to me.

“wife” or *one* “church”), in its local manifestation as “churches,” was now *kath-ol-ic / catholic* “throughout (*kath*) all (*oles*) Judea and Galilee and Samaria” (Acts 9:31), means it was racially and geographically *kath-ol-ic* “throughout (*kath*) all (*oles*)” the races and places in these regions, i.e., a *catholic* church whose gospel was open to all persons. Therefore, the word “catholic” in e.g., Article 10 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, “the holy catholic church,” means “the holy universal church.”

³³ See Commentary Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, “*Robinson & Pierpont’s (1991) new edition Byzantine Textform (2005),” paragraphs commencing, “Men are sometimes inconsistent in what they believe,” on Luther and von Soden.

At that time, the Seventh-day Adventist Church in Australia was experiencing what the Evangelical Anglican clergyman from the Evangelical *Diocese of Sydney*, Geoffrey Paxton, fairly and poignantly referred to in the title of his book, as *The Shaking of Adventism* (1977)³⁴. This movement sprang from the teachings of Dr. Desmond (Des) Ford, Chairman of the Theology Department, Avondale College. I never met Dr. Ford. He had left on a teacher-exchange programme between Avondale College and Pacific Union College before I arrived at College, and PUC had sent over Pastor Balharrie as part of the two-way exchange over several years. In broad terms, the issue revolved around the SDA's unique teaching of "an investigative judgment." This rests upon a far-fetched and fanciful interpretation of Dan. 8:14, in which it is said that the 2,300 days are 2,300 years terminating in 1844. At this time, it is said that Christ entered the heavenly Most Holy Place to "blot out sins," which are distinguished from any earlier "forgiveness of sins." The SDA Church is said to have been raised up in order to tell people about this, together with other things such as keeping the Jewish Sabbath (Saturday), and embracing ascetic dietary laws resulting in e.g., vegetarianism and alcohol prohibitionism. The great "authority" for these bizarre and unBiblical claims is Ellen White, who is said to be a modern "prophetess" who speaks with a prophet's authority³⁵.

Ford realized that the core teachings of the Reformation, *faith alone, grace alone, Scripture alone*, must strike down and render ineffective the SDA doctrine of "an investigative judgement," and claims of its accuracy by Ellen White.

My studies had led me to conclude that Dan. 8 is focused on the desecration of the Jewish temple under Antiochus Epiphanes, and the 2,300 days refers to a period of about 6 years ending when in 164 B.C., the Jews "cleansed the sanctuary" (I Macc. 4:41,43, Apocrypha) in fulfilment of the prophecy, "unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed" (Dan. 8:14). This is the general view taken of Dan. 8 by preterists, futurists, and most historicists alike. Though at the time I drew this conclusion of Dan. 8 as a preterist, (at the time also influenced by the fact that the OT translation of the RSV is preterist,) and I have since, by the grace of God come to adopt the Protestant historicist position, my views on this passage in Dan. 8 have not fundamentally changed with respect to the human fulfilment of this prophecy since that time. However, I would now consider that while the human features of this prophecy in Daniel chapter 8 fit Antiochus Epiphanes, I now also consider the spiritual features used to describe him and his warfare go well beyond him to Satan himself, and thus the great spiritual warfare between God and the Devil. I.e., I think Dan. 8:10,11,25, requires the conclusion that Antiochus Epiphanes was devil-possessed by Lucifer, just as was the king of Babylon in Isa. 14:13-15, or the king of Tyre in Ezek. 28:11-17.

³⁴ Paxton, G.J., *The Shaking of Adventism*, Zenith Publishers, Delaware, USA, 1977 (Library of Congress Card no 77-88139; ISBN 0-930802-01-2).

³⁵ See Hoekema's *The Four Major Cults*, *op. cit.*, e.g., pp. 96-98,100-108 (Ellen White), 144-160 (investigative judgement), 161-169 (Jewish Sabbath).

With respect to the broad teaching of Christ's entering the heavenly Most Holy Place, it is clear from the Book of Hebrews that the prophetic types of Lev. 16 with "the blood" "of goats" (Heb. 9:13), were fulfilled by Christ as part of his atoning sacrifice at Calvary. Thus we have access "into the holiest by the blood of Jesus" (Heb. 10:19). Christ's entry into "the holiest" (Heb. 10:19) or Most Holy Place, only occurred "once" (Heb. 9:28), "through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Heb. 10:10) and so there can be no later repeat of this. "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:14). When he said the words, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit" (Luke 23:46), he went into the presence of God the Father, and this entry into the Most Holy Place in heaven was symbolized on earth by the fact that "the vail of the temple was rent in the midst" (Luke 23:45). Hence he could say to the repentant thief on the cross, "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke 23:43).

"The Lord reigneth ... he sitteth between the cherubims" (Ps. 99:1). God's throne room in heaven is depicted by the ark of the covenant with its cherubims on earth. (Heb. 9:5,9). To claim that Christ for some 1800 years dawdled at the door of the heavenly Most Holy Place, before entering in, is among other things, to deny that the ascended Christ has been "standing on the right hand of God" (Acts 7:55) i.e., as man's mediator. It is a denial of Article 6, "he ascended into heaven," combined with Article 7, "and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty," in the *Apostles' Creed*. While the SDA Church would dispute this, and claim that they do not deny that Christ ascended into heaven to sit on God's right hand, and to some extent they do not, the reality is, that by denying that when he went to the Father at his death, and also upon his ascension, Christ "sitteth between the cherubims" (Ps. 99:1), they do in fact deny the fuller meaning of Articles 6 & 7 of the Creed. Thus they *partially deny* Articles 6 & 7 of the *Apostles' Creed*.

In the beautiful imagery of Leviticus, on the day of a leper's cleansing he would take "two birds" to "the priest." One would be killed, symbolizing that Christ's death takes away our sins, and one would be dipped in the blood and "let" "loose into the open field" (Lev. 14:4-7), symbolizing that Christ takes our sins far from us. Similar imagery is found in Lev. 16 with regard to the two goats. I.e., the priest was to take "two goats" (Lev. 16:8), and "kill" one "goat of the sin offering" (Lev. 16:15), symbolizing that Christ's death takes away our sins. Then he was to "lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities," "putting them upon the head of the goat," and then "send him away" "into the wilderness" (Lev. 16:21), symbolizing that Christ takes our sins far from us. Two animals were thus used to symbolize two different elements of the meaning of Christ's death for our sins.

For as typed by the first Day of Atonement goat, God says, "I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins" (Isa. 43:25; cf. 44:22); and as typed by the second Day of Atonement goat, "as far as the east is from the west, so far hath he [the Lord] removed our transgression from us" (Ps. 103:12). Thus the SDA claim that there is some kind of difference between "forgiveness of sins" which occurred before 1844, and "blotting out of sins" that occurred only after 1844, is not theologically sustainable. When St. Peter says, "Repent ... for the remission

of sins” (Acts 2:38), the meaning is the same as when he says, “Repent ... that your sins may be blotted out” (Acts 3:19). Both of these statements were made in Jerusalem (Acts 2:5,14; 3:1), and contextually manifest the promise of Jesus in Luke 24:47, “that repentance and *remission of sins* should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.”

To have forgiveness of sins is the same thing as to have one’s sins blotted out. Otherwise, there would be no propriety in King David referring to “the burnt offering and whole burnt offering,” when “they offer bullocks upon thine altar” (Ps. 51:19). For Moses says, “And he shall do with the bullock as he did with the bullock for a sin offering, so shall he do with this: and the priest shall make an atonement for them, and *it shall be forgiven them*” (Lev. 4:20). Now these sacrifices typed the atonement of Christ. For it was not “by the blood of goats *and calves*, but by his own blood” that Christ “entered in once into the holy place, having obtained redemption for us.” For “*the blood of bulls and of goats*” was not enough, but pointed to “the blood of Christ” (Heb. 9:12-14). Why? For “without shedding of blood” there “*is no remission*” (Heb. 9:22). Now if on the one hand, to “be forgiven” (Lev. 4:20) or to have “remission” of sins (Heb. 9:22) is found in “the blood of Christ” as typed by “the blood of bulls” (Heb. 9:13,14), and if on the other hand King David refers to the “burnt offering” of “bullocks” (Ps. 51:19), petitioning “God,” and praying, “*blot out my transgressions. Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin,*” (Ps. 51:1,2), “Hide thy face from my sins, and *blot out all mine iniquities*” (Ps. 51:9); then we cannot doubt that to have *remission* of one’s sins (Heb. 9:22), or to have them *forgiven* (Lev. 4:20), is synonymous with when God doth *blot out our sins* (Ps. 51:1,9).

If Seventh-day Adventist theology is correct here, then the Bible lied. E.g., at Heb. 1:3, we would have to add “partially” before “purged” in the infallible words of Scripture, which say that “when he had by himself *purged our sins,*” Christ “sat down in the right hand of the Majesty on high.” But the Word of God is verbally inspired (Exod. 4:12,15; Jer. 1:7; II Tim. 3:16), and it is “impossible for God to lie” (Heb. 6:18). Thus when we read that “by the shedding of” the “blood” of “Christ,” we were “purged” of our sins and given “remission” (Heb. 9:22-24), “nor yet that he should offer himself often,” “but” just “once” “to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself” (Heb. 9:25,26); then we can be confident that this is correct. For “when he had by himself *purged our sins,*” Christ “sat down in the right hand of the Majesty on high” (Heb. 1:3).

The failure of SDA theology to recognize that the *forgiveness of sins* is synonymous with *the blotting out of sins*, puts them in a quandary as to what to do with the typology of the second Day of Atonement goat which represented the fact that *Christ takes our sins far from us*, “as far as the east is from the west” (Ps. 103:12). (This matter touches on another element of SDA theology that I shall not now discuss in detail³⁶.)

³⁶ SDA’s claim the state of man after death is one that is usually called “soul sleep” (although SDAs deny a man has a spirit / soul, Matt. 10:28) i.e., a state of sleep until the Second Advent. This is contrary to clear Biblical teaching (e.g., Matt. 22:32; John 11:23-26; Philp. 1:20-24; Heb. 12:23; Rev. 6:9-11). This means that they think when Christ died, he too was “asleep” in the grave till the third day. Thus they fail to

The SDA solution is as novel as it is blasphemous. Like other elements of the SDA doctrine of “an investigative judgement,” it is a point of great alarm to those of the holy Protestant faith.

It is said that the second goat, also known as the “Azazel” goat (Lev. 16:26, ASV), represents Satan. Thus the SDA “prophetess,” Ellen White, says, “Important truths concerning the atonement are taught by the typical service” “on the great Day of Atonement.” “On the Day of Atonement the high priest, having taken an offering ... went into the most holy place with the blood of this offering, and sprinkled it upon the mercy seat, directly over the law, to make satisfaction for its claims. Then, in his character of mediator, *he took the sins upon himself and bore them from the sanctuary. Placing his hands upon the head of the scapegoat, he confessed over him all these sins, thus in figure transferring them from himself to the goat.* The goat then bore them away, and they were regarded as forever separated from the people” (*Great Controversy*, chapter 23). Thus “the scapegoat was presented alive before the Lord: and in the presence of all the congregation the high priest confessed over him ‘all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgression in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat.’ Leviticus 16:21. In like manner ...the sins of God’s people will be placed upon Satan; he will declare guilty of all the evil which he has caused them to commit. And as the scapegoat was sent away into a land not inhabited, so Satan will be banished ...” (*Great Controversy*, chapter 41)³⁷.

I.e., the Day of Atonement ceremonies in which “the scapegoat, shall be presented alive before the Lord, to make an atonement” (Lev. 16:10), are not regarded as having been fulfilled in Christ’s atonement when he uttered the words, “It is finished” (John 19:30). Rather, the complete “atonement” (Lev. 16:10), is not finished till “all the iniquities” “and all” the “transgression in all” “sins,” are put “upon the head of the goat” (Lev. 16:21), meaning in Seventh-day Adventism, Satan. Thus this end-time goat sacrifice, in which Satan is said to *bear final responsibility* for man’s sin, must first occur *after the Second Advent*. Only then is the “atonement” (Lev. 16:10,33,34) complete. Thus on this SDA view, thousands of years after Christ died on Calvary, we still have only an *almost* complete or *almost* finished “atonement” (Lev. 16:10), since we are still waiting on the “goat” sacrifice (Lev. 16:21) of the Devil, to “bear upon him all” “iniquities” (Lev. 16:22) after Christ’s return, before we can say that a complete “atonement” (Lev. 16:10,33,34) has been made.

understand Luke 23:43-46, i.e., that when Christ said, “Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,” that he went into “Paradise” i.e., the presence of God the Father, and at this time “the vail of the temple was rent in the midst,” signifying he went into the Most Holy Place (Heb. 9:8,27,28; 10:19,20). Thus their teaching of soul sleep causes them to fundamentally misunderstand that Christ entered the Most Holy Place and fulfilled the Day of Atonement imagery at his death.

³⁷ White, E.G., *The Great Controversy*, 1881, 1911, Pacific Press, California, USA, chapters 23 (emphasis mine) & 41.

This type of usage of a goat to represent Satan, is found in a number of pagan or Satanic religious systems. E.g., in modern forms of satanic rock, the group, *The Rolling Stones*, whose songs include the Satanist's anthem, "Sympathy for the Devil," produced an album recorded at a Haitian voodoo ritual, entitled, *Goat's Head Soup*. One of the songs is entitled, "Dancing with Mr. D." i.e., the Devil. *The Rolling Stones* evidently used the symbol of the goat in the name of this album, because it is a heathen symbol of Satan³⁸. Or in modern Masonic rituals, the ancient pagan horned god, Pan, is called the he-goat of the Sabbat (Sabbath), and the brother of the serpent, and Light-bearer. Or the hermaphroditic goat of Mendes³⁹. Pan is an ancient pagan Greek goat god, sometimes identified with the pagan Roman god, Faunus, who had a shrine on the Palatine Hill, one of the seven hills of Rome (Rev. 17:9). This link with Rome is of some interest, for Rome is "the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit" (Rev. 18:2).

Thus this usage of a goat to represent Satan, and then anachronistically apply this idea into Scripture with Satan representing the "Azazel" (ASV) goat of Lev. 16, points us to demonic powers and concepts. "O foolish Galatians, *who hath bewitched you*, that ye should not obey the truth" (Gal. 3:1). This should not surprise us, since "the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils" (I Tim. 4:1), and we cannot doubt that Ellen White was such a person. This type of syncretism between paganism and revealed religion also has an ancient precedent from inter-testamental times, for in the pseudepigrapha Book of Enoch (chapters 8 & 13), "Azazel" is depicted as a great devil⁴⁰. This is the type of syncretism that one finds in Roman Catholicism, although not specifically with regard to the "Azazel" goat (ASV). E.g., Romanism adopts pagan mother-goddess ideas that it blasphemously applies to Mary, the mother of Jesus. This

³⁸ Bob Larson's *Book of Rock*, Tyndale House, Illinois, USA, 1987, pp. 53,181. (The reader should be warned that Larson tends towards sensationalism e.g., contrary to Eph. 5:12 he sometimes often uses too much graphic details; and contrary to Rom. 1:17; 16:17; Gal. 1:6-9; 3:11 he embraces the ecumenical compromise with Papists, so that e.g., contrary to Matt. 7:21-23 he thinks Papist exorcists are genuine Christians. But for the spiritually mature and discerning reader, his works on rock music contain some very useful information. Thus Larson's works must be used with caution. See my comments on Bob Larson in Textual Commentaries Vol. 4 on Matt. 26-28, at "Defence of Evangelical Protestant truth," subsection "c" entitled, "A Case Study on Bob Larson Ministries, USA."

³⁹ Storms, E.M., *Should a Christian Be a Mason?*, New Puritan Library, USA, 1980, 1992, p. 28; citing Mackey, A.G. & Hawkins, E.L., "Mysteries Ancient," *An Encyclopedia of Freemasonry*, American Heritage Publishing Co., New York & London, 1920, Vol. 2, p. 497; p. 33, citing Pike, A., *Morals & Dogma of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry*, L.J. Jenkins Incorporated, Richmond, Virginia, USA, 1921, p. 23; cf. pp. 33-4.

⁴⁰ Charles R.H. (translator), *The Book of Enoch* (I Enoch), With an introduction by W.O.E. Oseterley, SPCK, London, 1917, pp. 35,39-40.

leads us to raise more general questions as to the similarities between Romanism and Adventism.

In the NT the image of the slain Day of Atonement goat is clearly applied to Christ (Heb. 9:12,13; 10:4), and the commonality of the Lev. 16 typology of two goats with the Lev. 14 typology of two birds, means it is certainly forced and unnatural to regard the second goat as typing anyone but Christ. There is no Biblical sense in which the “atonement” (Lev. 16:10,34) is only *almost* complete or *almost* finished. The Bible teaches that, “It is finished” (John 19:30), and it is complete (Heb. 9:12-14,27,28); and that it is “Christ,” not the Devil, who in fulfilment of the Day of Atonement imagery did “bear” the “iniquities” (Lev. 16:22) or “bear the sins” (Heb. 9:28), when he “was once offered” and did “die” (Heb. 9:27,28) at Calvary.

The context of Lev. 16 is clearly *atonement*. This is clearly the contextual meaning of Lev. 16:21,22, “And Aaron shall lay his hands upon the head of the goat, and confess over him all the iniquities ..., and ... transgressions in ... sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away ... into the wilderness: and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities” The fact that this second goat is said to “bear upon him all their iniquities” (Lev. 16:22) on this great day of “atonement” (Lev. 16:6,10,11,16,17,18,24, 27,30,32,33,34), means that it can only refer to Christ, “who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree” (I Peter 2:24). The words of Lev. 16:10 are crystal clear in saying, “the scapegoat, shall be presented alive before the Lord, *to make an atonement* ..., and to ... go for a scapegoat into the wilderness.” He was thus to “bear upon him all their iniquities” (Lev. 16:22). This application can only be to Christ, for “surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows” (Isa. 53:4), “and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all” (Isa. 53:6). Thus while it is true that Scripture uses the goat to type Grecia in Dan. 8:21, or the wicked in Zech. 10:3; Matt. 25:32,33; in the context of *atonement* on the *Day of Atonement*, we cannot doubt that the goat imagery must apply to Christ and Christ alone.

Therefore to claim, as the Seventh-day Adventist cult does, that one element of the *Day of Atonement* ceremony involves the usage of a goat to represent Satan who in some sense is to “to make an atonement” (Lev. 16:10) and “bear upon him all their iniquities” (Lev. 16:22), even in the reduced SDA sense of being “declared guilty of all the evil which he has caused them to commit” (Ellen White, *supra*), acts to diminish the completeness of Christ’s atonement. While “the Devil” is to be “bound” “a thousand years,” and later “cast into the lake of fire and brimstone” (Rev. 20:2,10), these are *punishments* and not in any sense “an atonement” for man’s “iniquities” (Lev. 16:10,22). The Roman Catholic Church diminishes the completeness of Christ’s atonement in their teaching of “Mary co-redeemer,” and likewise the Seventh-day Adventist Church diminishes the completeness of Christ’s atonement in their teaching that “Satan” fulfils the imagery of the second Day of Atonement goat in Lev. 16:21,22.

There is an indissoluble nexus between atonement and salvation or redemption. E.g., God “redeemed” Israel “out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt” (Deut. 7:8). Now “the blood” of the “lamb” was placed “at the door of”

the “house” of the Israelites, and “the Lord” would “pass over the door, and” “not suffer the destroyer to come in” “to smite” the Israelites (Exod. 12:21-23). That lamb typed Christ (John 1:29; I Cor. 5:7), who is our Saviour and our Redeemer from sin. The fact that Christ is *the only one* to make an atonement for us, means he is *our only Saviour* and *our only Redeemer*. In practice, Seventh-day Adventists *do not* consciously think about the idea of Satan as the second Azazel goat to the point where they overtly refer to the Devil as their “co-redeemer,” in the same way that Roman Catholics consciously think about Mary “standing next to the cross” to the point where they overtly refer to Mary as their “co-redeemer.” But though in general they would genuinely balk to call the Devil their “co-redeemer,” and would sincerely think that in some way they “were being misrepresented,” the reality is that the SDA teaching of the Devil being *a joint sin bearer* by fulfilling the imagery of “the scapegoat” making “an atonement” (Lev. 16:10), *means just that*. IF THE CAP FITS, WEAR IT!

The Devil is depicted in SDA theology as part of the process of “atonement” (Lev. 16:33,34), and thus part of the process of salvation and redemption. His role is limited to “bearing final responsibility for sin,” but he nevertheless is given a role as a co-redeemer. Though in my experience Seventh-day Adventists do not think their theology through to the point of consciously thinking and so verbalizing the Devil as their “co-redeemer,” in the same way that Roman Catholics do consciously think through and so verbalize Mary as their “co-redeemer,” the inescapable theological reality is that this is an irreducible part of SDA theology and teaching in connection with their “investigative judgement” teaching. If SDAs do not consciously think about the ramifications of their own theology, it is because “the god of this world hath blinded” their “minds” (II Cor. 4:4). “O foolish Galatians, *who hath bewitched you*, that ye should not obey the truth” (Gal. 3:1). “God sent forth his Son ... to redeem them that were under the law” (Gal. 4:4,5), and he sent forth *no-one else!* “Christ hath redeemed us” when he hung “on a tree” (Gal. 3:13) at Calvary, *not* Christ and another “during the millennium”!

Scripture says that Christ doth “forgive us our sins, and ... cleanse us from *all* unrighteousness” (I John 1:9), not just *some* or even *most* unrighteousness. There is nothing left to do. *There is no joint sin bearing*, whether by us in works righteousness (NT Judaism & Roman Catholicism), e.g., the claim of apostate inter-testamental Judaism that giving “alms maketh an atonement for sins” (Sirach 3:30, *Apocrypha*), or by Mary in “co-redemption” (Roman Catholicism), or by Satan in “bearing ultimate responsibility” (Seventh-day Adventism)⁴¹, or by anyone else! *Christ’s atonement is*

⁴¹ Typical of this view are the comments by Frank Breaden of Queensland. The official SDA publisher in Australia, Signs Publishing, in Warburton, Victoria, published Breaden’s *Instruction Manuel*. This work has the endorsement of the “South Pacific Division Committee” of the Seventh-day Adventist cult, “whose evangelistic vision, financial backing, and sub-committee assistance,” “made” this work “possible.” In it, Breaden describes SDA “Sanctuary” views as “The ‘hub’ of Bible Truth.” Concerning, “The Antitypical Fulfillment of the ‘Scape-goat’ Ceremony,” he refers to “Leviticus 16:10,20-22,” and says that in this “was pictured *the climactic moment when the finger of universal blame would be pointed at Satan*,” i.e., “the responsibility for his part in the sins of believers” (Breaden, F., *Instruction Manuel* for 60 Study Guides, Signs

complete. It covers everything! To deny this is a violation of the 8th commandment, “Thou shalt not steal” (Exod. 20:15), since it is an attempt to rob Christ of his glory in paying the full price for sin in “the redemption of . . . transgressions” (Heb. 9:15), “having obtained eternal redemption for us” (Heb. 9:12). For the blood of Christ doth “cleanse us from *all* unrighteousness” (I John 1:9).

Moreover, *one element of atonement* is the idea of *an innocent sacrifice*. For when in the OT, e.g., “the elders” “shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock before the Lord: and the bullock shall be killed” (Lev. 4:15); or “Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the bullock for the sin offering. And he slew it” (Lev. 8:14,15), this included both the idea that *sin deserves death*, “For the wages of sin is death” (Rom. 6:23 cf. Gen. 2:17; 4:4); and the idea that *an innocent sacrifice* is put in the man’s place. This pointed to “Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot” (I Peter 1:19), who “through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God” (Heb. 9:14), being “without sin” (Heb. 4:15). Thus through his substitutionary atonement we are reckoned to be “of him in peace, without spot, and blameless” (II Peter 3:14). Hence the unacceptability of OT sacrifices which were “blind,” “lame,” or “sick” (Mal. 1:8).

Man was made in a state of original righteousness (Eccl. 7:29, NKJV); but due to the fall, he is conceived in original “sin” and “shapen in iniquity” (Ps. 51:5). Thus he is born with a sinful nature, for his “heart is deceitful” “and desperately wicked” (Jer. 17:9). Since on general principles guilt attaches to sin (Rom. 6:23), it follows that original guilt attaches to original sin (Rom. 5:12). Hence because we fallen men “have borne the image” of “the first man,” “Adam,” it follows that “in Adam all die” (I Cor. 15:22,45,47,49; cf. Gen. 3:20; 5:3,4). I.e., the penalty of original guilt (“thou shalt surely die,” Gen. 2:17) for original sin (“thou shalt not eat of it,” Gen. 2:17), which comes to us because racially we are “in Adam” (I Cor. 15:22; Gen. 3:20), makes us naturally mortal (Rom. 5:12), as well as giving us sinful natures (Rom. 7:18,23,25). Therefore, if Christ had a sinful human nature, he could never have been an acceptable sacrifice for sin, because this human nature would have had of it the elements of sin and guilt, so that he could not have been an innocent sacrifice. But he “who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth” (I Peter 2:22), in fact was “a lamb without blemish and without spot” (I Peter 1:19), being without original sin or original guilt, because he had the unfallen human nature of Adam *before the Fall*, not the fallen nature of Adam and all his descendants *after the Fall*.

This matter clearly touches on Christological issues of the Trinity. Hence while the four *Church Fathers’ Era* general councils (Nicea, 325; Constantinople, 381; Ephesus, 431; & Chalcedon, 451), are focused on Trinitarian matters, one should understand the statement of Christ’s sinless human nature at *Chalcedon* (451), against the backdrop of the earlier *Council of Ephesus* (431), which condemned Pelagianism, through reference to Coelestius, the disciple of Pelagius. E.g., Coelestius claimed, “That a man can be without sin, if he choose⁴²” (I Kgs 8:46; I John 1:8). By first condemning

Publishing, Warburton, Victoria, Australia, 1987, pp. 10,12,170 Study 41).

⁴² In Augustine’s *De gestis Pelagii*, 23; Bettenson, H., *Documents of the*

this heresy at the *Council of Ephesus*, and then stating at the *Council of Chalcedon* that Christ is “of one substance with us as regards his humanity; like us in all respects, apart from sin,” it follows that Christ had the sinless human nature of Adam before the Fall, and overcame where Adam fell; not the sinful human nature of men after the Fall, who *before glorification* can never “be without sin” in the sense of sinless perfection.

To understand this element of atonement means that when we read that “the scapegoat, shall ... make an atonement; ”and “Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities ..., and all ... transgressions in all ... sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away ... into the wilderness: and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited ... in the wilderness” (Lev. 16:10,21,22); then this means that this second goat would ultimately have had to die in some way. It also means that this cannot refer to the Devil, but must refer to Christ, since *Christ is an innocent substitute* and *Christ died*, whereas *the Devil is not an innocent substitute* and *the Devil does not die*, but is to “be tormented day and night for ever and ever” (Rev. 10:10).

This matter touches on two other elements of SDA theology that I shall not now discuss in detail. One is the idea that Satan is “to die” (death is an element of atonement), and this view is held by 100% of SDAs⁴³. The other idea is that Christ had “a sinful human nature.” One the one hand, I found that in the mid to late 1970s and early 1980s, among SDAs in Australia (and Avondale College draws students from all over Australia, and a smaller number from elsewhere,) less than 10% of SDAs believed this. I.e., I found more than 90% of SDAs would accept the orthodox position that Christ had a sinless human nature. But on the other hand, nor would the SDAs I came across support any kind of disciplinary action against the small minority group who believed Christ had “a sinful human nature” like Adam after the Fall (the sinless perfectionist group), rather than a sinless human nature like Adam before the Fall (the group considering sinless perfection is not possible).

E.g., I recall one, very unrepresentative Theology student, who believed in this type of thing (as apparently did his SDA parents). While most Theology students disagreed with him, no-one would ever have suggested that he should be disciplined for holding these views, or put through a heresy trial, i.e., his views were tolerated as

Christian Church, 1943, 2nd edition, 1963, Oxford University, UK, 1977 (hereafter called, Bettenson’s *Documents*), pp. 53-4.

⁴³ SDAs fail to recognize that the Devil cannot make an “atonement” (Lev. 16:10,33,34) because one element of atonement is the requirement of a death (e.g., Lev. 1:5,11; 3:2,8, *et al*). In the first instance, SDAs think the Devil can be making this “atonement” (Lev. 16:10,33,34) without dying during the millennium; and they then think that Satan will *be annihilated* i.e., die, after the millennium (White, E.G., *The Great Controversy*, 1881, 1911, chapter 41; Breaden, F., *op. cit.*, p. 170, Study 41; Hoekema’s *The Four Major Cults*, *op. cit.*, p. 142). In fact, Satan will never die (Rev. 20:10), and this is *one* reason why he could never make an “atonement” (Lev. 16:10,33,34).

diversity within permissible boundaries. Notably, this small group of SDAs who believe Christ had a sinful human nature, has included a former President of the SDA General-Conference (the highest SDA church office), William Branson. If an SDA President is not going to be disciplined about such a matter, certainly no-one lower down will be either. (Whether these Australian figures hold true for the wider SDA Church in other parts of the world, or various parts of the SDA Church in times other than the later 1970s and early 1980s, I do not know.)⁴⁴

Suffice to note, that because *one element of atonement* is the idea of *an innocent sacrifice*, there is no way that the second “scapegoat” of Lev. 16 can refer to any other but Christ. It also means that the claim of e.g. apostate inter-testamental and NT Judaism that one’s good works can atone for sins, e.g., the claim “whoso honoureth his father maketh an atonement for his sins” (Sirach 3:3, *Apocrypha*), is necessarily false, because *a sinful fallen man* lacks the original righteousness to do anything pleasing in God’s sight in the form of meriting any favour with God. This same factor strikes down the Roman Catholic notion of faith *and good works* meriting favour with God, “for, The just shall

⁴⁴ Because they fail to recognize that *an atonement requires an innocent sacrifice*; they fail to understand that Christ *must* have had a sinless human nature. Rather, they historically allow diversity of opinion on whether or not Christ did or did not have a sinless human nature like Adam before the Fall, or a sinful human nature like Adam after the Fall. This SDA debate is complicated by the fact that Ellen White made contradictory statements, sometimes supporting Christ’s sinless nature and sometimes supporting the claim he had a sinful nature. Hoekema notes that in the SDA *Questions on Doctrine* (1957), Christ is presented as having a sinless human nature; but in *Drama of the Ages* (1950), the President of the SDA General-Conference, William Branson, presents Christ as having a sinful human nature. Martin disagreed with Hoekema on the dangers posed by SDA theology. E.g., Martin considered that such “official Seventh-day Adventist sources which deny the sinful nature theory” mean that “Anthony Hoekema in his volume, *The Four Major Cults*,” was in “error.” But Martin failed to recognize that there *are different views* allowed in the SDA cult *without fear of heresy trial* on this issue. Though by the grace of God, I for one never believed that Christ had a sinful nature, I remember e.g., a never-ending debate between two Sabbath School teachers at the Dundas SDA Church, *infra*, who held opposing views on this and associated issues. Hoekema is a better analyst of the SDA Cult than is Martin. Hoekema does not say that *all* SDAs believe Christ had a sinful nature. Rather he says, “On the question ... of the sinlessness of Christ’s human nature, we conclude that there is still much ambiguity in Seventh-day Adventist teaching.” Hoekema’s position was vindicated in the very year of Martin’s Revised 1977 edition, since as Paxton notes, in 1977 the SDA Church issued worldwide “Adult Sabbath School Lessons,” which claimed, “Jesus ... possessed a sinful nature common to all men.” This “caused no small stir in Adventist circles,” of the type I witnessed among SDAs at the Dundas Church (Hoekema’s *The Four Major Cults*, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-115; Martin, W.R., *The Kingdom of the Cults*, Bethany Fellowship, Minnesota, USA, 1965, Revised Edition, 1977, pp. 360-423 at pp. 360, 375-6; Paxton, G.P., *op. cit.*, pp. 133-5.)

live by faith” (Gal. 3:11).

Another *element of atonement* is the idea of a *willing / voluntary sacrifice*. Thus when type meets antetype, we read of Christ, “He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth” (Isa. 53:7). “Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not: but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously, who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree” (I Peter 2:23,24). Thus once again, on general principles it is a fundamental misunderstanding to claim that “an atonement” (Lev. 16:10) could occur with an *unwilling sacrifice*, who had it imposed on him as a punishment, which is the SDA claim about Satan during the millennium.

Thus for the SDA cult to set aside such Scriptures, and by religious syncretism adopt the idea from pagan and Satanic rituals that the second goat or “scapegoat” (AV) or “Azazel” “goat” (ASV) in Lev. 16 represents Satan, not Christ, is deeply disturbing. It is a “blasphemy” (Col. 3:8) against Christ, “in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins” (Col. 1:14). If our focus is on “him” “in” whom “dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily” (Col. 2:9), then we cannot deny such a truth. Unlike either apostate inter-testamental and NT Judaism, or Roman Catholic, or Seventh-day Adventist positions, the Protestant position is the Biblical position (Rom. 5:6,8; 6:10; Heb. 9:28; I Peter 2:24; I John 1:9). It is expressed in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* Communion Service in the words, that “Jesus Christ” did “suffer death upon the cross for our redemption,” and he “made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world.”

The distinguished Reformed theologian from the United States of America, Anthony Hoekema, and the Evangelical Anglican Diocese of Sydney clergyman from Australia, Geoffrey Paxton, have shown that despite their erroneous usage of the term “justification by faith” to describe their teaching of salvation, in fact Seventh-day Adventists do not believe in justification by faith. As Paxton rightly concludes in *The Shaking of Adventism*, Seventh-day Adventist theology on soteriology is intermediate between Roman Catholic and Protestant theology, it stands somewhere in between the Protestant Reformation and the Roman Catholic *Council of Trent* Counter-Reformation.

Indeed, I remember one College teacher at Avondale saying that the traditional Seventh-day Adventist teaching on “forgiveness of sins” is like an “Arminian” idea of *general atonement*, i.e., open to anyone; whereas the SDA teaching on “blotting out of sins” is like a “Calvinist” idea of *limited atonement*, i.e., only open to some. But if, as did not occur, this dichotomy was further developed, do we not then have *two atonements* for *sin*? I.e., one *general atonement* when Christ died and according to SDA theology “entered the heavenly Holy Place” for “the forgiveness of sins;” and another *particular atonement* from 1844 onwards when according to SDA theology Christ “entered the heavenly Most Holy Place” for “the blotting out of sins”? And is not this really just a

different form of the old Romish idea of *multiple atonements* in the Roman Mass?⁴⁵

This intermediate Protestant-Roman Catholic nature of SDA theology is also found in the teachings of *justification by confession* connected with the SDA doctrine of “an investigative judgement,” as set forth in the writings of the SDA “prophetess,” Ellen White. What is termed, “justification by confession,” is the very thing Luther broke from when after years of long hours in the confessional trying to remember all his sins lest failing to confess one he should not go to heaven, he then discovered the Biblical doctrine of justification by faith and the gates of heaven swung open to him. He realized that in receiving the gift of salvation all his sins, past, present, and future, had been forgiven, and so he could not be barred entrance into heaven if he had forgotten to confess a sin (Ps. 103:12; Isa. 44:22; Rom. 5:21; 8:1,32-34; Heb. 10:14)⁴⁶.

That is, believers confess their sins after salvation not in order to be saved, but because they are saved, so if they should forget to confess some sin this does not affect their salvation. Hence, e.g., the usage in the Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* (1530) of Ps. 19:12, “Who can understand his errors?” By contrast, in chapter 28 of “Great Controversy,” Ellen White, taught *justification by confession* and *the uncompleted atonement on the cross* through a pseudo-historicist understanding of Dan. 8:14 with regard to the claim of “an investigative judgment” starting in “1844.” White says, e.g., “When any have sins remaining upon the books of record, unrepented of and unforgiven, their names will be blotted out of the book of life, and the record of their good deeds will be erased.” *This is the very type of thing Luther and Protestantism has always rejected!*

Of course, in the same way that most Roman Catholics do not, like the monk Luther, push the system of Romanism to its limits, and so discover that its answer to the sin problem is the sham of a false gospel; so likewise, most Seventh-day Adventists do not push the system of Adventism to its limits, and so discover that its answer to the sin problem is the sham of a false gospel. Nevertheless, for those more pious, and admittedly far less numerical, Papists like the Augustinian monk Luther, who take the system of Romanism with complete seriousness; as for those more pious, and admittedly far less numerical, Adventists, who take the system of Seventh-day Adventism with complete seriousness; the *end point is justification by confession*, and with it an abiding concern that they have moved out of salvation because they have one or more

⁴⁵ Article 31 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* says, “The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of the Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that *the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt*, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.”

⁴⁶ Elwell, W.A., (Editor), *Handbook of Evangelical Theologians*, Michigan: Baker, 1993; Hoekema, A., *op. cit.*; Paxton, *op. cit.*; Berkhof, L., *Systematic Theology*, 1939, British Edition 1958, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 1976 (hereafter referred to as Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*), p. 514.

unconfessed sins.

This SDA doctrine of “an investigative judgment” is bolstered by the writings of the SDA “prophetess,” Ellen White. Thus it became clear to me as a 19 and 20 year old young college man in my second and third years of College, that the SDA doctrine of “an investigative judgment” was not only contrary to the Biblical and Protestant teaching of justification by faith, but the idea of Ellen White as a “prophetess” was contrary to the Reformation tenet of *sola Scriptura* or *Scripture alone*.

Seventh-day Adventists sometimes refer to Ellen White as, “The lesser light on the greater light.” Typical of this type of terminology, for use in SDA studies to gain proselytes, Breaden’s pictorial chart has a picture of Ellen White sitting in a chair surrounded by 27 of her books she had written in front of her. She has a 28th book in her hand which is *presumably* meant to be a Bible since it appears to be double columned pages, and such an interpretation then fits the lower caption. Proportionally, if these 27 books were stacked on top of one another, they would approximate the height of Ellen White herself. Over the top of this picture are the words, “The Abiding Gift of Prophecy,” with an arrow pointing to her with the words, “The gift of prophecy.” Underneath this picture, referring to Ellen White are the words, “A lesser light, to lead to the greater light⁴⁷.”

I remember Dr. Patrick of the *Ellen G. White Research Centre* at Avondale College, showing a group of College students that included myself, a picture of a man⁴⁸. He was standing next to a pile of books stacked on top of one another which was taller than he was. These books, Dr. Patrick said, were the writings of Ellen White. As I thought about this later, I remember thinking that the idea that a new “divine revelation” from Ellen White that stood at about 5 to 6 feet tall (or about 150-180 centimetres), being described as, “The lesser light on the greater light” of my 1¼ inch (about 3.2 centimeter) Bible, *was a cartoon like joke! How absurd that 6 feet of new “divine revelation” would be called “the lesser light” on the 1¼ inch “greater light” of divine revelation in the Bible!*

If my concerns and studies had stopped at this point, then I would have been much more like a relatively small number of other Seventh-day Adventist Church members, who were influenced by the ideas and concerns raised by Dr. Des Ford. I.e., the issues raised by the then contemporary, *Shaking of Adventism movement*. Although even here I was unlike Ford. In a commentary on the OT Book of Daniel by Ford, which

⁴⁷ Breaden, F., *Instruction Manuel* for 60 Study Guides, *op. cit.*, Chart 62, for use together with Study 45, pp. 183-4, entitled, “The gift of prophecy in the remnant church.”

⁴⁸ Though I formerly understood this to be Ellen White’s son, Willy (William) White, upon seeking a copy of this photo, I was advised by the Ellen G. White Research Centre in Feb. 2008 that it is a picture of an unknown man which is displayed at “Sunnyside” (E.G. White’s Australian residence at one stage,) near Avondale College, Cooranbong.

was given wide coverage at Avondale College at the time⁴⁹, Ford followed the Multiple-Fulfilments School of Prophetic Interpretation, and through it, he still tried to interpret Dan. 8:14 as in some way applying to the Seventh-day Adventist Church from 1844, and still continued to try and make some modified usage of White's writings⁵⁰. By contrast, I had come to repudiate both ideas. Thus my concerns were much wider than Ford's. On these and other issues, *Ford's concerns i.e., the Shaking of Adventism movement, was my starting point, but not my finishing point.*

My studies of NT passages such as Mark 7:19, in which "purging all meats" (AV), may be fairly rendered as, "making all meats clean" (ASV); and Col. 2:16-23, led me to conclude that the SDA cult's Judaizing teaching which requires adherence to the Jewish dietary laws (Lev. 11 *et al*) was wrong, and that in fact these laws were not

⁴⁹ Ford, D., *Daniel*, With a Foreword by F.F. Bruce, Rylands Professor of Manchester University, Southern Publishing Association, Tennessee, USA, 1978. In the Foreword (*Ibid.*, pp. 5,6), F.F. Bruce, a well known advocate of the neo-Alexandrian text (Bruce, F.F., *The NT Documents*, IVF Press, UK, 1960, reprint 1992, p. 16), says he is "more positive" "towards ecumenists, charismatics, and our beloved brethren of the Roman obedience," than is Ford. But though "some aspects of his interpretation differ from mine," "It is a pleasure," he says, "to write a foreword to this exposition of Daniel by Dr. Desmond Ford," because the "gospel which he proclaims is the gospel which I acknowledge."

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, e.g., pp. 69 (Multiple Fulfilments School, referred to by Ford as "the apotelesmatic principle"); pp. 176 & 182 on Dan. 8:14 (selectively and misleadingly quoting Ellen White favourably); pp. 188-190 (Dan. 8:14). The Multiple Fulfilments School evacuates the prophecies of any credulity, as they are pulled like a piece of elastic this way and that, in order to fit many fulfilments. It reminds me of the type of nonsense argued by followers of Nostradamus (1503-66). In effect, the prophecies become so vague, that they mean something like, "A bad man will arise, and do much evil," as they are repeatedly applied in multiple fulfilments. *Because they are made to mean anything and everything, they are made to mean nothing.* The Biblical teaching of I John 2:18, that there are "many antichrists" (plural) who type *the* "Antichrist" (singular), is thus turned on its head. I.e., in *some* instances of Biblical apocalyptic prophecy, there is *one* lesser prophetic type as discussed on Dan. 11:31 in Preface section 7, "Degrees of degradation ..." *infra*; but at the hands of the Multiple-Fulfilments School this concept is greatly abused, as prophecies dealing with *the* Antichrist, are pulled and contorted this way and that, and made to fit any and every "great bad man" that takes their fancy at the time, e.g., Antiochus Epiphanes, the Pope, Mohammed, Genghis Khan, Mussolini, Hitler, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Tse-Tung, or some militant Islamic leader known today and forgotten tomorrow. Like the Idealist School (*Id.*, p. 68), the Multiple-Fulfilments School is not as well known as the Preterist, Futurist, or Historicist Schools. But the importance of Ford to Avondale College when I was there, meant that both the Multiple-Fulfilments School (Ford's Commentary on Daniel) and Preterist School (Young), together with the Pseudo-Historicist School of Seventh-day Adventism (Tolhurst), were all being promoted as alternatives, and all fairly well known by me at the time.

binding on Christians. (Although I consider Col. 2:16 cuts two ways, i.e., Jewish Christians may still keep these OT dietary laws if they so wish, as part of their cultural heritage, and if so, in Jewish Christian and Gentile Christian fellowship meals, only such Jewish food should be used, Acts 15:20,29; 21:25; Rom. 14:14-17,21.)

I spoke about this matter to Dr. Patrick, a religiously conservative member of the Theology Department, in charge of the Ellen White centre at Avondale College. He strongly disagreed with me. The argument he offered in favour of the Jewish dietary laws was this. *Does the Jew have a different digestive tract to the Gentile?* This is actually a circular argument in that it presumes that these Jewish dietary laws had a basis in what SDAs call “the health message,” a proposition that I would reject. I.e., “unclean” meats were in some sense regarded as “unhealthy” (a view reminiscent to me of Mohammedan claims about “the dirty pig⁵¹”).

This to some extent also relates to SDA faulty teachings on atonement. Indeed, in this context, I think that when the Devil set up the false teachings of Seventh-day Adventism, *to some extent* he used the SDA’s Jewish Sabbatarianism (Gal. 4:10,11; Col. 2:16) as a smoke-screen so that people would think that because they were Judaizers on “sabbath days,” they were also Judaizers on “meat” as well (Col. 2:16). *To some extent* that is also true. But I think the SDA retention of OT Jewish dietary rules is multifaceted, and the Devil also wanted those whom he had deceived to think the “clean” and “unclean” distinction was dietary based. That is because they would not start thinking in terms of a “clean” animal being used for sacrifices (Gen. 8:20), indicating *cleanness* from sin in the sacrifice of Christ, since this would lead them to necessarily condemn any notion of Christ having a sinful human nature, or of the scapegoat in Lev. 16 referring to the Devil⁵².

⁵¹ See, “blood, and swine’s flesh ... is forbidden you” (Mohammedan’s *Koran*, Sura 2:168); “blood, and swine’s flesh, ... is forbidden you” (*Koran*, Sura 5:4) (*The Koran*, translated by J.M. Rodwell, 1909, Everyman’s Library, London, UK, 1974).

⁵² The OT distinction between clean and unclean meats was not dietary as it dates to a time when man was still a vegetarian (Gen. 1:29; 9:3), since Noah was told to take into the ark “clean” animals “by sevens” and those “not clean by two” (Gen. 7:2). Rather, the distinction was related to sacrificial matters (Gen. 8:20). A matter that was sinful might be said to be “unclean” (Lev. 20:21), and so on the “day” of “Atonement,” the priest would “cleanses” people, “that ye may be clean from all your sins” (Lev. 16:30). Thus the clean animals typed the fact that the one they pointed to was sinless. If SDA’s understood this, they would be both intolerant to those who claim Christ had a sinful human nature; and also realize that the sinful Satan could never be used for “atonement” (Lev. 16:10). Thus unclean animals are used to represent devils in the Book of Revelation (Rev. 16:13,14; 18:2). Hence a clean animal like a goat could never be used to type the Devil. Likewise, the concern with “blood” was not dietary, but related to atonement, “... I will ... set my face against that soul that eateth blood, ... for the life of the flesh is in the blood: *and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh atonement for the soul*” (Lev. 17:10,11). If SDA’s understood this, then they would realize that the idea of a non-bloody goat

Dr. Patrick's claim that the Jewish dietary laws are "health" based, *supra*, is thus an interesting statement not only for showing how SDAs conceptualize these Jewish dietary laws, but also for showing why they then develop this into a prohibition on meat altogether i.e., they strongly encourage vegetarianism. In this context, a favourite quote used is by Ellen White, from her book, *Counsels on Diets & Foods*. Under the heading, "Preparing for Translation," she says, "Among those who are waiting for the coming of the Lord, meat eating will eventually be done away; flesh will cease to form a part of their diet."⁵³ For the same purported reasons of "health," the cult also prohibits e.g., caffeine and alcohol. Unbeknown to me at this time, Dr. Patrick would later be one of the Committee members of my College heresy trial, *infra*.

My understanding of Scripture grew to a point where I then rejected all these type of ascetic dietary teachings of Seventh-day Adventism. I.e., on the one hand, I consider that the NT prohibits gluttony (Philp. 3:19) and drunkenness (I Cor. 6:10; Gal 5:21), and allows voluntary fasting (Matt. 6:16-18; Rom. 14:6; I Cor. 7:5) (or by derivation of this principle the lesser voluntary discipline of *abstinence* i.e., forgoing some particular food for a time e.g., not eating chocolate or ice-cream during Lent⁵⁴). Thus Christ warns that "as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be," i.e., in the days just before Christ's return, such lusts as gluttonous "eating" and drunken "drinking" will characterize the immorality of the age (Matt. 24:37-39; cf. Matt. 11:19; 24:49). But on the other hand, I consider the type of ascetic prohibitions on meat (promoting vegetarianism) and drink (prohibiting caffeine and alcohol) that are found in the SDA

sacrifice of Satan could never make "an atonement" (Lev. 16:10), and so the scapegoat had to type the same event as the other goat, met in Christ on the cross, for "without shedding of blood" there "is no remission" (Heb. 9:22).

⁵³ White, E.G., *Counsels on Diets & Foods*, Review & Herald Publishing, Takoma Park, Washington, D.C., USA, 1938, 1946, pp. 380-1 (1890 A.D.).

⁵⁴ E.g., the "Tables and Rules" in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) allows "The Forty Days of Lent" as a time of such voluntary "days of" "abstinence." I distinguish this Protestant Anglican practice from the Roman Catholic practice. Before the mid 1960s it was historically compulsory for Roman Catholics, although since the Vatican II Council it has become voluntary, like the Anglican practice. Nevertheless, they still *make holiness to consist in these acts*, rather than in being in Christ's righteousness. E.g., Canon 1251 of the Roman Catholic *Code of Canon Law* (1983) refers to such "abstinence," and then Canon 1253 classifies this as one of the "forms of penance." By contrast, the Reformed Anglican idea of self-denial in abstinence as a lesser form of fasting, "for a time, that ye may give yourselves to" such abstinence "and prayer" (I Cor. 7:5), contains no such elements of "penance" or justification by works. Since the Scriptures allow fasting (e.g., Matt. 6:16-18; 17:21), not for the purposes of works righteousness (Isa. 58:3-5; Luke 18:12), but in order to humble ourselves before God for our sins (Isa. 58:6,7; Joel 1:13,14; 2:12-17); they clearly do not prohibit the lesser discipline of selective abstinence e.g., during Lent.

cult, are the kind of thing condemned by Biblical authority. “Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink.” “Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances,” such as “Touch not; taste not; handle not; which are all to perish with the using,” “after the commandments and doctrines of men? Which things have indeed a shew of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and neglecting of the body; not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh” (Col. 2:16,20-23).

I also came to reject the Seventh-day Adventist cult’s Judaizing teaching that one should keep the Jewish Sabbath (Saturday). This is perhaps the most important core teaching of the *Seventh-day Adventist Church*, and like the *Seventh Day Baptist Church*, this teaching is prominently featured in *the very name* of their church. My views on this followed two distinct, but complementary pathways. One pathway was my understanding of Divine Law (including all relevant matters of Divine revelation in Holy Scripture), and the other pathway was my understanding of Natural Law (meaning godly reason that is not contrary to Divine Law, Rom. 1 & 2). Looking back on it with hindsight, this methodology of natural law and divine law was very Reformed Anglican in its fundamental categories of thought, even though I did not consciously conceptualize it as a classical Anglican methodology at the time⁵⁵.

With regard to the Divine Law of Exod. 20:8-11, I concluded that in the Old Testament the term “the seventh day” (Exod. 20:8,9) is used as a relative, not unalterable, time designation (Exod. 12:15,16; 13:6; 24:16; Lev. 13:5,6,27, 32,34,51; Num. 6:9; 7:48; 19:12,19; 29:32; 31:19,24; Josh. 6:4,15; II Sam. 12:18). E.g., a leper was to shave and wash “on the seventh day” after he was cleansed (Lev. 14:9,39); Samson’s wife wept for “seven days,” and “on the seventh day” he told her the riddle (Judg. 14:17); or Ahab’s forces camped “seven days,” and then on “the seventh day the battle” occurred (I Kgs 20:29,30).

Moreover, in Exod. 23:10-12 the sabbatical years and days are placed in Hebraic parallelism, and since the starting point of the sabbatical years was altered due to the forty years in the wilderness (Lev. 25:2-5; Deut. 2:7; Ps. 95:7-11), I concluded that it therefore follows that “the seventh day” of the fourth commandment can likewise alter its starting point relative to a working week. Hence in our society Saturday and Sunday are called “the weekend,” because even though Sunday is the first day of the calendar week,

⁵⁵ Blackstone, W., *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, 1765-1769; 15th edition by Edward Christian, London, 1809 e.g., Vol. 1, pp. 42,43, “Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, no human laws should be suffered to contradict these.” “To instance in the case of murder: this is expressly forbidden by the divine [Exod. 20:13; Rom. 13:9; James 2:11], and demonstrably by the natural law; and from these prohibitions arises the true unlawfulness of this crime. Those human laws that annex a punishment to it, do not at all increase its moral guilt Nay, if any human law should allow or enjoin us to commit it, we are bound to transgress that human law [Acts 5:29], or else must offend both the natural and the divine.”

it is the seventh day of our working week - and hence the seventh day of the fourth commandment (and on this same principle the sabbath is calculated on a midnight to midnight day, rather than the Jewish sunset to sunset day.)

I thus concluded that there was no tension between keeping Sunday and keeping the fourth commandment. I.e., I did not, like e.g., Lutherans, *infra*, become an anti-sabbatarian. Rather, I came to conclude that whereas the Jews had traditionally observed the sabbath on Saturday (e.g., Acts 17:2), Christians had traditionally observed the fourth commandment by keeping Sunday (e.g., Acts 20:7).

With respect to natural law, I was also aware of the fact that Seventh-day Adventists in Tonga keep Sunday and not Saturday. When the International Date Line was fixed by the *International Meridian Conference* (1884), called by the President of the USA, Chester Arthur (President 1881-1885), the King of Tonga decided that he wanted to be in line with the days on the Australasian-Pacific rim countries, not the American-Pacific rim countries. Thus what is Sunday in e.g., Australia and Tonga, is Saturday in nearby Samoa. Tongans and Samoans are both Kanakas (a Mongoloid-Caucasoid admixed group spread over the Pacific Islands, that is predominately Mongoloid).

The Tongan Seventh-day Adventists considered that the King, a very powerful figure in Tonga, had in fact exercised the powers of a time lord. Though this type of thing sounds more like science fiction than science fact, nevertheless, such views are credible among a number of Kanakas in the backwater of Tonga. The King of Tonga had, they thought, cast a time-loop around Tonga, but that a time vortex located in the surrounding Kanaka islands such as Samoa, acted to inexorably suck them out of this time-loop and into a Samoan time-frame. Thus since it was Saturday in Samoa when it was Sunday in Tonga, SDAs keep Sunday, not Saturday, in Tonga. This means the SDA Church sanctions Seventh-day Adventists in Tonga keeping the same day that they claim will result in getting “the mark of the beast” if one keeps it in East Asia and Australia!

This issue raises many questions. Why not argue it the other way around? I.e., why not say that a Tongan time vortex acts as a time suction device to suck Samoans into a Tongan time frame? After all, it was in fact Samoa that in 1892, some eight years after the 1884 *International Meridian Conference*, that changed days. After being persuaded to do so by American businessmen, on the basis that by adopting American time Samoa would be only three hours behind California, the King of Samoa agreed to change days. There were thus 367 days that year in Samoa. The change was made on Monday 4 July, 1892, so that Samoa celebrated 4 July twice. 4 July is *Independence Day* in the USA, and so the selection of 4 July as the day to have twice that year, was a clear statement that Samoa saw its economic future more with the Americas than with Australasia.

Developing this further, why not argue that because the pre-European Conquest peoples in the Americas were Mongoloid Red Indians, that in fact the Western Europeans “exercised the powers of a time lord” by casting a time-loop around the Americas to bring it into line with Western European time; and that in fact a time vortex from East Asia acts to suck the Americas into East Asian time. I.e., on this argument, the

International Date Line should be in the Atlantic Ocean between the Americas to its west, and Europe and Africa to its east. If this argument is developed, it means that Seventh-day Adventists in the United States of America, where the SDA cult began, when keeping the American Saturday, have really been keeping the East Asian Sunday. If so, this is quite fatal for their theology, since it means that they have all been keeping the very day that they believe results in getting “the mark of the beast⁵⁶”!

I ran some of these types of arguments about Tonga around some fellow College students at Avondale. I even raised the issue of the Tongan time-loop with the College Accountant, Mr. Moffitt, when I was in his office on one occasion. Mr. Moffitt was not impressed. I remember him saying to me, “You’re barking up the wrong tree! You’re barking up the wrong tree!”

A book that was being greatly publicized among SDAs in both Sydney and Avondale College at the time I was there, was Samuel Bacchiocchi’s *From Sabbath To Sunday* (1977). Like many others, I purchased a copy. Bacchiocchi is a member of the Seventh-day Adventist cult. The back cover of this book says that at that time Bacchiocchi was a teacher of theology and church history at the SDA’s Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan, USA. Notably, for graduating with *summa cum laude* (Latin, “with highest merit / praise”) at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome, he received an academic gold medal from Pope Paul VI (Pope 1963-1978). Bacchiocchi’s book bears a Roman Catholic *Imprimatur* from the Rector of the University, R.P. Herve Carrier, S.J. (*Society of Jesus* i.e., a Jesuit), given at Rome on 16 June 1975. The work was published in 1977 by the Pontifical Gregorian University Press in Rome.

The Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome is the oldest and most prestigious Jesuit university in the world. It was founded in 1551 by the founder of Jesuitry, “Saint” Ignatius Loyola (Beatified by Pope Paul V in 1609; canonized by Pope Gregory XV in 1622). The majority of its academic staff are Jesuits. The university’s rector is appointed by the Pope himself. The university’s graduates include 24 beatified Roman Catholics (with the title, “Blessed”), 19 canonized Roman Catholic “saints” (with the title, “Saint”), and 16 Popes.

Those knowledgeable of Protestant history, know that the Jesuits are an old, wily, and deadly dangerous foe. The Jesuits were important instruments of the Counter-

⁵⁶ Hoekema, A., *op. cit.*, pp. 163-4 (on the mark of the beast). Since I do not consider that there is any intrinsic significance in one day over another (e.g., Col. 2:16,17), it follows that I think it does not matter which side of the Americas the International Date Line goes on. But once such a decision is made (I do not say permanently i.e., it would not concern me one way or the other if it was or was not changed at some point in the future), then on that time frame, I would keep the fourth commandment on what is simultaneously the seventh day of the working week in memory of the creation in Gen. 1:2-2:3, and also the first day of the week, principally in honour of the Lord’s resurrection (although also in relation to some other NT events).

Reformation. E.g., Jesuitry played a part in the Papists' conspiracy to blow up the Protestant King James and Parliament in 1605. Or the Jesuits were important instruments for persecuting and removing Protestantism from what was is now eastern Austria, Slovenia, and north-western Croatia, forcing out e.g., the great Protestant Reformer of Slovenia, Primoz Trubar (1508-1585). Or the *Irish Massacre of 1641* was symbolically perpetrated by Papists against Protestants on *St. Ignatius Day* (23 Oct.) in deference to Ignatius Loyola⁵⁷. Or the Jesuit "Saint" Sarkander (1576-1620) of Moravia was involved in campaigns of forced "conversions" of Protestants to Roman Catholicism, and for his efforts was canonized by Pope John-Paul II in 1995.

The Pontifical Gregorian University is designed for Papists, and the admission of Bacchiocchi was the first and last time in more than 400 years, that a non-Papist has been admitted. While it is possible that the Pontifical Gregorian University will admit another non-Papist at some point in the future, the point is that it is extremely rare and unusual for them to do so. This necessarily raises the question as to why, that ancient foe of Protestants, the Jesuits, would admit a member of the Seventh-day Adventist cult to their top Jesuit University, lavish him with such honours as a Papal medal, and give an

⁵⁷ Bramley-Moore, W., *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, 1563, revised folio edition, 1684, 3rd edition, Cassell, Patter, and Galpin, London, 1867, pp. 587-91 (Gunpowder Treason Plot of Guy Fawkes), pp. 591-619 (pp. 591-600, Irish Massacre). On the basis of Bramley-Moore's statement, "The day fixed for this horrid massacre was the 23rd of October, 1641, the feast of Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Jesuits" (*Ibid.*, p. 592), I formerly thought Loyola's day must therefore have been later changed to 31 July. Having now investigated the matter further, I would make some qualifications that Bramley-Moore does not. Loyola (d. 1556) was originally baptized with the common Basque name, "Inigo," after Enecus (Innicus), Abbot of Ona. When he left the Basque country, he started to call himself the similar but different name, "Ignatius." There were then two relatively well known church figures of this name, Ignatius of Antioch (d. c. 110) remembered on 1 Feb., and Ignatius of Constantinople (c. 799-877) who died on, and is remembered on, 23 Oct. . This leads to the question, *Did Loyola rename himself "Ignatius" in honour of Ignatius of Antioch, or Ignatius of Constantinople, or both?* There is no definitive answer. The Jesuits were deeply involved in the Irish Massacre, and the day set was 23 October. Taking into account the tradition referred to by Bramley-Moore that this massacre occurred on *St. Ignatius Loyola's Day* (23 Oct.), the implication is that the crafty Jesuits were saying something like, "23 October is the day to strike because it is St. Ignatius' Day, after whom St. Ignatius Loyola was named." I.e., the inference appears to be that they were making some reference to 23 October as "St. Ignatius Day" *in deference to* the renaming of "Ignatius" Loyola, and so there is a qualified sense in which 23 Oct. was being used by them as a day to remember Ignatius Loyola. (Of course, they could have done a similar thing on 1 Feb. with reference to Ignatius of Antioch.) Given the involvement of Jesuitry in the 1641 massacre, and this issue of "Inigo" Loyola renaming himself after one or both earlier persons named "Ignatius," either *with greater qualification*, one can say it occurred on "Ignatius Loyola" "day," "the 23rd of October" (Bramley-Moore); or *with lesser qualification*, one can simply say it occurred on "*St. Ignatius Day* (23 Oct.) in deference to Ignatius Loyola" (myself, *supra*).

Imprimatur to a book of his that upholds the traditional SDA claim that the Church of Rome changed the day of worship from the Jewish Sabbath (Saturday) to Sunday?

The answer lies in the fact that historically the Roman Catholic Church has, like the Seventh-day Adventist Church, argued that the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath and introduction of Sunday is not of Divine Law in the Bible, but rather is a post-Biblical event that manifests the authority of the Roman Church. However, the Roman Church has not been entirely consistent in this matter. Her duplicity means that sometimes she runs this false argument in order to enhance her power in certain circles, and at other times, she allows the Protestant view that Sunday sacredness dates from NT times.

Thus on the one hand Bacchiocchi is able to cite Roman Catholic theologian, Thomas Aquinas, who says “the Lord’s day took the place of the observance of the Sabbath ... by the institution of the Church and the custom of Christian people,” or Vincent Kelly in his *Catholic University of America* dissertation who claims “that God ... gave his Church the power to set aside whatever day or days she would deem suitable as holy days. The Church chose Sunday, the first day of the week.” Or Bacchiocchi can further refer to *The American Catholic Quarterly Review* (1883), which claims, “Sunday, as a day of the week to be set apart for obligatory public worship for Almighty God, to be sanctified by a suspension of all servile labor, trade, and worldly avocations and by exercises of devotion, is purely a creation of the [Roman] Catholic Church.” But on the other hand, Bacchiocchi says the “traditional claim that the Church of Rome has been primarily responsible for the institution of Sunday observance,” has been “widely challenged by recent [Roman] Catholic (and Protestant) scholarship,” “though” he claims it “has been amply substantiated by” his “investigation⁵⁸.”

In order to buttress these claims, Bacchiocchi must first explain away Scriptures such as Rev. 1:10 which refer to “the Lord’s day.” This terminology is cross-referrable to the fourth commandment which says, “the sabbath day” “is the sabbath of the Lord” (Exod. 20:8,10), i.e., the Lord’s day. It is also cross-referrable to Ps. 118:24 which says, “This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it” i.e., the Lord’s day. The prophetic element of Ps. 118 is quite clear. The words of Ps. 118:22, “The stone which the builder refused is become the head of the corner” is applied in Acts 4:10,11, where we read, “Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here before you whole. This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders which is become the head of the corner.” In this

⁵⁸ Bacchiocchi, S., *From Sabbath To Sunday*, A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity, *Imprimatur*: Romae, die 16 Iunii 1975 R.P. Herve Carrier, S.I. [Latin = “S.J.” = “Society of Jesus” = Jesuit], Rector Universitatis, Pontifica Universitas Gregoriana, The Pontifical Gregorian University Press, Rome, 1977, pp. 211-2, 310-1; citing Aquinas, T., *Summa Theologica*, 1947, II, Q. 122 Art. 4, p. 1702, and Kelly, V.J., *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, Catholic University of America Press, 1943, p. 2; *The American Catholic Quarterly Review* 8 (Jan. 1883), p. 139.

application, it is clear that “whom ye crucified” relates in meaning to “the stone which was set at nought,” and “raised from the dead” relates in meaning to “which is become the head of the corner.” We thus have a specific point in time, namely Christ’s resurrection, to which to apply the words of Ps. 118:23,24, “This is the Lord’s doing; it is marvellous in our eyes. This is the day which the Lord hath made” etc. . Thus in Ps. 118:22-24, Scripture points us to Sunday to call “the Lord’s day.”

We have further confirmation of this conclusion with respect to Palm Sunday. St. John the Apostle sandwiches his reference to Christ’s resurrection on Sunday (John 20:1,19), between Palm Sunday and the First Sunday after Easter (John 20:26-29) i.e., the Sunday before, and the Sunday after, Easter Sunday respectively. Thus this sanctifying of Sunday as *the Lord’s day* was anticipated a week before on Palm Sunday⁵⁹. On Palm Sunday, the people proclaimed the words of Ps. 118:25, “Save now” or “Hosanna,” followed by Ps. 118:26, “Hosanna; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord” etc. (Ps. 118:25; Mark 11:9). But in the immediately preceding verse, this Sunday “is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it” (Ps. 118:24). Thus in its derivation from Ps. 118:24, the terminology of “the Lord’s day” (Rev. 1:10), refers to Sunday with special reference to both Palm Sunday and Christ’s resurrection on Easter Sunday. It thus points to the Christian Sunday in Messianic Prophecy of these two great Sundays which acted to inaugurate Sunday sacredness.

But in order to try and circumvent this, Bacchiocchi makes the claim that “the ‘Lord’s day’ of Revelation 1:10” is “the eschatological day of the Lord” i.e., the Second Coming⁶⁰. That this is a clear distortion of the text is evident from the fact that Christ immediately says to “write” certain matters “in a book, and send it unto the seven churches” (Rev. 1:11). These events of the seven churches (Rev. 2 & 3), like a number of other events in the Book of Revelation (e.g., Rev. 13), clearly occur *prior* to the great Day of the Lord. Some events in the Book of Revelation also clearly occur *after* the Day of the Lord (Rev. 20-22). Though some events clearly do depict the great Day of the Lord (e.g., Rev. 6:14-17; 19:11). Thus to claim that St. John the Divine (Theologian) was able to see all events in the Book of Revelation by being prophetically transported forward in time to *the Day of the Lord*, is contextual nonsense, both in the immediate context (Rev. 1:10,11) and wider context of the Book of Revelation. Bacchiocchi’s claim that “the Lord’s day” of Rev. 1:10 is *the Day of the Lord*, is clearly a fudge, seeking to dodge the more natural meaning of this as the Christian Sunday (Exod. 20:8-11; Ps. 118:22-26). That is because to recognize that “the Lord’s day” of Rev. 1:10 is Sunday, strikes down his basic claim that Sunday sacredness is not sanctioned by the Divine Law of the Bible.

⁵⁹ 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.

⁶⁰ Bacchiocchi, S., *From Sabbath To Sunday, op. cit.*, pp. 123-131 at p. 123.

Moreover, Bacchiocchi's claim that the "traditional claim that the Church of Rome has been primarily responsible for the institution of Sunday observance," has been "widely challenged by ... [Roman] Catholic (and Protestant) scholarship" only in "recent" times⁶¹, is also misleadingly incorrect. In fact challenges to these claims from "Protestant" "scholarship" are not simply "recent" ones. One of the many defects in Bacchiocchi's work is that he makes no reference in it to the Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* (1530).

In Part 2 of the *Augsburg Confession*⁶², reference is made to "the jurisdiction of Bishops," and the fact that "there is a controversy whether Bishops or Pastors have power to institute ... and to make laws concerning ... holidays." It is said of those who so argue, "They allege ... the change of the Sabbath into the Lord's day, contrary, as it seemeth, to the Decalogue; and they have no example more in their mouths than the change of the Sabbath. They will needs have the Church's power to be very great, because it hath dispensed with a precept of the Decalogue." But the response of the *Augsburg Confession* is that the abolition of the Jewish sabbath is in fact Divine Law. "For there" is "clear testimony" in the fact that the Apostle "Paul saith to the Colossians, 'Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holiday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days' (Col. 2:16)." Thus "the Scripture, which teacheth that all the Mosaical ceremonies can be omitted after the Gospel is revealed, had abrogated the Sabbath." The *Augsburg Confession* is anti-Sabbatarian, and considers that the observation of any day, including "the Lord's day" is not "of necessity."

In the first stage of the Reformation, the Lutheran Reformation, the Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* (2:6) recognized that Col. 2:16,17 means that the Jewish Sabbath no longer binds Christians. Likewise Calvin's *Catechism* (or Calvin's *Geneva Catechism*) of 1545 considered that Col. 2:16,17 taught the Jewish sabbath was "abolished," and that Sundays were merely days of "sacred assemblies," when "the people meet" "to hear the word of God," "to hear the doctrine of Christ, to engage in public prayer," "to celebrate the sacraments," "and make profession of their faith."

Then during the second stage of the Reformation, came the clear recognition of the double-meaning in the Greek, "*mia ton sabbaton*," that Jesus rose "on the first of the week" also meaning "the first of the Sabbaths" (John 20:1 *et al*), so that by his resurrection Christ made Sunday the Sabbath. I.e., the teaching *in the underpinning Greek* of Luke 24:1 *et al* is that the fourth precept (Exod. 20:8-11; Deut. 5:12-15) continues with the first day of the week, Sunday, as the Sabbath, starting with "the first of the sabbaths" which was on "the first of the week" with Easter Sunday.

Connected with this, in the second stage of the Reformation it was recognized that the morality of working six days and then resting on the sabbath day, is rooted in the six

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 311.

⁶² In Schaff, P., *Creeds of Christendom*, Harper, 1877, reprint by Baker Books, Michigan, USA, 1969, Volume 3, at pp. 62-73.

day creation (Exod. 20:8-11; cf. Gen. 2:1-3), and so contrary to the anti-sabbatarian view of Luther and Calvin (we think very highly of these men, but our authority is Scripture, not man), it transcends the Jewish laws given to Moses. Thus while the keeping of the Jewish Sabbath (Saturday) no longer binds Christians (Col. 2:16), as part of the Ten Commandments (Rom. 7:7; 13:9), the fundamental sabbath morality of the fourth commandment remains binding, and is manifested in keeping the Sunday Sabbath. E.g., from 1562 the Anglican Church recognized Sunday as the Sabbath in its Homily 8, Book 2, Article 35, of the *Thirty-Nine Articles*. All three Reformed Puritan rival “third” stages of the Reformation, also recognized this second stage Reformation truth in their “third” stage confessions, Presbyterian (*Westminster Confession* 21:7), Congregational (*Savoy Declaration* 22:7), and Baptist (*Baptist Confession* 22:7).

Thus e.g., the Marian martyrs who died at the hands of the Popish Queen, Bloody Mary (Regnal Years: 1553-8), because of their faithfulness to the tenets of the Reformation, included both the non-sabbatarian, Archbishop Cranmer, and also the sabbatarians, Bishops Hooper and Latimer. I think the Sabbatarians Hooper and Latimer were greater lights than the non-Sabbatarians Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer, on this issue. For matured reflection on, e.g., the contextual double meaning in the Greek “*mia ton sabbaton*” in Mark 16:2; Luke 24:1; John 20:1, where “the first [day] of the week” simultaneously means “the first of the sabbaths,” led others to realize the fourth precept (Exod. 20:8-11; Deut. 5:12-15) continues with the first day of the week, Sunday, as the Sabbath. For instance the Marian martyr, Bishop Hooper, said that for the Christian, we are “by express words commanded, that we should observe this day (the Sunday) for our Sabbath, as the words of Saint Paul declareth (I Corinthians 16), commanding every man to appoint his alms for the poor in the Sunday.” In “Luke 24 and John 20,” “of the women that came to the sepulchre to anoint the dead body of Christ;” “Luke saith, ‘In one of the Sabbaths early they came to the sepulchre;’ and so saith John by the same words, the which was the Sunday, as no man doubteth. For it is our faith that Christ rose the third day.”⁶³

Importantly then, both anti-sabbatarian Protestants (e.g., Luther, Calvin, Cranmer), and Sabbatarian Protestants (e.g., Hooper, Latimer, confessions of Anglicanism, Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, and the Reformed Baptists), all regarded the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath, as a matter of Divine Law. For the express law of God forbids Gentile Christians to keep Jewish sabbath “days” in Gal. 4:10,11 (cf. weekly *days*, lunar *months*, annual *times* or *seasons*, and jubilee *years* in Lev. 23:25; Num. 28:29), or forbids that any man “judge you” with regard to the Jewish “sabbath days” in Col. 2:16,17 (cf. weekly *sabbaths*, monthly *new moons*, and annual *holy days* or *festivals* in II Kgs 4:23; I Chron. 23:31; II Chron. 2:4; 8:13; 31:3; Neh. 10:33; Isa. 1:13; Ezek. 45:17; Hosea 2:11). E.g., St. Paul says to Gentile Christians who had been Judaized, “How turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire

⁶³ Carr, S. (Editor), *Early Writings of John Hooper, D.D.*, Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Worcester, Martyr, 1555, The Parker Society, Cambridge Univ., 1843, pp. 338,342 (cf. Exod. 31:15; Ezek 46:4); quoted in Leggerton, H.J.W., *The Church of Rome and the Lord's Day, Tradition or Bible: Which?*, Lord's Day Observance Society, London, UK, [c. 1960], p. 24.

again to be in bondage? Ye observe [Jewish sabbath] days, and [new moon] months, and [annual] times, and [jubilee] years. I am afraid,” “lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain” (Gal. 4:9-11). Nevertheless, it must be clearly understood that beyond this area of agreement, there is then an area of historic dispute among Protestants as to whether Sunday is simply a day of assembly (Luther and Calvin), and if so, whether or not a day of *voluntary* assembly (Lutheran *Augsburg Confession*), or a Sabbath day (Reformation confessions of Anglicans, Presbyterians, Congregationalist, and Reformed Baptists). Nevertheless, in general most Protestants find the NT teaching of Sunday sacredness in such Scriptures as John 20:1,19,26; Acts 2:1; 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10.

Therefore, the position of the Seventh-day Adventist Church on the Sabbath is actually intermediate between the Roman Catholic and Protestant positions. On the one hand, in agreement with Roman Catholics, or at least one of the two traditional positions one can find in Roman Catholicism, Seventh-day Adventists consider that the words, “the seventh day” in Exod. 20:8-11 refer to a specific day, Saturday, that there is no Divine Law basis in Scripture for the abolition of this day, and that the NT does not authorize Sunday sacredness. But on the other hand, in agreement with Protestantism, the Seventh-day Adventists then say that the Pope of Rome or Roman Church has no authority to set aside a precept of the Decalogue. Thus whereas the Church of Rome has used this type of thinking to falsely claim, in the words of the *Augsburg Confession*, that the Roman Catholic “Church’s power” must “needs” “be very great, because it hath dispensed with a precept of the Decalogue;” the Seventh-day Adventist Church has used this type of thinking to falsely claim that the Jewish Sabbath should still be kept.

When one understands this, one understands that for the wily Pope Paul VI who gave Bacchiocchi a Papal medal, and for the crafty Jesuits at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome, the rare and unusual admission of Bacchiocchi to undertake studies in this area at the Pontifical Gregorian University as Rome was seen as a win-win situation for both the Roman Catholic and Seventh-day Adventist Churches. On the one hand, the Roman Catholic Church could use Bacchiocchi’s work to say, Here is a non-Roman Catholic, saying that there is no basis for Sunday sacredness in the Bible, and that the authority for Sunday sacredness is found in the power of the Pope and Roman Church. Therefore we have an admission of this great Papal power by a non-Roman Catholic, and we enjoin all Roman Catholics to keep Sunday in recognition of the Roman Church’s great power. But on the one hand, the Seventh-day Adventist Church could use Bacchiocchi’s work to say, Here is a work from a Roman Catholic university with a Roman Catholic imprimatur, saying that there is no basis for Sunday sacredness in the Bible, and that the authority for Sunday sacredness is found in the power of the Pope and Roman Church. Therefore we have proof of this great Papal power by a thesis from a Roman Catholic University in Rome itself, and we enjoin all Seventh-day Adventists to keep the Jewish Sabbath in rejection of the Roman Church’s power.

Who then is the proverbial “meat in the sandwich” between the two slices of Papist and Adventist bread? None other but *those mutually hated Protestants who point to passages like Gal. 4:10,11 and Col. 2:16,17, to show that the abolition of the Jewish Sabbath is by Divine Law, not Papal law! And who also point to passages like Acts*

20:7, I Cor. 16:2, and Rev. 1:10, to show that Sunday sacredness comes from New Testament authority as a celebration of the resurrection of Christ on the first day of the week, and not from the promulgation of some Papal law!

The Bible describes the Roman Papacy and Roman Church as a “great whore,” “with whom the kings of the earth have committed” spiritual “fornication” (Rev. 17:1,2). The Roman Papacy and Church is a whore that goes to bed with various bidders. Bacchiocchi made the old whore an offer. She would get something out of it; and he would get something out of it. So the old whore of Rome replied to Bacchiocchi, *Come lie in my Jesuit bed in Rome*. Both the Roman Catholic and Seventh-day Adventist Churches evidently found this win-win union to be a spiritually stimulating experience, one that St. John describes as spiritual “fornication” (Rev. 17:2).

By 1979 and 1980, as a 19 year old second year college student and a 20 year old third year college student, I was in the process of leaving the Seventh-day Adventist Church. My vacation employment in the 1979 end of year and 1980 beginning of year period had not been like in the previous two years as an SDA colporteur, in that this time it was with non-SDA companies. I had also maintained some connections with Evangelical Anglicans, some of whom were present at an SDA Church I preached at in January 1980, *infra*. But I was ambling towards the SDA “EXIT” doors in a slow and steady manner, with great caution and care, methodically thinking through the relevant matters. However, certain events related to my College heresy trial, acted as a swift boot to kick and catapult me out the door much quicker than I had planned on going.

The *Pacific Union College* Arts degree at *Avondale College*, contained a mix of required subjects and electives that only specialized more on e.g., education or theology in the third and fourth years. Thus while my first two years at College included some classroom study of the unique or near unique teachings of the SDA Church (a small component of Theology I as taught by Pastor Tolhurst, and the main component of Biblical Apocalyptic as taught by Pastor Tolhurst who focused on SDA interpretations of Daniel and Revelation), most of what I did was fairly general. It ranged in subjects over the Education Department (Psychology), Humanities Department (one English and three History subjects), Science Department (Human Biology), and Theology Department. Much of what I did in the Theology Department, e.g., NT Greek, was not specifically focused on the unique or near unique SDA teachings.

For example, I greatly enjoyed the subject, New Testament I, with Pastor Balharrie, the Chairman of the Theology Department, who spoke with a strong American accent. This involved studying some broad content of the four gospels, although contained the defect of a “harmony” of the Gospels methodology, also followed by many non-SDAs that I do not always agree with. Pastor Balharrie was on secondment from *Pacific Union College* in America, having undertaken a teacher-exchange with Dr. Des Ford. He was a friendly man, who told some interesting anecdotal stories. E.g., he said that when he was a boy in the USA, after the horrors of World War One (1914-1918), it became known as the war to end all wars. In this context, it became common to play on the final year of the war, “1918,” with the Biblical verse in Lev. 19:18, and to say, “1918

– Leviticus 19:18, ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself’.

Nevertheless, this was still a Seventh-day Adventist College, and at times that was very apparent. E.g., one of the theology students, Don Fehlberg, used to fly in the College aircraft every weekend with a team of student evangelists under him to a set location. There with his team, Don Fehlberg would try to win converts for the Seventh-day Adventist cult. In the language of College, this was sometimes referred to as, “How many skulls an [SDA] evangelist had on his belt.” I.e., this was head-hunter imagery, in which converts were metaphorically depicted with shrunken heads, “gloriously” adorning the belt of a given Seventh-day Adventist evangelist. The more heads an evangelist had on his belt, the more highly he was regarded. I well remember how Donny Fehlberg would sometimes stand at different places around College, and with a very big smile on his face, say in a loud public voice, “*I AWAKE! I ARISE!! I EVANGELIZE!!!*”

In my third year at College I undertook a subject called, *Practical Theology I*, to which was attached a second subject called, *Externship*. The former was taken by, and the latter was supervised by, Pastor Fletcher. He first arrived at College in 1980, and he came with an inquisitor’s like zeal to crack down on theologically dissident College students. In hindsight, it was rather unfortunate for me that our first conflict was over an issue that he was actually correct on, and at the time I was wrong on. I had been seduced by college teachers such as Dr. Young, Dr. Cox, and Dr. Clapham, into the error of thinking the Revised Standard Version was a better version than the Authorized Version. When he attacked the RSV (and a host of other modern versions), and upheld the AV, I regret to say that I disagreed with him, spoke in favour of the RSV, and thus came to first incur his wrath.

Although I now realize that he was absolutely correct to defend the AV over the RSV, unfortunately he was not a particularly intellectually gifted man, and he never gave any intellectually sound reason for preferring the AV. He simply yelled loudly, and expected the fear of his presence to persuade people to adopt his view. This is not a methodology that worked with me. His view was correct, his methodology was not. Had I given the matter more matured thought and reflection by that time, I could have supported him on the matter, and by the grace of God, given some intellectual justifications and support for the AV that he could not. But I was not at that point. While rejecting his methodology, I must now in humility, nevertheless admit, that on this first issue of conflict that arose between us, he was right and I was wrong.

Having first raised Pastor Fletcher’s ire, he turned his inquisitorial zeal more comprehensively to investigate me. Under the cultural practices of Avondale College, there was a very great academic freedom given to College teachers (or lecturers), but a relatively small amount of academic freedom given to College students. (This same problem exists more widely in Western tertiary institutions, where students are generally marked down, a process more acute in postgraduate work than even undergraduate work, if they do not maintain secularist normativity e.g., support for anti-supernaturalist views of history and science, or support for so called “human rights” on race, sex, and sexual practices). Under the normative rules of College life, in practice, College Departments,

and within them College teachers, were largely confederal in their operations. If two College teachers raised the same issue, e.g., one said in their subject that they regarded the RSV as the better translation, and the other said in their subject that they regarded the AV as the better translation, then one could only state an agreement in that subject where the College teacher was advocating a particular position. Academic freedom was in general taken to mean the academic freedom of college teachers, not of college students.

Individual College teachers were fairly free to do what they wanted in classes, and in their relationship to their students, but they had no such powers over fellow College teachers. It was this type of College normativity that had allowed the rise of the *Shaking of Adventism movement* under Dr. Ford's leadership, who was thus able to develop his ideas at Avondale College with impunity from any fellow College teachers who disagreed with him, and he presumably expected this same type of normativity would exist at Pacific Union College when he went there on a college teacher exchange programme (though if so, subsequent events at PUC were to evidently prove him wrong, *infra*). Thus if Pastor Fletcher wanted to, he could go on a heretic hunt against students in his classes, but under the normative rules of the College's operations, he could not extend this to a heretic hunt against fellow College teachers.

My views on a range of issues were not hard to locate. I had raised the issue of the NT abolishing the Jewish dietary laws with e.g., Dr. Patrick. I had raised the issue of Col. 2:16 referring to the weekly sabbath on the basis that it isolates annual, monthly and weekly Jewish days respectively, with both college students and teachers. I had clearly rejected the SDA teaching of Dan. 8:14 about an "investigate judgement," and raised this with both College teachers and students. It would have been a fairly slipshod SDA "heretic hunter" who could not find "a hot trail emblazoned" to my "Room 9" door in Watson Hall. Pastor Fletcher picked up the trail and pursued it with remorseless rigour and unrelenting zeal. In fairness to the man, his zeal was a credit to the Seventh-day Adventist Church, whose unique and near unique doctrines he believed with a great and very sincere passion, even as I had come to reject them with a great and very sincere passion as being unBiblical.

Apart from marking a student's class work down, *prima facie*, there were three forms of "discipline" open to a College teacher that he could pursue in order to "deal" with a "problem" student. The first was the Ethics Committee. However, this was not used for issues of "heresy," but rather for issues of morals.

The only time I ever heard of the Ethics Committee being used, was for the purposes of expelling a small number of fornicators. We College students held to a number of conservative Christian morals which would be maintained far more widely than simply among SDAs. We believed that if a boy and girl in dating came to hold hands, then "they had made it." One might kiss or hug a girl *in moderation* e.g., when saying farewell to her, *but not in excess*. One would certainly not touch or fondle any of her private parts e.g., her breasts. Most of us were perfectly happy with these kind of College cultural conventions. Certainly none of us had any sympathy with fornicators, and when we learnt of the occasional Ethics Committee expulsion of fornicators, we were

both surprised at the pair of them, and agreed that they should have been expelled.

E.g., a boy at College who was from America, and whose strong American accent gained him some popular novelty, committed fornication with a girl from College. From memory, this was not known about at the time. They both left College and when I was visiting a friend who worked at, and lived near the San, I met the girl's brother. I learnt that they had lived together in sin for some time, "in a log cabin." But then the boy had disappeared in a puff of smoke. The rumour was he had gone back to America, though nobody was sure. This was regarded as outrageous, since the understanding was that if fornication occurred, then the pair would have to marry. The girl's brother said to me that he wished that he could locate him. He would have liked to have first tried to persuade him to marry her, and if that had failed, to have thrown a few punches at him for deflowering the honour of his sister (even though SDAs are meant to be pacifists). In this type of culture, brothers are meant to protect the honour of their sisters.

Or on another occasion, I well remember on one rainy day walking past Watson Hall (the male boarding residence). Now it is sometimes said to unmarried girls who prize their pre-marital virginity, *When the rains come down, they cannot be put back into the sky*. Outside Watson Hall was a mother in her car, tears trickling down her face inside the car, weeping bitterly, as rain drops trickled down outside onto the car. She was there to pick up her daughter (whom I had seen around College but did not know), who was being sent home in disgrace. She had committed fornication with a boy in my year whom I knew slightly, but not well. He was a popularist figure among some, as a guy with a beard who strummed a guitar. Evidently, he had become *too* popular. I remember how word of their expulsion spread around College and was discussed. Though the young man was a popularist figure, I recall absolutely no sympathy for him. We all agreed that it was right that the two of them had been expelled⁶⁴. The figure of that weeping mother sitting in her car as the rain fell, and the car wipers went back and forth, has stayed with me. *She was giving a good witness to Christian morals, and the proper response of a godly mother in these tragic circumstances*. I am grateful to both God and her for having seen her Biblical witness on this matter.

This first option of using the Ethics Committee with respect to myself, was not

⁶⁴ Though it is admittedly a *stern action* to remove such fornicators from College, or excommunicate them from a church, it should be remembered that St. Paul, quoting an ancient Greek poet of Athens, says, "Evil companions corrupt good morals" (I Cor. 15:33, ASV). Once a girl has lost her virginity in fornication, she realizes that she has lost the respect of decent men who might marry her. She knows they will think of her as "damaged property." Having played the slut, she then goes out to influence other girls to likewise play the slut, so they will be in the same bad situation she is in. What then should we do with "fornicators" (I Cor. 6:9)? "Purge" them "out" (I Cor. 5:7), for we ought "not to" keep "company with fornicators" (I Cor. 5:9) i.e., if they profess and call themselves Christians (I Cor. 5:10-13). (On my usage of the term, "Christian," see section 10a, *infra*.) "From fornication, and all other deadly sin ..., Good Lord, deliver us" (*Litany*, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662).

open to Pastor Fletcher, since its orbit of operations were moral matters, and Pastor Fletcher's concerns were with heresy. Pastor Fletcher's second option was to bring the matter of heresy before a Department Committee under the Department Chairman, in this instance, the Chairman of the Theology Department, Pastor Balharrie, on the basis that I was no longer a suitable Ministerial student. Avondale College operated under religious tests, as did Oxbridge Universities before their abolition in the 19th century, or a number of contemporary American Colleges or Universities. If he pursued this path, any penalty applied would be limited to the Faculty in question. However, a successful heresy trial at this point, and barring of a student from undertaking certain subjects in that faculty on the basis that he was an unsuitable Ministerial student, could act as a prelude to, and would greatly assist in terms of presenting evidence, in a follow up action which was the third option. This third option was a heresy trial brought before the SDA Church itself. If successful, the powers of such a body were those of "disfellowship," the SDA equivalent of excommunication.

Pastor Fletcher selected the second option. If he was successful at this point, he would be in a good position to push the matter on to a subsequent Church heresy trial, if he so wished. If he was unsuccessful at this point, it would not be as bad for him as if he was unsuccessful at a Church heresy trial. By selecting the second option, Pastor Fletcher was also keeping his initial actions under tighter personal control. He could seek to more directly influence such persons who were at close quarters to him. The heresy trial committee appointed by the Theology Department included e.g., Dr. Patrick, to whom I had formerly said that I did not agree with the SDA claim that the OT Jewish dietary laws continued to bind Christians. In these matters, Pastor Fletcher played "hard cop" with me, whereas Dr. Patrick played "soft cop" with me, and Pastor Balharrie tried to appear neutral and aloof as the Chairman of the Theology Department overseeing the whole matter.

I was called to appear before the Theology Department Committee on a set day at a set time. The technical grounds upon which I was being summoned was that this was an investigation from the SDA perspective of my "suitability" as a Ministerial student, and thus my suitability to be enrolled in the Theology Department subject of Pastor Fletcher's *Practical Theology I* (or any other future Ministerial student subjects). Both just before and after this time an unusual matter occurred. There was a relatively formal demarcation line between College teachers (or lecturers) and students. In most instances, we students did not even know what the first names of the College teachers were. Nor did we have any interest in knowing. We simply accepted the *status quo*. There was a clearly defined formal barrier between teachers and students, represented in the formal titles used for the teachers. I do not say this was right or wrong. I simply say this is how it was. An exception to this was Dr. Young, who in private, but not public, i.e., not in the class-room, allowed a small number of students, myself included, to call him "Norm" (Norman). Dr. Young would also sometimes refer, in a favourable tone, to "John Cox," i.e., Dr. Cox of the Humanities Department.

But just before and just after my heresy trial, on a number of occasions, when I was in the canteen, Dr. Brinsmead of the Theology Department would appear. (As with

most of my college teachers, I have no idea what his first name was.) He was always very friendly. By general College standards, this type of fraternity with a student in the canteen was abnormal and unusual (though not specifically prohibited). But after a while, he would always then say something like, “Gee Gavin, I just don’t know how ya’ manage to stay at College. If what was happenin’ to you was happenin’ to me, I’d be drivin’ out of College with my bags on my roof racks.” (In those days I drove a black Peugeot 404, which had removable clip on-off roof racks.)

The heresy trial committee summoned me to appear before them in a room of the Theology Department. The methodology used entailed an element of simple tactical brilliance. Under examination and cross-examination for heresy, every matter was reduced down to just one simple matter, namely, whether or not I was prepared to say that the Seventh-day Adventist Church was “the only church” that a person should join. This methodology was centred on the issue of church authority. After all, if I accepted the basic proposition that the SDA cult was “the only church” that a person should join, it inexorably followed from this that I must submit to SDA Church discipline on a whole range of theological matters.

My defence also contained an element of elegant simplicity. Though I did not specifically refer to the *Apostles’ Creed* by name (the SDA Church does not acknowledge this creed), my defence was based around Article 10 of the creed, “I believe in ... the holy catholic (universal) church; the communion (fellowship) of saints (believers).” My position that there is a wider universal church, so that one could certainly not refer to the Seventh-day Adventist Church as “the only church for someone to join,” meant that I was defending established orthodoxy. The *Apostles’ Creed* is found in the major confessions and catechisms of the Protestant Reformation, e.g., Lutheran, Anglican, and Presbyterian. One cannot fairly condemn as a “heretic,” a man who upholds an Article of the *Apostles’ Creed* as it has been generally understood by Protestants.

Thus under examination and cross-examination by the heresy committee, I repeatedly refused to accept the proposition, specifically put to me again and again, that the Seventh-day Adventist Church is “the only church that someone should join.” The Theology Department Committee under Pastor Balharrie was clearly very unimpressed with my defence based around Article 10 of the *Apostles’ Creed*. From their perspective as members of the Seventh-day Adventist cult, I was clearly some kind of heretic. They thus regarded me as unsuitable to be a Ministerial student, and so unsuitable to be enrolled in such subjects as e.g., Pastor Fletcher’s *Practical Theology I*.

The penalty that was imposed upon me by the Theology Department Committee was that I was barred from undertaking a certain number of subjects in the Theology Department. This included what was known as a *forced withdrawal*, from the two subjects taken or supervised by Pastor Fletcher, *supra*. This meant that while I could theoretically stay at College, I could not complete the degree. Thus this decision was calculated to make me complement the *forced withdrawal* from two subjects, with a *voluntary withdrawal* from the remaining subjects, and thus a “voluntary” withdrawal from College. One could thus leave with a more honourable exit than those who were

expelled by the Ethics Committee. *Heretics, it seems, were regarded as more honourable than fornicators.*

When I was considering possible options, I made an appointment to see the Acting Chairman of the Education Department, Miss Yob, to see if I could change the majors in my degree from Theology to Education. This was not theoretically too difficult, since the PUC Arts degree only became more specialized in the third and fourth years, and this was still early in the third year. Miss Yob evidently held some religiously liberal views, since she was a feminist, and happy to take a traditionally male role as Chairman of the Education Department. Miss Yob's answer was unambiguous. She said she did not want, what she called "Rejects" like me, in the Education Department. (Cf. "A man that is an *heretick*, after the first and second admonition *reject*," Titus 3:10.)

As I was preparing to leave, I spoke to Dr. Hansen of the Humanities Department, with whom I had studied a number of History subjects. He spoke with the College Principal, Dr. Magnusson, who then called me to his office. Dr. Magnusson was always reticent to allow a student to leave. He had spoken at Chapel services about how the annual college budget allowed for a small number of students to leave each year, but not many, and that College fees were based on the maintenance of a set number of students. Dr. Magnusson took a very administrative approach to my case. I had been barred from certain Theology Department subjects as an unsuitable Ministerial student on the basis of what from the SDA perspective were my "unorthodox" theological beliefs. But I could still complete the B.A. with an Education major. The religious test requirements of Avondale College were still met by me, since I had not been before an SDA Church Committee on the charge of heresy, but only a Theology Department Committee whose jurisdiction did not extend beyond their Department. Therefore, Dr. Magnusson said that if I wanted to stay and pursue an Education major, he would overrule Miss Yob and force her to accept my enrolment.

On one level it was a kindly last minute offer by Dr. Magnusson, who thought highly of Dr. Hansen, and was prepared to act on his advice. It would certainly have embroiled Dr. Magnusson in College controversy. But on another level I had ceased to regard completion of the PUC Arts degree as a viable option, even though at first I had thought this a possibility. With the heresy hunter, Pastor Fletcher, still operative, such a decision might well have been the catalyst for him to move to his third option, and seek an SDA Church heresy trial of myself. If he did so, he would certainly have been successful, and it seemed clear that he would have also have had the support of the Acting Chairman of the Education Department, Miss Yob (whom after I left College was later appointed as the Chairman of the Education Department). Whether or not this happened, I was clearly in a hostile environment.

The truth of the matter was that Pastor Fletcher, Miss Yob, and the Theology Department Committee under Pastor Balharrie were absolutely correct in their basic assessment that at a Seventh-day Adventist College I was a square peg in a round hole. I did not subscribe to the unique, or near unique beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Clearly I was not suitable as a Ministerial student for the SDA Church. I had

maintained under examination and cross-examination for heresy, the theological orthodoxy of Article 10 of the *Apostles' Creed* against the claims of the Seventh-day Adventist cult to be “the only church that someone should join.” The time for me to go had come. I declined Dr. Magnusson’s offer. I undertook the relevant steps to formally withdraw from both Avondale College and the Seventh-day Adventist Church. *Thus ended my experience of life in a cult, and also what some might call, “an American College education.”*

My five years in the Seventh-day Adventist Church from the ages of 15 to 20, including just over two years at Avondale College, was a mix of *the good, the bad, and the ugly*. Though it ended with *the ugly* spectacle of a heresy trial, and included my temporary embrace of some of *the ugly and bad* in SDA theology, it must be said that there was also quite a lot of *good*. And that *good* was quite good and quite enjoyable. I thank God for it.

E.g., with respect to Avondale College, I remember many elements of it with fondness. Coming as I did from an educational background in Victorian, New South Welsh, and Australian Capital Territorial public schools that had not taught English grammar for years, I found a nuts’n’bolts study of English grammar with Dr. Cox and Mr. Cooper to be very useful for both English and Greek⁶⁵. I greatly enjoyed a lot of what I studied. E.g., elements of Protestant Reformation history undertaken with Mr. (from 1979, Dr.) Hansen. As one who both then and now listens to very little radio (whose popular / pop music and radio announcers are chief brainwashers of our worldly age), or watches very little television (the proverbial “idiot box”), or sees very few movies (most of which take pleasure in those who are reprobate), like so many other students, I was riveted and greatly impressed by an annual event of Mr. Hansen’s in my first College year. On a given night, the main lecture theatre became a movie hall. (These were the days of movie projectors with winding reels of film, necessitating an intermission half way, as the first reel of film was rewound and the second reel set up.) This was the classic Louis De Rochemont’s Production, *Martin Luther* (Lutheran Film Associates, 1953, black and white, 105 minutes). Years later I purchased this when it became available on video, and though not the same as seeing it on “the big screen,” it still remains a very moving, gripping, and exciting film to me.

As one who hates the general irreligiosity of the secular society, with its false claims that Christianity is just one of a number of equally true or false religions, and its constant desire to degrade and / or sideline Christian spirituality; I found the higher religiosity environment of a specifically Christian College, very much to my liking; I only wish that it had been an *orthodox* Christian College. I also remain grateful for the opportunity of studying NT Greek with Dr. Young. At those points where it intersects with traditional Protestant morality, I look with happiness on the moral and spiritual conservatism of College life, in which foul language, fornication, and a disinterest in Biblical matters were deemed unwelcome intruders. I am grateful for (both compulsory

⁶⁵ Among other things, in *English I* we used J.R. Bernard’s *A Short Guide to Traditional Grammar*, Sydney University Press, N.S.W. Australia, 1975, reprint 1976.

and voluntary) Chapel services I attended in the Chapel of Watson Hall (the men's dormitory), and also midweek Chapel services I attended in the College Chapel & Hall⁶⁶.

I hold no grudges against Pastor Fletcher, Pastor Balharrie's Theology Department Committee, or Miss Yob. They believed one thing, and I believed another. Our divergent theological beliefs were like chalk'n'cheese. The division that occurred between us was logical, inevitable, and right. They were not wrong to want me out of College. From their perspective I was a *heretic* (Pastor Fletcher & Pastor Balharrie's Theology Department Committee) and *reject* (Miss Yob). It would have been wrong for me to have stayed either in Avondale College or in the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

It should also be remembered that the period of the late 1970s and early 1980s was one in which the Seventh-day Adventist cult was experiencing the *Shaking of Adventism movement* under the originating leadership of Dr. Ford. This movement would ultimately fizzle away, but at the time it was an important, and at times dominating reality, in the Australian section of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. E.g., I remember how at the Dundas Church which I had attended since returning to Sydney from Canberra, and also attended in College holidays, divisions had arisen among SDAs over the *Shaking of Adventism movement*. For instance, at the Dundas Church there was a sharp disagreement on the matter between two Adult Sabbath School teachers, one who was anti-Ford and anti-Paxton (Lynden Kent), and one who was pro-Ford and pro-Paxton (an SDA school teacher).

To some extent, the concerns raised in my heresy trial had reflected a wider concern by some in the SDA hierarchy, that there was a need "to set limits" on the sort of things raised by Dr. Ford and the *Shaking of Adventism movement*. As one who considered Dr. Ford was not only correct in his concerns about the SDA "investigative judgement" teaching and associated issues of Ellen White's authority, but who considered that Ford did not go far enough in his repudiation of SDA doctrine (e.g., Ford still regarded the Jewish Sabbath as binding, contrary to Col. 2:16), I presented as a fairly obvious target. I was clearly the type of person that those in the SDA Church hierarchy were increasingly worried about, and increasingly prepared to start "gunning for."

The details behind the Ford-Balharrie teacher exchange are speculative. They are shrouded in silence. But in view of the turbulent times inside the Seventh-day Adventist Church over the *Shaking of Adventism movement*, it is possible, *though by no means*

⁶⁶ Photographs of myself are in the College's 1978 *Jacaranda (Jac)* ("Plate 6 Boys' Worship," shows the back of my head immediately above the Hymn Book in Watson Hall Chapel), and 1979 *Jac* (p. 52 at the top of the stairs in a stripped jumper, shows me leaving the top storey of the College Chapel & Hall after a mid-week Chapel service; p. 31 shows me looking to the right at a clock during an exam in the College Auditorium). Combined Chapel Services i.e., Men and Women together, such as the mid-week Chapel service, were held in a multi-functional College Chapel and Hall, a historic building at Avondale, pictured in the 1978 *Jacaranda* (p. 61) with the caption, "The Chapel – Avondale's landmark."

certain, that Pastor Balharrie was sent out as some kind of “trouble-shooter.” If so, he may have been told something like this, in a strong American accent. “We’ll monitor Ford over here at Pacific Union College’s American campus in California, while you try and get on top of the situation at Pacific Union College’s Australian campus in New South Western, ... ah, ... um, I mean, ... er, New South Wales, ... *over on the other side of the Pacific.*” If Pastor Balharrie was sent out as some type of American “trouble-shooter,” then he came looking for trouble, and it must be admitted, that he go a lot of it with me. But he had the SDA power structures on his side, and so he was necessarily going to win in the ensuing “shoot-out” at “the Avondale College’s OK corral.”

What relatively little media coverage there was given to the *Shaking of Adventism movement*, focused primarily on its undisputed leader, Dr. Ford, who was “the big fry,” and to a lesser extent some other SDA teachers and pastors, who were “the medium fry.” A 20 year old third year College student such as myself, who considered that in fact Ford did not go far enough in his critique of Seventh-day Adventism, was very much “the little fry,” and too small to attract any such media coverage.

An interesting article on his matter, entitled, “The Shaking Up of Adventism,” appeared in *Christianity Today* in February 1980. It referred to the fact that Dr. Ford of Pacific Union College had been summoned to the SDA headquarters in Washington D.C., over his teachings. He had been given six months paid leave to prepare a paper explaining his position. An Adult Sabbath School Quarterly written by him had been now suppressed. In October 1980, *Christianity Today* reported that Dr. Ford had been stripped of his credentials as a Seventh-day Adventist Minister. Less than twelve months later, *Christianity Today* further reported in June 1981 that Smuts van Rooyen, an Assistant Professor at Andrews University, Michigan, USA, had resigned after being told that he could no longer teach there because of his pro-Ford views. Then in March 1983, *Christianity Today* reported further actions against SDA teachers and pastors. Ford and others had been accused of “heresy, apostasy,” and “rebellion” over their rejection of the SDA’s “investigative judgment” doctrine, and associated rejection of “prophetess” Ellen White’s claims to authority on the matter⁶⁷.

Of note, the February 1980 article, “The Shaking Up of Adventism,” records that

⁶⁷ “The Shaking Up of Adventism?”, *Christianity Today*, 8 Feb 1980, pp. 64-5; Minnery, T., “The Adventist Showdown: Will It Trigger a Rash of Defections”, *Christianity Today*, 10 Oct. 1980, pp. 76-7; “Another Adventist Professor Is Ejected for His Views,” *Christianity Today*, 12 June 1981, p. 35; Hefley, J.C., “Adventist Teachers Are Forced Out in a Doctrinal Dispute,” *Christianity Today*, 18 March 1983, pp. 23-5. This latter article makes reference to the SDA historian, Ronald Numbers (at pp. 24-5). Numbers is a former SDA who took the poison pill of Darwinian macroevolution and ended up in religious agnosticism (Numbers, R., *The Creationists*, *op. cit.*, p. xvi). The best known SDA historian of our times, he has given guest lectures at e.g., Andrews University (1979, 2001, & 2006), Pacific Union College (1991), Avondale College (1995), and Sydney University (1994) (RONALD L. NUMBERS, Wisconsin University, www.medhist.wisc.edu/faculty/numbers/numbers-cv.pdf).

those on the Ford side, considered the SDA hierarchy “is the Vatican, and administration officials are the Italian Curia.” This records an important element of the *Shaking of Adventism movement* of which I was a part, although I went well beyond its concerns. I.e., we saw ourselves as in a Martin Luther type struggle against the theological errors of Rome, as found in the SDA Church.

Looking back at the matter more than a quarter of a century later, on the one hand, I also think we overstated our own importance. After all, the SDA cult was not like the Western European politico-religious power of 16th century Roman Catholicism. None of us were going to get burnt at the stake. And whether we won or lost, our relative importance in the broad sweep of church history could never compare to those momentous events of the Protestant Reformation.

But on the other hand, in one way we were more like Luther than we realized. Luther had brought with him some of the old Romish baggage with respect to his sacramentalism (baptismal regeneration, consubstantiation, and voluntary auricular confession as a church ordained “sacrament”), which he sadly retained for the rest of his life. Ford *et al* clung onto the SDA baggage of thinking “the Jews’ Preparation Day” (John 19:42) and connected Jewish Sabbath “days” (Gal. 4:10; Col. 2:16) were still binding. I took with me religiously liberal baggage picked up primarily, although not exclusively, from Dr. Young and Dr. Hosken. We were like Luther in that we were frail and imperfect, and had not by the grace of God entirely ridded ourselves of all the bad theology that had come from our experiences of the Seventh-day Adventist cult.

But I also think we were fundamentally correct in understanding the issues of our struggle, which were to uphold basic tenets of apostolic Christianity recovered at the time of the Reformation, but reintroduced with a different slant by the Seventh-day Adventist cult from the 19th century. Among Protestants, the *Apostles’ Creed* and *Reformation Motto* form the most basic summaries of the Christian faith. Together with the *Ten Commandments* (as understood for Christians in the NT), *Lord’s Prayer*, and Gospel sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper, they are clearly identifiable foundational planks in the theology of Protestant Christianity.

In elucidation, the threefold *Reformation Motto* is sometimes stated in the fivefold form: *faith alone, Christ alone, grace alone, Glory to God alone, Scripture alone*. If “faith alone” requires “Christ alone” (Philp. 3:8,9), and the whole work of *sola fide* (faith alone) and *sola gratia* (grace alone) requires “glory to God alone” (Rom. 4:2,20; Eph. 3:21); then there can be no place for any joint sin bearer, such as a man’s own works righteousness or Mary and the Saints in Roman Catholicism, or the goat sacrifice of the Devil in Seventh-day Adventism. If we accept Article 11 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, on “the forgiveness of sins,” in the true and Biblical sense, we can accept neither Romish nor Adventist beliefs and practices. Therefore, I consider we rightly recognized that Seventh-day Adventist theology on the plan of salvation is intermediate between Protestant and Roman Catholic positions. It is a half-way house system of salvation, that stands somewhere in between the teachings of the Protestant Reformation and the teachings of the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation. It is not Romanist Proper, but it

is semi-Romanist, and so it embraces *some* key elements of Roman Catholic soteriological theology.

We maintained *the completeness of Christ's atonement*, i.e., *the finished work of Christ on the cross*, requiring neither the Romish additions of works righteousness, or Mary as "co-redeemer;" nor the SDA additions of Satan as some kind of end-time goat sacrifice following Christ's return, with the Devil as the "Azazel" goat bearing ultimate and final responsibility for man's sin, before which there is only an *almost* complete or *almost* finished atonement. We held that there is no place for any notion of *joint sin bearing*. Whether that is a man who in apostate inter-testamental or NT Judaism is claiming, "to forsake unrighteousness is a propitiation" "for sins" (Sirach 3:3; 35:3, *Apocrypha*), or a Roman Catholic claiming that he can do "good works" to "help get time out of purgatory," or a Roman Catholic claiming he can avail "of Mary's merit" with Mary as "co-redeemer," or a Seventh-day Adventist thinking that by Satan "bearing ultimate responsibility" there will then be a final completion of the "atonement" "for" "sins" (Lev. 16:10,34).

We maintained *the singularity of Christ's atonement*, requiring neither the Romish multiple acts of atonement with "sacrifices of the Masses," in which it was said, "the priest did offer Christ for the living and the dead;" nor the SDA multiple acts of atonement with an absurd distinction between "forgiveness of sins" and "blotting out of sins." This requires the view that more than 18 centuries after he hung on the cross, Christ started a process that reaches up to just before the Second Advent, in which he makes a further atonement from 1844 onwards, i.e., contrary to Heb. 1:3, when Christ sat down on the Father's right hand, this means Christ had only *partially* "purged our sins."

We maintained *the singularity of Christ's atonement ON THE CROSS*, requiring neither later Romish good works and "sacrifices of Masses;" nor a later Seventh-day Adventist initial *stretch* of this work to 1844 when, after allegedly dawdling at the door of the heavenly Most Holy Place for some 1800 years, it is said Christ *finally* entered the Most Holy Place, to "blot out sins." But there is then a *double stretch*, as from 1844 this work is said to continue till just before the Second Advent. And there is then a *triple stretch* of the completed atonement, as it is then said that for a further 1,000 years during the millennium that starts after the Second Advent, there is to be an offering of the Devil as a goat sacrifice in order to *finally* fulfil the "atonement" typed in the OT Day of Atonement ceremony (Lev. 16:10,33,34). I.e., on this view, even when Christ appears in power and great glory at his Second Coming, he must declare, "The atonement will not be complete for about another 1,000 years, because the goat sacrifice of Satan still hasn't been made."

We maintained *the effectiveness or sufficiency of Christ's atonement of all sins, past, present, and future*, so that "by one offering, *he hath perfected for ever* them that are sanctified" (Heb. 10:14), since salvation is a GIFT, given by God's grace alone and accepted by faith alone (Eph. 2:8,9). I.e., the security of the believer, requiring no *justification by confession*, wherein one's salvation is uncertain as one moves in and out of being saved. Either on the Roman Catholic model of auricular confession to a Popish

priest, requiring e.g., the so called “Last Confession” before one dies; or on the Seventh-day-Adventist model, depending on whether or not one has any unconfessed sins that Christ has not “blotted out” in the so called “investigative judgement,” that is said to have started in 1844 and said to finish just before the Second Advent.

We maintained *the sufficiency of Scripture alone* to understand such things. We held that one requires no “new revelations of the Spirit,” whether from Popish saints or councils, or whether from the SDA “prophetess,” E.G. White teaching an “investigative judgment” doctrine *et al*, or whether from anyone else. We held our authority to be Scripture and *Scripture alone*. “*Sola Scriptura*” was a Latin saying oft heard upon my lips, being one that I loved to repeat, again and again. It was life. It was freedom. It was health. It was peace (Philp. 2:16; Gal. 5:1; Jer. 33:6; II Tim. 2:15; Jas 1:18).

The Seventh-day Adventist Church of our day was nothing like as powerful as the Roman Catholic Church of Luther’s day, but it was powerful to us. Avondale College and the surrounding area of Cooranbong were largely peopled by SDAs. We ran the gauntlet of being branded heretics. We stood for a clearer teaching of justification by faith and Scripture alone. We pursued the truth at all costs. And we were prepared to pay any price in its discovery and defence. In the larger annals of church history we were a fairly minor side show. But in the great personal battles of faith that we fought, the matters that we upheld were believed by us to be truly earth-shattering and momentous matters in our own lives and the lives of those whom we touched. We stood where our great hero Martin Luther had stood. Like Luther, we held that unless convicted by the words of Scripture and consonant godly reason, we could not and would not recant. Here Luther stood. He could do no other. Here we stood. We could do no other. Here I stood. I could do no other.

Return to Anglicanism (at 20 years old and later)

Even while in Adventism, over the years I had sometimes read over parts of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* and *Thirty-Nine Articles*. From whence I had come, thence I returned. I had been hewn from an Anglican rock, and to the Anglican Church I returned.

To some extent I had already prepared the way by attending the occasional Evangelical Anglican service on Sunday nights during College holidays, at St. Paul’s *Church of England*, Carlingford, with the Reverend Mr. Vitnell (called, “Mr. Vitnell” in formal contexts, and “Mr. Vit” in more informal contexts). I had also maintained friendships from school contacts with some Evangelical Anglicans in the Diocese of Sydney. When I preached my first sermon on *Australia Day*, Saturday the 26th of January, 1980, at Kellyville Seventh-day Adventist Church (the old church, Cnr President & Greenwood Rds), I invited two Evangelical Anglicans. An old school friend, Mark Denny, did the reading from Luke 18:18ff; and a friend from St. Paul’s Carlingford, Graham Newmarch (at the time an Anglican Youth Worker), presented a Special Item (with puppets).

I was Confirmed by the Bishop of Parramatta, Donald Robinson, on St. Clement's Day (23 November), 1980, in confirmation of my Anglican baptism, almost 20 years before on 18 December, 1960. I was Confirmed at St. Mary's Anglican Church, Toongabbie (Sydney). Bishop Robinson later became Archbishop of Sydney. In that capacity, I again met him when I was a student at Sydney University, while living in an Anglican residential College of that university in 1987 and 1988. As Archbishop, he was the Visitor of the College, and sometimes came to the mid-week evening Chapel Services. Though he is now retired, I have also met him in recent years at St. Swithun's Anglican Church, Pymble (Sydney), when I have attended one of their Sunday services of Evensong from the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*.

While living in Sydney, in 1981 I became a part-time student, studying theology for about eight months, at St. John's College, Morpeth. This was an Anglican College north of Sydney in the Diocese of Newcastle. I enrolled as an external student somewhat naively. I thought I would enjoy the trip into the country on weekends every couple of months or so (which I did). But I got more than I had bargained for. We did not go to the campus for class-room lectures from the College teachers very often. We went on weekends, whose intervals were measured in terms of months. Thus it took a while to work out what was going on. But for all that, I did not stay for very long.

On the up side, I attended some interesting guest lectures from different people brought in from outside the College for the weekend external students. I bought a number of books for the course, some, though not all of which I later retained as works possessing requisite value. (It was also one factor assisting me to later gain admission to an Anglican residential College at Sydney University, *infra*.) But on the down side, St. John's College Morpeth had many problems. E.g., it was a religiously liberal nightmare. The College strongly promoted the religiously liberal Revised Standard Version, although at the time, I was sadly not sufficiently mature in the faith to be opposed to this, and so I was happy to use the RSV.

On one occasion, I found it necessary to defend the doctrine of Christ's virgin birth (Isa. 7:14; Matt. 1:18-25; Luke 1:26-38). In conversation, a full-time student of the College strongly criticized the teaching of the virgin birth. He thought he was very smart and very intelligent because he had worked out that a baby could not have come into existence by a virgin birth. My methodology for defence was the Deity of Christ (Isa. 7:14; 9:6 "The Mighty God;" Matt. 1:23; 3:3 "the Lord" from Isa. 40:3; Luke 1:27; 3:4). I asked him, How could he believe in the Divinity of Christ, without believing in the virgin birth? The idea of the incarnation is that the Second Person of the Trinity, *took humanity into himself as God*. If there was no virgin birth, then Christ would in some sense have had to "possess" a pre-existing human being, which would not be an incarnation at all. He was unable to answer my question. He could not overcome my objection. But he would not accept that far from being very smart, those who denied the virgin birth were really very silly.

A new Principal had arrived at the College, George Garnsey. At a personal level

he was a very friendly man. But he was a wolf in sheep's clothing (Matt. 7:15). In class, he denied the existence of angels, and regarded this as a very modern and very scientific understanding. Actually, it is a very old heresy. In NT times, Judaism divided between a religiously liberal group, the "Sadducees," who "say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit," and a religiously conservative group, "the Pharisees," who "confess both" (Acts 23:8). The NT clearly rejects the denial of "angels" claimed by the "Sadducees" (Acts 23:8), and affirms their reality. In Isa. 6:3, the OT prophet, Holy Isaiah refers to an angel who cried out, "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory." And in Rev. 4:8, the NT prophet, St. John the Divine, refers to angels who declare, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty" etc., to which another four angels (cf. Ezek. 1) reply by giving "glory" "to" God (Rev. 4:8,9). In harmony with such Scriptures, the *Communion Service* in the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* says, "Therefore with angels and archangels, ... we laud and magnify thy glorious name; evermore praising thee." This is then followed by the Sanctus, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts," etc. . Therefore to deny the existence of angels is clearly contrary to both Scripture, and the publicly declared doctrine of the Anglican Church.

In class, the Principal also attacked and denied the literal Second Coming of Christ. He claimed that after 2,000 years, one could conclude that this had been some kind of "misunderstanding" by the NT writers as to what Jesus had said. He thus gave it a "spiritual" meaning. He further denied the reality of hell, and taught a doctrine of universalism. I.e., he believed that in the end, all people would be saved. He considered that what had been traditionally called hell, was in fact a universal reformatory. He considered this was not as bad as the traditional Roman Catholic purgatory, but a more pleasant place, where people had the gospel presented to them correctly, and when at length they inevitably accepted it, they then went on to heaven.

In fact, the basic idea behind these errors about Christ's return is nothing new. When some NT Christians thought "the day of the Christ *is at hand* (Greek, *enesteken*, literally, 'it is at hand' or 'it is come,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *enistemi*)," St. Paul wrote explaining that "that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition" (II Thess. 2:2,3). The ambiguity of the Greek *enesteken*, may indicate that St. Paul was addressing both the claim by one group that Christ's coming was about to occur, "is at hand" (AV), and the claim by another group that Christ "has come" already.

But in answer, St. Paul says a period of apostasy and subsequent rise of the Antichrist would first occur and take some time. Thus in the first place, the idea of the kind of imminence of Christ's return in the NT that was claimed by George Garnsey, is simply not correct; and in the second place, the idea of some secretive "spiritual" return is also incorrect (cf. Matt. 24:26,27). Both ideas may be referred to in St. Paul's usage of *enesteken*, *supra*. Indeed, in the first context, St. Peter says that we should be mindful of the fact "that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day" (II Peter 3:8), so that whereas we might think of Christ saying, "I come quickly" (Rev. 22:20) in terms of days or months, God evidently thinks of this in terms of

thousands of years. Moreover, in this context we are specifically warned about the type of erroneous thing claimed by this College teacher, for St. Peter says, “in the last days scoffers” “shall come,” “walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation” (II Peter 3:3,4).

Furthermore, the teaching of Christ’s Second Coming is clearly linked to the Final Judgement. The words of Christ in Matt. 25:31-46 are clear. Christ shall “separate” people “as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats” (Matt. 25:32). The purpose of this separation is not to put one group in heaven and one group in a purgatorial reformatory, but rather, to put one group in heaven and one into hell (Matt. 25:46). This same kind of teaching is also apparent in St. Luke’s Gospel. Christ here warns that at an unexpected hour, a man’s “soul” may “be required” of him (Luke 12:19). In Luke 16:19-31, our Lord makes a distinction between a man, Lazarus, who dies, and his soul is “carried by the angels” to heaven (Luke 16:22), and Dives, who is “in hell” (Luke 16:23). Here we read, “between” the two of them, “there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from” one to the other “cannot” do so (Luke 16:26). Rather, men must repent and be saved in this life (Luke 16:27-31). For we must “work” “while it is day,” since “the night cometh, when no man can work” (John 9:4); and “behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation” (II Cor. 6:2). “Today if ye will hear his voice, harden not your heart” (Ps. 95:7,8).

Christ’s virgin birth is found in Article 3 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, which referring to Christ says, “who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary.” The reality of “hell” is stated in Article 4 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, which says that Christ, “descended into hell” (Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27,31); and the Final Judgement of the good and bad is taught in Article 8, which says that Christ “shall come to judge the quick and the dead” (Matt. 25:31-46). I had learnt this Creed as a boy in the *Church of England Boys Society*. I had defended the doctrine of Article 10 of this Creed under interrogation for heresy by the Theology Department Committee of Avondale College. I had been Confirmed the year before, after studying the Catechism containing this Creed, and being specifically required to profess that Creed as part of my Confirmation.

We Protestants look to our ultimate authority in the Bible. The *Apostles’ Creed* is so called, not because it was written by the Apostles, but because it is named after the apostles, whose teachings it accurately contains. On the one hand, the *Apostles’ Creed* is an insufficient statement of the Christian faith to stand by itself. But on the other hand, the *Apostles’ Creed* is a Biblically accurate statement of a number of the fundamentals of the Christian faith. It is a starting point, not a finishing point for understanding and believing the Christian faith. The reason why we believe in the *Apostles’ Creed* is succinctly stated in Article 8 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*. This says, “that which is commonly called the *Apostles’ Creed*, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for” it “may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.” Since the *Apostles’ Creed* states Biblical truth, it is a trusty “shield, wherewith ye shall be able to quench” some of “the fiery darts of the wicked” (Eph. 6:16).

But I now found myself at an Anglican College where any College teacher or student from the Principal down, could via religious liberalism, freely set aside that Creed with impunity. I for one, could not regard it as simply a matter of “private opinion,” as to whether or not one believed in e.g., the virgin birth of Christ (Article 3, *Apostles’ Creed*), or the Second Coming of Christ (Article 8, *Apostles’ Creed*). On the one hand, my theology was still a long way from where it needed to be, and by the grace of God it would ultimately go. But on the other hand, I correctly understood enough of Scripture to know that any clear attack on, or undermining of, the doctrine of the *Apostles’ Creed*, was an attack on the authority of Scripture and the truth of Christianity.

I found myself in disagreement with the College on a number of issues, including their view that matters such as the virgin birth and Second Advent were “personal opinions” where diversity of view could freely exist. After only about two-thirds of a year as an external part-time student, I left St. John’s College, Morpeth⁶⁸.

I also undertook studies at the University of Sydney. While at Sydney University I encountered the persecution of the secular libertine society against the godly. In the Criminology class, the law school teacher asked our opinions on the law and homosexuality. Sodomy had been decriminalized in New South Wales in the early 1980s. I defended the thesis of the English Common Law jurist and judge, Lord Patrick Devlin. This was the idea that people in society should have freedom of religious belief, but not freedom of moral behaviour from Christian morality which historically was found in the common law (and was Protestant morality). For Devlin, Christian morals had an overall beneficial social cohesion. Hence e.g., Lord Devlin says, “I suppose that moral standards do not shift; so far as they come from divine revelation they do not [T]he moral order ... has its origin in and takes its strength from Christian beliefs The divine law and the secular ... are brought together ... by the need which each has for the other. ... So the law must base itself on Christian morals ...⁶⁹.”

In this context, I argued against sodomy (which in law is wider than male homosexual acts, but includes these in its orbit). E.g., I had formed the opinion that in a military context, the close fraternity among men is damaged, with a loss of trust, when there is “a poofter in the pack” i.e., a homosexual (by this time I had served in Sydney University Regiment where homosexual acts were still illegal under military law). I stood alone in the class-room on this issue. *I was like the one white man in black Zululand, ... fifty years after the British had left!* I encountered strong opposition. Unbeknown to me, students made complaints against me to the Law School Dean, Colin Phegan. As far as they were concerned, this was an era of “human rights” where academic and intellectual freedom was only extended to those who first agreed to these so called “human rights,” which I somewhat controversially called, “human wrongs.”

⁶⁸ For financial reasons, St. John’s College, Morpeth was closed in 2006, students were transferred to Newcastle University (a NSW State university) from 2007, and the property was sold to a property redeveloper.

⁶⁹ Devlin, P., *Enforcement of Morals*, Oxford, UK, 1965, pp. 18,23,25.

Around the same time, one day I entered a Law School classroom. As we were waiting for the law school teacher to arrive for the lecture, an unmarried girl holding her illegitimate child, sat down next to me. She then stuck out her breast, and started to breast-feed it. In the first place I was horrified to see a woman's breast publicly exposed, and in the second place, I was worried that someone might think this was my bastard child. I got up, frowned at the girl, and moved a good distance away. After the lecture, when I stepped outside she hurled great abuse at me, repeatedly calling me a "misogynist⁷⁰." Though I am opposed to all feminists, not all feminists would classify public breast-feeding of a bastard child as one of their "rights," although this one apparently did. Unbeknown to me, she made a complaint against me to the Law School Dean, Colin Phegan.

Dean Phegan summoned me to his office in the Law School. He told me that he had received a number of complaints about me from fellow students. He itemized those above. He sought to restrain me from making any further such comments, or engaging in any further such actions. I refused his petition, and argued that the problem was with these other students, not myself. E.g., I said that in the Criminology class we had been specifically asked for our views, and so I had given mine. Dean Phegan tried to give some ground, saying that he had been unaware that the woman had been publicly breast-feeding a child. Nevertheless, we were unable to concur on a mutually agreeable way forward. It was a Mexican stand-off. Dean Phegan was not impressed.

In I Tim. 1:9,10, (as in Rom. 7:7, 10th commandment) St. Paul isolates sin through reference to the *Ten Commandments* (Exod. 20; Deut. 5). Thus "the ungodly" parallels "god" (1st commandment); "sinners" parallels "iniquity" (2nd commandment) and "not ... guiltless" (3rd commandment); "unholy and profane" parallels "holy" (4th commandment) and "not do any work" (4th commandment, cf. Matt. 12:5), and "profane" also parallels "in vain" (3rd commandment); "murders of father and murderers of mothers" parallels "father" and "mother" (5th commandment) and "kill" (6th commandment); "manslayers" parallels "kill" (6th commandment); "whoremongers" and "them that defile themselves with mankind" parallels "adultery" (7th commandment) and "covet" in the form of sexual lust (10th commandment); "menstealers" parallels "steal" (8th commandment); "liars" parallels "bear false witness" (9th commandment); and "perjured persons" parallels "bear false witness" and "not take the Lord's name in vain" (3rd & 9th commandments).

Therefore, the Holy Ghost speaking through St. Paul, here teachers that

⁷⁰ That I hate feminism, and do not approve of any females studying law, is true. To say that the ideology of feminism largely aims to entice female lusts, like pornography largely aims to entice male lusts, is a reasonable analogy. But to say that a hater of feminism is a hater of women, is simply not correct. It is political propaganda. It is like the Communists claiming to speak "for the people" in e.g., "the Peoples' Republic of China." Feminism is an ideology, and a bad one. I distinguish a person's sex, from their ideology.

“whoremongers” and “them that defile themselves with mankind” are egregious breaches of the wider and fuller meaning of the seventh commandment, “Thou shalt not commit adultery,” which acts to uphold the sanctity of marriage. A “whoremonger” (Greek, *pornois*, masculine plural dative noun, from *pornos*) is a male fornicator who lies with a “whore” i.e., a female fornicator. This may be for money (a harlot / prostitute) or not (a slut). But either way, the female is a whore. “Them that defile themselves with mankind” (Greek, *arsenokoitais*, masculine plural dative noun, from *arsenokoites*), commit the sin of Lev. 18:22,24.

I confess I much preferred the moral conservatism of Avondale College on these type of issues, to the secular “human rights” libertinism of Sydney University. In the first place I had defended the morality of the *Ten Commandments* against egregious breaches of the 7th and 10th commandments in my opposition to homosexuality in the Criminology Class; and then I had further defended the Holy Decalogue against the moral looseness of a whore who had a bastard child by a whoremonger, and who now indecently exposed herself in public. But to add insult to injury, the complaints had been lodged against me, not the Decalogue breakers. “O how I love thy law!,” “O Lord,” “It is my meditation all the day. Thou through thy commandments hast made me wiser than mine enemies: for they are ever with me. I have more understanding than all my teachers: for thy testimonies are my meditation” (Ps. 119:89,97-99).

Thus I read Arts and Law at Sydney University. This included many Latin legal maxims⁷¹. While living at St. Paul’s College in 1987 and 1988, an Anglican residential College on the campus of Sydney University⁷², I was asked to join the University of Sydney academic procession for *Sydney University Open Day ’88*, in Australia’s *Bicentennial Celebration Year (1788-1988)*⁷³. I also studied both Theology at Moore Theological College, an Evangelical Anglican College in the Evangelical *Diocese of Sydney*; and Education at the University of Western Sydney. I further studied Hebrew at the Jews’ Shalom College, Sydney. (These were privately run classes at the privately Jewish administered Shalom College of the State’s *University of New South Wales*.)

⁷¹ Cf. my comments at Matt. 14:22a, *Preliminary Textual Discussion*.

⁷² Very few students from my state school background are ever admitted to St. Paul’s College. When applying to go there, I listed my “Last School or College” as St. John’s College, Morpeth; a college known to the Warden. Three factors relevant to my admission by the College Warden included: 1) religiosity (in an Anglican College with generally irreligious students); 2) I was an older student; and 3) I had been to an Anglican College (St. John’s Morpeth).

⁷³ A photograph of this event on Saturday 23 July 1988, appears in a work by the Sydney University New Service photographer, Raymond de Berquelle, *The University of Sydney Photographic Essays*, With a Preface by Sir Herman Black, Chancellor of Sydney University, 1990 (ISBN 0 7316 2213 8), p. 22, Academic procession going past the main doors of the Great Hall (I am in photo 1, 5th person in left lane, with a winged collar).

I became what the Greeks call, *Didaskale*, and some Celtic Latins call, *Dominie*. I have taught in primary, secondary, and tertiary schools. I have taught in both private and state schools, and in both New South Wales (Australia) and London (UK). At such state schools as e.g., Girraween (Selective) High School (Sydney) or Epping Boys' High School (Sydney); and at such private schools as e.g., St. John's Church of England Primary School in Elephant & Castle (London, near the Baptist preacher, Charles Spurgeon's old church of Metropolitan Tabernacle), Christ's (Church of England) School in Richmond (London), and I taught both primary and secondary students at St. Paul's School in London (now located at Barnes, this school was originally founded over 500 years ago as the cathedral school of St. Paul's Cathedral, London). And I have taught tertiary students at e.g., Wollongong University (south of Sydney), N.S.W., Australia⁷⁴.

I attend 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* Sunday Services in Low Church Evangelical Churches that are both inside the Anglican Communion and outside the Anglican Communion, but in either instance, I seek to practice a suitable level of religious separation from the wider religious apostasy clearly evident in e.g., the Anglican Communion. And the matter is complicated by the fact that I have also found varying levels religious apostasy in Anglican Churches that are outside the Anglican Communion e.g., the *Free Church of England* and *Church of England (Continuing)*. I have lived in London a number of times totally about three and a half years between 2001 and 2009⁷⁵, and one of the generally better Anglican Churches I have come across is the *Church of England (Continuing)*. This is a Reformed (Evangelical) Anglican Church, that uses only the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* and Authorized Version of the Bible

⁷⁴ Greek, *Didaskale* (masculine singular vocative, noun from *didaskalos*), or Latin, *Dominie* (a Scottish form of *Domine*, masculine singular vocative, noun from *dominus*), are both vocative forms i.e., used in direct address. E.g., in Luke 20:21, the Greek form may be rendered as "Teacher" (ASV) or "Master" (AV). The more common Latin form for "Teacher" is "Magister" (e.g., Luke 20:21, Vulgate), with "Domine" used for "Lord" (e.g., at Matt. 7:21, the Vulgate's "Domine, Domine" = "Lord, Lord"). But the associated usage of the two in the Vulgate's John 13:13, where Christ says, "Ye call me, Master (Latin, *Magister*) and Lord (Latin, *Domine*)," may help us better understand the origins of the Celtic Latin usage of *Dominie* (*Domine*). Though I am a New South Wales school teacher, I have also worked as a teacher in London, England during my five trips there from 2001-2009. I worked as a supply / casual teacher e.g., I taught at St. Paul's School, Colet Court, at Barnes in London, Primary School Years 5 & 6 (known at St. Paul's School as Forms 2 & 3), and Secondary School Years 7 & 8 (known at St. Paul's School as Forms 4 & 5) (substituting for a number of weeks in 2003 for Chris Porter on jury service). (More commonly it has been at State Schools, or sometimes a C. of E. School, and less commonly a prestige school like St. Paul's Barnes.) I was a casual tutor (Human Geography: The Human Environment) at the Moss Vale campus of Wollongong University for Semester 2 (25 July to 31 October) 2002 in the School of Geosciences.

⁷⁵ I went to London, April 2001-April 02 (1st trip); Dec. 02-July 03 (2nd trip); August 03-April 04 (3rd trip); Oct. 05-April 06 (4th trip); & Sept. 08-March 09 (5th trip).

(1611). Its doctrinal standard is meant to be the Church of England's *Thirty-Nine Articles* which it is meant to hold to in the Reformed tradition, although it does not always uphold either this standard or the 1662 prayer book⁷⁶. In Australia, I may attend Reformed (Evangelical) Diocese of Sydney "Low Church" Anglican services that use the 1662 prayer book (although these are increasingly difficult to find). E.g., in Sydney I regularly attend the 1662 prayer book services of Evensong at St. Swithun's Pymble (held variously between four and six times a year at 3 pm). [Such Sunday services were sadly discontinued from 2013, although they still have some occasional weekday 1662 prayer book services. I also went to London Oct. 2012- March 2013. Update of this and some other matters in this paragraph as at 2015.] In practice, I also attend better Puritan derived Churches; although in doing so, I regard myself as an Anglican Protestant visitor to these churches, and not in any sense a Puritan. Sadly, the number of higher quality Biblically sound churches, both Anglican Protestant and Puritan Protestant, has greatly diminished in recent years as greater and greater worldliness grips more and more of them. Thus in the end, I am left to look to "the best of a bad lot" of churches in both England and Australia. Once sound Protestant churches have increasingly become apostate in this prophesied Laodicean Church Age (Rev. 3:14-22), which seems to have begun in the late eighteenth and earlier to mid nineteenth century, but which has been in an even greater accelerated decline in the post World War Two (1939-45) era.

I had left Avondale College with one good leg of religiously conservative Protestant teaching, and one bad leg of tolerance to religiously liberal views, such as a second century B.C. dating of Daniel and preterism, theistic macroevolution, and a belief in the RSV as the best Bible translation. Over the years the Lord slowly purged me of these and other errors.

Flowing from the poison pill dropped by Dr. Hosken of Avondale College, for many years I subscribed to the errors of theistic macroevolution⁷⁷. But in time I came to repudiate this in favour of old earth creationism⁷⁸. My emphasis is on the twin issues of *creation not macroevolution* and *the authority of the Bible*. Beyond this I maintain that with regard to the issue of what model of creation one adopts, i.e., one's more detailed

⁷⁶ Samuel, D.N., *The Church in Crisis*, Church of England (Continuing), Maurice Payne Colour Printers, Reading, England, UK, 2004.

⁷⁷ *The American Journal of Jurisprudence*, Vol. 40 (1995), pp. 229-285 at pp. 235-263; *Perspectives on Science & Christian Faith*, Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation, Vol. 49, No. 4 (Dec. 1997), pp. 252-263; Vol. 50 (No 1) (March 1998), p. 78; Vol. 51, No. 2 (June 1999), pp. 114-120; Vol. 52, No. 1 (2000), p. 76.

⁷⁸ McGrath, G.B. (myself), "Intelligent Design from an Old Earth Creationist Perspective," *Perspectives on Science & Christian Faith* (PSCF), Vol. 58, No. 3 (Sept. 2006), pp. 252-253; McGrath, G.B. (myself), "The Gap [School] ...," PSCF, Vol. 59 (Dec. 2007), pp. 318-319; McGrath, G.B. (myself), "Old Earth Creationists," *English Churchman* (7779) (6 & 13 Nov. 2009), p. 2; McGrath, G.B. (myself), "Old Earth Creation," *English Churchman* (7782) (18 & 25 Dec. 2009), p. 2.

understanding of Gen. 1 & 2, that this is a matter of private judgement. But within such qualifications, I now follow the creationist gap school model (the succession of global “worlds” of Heb. 1:2; 11:3 in Gen. 1:1; followed by the destruction of a local world in Gen. 1:2, cf. Jer. 4:23; followed by the creation of the local world of Gen. 2:10-15 i.e., Eden in Gen. 1:2:b-2:3, in which I locate the region of Eden in the area of the Persian Gulf⁷⁹). In broad terms, though not necessarily in all detailed specifics, this school of creationists is represented by such writers as the Congregational theologian, J. Pye Smith (1774-1851), who was the Principal of Homerton College (1800-1850, known as Homerton Academy till 1823), located in London (till it divided into a Theological College, namely, New College, London University till its closure in 1977; and a Teacher’s College, namely, Homerton College, Cambridge, which since 1978 has been a part of Cambridge University). Or the Anglican clergyman, Henry Alcock (1838/9-1915), who as a white missionary to the black man of west Africa was for several years the Principal of the Church Missionary Society’s *Fourah Bay College*, Freetown, Sierra Leone (now part of the University of Sierra Leone). Or the *Evangelical Free Church* theologian, John Sailhamer, who has held academic positions at a number of educational institutions, including, Western Seminary in Portland, Oregon, USA; Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in North Carolina, USA; and Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, North Carolina, USA, where in 1999, he was appointed the Senior Professor of Old Testament. He is now Professor of Old Testament at Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary in Brea, California, a college with scenic views of San Francisco Bay⁸⁰.

Flowing from one of the poison pills dropped by Dr. Young of Avondale College, I was a preterist for many years. First after further study, I came to realize that the Book of Daniel was in fact written in the 6th century B.C., and not as Dr. Young had claimed, the 2nd century B.C. . This was an important break-through. I then first became a futurist. Then by the grace of God, I came to a clearer understanding of Scripture and embraced the Protestant school of Historicism, which I distinguish from the pseudo-historicism of e.g., Seventh-day Adventism. In this context, I have produced a book entitled, *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist* (2006), With a Foreword by the Reverend Sam McKay, Secretary of the Protestant Truth Society (1996-2004). It is available on the internet via Yahoo and Google at “Gavin McGrath Books,” or direct at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

Flowing from errors I had picked up in the deeply Arminian, Seventh-day Adventist Church and Avondale College, for many years after I left Avondale I was a Wesleyan Arminian. But in time I became Reformed. I came to understand that we

⁷⁹ As per my map in 49 *Perspectives on Science & Christian Faith*, p. 259.

⁸⁰ Smith, J.P., *The Relation between the Holy Scriptures and some parts of Geological Science* (1839, Jackson & Walford, London, fifth edition 1852); Alcock, H.J., *Earth’s Preparation for Man*, An exposition on the lines suggested by the late Rev. Dr. Pye Smith, James Nisbett, London, UK, 1897; Sailhamer, J.H., *Genesis Unbound*, Multnomah Books, Sisters, Oregon, USA, 1996.

“were dead in trespasses and sins” (Eph. 2:1), and were “quickened” (Eph. 2:5), not merely, very ill. For a “dead” man (Eph. 2:1,5) cannot so much as cry out for help, or exercise faith. He must be “quickened,” and so enabled and given the gift of “faith” in order to accept God’s “grace” of salvation (Eph. 2:8), even “redemption through” Christ’s “blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace” (Eph. 1:7). I came to understand that when in the Book of Acts the gospel was preached, both to “Jews” and “Gentiles,” “as many as were ordained to eternal life believed” (Acts 13:45-48). I came to a better, and thus a Reformed understanding, of passages such as Rom. 9-11; Eph. 1 & 2.

In time, I become what is sometimes called, “a five point Calvinist.” Though on one level this is arguably too simplistic a conceptualization of Reformed theology, on another level, this “five point summary,” found in the acronym, “TULIP,” serves some value for defining some key elements of faith.

Total depravity (i.e., inability due to original sin, requiring enabling to be saved
e.g., Ps. 51:5; Jer. 17:9; Ezek. 16:6; John 1:12,13; 6:28,29; 12:32;
Rom. 5:12-14; Eph. 2:5,8,9).

Unconditional Election (e.g., Rom. 8:28-30; 9:11-13,15,21; Eph. 1:4-9).

Limited Atonement (e.g., Lev. 16:17; 23:27; Matt. 1:21; 26:28;
John 10:11,15; Eph. 5:25-27).

Irresistible Grace (e.g., John 1:12,13; 6:28,29; Acts 13:48; Rom. 9:16).

Perseverance of the saints (“once saved always saved,” e.g., John 6:47; 10:27,28;
Eph. 6:18; Philp. 1:6; Rev. 14:12).

The tulip is multi-coloured, and so one tulip field or garden may in some ways vary from another. Nevertheless, the common garden TULIP of the Reformed Garden, is a most beautiful theological plant. Thus the reader of this commentary will at times find it necessary, “to tip-toe, through the TULIPs, with me.”

Flowing from the poison pills dropped by Dr. Young of Avondale College, Dr. Cox of Avondale College, Reverend George Garnsey of St. John’s College, *et al*, for many years I used the Revised Standard Version. But I became disenchanted with it. The RSV footnote symbol, “Cn” indicates an RSV translator’s “correction.” E.g., in the OT, I remember going through every RSV “correction” in the Book of Proverbs, and concluding that they were all wrong, and that the *uncorrected* Hebrew was always the better reading.

In the NT, I became increasingly unhappy with unmarked interpretations, corrections, and the lack of italics. I had come across a number of instances where I was discontent with the RSV. I remember that *the straw that broke the camel’s back* was my reading in the Greek of Gal. 6:16, as compared with the RSV’s Gal. 6:16. This Epistle was written to a Gentile Christian Church, in which some heretics had come in and tried to Judaize the Gentile Christians, telling them e.g., to keep the weekly Jewish sabbath “days” (Saturdays) (Gal. 4:10); whereas “the churches of Galatia” were meant to keep “the first day of the week” (Sunday) (I Cor. 16:1,2).

In Gal. 6:15 reference is made in the AV to the “circumcision” (Jews) and “uncircumcision” (Gentiles), and this then parallels the reference in Gal. 6:16, “And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy” (i.e., in the immediate context, to all those Gentile Christians which were inside the Gentile Galatian Church, although by extension of the principle to other Gentile Christians as well), “and (Greek, *kai*) upon the Israel of God” (i.e., thereafter to Jewish Christians which were all outside the Galatian Church). But in the RSV, the “and (Greek, *kai*)” is omitted without any footnote stating that this is a “correction,” and so the final clause of Gal. 6:16 is made to be a parallel synonym with the Gentiles. I.e., the RSV claims that the Gentile Christians at Galatia are being referred to as Israel.

On the one hand, I believe the Christian Church is now Israel (Gal. 3:28,29), and that the “Jerusalem” whose “peace” we Christians “pray for” (Ps. 122:6), is now “new Jerusalem” (Rev. 21:2) i.e., heaven, evident in the petition of the *Lord’s Prayer*, “*Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven*” (Matt. 6:10). But on the other hand, I also think that depending on context, there are racial references to Jews in the NT, in contrast with Gentiles (Gal. 2:8; Rom. 9-11); and I think that this reference in Gal. 6:16 is one such reference, although contextually they are Christians i.e., Jewish Christians *outside of the Galatian Church* (Gal. 6:16b) as opposed to Gentile Christians *inside the Galatian Church* (Gal. 6:16a, although by natural extension of the principle in applying the message of this book to all the church, other Gentile Christians as well). (Cf. e.g., I Cor. 10:32, where the overlap between, “Jews,” “Gentiles,” and “the church of God” likewise requires a racial distinction between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians; or Rom. 9-11.)

I thus moved over to the New American Standard Bible (NASB), which I preferred because it used italics for added words and was more theologically conservative, and then by logical extension, I also started to use the American Standard Version (ASV) far more as well. I also went back to using the Authorized Version (AV) a lot more, although I still wrongly considered the text-types of these newer versions were better than the Received Text of the AV. E.g., I continued to uncritically accept the claims of neo-Alexandrians that the underpinning New Testament Greek texts of the ASV and NASB were better than the underpinning Received Text of the AV⁸¹.

I thought that by the grace of God, I had now over some decades been finally purged of all the religiously liberal errors that had been implanted in my brain when I was a young and impressionable College student. But there was more error that I had not yet realized. Over time I heard of the work of the Trinitarian Bible Society, and others who supported the AV, and considered that the *Textus Receptus* was the best text. At first, it

⁸¹ Modern translations look to Codex Leningrad or a Codex Leningrad based critical text for the OT. These are not as good as the OT Received Text of the AV, but are much closer to the OT Received Text than either a neo-Alexandrian or Burgonite NT Text is to the NT Received Text. I will discuss these OT textual matters further in my final volume.

did not make much of an impression upon me, and did not much interest me.

On the one hand, for years I had used the AV as my main translation, with the ASV and NASB as my main supplementary translations. But on the other hand, I pencilled in “corrections” to the AV by considering that where the NT text differed to that of e.g., the ASV or NASB, then the neo-Alexandrian reading was the “correct” one. This was simply a development of the idea that I had been familiar with since a boy, found in the selective ASV and RSV parallel readings of the *Clarified Edition* of the King James Version that I had gotten in my childhood. I continued in this practice for many years. In this process, I generally followed the neo-Alexandrian text; although an unusual expectation was my conclusion that textual analysis strongly favoured Mark 16:9-20, which I held to be good Scripture (even though it is in a very different writing style to the rest of Mark’s Gospel).

However, I had also attended some AV using Churches. E.g., the AV was used in conjunction with the *Book of Common Prayer (1662)* at services I attended at St. Philip’s Church Hill (City of Sydney) in the 1980s and 1990s. I noticed that of different churches I sometimes visited, the ones that I consistently found to be the best used the AV, and the ones that I consistently found to be the second best used the New King James Version (NKJV). Both of these used the same NT Received Text or *Textus Receptus*, although the NKJV is a Burgonite production that makes “corrections” through reference to Burgon’s Majority Text principles in the footnotes, although it is misleading in that it is highly selective in telling its readers when the majority Text does not agree with the Received Text. Its general standard of translation accuracy is also substantially below that of the KJV. Even though the NKJV is in many ways the best of all “the modern” translations by virtue of the fact that it uses the NT Received Text, the men who translated the NKJV were clearly intellectual and spiritual pygmies when compared and contrasted with the intellectual and spiritual giants of the KJV.

I also started to consider the issue of the preservation of the NT text. I had heard the issue raised, but had not pursued it with any great rigour. I had thought of textual preservation simply in a *general* way as a promise for the *general* preservation of the text of Scripture only. I had not considered the ramifications of this promise in a more *specific* way with respect to the differences between the Received Text and the neo-Alexandrian texts. The Lord had not yet impressed me with the fuller meaning of the Scripture, “the Word of the Lord endureth for ever” (I Peter 1:25). He wanted me to look back on my error, and “not” “be” “highminded, but fear,” and to remember, that “thou standest by faith” (Rom. 11:20), and that our knowledge of such things, like our salvation, is a work of God’s grace. “We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us” (II Cor. 4:7). For many times I have thought I knew what a Scripture meant, but then the Spirit of God has impressed me as to its fuller meaning which had been previously lost on me; and other Christians I know have also had this same experience.

I had arrived at the conclusion that the AV was the most accurate translation except for the issue of text type. But I thought this did not really make much difference

for the OT where textual differences are massively lower, than for the NT; and so I thought that for about 75% of the Bible i.e., the OT, the issue of text type did not really make the AV less accurate, and hence as a package deal it was far more correct than “incorrect” with respect to text type. I repeatedly found that the King James Version translators showed a spiritual depth and maturity in their renderings that put them in a higher spiritual, linguistic, and English language class than any of the modern versions. I thought them to better understand the mind of God as found in Holy Writ, while inconsistently thinking they had used an inferior text type, especially in the NT.

Then in my mind, I started to compare and contrast the generally third class “fruits” (Matt. 7:16), or even lower class “fruits” often found in neo-Alexandrian NT text using churches; with the first class “fruits” (Matt. 7:16) found in many, though not all, AV using churches, and the second class “fruits” found in many, though not all, NKJV using churches. I now posed what seemed to me to be a radical question. I asked, Is it possible that the Trinitarian Bible Society *et al* are correct, and that the Received Text is in fact the best text?

As I undertook background studies on this question, I found that the representative Byzantine Greek text was in effect defended under the majority text theoretics of the Protestant Burgonites, who have a more specific understanding of the promise, “the Word of the Lord endureth for ever” (I Peter 1:25). I also found that the Latin text was likewise defended by the Latin text theoretics of the Roman Catholic Latins of the *Clementine Vulgate*. These also have a more specific understanding of the promise of I Peter 1:25, written across Augustine Merk’s Greek and Latin *Novum Testamentum* (1964) in the Latin of this verse, “*Verbvm Domini Manet in Aeternvm.*” However, this Roman Catholic School has gone into major decline since the *Vatican II Council* (1962-5). This is seen in the fact that while Merk’s *Novum Testamentum* went through nine editions from 1933 to 1964, it thereafter ceased to be generally printed (although there was a reprint of it in 1984).

I then started to undertake various textual analysis of the NT. I found that not only the larger Biblical passages of Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11; but also shorter passages such as I John 5:7,8 were favoured by textual analysis. I considered a number of readings marked in the NKJV footnotes of St. Matthew’s Gospel as being different in both the neo-Alexandrian NU Text and Burgonite Majority Text, and after textual analysis I consistently found the reading of the *Textus Receptus* to be the best reading.

It was clear to me that the *Textus Receptus* was neither the Protestant Burgonites’ Majority Text nor the Roman Catholic’s Latin text. I was unable to find any writer knowledgeable about textual analysis and the Received Text, even from the Trinitarian Bible Society. By the grace of God, I started to discover, systematically reconstruct, and scrutinize the methodology that had produced the Received Text. I found that the motto of the Lutheran Reformation, first used in 1522 by Frederick the Wise, encapsulated it. This was the Latin Vulgate form of I Peter 1:25, “*Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum*” i.e., “the Word of the Lord endureth for ever.”

My conclusions are more comprehensively set out below in section 1) “Textual Commentary Principles,” section “* b) The Received Text (Latin, Textus Receptus),” at subsections “* i) General;” and “*ii) New Testament.”

The need for this commentary.

I thanked God for now coming to better understand the meaning of the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture, which I now properly understood to be the other side of the coin to the Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture. On the one hand, God gives the church the gift of “teachers” (I Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11), and he gives many teachers. But on the other hand, they are given for a specific purpose, “For the perfecting of the saints, for the works of ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ” (Eph. 4:12), and since he gives as he knoweth best in his godly wisdom, he does not seem to give out many neo-Byzantine textual teachers of the *Textus Receptus*. His greatest bestowing of this particular *type* of teacher was in the 16th and 17th centuries, but even then, there were not many like Beza of Geneva, or the Elzevirs of Leiden.

By the grace of God, I had now come to better understand the Received Text. Should I publicly share this knowledge for the benefit of the brethren, or should I keep it as a purely personal insight? Should I like Jonah, who by all accounts was an evangelist with a very bad attitude (Jonah 4), run away to Tarshish (Jonah 1:3)? Or should I like Sirach, humbly declare, “Draw near unto me, ye unlearned, and dwell in the house of learning” (Ecclesiasticus / Sirach 51:23, Apocrypha)? In answer to the Lord’s leading and call, I chose the teaching example of Sirach’s school-house.

In doing so, I think of the words of the English poet, Geoffrey Chaucer (c.1340-1400), “And gladly teach,” in the wider quote, “And gladly would he *learn* and gladly *teach*.” These are found in the old English motto of Macquarie University in Sydney, where I did both *learn* as a student (undertaking a year of an Arts course), and also *teach* as a law teacher in the Law School. The university motto is, “And gladly teche.” Here the old English word, “teche,” means, “teach.” Describing an Oxford cleric in *The Prologue* of his classic 1390s work, *Canterbury Tales*, Chaucer said of this scholarly man:

Of study took he most care and most heed
Sounding in moral virtue was his speech.
And gladly would he learn *and gladly teach (teche)*⁸².

I am certainly not yet, “an old man,” but I am old enough to understand the concerns of the poem by Willimonia Allenia Dromgoole (1860-1934), “Building the Bridge for Him.” On the one hand, I beg God and man, humble pardon for any errors or blemishes that may appear in any of the volumes of this work due to the frailty and imperfection of man. I shall not intentionally make any such errors. But on the other hand, I think of “that fair-haired boy” in college, with no answer to the claims of neo-Alexandrian textual critics; as well as some older persons in need of teaching instruction

⁸² Modernized, original: “Of studie took he moost cure and moost heede Sownynge in moral vertu was his speche, And gladly wolde he lerne and gladly teche.” (I was a casual tutor at Macquarie University Law School in 1991.)

on the *Textus Receptus*. Sadly, my story of picking up erroneous ideas on the Received Text during my college days is by no means unique. Others have had taught to them in their college / seminary / university days, the type of errors I found taught on the Biblical text at Avondale College (a mix of religiously liberal and religiously conservative teachers), St. John's College (religiously liberal teachers), or Moore College (in general religiously conservative teachers, but due to inconsistencies not free from religiously liberal errors, of which their failure to endorse the Received Text and Authorized Version are glaringly obvious examples).

I humbly pray God that this commentary may be used to help such persons, as it acts to "build ... a bridge" across the many omissions and changes of the neo-Byzantine Received Text that appear in the modern neo-Alexandrian texts and / or Burgonite Majority texts, and their associated English (or other) versions.

*An old man travelling a lone highway,
Came at the evening cold and grey,
To a chasm vast, and deep, and wide.*

*The old man crossed in the twilight dim,
The sullen stream held no fears for him.
But he stopped when he reached the other side,
And built a bridge to span the tide.*

*"Old man," said a fellow pilgrim near,
"You are wasting your strength with building here;
Your journey will end with the ending day,
You never again will pass this way.*

*"You have crossed the chasm deep and wide.
Why build you a bridge at eventide?"
And the builder raised his old grey head:
"Good friend, on the path I have come," he said,
"There followed after me today,
A youth whose feet will pass this way.*

*"This chasm, which has been as naught to me,
To that fair-haired boy may a pitfall be;
He too, must cross in the twilight dim,
Good friend, I am building this bridge for him."*

1) *Textual Commentary Principles*

a) *The “AV only” history; *b) The Received Text (Latin, Textus Receptus).*

a) *The “AV only” history.*

The “AV only” legal history dates from the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries as part of Anglican ecclesiastical canon law. In 1604 the King of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and Supreme Governor of the established Anglican Church, King James I (Regnal Years: 1603-1625), summoned a meeting at Hampton Court, in which Puritan Churchmen recommended that a new translation of Holy Writ be made. The King agreed, and with Anglican Bible translators, the result was the King James Version of 1611. There is thus a sense in which the King James Bible is the Protestant fruit of a collaborative Anglican-Puritan effort i.e., a Puritan request and an Anglican response.

In 1638 a body of canon law issued solely by the King’s authority, known as the *Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical*, and designed to make the Church of Scotland Anglican, was issued by Royal decree. These contained provisions rejected by the Scottish who wished to be Presbyterian, such as a canon which required the “Lord’s Supper be received with the bowing of the knee.” But one of the provisions stated, “The Bible shall be of the translation of King James, and if any parish be unprovided thereof, the same shall be amended within two months at most after the publication of this constitution.” Though these canons were fairly quickly repealed, and the established *Church of Scotland* became Presbyterian in 1690, not Anglican, nevertheless, these Royal Anglican canons of 1638 meant that for a short while, the KJV *first* became the Authorized Version (AV) in Scotland i.e., it was the *version authorized* by the King’s Royal Decree.

Though the established *Church of Scotland* never issued similar Presbyterian canons, in practice the *Church of Scotland* became an “Authorized Version only” church till the late nineteenth century⁸³. The term “Authorized Version only” is placed in quotation marks, since the *Church of Scotland* historically authorized a different and metrical translation of the Psalms for usage in public worship, so that while it was an “AV only” church, it allowed some latitude providing the AV remained the principle translation.

The *Act of Uniformity* (1662) introduced the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), and this Act of Parliament states in the Preface, that the “portions of holy Scripture ... are now ordered to be read according to the last Translation.” Since the “last Translation” was the *King James Version* (KJV), this Act thus made the KJV the *Authorized Version* (AV) i.e., it was the *version authorized* to be read in *Church of England* Churches by Act of Westminster Parliament.

Furthermore, the Uniformity Act states that the Caroline Anglican *Book of*

⁸³ Burton, J.H., *The History of Scotland*, (8 volumes), 1873, William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, Vol. 6, pp. 104-7.

Common Prayer (1662) resulted from King Charles II's declaration of 1660, and the *Church of England* Convocations of Canterbury and York producing the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), which "His Majesty ... fully approved and allowed ..., and recommended to ... [the] Parliament." Thus it follows from examination of the 1662 Uniformity Act, that through the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) which included the relevant Preface authorizing the KJV, that the King James Version was the *version authorized* by King, Parliament, and Convocation. It was this triple authorization by King, Parliament, and Convocation found in the Act of Uniformity of 1662, that gave the King James Version its enduring designation as "the Authorized Version."

Thus the *Church of England* became an "Authorized Version only" church till the nineteenth century. But once again, the term "Authorized Version only" is placed in quotation marks, since the *Church of England* historically sometimes read in the place of a sermon, one of the Homilies of Article 35 in the *39 Articles*. These Homilies were originally compiled before 1611, and though some relatively minor revisions were made to them over the years, their earlier non-use of the King James Version in Biblical quotes was retained. The *Church of England* also historically authorized a different translation of the Psalms in the *Book of Common Prayer* for usage in public worship. Miles Coverdale was editor of the *Great Bible* (1538-9) (based on Tyndale's and Coverdale's earlier versions), with a Preface by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, in 1540. Coverdale's *Great Bible* psalms were used in the *Book of Common Prayer*. Thus while it was an "AV only" church, it allowed some latitude providing the AV remained the principle translation. Because of its status in Anglican canon law, the "AV only" status of the King James Version in Anglicanism was safeguarded in law.

The *Church of England* was the established religion in the Colony of New South Wales, Australia, from 1788 to 1836, till the *Church Act (Burke Act)* of 1836 disengaged the Anglican Church from its privileged position as the State's Christian religion. Thus when in 1815, the Evangelical Anglican Chaplain and Magistrate, Reverend Samuel Marsden (to whom I am related by ancestral affinity⁸⁴), used Goode's Version of the Psalms in place of those found in the *Great Bible's* psalms found in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), he was prohibited by His Excellency, the Governor of New South Wales, to continue this practice. In writing to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Earl Bathurst, Governor Macquarie referred to this matter and said, "I have deemed it my duty to prohibit this Version, or any other than that attached to the Bible and Prayer Book of the Church of England, from being any longer used⁸⁵." And in reply Earl Bathurst, whilst "induced to acquit" Marsden from any perverse reasons of trying "to promote peculiar doctrines," nevertheless agreed with Macquarie's decision⁸⁶.

⁸⁴ John Brabyn, an army officer of the New South Wales Corps (and later also a NSW Magistrate,) arrived in Australia in 1796, and is one of my matrilineal four times great-grandfathers. Brabyn's daughter Elizabeth, married Marsden's son, Charles.

⁸⁵ Macquarie to Bathurst, 2 Dec. 1815, *Historical Records of Australia* (H.R.A.), Commonwealth Government Printer, 1916, I, 8, pp. 336-337.

⁸⁶ Bathurst to Macquarie, 4 April 1817, *Ibid.*, p. 637.

Macquarie’s qualification that he would allow anything “attached to the Bible” is doubly significant, because it was a Royal Prerogative for “the King ... [to] grant to particular persons the sole use of some particular employments, (as of printing the Holy Scriptures ...)⁸⁷.” I.e., in this context, the “Authorized” of “Authorized Version” can also mean “Printed by Authority,” and thus refer to Letters Patent granted by Authority of the Crown to print the Holy Bible (or to print an edition of the Anglican Homilies with their non-AV Bible quotes). Since these were necessary for any printing of the AV in the British Empire, it thus follows that anything printed with the AV for use in *Church of England* churches, such as a version of the Psalms intended for singing, would also have to first be authorized by the Crown. Therefore Macquarie’s and Bathurst’s correspondence clearly presume that the King, acting as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith*, would not grant such Letters Patent for printing the AV, if anything for use in a *Church of England* Church was attached to it that was not first properly approved for usage in Anglican Churches. (There might be authorized exceptions e.g., in the UK an AV with an attached Psalter for usage in the Presbyterian *Church of Scotland*.)

Therefore, whilst the specific facts of the *Goode’s Version case (1815)* deal with departures from the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* (BCP), rather than the Authorized Version, three important facts must be borne in mind. Firstly, it was the Act establishing the BCP which authorized the AV; secondly, Governor Macquarie’s statement that he would “prohibit” anything other than what was attached to “the Bible” i.e., the Authorized (King James) Version “and Prayer Book;” and thirdly, Bathurst’s later supporting statement that Macquarie “enforce a strict adherence to those forms and Service, which are prescribed by competent Authority⁸⁸.” These all combine to show how, as a matter of Administrative Law, the status of the King James Version as the Authorized Version in the established *Church of England* was legally safeguarded. It also reflects the fact that the term “Authorized Version” historically referred both to the fact that it was the version authorized by King, Parliament, and Convocation through the BCP and associated 1662 Act of Uniformity; as well as being the version printed by Royal Authority.

The *Church of England* was an “AV only” church for about 200 years. The Revised Version (RV) (1881-1885), was undertaken after a resolution initiated by the Church of England’s Bishop Wilberforce (Bishop of Winchester), as amended by Bishop Ollivant (Bishop of Llandaff), in the Upper House of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, and was passed by both Houses of the *Church of England* Convocation in 1870. The revision committee consisted not only of Anglicans, but also men from other English speaking Churches, including Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregational, and Baptist. This was followed by a Standard American edition of the RV, known as the American Standard Version (ASV) in 1901. The RV effectively ended the *Church of*

⁸⁷ Hawkin’s *Pleas of the Crown*, Vol. 1, p. 231.

⁸⁸ Bathurst to Macquarie, 4 April 1817, H.R.A., *op. cit.*, p. 637.

England's era as an “AV only” church.

However in practice the Anglican Churches, while increasingly using other versions, remained largely AV churches till the post World War Two era. Perhaps even more so, the *Church of Scotland* remained largely an AV using church till the post World War Two era. In fact, this was generally true of all Protestant Churches. That is, in practice, English speaking Protestant Churches were generally, even if not officially, “AV only” churches till the late nineteenth century. However, from the late nineteenth century, there was then a three-way split among Protestant Churches. A relatively small number may have phased out usage of the AV. But the more common distinction was between that group of churches that used the AV as their main translation, while using the RV or ASV as a supplement to, not a replacement of the AV; and that group of churches that used only the AV.

The matter was then increasing complicated by the rise of more new translations, such as Weymouth's *New Testament in Modern Speech* (1903, 1907), the Moffatt Bible (1913-1924, Revised Ed. 1935)⁸⁹, and Goodspeed's *American Translation* (1923-1931). These all vied for status as supplements to the AV, or possibly replacements of the AV. Like the RV and ASV, they all claimed to be more accurate than the AV by attacking the AV's NT Received Text (and to a much lesser extent, the AV's OT Received Text). This led to an “AV only” backlash by some, who sought a return to the situation of the seventeenth to late nineteenth centuries when English speaking Protestant Churches were in practice, “AV only” churches. Thus the general situation between the late nineteenth and mid twentieth centuries, may be characterized as Protestant Churches forming two main groupings, one was a strict “AV only” grouping that only used the AV; and the other grouping used the AV as the main translation, but other versions, especially the RV or ASV, were used as supplements to, not as replacements of, the AV.

In the post World War Two, a plethora of new versions appeared, and seem to still be appearing. With regret, it must be admitted that the usage of versions other than the AV, albeit as supplements to, not as replacements of, the AV, proved in a number of instances to be a transitional phase away from the AV. But in such instances, it is also the case that such persons generally regarded the NT text types of these other versions as

⁸⁹ Though the religiously liberal apostate Protestant Bible “translator,” James Moffatt was held in high regard by the intellectually debased and formally recognized “academic world,” his skills of textual analysis, evident in e.g., his wild rearrangement of many portions of Holy Writ, rank him among the very worst examples of a “textual analyst” I have ever seen. In the “Introduction” to his religiously liberal and loose *Moffatt Bible*, Moffatt, thought himself very smart by making the astounding claim that the Authorized Version “was never authorized, by king, parliament, or convocation.” However here, as elsewhere in his version (e.g., in his treatment of OT Messianic prophecies), he fails to exercise due care and consideration. Similarly ignorant comments about reference to the KJV as the AV, have become all too common among the ignorant and unlearned. E.g., one finds similar inaccurate claims in *Collier's Encyclopedia*, Colliers, New York, USA, 1996, Vol. 4, p. 118.

making them “more accurate” than the AV, a position that I do not share. Certainly, I would not want my supplementary usage of the RV, ASV, NASB, and NKJV to have this effect on anyone, i.e., of having them replace the AV as their main translation, or think of the AV’s NT as less accurate because it uses the Received Text.

The plethora of post World War Two new versions, usually based on neo-Alexandrian texts e.g., one of Nestle’s editions or the NU Text (“N” from “Nestle” and “U” from “United Bible Societies”), has greatly undermined the historical place of the AV among Protestant Churches, and has been one of the corrosive influences in the great decay of true religion. Fortunately, a number of churches have, by the grace of God, kept alive the importance of the AV. In this process some have formally returned to, or never moved away from, the “AV only” Protestant position of the mid seventeenth to late nineteenth centuries. For example, the *Church of England (Continuing)* is an “AV only” Church⁹⁰. In the great and noble work of promoting the AV, the outstanding efforts and labours of the *Trinitarian Bible Society* have been of clear noteworthiness. The *Trinitarian Bible Society* publishes and distributes Scriptures in many different tongues throughout the world, but for English readers only publishes the Authorized Version. It is thus an “AV only” organization.

****b) The Received Text (Latin, Textus Receptus). General; New Testament; Old Testament. *i) General; *ii) New Testament; iii) Old Testament.***

****i) General***

On the one hand, we are warned that men may “add unto these things” in Rev. 22:18; but on the other hand, that men might “take away from the words of the book” contrary to the warning of Rev. 22:19. While in the first instance Rev. 22:18,19 refers to the Book of Revelation; since with this book, the entire Book of the Bible was completed, there is contextually a second meaning in these words to the whole Bible. This conclusion is consistent with other Scriptures (Deut. 4:2), since the psalmist says, “For ever O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven” (Ps. 119:89). I maintain that the Scriptures have been supernaturally preserved throughout the ages, for “the word of our God shall stand for ever” (Isa. 40:8). In applying this general principle to the OT Scriptures (Matt. 5:17), sometimes known generically as “the law” (John 10:34; 12:34; 15:25; I Cor. 14:21), Jesus made a specific promise with regard to the Hebrew Scriptures, “one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law” (Matt. 5:18). He further declared, “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away” (Matt. 24:35).

****ii) New Testament***

The work of Divine Preservation requires that the Received Text and the preservation of its constituent parts be undertaken by men gifted by God. This occurs in one of two ways. One way is that by God’s common grace to mankind, he selects certain unsaved persons to preserve his oracles. This may be linked with, although is not

⁹⁰ Samuel, D.N., *The Church in Crisis, op. cit.*, pp. 55-85 n.b. pp. 59-9,68.

necessarily linked with, a racial and / or religious division of labour between Jews and Gentiles. Thus through racial gifts God has given to the Jewish race, God has sometimes preserved the Old Testament oracles via unsaved men (Rom. 3:2; 11:29); or through racial gifts given to the Gentile race, God has sometimes preserved the New Testament oracles via unsaved men. This type of racial and / or religious division of labour appears to have been used more by God during the era of handwritten manuscripts i.e., before the printing press; e.g., it is notable that the mainly Gentile NT Church never sought to take over the role of preserving the OT Hebrew Oracles from the Jews. Given that while the Sephardic Jews are of the Jewish race, and post NT Judaism came to absorb the Ashkenazi Jew who is either a Caucasian or (if a white Jew having “the Jewish nose”) Caucasian-Semite admixed, it might be remarked that there was a fairly clear Jew-Christian religious division of labour before the time of the movement to printed texts over about 150 years from the mid 15th century to the end of the 16th century, i.e., between apostate Jews copying out OT manuscripts and what were usually apostate Christians copying out NT manuscripts (Greek and Latin). With regard to the NT Received Text, such were many religiously apostate eastern Greek writing Gentile scribes and religiously apostate Western Latin writing Gentile scribes; and such also were e.g., the Gentile Complutensians of Spain (who also did work on the OT).

Alternatively, another way the work of Divine Preservation is carried on occurs inside the body of true believers. Christ is monogamously married to “the church” (Eph. 5:31,32) i.e., what the *Apostles’ Creed* calls in Article 10, “the holy catholic church,” and God gives “gifts” to his church. One of these is “the gift” of “teachers” (Eph. 4:7,8,11). This is much wider than teachers of the Received Text, indeed, such are relatively rare manifestations of the teaching gift with most teachers being called to other roles e.g., pastoral roles in churches. But as one of the fruits of the Protestant Reformation, God called a relatively small select number of neo-Byzantine textual analysts to this teaching role in the 16th and 17th centuries. Inside the Neo-Byzantine School, such e.g., were Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs. And following a long, sustained, and systematic attack upon the Received Text of Holy Scripture, and upon petition of Almighty God by many Christian brethren of the holy Protestant faith for relief and assistance, in the early 21st century, for the first time in some hundreds of years, by the grace of God, I too was called to this neo-Byzantine task.

Now these two methods by which Divine Preservation operate, both manifest the power of God, and remind us that the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture rests upon the sovereign power of God. *At his pleasure, and entirely at his discretion*, this absolute sovereign monarch provides what his church needs, as seemeth best to *his* Godly wisdom. *So good Christian brethren, let us not only thank God for the air we breath, the trees we see, and our hearing ears; but let us also be sure to thank him for the work of such men as Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs.*

What of the Neo-Alexandrian School? With respect to the Greek NT Text, I think men like the late Kurt Aland (d. 1994) and the late Bruce Metzger (d. 2007) (leading men on the Nestle-Aland Greek NT Committee and UBS Greek NT Committee), hang too much on their anti-supernaturalist anti-Divine Preservation chains of logic that

revolve around their own intellectual capacities to construct what they think are likely or probable scenarios to account for textual variations. Like other elements of the Neo-Alexandrian School, the basic categories of thought used to construct their paradigm are an absorption of anti-supernatural secularist values. I also think they take an overly simplistic view of the older texts necessarily being more reliable. Even on their own principles, which I disagree with, one can in many instances find citations of a reading in ancient church writers which is either as old, or older than, their Alexandrian texts. In particular, I disagree with them since the textual critics of the nineteenth century and following, starting with men like Karl Lachmann (1831), Constantin von Tischendorf (1869-72), and Westcott and Hort (1881), did not consider that God Providentially preserved the text of Scripture over the ages i.e., they adopted an anti-supernaturalist view of the preservation of Scripture.

Thus one of the admirers of Tischendorf *et al*, Metzger, says approvingly of Lachmann, that he “ventured to apply to the New Testament the criteria that he had used in editing texts of the classics⁹¹.” At this point I consider that they hold an invalid presupposition, namely, that one can apply the same rules to an inspired and Divinely preserved document in the Bible, that one can apply to an uninspired and non-Divinely preserved document such as the Greek and Latin “classics.”

The belief in the non-Divine preservation of Scripture is thus as circular an argument as is the belief in the Divine preservation of Scripture. I.e., in both instances, it rests on a religious belief. It is admittedly a different religious belief to those who recognize the Divine Preservation of Scripture, but the reality is, that these people claim “there is no place for religious belief” in such matters. They however, exercise a religious belief which is anti-supernaturalist, just as I would exercise a religious belief that is supernaturalist. I.e., they say, “God did not preserve the Received Text” (a religious belief), or “There is no God and no Divine Preservation” (a religious belief); while denying any alternative view such as, “God preserved the Received Text” (a religious belief). Thus in the name of “secularist” “neutrality,” in fact they impose religious tests prohibiting a religious belief in Divine Preservation in the normative operations of their neo-Alexandrian controlled colleges, publishers etc., and in this way reflect wider religious tests imposed by the secular state.

If one treats the Bible as a Book not supernaturally preserved, it ought not to surprise us that one ends up thinking that the Bible was not supernaturally inspired. Inspiration and Preservation are the two sides of the one coin. A consequence of this anti-supernaturalist thinking, was that in the nineteenth century these liberal textual critics moved away from a starting point of textual analysis on the Byzantine Text, in which the representative Byzantine Text is regarded as the best raw Greek text or starting point (my view), to a new starting point of textual analysis on the Alexandrian Text, in which the Alexandrian Text is regarded as the best raw Greek Text or starting point.

While I support textual analysis, any such NT textual analysis is of the type and

⁹¹ Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 2nd ed., 1994, p. 10.

kind that was acclaimed in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and was especially associated with the names of Erasmus of Rotterdam, Beza of Geneva, the King James Version translators of the British Isles, and the Elzevirs of Leiden. *I do not share the presuppositions of modern liberal textual critics. Nevertheless, let us make our starting point one of textual analyses.* In considering this, no texts are more important than two disputed paragraphs, namely, Mark 16:19-20 and John 7:53-8:11, both of which are found in the Received Text. They are not found in the NU Text (pronounced “new text”) i.e., the Nestle-Aland (N) and United Bible Societies (UBS) (U) texts, corporately known as the NU Text. While I do not share the NU Text’s methodological presuppositions, for the purposes of making these initial points, let us consider all relevant text types on these matters.

Let the reader consider the issue of the longer ending of St. Mark’s Gospel (Mark 16:9-20). The UBS Greek NT Committee does not treat it as a serious possibility, giving their highest rating, an “A” to the shorter reading ending at Mark 16:8⁹². I would agree that the writing style is different to that of Mark’s Gospel, but I would not agree that this makes it a later addition. Rather, I think that this was an apostolic autograph from one of the Eleven. I think its later omission arose from the fact that men in ancient times, very much like men in modern times like Aland and Metzger, perceived that it was a different writing style, and so wrongly concluded it was a spurious addition. Therefore I think that any reference to the Alexandrian text must take into account this possibility of textual pruning, since Mark 16:9-20 is absent from the leading fourth century representatives of the Alexandrian text i.e., London Sinaiticus and Rome Vaticanus. These modern men such as Aland and Metzger are capable of concluding that because it is a different writing style it should be omitted; but they seem incapable of accepting that men exactly like them might have existed in ancient times, and for exactly, or near exactly the same reasons, may have omitted the longer ending, with the consequence that the longer ending is in fact the correct reading. Perhaps at an unconscious rather than a conscious level, they think their critical text “wisdom” is too great for the ancients to have attained to, and only “moderns” like them could think the way they do. In fact, “there is no new thing under the sun” (Eccl. 1:9).

Outside the closed class of sources, Mark 16:9-20 is absent from the leading (4th century) representatives of the Alexandrian text (London Sinaiticus & Rome Vaticanus). But inside the closed class of sources, it is found in the representative Byzantine text e.g., the fifth century London Alexandrinus (A 02, which is Byzantine only in the Gospels); and also Jerome’s *Latin Vulgate* (5th century for earliest Vulgate Codices in the Gospels), and a series of old Latin versions e.g., ff2 (5th century). Outside the closed class of sources, it is also found in the leading (5th century) representatives of the Western text (Cambridge Bezae Cantabrigiensis); (for those who group the relevant authorities

⁹² UBS 4th Revised Edition (1993), p. 189. For the NU Text Committee, “A indicates that the text is certain,” “B indicates that the text is almost certain,” “C” “indicates that the Committee had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text,” and “D” “indicates that the Committee had great difficulty in arriving at a decision” *Ibid.*, p. 3; Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1994, pp. 102-6.

together as “Caesarean,⁹³”) an important “pre-Caesarean” (5th Century) authority, Manuscript Washington (W 032, Western Text in Mark 1:1-5:30 & “Pre-Caesarean” text in Mark 5:31-16:20), and some later “Caesarean” authorities (Manuscript Families 1 and 13)⁹⁴.

Inside the closed class of sources, both textual traditions are referred to by church writers from the first five centuries. The same church writers sometimes refer to both traditions. Thus the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339) refers to both manuscript lines, as does Epiphanius (d. 403); and the ancient church Latin writer Jerome (d. 420). Whilst there is one other (4th/5th century) citation from this early era in support of its omission; there are a further nine good citations (from the 3rd to 5th centuries) in favour of its inclusion, including the ancient church Latin writers, of *Rebaptism* (c. 258), Ambrose (c. 397) (in a manuscript according to Jerome), and Augustine (d. 430).

Though not mentioned by the UBS textual apparatus, this longer ending is also supported by the ancient church Greek writers of *Apostolic Constitutions* and Irenaeus, and ancient church Latin writer Cyprian. In *Apostolic Constitutions* Book 8:1 (3rd or 4th century), we read, “With good reason did he say ..., ‘Now these signs shall follow them that have believed in my name, they shall cast out devils, they shall speak with new

⁹³ Some think a “Caesarean” text type, which is thought to have originated in Egypt, and taken to Caesarea, possibly by Origen, then went to Jerusalem; and Armenian missionaries then took the “Caesarean Text” to Georgia where it influenced Armenian manuscripts and a Georgian version of the NT. Others question the existence of a “Caesarean text” type. Modern textual critics of the UBS kind, have shown movement in thinking on this, in more recent times moving away from the idea of a “Caesarean text.” But in either instance, there is general agreement that “the Caesarean text” is a mixture of Western and Alexandrian readings. Its relatively slim manuscript support includes Papyrus 45 (“Pre-Caesarean” text; Alexandrian text in Acts) from the third century.

⁹⁴ Though I would not agree with many elements of Metzger’s neo-Alexandrian analysis, compare the first edition of Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, pp. xv-xxiii, xxviii-xxx (written when he more readily allowed for the possibility of a Caesarean Text type); with the second edition of Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1994, pp. 5-10, 14-16 (written after he less readily allowed for the possibility of a Caesarean Text type). Kurt Aland says Minuscule 69 is independent text in the Pauline Epistles and Byzantine Text elsewhere (Aland, K., *et unum, The Text of the New Testament*, translated by E.F. Rhodes, 2nd ed., Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1989, pp. 106 & 129). [Update 2015]. On this basis I formerly referred to “Minuscule 69 (15th century, Byzantine Text outside independent text Pauline Epistles; included in the wider generally non-Byzantine *Family 13 Manuscripts*).” However, from what I can tell of the relatively small sample I have examined in the Gospels, it is a mixed text type in Matthew and the early chapters of Mark (although I have not examined it beyond this).

tongues, they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall by no means hurt them, they shall lay their hands on the sick, and they shall recover' [Mark 16:17,18]. These gifts were first bestowed ... when ... about to 'preach the gospel to every creature' [Mark 16:15]." And in *Apostolic Constitutions* Book 6:3:15 we read, "For the Lord says... 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned'" (Mark 16:16)⁹⁵. Cyprian in about the middle of the third century, says, "Vincentius of Thibaris said, ... the Lord by his Divine precept commanded to his apostles saying, 'Go ye,' 'lay hands' 'in my name,' 'cast out demons'" (Mark 16:15,17,18)⁹⁶. Also Bishop Irenaeus of Lyons (c. 130- c. 200), in the second century said in *Irenaeus Against Heresies* (10:5), "Mark says, 'So then after the Lord Jesus had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God'" (Mark 16:19)⁹⁷. It is further support by the ancient church Latin doctor, St. Ambrose (d. 397) in manuscripts according to the ancient church Latin doctor, St. Jerome, (d. 420), and the ancient church Latin doctor, St. Augustine (d. 430). Reference is also made to the longer ending of Mark 16 by the early mediaeval church Latin doctor, Gregory (d. 604), who quotes Mark 16:14-20 as a unit, as well as quoting from Mark 16:15, Mark 16:16, and Mark 16:19⁹⁸. Even on anti-supernaturalist textual preservation principles which I do not share, one could argue that its impressive support from such authorities as these ancient manuscripts and ancient church writers, *supra*, is a good argument in favour of its inclusion⁹⁹.

On the one hand, the longer ending is to be favoured since St. Mark's Gospel clearly anticipates that Jesus will appear to his disciples after his resurrection (St. Mark 14:28; 16:7); and the ending at Mark 16:8 is too abrupt to consider that the Evangelist intended that the Gospel close at this point. But on the other hand, the writing style of Mark 16:9-20 is clearly different to that of the rest of the Gospel, and I consider that it was this fact which led to one line of ancient authorities deciding to omit it i.e., ancient critical text editors. Thus it seems to me most likely that some of the copyists, such as those of Alexandria, having an inclination to prune away what they considered to be unnecessary words; detected a clear change in writing style in Mark 16:9-20, and then wrongly concluding that this meant it was no part of the original, they removed this

⁹⁵ Roberts, A. & Donaldson, J., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1885, Vol. 7, p. 457 (Book 6:3), p. 479 (Book 8:1).

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol. 5, p. 569.

⁹⁷ Vol. 1, p. 426.

⁹⁸ St. Gregory the Great in: Migne 76:1213 (Mark 16:14-20); 76:694 (Mark 16:15); 79:15 (Mark 16:15); 79:397 (Mark 16:15); 79:524 (Mark 16:15); 79:1198 (Mark 16:15); 79:165 (Mark 16:16); & 79:262 (Mark 16:19).

⁹⁹ The footnote claim of the NASB which places this section in square brackets, and which says, "A few late mss [manuscripts] and versions contain this paragraph," is just plain wrong.

section. Its diverse writing style thus explains its omission from a number of ancient authorities.

Therefore, given both the ancient and widespread attestation of its antiquity, i.e., in Greek and Latin authorities from the first five centuries, together with its stylistic appropriateness, I consider that even on anti-supernaturalist textual preservation principles, one could still conclude it is part of the original autograph. And here I note that while the RSV's first edition (1952) placed the longer ending of Mark's Gospel in a footnote, the RSV Catholic edition (1965), and RSV's second edition (1971), reversed this order, placing the longer ending back in the main text. While this RSV about-face, which put the longer ending back in St. Mark's Gospel, albeit with footnotes promoting other views, is admittedly unusual, and neo-Alexandrian versions more commonly put the longer ending in square brackets, nevertheless, it shows that some following anti-supernaturalist textual preservation principles have reached this type of conclusion. Certainly I reached this conclusion while I still followed these erroneous anti-supernaturalist textual preservation principles.

This longer ending is generally found in Byzantine manuscripts of the sixth to sixteenth centuries, and forms part of the Received Text. How then do I account for the different authorship of this passage? It is clear that in the Apostolic Church a letter written under inspiration by one person, but with a different penman, would receive authority in the church as under inspiration it received the signature of an Apostle (Rom. 1:1; 16:22; II Thess. 3:17). Therefore I consider Mark 16:9-20 to be such an *Apostolic Signature by one of the Eleven* on Mark's Gospel, and that the apostolic signature's writing style was known to the NT Church though not later generations (a similar issue arises with the Epistle to the Hebrews). I.e., the Holy Ghost, taking the words from St. Mark's vocabulary, verbally inspired most of this Gospel at St. Mark's hand; and then the Holy Ghost, taking the words from the vocabulary of one of the Eleven, had him write the longer ending as an apostolic autograph that the wider body of believers would recognize.

That this signature was by one of the eleven is I think quite clear. The content of the Mark's Gospel could clearly be authenticated by autograph to the early church by one of The Eleven. Reference is made to "the eleven" in Mark 16:14, and Mark 16:14-20 revolves around the eleven. Clearly the testimony of St. Mary Magdalene in Mark 16:9-11 is known because she "went and told them that had been with him" (Mark 16:10) i.e., this included the eleven (John 20:18). Likewise, the appearance to the two in Mark 16:12,13 is known as they "told it unto the residue" (Mark 16:13) i.e., this included the eleven (Luke 24:33-35). Thus when Jesus later "appeared unto the eleven," he "upbraided them" for not believing these accounts (Mark 16:14). And the discourse ends with reference to the eleven preaching the word with the "signs following" (Mark 16:20) Jesus had promised them (Mark 16:17,18). Thus I consider God's Spirit chose words from Mark's vocabulary and told Mark exactly what to write in Mark 1:1-16:8; and then the Holy Spirit of God chose words from one of the eleven's vocabulary, and told that Apostle exactly what to write in Mark 16:9-20. The Spirit then used the *Apostolic Signature by one of the Eleven* as a proof of authenticity to confirm the Gospel's account to the wider body of believers who were familiar with that Apostle.

Let the reader now consider the issue of the paragraph concerning the Woman Caught in Adultery in St. John's Gospel (John 7:53-8:11). Once again, the UBS Greek NT Committee does not treat it as a serious possibility, giving their highest rating, an "A" to its omission. Once again I would agree that the broad writing style is different to that of John's Gospel (although Hodges & Farstad note that John 7:53-8:11 shows some Johannine terminology¹⁰⁰), but once again I would not agree with the interpretation that "this therefore" makes it a later addition.

Outside the closed class of sources, John 7:53-8:11 is absent from the leading (4th century) representatives of the Alexandrian text (London Sinaiticus & Rome Vaticanus), and Manuscript Washington (W 032, which is Alexandrian Text in Luke 1:1-8:12 & John's Gospel). But it is found in the leading (5th century) representatives of the Western text (Cambridge Bezae Cantabrigiensis). Inside the closed class of sources, (according to the UBS 4th revised ed. and Nestle-Aland 27th ed. textual apparatus), among church writers from the first five centuries it is omitted in citations from Tertullian (after 220), Origen (c. 254), Chrysostom (4th / 5th century), Cyril (mid 5th century), and Cyprian (258) in a manuscript according to Augustine (mid 5th century).

In some later manuscripts it is found in a different position. Inside the closed class of sources, UBS 4th revised edition (1994) shows it followed by the representative Byzantine text. (I shall leave elements of some greater complication with regard to aspects of this passage and issues of what parts have what manuscript support till the volume covering it on St. John's Gospel; and here just deal with a broad overview of it i.e., that UBS here state a form of it is in the majority Byzantine text.) It is also found in Jerome's *Latin Vulgate* (5th century for earliest Vulgate Codices in the Gospels), and a series of old Latin manuscripts e.g., old Latin versions e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), and ff2 (5th century). And (according to the UBS 4th revised ed. and Nestle-Aland 27th ed. textual apparatus), among church writers from the first five centuries it is included in citations from *Apostolic Constitutions*, Ambrosiaster (late 4th century), Ambrose (later 4th century), Pacian (late 4th century), Rufinus (early 5th century), an undated Greek and Latin manuscript according to Jerome (early 5th century), Jerome (d. 420), Faustus-Milevis (4th century), and Augustine (early 5th century).

In connection with those ancient manuscripts or ancient church writers omitting it, Metzger makes the staggering claim that the "evidence for the non-Johannine origin of" this paragraph "is overwhelming," further noting that "the style and vocabulary" of the paragraph "differ noticeably from the rest of the Fourth Gospel." He also claims "that it interrupts the sequence of 7:52 and 8:12ff." Metzger says the UBS "Committee was unanimous that" this paragraph "was originally no part of the Fourth Gospel"¹⁰¹.

¹⁰⁰ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxiii-xxiv.

¹⁰¹ UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), p. 347; Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1994, pp. 187-9.

There can be no doubt that John 7:53-8:11 is supported by reference to the ancient church Greek writer of *Apostolic Constitutions* (Book 2, Section 3:24). Here we read, “And when the elders had set another woman which had sinned before him, and had left the sentence to him, and were gone out, our Lord, the searcher of the hearts, inquiring of her whether the elders had condemned her, and being answered No, he said unto her, ‘Go’ thy way therefore, for ‘neither do I condemn thee’”(John 8:11)¹⁰². While the UBS edition dates *Apostolic Constitutions* to “about 380,” thus making this an ancient document from the late fourth century, it is worthy of note that others e.g., Dr. Von Drey, have dated it much earlier to the second half of the third century i.e., about 100 years earlier¹⁰³. But whether one dates *Apostolic Constitutions* to the second half of the third century or second half of the fourth century, it is clear that this passage has support among ancient church writers. I consider its impressive early support from e.g., *Apostolic Constitutions*, Ambrosiaster, Ambrose, and Augustine; together with Jerome’s *Latin Vulgate*, to mean that even on anti-supernaturalist textual preservation principles which I do not share, there is a good dating argument in favour of its inclusion¹⁰⁴.

The Woman Caught in Adultery paragraph in St. John’s Gospel (John 7:53-8:11) is to be favoured as the correct reading because in John 8:15 Jesus says to the Pharisees, “Ye judge after the flesh; I judge no man,” and this contextually favours the propriety of the events of John 7:53-8:11 setting the scene for this statement. Moreover, in John 7 & 8 there is a development of the meaning of Deut. 17:6,7 “At the mouth of two witnesses, or three witness, shall he that is worthy of death be put to death; but at the mouth of one witness he shall not be put to death. The hands of the witnesses shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterward the hands of all the people.” First we hear “Nicodemus” say, “Doth our law judge any man, before it hear him, and know what he doeth?” (John 7:50,51); and then this is followed by John 7:53-8:11 where it is clear that the Pharisees who seek to accuse Jesus do not, in fact, follow this legal procedure as seen in their treatment of the Woman Caught in Adultery. By contrast, Christ says, “It is also written in your law, that the testimony of two men is true. I am one that bear witness of myself” (one witness), “and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me” (the second witness) (John 8:17,18). One might ask what the propriety is of Christ using this argument at this point of John’s Gospel? It is clear that if the John 7:52-8:11 narrative is present it is much more apt, for then we find a contrast between the Pharisees who could not produce the necessary two witnesses, and Christ who can.

¹⁰² Roberts, A. & Donaldson, J., *op. cit.*, Vol. 7, p. 408.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 338, citing Dr. Von Drey’s *Neve Untersuchungen Uber die Constitu. U Kanomes der Ap.*, Tubingen, 1832, Hefele (Conciliengeschichte, ii Freiburg, 1855, 2nd ed. 1876, Edinburgh translation 1871, p. 449).

¹⁰⁴ The footnote claim of the NASB which places this section in square brackets, and which says, “Later mss [manuscripts] add the story of the adulterous woman, numbering it as John 7:53-8:11,” fails to satisfactorily take into account these earlier authorities.

Furthermore, we must ask, why does John 8:20 specify the treasury, “These words spake Jesus in the treasury, as he taught in the temple,” and how did Jesus and the Pharisees (John 8:13) get into “the temple” (John 8:20), when the narrative of John 7:52 leaves the Pharisees separate from Jesus who was somewhere at “the feast” (John 7:37). How could we say, “Then spake Jesus again unto them” (John 8:12) as a natural sequence from these events, unless in fact we are first told, “Jesus” “came again into the temple,” as did “the scribes and Pharisees” whom he spoke to (John 8:1-3,7)? Thus context strongly supports the inclusion of John 7:53-8:11 as part of the natural flow of John 7 & 8; whereas its omission creates an awkward and puzzling interruption in the flow of John 7 & 8.

It is also the case that key concepts in John 7:53-8:11 fit well with Johannine teaching emphasized in this Gospel. Christ’s words of John 8:11, “Go,” “neither do I condemn thee” quoted by *Apostolic Constitutions* (3rd or 4th century), echo important truths found elsewhere in the Gospel. “Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more” (John 8:11), manifest an element of John 3:17, “For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.” And the associated words, “Go, and sin no more” (John 8:11), are also strikingly similar to Christ’s words to the man Jesus healed on the sabbath day, saying once again “in the temple” (John 5:14, cf. 8:2), “Behold thou art made whole: sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee” (John 5:14).

On the one hand, the combination of all these factors make an overwhelmingly powerful case for the authenticity of the Woman Caught in Adultery as being part of St. John’s Gospel, and being originally placed where we now find it at John 7:53-8:11. But on the other hand, in broad terms the writing style of John 7:53-8:11 is different to that of the rest of the Gospel, and I consider that it was this fact which led to one line of ancient authorities deciding to omit it i.e., ancient critical text editors. Thus it seems to me most likely that some copyists, such as those of the Alexandrian School, having an inclination to prune away what they considered to be unnecessary words; detected a clear change in writing style in John 7:53-8:11. They then wrongly concluded that this meant it was no part of the original, and so they removed this section. This thus explains its omission from a number of ancient authorities. This same factor, explains why some other manuscripts sought to place it either at the end of St. Luke’s Gospel or at the end of St. John’s Gospel.

Therefore, even on anti-supernaturalist textual preservation principles which I do not share, given the ancient and reliable attestation of its antiquity, i.e., in Greek and Latin authorities from the first five centuries, together with its stylistic appropriateness, I consider it to be part of the original autograph. This paragraph is also generally found in Byzantine manuscripts. How then do I account for the different authorship of this passage? I think that in the same way Ezra was told under inspiration to write out “the copy of the letter that king Artaxerxes gave unto Ezra the priest” (Ezra 7:11-26), so St. John was asked to copy out a previously written inspired account of the Woman Caught in Adultery that was independently circulating in the apostolic Christian community. The Spirit of God selected words from St. John’s vocabulary to write most of St. John’s

Gospel, but the Spirit of God chose words from this other apostle's vocabulary to write what became later known as "John 7:53-8:11," even if John minimally molded it to fit in.

Identification of this other apostle is speculative. However, bearing in mind that John and James were brothers, being sons of Zebedee, that both these two names appear together (Matt. 4:21,22; 10:2; Mark 1:19; 3:17), and Jesus referred to them jointly as "Boanerges, which is, the sons of thunder" (Mark 3:17), (and they evidently had a fiery disposition, Luke 9:52-54), it seems likely that when Jesus sent out the disciples in pairs (Mark 6:7), that these two brothers were paired together. I think there is a good chance that James the son of Zebedee, wrote the Women Caught in Adultery under inspiration before his martyrdom (Acts 12:1,2). But whether it was St. James or another apostle, the Spirit of God then later told St. John to copy out this account which had been circulating in the NT community for some years, in the place that we now find it in St. John's Gospel. Its later omission arose from the fact that men in ancient times, very much like men in modern times like Aland and Metzger, perceived that it was basically a different writing style, and so wrongly concluded it was a spurious addition. Some others tried to rearrange its position to either after Luke 21:38 or after John 21:25 for similar reasons of thinking i.e., that it was a later attachment, although in their instance, evidently still thinking it was apostolic.

I shall leave a more thorough neo-Byzantine analysis of these passages till they are covered in these textual commentaries, and there are certainly relevant elements I have here left out for the purposes of this very broad overview. But having considered both Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11, it is clear that even on these more limited considerations, *supra*, that the inclusion of these passages is clearly warranted. It might also be remarked, that this diversity of text type with regard to these two passages, highlights some differences between the Latin Vulgate, Western Text, and Byzantine Text. E.g., the omission of these two passages by the ancient Alexandrian School of scribes, indicates that they did not have a very good grip on issues of textual analysis, and appear to have adopted overly simplistic rules such as, "a different writing style shows a section is not original," and in this sense, the modern Neo-Alexandrian School appears to be "a chip off this old" overly simplistic "block."

E.g., on Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11 the neo-Alexandrians think that something *so very obvious as a different writing style in these two passages*, can be detected by their "great brains," but "obviously not by those silly ancients," who *only knew Greek ten times better* than these moderns did. (Although it must be admitted that contrary to the Received Text, some Byzantine scribes sought to "Johannize" John 7:53-8:11, and Hodges & Farstad argue some small elements of it have Johannine terminology.) I.e., these anti-supernaturalists look to simplistically ridiculous arguments in which their own puny minds are elevated above those ancients, who are deemed "so silly" that they could not detect something *as obvious as a different writing style*. But as noted with respect to e.g., Ezra's citation of Artaxerxes decree in Ezra 7, an ancient author might e.g., cite something already well known and in a different writing style (John 7:53-8:11). Thus the issue of how that passage fits into its traditional place becomes the important question of stylistic analysis, not the issue of whether or not it is

in a different writing style.

In saying this I do not say we ignore the fascinating fact that e.g., John 7:53-8:11 is broadly in a different writing style, I simply say that it does not *ipso facto* mean that it is not thereby part of the original Gospel of St. John. If however, as occurs in the Western text, various additions are found that are inharmonious with the work, then this type of argument of diverse writing style may become relevant. It is thus a *potentially relevant factor*, but not as the neo-Alexandrian presume, an automatically relevant factor excluding such text.

I think the modern neo-Alexandrians, like the ancient Alexandrians, are not sufficiently comfortable with the Greek text of this Gospel to allow that an obvious change in nuance and style inside a Greek work could be part of the overall style of that work, representing an obvious citation by the author of another. I.e., something like a modern indented paragraph quoting an author, although for more general stylistic reasons of smooth transition, in this particular instance not specifically saying before it, “N. said.” Perhaps they should, on this basis, also omit I Cor. 15:33, where without specifically referring to his author, St. Paul quotes what in the Greco-Roman world was a well known maxim from *Thais* (218), written by the Greek poet and stage play writer, Menander (c. 342-c. 292), “Evil companionships corrupt good morals” (I Cor. 15:33, ASV)? With all due respect to the modern neo-Alexandrians such as Aland and Metzger who in worldly terms are deemed “great” men, I am unable to respect them as textual analysts¹⁰⁵.

We cannot agree on fundamental rules of textual analysis, and so the paradigms we use necessarily result in different conclusions as to what is the best NT text. In broad terms, the contemporary debate between textual scholars divides between three groups. Firstly, those who favor a critical text that regards the Alexandrian Text with high regard as the best Greek text type (e.g., Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and the NU Text). These use a variety of rules unique to their own school e.g., a strong preference for “the shorter reading” as being “more likely to be correct.” These are the neo-Alexandrians.

Secondly, those who favour a Majority Text in which their theoretical view is a count of all Greek manuscripts of all texts types in order to determine the text. But in practice the difficulties of accessing and counting between 4,500 and 5,000 manuscripts means only a sample can be used. Thus Burgon & Miller used about 100-150 manuscripts to determine their Majority Text (1899); and while that has now been improved upon due to von Soden’s work, the necessary reliance on von Soden’s textual apparatus for the best count presently available will in broad terms limit these to the c. 1,000 Codices and Minuscules of von Soden’s K group, such as used in Robinson & Pierpont’s Majority Text (1991 & 2005); or the c. 1,500 Codices and Minuscules of von Soden’s K and I groups, such as used in Hodges & Farstad’s Majority Text (1982 & 1985). However, since the overwhelming number of manuscripts are Byzantine, in

¹⁰⁵ Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, pp. 219-222; 2nd ed., 1994, pp 187-9.

practice those following the Majority Text arrive at the majority or representative Byzantine Text, or where the text is strongly divided between two or more readings, they arrive at a sizeable Byzantine reading. These are the Burgonites (following John Burgon, a 19th century Dean of Chichester who strongly opposed the Westcott and Hort Text).

This means e.g., that while 21 Papyri were used by von Soden¹⁰⁶, most of which are classified in his “H” group, these do not impact on the majority texts of Hodges & Farstad or Robinson & Pierpont. While there are about five times this number of papyri¹⁰⁷, the highly fragmentary nature of the papyri also raises the question of whether or not there is enough text present to give them a textual classification in the first place. Given this uncertainty, I have exercised a discretion and omitted reference to the Papyri in Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), and have also omitted reference to them in the Revised Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14)¹⁰⁸. I may or may not review this decision for the purposes of some future volumes.

Thirdly, those who favour textual analysis of the Byzantine Text as the best Greek text type, confining textual analysis to possibilities within a closed class of three sources reasonably accessible over the centuries, i.e., the Byzantine Greek, the Latin, and ancient church Greek and Latin writers of the first five centuries, or less commonly mediaeval church writers, if so, especially early mediaeval writers. This is the type of methodology that historically produced the Received Text, and advocates of this position from the 16th and 17th centuries, as much as myself in the 21st century, consider the same text could be determined in e.g., 500 or 600 A.D., 1000 or 1100 A.D., 1500 or 1600 A.D., or 2000 A.D. or later; and hold the Received Text in high regard as the best available NT Text. These are the neo-Byzantines.

All three groups agree that the Western Text is of some interest, but is a second rate text type when compared to their favoured text type. Likewise, whether or not the “the Caesarean text” is regarded as a separate text type, it is a mixture of the Western Text and Alexandrian Text, and all three groups agree that while the “Caesarean Text” is of some interest, it is a second rate text type when compared to their favoured text type. The post Vatican II Council Roman Catholic Church replaced the old Latin Papists of the

¹⁰⁶ Papyri 1 (H), 2 (H), 4 (H), 5 (H), 6, 7 (H), 8 (H), 9, 10, 11 (H or I), 12, 13 (H), 14 (H), 15 (H), 16 (H), 17, 18 (H), 19 (H), 20 (H), 35 (H) & 36 (H).

¹⁰⁷ See Aland, K., *et unum, The Text of the NT* (1989), *op. cit.*, pp. 96-102.

¹⁰⁸ Removing formerly in Volume 1, references at Matt. 1:6 (Papyrus 1, 3rd century, containing Matt. 1:1-9,12,14-20); Matt. 1:18 (Papyrus 1); Matt. 5:22 (Papyrus 64, c. 200, which together with papyrus 67 contains Matt. 3,9,15; 5:20-22,25-28; 26:7-8,10,15-15,22-23,31-33); Matt. 5:25 (Papyrus 64); Matt. 12:4 (Papyrus 70, 3rd century; a somewhat carelessly written fragment of St. Matthew’s Gospel, containing Matt. 2:13-16; 2:22-3:1; 11:26-27; 12:4-5; 24:3-6,12-15); and Matt. 12:25 (Papyrus 21, 3rd century, Matt. 12”24-26,32-33).

Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version with the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of e.g., the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bible; and so the old Latin Papists' School is no longer operative, having been closed down by the Roman Church herself in the post Vatican II Council (1962-5) era. *Thus in broad terms, the final battle is first reduced to one between advocates of the Byzantine Text (neo-Byzantines & in practice the Burgonites) and advocates of the Alexandrian Text. Thereafter a debate occurs inside the Byzantine Text supporters between Burgonites following the Majority Text which in practice is going to be a Byzantine Text, and neo-Byzantines such as myself of the Received Text.*

The Alexandrian text is usually shorter than other texts, and lacks grammatical and stylistic elegance. In my opinion, this indicates that some pruning has occurred, and the evidence for this is found in the "rougher" readings of the Alexandrian text. By contrast, the Byzantine text generally has grammatical and stylistic completeness. In my opinion, this indicates that it better preserves the original text before various modifications were made to it by uncouth "rough-necks." What is called the Byzantine Text, obviously predates the Byzantine (Eastern Roman) Empire, whose capital was Constantinople (modern Istanbul). When Emperor Theodosius the Great died in 395, the Roman Empire was split into the Eastern and Western Empires. The Western Roman Empire fell in 476 and the whole empire fell in 565, although ever increasingly small amounts of the Byzantine Empire which was largely the old Eastern Roman Empire existed in some form till the fall of Constantinople in 1453. The Western Roman Empire was continued as a spiritual empire under the Pope of Rome as "Pontifus Maximus" (the old title of the Roman Emperor).

The Western Roman Empire of Roman Catholicism used the ancient Roman language of Latin. However, the Byzantine Empire preserved Greek culture and the Greek language. Thus the NT in Greek was regarded as important. The Byzantine text was followed widely by those who commonly used the Greek language of the NT in the Byzantine Empire, for over a 1,000 years till the 15th century. However, due to the ever increasing encroachments of the sword of Islam, which increasingly spread the Mohammedan religion and introduced Arabic into captured areas, the areas of Byzantine Empire Greek culture increasingly diminished to a smaller and smaller area, finally centering in the 15th century on a western part of Asia Minor and Constantinople.

The Fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Mohammedan Turks in 1453, together with the invention of the printing press in the mid 15th century, meant that printed texts came to eventually replace the Byzantine copyists or scribes (although some handwritten Greek texts continued for some time). This means that the Byzantine Text continued and preserved the Greek text from NT times in the context of a Greek culture, till the mid 15th century; and shortly thereafter, with the rise of the printing press, its treasures came to be preserved in the printed page. This transition process from the written to printed text lasted about 150 years from the mid 15th century to the end of the 16th century. Thus printed texts started coming to the fore in the West with the Complutensian NT (1514) and Erasmus's first edition (1516). Produced on the Eve of the Protestant

Reformation, they were inseparable elements of that great Christian Reformation which commenced in 1517. (Some form of Greek culture and language continued in a reduced form in what is modern day Greece, together with some Greek pockets at Constantinople and in the Mediterranean world. E.g., the Greek Orthodox Patriarchs of Constantinople, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch.) This transition process to the printed text ends around the time of Beza's 5th edition (1598). Thus this process ending the closed class of Byzantine Greek manuscripts was finally completed in 1599¹⁰⁹.

Detailed analysis of the variant readings between either the Greek Byzantine Text type or Received Text on the one hand, and modern critical text based largely around a modified Alexandrian Text on the other hand, are beyond the scope of these prefatory remarks. But as with the above consideration of Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11, one can generally show support for the Byzantine Greek text's reading from the first five centuries from some Greek and / or Latin manuscript(s) and/or ancient Greek and / or Latin writer(s), and if not, then one can from mediaeval sources, preferably early medieval ones. Thereafter, one argues for stylistic reasons that the reading generally followed by the Byzantine text shows no textual problems in it and so generally is the better reading. Occasionally this is not the case, i.e., where there is a clear and obvious textual problem with the representative Byzantine text, and at this point we neo-Byzantines of the Received Text part company with the Burgonites of the Majority Text. Specifically, we neo-Byzantines will then adopt a reading inside the closed class of sources that resolves this textual problem, whether from the Greek (a minority Byzantine reading and / or Greek church writer / writers), or Latin (Latin textual tradition and / or Latin church writer / writers), or both Greek and Latin. Although the textual arguments may sometimes be very finely balanced, it is clear to me that the Alexandrian text was debased, and justifiably jettisoned by the Byzantine scholars who preserved a purer text in the representative or majority Byzantine text type.

When the Protestant Reformers came to the issue of translating the NT into a tongue understandable to the people, they were not unaware of these issues. Luther had recovered the truth of the Divine inspiration of Holy Scripture (Matt. 4:4; II Tim. 3:16). But the natural corollary to the doctrine of Divine inspiration, is the doctrine of Divine preservation of the Scriptures (Isa. 40:8; 59:21; Matt. 5:18; 24:35; Mark 13:31; Luke 21:33). The Apostle Paul referred to the Gospel of St. Luke as already forming part of "Scripture" (I Tim. 5:17,18; quoting Luke 10:7). The Apostle Peter, who makes references to the writings of the Apostle "Paul" as part of the "Scriptures" (II Peter 3:15,16), quotes Isa. 40:8 in saying, "the Word of the Lord endureth for ever" and then adds, "And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." Thus he includes both the OT together with what had then been written of the NT, as included in God's OT promise of Scriptural preservation, "the Word of the Lord endureth for ever" (I Peter 1:25). There is no point pronouncing a curse on those who "add" or "take away" from

¹⁰⁹ For this closure date of 1599 (for both Greek and Latin handwritten manuscripts), which necessarily includes an element of subjective assessment, see Textual Commentary Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, section, "*Determining the representative Byzantine Text."

the Word of God (Rev. 22:19,19), if there is no preserved Word of God. Divine inspiration is valueless, if there is not a Divine preservation of what has been written. If God spake infallibly some time in the past, but we are still trying to work out what he said, because it may have been lost, our doctrine of Divine inspiration is crippled.

The Word of God is indestructible. Thus e.g., when King Jehoiakim took the scroll of Jeremiah, and “cut it with the penknife, and cast it into the fire that was on the hearth, until all the roll was consumed in the fire” (Jer. 36:23); “then the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah after that the king had burned the roll,” “saying, Take thee again another roll, and write on it all the former words that were in the first roll, which Jehoiakim the king of Judah hath burned” (Jer. 36:27,28). So too, when the ancient Alexandrian textual critics cut out sections of Holy Writ, debasing it by removal of whole sections such as Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11; the Lord who has undertaken to preserve his holy oracles, ensured that more pure copies were made of the text by e.g., the Byzantine textual scholars. In the Book of Revelation, the OT and NT are described as “two witnesses,” “two olive trees,” or “two candlesticks.” “And if any man will hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies: and if any man will hurt them, he must in this manner be killed” (Rev. 11:3-5).

Protestants formally recognized this Biblical teaching of the preservation of Scripture in the first stage of the Reformation, evident in the Latin Motto of the Lutheran Reformation, the initials of which were sewn onto the sleeves (the right sleeve) of court officials under Frederick the Wise, *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!* (“The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever!” I Peter 1:25). Thus Protestant recognition of the Divine Preservation of Scripture was standard orthodoxy as part of the first stage of the Reformation. Thus e.g., some 40 years later in the 1560s, in the second stage of the Reformation Homily 1, Book 1, Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles says that “in” the “holy Scripture” “is contained God’s true word,” i.e., the Biblical teaching that “every word of God is pure” (Prov. 30:5). And some 80 years later again, the teaching of Divine Preservation is also found in the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 1:8, and derivatively from the *Westminster Confession* also in the Congregational *Savoy Declaration* 1:8, and Baptist *London Confession* 1:8, which say the Scriptures were “immediately inspired by God,” and “by his singular care and providence” were “kept pure in all ages” (or “kept pure through subsequent ages,” *London Confession*).

It is clear that over the ages, any Divinely preserved text, that had reasonable accessibility, limits the field to the Byzantine Greek Text type, Latin textual tradition such as e.g., the Latin Vulgate, and the preservation of texts in the writings of ancient church Greek and Latin writers of the first five centuries, or less commonly mediaeval church writers, especially early mediaeval church writers such as the Latin writer Gregory the Great (d. 604) or the Greek writer John of Damascus (d. before 754). The practical consequence of this is that in any age a good textual scholar should be able to take representative manuscripts of the Byzantine Greek text type, and by making analytical textual reference to the Latin Vulgate or other Latin manuscripts, as well as ancient, or less commonly mediaeval, church Greek and Latin writers, be able to compose a NT Greek text with fundamental integrity. This process was more formally and

comprehensively undertaken in the work on the NT Greek text in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. But the integrity of its basic principles and methodology predate this time, being done more on a verse by verse needs basis as required.

Erasmus (1469-1536) published a Greek NT in 1516, relying largely on a small number of late Byzantine Texts of very good quality. This consisted of e.g., two twelfth century Byzantine manuscripts, one of the Gospels and one of the Epistles (Acts to Jude), and one of Revelation. He used high quality techniques of textual criticism, comparing these with a small number of other textual sources, including the Latin Vulgate. He refined this with a 1519 text used by Martin Luther in Luther's German Bible (1522) and William Tyndale's English Bible (1525). Erasmus's work reminds us that because the Word of God has been preserved over time and through time, meeting the requirement of reasonable accessibility in both the Greek and Latin, one can in fact draw on any manuscripts in the Byzantine Greek and Latin textual traditions from any time, not just the first five centuries. But since the desire of neo-Byzantines is to show the reading over time and through time, if e.g., the earliest manuscript support for a given reading that one can find in the Greek or Latin tradition is 8th century or 9th century, then this will produce a lower rating on the A to E scale used in this commentary. Likewise, if in turn the earliest known manuscript is from the 12th century, the rating would be lower again.

The A to E rating system I use is explained in the Table, “*Rating the TR’s textual readings A to E,” *supra*. E.g., if I think the evidence for the TR reading is about equally divided with the alternative reading(s), so that we cannot be entirely certain as to which is the better reading, I will give a rating of “D” (50% certainty). If I use this rating, it means the TR reading can be neither definitely affirmed as correct, nor definitely rejected as wrong. Because the given reading is in the TR and AV, and has about equal certainty (50%) with the alternative reading given (50%), the TR reading may as well stay in the main text since it has a 50:50 chance of being correct; but this could have happened *vice versa* to what it did. In such instances, I think that in any “Reference Edition” or “Study Bible” of the AV, that a footnote be provided giving the alternative reading(s). However, this is not necessary in a normal edition of the AV, since the evidence for a “D” reading is about evenly divided with the alternative, so that the TR achieves a “basic pass” at 50% (as would the alternative reading had it been in the TR), and the AV translators’ policy was not to use footnotes. Thus while I think a footnote reading where the rating is a “D” is highly desirable, it is not absolutely essential. In the first two volumes of these commentaries, only one such “D” rating has been given, and this was at Matt. 19:5b (Volume 2, Matt. 15-20).

As has been noted in the Preface of Volume 2, the neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries disagreed among themselves in “under 400” places (Moorman), and “according to Scrivener ..., there are ... 252 places in which Erasmus, Stephanus, Elzevir, Beza, and [the] Complutensian Polyglot disagree sufficiently to affect the English translation” (Cloud)¹¹⁰. In the event that I think a Greek reading in the NT text

¹¹⁰ Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, “*Determining the representative Byzantine Text.”

underpinning the King James Version is wrong, and an alternative reading should be adopted, I will give an “E” (0-49% likelihood). This is a fail grade. It would mean that I do not think the KJV followed the true neo-Byzantine Received Text at this point. In the event that an “E” is given to the Greek text underpinning the AV reading, then I think that a footnote reading *should* be given to an English reader of the AV in any and all publications of the AV, stating what in fact the Greek reads. As more fully discussed in Appendices 1 & 2, a more subtle issue arises as to whether e.g. Scrivener’s Text is following the true Received Text in the case of variants that do affect English translation.

A summary of the ratings given for the main readings in the main part of the commentary, is found in an appendix at the end of each volume, entitled, *Scriptures rating the TR’s textual readings A to E*. In my first volume, dealing with Matt. 1-14 (omitting reference to the Appendices which do not have ratings,) there are about 200 such ratings, and I consider that no changes whatsoever should be made to the Received Text of the Authorized Version in Matt. 1-14. This contrasts with the first volume of Burgon’s *Textual Commentary* (1899) which is also on Matt. 1-14, and which as further discussed at section 4) *infra*, considered that about 50 changes should be made to Matt. 1-14 on his Majority Text principles. Though with some modifications due to their usage of von Soden as the basis of their majority texts, this basic view expressed by Burgon & Miller (1899) in Matt. 1-14 is also followed by modern Burgonites such as Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont. In my second Volume dealing with Matt. 15-20, there are about 120 such ratings, and once again I consider that no changes whatsoever should be made to the Received Text of the Authorized Version in Matt. 15-20. However, Matt. 19:5d has been found to be in the “D” range, i.e., it divides on a 50:50 basis with another reading, so that like the alternative reading, it receives a bare “pass” grade; and I think in study editions of the AV reference may be reasonably made to this alternative reading (although this is not essential). Moreover, in both Volumes 1 & 2 I have itemized in Appendix 1 some changes that need to be made to Scrivener’s Text in order for it to properly reflect the AV’s TR.

This combination of Byzantine Greek and Latin which is the hallmark of neo-Byzantine texts such as those of Erasmus, is found in all other texts of the Neo-Byzantine School e.g., the Complutensian Polyglot Bible, or the work of Stephanus (Stephens / Estienne) and Beza. The Complutensian Bible contained four volumes of the OT showing Hebrew, Septuagint Greek, and the Latin Vulgate (together with Onkelos’s Aramaic Targum of the Pentateuch), and two NT volumes showing Greek and Latin. In the OT the Septuagint Greek is presented with Latin underneath it i.e., a Greek-Latin interlinear of the Septuagint (LXX), so that one can immediately compare a Latin rendering of the LXX Greek with the Latin of the Vulgate. It was produced at Alcala de Henares University, Spain, under the Roman Catholic Cardinal Francisco Jimenez. It was published at Alcala in Spain, and inhabitants of the ancient Roman settlement there were called inhabitants of Complutensian, hence the name, Complutensian Bible. First published on the eve of the Protestant Reformation in 1514 to 1517, and again republished in 1521/2 just after the Reformation was ignited at the Chapel Door of

Wittenberg Castle on the Eve of All Saints' Day, 1517, the Complutensian Bible was an important work in the Reformation era¹¹¹.

Robert Stephanus (1503-1559) produced the first NT text with a comprehensive critical apparatus, showing variant readings in 1550 (Paris). Stephanus's NT reproduced Erasmus's Greek NT (1516, 2nd edition 1519), but added variants from 15 manuscripts, of which one was the Complutensian Bible's Greek NT text. Persecution in Paris led him to the safe-haven of Calvin's Geneva, where his 1551 edition contains two Latin texts, that of the Vulgate and Erasmus. In this 1551 Geneva edition, Stephanus introduced for the first time the present verse numberings of the Bible.

Did Stephanus simply come up with this idea of a critical apparatus as a consequence of his studies showing such variants? Or did he pick up the nucleus of the idea from one or more Byzantine texts, e.g., possibly a Lectionary which he did not itemize in his variants? (Or possibly a cross-application of ideas to some extent fertilized by OT Hebrew Kethib and Qere readings?) In this context, I draw the reader's attention to my Appendix 3 comments in Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20) on Matt. 19:21c. Here through reference to my work on Sydney University's Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.) from the Island of Cyprus in the Mediterranean Sea, I find that six years before Stephanus (1550) the scribe of this Lectionary provides alternative textual readings. *This also acts to raise the question of whether or not more comprehensive work on the Greek Lectionaries would find this to be a normative practice amongst at least some scribes, or whether the scribe of Lectionary 1968 is either rare or unique in adopting this interesting practice.*

As discussed elsewhere in this commentary, Stephanus's verse numberings were frequently the formalization of ancient stylistic divisions. E.g., from my facsimile of Codex W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), I note that page 53 reproducing Matt. 14:22-31 is in continuous script (i.e., no space between Greek words) and uncials (i.e., capital letters). The page starts after about two-thirds of a line has been left on the previous page after verse 21, so as to clearly start with verse 22. There is then a stylistic paper space of three letters spaces before verse 23; a stylistic paper space of one to two letters space before verse 24; and about two-thirds of a line is left, so that verse 25 starts on a new line. There is then a stylistic paper space of one letter space before verse 26; a stylistic paper space of 3 or 4 letters space before verse 27; and about half a line is left so verse 28 starts on a new line. There is then a stylistic paper space of two letters space before verse 29; a stylistic paper space of four or five letters space before verse 30; and a space of about five or six letters is then left, so that verse 31 starts on a new line. There is then a stylistic paper space of three or four letters before verse 31a, "*Kai (and) legei (he said) autō (unto him),*" which is where the page ends. This means that with the exception of verse 31, which the scribe of *Codex Freerianus* divided at verse 31b, Stephanus uses exactly the same divisions for

¹¹¹ Complutensian Bible (1514), *Biblia Complutensis*, Reprint: Typographia Polyglotta Pontificiae Universitatis Gregoriana, 1983-4, Romae (NSW State Library, Rare Books, RBF / 82-7).

his verse numberings of Matt. 14:22-31 as those found a thousand years before him in Manuscript Washington. This same pattern emerges elsewhere, and so while it is true that Stephanus introduced our present verse numbering; it should be clearly understood that he was frequently giving verse numbers to long established *unnumbered* verse ending and starting points.

The initial work on the Received Text was done by Erasmus of Rotterdam (1469-1536) over five editions (1516, 1519, 1522, 1527, 1535), and it would be fair to say that all subsequent work was a fine-tuning of Erasmus's work. Erasmus himself had fine-tuned his work with four revisions, and so this was really a continuation of his foundational work, which remains very textually close to the Received Text compiled with about 100 years of matured reflection and used in the Authorized Version of 1611. In 1533 the Prefect of the Vatican Library in Rome, John de Septueda, advised Erasmus in 1533 of some 365 places where the Alexandrian Text's *Codex Vaticanus* disagreed with his Greek text in preference to the Latin Vulgate. But Erasmus realized the self-evident truth that *Codex Vaticanus* is a corrupt text i.e., with regard to the Greek, he preferred the much later Byzantine Texts over this earlier Alexandrian text. *This is quite significant. It means that methodologically, a decision was made that the Greek text which God had preserved over the centuries, and which was reasonably accessible, was in broad terms the Byzantine Text.*

John Calvin's (1509-1564) successor at Geneva, Switzerland, was Theodore Beza (1519-1605). Beza acquired two Greek-Latin diglots, *Codex Claramontanus* (D 06, Paris, France 6th century, mixed text in part, independent text in part), and *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (D 05, Cambridge University, England, 5th century, Western text). In 1581 Beza donated the latter one to Cambridge University, which subsequently came to bear his name in Latin as the "Bezae" in *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*. Beza published multiple editions of the Greek New Testament between 1565 and 1604. Beza's classic edition is that of 1598 e.g., it is the one used to illustrate Beza's Text in Scholz's *Student's Analytical Greek Testament* (1894). Hence like Scrivener, I generally refer to Beza's five editions (1560, 1565, 1582, 1589, 1598)¹¹². E.g., at Matt. 2:11 I refer to "Beza's last four editions (1565-1598)." This is a policy decision that accords with Scholz's and Scrivener's usage, and also my position that the transition process from handwritten to printed copies of the NT that lasted about 150 years, was completed at the end of the 16th century as marked by Beza's edition of 1598, with a year of grace to allow for its initial circulation, and which for my purposes I thus regard as Beza's "final edition"¹¹³. Thus e.g., in the Dedication of this Revised Volume 1 I refer to "Beza five editions (1560, 1565, 1582, 1589, 1598)," since these are the ones of interest to me, even

¹¹² Scrivener, F.H.A., *The New Testament in the Original Greek According to the Text followed in the Authorized Version, Together with the Variants Adopted in the Revised Version*, Cambridge University, 1881, Appendix, p. 648 (copy held at Moore Theological College Library, Sydney).

¹¹³ See Textual Commentary Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, section "*Determining the representative Byzantine Text."

though he actually produced a later one in 1604¹¹⁴.

Thus Scrivener considers “that Beza’s fifth and last text of 1598 was more likely than any other to be in the hands of the King James revisers, and to be accepted by them as the best standard within their reach. It is moreover found on comparison to agree more closely with the Authorized Version than any other Greek text.” Indeed, Scrivener further says that “all variations from Beza’s text of 1598” and the AV, “number about 190,” and he itemizes these “in an Appendix¹¹⁵.” As Moorman notes in commenting on these facts, Beza’s 1598 edition was revised for Scrivener NT Greek Text (1881), and this work underpins Scrivener’s Text (1894 & 1902)¹¹⁶. Given that I use Scrivener’s Text as the closest thing we have to the NT Received Text of the AV, it follows that I share this high regard for Beza’s 1598 edition. For the purposes of composing his Greek NT text, Beza followed the Byzantine Greek Text or the Latin, i.e., with regard to the Greek, he preferred the much later Byzantine Texts over both of the Western text (D 05, *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*) or other non-Byzantine text whether an “independent” corruption or mixed text corruption (D 06, *Codex Claramontanus*). *This is quite significant. It means that methodologically, a decision was made that the Greek text which God had preserved over the centuries, and which was reasonably accessible, was in broad terms the Byzantine Text.*

Therefore for those of the Neo-Byzantine School such as Erasmus and Beza, the Byzantine Text was to be the basic text for the NT, and so this became the textual starting point for Protestants who continued as the sole guardians of the Neo-Byzantine School once the Roman Church moved to closed it down following the *Council of Trent* (1545-63), and the earlier work of the Roman Catholic Complutensians and Erasmus “was shelved.”

Thus Erasmus rejected the Alexandrian Text and Beza rejected the Western Text and also any “independent” or non-Byzantine mixed text¹¹⁷. For both, like others in the

¹¹⁴ Textual Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, section “*g) King Charles the First’s Day: with Dedication of Revised Volume 1 in 2010.”

¹¹⁵ Scrivener, F.J.A., *Scrivener’s Annotated Greek New Testament*, 1881, Reprint: Dean Burgon Society Press, Collingswood, New Jersey, USA, 1999, pp. viii & ix; quoted in Moorman, J.A., *8,000 Differences between the N.T. Greek Words of the King James Bible and the Modern Versions*, Dean Burgon Society Press, Collingswood, New Jersey, USA, 2006, p. vii.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁷ There are different possible combinations for different mixed text types. But one example of this is the “Caesarean” text type, which is a mixture of Western and Alexandrian readings.

Neo-Byzantine School, the Byzantine Text was the starting point. However, for neo-Byzantines the Latin Vulgate of St. Jerome and other Latin manuscripts were also held in high regard, as were ancient Greek and Latin church writers from the first five centuries, and to a lesser extent mediaeval church writers, especially early mediaeval church writers. Therefore, it was considered that some fine-tuning of this Byzantine Greek text may still occur through textual analysis and reference to such authorities including any minority Byzantine readings, if and when a clear and obvious textual problem existed in the representative Byzantine Text.

Thus contrary to the highly inaccurate claims of Hembd that there are only “eight places” where the Received Text is not the representative Byzantine Text¹¹⁸, there are many more such places. E.g., in the main part of this Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) alone, putting aside instances where the Majority Byzantine Text is fairly evenly divided (Matt. 5:39b; 9:27b; 11:16b; 11:16c,17; 11:23; 13:15), one can find instances where the TR (*Textus Receptus*) reading is not the majority Byzantine reading in *eight places* at Matt. 3:8; 3:11; 4:10; 4:18; 5:11a; 5:27; 5:31a; & 5:47a. One can further find a second such *eight places* at Matt. 6:18; 7:2; 7:4; 7:14a; 7:15; 8:5; 8:8a; & 8:15. One can further find a third such *eight places* at Matt. 8:25; 9:45a; 9:5b; 9:36; 10:8; 12:6; 12:8; & 12:35. And then one can also find *half this number*, i.e., a yet further four such places at Matt. 13:14; 13:28; 14:19c; & 14:22c.

Thus these 16th (and later 17th) textual scholars were neo-Byzantine. I.e., they started with the representative Byzantine text which they held in high regard as the best Greek text, and to be preferred against any Greek rival, such as the Western text. But they were “new” or “neo” (from Greek, *neos-a-on*, meaning “new”) Byzantines, in that they were prepared to relieve relatively rare textual problems presented in the representative Byzantine text, with a better reading from the Byzantine Greek textual tradition (i.e., as a minority reading), the Latin textual tradition, ancient church Greek and Latin writers, or less commonly some mediaeval church writers, if and when *textual analysis of the Greek* warranted this. I.e., there has to first be a clear and obvious textual problem with the representative Byzantine Greek reading, that is remedied by a reading from one or more of these sources inside this closed class of NT sources. God has preserved both the Greek and Latin over time, and through time, and so these form a closed class of sources that can be consulted to determine the NT Text; although the priority must go the Greek, this being the original tongue in which the NT was written. They were thus neo-Byzantine, as opposed to Byzantine.

This same distinction between a neo-Byzantine text (the Received Text) and a Byzantine text, is found today in the difference between myself as a neo-Byzantine textual analyst of the Received Text, as opposed to a supporter of the Byzantine Text in the form of Burgonites’ Majority Text. That is because, although in theory Burgonites follow the Majority Text, i.e., including manuscripts that are Alexandrian text or Western text in their majority count, in practice the overwhelmingly high number of several

¹¹⁸ *Trinitarian Bible Society Quarterly Record*, Jan.-March 2008, Part 2, p. 39; discussed in Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, section, “*Determining the representative Byzantine Text.”

thousands of Byzantine text manuscripts means that the Burgonites' majority text generally equates the representative or majority Byzantine text. E.g., in Matthew to Jude, Hodges & Farstad's Majority Text is based on c. 1500 manuscripts from von Soden's I and K groups which corporately is over 85% Byzantine Text; or Robinson & Pierpont's Majority Text is based on c. 1000 manuscripts from von Soden's K group which corporately is over 90% Byzantine Text. Other than where the texts are fairly generally split, both have the same basic von Soden based Majority Text for St. Matthew to Jude, notwithstanding their diverse methodologies, and in both instances this is in practice a Byzantine Majority Text, even though only Robinson & Pierpont consciously adopted what they called a "Byzantine priority" methodology. And where the Byzantine text is split between two or more readings, a Burgonite majority text will in practice always follow one of the sizeable Byzantine readings, only in the case of a very close count, possibly being drawn one way or the other in its selection of its sizeable Byzantine reading of choice by the manuscript numbers found in the lesser count of non-Byzantine manuscripts. Thus in practice a Burgonite Majority Text is always a Byzantine Greek Text; so that even in those relatively rare places where e.g., the main texts of Hodges & Farstad (1982 & 1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005) disagree with each other in Matthew to Jude, they both have strongly attested to Byzantine Textual support underpinning their diverse readings.

The original work on formally composing a complete Received Text had the support of the Roman Catholic Church with the Complutensian NT (1514), and the NT owes much to Erasmus's five Greek editions (1516-1535). Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam (1469-1536) was a teacher at Cambridge University during his time in England from 1509 to 1514. It is known that he was working on the first edition of his Greek NT (1516) during this time. His Greek NT was an important element in the Protestant Reformation. But Erasmus himself stayed with the Roman Church. He disagreed with Luther, and in 1518 directed his printer to stop printing Martin Luther's works for fear that his and Luther's causes might be confused by some as the same thing. In the 1520s he entered into formal debate with Luther with *De Libero Arbitrio* (1524) to which Luther replied with *De Servo Arbitrio* (1525), to which Erasmus replied with *Hyperaspistes* (1526-7). It became clear from this debate "On the Freewill" (1524) and Luther's reply "On the Enslaved Will" (1525), that while Erasmus was something of a free thinker, he was nevertheless going to remain with the Roman Church. At his deathbed in 1536, he asked for a Roman Catholic priest to administer the last rites to him.

It is nevertheless significant that Erasmus lived and worked before the systematic denial of Protestant Christian truth by the *Council of Trent* (1545-63). It is clear that with respect to the issue of the New Testament Text of Scripture, the Roman Church from the time of the *Council of Trent* was anti-Erasmus in substance, though not in form, since it completely closed down the neo-Byzantine work by Erasmus and the earlier Complutensians on the Received Text; and substituted in their place the idea that only the Latin had been Divinely Preserved. The post Trent view gave rise to both the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Erasmus's high standing meant that the Church of Rome did not want to openly attack him while he was alive; and even in his death; it did not attack him by name when they closed down their usage of the neo-

Byzantine principles of the *Textus Receptus* found in the earlier pre-Trent Roman Catholic work of the Complutensians and Erasmus.

Thus following the Roman Catholic *Council of Trent (1543-63)* and Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation, the Church of Rome moved against the Greek Received Text (and Hebrew OT Received Text), with its usage of the Latin in subservience to the Greek, that had been so foundational to the Protestant Reformation. The Protestants had found God's "word" to be "a lamp unto" their "feet, and a light unto" their path" (Ps. 119:105); finding that "the entrance of" God's "words giveth light" (Ps. 119:130). Thus the Church of Rome realized that the light of God's Word had power to strike them down, and render them ineffectual. They feared the "two candlesticks" of the OT and NT Received Texts, for they had found that "If any man will hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies" (Rev. 11:4,5). They moved to try and undo the earlier 16th century work of the Roman Catholics on the Complutensian Bible and Erasmus's Greek NT. The Word of God was clearly *too powerful* and *too dangerous to the Roman Church* for Rome to simply ignore.

The work of Erasmus on the Greek NT was no longer welcome in Roman Church circles (nor the work on the Hebrew OT in the Complutensian Bible). The Roman Church now denied God's providential protection of the NT Greek manuscripts and ancient or mediaeval church Greek writers (and likewise for the OT text). Having done so, they decided that they dare not make a comparable claim for the NT (or OT) Latin manuscripts and ancient or mediaeval church Latin writers. Thus with regard to the NT, they came to recognize God's providential protection of the NT Latin but not the NT Greek. Hence in time, neo-Byzantine Protestant supporters of the NT *Textus Receptus*, came to hold the work of Erasmus of Rotterdam (or the Complutensian Bible and OT Hebrew *et al*), in much higher regard than did the Roman Church to which Erasmus belonged. Hence from the time of the *Council of Trent* the Received Text has been very much a *Protestant Text*, with Protestants upholding it in battle with the post *Council of Trent* old Latin Papists, and Protestant upholding it more recent times in battle with the post *Vatican II Council* new neo-Alexandrian Papists who now unite with apostate Protestants in favour of a neo-Alexandrian NT Greek text.

This leads to the following paradox. On the one hand, Erasmus's five editions (1516, 1519, 1522, 1527, & 1535) are the foundational work on the complete New Testament Received Text. I.e., later work by e.g., Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs, were refinements of Erasmus's basic work, of which Beza's five editions culminating in his 1598 edition (1560, 1565, 1582, 1589, 1598) are the most significant, although the Elzevirs work is also quite important. But on the other hand, the Roman Catholic Church closed down all neo-Byzantine work as a consequence of the *Council of Trent (1543-63)*. Thus while the TR is historically defended by just Protestants from the time of *Council of Trent*, its main basis from before Trent is primarily the work of a Roman Catholic, Erasmus, and also the work of the Roman Catholic Complutensians (1514-17) which was published in 1521 or 1522. *The paradox we thus find is that while the Received Text is the traditional Protestant Text of Scripture, and historically defended against Latin Papists till the time of the Second Vatican Council (1962-5) from which*

time they became neo-Alexandrians, and so defended against neo-Alexandrian Papists from the time of the Vatican II Council; nevertheless, this Protestant text is at its foundational level the corporately composed work of the Roman Catholic, Erasmus; and in this the work of the Roman Catholic Complutensians is also very important.

How then should we view e.g., the Complutensians? Certainly we cannot accept that their work was a manifestation of the Lord calling forth “teachers” in his “body” of “the church” universal (Eph. 4:4,11; 5:31,32), since e.g., the Complutensians worked under the sponsorship of Cardinal Francisco Jimenez (1436-1517). Cardinal Jimenez was from 1507 the Grand Inquisitor of Spain, and the Spanish Inquisition regarded proto-Protestants such as the Waldenses as “heretics.” (The Waldenses had communities throughout Europe e.g., one was at Lerida, Spain, c. 1200.) But theological orthodoxy is not a pre-requisite for Gentiles preserving NT documents inside the closed class of sources, for if it was, the apostate Jews could never have preserved the Hebrew OT (Rom. 3:1-3; 11:29). But even as before the time of the printing press, the Jews preserved the OT Hebrew Oracles, whether or not in apostasy; so likewise, before the time of the printing press, Gentiles who professed and called themselves Christians preserved the NT Oracles, whether or not in apostasy. Thus likewise, through a form of common grace to the Gentiles, God blessed the work of the Complutensians. Hence *to some extent* the work of Divine Preservation proceeded on the basis of a Divinely decreed racial and / or religious division of labour between Jews and Gentiles, as a manifestation of God’s power and holiness (cf. Rom. 9-11). Thus the work of the Complutensians manifests God’s gracious blessing of the Gentiles. And as one who is a Christian of the Gentile race, I take this opportunity to humbly declare, *Thanks be to God!!!*

Following the *Council of Trent* the Roman Church produced two important Latin Versions which drew on the Latin textual tradition, the Sixtinam (Sixtine) Vulgate (1590) and Clementine Vulgate (1592)¹¹⁹. On the one hand, this acted to heighten the divide between Papists using the NT Latin Text, and Protestants using the Greek and Latin based NT Received Text (and likewise for the OT text with respect to Hebrew *et al*). But on the other hand, Protestants accepted the basic claim that God had providentially preserved the Latin text, and so they found some value in these two Latin versions. Some further duplicity in the Roman Church, which makes the claim to be “*semper eadem*” (Latin, “always the same”), emerged when having first forbidden any changes to the Sixtinam Vulgate with threats of excommunication, they then undertook about 5,000 changes to the Sixtinam Vulgate (1590) in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

In this context, on the one hand, the Sixtinam Vulgate and Clementine Vulgate are outside the closed class of three NT sources which had reasonable accessibility over time and through time (i.e., the Byzantine Greek textual tradition till the 16th century; the Latin textual tradition till the 16th century; and ancient, or less commonly mediaeval, church Greek and Latin writers). But on the other hand, the Sixtinam Vulgate and Clementine Vulgate may also be sometimes cited in a qualified way, i.e., on the basis that

¹¹⁹ The Sixtinam Vulgate was named after the Roman Catholic Pope Sixtus V (Pope 1585-90), and the Clementine Vulgate after Pope Clement VIII (Pope 1592-1605).

they represents a 16th century Latin text that draws on earlier Latin manuscripts. Even as Jerome's Vulgate may sometimes simply be called, "the Vulgate," so the Clementine Vulgate may sometimes simply be called, "the Clementine," or the Sixtinam (or Sixtine) Vulgate may sometimes simply be called, "the Sixtinam" (or "Sixtine"). In this context, Wordsworth & White's *Novum Testamentum Latine* (1911) has a useful NT textual apparatus showing where there is variation between St. Jerome's Vulgate and both the Sixtinam Vulgate (1590) and Clementine Vulgate (1592). Because the Clementine generally follows the Sixtinam, it is sometimes referred to as "the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate;" and I do not generally refer to the Sixtinam. However, occasionally the Clementine and Sixtinam manifest different readings from the Latin textual tradition. While I only occasionally refer to the fact that from the Latin support for a reading it is manifested in the Sixtinam Vulgate; I commonly refer to the fact that, from the Latin support for a reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate.

The Clementine remained the official Latin text of the Latin Church (or Roman Catholic Church) till 1979. The fact that Merk's Latin *Novum Testamentum* (1964) which constitutes a revised Clementine as its main text with an apparatus showing some Latin variants, has written across its front page, "*Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum*" i.e., "The Word of the Lord endureth forever," reflects the pre-Vatican II (1962-5) Roman Catholic view that God providentially protected the Latin text, including the writings of ancient or mediaeval church Latin writers. *This creates an important area of overlap with Protestant neo-Byzantines such as myself and such Latin Church Latins*, since we neo-Byzantines also accept this recognition; but like the great neo-Byzantine Roman Catholic textual analyst, Erasmus of Rotterdam, we Protestant neo-Byzantines additionally recognize the same providential preservation for the Byzantine Greek NT text and ancient, or less commonly mediaeval, if so, especially early mediaeval, church Greek writers. We also uphold the superiority of the maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, over the inferior but important maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*. Hence we only draw on the Latin as a consequence of textual analysis of the NT Greek, where it remedies a problem in the representative Byzantine Greek text. By contrast, the Roman Church Latins (who were mainly pre-Vatican II), elevate the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, over the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*.

But since the Vatican II Council (1962-5), the Roman Church has largely increased her attack on the NT *Textus Receptus* from an attack on the providential protection of the NT Byzantine Greek and ancient, or less commonly mediaeval, church Greek writers (pre Vatican II position), to additionally now including an attack on the providential protection of the Latin textual tradition and ancient, or less commonly mediaeval, church Latin writers (post Vatican II position). The Roman Church has thus *intensified her attack on the Received Text as a consequence of the Second Vatican Council*. In short, it has become neo-Alexandrian in outlook, a fact reflected in e.g., her neo-Alexandrian, *Revised Standard Version Catholic Edition* (1965) or *Jerusalem Bible* (1966). To these new breed post Vatican II neo-Alexandrian Papists, Augustine Merk is *persona non grata* (Latin, "a person not pleasing" or "an unwelcome person"). Thus as in other areas, we find we cannot accept the claim of the Roman Church or Latin Church, that it is, "*semper eadem*" (Latin, "always the same").

A fascinating insider's view of what was happening at the Vatican II Council, comes to us from an eminent "council father" of *Vatican II*, Archbishop Lefebvre. The French Archbishop has outstanding credentials as a "council father," for example, he was nominated by the Pope to be a member of the Central Preparatory Commission for the *Vatican II Council*. In his *Open Letter* of 1986, the Archbishop (who opposed the general direction that the Vatican II Council ultimately took,) says, "the *Council Fathers felt guilty themselves* at not being in the world and *at not being of the world*" (cf. John 17:15,16; I John 2:15-17). This *worldly spirit* of the *Vatican II Council*, helps us better understand why the Roman Church was desirous of the worldly praise given to the secularist neo-Alexandrians who deny the Divine Preservation of the NT Greek and Latin¹²⁰. Rome later excommunicated the outspoken Archbishop Lefebvre in 1988.

Thus in the same way that following the *Council of Trent* (1543-63), the Roman Church sought to "put the lid on" the Received Text teachings of the Roman Catholic Complutensians, Erasmus, *et al*, by denying God's Providential preservation of both the Greek and Latin for the NT (and Hebrew *et al* for the OT), claiming only the Latin was Divinely preserved; so likewise, following the *Vatican II Council* (1962-5), the Roman Church sought to "put the lid on" the area of intersecting agreement between old Latin Papists and the Received Text i.e., the Divine Preservation of the Latin teaching, which is manifested in e.g., the Roman Catholic *Clementine Vulgate*, by denying God's Providential preservation of the Latin. Instead, in the post Vatican II era she claimed on secularist and anti-supernaturalist principles that the neo-Alexandrian text was the NT text to follow. The Roman Church thus went from a bad pre-Vatican II Council position (only the Latin was Divinely preserved over time, and through time), to an even worse post-Vatican II Council position (neither the Latin nor anything else was Divinely preserved over time, *and through time*). We thus see that the Roman Church will always go as far as she can to attack and undermine the *Textus Receptus*, and in this context, she has more thoroughly attacked the building blocks of the Received Text after Vatican II, than she even dared to do after Trent.

Reference is sometimes made in these commentaries to various "sword fights" or "battles" (e.g., Matt. 8:13 in Vol. 1, Appendix 3). E.g., "The Book of the Battles between the Protestant Neo-Byzantines of the Textus Receptus and the post Council of Trent Latin Papists of the Clementine Vulgate" and "The Book of the Battles between the Protestant Neo-Byzantines of the Textus Receptus and the post Vatican II Council neo-Alexandrian Papists" (Vol. 1, Matt. 1-14, at Matt. 13:55); or "chronicles" of "battles" with Neo-Alexandrian Papists (Volume 2, Matt. 15-20, at Matt. 20:22b,c; 23b). Of course, such references, including the existence of any such "book" or "chronicles" are written in an allegorical or metaphoric literary *genre*.

In the place of the Clementine Vulgate (1592), the Roman Church has produced the Neo-Vulgate (1979). "Neo" is from Greek, *neos*, meaning "new," and so the Neo-Vulgate is the New Vulgate. But though known by this name in English, in Latin it is

¹²⁰ Lefebvre, M., *Open Letter to Confused Catholics*, Angelus Press, USA, 1986, pp. 100,102,105 (emphasis mine).

called the *Nova Vulgata* (*Nova Vulgata Bibliorum sacrorum editio*, Rome, 1979), and *Nova* is from Latin, *novus*, meaning “new.” The Neo-Vulgate which was initiated by Pope Paul VI (Pope 1963-78), and promulgated by Papal authority under Pope John Paul II (Pope 1978-2005) in 1979, makes alterations to the Latin text *on the basis of neo-Alexandrian Greek principles*. Like all neo-Alexandrian texts, there are places where it may disagree with other neo-Alexandrian texts, but in broad terms, the Neo-Vulgate might be said to be a Latin translation of a Greek neo-Alexandrian text. The consequence of this is that the Neo-Vulgate is a Latin Version of no abiding interest to we neo-Byzantines, in the way that the Clementine Vulgate (or Sixtinam Vulgate) is. As far as I can tell, it has not been of much interest to those in the Roman Church either. It seems that neither Protestant nor Papist finds much value in this Neo-Vulgate (1979)!

Though a Roman Catholic work, the wider value of the Clementine Vulgate was historically recognized in Protestantism. E.g., the Latin titles on the psalms in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) are all based around the Clementine Vulgate, rather than Jerome’s Vulgate. For instance, Ps. 2:1 of the Vulgate starts with the words, “*Quare* (Why) *turbabuntur* (‘they will be disturbed,’ indicative passive future, 3rd person plural verb, from *turbo*) *gentes* (Gentiles),” i.e., “Why will the Gentiles be disturbed?” However, the Clementine starts with the words, “*Quare* (Why) *fremuerunt* (‘they may have raged,’ indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *fremo*) *gentes* (Gentiles),” i.e., “Why have the Gentiles raged?” The Latin title on Psalm 2 in the 1662 Anglican prayer book is, “*Quare fremuerunt gentes?*”

The Clementine Vulgate is a particularly useful work for showing that various readings have support in the wider Latin textual tradition upon which it is based. (Although this is a general, not absolute, rule¹²¹.) Though the Clementine is not as widely used as it once was, for we neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus*, the Clementine remains an important and useful work. We certainly will not be singing:

Oh my darlin’, Oh my darlin’,
Oh my darlin’, Clementine;
Thou art lost and gone forever,
Dreadful sorry, Clementine¹²².

There remains a time and a place to consult the Clementine, and to compare it with the Vulgate and other texts of Scripture.

Stephanus’s NT with textual apparatus, Greek and Latin readings, and over a

¹²¹ See Commentary Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), at Matt. 15:14a, “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” “The Second Matter.”

¹²² This American folk ballad is usually attributed to Percy Montrose (1884), although sometimes said to be written by Barker Bradford. Contextually, it is not used the way I have applied it i.e., about the Clementine Vulgate; but rather, it is about a miner from the 1849 Californian gold rush, “a miner forty-niner; and his daughter, Clementine.”

dozen variant manuscript readings, and also Beza's Greek and Latin translations of the NT, were both important for the established Received Text and Authorized Version of 1611. It is clear that in composing the Received Text, methodologically, later manuscripts of the Byzantine Text were preferred over the earlier known Alexandrian (B 03, *Codex Vaticanus*) and Western (D 05, *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*) Texts, and variants of the Byzantine Text were used to distinguish a representative Byzantine text from Byzantine textual variants. But it is also clear that the representative Byzantine text was the starting point, not the finishing point, and that in this process, the Latin as well as Greek and Latin ancient, or less commonly mediaeval, church writers were also consulted. Hence from examination of both Erasmus's Greek text and other sixteenth or seventeenth century Greek NT texts, it is clear that the representative Byzantine text was sometimes fine-tuned by these neo-Byzantine textual analysts in composing the Greek New Testament Text.

Whether one uses a representative sample of Byzantine manuscripts e.g., Stephanus's mid sixteenth century Greek NT, or a twentieth century majority Byzantine Text, makes no real difference. In either instance one may compose the representative Byzantine Text. The unnecessarily frustrated neo-Alexandrian, Aland, says that e.g., "the approximately 2,300 [Byzantine text] lectionary manuscripts can be of significance only in exceptional circumstances" because they are usually "'normal' lectionaries"¹²³ i.e., with the same representative Byzantine reading. But that which our adversaries, the neo-Alexandrians think is the shame of the Byzantine Text, we neo-Byzantines think is its glory, as do also our other adversaries, the Burgonites.

Indeed, since in practice the Burgonites' majority Text generally equates the representative or majority Byzantine text (although where a two or more way split exists in the Byzantine text, they represent a sizeable Byzantine reading), it follows that the Burgonites' texts such as Robinson & Pierpont, or Hodges & Farstad, or Jay Green's Majority Text textual apparatus, *infra*, are generally of some value to we neo-Byzantines for determining the initial representative Byzantine text. Thus in the same way that we neo-Byzantines find some common ground with the Roman Catholic Latins of the Clementine Vulgate, so too we find some common ground with the Burgonites' Majority Greek Texts.

We neo-Byzantine Received Text textual analysts use the representative Byzantine Text as the basic NT text. It is our starting point. We neo-Byzantines only move away from a representative number of Byzantine texts (available in the 16th & 17th centuries), or a majority Byzantine text (available in the 20th & 21st centuries), *either of which may be used to produce a representative Byzantine text*, in relatively rare and unusual circumstances i.e., where textual analysis indicates this is absolutely required due a textual problem in the representative Byzantine text that can only be remedied by adopting another reading inside the closed class of Greek and Latin sources.

¹²³ Aland, K., *et unum*, *The Text of the NT* (1989), *op. cit.*, p. 169.

These three sources i.e., the Byzantine Greek textual tradition, the Latin textual tradition, and ancient, or less commonly mediaeval, church Greek and Latin writers, are a closed class for the NT text. They alone had general accessibility over the centuries. They cannot now be added to (other than the qualified exception of rediscovered manuscripts that agree with what we already have, e.g., *Codex Rossanesis*, Sigma 042, Byzantine Text St. Matthew & St. Mark, 6th century). Thus when textual analysis requires that one reluctantly move away from the representative Byzantine text, it is only ever in order to adopt a reading found within the closed class of three witnesses i.e., a non-representative Byzantine Greek Text, and / or a reading in the Latin textual tradition e.g., Jerome's Vulgate, and / or a reading from one or more of the ancient, or less commonly mediaeval, church Greek or Latin writers.

In the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, there was not really *one* NT Greek Text, but a small number of NT Greek Texts. Erasmus produced five editions in 1516, 1519, 1522, 1527, and 1535. In 1534 Colienaeus produced an edition based on Erasmus and the Complutensian Bible. Stephanus produced four editions in 1546, 1549, 1550 and 1551. Theodore Beza produced four basic editions in 1556, 1582, 1588-9, and 1598; although in total they are found across 10 editions between 1565 and 1604, with the 10th edition being published after his death in 1611. The name "Textus Receptus" came from the 1633 Elzevir edition (of which there were also editions in 1624 and 1641). This reads, "*Textum ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus receptum*"¹²⁴ i.e., "Therefore (*ergo*) the text (*textum*) he holds (*habes*) by (*ab*) now (*nunc*) all (*omnibus*) receive (*receptum*)." From the Latin, "*textum ... receptum*," we derive the Latin name, *Textus Receptus*.

Though all these NT Greek texts were neo-Byzantine "winners," in particular, Stephanus's editions of 1550 and 1551, and Beza's edition of 1598, were neo-Byzantine "CHAMPIONS." The Authorized Version translators used these CHAMPION EDITIONS of Stephanus 1550 and 1551 and Beza 1598; producing in the process their own CHAMPION TEXT, and the one I isolate as the Received Text or *Textus Receptus* in my work on the AV. This was largely reconstructed by Frederick Scrivener (1813-1891) in 1881, and published in 1894 (Cambridge University Press)¹²⁵. There are about 200 differences between Scrivener's text and Beza's text of 1598; and about 300 differences between it and Stephanus's text of 1550. Such differences represent readings within the closed class of three witnesses, and have been described by the Trinitarian Bible Society as "minor"¹²⁶.

¹²⁴ Quoted in the Preface, *E KAINĒ DIATHEKĒ, The New Testament, The Greek Text Underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611*, Trinitarian Bible Society, London, England, UK, [undated]; reprinting Scrivener's, *New Testament in .. Greek* (1894 & 1902).

¹²⁵ See Appendix 1 Chart in each Textual Commentary Volume for readings where Scrivener's Text clearly is not the Received Text.

¹²⁶ *The Textus Receptus*, Trinitarian Bible Society, UK (www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/site/articles/tr-art.asp).

Thus the Received Text of the AV is essentially a Byzantine Text. For broadly the same reasons i.e., a representative sample of Byzantine Texts are used to establish the basic text, the Burgonite Majority Text is also essentially a Byzantine Text, and so agrees with the Received text far more frequently than do the neo-Alexandrian texts, e.g., the NU Text. Flowing from the much higher number of points of intersecting agreement between the Received Text and the Burgonite Majority Text, the much higher regard Burgonites have for the Received Text than the neo-Alexandrians have, is manifested in the fact that the Burgonites who translated the *New King James Version* (1979-1982), used the Received Text in the main body of their NT, even though they introduced a textual apparatus showing diversity from this with a limited selection of both the neo-Alexandrian's NU Text and the Burgonites' Majority Text readings.

On the one hand, this means that both Received Text advocates and Majority Text advocates, arrive at the same conclusion on a large number of NT texts for basically the same reason i.e., they consider that in broad terms, the Byzantine Greek Text is the text providentially preserved by God over the centuries, and so a reading that is representative of the Byzantine text is the preferred reading. But on the other hand, this is *a general rule* for neo-Byzantine Received Text advocates, but *an absolute rule* for Burgonite Majority Text advocates, other than where the Byzantine text is split and Burgonites follow the most sizeable reading, *supra*, in which instance they may apply some form of "textual analysis" to determine "the better reading." Where this has been done, sometimes Robinson & Pierpont's Majority Text (1991 & 2005) agrees with, and at other times disagrees with, Hodges & Farstad's Majority Text (1982 & 1985).

The argument that Jerome's Latin Vulgate preserves an earlier Greek reading so that it had general accessibility over the centuries, which textual analysis of the Greek indicates was part of the autograph, is not an argument Burgonite Majority Text advocates would accept if that reading lacked majority text support, with e.g., possibly no Greek manuscript support *per se* (although they might accept it in the case of a fairly evenly divided majority Greek text). And while Burgon & Miller (1899) used manuscripts from Greek, Latin, and elsewhere in their majority text count (of less than 200 manuscripts); by contrast, the modern Burgonites' von Soden (1913) based majority texts of Hodges & Farstad (1982 & 1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005), consider ONLY Greek texts are to be used in their majority text counts. Thus notwithstanding their shared high view of the Byzantine Text, diversity emerges over some portions of the NT Text between neo-Byzantine Text (Received Text) advocates, and Byzantine Text (Majority Text) advocates.

There is nothing new or startling about the modern nineteenth century and following "discoveries" by neo-Alexandrian textual critics like Westcott and Hort, or Majority Text Burgonite critics like Jay Green, Sr., that e.g., Acts 9:5,6 came from the Latin Vulgate, or that I John 5:7,8 has only slim and late Greek manuscript support, but earlier and much better Latin support. In *The Interlinear Bible*, Jay Green Sr., uses as his basic NT text the Received Text¹²⁷. But he supports the Burgonites' Majority Text,

¹²⁷ Green, J., Sr., *The Interlinear Bible*, Hendrickson, Massachusetts, USA, 2nd

and this work includes Green's Majority Text textual apparatus as composed by William Grover Pierpont (d. 2003). This shows when a Majority Text reading at variance with the Received Text has 95-100 % manuscript support; 80-94% manuscript support; or 61-79% manuscript support. (In the Book of Revelation only, where the Majority Text support is at 61-79%, a symbol also indicates when "the Received Text has very weak manuscript support¹²⁸.") Green's Majority Text textual apparatus also includes a list of "alternatives" where "the evidence is about evenly divided" at "40-60%" manuscript support. These calculations by Pierpont are generalist and provide only a broad-brush guide, but are nevertheless a useful indicator¹²⁹.

The Burgonite, Jay Green, says of the Received Text used in the main text, "The text retains a few readings from the Latin Vulgate, two or three without Greek manuscript authority (e.g., Acts 9:5-6), and one from the Complutensian Bible (I Jn 5:7). Although we do not accept these as true Scripture, we have allowed them to remain; the appendix" with the Majority Text textual apparatus "must serve as the needed corrective."¹³⁰

Similar comments are found in the New King James Version, which in its Burgonite Preface says the "Majority Text" (M-Text) "corrects those readings which have little or no support in the Greek manuscript tradition" (NKJV). Then e.g., at Acts 9:5, a footnote says, "NU-Text and M-Text omit the last sentence of verse 5 and begin

edition 1986, using NT text of Frederick H.A. Scrivener, *The New Testament in the Original Greek According to the Text followed in the Authorized Version, 1894-1902*, reprinted by the Trinitarian Bible Society, London, UK, 1976.

¹²⁸ The majority text work uses von Soden only for Matthew to Jude, whereas Hoskier is used for the Book of Revelation. I shall leave discussion of Hoskier and the Book of Revelation to a future volume (probably the first volume dealing with Revelation).

¹²⁹ These percentage figures may be criticized in that when he constructed these charts Pierpont did not factor in a 10% error bar based on the generalist nature of von Soden's groupings, e.g., where von Soden shows K group support, one could say "c. 90-100%" support, but not the "95-100%" support of Green's charts. I.e., there could still be up to c. 10% of K group manuscripts with a different reading that von Soden does not show; and this generalist feature remains so even if he shows some of this up to c. 10% group. Thus if e.g., he showed a diverse reading inside the K group as followed by only 3 K group manuscripts, one cannot conclude that all non-itemized manuscripts in the K group therefore support the general reading he shows for "K," even though at least c. 90% of them would. But this defect in Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) does not affect the overall usefulness of these charts. Thus due to time constraints, as a general rule I consult *Green's Textual Apparatus* where it contains the relevant information, and I only go to von Soden directly for this type of information if I absolutely have to for some reason.

¹³⁰ Green, J., Sr., *op. cit.*, Preface, pp. 967-74.

verse 6 with, ‘But arise and go’” (NKJV). Likewise a footnote at I John 5:7,8 says, “NU-Text and M-Text omit the words from ‘in heaven’ (verse 7) through ‘on earth’ (verse 8). Only four or five very late manuscripts contain these words in Greek” (NKJV). The Burgonite, Zane Hodges, is the joint composer of a modern Majority Text¹³¹. Like other Majority Text advocates, this Burgonite has a much higher regard for the Received Text than do neo-Alexandrians. But he is still critical of the Received Text in favour of the Majority Text. Hence e.g., Hodges claims, “It is hoped,” “that the general Christian reader,” following “the Majority Text,” will start “accepting corrections to his Authorized Version which are not supported by a large majority of manuscripts¹³².”

By contrast, others such as the *Trinitarian Bible Society* have defended the Received Text and Authorized Version¹³³. At the local church level, numerous churches have decided to use the AV, and some are known as “AV only” churches. However, this type of view has been adopted at a denomination level by the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* (FPCS), which stated, “we hold the doctrine of the inerrancy and verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture.” This particular Free Presbyterian Church¹³⁴, has rightly criticized another church, in which “from” “both” “professor and lay preacher doubt has been voiced as to the Marcan authorship of Mark [chapter] 16, v[erses] 9-20 and the Johannine authorship of I John, [chapter 5] v[erse] 7. Instead of the church courts calling these to account, the matter has passed over in silence” on those “who took an active part on the wrong side¹³⁵.”

¹³¹ Hodges, Z.C. & Farstad, A.L., *The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text*, Thomas Nelson, Nashville, Tennessee, USA, 1982, 2nd edition, 1985.

¹³² Fuller, D.O. (Editor), *Which Bible?* Grand Rapids International Publications, Michigan, USA, 1970,1975, 5th edition, 1977, pp. 37-8.

¹³³ Anderson, G.W., Anderson, D.F., *A Textual Key to the New Testament, A List of Omissions and Changes, Article 100*, Trinitarian Bible Society, London, UK, 1992.

¹³⁴ “Free Presbyterian Church” describes a broad religious tradition (like “Baptist” or “Anglican”). Different Free Presbyterian churches include e.g., the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia* (established 1846), which is derived from the *Free Church of Scotland* (established 1843), the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* (established 1893), and the *Free Church of Scotland (Continuing)* (established 2000). Their form of worship is generally characterized by the exclusive use of Biblical psalms and associated non use of hymns, as well as the non-use of musical accompaniment. Different Free Presbyterian Churches may disagree with each other on certain matters. E.g., PCEA does not agree with the view of FPCS that one cannot use public transport on Sunday. Or unlike most Free Presbyterian Churches, the *Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster* (established 1951) does use hymns and musical accompaniment, and also has modified the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* to make the issue of infant or adult baptism a matter of private judgment among members of the FPCU.

¹³⁵ McPherson, A. (Editor), A Committee Appointed by the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, *History of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*

Though I do not agree with the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* (or any other Free Presbyterian Church) in all matters, certainly this Free Presbyterian Church is within its rights to defend Scriptures such as I John 5:7, since the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* not only says the Scriptures were “inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages” (WC 1:8); but it also makes specific reference to I John 5:7, at the statement, “In the unity of the Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost,” saying this is contextually supported by such Scriptures as, “I John 5:7. For *there are three that bear record in heaven*, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and *these three are one*” (WC 2:3).

Jay Green Sr.’s view that the Majority Text is a “corrective” of such readings as Acts 9:5,6; & I John 5:7,8, like the NKJV’s view that the Majority Text “corrects” such “readings,” shows the Burgonite methodology is different to that of the Received Text methodology. The sixteenth and early seventeenth century textual scholars like Erasmus and Beza were known to have reconstructed these passages from Latin authorities and/or a slim number of Greek authorities not in the representative Byzantine text. There is nothing new or startling about this “discovery,” by e.g., twentieth century neo-Alexandrian advocates of the NU Text or Burgonite advocates of the Majority Text. Any fool who had asked about it in the sixteenth century could have been shown e.g., Stephanus’s NT with fifteen variants, showing both Greek and Latin, and told the basic facts. The issue both then and now is not, whether a relatively small number of verses in the NT were reconstructed from the Latin (possibly with a slim number of late Greek manuscripts); but rather, whether or not on the basis of textual analysis they are part of the original Greek autograph. To assume, as do modern textual critics, both of the neo-Alexandrian Westcott and Hort type in the RV or ASV, Nestle or NU Text type in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV, or the Burgonite Majority Text type in the NKJV, that the mere fact that they are not found in most or any “ancient” Greek manuscripts they are therefore not authentic, says more about the low level of textual analytical skills of these neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites, than it does about the merits of the matter.

Textual scholars like Erasmus, Beza, and the AV translators, considered the Byzantine text a *starting point*, and agreed with more than ninety per cent of it, but they were not prepared to regard the Byzantine texts they had, (or had it been available to them a modern equivalent such as a Byzantine Majority Text,) as the *finishing point*. Rather, they would carefully weigh any variants within the Byzantine texts, together with any variants found in the Latin textual tradition, as well as ancient, or less commonly mediaeval, church Latin and Greek writers, and make a decision on a stylistic analysis of the Greek text, if necessary, as reconstructed from the Latin. Thus on the one hand, their starting point was the representative Byzantine Text and they were only prepared to move

(1893-1970), Publications Committee in the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, [dated to 1973/4 in the Preface], p. 379. The concern about “Marcan authorship” appears to more accurately speaking, be a concern as to whether this passage is part of the inspired Gospel of St. Mark, as originally set forth in its autographs from apostolic times.

away from it with the greatest reluctance; but on the other hand, in the final analysis they were not prepared to abdicate their final decision to a number count of representative Byzantine texts. That is, they were textual scholars of a very fine order indeed. I consider men like e.g., Erasmus of Rotterdam, Stephanus of Geneva, and Beza of Geneva, to be in a class of textual scholarship well above anything that men like e.g., the neo-Alexandrian Westcott, Hort, Aland, and Metzger, or the Burgonite Majority Text Burgon, Green, Robinson, Pierpont, Hodges, and Farstad, could ever hope to realistically attain to.

Comprehensive analysis of this process is beyond the scope of this Preface. But let us consider the NT text with reference to just one more passage, namely, one of those isolated above which shows the difference between neo-Byzantines on the one hand, and both neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites on the other hand, namely, I John 5:7,8. This passage is found in both the Received Text and Authorized Version, but it is not found in the neo-Alexandrians texts e.g., the NU Text, or the Burgonites' Majority Text.

Translating the Greek Received Text, I John 5:7,8 in the Authorized Version of 1611 says, "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one" (AV). By contrast, omitting the words, "bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that" (vss. 7,8), and further omitting the words, "in earth" (vs. 8), the American Standard Version (1901), based on Westcott and Hort's neo-Alexandrian critical text, renumbers the last part of verse 6 as the new verse 7, and then verse 8 reads, "For there are three who bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and the three agree in one" (ASV). The ASV's type of reading is followed in other neo-Alexandrian versions based on other neo-Alexandrian critical texts, such as the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

The TR's reading in I John 5:7,8, i.e., "bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that" (AV), and the words, "in earth" (AV), are not found in the Alexandrian Text's London Sinaiticus (4th century) and Rome Vaticanus (4th century), or London Alexandrinus (5th century). According to the UBS textual apparatus, support for this shorter reading is found in Clement of Alexandria (before 215); with minor differences in Origen (253) and Cyril of Alexandria (444); Rebaptism (258), Ambrose (397), and Augustine (430). I would question the issue of "support" here, since while e.g., Origen quotes parts of I John 5:8, it does not therefore follow that such writers did not recognize I John 5:7,8 in its entirety. Origen simply said, "the disciple John speaks in his Epistle of 'the spirit, and the water, and the blood' as being 'one' [I John 5:8]¹³⁶." The UBS NT Committee does not treat the inclusion of the Trinitarian reading (I John 5:7,8) as a serious possibility, giving their highest rating, an "A" to its omission.

¹³⁶ Roberts, A. & Donaldson, J., *op. cit.*, Vol. 5, p. 677 (Rebaptism); Vol. 10, p. 372 (Origen).

Most of the Greek manuscripts containing this reading are not Byzantine and therefore not relevant to we neo-Byzantines for the purposes of determining the *Textus Receptus*. The later Greek marginal reading of Byzantine Minuscule 221 is of interest for showing the preservation of a Greek form. The Greek Trinitarian marginal reading of Byzantine Minuscule 221 may or may not be a reconstruction from the Latin. If it is an independent Greek line, then this Minuscule's added marginal reading constitutes the notable preservation of an independent line of Greek manuscripts; the existence of which is e.g., reflected in a similar Latin manuscript of the ancient church writer Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century) whose writings are preserved in Greek and / or Latin works. A Greek form of the verse is also found in a Greek translation of the Latin Acts of the Roman Church's Fourth Lateran Council (1215)¹³⁷.

But in the final analysis, the major manuscript support for this reading comes from the Latin, not the Greek. These words are found in a series of Latin readings. This includes support from multiple Latin codices (Tischendorf's 8th edition, 1869-72, Merk's 9th edition, 1964), and the ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 258), Priscillian (d. 358), and Eugenius (d. 484) quoting an earlier Council of Carthage. It remains in the Latin tradition with e.g., Fulgentius (d. 533). One also finds a similar Latin reading in old Latin Version m (dated variously between the 4th and 9th centuries). With this type of impressive support in the Latin textual tradition, from the Latin support for this reading, it is then manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

E.g., while a more detailed study of the Latin is beyond the scope of this Preface, let me give the reader some idea of the Latin support that exists for the Greek marginal reading of Byzantine Minuscule 221. The following Latin reading (omitting some UBS minor variants) is found in UBS's 4th revised edition as coming from the ancient Latin church writers, Pseudo-Vigilis (d. 4th /5th century), Speculum (5th century), Varimadum (d. 445 / 480), and early medieval Latin church writer Fulgentius (d. 533); together with unidentified Vulgate Manuscripts, as well as old Latin Versions q (6th / 7th century Munich, Germany & 7th century, Munich, Germany) and l (7th century, Leon, France & 8th century, Berlin, Germany); and Wordsworth & White also show this reading in *Codex Cavensis* (9th century, La Cava, Italy). "*Quia* (for) *tres* (three) *sunt* (they are) *qui* (who) *testimonium* (testimony) *dicunt* (declare) *in* (in) *terra* (earth), *spiritus* (the spirit), *et* (and) *aqua* (the water), *et* (and) *sanguis* (the blood), ... *et* (and) *tres* (three) *sunt* (they are) *qui* (who) *testimonium* (testimony) *dicunt* (declare) *in* (in) *caelo* (heaven), *Pater* (the Father), *Verbum* (the Word), *et* (and) *Spiritus* (the Spirit)," continuing (from Wordsworth & White) in *Codex Cavensis* (9th century), "*et* (and) *hii* (these) *tres* (three) *hunc* (one) *sunt* (they are).

Metzger says, "The earliest instance of the passage being quoted as a part of the actual text of the Epistle is in a fourth century Latin treatise [by Priscillian] entitled *Liber Apologeticus* (Chap. 4)¹³⁸." If this is the earliest preserved quote, it shows I John 5:7 to

¹³⁷ UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), p. 819; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 1971 edition, pp. 715-7; 2nd edition, 1994, pp. 647-9.

¹³⁸ Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 716; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 648.

be ancient, and in the same era as the Alexandrian texts fawned over by neo-Alexandrians such as Metzger, i.e., Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). These neo-Alexandrians sometimes follow a quote from just one of these two Alexandrian texts, so for them to turn around and start talking about slim manuscript support for I John 5:7,8, is much more than a case of *the pot calling the kettle black*. The Latin textual support for I John 5:7 dwarfs the manuscript support neo-Alexandrians often use, and so it is really a case of the gross hypocrisy and inconsistencies that characterizes neo-Alexandrian textual critics. The critics love to criticize the *Textus Receptus*, but they do not like anyone criticizing the critics. Thus they set themselves *over* the Word of God, rather than humbly setting themselves *under* the Word of God.

But in fact, reference is made to this passage at least one hundred years earlier by Cyprian in the mid third century. Cyprian (c. 200-258) was a bishop of Carthage. He is designated as an “Archbishop and Martyr” in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), and given a black letter day on 26 September. He was the first martyred bishop of Africa. His martyrdom is covered under “the eighth general persecution under the Roman Emperors,” in Foxe’s *Book of Martyrs*¹³⁹. St. Cyprian says, “The Lord says, ‘I and the Father are one’ [John 10:30], and again it is written of ‘the Father,’ of the Son, ‘and’ of ‘the Holy Spirit,’ ‘And these three are one’ [I John 5:7]¹⁴⁰.” The theological point that Cyprian is here making, i.e., that there is “one” God, but a plurality of Divine Persons, requires that he is contextually referring to the words of I John 5:7, “the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one.” This shows a very early Latin attestation of these words.

There are two rules of neo-Byzantine textual analysis, found in two maxims, of relevance here. The master maxim is, *The Greek improves the Latin*; and the servant maxim is, *The Latin improves the Greek*. I.e., we neo-Byzantines always start with the representative Byzantine Greek text, which is maintained unless there is a clear and obvious textual problem with it, for *The Greek improves the Latin*. However, if it is clear that a textual problem in the Byzantine Greek can be remedied by a reconstruction of the Greek from the Latin, then the Latin reading may be adopted, for in such a context, *The Latin improves the Greek*. But in all this textual analysis, it is the Greek that is our primary focus, and the Latin is only brought in to assist what is an evident textual problem in the Greek, and only adopted if it resolves this *Greek* textual problem. Thus the lesser maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, is always subject to the overriding greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*.

Significantly then, as it stands, the representative Byzantine Text presents a textual problem. We are told in the verse before I John 5:7,8, “*to* (the) *Pneuma* (Spirit) *esti* (he is) *to* (the) *marturoun* ([one] witnessing),” i.e., “the Spirit beareth witness” (I John 5:6, AV); and then just after I John 5:7,8 reference is made to “*ē* (the) *marturia* (witness) *tou* (-) *Theou* (of God),” i.e., “the witness of God” (I John 5:9, AV) which is

¹³⁹ Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-6.

¹⁴⁰ Roberts, A. & Donaldson, J., *op. cit.*, Vol. 5, p. 423.

Trinitarian in scope to “*ε* (the) *marturia* (witness) *tou* (-) *Theou* (of God),” i.e., “the witness of God” (I John 5:9, AV) which he has testified “*Yiou* (of Son) *autou* (of him)” i.e., “of his Son” (I John 5:9, AV). So that the contextual scope is on God “the Spirit” (I John 5:8), “God” the Father (I John 5:11), and God the “Son” (I John 5:9,11). This naturally results in the conclusion that I John 5:7,8 is referring to a Trinitarian witness by the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. But where is this expected witness in the representative Byzantine text reading?

Furthermore, “the witness of men” (I John 5:9) means “the testimony of two men is true,” so that Christ can refer to the witness of himself and the Father (John 8:16-18). And indeed this passage at Deut. 19:15 that Christ refers to in John 8:16-18, further specifies as St. Paul says, “two or three witnesses” (II Cor. 13:1). Therefore, given the emphasis on the “Spirit” in I John 5:8, it is reasonable to include the Holy Ghost, with the consequence that if “the witness of God is greater” than “the witness of men” (I John 5:9), then the expectation must be that this is a Trinitarian witness of all three Divine Persons that is in focus. I.e., the representative Byzantine text has a textual problem in which it appears that something has been omitted that refers to a witness or testimony by the three Divine Persons of the Trinity; and the problem of omission so caused by the loss of this stylistic expectation constitutes a stylistic tension that can only be relieved by adopting the Trinitarian reading of what is largely the Latin textual tradition at I John 5:7,8. Indeed, this factor does not appear to have been lost on the Latin composers of the Clementine Vulgate, who evidently reached a similar conclusion, as well they might given that the textual argument is basically the same from the Greek or the Latin, and the textual remedy for this problem is found in the Latin textual tradition.

I note that the Greek form in this Trinitarian reading found in the marginal reading of Byzantine Minuscule 221, whether understood as a Greek reconstruction through reference to the Latin, or as the preservation of the Greek form which is then further confirmed through reference to the Latin (a matter I shall not now discuss in further detail), is typically Johannine, both in writing style and theological emphasis. E.g., the fact that the Second Person of the Trinity is called “the Word” (Greek *o logos*) (I John 5:7), bears an obvious similarity with “the Word” (Greek *o logos*) of this Apostle’s Gospel (John 1:1,14). The statement of the three Divine Persons, “and these three are one” in which “one” is Greek “*en*” (I John 5:7), is strikingly similar to Christ’s statement about the two Divine Persons of the Father and the Son, “I and my Father are one” in which “one” is also Greek “*en*” (John 10:30), and shows a singular Supreme Being (God) with a plurality of Divine Persons. So too the idea of “the Father” and “the Word” bearing “record” or witness (I John 5:7) is typically Johannine, for Christ says, “I am one that bear witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me” (John 8:18). And of the Holy Ghost, Christ says, “the Spirit of truth” “shall testify of me” (John 15:26). Indeed just before the Trinitarian reading (I John 5:7,8) we read, “it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth” (I John 5:6).

Moreover, the Apostle John frequently brings out a contrast between heaven and earth, saying, “he that cometh from above is above all; he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that cometh from heaven is above all” (John 3:31). “Then

came there a voice from heaven,” “Jesus answered and said,” “And I, if I be lifted up from the earth” (John 12:28,30,32). “These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father,” “I have glorified thee on the earth” (John 17:1,4). Therefore, the Trinitarian reading which refers to the “three that bear record in heaven,” and the “three that bear witness in earth” (I John 5:7,8) seems typically Johannine. Thus the Greek words, the Greek writing style, and the theological emphasis, all point to the Trinitarian reading (I John 5:7,8) being authentically Johannine.

The longer Trinitarian reading in the First Epistle of the Apostle John (I John 5:7,8), is also to be favoured as the correct reading for both general and specific reasons of immediate context. In general terms, I John 5:1-8 works through a Trinitarian sequence in which “whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ” (Second Divine Person) is “born of God” (vs. 4), with reference to “the Son of God” (Second Divine Person, in connection with his relationship as “Son” to the First Divine Person) (vs. 5). Reference is then made to “the witness” of “the Spirit” (Third Divine Person) to “Jesus Christ” (Second Divine Person) (vs. 6). Thus the general context of I John 5:1-11 indicates a reference to “witness” by the other two Divine Persons, and this is what we then have in I John 5:7 when we read “there are three that bear record” (AV) or “three that bear witness” (NKJV) “in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost” (AV).

In the specific context, we read in I John 5:9, “If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son.” Since “God” (First Divine Person) “hath testified of his Son” (Second Divine Person), this event in the past where “God” the Father “hath” testified of God the “Son,” seems to be an incongruous statement, unless one is first introduced to this notion that God the Father is witness, i.e., “there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one” (I John 5:7). Since the shorter ending reading of I John 5:7,8 makes no reference to God the Father as a witness, the longer Trinitarian reading makes more contextual sense.

Thus the Trinitarian reading is also to be preferred for reasons of both general and specific immediate context in I John 5. The Trinitarian reading (I John 5:7,8) is to be preferred over the shorter reading on the basis that it alleviates a stylistic tension created in the Greek text without it. It is supported by ancient church Latin writers starting with Cyprian (258) and Priscillian (358), and continued in the Latin textual tradition, ultimately manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

The issue then arises as to why, if the Trinitarian reading (I John 5:7,8) is correct, is it absent in so many of the Byzantine Greek texts? The question of this omission’s origins is clearly speculative. On this basis, both advocates of the Burgonites’ Majority Text and neo-Alexandrian Texts e.g., the NU Text, consider they have a fatal argument for its authenticity. E.g., speaking for the NU Text Committee, Metzger claims, “if the passage were original, no good reason can be found to account for its omission, either accidentally or intentionally.”¹⁴¹

¹⁴¹ Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 716; 2nd ed., 1994, pp. 648.

Was this a deliberate omission? If so, probably some Trinitarian heretic deliberately expunged it.

Was this an accidental omission? If so, in order to consider this matter, it is first necessary to understand what the Greek text may have looked like on a copyist's page. Here some difficulty arises since the exact nature of the Greek script was subject to some variation, both due to personal factors of handwriting, and trends at certain times. E.g., uncials (4th to 10th centuries) were in capital letters, whereas minuscules (9th to 16th centuries) are in lower case letters. Continuous script was also used at various times (i.e., no spaces between words, although some stylistic paper spaces might sometimes occur to indicate a new verse, or to try and right hand justify the page). When dealing with reconstructions of earlier, no longer existing Greek manuscripts, the exact appearance of the script is open to question. For my purposes, I have used a modern Greek script, which looks *something like* the original, and is close enough to what is required *for the purposes of textual analysis*. My script approximates that generally found in Greek NT's published in modern times such as Scrivener's Text. Sometimes a different script is required for textual analysis (see e.g., I Tim. 3:16¹⁴²). Unless otherwise specified, I consider the script I use to be *close enough* to what is required, to make the basic point of textual analysis for my purposes.

In Greek it would have looked *something like* the following. The reading below first appears in a Greek script (which we find as a marginal reading in Minuscule 221,) and this would be *something more like*, though not identical with the unknown early handwritten copies; and then in the second instance this reading appears in the Greek with Anglicized letters. The practice we now use of lower case Greek letters in which the "s" or sigma inside a Greek word is "σ" but at the end of a Greek word is "ς", does not appear in ancient uncial manuscripts such as *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) where these always appear as a "C." Therefore, for my purposes below I shall write the "eis" of the last line in the Greek lower case script not as "εις" but as "εις", bearing in mind that in the actual manuscript we are talking about this may well have been written as "EIC." I will underline in the Greek script and highlight in bold in the Anglicized letters scripts, the sections I wish to draw particular attention to. With Greek in the round brackets "()", and any added words that might go in italics in the square brackets "[]," following the AV's translation as closely as possible (and only changing the Greek order once to accommodate the English rendering), the section more literally reads, "For (*oti*) three (*treis*) there are (*eisin*) the [ones] (*oi*) bearing record (*marturountes*) in (*en*) the (*to*) heaven (*ourano*), the (*o*) Father (*Pater*), the (*o*) Word (*Logos*), and (*kai*) the (*to*) Holy (*Agion*) Ghost (*Pneuma*): and (*kai*) these (*outoi*) the (*oi*) three (*treis*) are (*eisi*) one (*en*). And (*Kai*) three (*treis*) there are (*eisin*) the [ones] (*oi*) bearing witness (*marturountes*) in (*en*) the (*te*) earth (*ge*), the (*to*) spirit (*Pneuma*), and (*kai*) the (*to*) water (*udor*), and (*kai*) the (*to*) blood (*aima*): and (*kai*) the (*oi*) three (*treis*) in (*eis*) the (*to*) one (*en*) are (*eisin*). If

¹⁴² Burgon, J.W., *The Revision Revised*, John Murray, London, UK, 1883, pp. 98-105,424-7. (Though his style is convoluted, I agree with his basic conclusion on how the text should read, and consider that this is one of Burgon's better textual analyses).

(ei) the (ten) witness (*marturian*) ... etc. .

οτι τρεις εισιν οι μαρτυρουντες εν τω
 ουρανω ο πατηρ ο λογος και το Αγιον
πνευμα και ουτοι οι τρεις εν εισι και
τρεις εισιν οι μαρτυρουντες εν τη γη το
πνευμα και το υδωρ και το αιμα και οι
τρεις εις το εν εισιν ει την μαρτυριαν

oti treis eisin oi marturountes en to
ourano o pater o logos kai to Agion
pneuma kai outoi oi treis en eisi kai
treis eisin oi marturountes en te ge to
pneuma kai to udor kai to aima kai oi
treis eis to en eisin ei ten marturian

If an accidental omission, it seems that a copyist first wrote down, “*oti treis eisin oi marturountes en t*” (“For there are three that bear witness” with the first “t” of “the” in “the heaven,” I John 5:7), and then stopped for some kind of break. He possibly left a marker on the page pointing to the general area that he was up to. Either he remembered in his own mind, “I’m up to ‘*treis eisin oi marturountes en*’ with the first ‘t’ of the next word *at the end of the line*, just above the lines starting with ‘*pneuma kai*’ and ‘*treis eis*’ something;” or he said to a second copyist taking over, “I’m up to ‘*treis eisin oi marturountes en*’ with the first ‘t’ of the next word *at the end of the line*, just above the lines starting with ‘*pneuma kai*’ and ‘*treis eis*’ something.”

Upon resumption of copying out the text, returning to the right general area, the copyist’s eye saw on his original, *the second* ‘*treis eisin oi marturountes en,*’ his eye then looked down to see that this was just above the lines where without him realizing it, it was *the second* time ‘*pneuma kai*’ started a line, and *the second* time ‘*treis eis*’ something started the following line. His eye looked rapidly back to *the end of the above line* on his copyist’s page containing the words “*oti treis eisin oi marturountes en t,*” and seeing it ended with the “t” of “t” (from line 1, *supra*) and as he looked back, then remembering he was up to the end of a line, he then complicated his error as looked to the “to” (from line 4, *supra*), he copied “*to pneuma kai to udor kai to aima kai oi treis eis to en eisin*” etc., and so the text was inadvertently changed to, “For there are three that bear witness, the spirit, and the water and the blood: and these three agree in one.” If so, possibly the situation had been aggravated by the fact he was working in flickering candle light, or had a head cold, we simply do not know. Thus it was, that possibly by such an early accident in textual transmission history, in many Greek manuscripts the shorter ending later replaced the longer Trinitarian reading at I John 5:7,8.

On the one hand, textual analysis strongly supports the TR’s reading. It is also well attested to from a number of ancient church Latin writers, and was thus clearly accessible over the ages in Latin texts. But on the other hand, while found in the Greek

as a marginal reading of Byzantine Minuscule 221, the textual support is generally from the Latin, and so manifests the lesser maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, being subject to the greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, *supra*, I would give the TR's reading at I John 5:7,8 a low level "B" (in the range of 66% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

This copyist's error appears to have occurred quite early in the history of the text's transmission, probably in the second century. That some manuscripts containing the correct and longer Trinitarian reading (I John 5:7,8) survived, is evident in the Latin authorities which support this text. Thus a general witness of this text clearly that had reasonable accessibility was preserved over the centuries with the Latin. Then in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, this matter was brought to the attention of those masters of textual analysis who had been called and gifted by God to be neo-Byzantine textual analysts. It was spotted by them whether they were textual analysts of the Neo-Byzantine School through God's common grace by racial gifts to Gentiles, such as the religiously apostate Gentile Christians of the Complutensian Bible; or whether they were textual analysts of the Neo-Byzantine School by special grace as elect vessels called and saved, and then made textual analyst "teachers" in his "body" of "the church" universal (Eph. 4:4,11; 5:31,32), such as Stephanus or Beza.

And so it was, that these gifted and learned men who composed our Received Text in the 16th and 17th centuries, and whose work represents a zenith of textual achievement in terms of producing an entire NT Received Text, not simply this or that verse as in former times, (the like of which shows up the neo-Alexandrian and Burgonite textual "scholars" to be truly second rate,) turned their learned eyes to the matter. And when these neo-Byzantines did so, seeking the guidance of God's good Spirit, the deficiency in the representative Greek Byzantine manuscripts was thus spotted and remedied. Thus I John 5:7,8 was restored to its rightful place in the Received Text, and came to be translated in the Authorized Version. Praise God! His "word" "endureth for ever" (I Peter 2:25).

It is clear that *over* time and *through* time, the fact that any Divinely preserved text whose basic building blocks were reasonably available, limits the field to the Byzantine Greek Text type as the base text's starting point, and limits any adoptions following textual analysis where a defect exists in the representative Byzantine text, to minority Byzantine Greek readings, Latin texts, and citations of Scripture in the writings of ancient or mediaeval church Greek and Latin writers. (Although if reference is made to medieval church writers in the Greek or Latin tradition, then being after ancient times, as with later manuscript citations that lack testimony from one or more ancient church writer, this must then reduce the rating one gives.) These NT Greek and Latin sources are a closed class, since only these three sources meet the criterion of general accessibility throughout the ages, and so any other claimants necessarily fail at the threshold. Recognizing these facts, the great textual scholars of the 16th century considered they could safely exclude other texts as deviant, such as Erasmus's exclusion of the Alexandrian text type of *Codex Vaticanus* (B 02), or Beza's exclusion of the

“independent” and “mixed” text type of *Codex Claramontanus* (D 06) and (even though it had accessibility over the centuries,) the Western text type of *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (D 05).

On these same principles, the discovery of more deviant text types, such as (if one considers there is such a text type,) the “Caesarean” Text (a mix of Alexandrian and Western readings), may likewise safely be excluded. Thus while *Codex Alexandrinus* (fifth century) is Byzantine text in the gospels, the rest of it is Alexandrian text. It was evidently joined together by a scribe drawing on manuscripts from the disparate Byzantine and Alexandrian Schools of scribes, both of which appear to have been represented in Alexandria. (This same sort of thing is also evident with e.g., Manuscript Washington, also from the 5th century.) *Codex Alexandrinus* was acquired by King Charles I in 1628. Yet e.g., the Elzevirs of Leiden wisely made no use of its Alexandrian text found in Acts to Revelation. Those manuscripts outside this NT text’s closed class of three, e.g., the Western Text, Alexandrian Text, Syriac Versions, Coptic Version, or Ethiopic Version, may be studied in certain contexts of interest in order to study the textual history of works that God has not providentially preserved, to see where they have and have not preserved the text. But they may not be used to compose the NT text. Whether one does or does not look at them is entirely optional. It is a best, a matter of passing interest only.

It is clear from the above considerations, that as a historical class of persons, the Alexandrian School Greek text copyists of Alexandria in Africa, (like the Western Greek text copyists,) were of a much inferior quality to both their counterpart Byzantine Greek text copyists of Alexandria in Africa, Europe, and West Asia, and also their counterpart Latin text copyists who were mainly of Western Europe.

The recognition that the Byzantine Greek textual tradition, Latin textual tradition, and citation of NT texts in the writings of Greek and Latin church writers from the ancient times of the first five centuries, or less commonly from mediaeval times, and if so, especially early mediaeval writers, are a closed class of three reputable sources is very important. The Trinitarian God whose character is such that “there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one” (I John 5:7), manifested his character in the preservation of the NT Text through a system of triangulation. I.e., he evidently ordained that there be three witnesses: the Byzantine Greek, the Western Latin, and the ancient or mediaeval church Greek and Latin writers. Thus it follows that isolating just one of these three sources is insufficient.

The Church of Rome adopted the error of consulting just one of these witnesses in its historic position from the time of the Council of Trent to the pre-Vatican II Council era, that just the Latin mattered. Likewise, unlike Burgon himself who consulted literally any text he could find in his majority count, no matter how corrupt it was; later Burgonite Majority Text advocates have in practice, though not in theory, adopted the error of consulting just one of these witnesses with their majority texts which are, in practice, majority Byzantine Greek texts, whether this is their stated intention (Robinson & Pierpont) or not (Hodges & Farstad). Thus for the Burgonites, in practice, it is just the

Byzantine Greek that matters in the final analysis (even though in the process, those like Hodges & Farstad also happily consult Greek manuscripts outside the closed class of sources for their majority count). This is seen in the majority texts of both Hodges & Farstad whose Greek manuscripts from von Soden's I and K groups are Byzantine Text in more than 85% of instances, and Robinson & Pierpont whose Greek manuscripts from von Soden's K group are Byzantine Text in more than 90% of instances. Thus both groups assert the importance of one of the God ordained witnesses, but at the unwarranted detriment of the other two God ordained witnesses. By contrast, Erasmus of Rotterdam, Beza of Geneva, the Elzivers of Leiden, *et al*, recognized that while the Byzantine Greek has paramount importance, the other two sources must also be consulted, and where justified by textual analysis, the representative Byzantine Greek text modified in order to discover and formally compose the Received Text of the NT.

For sources from which to construct the Providentially preserved Greek NT text, that have been reasonably accessible over the centuries, we need to look no further than this closed class of three sources. This means that the Word of God has been preserved over the centuries, since once apographs (copies) began to be made of the Greek NT autographs (originals), a good textual scholar has been able to take a representative sample of what are now called the Byzantine Greek text type, as well as consult Latin texts and ancient or mediaeval church Greek and Latin writers. From this, a good textual scholar has been able to compose a NT Greek text with fundamental integrity in e.g., 500 or 600 A.D., 1000 or 1100 A.D., 1500 or 1600 A.D., our own day in c. 2000 A.D., or some time in the future. Though before the sixteenth century this process might have occurred only on this or that verse, by this or that textual analyst, over time; this process was undertaken at a more formally recognized and comprehensive level in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, than it had been in previous centuries. This occurred when the desire to have a NT Greek text and the usage of the printing press facilitated the rise of a formally recognized class of textual scholars, such as Erasmus of Rotterdam, Stephanus of Geneva, and Beza of Geneva. It was greatly promoted by the Protestant Reformation, for in the Latin words inscribed on the Reformation Wall in Geneva, Switzerland, "*Post (After) tenebras (darkness), lux (light).*"

Textual analysis is thus only within the closed class of Providentially preserved sources; and one only moves away from the representative Byzantine Greek Text when required to do so for some good textual reason. E.g., textual analysis of the kind undertaken in this commentary at e.g., Matt. 5:11, may only legitimately occur where there is first a textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading, and there is a conflict in readings within the closed class of three sources that requires resolution. Textual analysis may not be used, as the religious liberals assert, to move outside the closed class of three sources. To do so is textual analytical abuse, not textual analytical use. What is my authority for saying this? "For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven" (Ps. 119:89). God's Word is preserved here on earth "for ever" (Isa. 40:8).

The documents God did this work of preservation in, must have had reasonable accessibility over the ages, meaning one could construct the correct text e.g., 500 years after the close of the NT in 600 A.D., or 1000 years after the closed of the NT in 1100

A.D., or 1500 years after the close of the NT in 1600 A.D., or (if the Lord tarries,) 2000 years after the close of the NT in 2100 A.D., or (if the Lord tarries,) 2500 years after the close of the NT in 2600 A.D. . Ideally, this means that one can show support for the reading from one or more ancient church writers. I.e., before *c.* 500 A.D., as well as textual knowledge of the reading between *c.* 500 and *c.* 1500 A.D. . This ideal clearly points us to, and isolates for us, the Byzantine Greek textual tradition and Western Latin tradition, together with the ancient, or less commonly mediaeval, church Greek and Latin writers, as a closed class of three sources used for composing the NT Greek Text.

But the ideal is not always attainable, and so if e.g., one can show any reading from any time is within the closed class of sources, one might argue for it on a textual basis. I.e., if there is first a textual problem in the representative Byzantine reading, which is relieved by a reading inside the closed class of sources, but one cannot show support for this reading inside the closed class of sources before e.g., a 12th or 13th century minuscule, the reading adopted from this 12th or 13th century minuscule will stand because there is a good textual argument in its favour. On the one hand, because of the neo-Byzantine belief that God has preserved his Word over time and through time in the Byzantine Greek textual tradition and Latin textual tradition, such a 12th or 13th century minuscule is within the closed class of sources, and so may be adopted to resolve a textual difficulty in the representative Byzantine Greek text. But on the other hand, because *the desire* is to show the reading over time and through time *as usually one can*, it follows that this later date of a 12th or 13th century Greek minuscule being the earliest known witness inside the closed class of sources, will have the effect of reducing the rating on the A to E scale in a downward direction, but still rating at least a “C” (i.e., a lower level of certainty, in the range of 51%-64% certainty). However, such a scenario is relatively rare, and more commonly one can find specific proof of a reading’s existence in e.g., the ancient church writers, Jerome’s Vulgate, or an old Latin Version from ancient times.

The Received Text used by the translators of the Authorized Version of 1611 was largely based on Beza’s 5th edition of 1598, to which some modification were then made¹⁴³. *The AV’s Received Text thus represents the chief culmination point of this century long process (although the Elzivers continued elements of such work in the 17th century). It crystallizes with matured wisdom, the very best work of this great class of textual scholars, and is thus of the first order.* God provides people for his church as required, at his good pleasure. The AV’s TR represents the very zenith of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries’ textual work; and this great work once completed with unprecedented formality in the formation of the NT’s Received Text, the need for this select group of formally recognized class of NT textual scholars had largely gone.

The Elzivers would soon close off this major period. God might still unleash his power and call forth such neo-Byzantine textual scholars in order to defend the *Textus Receptus* against a formidable threat, and indeed he would do so in the early twenty-first

¹⁴³ Scrivener, F.H.A., *The New Testament in the Original Greek According to the Text Followed in the Authorised Version*, Cambridge University, 1881, pp. 648-56.

century when he called forth myself. But in the absence of any such imminent danger, the dust of the ages started to blow over these sixteenth and seventeenth centuries' seats of learning. "For ever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven" (Ps. 119:89). "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven" (Matt. 6:10).

Thus as a formally recognized academic or scholastic group, this great class of men found in the 16th and 17th centuries basically disappeared. Although some small amount of textual work sometimes existed thereafter, as seen, for instance, in the work of John Mill (c. 1645-1707), an English theologian and Anglican clergyman who confirmed the obvious accuracy of Erasmus's earlier assessment that the Alexandrian text's *Codex Vaticanus* was a bad and corrupt text. It is true that the earliest neo-Byzantines were Gentile Christians such as the Complutensians, who were Roman Catholics and not Protestants, and though religious apostates, their work proceeded under the common grace of God's racial blessing to Gentiles. But Protestants recognized the importance of their work, and by the grace of God continued to give honour to the diligent work of the Complutensians of Spain and Erasmus of Rotterdam, long after the Roman Church of their allegiance had "put the lid" on their work at the Romish *Council of Trent* (1545-63), and "closed them down" inside the Roman Church as part of the Counter-Reformation. The Roman Church had learnt afresh that the pure Word of God found in the Received Text is most powerful, and "devoureth" its "enemies" (Rev. 11:5), for which reason it understandably wanted it suppressed. But the Protestants had learnt afresh the same truth, and so they understandably wanted it proclaimed. *Thus the matter became a demarcation line between Protestant and Papist, even though for some short time, it had been a point of broad agreement between them.*

In many ways the neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries are the largely unsung heroes of Protestantism, for while we Protestants greatly benefited from the translations of Holy Writ based on the Received Text, it tended to be the Bible translators e.g., Wycliffe, Luther, Tyndale, and the King James translators that people thought of. Even though Beza and the KJV translators were celebrated, it was not generally for their work on the Received Text that they have been historically remembered. And so it was that their seats of neo-Byzantine textual analysis and scholarship lay dormant. *By the grace of God they had come. By the grace of God they had seen what needed to be done and did it. And at God's good pleasure, they wiped their weary eyes, bid the saints on earth, "Farewell," and their disembodied souls were "carried by the angels" to glory (Luke 16:22; Heb. 12:23). Let us thank God for their labours here on earth!*

When in the nineteenth century the so called "textual critics" of the neo-Alexandrian School and Burgonite School arose, they were, and are, but a pale reflection of these great men, whose work they cannot ever hope to match. But finding the formally recognized academic rooms of NT textual analysis vacant, with hundreds of years old cob-webs over their doorways, they were able to walk in, and falsely claim the seats of learning once held by such great men as Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and the AV translators. "Vanity of vanities, saith the Preacher, vanity of vanities; all is vanity" (Eccl. 1:2).

The three NT textual witnesses, the Byzantine Greek witness of Eastern Europe, Western Asia, and Northern Africa; the Latin witness of Western Europe *et al*; and the ancient, or less commonly mediaeval, church Greek and Latin writers' witness from the three continents of Europe, Africa, and Asia; were good enough for the Trinitarian God to preserve the NT text over the centuries, in manifestation of his character via a methodology of triangulation. The three Greek and Latin witnesses were good enough for the great sixteenth and early seventeenth century NT textual scholars to compose the Received Text from, and the Authorized Version translators to translate from. And the three Greek and Latin witnesses must be good enough for every good and true Christian man whom God calls to be a NT textual analyst, through to the Second Coming of Christ. We have no other witnesses! We need no other witnesses! We want no other witnesses! We will recognize no other witnesses! We will have no more than our three witnesses!! And we will have no less than our three witnesses!!!

The doctrine of preservation of divine revelation came under serious attack in the nineteenth century. E.g., I have had Mormon missionaries knock on my door in Sydney, and have also come across them on both the streets of Sydney in Australia, and (when I was living there,) the streets of London in the United Kingdom. The false prophet, Joseph Smith, founded the Mormon cult (the larger *Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Saints* and the smaller *Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints*), on the claim that the *Book of Mormon* was a Divine revelation that had been rediscovered after hundreds of years¹⁴⁴. Theologically similar claims of a “long lost” NT text being “rediscovered” after hundreds of years, were made by Alexandrian Text advocates; upon Tischendorf's find of *Codex Sinaiticus* on the Arabian Peninsula, and associated “rediscovery” of *Codex Vaticanus* which had been rightly repudiated by Erasmus and John Mill.

The Received Text's most significant modern rivals are the neo-Alexandrian texts e.g., the NU Text, all of which are based on “textual analysis” centering around the premise that the ancient Alexandrian Text is generally the best text. Though Acts to Revelation in an Alexandrian text is contained in *Codex Alexandrinus* which came to England in 1628, the Alexandrian Text only became generally known after the religiously liberal textual critic, Constantine von Tischendorf, who did not consider that God had Providentially preserved the text of Scripture over the ages, was scabbing around the rubbish bin of a benighted Middle Eastern Greek Orthodox monastery in 1844, where he discovered some old manuscripts used to start the oven fires. On his third visit to this St. Catherine's Greek Orthodox Monastery, Sinai, in 1859, Tischendorf came across a manuscript of the Alexandrian Text, now known as *London: Sinaiticus* (4th century), to which was attached the spurious and apocryphal Epistle of Barnabas, together with the Shepherd of Hermas. With these two additional books, *London: Sinaiticus* clearly resembled a NT equivalent of the OT Septuagint i.e., it was clearly a corrupt text containing spurious apocryphal material.

¹⁴⁴ See Anthony Hoekema's *The Four Major Cults, op. cit.*, pp. 9-74 (Mormons), & Appendix A has more detail on *The Book of Mormon* (pp. 75-87).

Further research found that a similar copy of the Alexandrian Text had been secreted in the old Roman Antichrist's library, now known as *Rome Vaticanus* (4th century). It had been rejected as an obviously corrupt text by Erasmus. But religious liberals like Tischendorf, together with Papists still smarting under the blow delivered to them by the Protestant Reformation of the 16th century, now rubbed their hands together in glee at the prospect of *the new African Text*, coming to the fore and replacing the hated Protestant's Received Text, whose integral usage in the Authorized Version had, in the words of the AV's Preface, "given such a blow unto that man of sin, as will not be healed." This *new African Text* had been hidden and obscured from the light of general accessibility over the centuries, gathering dust in the dark corner of the Pope's Library, or in the dark corner of a Greek Orthodox's dusty desert monastery. For those who did not believe that God had supernaturally preserved the text of Scripture over the ages, who denied that "the Word of the Lord endureth for ever" (I Peter 1:25), and so had been kept pure in all ages, in general the new African Text came to replace the old Byzantine Text as the preferred base Greek text type.

But there was a basic problem for the neo-Alexandrians with these two newly rediscovered Alexandrian texts, to wit, they disagreed with each other on many readings¹⁴⁵. How could this problem be resolved? To some extent, bald-faced prejudice. The founding father of the Neo-Alexandrian School in its broadly modern form, Tischendorf, had discovered *Codex Sinaiticus*, so he would tend to favour it over *Codex Vaticanus* when the two disagreed. But bigotry can cut two-ways, so the semi-Romanists Westcott & Hort decided to look homeward and Romeward by generally favouring *Codex Vaticanus* when it disagreed with *Codex Sinaiticus*. In both instances, these were general prejudicial tendencies rather than absolute rules. But beyond this, a form of pseudo-textual analysis was created to help resolve these type of problems between what were claimed by the neo-Alexandrians to be "the best two texts," but which amidst constant disagreements between them, the neo-Alexandrians had to keep scratching their heads and asking, "Which text is the best text?" These rules of pseudo-textual criticism included such supercilious notions as, e.g., "the shorter text is generally the better text," or "clearly different writing styles such as Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8-11 *just have to be* ... scribal confluations."

The obvious intellectual mediocrity of the humdrum minds that come up with a rule like, "clearly different writing styles such as Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8-11 *just have to be* ... scribal confluations," speaks for itself. These "great brains" appear to have sincerely believed that they had somehow "detected something" that "those silly ancients," who *only knew Greek ten times better* than these neo-Alexandrian moderns did, "had missed." Westcott & Hort were a Committee of two, and the NU Text had a Committee of five. They could accept that they could jointly co-author an original book, but insisted that any evidence of co-authorship of a New Testament book required the conclusion of "later scribal conflation." *Why could they not see past the noses on their faces? Was it because they had long noses that they were sticking into other people's*

¹⁴⁵ Herman Hoskier's *Codex B [Rome Vaticanus] & its Allies, A Study & an Indictment*, Bernard Quaritch, London, UK, 1914 (2 volumes).

textual analytical business? Or was it because they were simply short-sighted?

On the one hand, Papists before the Vatican II Council with their Douay-Rheims Version (1582-1610) based *only* on the Latin textual tradition, or Papists after the Vatican II Council with their neo-Alexandrian text based Revised Standard Version Catholic Edition (1965), or Jerusalem Bible (1966), or New Jerusalem Bible (1985); or Burgonite Majority Text advocates with their New King James Version (1982), based on Hodges & Farstad's type of theory on the Majority Text drawn from different text types, but because the overwhelmingly high number of Greek manuscripts are Byzantine Text, in practice meaning they are based *only* on the Byzantine Greek; and religious liberals with a host of neo-Alexandrian text versions e.g., the Revised Standard Version (1946-52), New English Bible (1961-70), or New Revised Standard Version (1990); all agreed that the Authorized Version's NT Received Text *had to go!* But on the other hand, armed with the fact that the text which God inspired is the text which he Providentially protected and preserved over the ages, and the fact that the requirement of general accessibility meant the Byzantine Greek textual tradition, Latin textual tradition, and the writings of ancient or mediaeval church Greek and Latin writers, are a closed class of three reputable sources, defenders of the Received Text cannot be duped.

The Trinitarian God had preserved the New Testament's Received Text by this system of triangulation over the centuries of time by these three witnesses, and there could be no such thing as a new "fourth" or "fifth" or further "witness," adding to that which had been given and granted reasonable accessibility throughout the centuries. The "three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost" (I John 5:7), gave their Trinitarian protection to the Received Text, and their Trinitarian comfort to its defenders. For defenders of the Received Text, the issues at stake over the neo-Alexandrian texts are reminiscent of the issues at stake over the Alexandrian Text of *Codex Vaticanus* and Western Text of *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* in the sixteenth century. Rejection of the neo-Alexandrian Texts based principally on the Alexandrian Texts of *Codex Vaticanus* and *Codex Sinaiticus*, (or any other new text type that might appear,) is simply a contemporary application of an old and well established Protestant principle, manifested in the sixteenth century by the Reformers rejection of the Alexandrian Text's *Codex Vaticanus* and Western Text's *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*. *Coming across corrupt texts is part of the turf of a neo-Byzantine textual analyst who must reject them in whatever century he is living in.*

Likewise, for defenders of the *Textus Receptus* (TR), the issues at stake with the Burgonites (in practice, though not in theory,) using only the representative Byzantine Greek (or where that text is divided, a sizeable Byzantine reading), are reminiscent of the issues at stake over the usage of only one of the three witnesses, the Latin witness, by the Roman Church in the sixteenth century. Rejection of the Majority Text is simply a new application of an old and well established Protestant principle, manifested in the sixteenth century by the Reformers rejection of using just one of the three witnesses, Latin, and their corresponding usage of all three of the Greek and Latin witnesses in the TR.

The battle between neo-Byzantines and both neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites

might seem new, and on one level it is. But at heart, it is just a different slant on an old series of battles that 16th century neo-Byzantines fought against the spurious Alexandrian Text rejected by Erasmus and the spurious Western Text rejected by Beza; or the battle 16th to 20th century defenders of the Received Text fought from the time of the Council of Trent till the time of the Vatican II Council against Latin Papists of the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version. Its antecedents are clear. We tread where the saints afore us have trod.

O God, we have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us, the noble works that thou didst in their days, and in the old time before them.

O Lord, arise, help us, and deliver us for thine honour.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son: and to the Holy Ghost; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen,

From our enemies defend us, O Christ.

Graciously look upon our afflictions,

Pitifully behold the sorrows of our hearts.

Mercifully forgive the sins of thy people.

Favorably, with mercy hear our prayers.

O Son of David, have mercy upon us.

Both now and ever vouchsafe to hear us, O Christ.

Graciously hear us O Lord Christ.

O let thy mercy be shewed upon us.

As we do put our trust in thee. ... Amen¹⁴⁶.

Even as in the olden time 16th century battle of the neo-Byzantines against e.g., the Western Greek Text and Latin Papists, so now in our 21st century battle against the Alexandrian Greek Text and Majority Text Burgonites, such spiritual discernment and knowledge about the *Textus Receptus* is crucial. Such knowledge strikes down and renders ineffectual the claims of Tischendorf and others for *the new African Text*, known as the Alexandrian Text, together with its textually critical neo-Alexandrian derivatives such as e.g., Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st

¹⁴⁶ Prayers from the Litany, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662).

edition (1952), Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) or the UBS 3rd (1975), 3rd corrected (1983), and 4th revised (1993) editions. It doth shake and break into pieces the claims of Burgon and his Majority Text Burgonites. The recognition of a closed class of three reputable sources, three witnesses from which the Received Text was composed, is thus very important. It means that if e.g., a "new Text" were to be found in e.g., Iraq, or Caesarea, or Zululand, or Alexandria, or Ethiopia, or Timbuktu, it could be eliminated at the threshold on the basis that had it been the text preserved by God over time and through time, it would have had general accessibility over the centuries, which e.g., a "new African Text" from Botswana or Zululand would not have had. Thus, for instance, we can safely dismiss any variants in the *Asiatic Armenian Version*, or the new African text type found in the Alexandrian Text.

Therefore, we should not be concerned if, one day, we were to pick up a newspaper such as *English Churchman* (an Anglican Protestant newspaper) or *British Church Newspaper* (an inter-denominational Protestant newspaper), and read something like the following.

Recently, a great English archaeologist, Doctor I.M.A. Botheringham, was poking around with a stick in Africa. Dr. Botheringham came to the attention of his fellow academics years ago, after the publication of his celebrated Ph.D thesis. As a student he won three universities medals for his landmark Ph.D. thesis entitled, "No foreseeable solution to the insoluble conundrum: Why People Can't Hear, When they Put Their Fingers in Their Ears."

Since suffering from sun-stroke in hot African conditions two years ago, Dr. Botheringham has taken to holding up a large, bulky, heavy, beach-umbrella over himself when trekking around Africa by foot. After recovering from his latest bout of dysentery, contracted under African conditions in the Land of Ham, Doctor I.M.A. Botheringham, was poking around with a stick in the nooks and crannies of Egypt's sandy deserts. In what Dr. Botheringham now describes as "a colossal blunder," he mistook a mosquito that had bitten him for a tsetse (pronounced "teet-see") fly.

Chasing after the tsetse fly on the basis that he had never seen one in that part of Africa before, his beach umbrella obscured his vision with the consequence that he hit his head on a low lying outcrop of rocks, that proved to be a cave. Thinking the "tsetse fly" might be in the cave, he then entered the small low lying cave, and inadvertently discovered in this dark and dingy corner of the Dark Continent, a mid-third century New Testament text, to which the apocryphal "Gospel of Thomas" and "Epistle of Barnabas" were attached.

This manuscript has now given rise to a new African text type, called the *Camel-Users-Riders' Text*, acronym CURT (pronounced "Kurt" as in Kurt Aland). Dr. Botheringham found the manuscript, surrounded, covered, and enveloped in camel dung, from which he deduces that camel-users-riders may have carted this manuscript around Africa in ancient times. The manuscript also

contains a painted picture on the front of its cover depicting men bowing down and worshipping a camel, “an inter-faith fact,” Dr Botheringham asserts, that “proves we should not be hostile about the idea that someone can be both a Christian and an idolater.”

Upon scraping away centuries old ancient camel dung from the leaves containing I John 5:7,8, he found that they contained the shorter reading, rather than the longer reading of the Received Text. Dr. I.M.A. Botheringham said this new African text, found near Alexandria, was “proof positive” that the readings of the Received Text and Authorized Version are incorrect. “One thing it proves,” said Dr. Botheringham, “You can believe in Kurt Aland’s NU Text, or you can believe in John Burgon’s Majority Text, but there’s no way you can believe in Theodore Beza’s Text or the Authorized King James Version’s Received Text!”

Dr. Botheringham said, “It’s just bad luck that the Camel-Users-Riders’ Text hasn’t been better preserved and better known about over the centuries. As far as we know, knowledge of it was only kept alive by a small group of ancient camel users or camel riders, who appear to have had no conflict in both worshipping camels and professing themselves to be Christian; and whose little known text type then got lost and became unknown to anyone for about 1,500 years or more. The story of the loss and much later recovery of the Camel-Users-Riders’ Text, is actually very similar to the story of the loss and much later recovery of the Alexandrian Text. I think the fact that like the Alexandrian Text found at Sinai, the Camel-Users-Riders’ Text attaches the Epistle of Barnabas to the NT, must make us seriously consider including this book in a new and revised NT canon.”

“Actually,” continued Dr. Botheringham, “there’s just so much in CURT that we can’t find in any other texts, it’s even better than the Alexandrian Text which must now take second place to CURT. If Protestants like Stephanus of Geneva, Beza of Geneva, the Elzivers of Leiden, and the AV translators, had *only* known what CURT says, and had known how poorly attested to passages like I John 5:7,8 really are in the Greek manuscripts, I *just know* they would never have included them in the Received Text or Authorized Version. We’re so fortunate to have evolved on up, and to have CURT to tell us what they didn’t know.”

iii) Old Testament

The OT Received Text will be discussed more fully in the final volume.

2) The Diatessaron

Tatian was a second century A.D. “stony ground” believer, who would “endure but for a time” (Mark 4:5,16,17), and then did “fall away” into apostasy, so that it was “impossible” for him to ever be saved (Heb. 6:4,6). During the time his faith “sprang up” (Mark 4:5), and he did “receive it with gladness” (Mark 4:16), at around 150 A.D., he listened to the preaching of Justin Martyr at Rome. As part of his experience to “have

tasted the good Word of God” (Heb. 6:5), he prepared what some call “a harmony of the Gospels,” although in his instance, not in four “parallel” columns, but rather, by seeking to put together the accounts of all four gospels into one account. This legendary work is known as *Tatian’s Diatessaron*.

Whether it was originally in Greek or Syriac is a matter of historic debate. Indeed, Tatian’s Diatessaron is in the eye of an academic storm. Diatessaron studies are controversial, and it seems *everyone wants to make something of the Diatessaron, but no-one can agree with anyone else as to exactly what to make of the Diatessaron*.

The matter is complicated by the loss of Tatian’s original Diatessaron, and large numbers of different Diatessarons in different languages. E.g., the view of the United Bible Societies (UBS) 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, was that reference should be made to the Arabic Diatessaron, the Armenian Diatessaron as preserved in Ephraem’s commentary, the Syriac text of Ephraem’s commentary, the Fulda Diatessaron, the Italian Diatessaron, the Liege Diatessaron, the Old Dutch Diatessaron, the Persian Diatessaron, the Stuttgart Diatessaron, the Tuscan Diatessaron, and the Venetian Diatessaron. But that was not the view of the subsequent UBS 4th revised (1993) edition. They took the view that one should only consider the Armenian Diatessaron and Syriac Diatessaron, and that the “inclusion” of any other Diatessaron “could only lead to confusion.”

But in turn, that was not the view of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993). They took the view that no reference to any Diatessaron was desirable. They ignore it completely. But that was not the earlier view of Von Soden’s text some 80 years before (1913). He thought highly of the Arabic Diatessaron and associated Syriac references of Ephraem (the latter of which is also sometimes referred to by Tischendorf).

For neo-Alexandrians the problem seems insoluble. Though many Diatessarons exist, Tatian’s original or anything like it seems to be long lost. There is thus a groping about by them in a fairly circular manner, trying to work out which one, if any one, might be “the best.” Their views on the matter are historically very diverse.

But applying the principle of distinguishing between those manuscripts inside and outside the closed class of sources, acts to help we neo-Byzantine first isolate any useful Diatessarons. Though the fragment of a Greek Diatessaron was found in the 20th century, the Greek Diatessarons had no reasonable accessibility over the ages and so must be rejected. (Unless of course one were to turn up which simply agreed with the established Byzantine and / or Received Texts, in which case it would prove nothing textually new.) But some Latin Diatessarons meet the basic requirements.

The Fuldensis Diatessaron, in Codex Fuldensis (mid 6th century), and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century), are both inside the closed class of sources. These are both Latin Vulgate Codices. I.e., their compilers either applied a Diatessaron format to the Latin Vulgate, or took some old Latin Diatessarons, and conformed their readings to the Latin Vulgate. The small amount of variations in e.g., the Sangallensis

Latin Diatessaron (9th century) compared with the Latin Vulgate I use (Wordsworth & White), are within Latin Vulgate Codices limits, and so either interpretation is possible. Therefore these Latin Diatessarons might be reasonably referred to as Latin Vulgate Diatessarons, and generally are the same as the Latin Vulgate. Occasional Vulgate variants of this Vulgate Codex on passages discussed in this commentary are noted with interest (see e.g., commentary at Matt. 8:13c; 9:27a; 9:34; 11:17b).

On the one hand, these two Diatessarons are Latin Vulgate Codices. Thus their Latin text has no specific relationship to Tatian's original Diatessaron. But on the other hand, Tatian's formatting idea is present in these Diatessarons, even if it was, as it well may have been in some instances, refined or modified from exactly the way that Tatian did his original, now long lost, "harmony of the gospels" Diatessaron.

I am particularly interested in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). This is found in Eduard Siever's 1892 edition, and is also available on the internet, which is where I have accessed it¹⁴⁷. This is a bi-lingual in old High German and Latin. It is thus also of historical interest in the study of German. On one path, West Germanic became old High German, and eventually modern German. On another path, West Germanic became Anglo-Saxon, then Middle English, and then modern English. White Aryans from both the British Isles and Germany thus have a common linguistic heritage in West Germanic, which also bespeaks of their common racial heritage. As a white Caucasian, like all white Caucasians I am descended from Noah's son, Japheth (Gen. 10:1-5). This wider Japhethite element gives the bi-lingual German-Latin Sangallensis Diatessaron a special place of interest. I have accordingly decided to feature this Latin Vulgate Codex of the Gospels as one of the jewels of the Western Latin textual tradition.

The other Diatessaron of interest to me is featured outside the closed class of sources. This is Augustine Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century)¹⁴⁸. The Arabic translation is dated by Samuel Hemphill to the mid 11th century, which he thinks was based on a Syriac Diatessaron dating from the late 9th century. He considers "Ciasca's Latin" is "a trustworthy witness of" "the Arabic version"¹⁴⁹. But as in many things connected with Diatessaron studies, others dispute this assessment of Ciasca's Latin¹⁵⁰.

¹⁴⁷ Carlson, S.C.C., Hypotyposeis: Codex Sangallensis on line (www.hypotyposeis.org weblog/2006/01/codex-sangallensis-online.html).

¹⁴⁸ Ciasca, P.A., *Tatiani Evangeliorum Harmoniae Arabice*, Ex Typographia Polyglotta, Romae, 1888.

¹⁴⁹ Hemphill, S., *The Diatessaron of Tatian*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1888, pp. xxviii, xxix.

¹⁵⁰ Petersen, W.L., *Tatian's Diatessaron*, E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands (Holland), 1994, pp. 137-8.

The issue of how old the Arabic Diatessaron dates back to in its Arabic form is also a matter of dispute. Some think the founder of the Mohammedan religion, Mohammed, knew of an Arabic Diatessaron in the 7th century, from which the later Arabic Diatessaron was derived. This view is a deduction based on Mohammed's usage of the singular "Evangel" or "Gospel," when he refers to "the Jews . . . and the Christians" respectively as those who "observe the Law (Jews) and the Evangel (Christians)" (*Koran*, Sura 5:73,74)¹⁵¹. But this argument is tenuous and inconclusive, since Christians sometimes refer to e.g., "the Gospel reading" at Communion in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), and the singular usage of "gospel" does not here denote a harmony of the four gospels. Thus the issue of whether or not Mohammed was referring to an Arabic Diatessaron in his reference to the "Christians" belief in the singular "Evangel" is inconclusive, uncertain, unclear, and open to interpretation.

So too, the relationship between the Arabic Diatessaron and Syriac is a matter of dispute. The much celebrated Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century)¹⁵² is known to conform more closely to the Byzantine Text, a fact causing neo-Alexandrians some consternation, since it is of ancient date, and testifies to a widely circulating Byzantine Text type from ancient times. Though the earliest extant manuscripts of the Pesitto date to the early 5th century, and so I use the date "first half 5th century," these may come from earlier Syriac manuscripts.

Whether or not the Syriac Pesitto is earlier than the 5th century, whether or not the Arabic Diatessaron was translated from the Syriac, or perhaps just influenced by the Syriac, and if so, when; whether or not Ciasca was right or wrong to use two Arabic manuscripts in a critical manner to compose his Arabic Diatessaron; whether or not his Latin is entirely trustworthy; like so many other questions about the Diatessaron, are ultimately not of crucial importance to me, nor to any neo-Byzantine analyst of the Received Text. That is because however one determines these questions, Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron is an example of textual transmission outside the closed class of sources. It may thus be of interest. But it is of no crucial importance.

Ciasca undertook his work at Rome, and later became a Roman Catholic Cardinal. Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) was a watershed to Diatessaron studies. It first aroused modern interest in the Diatessaron in the context of textual studies. Though I would never use it, or any other manuscript outside the closed class of sources to determine the NT text, nevertheless, there is a sense in which my usage of it in this commentary means that we have come full circle from Ciasca's time. That is because it means the work that first aroused such great interest in

¹⁵¹ Mohammed's *Koran*, translated from the Arabic by J.M. Rodwell, 1861, second edition, 1876, with an Introduction by G. Margoliouth, Everyman's Library, Dent, London, UK, 1909, reprint 1974, p. 494 (Sura 5:73,74).

¹⁵² Also known as the "Peshitta," I prefer the German form, "Pesitto" (e.g., Gustav Diettrich's *Ein Apparatus criticus zur Pesitto zum Propheten Jesaia*, A. Topelmann, Giessen, Germany, 1905), and use this form throughout in this work.

modern Diatessaron studies, as reflected in e.g., references to the Arabic Diatessaron in the NT textual apparatus of von Soden (1913), is once again in a spot-light, since it is featured in this commentary as an interesting work to include when considering textual transmission outside the closed class of sources.

I am not familiar with Arabic, and when referring to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, I generally consult only Ciasca's Latin. However, I have occasionally consulted an English translation of the Arabic, usually Hope Hogg (Editor A. Menzies, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 1895, Reprint, Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1969, 1978, Vol. 10), and less frequently again, Hamlyn Hill (*Diatessaron of Tatian*, T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, 2nd ed. 1910). For these purposes, I may sometime refer to Hogg in the commentary.

For those interested in Diatessaron studies, this textual commentary of the NT is thus of great interest. That is because in the Gospels I feature the *Sangallensis Latin* Diatessaron (9th century) inside the closed class of sources, and *Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron* outside the closed class of sources.

As for other Diatessarons, one could feature any inside the Latin tradition, most notably the *Fuldensis Latin Diatessaron*, as inside the closed class of sources; and all others as examples of textual transmission outside the closed class of sources. But I have decided due to issues of space limitations and time economy, for my general purposes in this commentary to simply remain with just these two Diatessarons, one inside, and one outside, the closed class of sources. Thus in my commentaries covering the four gospels, I shall only refer to the *Sangallensis Latin* Diatessaron inside the closed class of sources, and *Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron* outside the closed class of sources. For as the Spirit speaking through King Solomon says, "of making many books there is no end; and much study is a weariness of the flesh" (Eccl. 12:12).

3) *Church Writers.*

Reference is generally made to ancient "church writers" (Latin or Greek) from the first five centuries, rather than "church fathers" as in the UBS and Nestle-Aland texts, since while some of these ancient church writers were orthodox, others were heretics, and so in no sense "fathers" (I Cor. 4:15; Titus 1:4; Heb. 1:1) to the saints of God. The same nomenclature is also used for mediaeval church writers, which Protestants have *not* historically regarded as coming from the era of "church fathers," although the early mediaeval Latin writer, St. Gregory, is traditionally regarded as a later "church doctor."

By contrast, the UBS list of "church fathers" includes e.g., the early medieval Greek church writer, John of Damascus (John Damascus) (d. before 754), a very prominent iconolater (icon idolater), whose deep commitment to idolatry made him, (together with Theodore of Studios,) one of the two biggest names in antithesis to the anti-idolatry periods of *The First & Second Iconoclasm*. What saith the Word of God about such men? "Be not deceived," "idolaters" "shall not inherit the kingdom of God"

(I Cor. 6:9). If neo-Alexandrians of the NU Text Committee refer to such a man in their UBS 4th revised edition of 1993 as a “father,” what does this tell us about the spiritual lineage of these neo-Alexandrians? (Cf. “Ye are of your father the Devil,” John 8:44).

Indeed, the UBS list of “church fathers” is even happy to include under the name of “church fathers,” an anti-Christian heathen like Porphyry (UBS 4th revised edition, pp. 31,33; whom I refer to in this commentary at Matt. 13:35). We cannot doubt that e.g., the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Theodoret of Cyrus (d. 460); or the ancient church Latin writer, Tertullian (d. after 220), were heretics. This does not mean that we cannot cite their writings for readings of Scriptures, but it does mean that we should exercise due caution, care, and consideration in citing them. *But I cannot accept that heretics or heathens should be classified as “church fathers.”*

The heretical Nestorian Bishop of Cyrus, Theodoret (393-460), known in this commentary as Theodoret of Cyrus (d. 460), endorsed Trinitarian heresy in his *Ecclesiastical History*, where he glorifies the Nestorian heretic, Theodore of Mopsuestia (Antioch) (c. 350-428), describing him as a “successful combatant against every heretical phalanx.” He thus describes as “heretical” the orthodox who accepted the *Council of Ephesus* (431 A.D.) and *Council of Chalcedon* (451 A.D.) Christological teaching that Mary was the “God-bearer” (Greek *Theotokos*) (Isa. 7:14; 9:6; Matt. 1:22,23), and were therefore opposed to this heretical Bishop of Mopsuestia. Gregory the Great (Epistles, Book 6:31), says Theodoret of Cyrus’s *Ecclesiastical History* was not liked because of his positive comments on Theodore of Mopsuestia¹⁵³. St. Gregory further said in a letter of 591 A.D. to the Bishops in the Metropolitan Sees of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and a former patriarch of Antioch, “I spurn” “the writings of Theodoret [of Cyrus], in which the faith of blessed Cyril [of Alexandria] is condemned with audacious madness.” “And so let whoever thinks otherwise be anathema.”¹⁵⁴ “Cyril” here is the ancient church father, Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria (412-444), whose anathemas of Nestorius (d. after 451) were approved at the Council of Ephesus (431)¹⁵⁵. I do not doubt that St. Gregory the Great is absolutely correct in his condemnation of Theodoret of Cyrus, and St. Gregory is certainly an example of a mediaeval church writer whose citation of Scriptures may be referred to. Nevertheless, as with other ancient heretics, or mediaeval heretics such as John Damascus, in this commentary I sometimes refer to the writings of Theodoret of Cyrus since they remain useful for showing certain textual readings (e.g., Matt. 5:11b,22).

On the one hand, heretics such as Origen and Tertullian held to many orthodox

¹⁵³ Referred to in the translation, *A History of the Church* by Theodoret from 322 to 427, and by Evagrius to 594 A.D., Henry G. Bohn, London, UK, 1854, p. 248.

¹⁵⁴ Martyn, J.R.C. (translator), *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, Toronto, Canada, 2004, 3 volumes, Vol. 1, Book 1, section 24, p. 146.

¹⁵⁵ Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 46-8.

truths. But on the other hand, both Origen and Tertullian held to a number of unorthodox views, for which reason they are rightly remembered as heretics. Neither has ever been regarded by the orthodox as “church fathers,” far less, as “church doctors.” Their errors appear to have included a belief in “stylistic improvements” to the text of Holy Scripture. I.e., a number of erroneous variants, appear to have originated with Origen and / or Tertullian (e.g., Matt. 4:12; 5:4,5; 5:11b; 5:44b; 6:13), more commonly it seems, a variant started by Origen in the Greek, was then followed by Tertullian in the Latin.

Of course, this does not mean there were not other occasions when writers like Origen and Tertullian both made no alteration to the text of Scripture. But it does mean one must look at such writers with a critical approach to their Greek or Latin citations. In this sense, a modern equivalent may be the Jehovah’s Witnesses *New World Translation* (NWT) (1961). On the one hand, like Origen and Tertullian, much of this translation is accurate. But on the other hand, the Jehovah’s Witnesses are Arian heretics, and parts of the NWT are slanted to their heretical views e.g., Christ is made “a god” (John 1:1; 10:33). They are also Macedonian heretics who deny the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, and indeed the very personhood of the Holy Ghost, thus denying the Trinity at a fundamental level. Hence the “Spirit” is always referred to with a lower case “s” in the NWT. Similar issues also exist with e.g., the Roman Catholic *Douay-Rheims Version* (1582 & 1609/10¹⁵⁶) where e.g., “repent” (Greek *metanoēō*) becomes the Romish, “do penance.”

Origen’s heretical view of pre-existent souls meant that he thought because of the deeds a person did in a former life, they had their souls confined to a material mortal body. He linked this to the idea of a pre-temporal fall. He also denied the *bodily* resurrection, regarding the flesh as inherently evil. He considered only one soul had not fallen, and this was united with the Divine Word (Son) for the incarnation. Such factors may e.g., have influenced his reading of Matt. 6:13 (see commentary at Matt. 6:13).

Tertullian was a Montanist. This heresy involved “ecstatic visions in the Spirit” i.e., “prophesying;” as well as “babble in a jargon” when the Montanists “began to rave in a kind of ecstatic trance.¹⁵⁷” Such irrational practises denied e.g., that “the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets,” and that “God is not the author of confusion” “in all the churches of the saints” (I Cor. 14:32,33). The two key Montanist elements of “tongues” and “prophesy” were rejected by the Protestant Reformers. Any form of unknown tongue was repudiated for public worship (I Cor. 14). Likewise, the teaching

¹⁵⁶ The *Douay-Rheims Version* (1582 & 1609/10) consists of the *Rheims NT* (1582) and *Douay / Douai OT* (1609/10), both of which were translated from the Latin, rather than the original tongues of Hebrew (and Aramaic) in the OT, and Greek in the NT. It also includes a number of OT Apocrypha Books from the Greek Septuagint, interspersed throughout the OT.

¹⁵⁷ Tertullian, *De amina*, 9, c. 210; Eusebius, HEV 16:7; both in Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 77-8.

that Scripture is complete, and the gift of prophesy does not exist outside of Bible times (Dan. 9:24, ASV ftn & AV; Luke 11:49-51; I Cor. 13:8, NASB; Rev. 11:4), is one element of the Reformation teaching of *Scripture alone* (Latin, *sola Scriptura*).

I.e., the gift of prophecy existed only in Bible times. Jesus clearly taught this in Luke 11:49-51 where he refers to “the prophets” “from” “Abel” “unto” “Zacharias,” that is, the Old Testament canon arranged in Jewish order with the thirty-nine books placed on twenty-two scrolls from Genesis to I & II Chronicles, thus rejecting the Apocrypha and any prophetic gift in inter-testamental times, and then says “prophets” returned with “apostles” thus dating these new prophets to the same general time as the apostles, that is, New Testament times, and then Jesus says “the blood of all the prophets” would “be required of this generation.” The only way that “this generation” could be judged for “the blood of all the prophets” is if “all the prophets” existed by then. Since this was said about 30 A.D., and if a little baby then alive was the youngest of “this generation” to be a prophet, he would die by about 100 A.D. (if he lived to about 70, Ps. 90:10), so this requires a termination of the prophetic gift by about 130 at the latest, and indeed the canon of Scripture closed with the Book of Revelation around 96 A.D. . Moreover, the prophet Daniel foretold that the Messiah would “seal up vision and prophet” (Dan. 9:24, ASV footnote), that is, the gift of “prophecy” (Dan. 9:24, AV), and so Christ fulfilled this by declaring in Luke 11:49-51 that the prophetic gift would cease within 70 to 100 years of about 30 A.D. .

The Apostle Paul also clearly taught this, saying, “if there are gifts of prophecy, they will be done away” (I Cor. 13:8, NASB). He dated this termination time by saying “apostles and prophets” were for the church’s “foundation” period (Eph. 2:20). This nexus between “apostles and prophets” shows both are limited in time to the church’s “foundation” period in New Testament times, and so neither can exist after apostolic New Testament times. The Apostle Paul died before the Book of Revelation. When Jesus appointed his apostles in about 30 A.D., they were all adult men, so the minimal possible age for any would be about 20 years old. If a person who was 20 in 30 A.D., lived to be 70 years of age he would die in 80 A.D. and if he lived to be 100 years of age, he would die in 110 A.D. . This means *the prophetic gift which existed among more than just the apostles, but which existed only during apostolic times*, had to cease between 80 and 110 A.D. . When these dates are compared with the dates from Luke 11:49-51 of the prophetic gift ceasing between 100 and 130 A.D., the overlap between these two ranges of dates means that the prophetic gift had to cease between about 100 and 110 A.D. . The Book of Revelation was written in about 96 A.D., but the prophetic gift would have continued for some years in order for these prophets to confirm to the body of believers that the Book of Revelation was inspired. But all such prophets would have ceased to possess the gift of prophesy within a maximum period of about 15 years of St. John penning the final “Amen” to the Book of Revelation.

Thus the Protestant recognition of *sola scriptura* (Scripture alone) struck down the Romish pretensions to “visions” or “revelation” in their “Saints” or “ecumenical councils.” That is, the recognition that the gift of prophecy existed only in Bible times, means any claim to this gift either in inter-testamental or post New Testament times (for

which I include a very short period of no more than 15 years after the New Testament was completed,) is thus necessarily the claim of a false prophet. Hence the words, “Despise not prophesyings” (I Thess. 5:20), now means “Despise not” the “prophesyings” found in Scripture. Or God’s warning, “do my prophets no harm” (Ps. 105:15), refers to the “two” prophets St. John the Divine could refer to when he wrote the last Book of the Bible (Rev. 11:3,4; 22:18,19) i.e., the Old Testament and the New Testament.

The Montanist heresy has returned in the so called Charismatic or Pentecostal phenomena (and elements of it in the notion found in three of the four major cults, Mormons, Seventh-day Adventists, and Christian Scientists, all of which claim their Church has a historically modern “prophet¹⁵⁸”). Tertullian’s belief that the gift of prophesy exists outside of Bible times, may on given occasions have been important for some of his readings, we just do not know. E.g., in omitting the doxology of the Lord’s Prayer at Matt. 6:13, to what extent, if any, was Tertullian influenced by a Montanist belief that “the Spirit had told him” or “had told Origen,” “that these words were not part of Scripture”?

In Book 1, Homily 3, “Of Salvation” in Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, reference is made to such “old and ancient authors, both Greeks” (i.e., Greek writers) “and Latins” (i.e., Latin writers) as “St. Basil, a Greek author,” and “St. Ambrose, a Latin author.” Also referred to are e.g., “St. Chrysostom,” “St. Augustine,” “St. Hierome” (Jerome), and “Origen.” In this Anglican tradition, the honourific titular title “St.” is sometimes used before the name of any NT saint, together with *prominent* “saints” from the first five centuries (or less commonly first six centuries) in general, and for “saints” after this time only in a localized context (e.g., a church name, or the national motif saint of Wales, David, in a Welsh national context). Here “saint” means any Christian in the universal sainthood of all believers (e.g., Eph. 1:1; Philp. 1:1; Rev. 14:12). (Old Testament saints may given the honourific titular title “Holy,” e.g., “Holy Moses”).

Within this Protestant tradition, the fact that in the Anglican Homilies, “Origen” is a prominent ancient writer of the first five centuries, favourably referred to on a number of occasions (where his theology was orthodox)¹⁵⁹, but never given the honourific titular title “St.,” is thus an indicator of some serious concerns about some elements of his theology.

Indeed, an ancient tradition evident in e.g., the writings of Jerome, and followed

¹⁵⁸ Hoekema, A., *The Four Major Cults*, Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1963.

¹⁵⁹ Book 1, Homily 3, “Of Salvation” (Griffiths, J., {Editor}, *The Two Books of Homilies*, Oxford, UK, 1859, at p. 29); Book 1, Homily 8, “Of Declining” or “Falling from God” (*Ibid.*, at p. 82); Book 2, Homily 2, “Against Peril of Idolatry” (*Ibid.*, at pp. 181,182,220,221,222); Book 2, Homily 15, “Of the worthy receiving of the sacrament” (*Ibid.*, at p. 450).

by Protestants in e.g., the Anglican Homilies of the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, *supra*, on the one hand rejects Origen's well known heresies such as the idea of pre-existent souls, but on the other hand favourably uses Origen's writings where they do not conflict with orthodoxy. Thus e.g., on the one hand, Jerome, rightly rejects Origen's view on pre-existent souls, saying, "It is impossible that you should hold the opinion of Origen," "and other heretics that it is for the deeds done in a former life that souls are confined in earthly and mortal bodies. This opinion is indeed, flatly contradicted by the Apostle who says of Jacob and Esau that before they were born they had done neither good nor evil (Rom. 9:11)¹⁶⁰" Likewise, Jerome fairly describes Origen's denial of a *bodily* resurrection as "poison"¹⁶¹. But on the other hand, where Origen's views do not conflict with orthodoxy, Jerome is happy to cite them. E.g., in his "Preface to the translation of Origen's two homilies on the Song of Songs," Jerome says, "Origen, whilst in his other books he has surpassed all others, has in the Song of Songs surpassed himself. He wrote ten volumes upon it," "and I have translated these two short treatises, which he composed in the form of daily lectures for those who were still like babes and sucklings, and I have studied faithfulness rather than elegance. You can conceive how great value the larger work possesses, when the smaller gives you such satisfaction"¹⁶².

St. Jerome clearly stated his methodological approach to Origen in his Letter to Tranquillinus. Here in Letter 62, Jerome says, "you ask me," "for an opinion as the advisability of reading Origen's works. Are we, you say, to reject him altogether," "or are we," "to read him in part? My opinion is that we should sometimes read him for his learning just as we read Tertullian," "and some other church writers," "and that we should select what is good and avoid what is bad in their writings according to the words of the Apostle, 'Prove all things, hold fast that which is good' (I Thess. 5:21). Those, however, who are led by some perversity in their dispositions to conceive for him too much fondness or too much aversion seem to me to lie under the curse of the prophet, 'Woe unto them that call evil good and good evil; that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter!' (Isa. 5:20). For while the ability of his teaching must not lead us to embrace his wrong opinions, the wrongness of his opinions should not cause us altogether to reject the useful commentaries which he has published on the Holy Scriptures"¹⁶³.

I fully concur with the methodological approach to Origen used by e.g., St. Jerome and the Anglican Homilies of the *Thirty-Nine Articles*. Hence one must sift the gold from the dross in Origen's writings, much like one sifts the gold from the dross in the OT Apocrypha. It is with these type of qualifications that I use Origen, Tertullian, or

¹⁶⁰ Wace, H. & Schaff, P. (Eds), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, James Parker & Co., Oxford and Christian Literature Co., New York, USA, 1895, Vol. 6, St. Jerome: Letters & Select Works, 1893, p. 284 (Letter 144).

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 436 (Pamachius 25) cf. e.g., pp. 428,432-6.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 485 (Jerome to Damasus, 383 A.D.).

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 133-4 (Letter 62:2).

any other writer who mixes orthodoxy with unorthodoxy. We rarely read any book, perhaps only the Bible, where we agree with absolutely everything in it, and so I am merely applying a more general rule to the writings of the unorthodox, or at least sometimes unorthodox, ancient or mediaeval church writers sometimes cited for their quotations of Scripture. Indeed, I think the fact that one can find some usefulness in these heretics writings is a fulfillment of the Scripture, that “God” may make “the wrath of man” to “praise him” (Ps. 76:9,10). *Praise be to God!*

A special place is thus given in this commentary to writings from the “Church Fathers’ Era” i.e., by usual Reformed Anglican reckoning, post NT times to the mid 5th century ending with the *Council of Chalcedon* in 451 (although Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox extend it for longer than this, usually through to the 8th century). But whilst some of the writers in this era were orthodox and so in some sense ancient church “fathers” by description (I Cor. 4:15; Gal. 4:19; I Thess. 2:11; I Tim. 1:2,18; II Tim. 1:2; 2:1; Titus 1:4; Philem. 10); though not as a term of title (Matt. 23:9); other writers from this era were heretics e.g., Origen. Therefore, I have generally used the neutral term “ancient church writers” rather than followed Nestle-Aland or UBS in referring to “church fathers,” since the heretics in this grouping are in no sense worthy of this description. However, where all ancient church writers are among the traditional church fathers, I may sometimes use the terminology of church fathers (e.g., see commentary at Matt. 7:9). The same nomenclature is also used for the “mediaeval church writers.”

The church writers that stand in their own right for the purposes of composing the Received Text are the better known Greek and Latin ones that had accessibility over times and through time. But in the same way one can use a more recently rediscovered Byzantine manuscript e.g., *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century) in its Byzantine parts (Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) because it contains nothing new but simply shows an earlier date for what we know before from other manuscripts; so likewise one can cite lost and rediscovered church writers that lacked general accessibility over time or through time, *providing their readings show nothing new that we did not know over time and through time.* E.g., on this basis some reference may be made to Didymus the Blind (d. 398). He was a heretic rightly condemned by the *Third Council of Constantinople* (680-1), but his works re-emerged in 1941, and are sometimes cited in this commentary to show an early date for a reading *that we know about inside the closed class of sources without reference to him.*

The emphasis for church writers is first and foremost on ancient ones. But sometimes a mediaeval writer may also be cited, if so, especially an early medieval writer, such as the Latin writer, St. Gregory (d. 604), or the Greek writer, John Damascus (d. before 754). The Anglican Homilies may also refer to a mediaeval church writer. While any mediaeval church writer may be cited, this is particularly so of early mediaeval church writers which by tradition end in the 8th century. On the one hand, one may cite an early mediaeval church writer. But on the other hand, by usual Reformed Anglican reckoning of the Church Fathers’ Era ending in the 5th century A.D., one would not, as Roman Catholicism or Eastern Orthodoxy, refer to such early mediaeval church writers as “church fathers,” even if they were orthodox.

This thinking is illustrated in the usage of the honourific titular title “St.” which is used of NT figures and prominent figures from the Church Father Era, and less commonly also done for figures from the sixth century. A good example of both of these is St. Gregory the Great, who was largely a sixth century figure, although he died in the early seventh century (Bishop of Rome, 590-604). E.g., Homily 16, Book 2, Article 35 of the 39 Articles refers to what “St. Gregory saith” in his opposition to the formation of the Office of Pope (the first Pope being Boniface III, Bishop of Rome, 607; first Pope, 607). E.g., “writing to Mauritius the Emperor,” Bishop Gregory “condemneth John Bishop of Constantinople in that” he would “be termed universal bishop,” “calling him ... the forerunner of ‘Antichrist’” (I John 2:18).

Thus early mediaeval church writers in general, and the church doctor, St. Gregory in particular, are also historically referred to (as indeed later mediaeval figures may be, though this is far less common). Indeed, part of the reason for the revision of Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) of these textual commentaries was my desire to include citations of St. Gregory, one of four traditional ancient and early mediaeval church doctors. The writings of St. Gregory the Great had accessibility over time and through time, and thus stand in their own right for the purposes of determining the Received Text. As a son of the Western Church¹⁶⁴, I became increasingly concerned that one of these four doctors was not included in the citations of the various textual apparatuses, even though they cite other early mediaeval writers. For example, Tischendorf (1869-72) and UBS (1975 & 1983) cite the early mediaeval church writers, Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century¹⁶⁵) and Pseudo-Chrysostom (6th century); Nestle-Aland (1993) and UBS (1993) cite the mediaeval church Latin writer, Primasius (d. after 567); and both Tischendorf (1869-72) and UBS (1975, 1983, & 1993) cite the mediaeval church Greek writer, John Damascus (d. before 754). In order to remedy this defect of omitting Gregory, by the grace of God, I set about to undertake the necessary work to include citations of Gregory (d. 604), who held the Bishopric of Rome (Bishop of Rome 590-604) at a time before there were Popes of Rome (Boniface III, Bishop of Rome, 607; First Pope, 607). This is original work

¹⁶⁴ Gen. 3:15 refers to the “seed” of “the women,” which in a literal biological sense is the Messiah, Christ, via Abraham and David (Rom. 1:3, Gal. 3:16; Heb. 2:16). But there is also an allegorical sense in which Adam types the second Adam, Christ (I Cor. 15:45), and Eve types the catholic or universal church (Rom. 16:20; II Cor. 11:2; Eph. 5:30-32). In this second allegorical sense, when distinguishing the church as an institutional organizational body from her believers, the “seed” of the “woman” (Gen. 3:15) or church via Abraham are all believers (Gal. 3:29; Rev. 12:17). Thus believers are the children of the universal church. In this sense I am a son of the catholic church. But this mystical one church thereafter contains lesser church divisions, whether by racial groupings (Rom. 16:4; Jas. 1:1), by geographical areas (I Cor. 16:1; Rev. 1:4), or by local city churches (I Cor. 1:2; I Thess. 1:1). And in this more localized sense, I am a son of the Western Church.

¹⁶⁵ Some doubt exists as to the exact date of Pseudo-Athanasius, but I have used the 6th century date given for him in the UBS 3rd (1975) & 3rd Corrected (1983) editions.

based on St. Gregory's Latin writings in Migne, and so finds no equivalent in any other textual commentary.

Moreover, I have like the UBS 4th corrected edition division of "Greek Church Fathers" and "Latin Church Fathers," divided these into "ancient church Greek writers," and "ancient church Latin writers," or less commonly an "early mediaeval church Greek writer" or an "early medieval church Latin writer." This is a well established division. E.g., in Book 1, Homily 3, "Of Salvation" in Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles, supra*, reference is made to such "old and ancient authors, both Greeks" (i.e., Greek writers) "and Latins" (i.e., Latin writers) as "St. Basil, a Greek author," and "St. Ambrose, a Latin author."

Writings from *de Promissionibus* ("Promiss" in Tischendorf's textual apparatus), are attributed in this commentary to the ancient church Latin writer, Quodvultdeus (d. c. 453).

Reference is also sometimes made to the ancient church Latin writer, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370). In such instances, the reader should remember that "Lucifer" is a Latin word meaning "light-bearer." In the cultural context of these ancient times it could carry a positive connotation of good or godly light. It was disassociated from the later idea that the name "Lucifer" should be reserved exclusively for "Satan," who "is transformed into an angel of light" (II Cor. 11:14), and called "Lucifer" (Isa. 14:12). Lucifer Calaritanus was Bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia, north-west Italy. He was a defender of orthodoxy with regard to Christ's Divinity against Arian heretics.

4) *O Oh, the Burgonites are coming!*

The undisputed originator of the Majority Text idea was the *Church of England* Dean of Chichester Cathedral, John William Burgon (1813-1888)¹⁶⁶. In John Burgon's *Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels* (1896), he says, "I am not defending the '*Textus Receptus*' ..., it is without authority to bind, ... [and] it calls for ... revision," "upon the" basis of the "majority of authorities"¹⁶⁷. In what is perhaps Burgon's best known work,

¹⁶⁶ In Australia and England, I have always found "Burgon" is pronounced by native speakers as "Burjon," so that the pronunciation of the "g" as "j" is comparable to the spelling in the word, "burgeon" e.g., one might refer to "Burgon's burgeoning majority text." But in my conversations with Americans from the USA connected with the *Dean Burgon Society*, they always pronounce the "g" of "Burgon" like the "g" in "ice-berg" e.g., one might refer to how "the ice-breaker ship of the Received Text splits asunder and crushes to smithereens the ice-bergs of Burgon's so called 'traditional text'."

¹⁶⁷ Burgon's *Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels, infra*, pp. 13,15; cited in Gary R. Hudson's, "Why Dean Burgon would not join 'The Dean Burgon Society'" (members.aol.com/pilgrimpub/burgon.htm). Hudson also refers to Burgon's & Miller's *Textual Commentary, infra*, and the "Wilbur Pickering ... chart" of 1990 shown to "the Majority Text Society." This says that out of "52" places in Matt. 1-14, "Burgon ... sided with the TR against Hodges & Farstad in 2 places; Burgon stands ... against both

The Revision Revised (1883), Burgon's great brag was this, "Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction¹⁶⁸."

While in broad terms that brag has been continued in the Burgonite Majority Texts of Hodges & Farstad and Pierpont & Robinson, there is a qualified sense in which these Majority Text compilers have found it necessary to additionally say, *Again and again we shall also have occasion to point out that the Majority Text of our great leaders Miller & Burgon (1899) needs correction as well.* Specifically, in Matt. 1-14 their majority texts agree with "changes" to the Received Text (some of which are not really changes, *infra*) found in Burgon & Miller in c. 94% of instances i.e., 50/53 times for both Hodges & Farstad (1985) Robinson & Pierpont (2005), although a small number of these 50/53 are different in Hodges & Farstad to Robinson & Pierpont. The "majority" text count methodology of Burgon & Miller (1899) was different to both the majority text count methodologies of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). In part because Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005) had the great benefit of von Soden's textual apparatus (1913) (for Matthew to Jude) that Burgon & Miller (1899) lacked, and in part due to diverse revisionism on how to undertake a majority text count based on von Soden's data. Specifically, Robinson & Pierpont adopted a "Byzantine priority" methodology that used about 1,000 of von Soden's manuscripts from his K group which is more than 90% Byzantine Text; whereas Hodges & Farstad used a different methodology and employed about 1,500 of von Soden's manuscripts from his K and I groups which is more than 85% Byzantine Text¹⁶⁹. But both Robinson & Pierpont and Hodges & Farstad basically followed Burgon's majority text ideas, and both produced what are in substance Majority Byzantine Texts, dividing on the reading in their von Soden based main texts in Matthew to Jude only on some relatively rare occasions where the texts contain a major numbers count split.

Burgon set out to produce a majority text *Textual Commentary* in which he would "point out" in more detail where "the *Textus Receptus* needs correction," on the basis of his majority text views. But he only completed something approaching a final draft of Volume 1 on Matt. 1-14, before he died. Burgon's first volume was then prepared for publication by the Burgonite, Edward Miller (1825-1901), a Prebendary of the Cathedral Burgon was Dean at, and published posthumously in 1899¹⁷⁰. The reader will find

Hodges and Farstad and the TR in 3 places; ... Burgon stands with Hodges & Farstad against the TR in 47 places."

¹⁶⁸ Burgon's *Revision Revised*, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

¹⁶⁹ See Commentary Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, section, "*Robinson & Pierpont's (1991) new edition Byzantine Textform (2005)."

¹⁷⁰ Burgon, J.W. & Miller, E., *A Textual Commentary Upon the Holy Gospels*, Largely from the use of materials, and mainly on the text, left by the late J.W. Burgon, Part I, St. Matthew, Division I, i-xiv [Matt. i.6 - xiv.19], by Edward Miller, G. Bell & Sons, London, England, UK, 1899.

Burgon & Miller (1899) quite a different work to the first volume of my textual commentary, which is also on Matt. 1-14. Burgon's *Textual Commentary* (1899) makes about 40 to 50 changes to the *Textus Receptus* in Matt. 1-14, of which c. 95% are followed by both Hodges and Farstad (1982 & 1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005), *supra*. By contrast, the first volume of my *Textual Commentary*, finds in this same portion of Scripture, Matt. 1-14, that in fact no changes to the *Textus Receptus* are warranted. (Although there is a qualified sense in which I agree with Burgon on a small number of instances where he wrongly considers a reading is the "TR," such as at Matt. 5:28 or Matt. 5:44.)

Like the neo-Alexandrians Westcott and Hort, Burgon was a Puseyite. Neo-Alexandrians such as Metzger are comfortable with Burgon's Puseyism¹⁷¹, though Burgonite Protestants generally tend to play down or conceal the fact that Burgon walked on the anti-Protestant dark-side with the Puseyites. Some however are prepared to talk candidly about this unpleasant and heretical element of Burgon's theology. E.g., the Burgonite, Maurice Robinson, who together with William Pierpont has produced *The New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform* (1991) & *The New Testament in ... Byzantine Textform* (2005), *infra*, is quite candid about the matter. He says that "Burgon's ... Textual Commentary, which shows Burgon's preferred Traditional / Majority alterations to the TR of Matthew 1-14," is "almost identically parallel those of Hodges / Farstad" and himself. But concerning "Anglican heresy," he further says, "one cannot feign ignorance regarding the fact that Burgon was a ... Puseyite Anglo-Catholic." E.g., he held a Puseyite's semi-Romanist view of the so called, "mass"¹⁷².

He referred to what later became known as the Majority Text, as the "Traditional Text." Burgon was critical of both the Protestant's *Received Text* used in the Authorized Version (1611), and also the neo-Alexandrian texts, for instance, the Westcott-Hort text used in the Revised Version's NT (1881). Having rejected the Received Text in favour of the Majority Text, Burgon specifically rejected the usage of e.g., "the Vulgate", or "any ancient Father," such as e.g., the ancient church Greek writers, "Chrysostom" or "Cyril," contrary to "the whole body of ancient authorities" i.e., contrary to the Majority Text¹⁷³. For the Puseyite inventor of "the Majority Text," important buildings blocks of the *Textus Receptus* were thus attacked.

¹⁷¹ Metzger, B.M., *The Canon of the New Testament*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, UK, 1987, p. 267.

¹⁷² Robinson, M.A., "Whose Unholy Hands on What?", A Review of Jay Green Sr.'s *Unholy Hands on the Bible: Vol. 1, An Introduction to Textual Criticism including the Complete Works of John W. Burgon, Dean of Chichester* (Sovereign Grace Trust Fund, Lafayette, Indiana, USA, 1990) pp. 10,13 (holywordcafe.com/bible/resources/UNHOLY.pdf).

¹⁷³ Burgon, J.W., *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established*, (short title, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*), George Bell & Sons, London, UK, 1896, pp. 30-1; 47-50.

Curious and deranged persons who have come after him, such as the Majority Text advocate, David Ottis Fuller, like to refer to “the magnificent Burgon,” and speak in a truly shocking and appalling derogatory tone, of Saint Jerome’s Latin Vulgate¹⁷⁴. While we Protestants historically prefer the Greek Received Text to the Latin Vulgate for the purposes of NT translation, and while we Protestants want the Bible in our mother-tongue rather than in Latin, nevertheless, Jerome’s Latin Vulgate is accorded a place of proper respect. It is the single most distinguished representative from the Latin textual tradition, that forms one of the three closed classes of reputable sources with reasonable accessibility over time and through time, from which the NT Greek Text is properly composed. Majority Text advocates like Burgon and Fuller who deny the Latin Vulgate its due respect, therefore throw the baby out with the bathwater.

Burgon said the Received Text, or “‘Textus Receptus’ *does* call for revision,” but on Majority Text lines. “To mention an” “instance” by way of example. Burgon claims, “When our Lord first sent forth his Twelve Apostle, it was certainly no part of his ministerial commission to them to ‘raise the dead’ (*nekrous egeirete*, Saint Matthew 10:8). This is easily demonstrable.” Burgon first says it is “found in corrupt witnesses” such as “the Latin copies” (used in the Received Text and AV), as well as some Alexandrian manuscripts (used in the Westcott and Hort text and RV). But he then says, “the conclusive evidence is supplied by the Manuscripts; not more than 1 out of 20 of which contain this clause¹⁷⁵.”

With e.g., Stephanus’s 16th century NT, containing fifteen variants, both Greek and Latin, together with other Greek manuscripts available to them, the Reformers such as Beza, could easily have denied the Latin Vulgate its due respect, and produced a representative Byzantine Text that would have equated Burgon’s Majority Text. If they had done so, we would not have had e.g., Matt. 10:8, Acts 9:5,6; or I John 5:7,8 as they appear in the AV. But they rejected Burgon’s type of methodology. *The Majority Text is not the Protestant Text!* Thus it is clear, that those who support the Protestant’s *Received Text* reading of Scriptures such as Matt. 10:8, necessarily have a different view of them than those following the Puseyite Burgon’s *Majority Text*. Certainly I do not follow men like Burgon, Green, and the NKJV. I for one, have no intention of rubbing out “raise the dead” at Matt. 10:8 in my copy of the Authorized Version, on the basis of the Majority Text reading and Burgon’s say so. I stand where Beza and the Reformers stood, and thank God for the privilege of doing so! (For my treatment of these words, see commentary at Matt. 10:8.)

My view of the *Church of England* Dean of Chichester, Dean Burgon, includes some ambivalence; since I agree with some elements of his work. It is also true, that Burgon and his Burgonites have done *some* good work in warning people of the dangers

¹⁷⁴ Fuller, D.O. (Editor), *Which Bible?*, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-3; 89; 219-21. There is an entire chapter by one writer entitled, “The Magnificent Burgon” (pp. 86-105).

¹⁷⁵ Burgon’s *Revision Revised*, *op. cit.*, pp. 107-8.

of the neo-Alexandrian texts that have come in like a plague since the 19th century, and e.g., most recently have produced the NU Text. In fairness to the Burgonites, they often have a high regard for the King James Version, and promote it (although I think this is somewhat inconsistent with their majority text claims).

It should also be noted, that some good people, convicted by the Holy Ghost that God has indeed preserved the text of Scripture, and that the Received Text of the Authorized Version is the best; have then wrongly thought that the Burgonites must be right because of their promotion of the AV. These are simple people, who lacking good human shepherds here on earth, “fainted” under the pressure of the neo-Alexandrian propaganda machine, and “were scattered abroad” (Matt. 9:36). In an age when many of those with the requisite skills and abilities are derelict in their duty, choosing worldly pleasures and taking the gifts God has given them, that they might “consume” them “upon” their “lusts” (James 4:3), in this as in so many other areas, *the cats are away, and the mice do play*. I may be one “cat,” but most of my fellow “cats” are “stray cats” nowadays, and have been for some time. They refuse to join forces in helping me chase down “the rats.” The Burgonites are bad, but at least *to some extent*, they can only succeed because those who are meant to be doing the right thing, simply are not. The Burgonites who picked up these simple folk were not as cruel to them as the neo-Alexandrians would have been, for which we can be grateful, but they nevertheless gave them some bad directions.

In the final analysis, the Puseyite, Burgon was a classic wolf “in sheep’s clothing” (Matt. 7:15). This is seen in the title of his book, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels: Vindicated and Established* (1896). By “Traditional Text” Burgon means a Majority Text rather than the Received Text, so the reality is that Burgon did not believe at all in what is the true “traditional text,” i.e., the Protestant’s *Received Text*. Like his fellow Puseyites, he was anti-Protestant. But he liked to select instances where his “Majority Text” was in agreement with the Received Text, in order to paint himself as supporting “the traditional text” against the neo-Alexandrians, such as those of the Westcott-Hort Text (1881). This same book by Burgon is very shy about admitting *the very numerous* other occasions where his theory of the majority text joins forces with the neo-Alexandrians in order to attack the Received Text, even though some small number of such instances are referred to by Burgon. The truth concealed in such Burgonite books is, that like the neo-Alexandrians, Burgon was an enemy of the Received Text (e.g., see commentary at Matt. 3:11).

When e.g., Burgon sought to carve out of Scripture, the words, “not being mixed with faith in” etc. at Heb. 4:2; and replace them with the words of his Majority Text (and also of the neo-Alexandrian’s NU Text), “they were not united in respect of faith with” etc., he first said that the TR’s reading was “supported by the united testimony of the” Syriac Pesitto “and of the Latin versions.” He then said, “let no one cherish a secret suspicion that because the Syriac and the Latin versions are such venerable documents they must be held to outweigh all the rest, and may be right in this matter.”¹⁷⁶ Notably,

¹⁷⁶ Burgon’s *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels: Vindicated and Established*, George Bell & Sons, London, 1896, pp. 47-49.

Burgon here includes non-Greek texts in his majority count of all manuscripts, whereas modern Burgonites generally do not. E.g., Hodges & Farstad (1982 & 1985) Robinson and Pierpont (1991 & 2005) use only Greek manuscripts collated in some of von Soden's groups; whereas Burgon himself also used e.g., the Latin (inside the closed class of sources) and the Syriac (outside the closed class of sources).

In the first instance, if push comes to shove, what the Syriac says does not matter. It is outside the closed class of sources. The Pesitto, though an interesting document, is not in the closed class of three NT text sources, and so not used to determine the TR anyway. In the second instance, there is nothing "secret" about the TR's usage of Latin, the great textual scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries did not, as Burgon here infers, keep their Latin texts in some dark corner, and not tell anyone about them. Unlike Burgon's followers, they did not suffer from some kind of Latin-phobia. Rather, their work on the NT text, shows that they celebrated the classical learning of Greek *and Latin*. Thirdly, the TR does not follow a Latin text here because the AV translators thought the Latin was simply "venerable." Rather, they did so on the basis of *textual analysis* of the Greek i.e., to remedy a textual problem in the Greek (see my commentary at Heb. 4:2).

Sadly, these type of lies, so integral to Burgon's claims, have come to be expanded and repeated by the plague of Burgonites following in their leader's foolish footsteps. Those who have come after him, demurring as Burgonites, to the so called "magnificent Burgon" whom they follow, have frequently been even more savage in the language they use in their attacks on the Received Text. E.g., in a book with a Foreword by the well known Burgonite, David Otis Fuller, we find that Theodore Letis, in order to seal the Burgonite deception that their "majority text" is the correct one, finds it necessary to tell the most horrendous and wicked lies against Beza of Geneva, whose textual analysis he clearly does not even begin to understand. He falsely claims that Beza's criteria for passages that are not part of the Burgonites majority text, such as I John 5:7,8, was the pleasing sound of doctrinal *orthodoxy*, when in fact it was *textual analysis*¹⁷⁷.

As one who recognizes the Providential protection of the NT Received Text in three closed classes, I consider the truly shocking and appallingly derogatory tone of Burgonite Majority Text advocates such as David Ottis Fuller against Saint Jerome's Latin Vulgate, to not only constitute falsehood (9th commandment, Exod. 20:16), but also to enter the very realm of blasphemy itself (3rd commandment, Exod. 20:7; Rom. 2:24)¹⁷⁸. While we do not regard him or his Latin Vulgate as infallible, certainly we Anglicans of the holy Reformed faith, look with general favour on that great and noble Biblical scholar, Saint Jerome (c. 342-420), whom the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) remembers as a "Confessor and Doctor" of the church with a black letter day on 30

¹⁷⁷ Letis, T., *The Majority Text*, Institute For Biblical Textual Studies, USA, 1987, p. 133.

¹⁷⁸ Fuller, D.O., *Which Bible? op. cit.*, pp. 32-3; 89; 219-21.

September. As Article 6 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* says of the OT canon, “the other” OT Apocryphal “books (as Hierome [/ Jerome] saith) the Church doth ... not apply them to establish any doctrine.”

While we Protestants prefer the Greek Received Text to the Latin Vulgate for the purposes of NT translation, and while we Protestants want the Bible in our mother-tongue rather than in Latin, nevertheless, Jerome’s Latin Vulgate should be accorded a place of proper respect. It is the single most distinguished representative of the Latin textual tradition, that forms one of the three closed classes of reputable sources with reasonable accessibility over the centuries, from which the NT Greek Text is properly composed. It is the single most outstanding example of the Western Church’s Latin texts. It is one of Western Christendom’s great glories.

The undisputed leader of the Burgonites, Dean Burgon, is a clever and crafty adversary. Burgon’s general technique of enticement, was to first “throw a strong right punch” at the neo-Alexandrians. He would focus on areas where his Majority Text agreed with the Received Text, and use these points of agreement to attack the neo-Alexandrian Text of Westcott and Hort that underpinned the (English) Revised Version (and later the American Standard Version). He would thus get the applause of unwary AV supporters who wrongly thought of him as supporting their cause. Having first grouped around him as many people as he could who were standing for the AV against the RV (or later ASV), and having gotten the confidence of the *Textus Receptus* based AV supporters; this Puseyite would then suddenly “swing a lightning left hook punch” into the Protestant’s *Received Text*, catching the unwary TR supporters off guard, off balance, and he would hope, knocked down to the ground. Thus his second focus, and his ultimate end-game, was to attack the *Textus Receptus* itself. I.e., his final goal was the same as that of the neo-Alexandrians, namely, to attack the Protestant doctrine of the Divine preservation of Scripture in the Received Text; and sever people from the authority of Holy Scripture as found in the AV.

The Devil sometimes sets up a false paradigm with two bad alternatives deemed “the only” options. Of which an obvious enough example are the Western secular “democracies” of our own day with their “two main political parties,” in which Devil-blinded secularist “bi-partisan agreement” on e.g., “human rights” opposing a specifically Christian culture (Ps. 10-12; Isa. 49:23), white race-based nationalism (Gen. 9:27; 10:1-5), patriarchal sexism (Isa. 3:12), fornication, adultery, homosexuality (I Cor. 6:9,10), abortion (Gal. 5:21), etc., means the programmed puppets exclaim, “only extremist bigoted fanatics disagree” etc. . So too we find this in the idea of “white magic” as opposed to “black magic,” in which the Devil will suck people into the vortex of witchcraft one way or the other. The Puseyite attack on the Received Text strikes me as a similar paradigm. On the one hand, there is “the white witch” of Burgon saying, “Follow my majority text ‘traditional text’ and you’ll get something closer to the King James Version;” and on the other hand, there are “the black witches” of Westcott & Hort saying, “Follow our Alexandrian text based critical text and you’ll get something further away from the King James Version, something that calls for the revision of King James Version with the Revised Version of 1881.” But if one follows either “the white

wicken” of Burgon’s Majority Text, or “the black wicken” of Westcott & Hort’s neo-Alexandrian text, one becomes part of the anti-Protestant push of those apostate Anglicans far gone in the wickedness of Puseyism.

In this process, Burgon became so satiated in his fleshly lust to first find a point of intersecting agreement between his Majority Text and the AV, as opposed to the Revised Version (RV), in order to bring the *Textus Receptus* (TR) supporters under his sway by cunning and guile, that he made supercilious criticisms of the RV. Let the reader consider e.g., his criticisms of the RV at Matt. 2:16. This is translated in the AV as “all the children,” and in the RV (and later ASV) as “all the male children.” This is not a textual issue, since there is no disagreement here between the neo-Byzantine Received Text and the neo-Alexandrian texts such as Westcott-Hort. Burgon says, “‘All the male children’ (Matt. 2:16) as a translation of *pantas tous paidas* is an unauthorized statement. There is no reason for supposing that the female infants of Bethlehem were spared in the general massacre: and the Greek certainly conveys no such information¹⁷⁹.”

The Greek *pais*, *paidos*, can mean e.g., boy, girl, child, son, servant, or slave. In the AV, the Greek *tous paidas* is translated “the children” at Matt. 21:15. But in Luke 12:45 *tous paidas* is translated with masculine gender as “the menservants,” in contradistinction to *tas paidiskas* which is translated with feminine gender as “maidens” (AV) or “maidservants” (ASV). The issue of how it should be rendered in Matt. 2:16 is not a fundamental of the faith, and is a matter of reasonable debate among those supporting the TR, since either translation is possible. It is possible to argue that “children” (AV) is the better translation, on e.g., the basis that in the quotation of Jeremiah 31:15, the Septuagint has the masculine “sons” (*uiois*, Jer. 38:15, LXX), yet St. Matthew has “children” (*tekna*). Alternatively, one might argue that male children are meant on the basis that Christ’s sex was known (Matt. 2:2,4). Without elucidating on the respective merits of these two views; whichever view one takes, the fact remains that one can translate *tous paidas* at Matt. 2:16 either without gender, as at Matt. 21:15 in the AV, or with masculine gender as in Luke 12:45 in the AV.

While we supporters of the AV maintain that the underpinning Received Text apographs preserves the infallible autographs, and that the AV is the very best English translation available, we do not disallow godly men the right to argue the toss on whether Matt. 2:16 refers to all children or only male children. We do however, maintain that “children” (AV) is certainly *one* reasonable translation, whether or nor we ultimately agree or disagree with this translation. Thus to claim, as Burgon did, that “*pantas tous paidas* is an unauthorized statement. There is no reason for supposing that the female infants of Bethlehem were spared in the general massacre: and the Greek certainly conveys no such information;” is a gross overstatement. It is designed to simply try and harness a justifiable anti-RV and pro-AV sentiment, but to then twist that sentiment and take it down the track of the Burgonite Majority Text. We have much we can fairly and reasonably criticize the neo-Alexandrian translations for. We do not need to add to it this type of criticism by Burgon, which is really outside the proper realm of the

¹⁷⁹ Burgon’s *Revision Revised*, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

fundamental debate about text type, and the enduring value of the AV as the best available English translation.

Burgon's proud Puseyite boast was this, "Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction¹⁸⁰," "upon the" basis of the "majority of authorities¹⁸¹" i.e., the Majority Text. His claims against the Protestant *Received Text* cannot be ignored, and in contemporary times they are given specific force in the many Majority Text readings found in the textual apparatus of the NKJV, and which are in fact only a very reduced sample of where the Majority Text disagrees with the Received Text. By contrast, whenever I have looked at readings in the Received Text, again and again I have found occasion to point out that the *Textus Receptus* needs no correction. It needs no correction from Papist Latins who elevate the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, over the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. It needs no improvement from religiously liberal neo-Alexandrians who do not believe in any Divine Preservation of the Scriptures. And it needs no improvement from Burgon and his Majority Text Burgonites.

A special feature of this Revised Volume 1 includes reference to the Majority Text of Burgon & Miller (1899), which in *c.* 95% of instances agrees with Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). Notwithstanding some majority text differences in methodology, for instance, unlike Burgon & Miller who consulted any text under the sun e.g., Syriac, Armenian, Egyptian, or Ethiopic Versions, both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont adopted a von Soden (1913) based GREEK MANSUCRIPTS ONLY PRIORITY; these Burgonite revisionists are sufficiently close to Burgon's principles to generally produce the same result. This special feature will be limited to the Revised Volume 1 because Burgon & Miller only ever published the first volume of their majority text, which like my first volume, covers Matt. 1-14. Thus (here using an asterisk * where I would disagree with Burgon & Miller's designation of a non-majority Byzantine text reading as the "Textus Receptus," and would consider the majority Byzantine reading they cite is in fact the TR of the AV,) the reader will find references to the majority text of Burgon & Miller in both the main part of the commentary and appendices at: Matt. 1:1; *Matt. 1:6 (once) & *12:42 (twice) Burgon & Miller are here thrice non-committal as to what the TR's reading is; Matt. 2:11; Matt. 3:8; Matt. 3:11; Matt. 4:10; Matt. 4:18; Matt. 5:20; Matt. 5:21; Matt. 5:23; Matt. 5:27; Matt. 5:28; Matt. 5:39b; Matt. 5:44; Matt. 5:47; Matt. 5:48b; Matt. 6:18; Matt. 7:2; Matt. 7:14; Matt. 8:4; Matt. 8:5; Matt. 8:13; Matt. 8:15; Matt. 8:25; Matt. 9:5b; Matt. 9:5c; Matt. 9:17; Matt. 9:18; Matt. 9:36; Matt. 10:8; Matt. 10:10; Matt. 10:25; Matt. 10:28a; *Matt. 10:28b; *Matt. 11:8; *Matt. 11:16a; Matt. 11:16b; *Matt. 11:21; Matt. 12:3; Matt. 12:6; Matt. 12:8; Matt. 12:13; *Matt. 12:21; Matt. 12:28; *Matt. 12:32a; *Matt. 12:32b; Matt. 12:35a; *Matt. 12:35b; Matt. 13:15; *Matt. 13:27; Matt. 13:28; *Matt. 13:30; *Matt. 13:33; Matt. 13:40; & Matt. 14:19.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 21.

¹⁸¹ Burgon's *Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15.

5) *Greek and Latin Texts.*

The Greek and Latin languages are both members of the Japhetic (or Aryan) Linguistic Family. Erasmus's *Novum Testamentum* (1516) was in Greek and Latin columns. I would like to see a good *Greek and Latin New Testament* published with the benefits we now have of textual information. I.e., on the left page, the Greek Received Text or Textus Receptus (TR) with a good textual apparatus, showing all relevant Greek variants and their support among Greek and Latin texts and ancient, or less commonly mediaeval, writers. Then on the right hand page, Jerome's Latin Vulgate, with a good textual apparatus printing out all the Latin variants in Vulgate Codices, old Latin Versions, ancient and mediaeval church Latin writers, and the Clementine Vulgate. Thus I consider a good Greek and Latin New Testament would be a valuable tool to better understanding the TR. Sadly, notwithstanding some Latin NTs with far too limited textual apparatuses, Latin NTs with a good textual apparatus have been slow to come on the market; and a Greek and Latin NT *of the type I describe* is also still unavailable on the market.

Though I am pleased to have a computer disc (CD) copy of Erasmus's 1516 Greek-Latin New Testament; and a hardbound printed (photocopied) copy of Erasmus's Greek-Latin New Testament of 1522; it seems to me that this type of desirable recognition that both Greek and Latin are the Biblical languages of the New Testament because of the doctrine of Divine Preservation, is sadly lacking is a more general recognition now-a-days. E.g., the TBS print Scrivener's Greek NT Text only, with no accompanying Latin Text, let alone one with a Greek and Latin textual apparatus of the type I would like to see. Protestant tertiary Colleges think it important for Ministerial students to study some Greek, *and they are quite right to do so*; but they do not generally think it important for them to also study some Latin. Even a modest one semester (six month) "Latin Introduction" compulsory subject in a year they were not studying Greek, (with electives in Latin for those who wanted more,) would be enough, with the grammar basics they learnt in Greek, to develop this further once they left College, if they so wished. *Without this type of thing, is it any wonder so many Protestant Ministers fail to appreciate the NT Received Text?*

A Greek and Latin New Testament which is *prima facie* in the right direction, is Augustine Merk's *Novum Testamentum* (1964)¹⁸². Merk's Greek & Latin *Novum Testamentum* (1964), is certainly of some value for its Latin textual apparatus. Latin Vulgate Codices consulted by Merk include F (Codex Fuldensis, Fulda, 6th century), S (Codex Sangallensis, Gospels, St. Gallen, 6th century; & Codex Sangallensis, Acts, St. Gallen, 8th century), U (Codex Claromontanus, Vatican City, Rome, Mark-John, 6th century; & Codex Ulnesis, London, Acts *et al*), St (Codex Stonyhurstensis J, Stonyhurst, 7th century), O (Codex Seldenianus, Acts, Oxford, 7th / 8th century), Z (Codex Harleianus, Pauline Epistles & Revelation, London, 7th / 8th century), M (Codex

¹⁸² Graece et Latine, 1933, Sumptibus Pontificii Instituti Biblici, Rome, 9th edition, 1964.

Monacensis Pauline Epistles, Munich, 8th century; Codex Monacensis, Acts & Revelation, Munich, 9th century), H (Codex Herefordensis L, Hereford, 8th / 9th century), J (Codex Iuvenianus, Acts, Revelation, Roma Vall., 8th / 9th century), Wi (Codex Wirceburgensis, Pauline Epistles, Wurzburg, 8th / 9th century), B (Codex Bamergensis, Acts, Pauline Epistles, Revelation, Bamberg, 9th century), G (Codex Sangermanensis Mark-John, Paris, 9th century), and R (Codex de Rosas, Acts *et al*, Paris, 10th century). (For a list of the other Latin Vulgate Codices used in Merk's textual apparatus, though not all the old Latin Versions used in Merk's textual apparatus, see commentary at Matt. 14:12.)

On the one hand, I greatly appreciate the Latin textual information that one finds in Merk's textual apparatus. But on the other hand, Merk's selections in his Latin textual apparatus are very arbitrary, very incomplete, and some might even say, very erratic. This sadly limits the value of his work. Merk had access to a large number of Latin codices, old Latin versions, ancient and mediaeval Latin writers. When using his *Novum Testamentum*, I cannot help thinking that he lost a wonderful opportunity to produce a comprehensive Latin textual apparatus; comparable in Latin terms, with the best of the Greek NT textual apparatuses. E.g., at Matt. 14:30 I know from the UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) simply that a Latin Vulgate Codex supports *Variant 2*. But I am unable to find even this much information in Merk's *Novum Testamentum*, which if it had a decent Latin textual apparatus, could identify this Vulgate Codex for me.

On the one hand, we of the holy Protestant faith could never accept the *unqualified* old Romish maxim, generally abandoned by Papists after the Vatican II Council (1962-65), though formerly used in defence of e.g., the Clementine Latin Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version over the NT Greek Received Text and Authorized Version, namely, *The Latin improves the Greek*. But on the other hand, it must be admitted that in particular instances (e.g., Matt. 4:18), the Latin is preferred over the Greek. But in reaching this conclusion, one should always bear in mind that the Latin reading is followed by neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus* on the basis of stylistic analysis of the Greek. Moreover, where the Latin reading is followed as being correct, this means that since in the final analysis the Latin is a translation of the Greek NT, the Latin was simply the vehicle to preserve over the centuries the underpinning *Greek Text*. In this sense, when such a reconstruction from the Latin as that done at e.g., Matt. 5:32 occurs, it is a case of the lesser maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, being used *subject to*, the greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*.

In this work, the basic TR text I use is that found in Frederick H.A. Scrivener's, *The New Testament in the Original Greek According to the Text followed in the Authorized Version*, Cambridge University Press, UK, 1894 & 1902 (Reprinted as *H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ [E KAINĒ DIATHEKE]* / *The New Testament, The Greek Text Underlying the English Authorised Version of 1611*, Trinitarian Bible Society, London, England, UK, [undated]). Of importance for variants between the Received Text of the AV and Beza's fifth edition of the Greek NT which was used critically by the AV translators, I have used Scrivener's, *The New Testament in the Original Greek According to the Text followed in the Authorized Version, Together with the Variants Adopted in the*

Revised Version (Cambridge University, 1881, Appendix, pp. 648-56). Despite its name, this work is not quite the AV's TR, although it is very close to it (See Appendix 1 and issues raised in Appendix 2 of this commentary). Scrivener includes a list of variants in his Appendix (*Ibid.*, pp. 655-6), saying, "The text of Beza 1598 has been left unchanged when the variant from it made in the Authorized Version is not countenanced by any earlier edition of the Greek. In the following places the Latin Vulgate appears to have been the authority adopted in preference to Beza." Examples given include Scrivener's "Beelzeboul" at Matt. 12:24,27 rather than the AV's "Beelzebub." In fact the AV translators would not have disputed the Greek at these passages, but for translation purposes they chose the Anglicized word derived from the Latin, rather than the Anglicized word derived from the Greek¹⁸³. Such factors mean Scrivener does not properly understand the AV translators, and reminds us that his work must be used with some qualification and caution.

My source knowledge for textual variants, and their support both in manuscripts, ancient, or less commonly mediaeval, church writers, and different versions, though less commonly from independent research e.g., all citations of St. Gregory, usually comes from the textual apparatus of a Greek NT. Unless otherwise stated, all Codices, Minuscules, and Lectionaries referred to in this commentary, are in Greek. They, together with Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, are used as basic reference works throughout this textual commentary, too often to usually acknowledge specifically at commentary verses.

The most commonly consulted textual apparatuses and commentaries are the following. Constantine Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Graece* (1st edition, 1841; 8th edition Giesecke & Devrient, Lipsia / Leipzig, Volumes 1 & 2, 1869-72; Vol. 3, Prolegomena, 1894, Vol. 3 was finished after Tischendorf's death by Caspar Gregory). Ethiopic is a Hamitic tongue derived from Cush inside the Hamito-Semitic Linguistic Family, this larger linguistic family being derived from Noah's sons Ham and Shem (Sem). Where reference is made to the "Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries)" then Tischendorf is the source for this. Augustus Dillmann's Ethiopic Version (1859) was based on two sources. An 18th century manuscript he obtained from Abbadie; and also a 19th century manuscript from Knapp's Secretary (the Abyssinian Secretary who gave it to the Tübingen Library in 1844). Dillmann made numerous corrections to the 19th century manuscript, and the 18th century manuscript has also been criticized as faulty.

Neo-Alexandrian textual apparatuses no longer refer to Dillmann's Ethiopic Version because older Ethiopic Versions have since been found. To the obvious criticism

¹⁸³ There are increasing examples of this type of nonsense. E.g., some claim the *Koran* should be spelt as, "*Qur'an*" on the basis that this is "the Arabic form" (although in fact even this is a transliteration from the Arabic alphabet). Do I speak Arabic or English? As an Anglophone I happily admit that "Koran" is an Anglicized transliteration of the Arabic. But we speak English, not Arabic! Thus I would entirely agree with the spelling found in the translation I normally consult, to wit, Rodwell's translation (1876, Everyman's Library, 1909, reprint 1974), which is "Koran."

that no-one in their right mind would use Dillmann's Ethiopic Version to determine the NT text, I would reply that the same is true for any of the manuscripts I cite in the section on the sources outside the closed class of sources e.g., the same would be true for the Alexandrian texts. They are nevertheless of some interest in considering the history of textual transmission outside the closed class of Greek and Latin NT sources. Tischendorf evidently found Dillmann's Allophylic *Ethiopic Version* of some value in determining his neo-Alexandrian Text. I have generally referred to this Allophylian language translation when it is in Tischendorf's textual apparatus. Like Tischendorf's neo-Alexandrian text which it influenced, it is admittedly unreliable.

My usage of this Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries), should also act to remind the reader of yet another problem with the neo-Alexandrian texts, namely, that their sources keep changing, depending on "the most recent discoveries." Thus in Tischendorf's day, the "discovery" of Dillmann's Ethiopic Version put it at "the cutting edge" of neo-Alexandrian textual analysis. But as the years rolled by, and older "and therefore better" Ethiopic versions were "discovered," Dillmann's Ethiopic Version faded from neo-Alexandrian textual apparatuses. "Truth" it seems, is "a relative thing" for neo-Alexandrians, depending on "what manuscripts have been discovered." Thus e.g., who is to say that manuscripts they now think so highly of, might not likewise suddenly become redundant if e.g., "new discoveries" of some older manuscripts are suddenly "discovered."

By contrast, we neo-Byzantines of the Received Text may from time to time discover new Byzantine Greek or Western Latin manuscripts. E.g., in 1879 the Byzantine Manuscript Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), was discovered in Western Europe at the Cathedral sacristy of Rossano in southern Italy. But like other such discovered texts, they are acceptable to us to use because they conform to that which we already have had preserved for us over time and through time. They are not "new textual discoveries" in the sense of some "new text type," but rediscoveries of a text type we already had and knew about. Thus they actually go to help show that which we always maintained. Their effect is to show how accurate e.g., Erasmus, Stephanus, and Beza were, to base the starting point of their Greek NT texts on representative Byzantine texts as determined from a relatively small sample of much later Byzantine Text manuscripts e.g., Erasmus's Greek texts were no earlier than the 12th century.

The work on the Received text in the 16th and 17th centuries was really just a fine-tuning of Erasmus's Greek NT text of (1516), which drew on a relatively small number of manuscripts, none of which were earlier than about the 12th century A.D. . The fact that the *Textus Receptus* can now be defended and determined through reference to much older Byzantine texts, such as e.g., *Codex Rossanensis*, from the late 5th or 6th century, in my opinion is a wonderful proof of how accurate the neo-Byzantines belief was in the preservation of the text over time and through time. *In general, if not in every instance, we should reasonably expect to find texts much earlier than the 12th century which confirms for us the work of the 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines working from these 12th century and later manuscripts.* Thus these later discoveries of earlier Byzantine texts from e.g., the 9th century (*Codex Cyprius*), or 8th century (*Codex*

Basilensis), or 6th century (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*), or 5th century (*Codex Freerianus* in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53; and *Codex Alexandrinus* in the Gospels), or other centuries, *is really exactly the sort of thing we always expected!*

Moreover, neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries knew that there were faulty texts circulating in ancient times. This was clear from e.g., Erasmus's rejection of the Alexandrian Text dating to the 4th century in Codex B 02 (*Codex Vaticanus*), or Beza's rejection of the Western Text dating to the 5th century in Codex D 05 (*Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*), named after Beza who once owned it. Think of it! Neo-Byzantines of the 16th century preferred a 12th century Byzantine Text over a 4th century Alexandrian Txt or 5th century Western Text! The idea "the oldest known text is the best text" was clearly and wisely rejected by them. *And time has proven them right!* Thus the later discoveries of earlier corrupt texts from e.g., the 4th century with *Codex Sinaiticus* and connected "rediscovery" of the Erasmus repudiated *Codex Vaticanus*, is once again *the very sort of thing we always expected!* There is thus stability to the *Textus Receptus* unmatched by the neo-Alexandrians. For we neo-Byzantines, truth is not relative, truth is absolute. The reader may therefore wish to ponder anew such things when he sees references to Dillmann's Ethiopic Version, remembering how important this text was to the neo-Alexandrian Tischendorf, and how unimportant it is to later neo-Alexandrians.

I have also used the United Bible Societies' (UBS) UBS 3rd (1975), 3rd corrected (1983), and 4th revised (1993) editions (Kurt Aland, Bruce Metzger, *et al*, *The Greek New Testament*, United Bible Societies, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, Germany, 1993); Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) (Kurt Aland, Bruce Metzger, *et al*, *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, Germany, 1993); and Metzger's (neo-Alexandrian critical) *Textual Commentary* (1971 & 1994) (Metzger, B.M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, first edition 1971, second edition 1994, United Bible Societies, Bibelgesellschaft / German Bible Society, Stuttgart, Germany).

I have also consulted Jay Green Sr.'s Burgonite Majority Text textual apparatus found in Green's *Interlinear Bible* (1986) (Green, J., Sr., *The Interlinear Bible*, Hendrickson, Massachusetts, USA, 2nd edition 1986). Composed by William Pierpont, Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) is used subject to the qualification that Pierpont did not factor into it a 10% error bar required by the generalist nature of von Soden's counting system. Nevertheless, in broad-brush terms it is a useful time-saving device that I use when its selections include a relevant verse.

Also of value has been the text of the Burgonites, Maurice Robinson and William Pierpont. Even though the Majority Text is a count of all Greek manuscripts, not just the Byzantine Text ones (i.e., in Robinson & Pierpont's K group selection taken from von Soden), because all others are a slim percentage well below five per cent of the total, in practice, the Majority Text equates the Byzantine Text¹⁸⁴. And where the Byzantine Text

¹⁸⁴ In von Soden's K group there are 983 manuscripts, of which 949 or c. 96.5% are Byzantine and 914 or c. 93% are exclusively Byzantine. Thus only about 3.5% of

is split, the Majority Text will always follow a sizeable Byzantine reading. Hence in practice it is clearly a Byzantine text. Thus if the Byzantine Text is fairly evenly divided between two readings, it will likewise be fairly evenly divided in their Majority Text. Hence Robinson & Pierpont's 1991 work is fairly entitled, *The New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform*, and their revised 2005 work is fairly entitled, *The New Testament in the ... the Byzantine Textform*. For the revised Volume 1 (2010), I have in Appendix 3 also gone over the readings again with Robinson's & Pierpont's 2005 edition. So too I have consulted Zane Hodges & Arthur Farstad's *The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text* (1982 & 1985) (whose Majority Text focuses on von Soden's K and I groups).

Hodges & Farstad's and Robinson & Pierpont's majority texts were basically constructed in Matthew to Jude from the data found in the work of Hermann Freiherr von Soden (1852-1911) (*Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in inhrer altesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, Germany, 1913), and in Revelation from the data in the work of Herman Hoskier (1864-1938) (*Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, Bernard Quaritch, London, UK, 1929). I most commonly use von Soden in a secondary manner through reference to the majority text work of Robinson & Pierpont, Hodges & Farstad, and Green's Textual Apparatus. However, between the time of Volume 1 (2008) and the Revised Volume 1 (2010), I photocopied the Sydney University copy of von Soden's four volumes (at c. 90% reduction) on double-sided A4 size sheets, and had the four volumes individually comb-bound with covers. With my own copy of this excellent resource, for the purposes of the Revised Volume 1 I have made a much more extensive usage of von Soden than I did for the original Volume 1 in order to isolate manuscripts for Received Text readings that are minority Byzantine readings. E.g., at Matt. 12:8 three such Greek manuscripts were located via von Soden, and I there note that, "It is possible that the 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantine reconstructed this Greek reading from the Latin ... of St. Jerome's Vulgate," "as indeed I did for the original Volume 1, before for the purposes of this revised volume 1 gaining knowledge of the three Greek manuscripts supporting it ... from von Soden."

Usually these Burgonites agree on the text count. E.g., at Matt. 5:39 Green's Majority Text textual apparatus says the texts are split in the 50%-50% range as to whether or not to include the TR's "thy (*sou*)" at Matt. 5:39b. Since the majority text approximates the majority Byzantine Text, this means the Byzantine Text is fairly evenly divided between these readings. Robinson and Pierpont's *The New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform* (1991) place "*sou*" in square brackets, indicating doubt as to its place in the text, and regarding its inclusion or omission as optional, or in *The New Testament in the ... the Byzantine Textform* (2005) place it in a side-note indicating the text is "significantly divided." Hodges and Farstad's *Greek NT According to the Majority Text*, puts *sou* in the main text, and says that while there is a

these are of no interest for the purposes of composing the Received Text. Even if on a given reading the number were to go as low as c. 93%, this would only double the non-Byzantine text count to 7%, and more than a good c. 90% would still be Byzantine Text.

major textual division, the manuscripts favour the inclusion of *sou* over its omission.

But less commonly, there is disagreement among textual apparatuses. E.g., at Matt. 9:27 and Matt. 11:16,17, Green's Majority Text textual apparatus says the texts are split in the 50%-50% range as to whether or not the texts read "Yie" or "Yios" (Matt. 9:27) and "*etairois* (fellows) or "*eterois* (others)" (Matt. 11:16). Since in practice the majority text is a near synonym for the majority Byzantine Text, this means the Byzantine Text is fairly evenly divided between these readings. Robinson and Pierpont's *The New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform*, says "Yie" is the majority reading, and does not give "Yios" as an alternative reading (Matt. 9:27); and says "*etairois*" is the majority reading, and does not give "*eterois*" as an alternative reading (Matt. 11:16). By contrast, Hodges and Farstad's *Greek NT According to the Majority Text*, goes the other way, putting *Yios* in the main text as the majority text reading, and saying that while there is a major textual division, the manuscripts favour *Yios* over *Yie* (Matt. 9:27); and putting *eterois* in the main text, and saying that while there is a major textual division, the manuscripts favour *eterois* over *etairois* (Matt. 11:16). Under the circumstances, Green's Textual Apparatus position is the safest. Indeed, in *The New Testament in the ... the Byzantine Textform* of 2005, (which I learnt of between the time of my Volume 1 and Revised Volume 1,) Robinson & Pierpont have now placed "*etairois* (fellows)" in a side-note indicating the text is "significantly divided."

However, where it is clear from such textual apparatuses that the majority text is fairly evenly split; and because the majority text approximates the majority Byzantine text therefore the majority Byzantine text is also fairly evenly split, I do not generally enter further discussion. Rather, in general, I simply state that about half the Byzantine manuscripts support one reading, and about half the other reading. This however is a general, not an absolute rule, as I may occasionally refer to such matters for some reason (e.g., commentary at Matt. 11:16,17; 11:23a). I may also sometimes directly consult von Soden's *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* (1913) i.e., the work upon which Green's Textual Apparatus, and both the majority texts of Hodges & Farstad and Pierpont & Robinson are all based. But factors of time constraint mean that I will generally just use these von Soden based works, and so use von Soden in a second-hand way, rather than, as is far less commonly the case, directly consulting von Soden in a first-hand way.

Though less frequently cited, I have also referred to other textual apparatuses, such as that of Nestle's 21st edition (Eberhard Nestle's *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Privileg. Wurt. Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, West Germany, for the American Bible Society of New York, USA, 1898, 21st edition, 1952); or Westcott and Hort's Greek NT (Westcott, B.F., & Hort, F.J., Macmillan, Cambridge University Press, UK, 1881). Swanson is also consulted (Swanson, R., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts, Variant readings ... against Codex Vaticanus*, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, England, UK, 1995). He is to be commended for including specific readings from the Byzantine Codex N 022 (6th century); since the textual apparatuses unfortunately give precious little detail on individual Byzantine manuscripts making up, for instance, the several thousands of Byzantine: unicals (in capital letters), minuscules (using lower case letters in a connected

form of running writing), and lectionaries (liturgically selected Scripture readings for church services), supporting the representative or majority Byzantine Text. The matter is complicated by the lack of photolithographic copies of Byzantine Texts. Sadly, the academic interest of the neo-Alexandrians who control the universities and influence publishers is not really in the Byzantine textual tradition, and this is reflected in the lack of published Byzantine material. But mercifully there are exceptions, and Codex N is such an exception. While this manuscript of the Gospels is incomplete, Swanson does not always cite it where he could e.g., Matt. 8:2. But as a general rule, I have gone straight to H.S. Cronin's very useful complete copy of Codex N to get my information on this Byzantine jewel (Robinson, J.A., Editor, *Texts and Studies*, Vol. V, No. 4, Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus, Cambridge University, UK, 1899).

Moreover, Swanson's usage of Family 1 & 13 manuscripts is not identical with that of the NU Text Committee. Like them, in Family 13 he includes a Byzantine reading found in parts of Minuscule 69 (15th century). I thus distinguish between *Family 1 and 13 Manuscripts* on the one hand; and on the other hand, *Family 1 and 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*. When unqualified reference is made to *Family 1 and 13 Manuscripts*, then I am referring to the itemization that one finds by the *NU Text Committee* either in Nestle-Aland (27th ed.) or UBS (3rd, 3rd corrected, or 4th ed.). If however my source is Swanson, then I include "(Swanson)" after this designation, and I itemize manuscripts used by Swanson that are also used by the NU Text Committee (in Family 1, Swanson omits e.g., the NU Text Committee's Minuscule 209 and adds Minuscule 118; meaning by this designation only Minuscules 1, 118, & 1582; and in Family 13, he omits e.g., the NU Text Committee's Minuscules 346, 543, 826, 828, and 983; but adds some, so that he means by this designation Minuscules 13, 69, 124, 788, & 1346). Thus when using Swanson as my source for Family 1 or 13 Manuscripts, I specifically name only those Minuscules that are also itemized by the NU Text Committee as belonging to one of these manuscript families.

Neo-Byzantines who support the Received Text of the NT, such as myself, can only look with regret on the fact that supporters of the Neo-Alexandrian School have control of the formally recognized forums of learning in Colleges or Universities, perhaps with the odd supporter of the Burgonite School in this or that Christian College; and supporters of the neo-Byzantine School generally do not have such a presence. It might be said in the tertiary Colleges or universities about Christ's Word, the Received Text, that which it was said of Christ in NT times, "Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him?" (John 7:48). Part of this regret is the fact that the neo-Alexandrian textual apparatuses do not specifically itemize readings from the Byzantine manuscript, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century). Fortunately though, a copy of this manuscript, containing most of the first two gospels, was published by Adolf von Harnack, and reprinted by Akademie Verlag in the late 20th century. I have thus been able to consult this fascinating and valuable Byzantine manuscript. (Harnack, A. von., *Die Überlieferung Der Griechischen Apologeten Des Zweiten Jahrhunderts in Der Alten Kirche Und Im Mittelalter*, Leipzig, 1882/3; reprint, Akademie Verlag GmbH, Berlin, Germany, 1991, ISBN 3-05-001822-4, Codex Purpureus Rossanensis, pp. 1-96 [pp. 19-376]).

This codex has been dated variously from the late fifth to the eight centuries¹⁸⁵. Guglielmo Cavallo shows that such a developed clerical codex could not be early than the late 4th century, whereas such polished craftsmanship could not be later than the end of the 6th or beginning of the 7th century. Then in fixing a narrower upper date than this, he observes that the script of *Codex Rossanensis* shows earlier stylistic features in its fluent drawing with sobriety, its light and shade which is unstressed in its alternation, and its drawing which is rather fluent. On this basis he rules out the early 7th century, and makes its upper date that of the 6th century. In fixing a lower date, he notes that Biblical capital letters (unicals) date from the 5th century; but he concludes that the usage in this codex of Biblical capital letters (unicals) and the upright ogival capitals (majuscules), requires a 6th century dating¹⁸⁶. In broad terms it is difficult to disagree with Cavallo's analysis. Nevertheless, I note that seemingly unknown to Cavallo, the *Cologne Papyrus*, number 175, shows that Biblical capital letters (unicals) were juxtaposed with ogival capitals (majuscules) in the 5th century¹⁸⁷. I thus consider *Codex Rossanensis* is best dated at the late 5th or 6th century.

Also of value has been Kurt Aland *et unum, The Text of the New Testament* (An Introduction to the Critical Editions & to the Theory & Practice of Modern Textual Criticism, translated by E.F. Rhodes, 2nd ed., Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1989); and Kurt Aland's *Kurzgefasste Liste Der Griechishchen Handschriften Des Neuen Testaments* (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, Germany, and New York, USA, 1994). I follow Kurt Aland's textual classifications in *The Text of the NT* (1989) which I take to be correct since I am not generally able to independently verify such things. This incorporates the problem that sometimes manuscripts are reclassified with respect to date or text-type, and I am not able to generally verify the accuracy of suchlike. E.g., Minuscule 69 was formerly regarded as "Pre-Caesarean" Text being part of the *Family 13 Manuscripts*¹⁸⁸. But with the demise of the theory of a "Caesarean" text type, further study came to the view that Minuscule 69 is independent text in the Pauline Epistles but Byzantine Text elsewhere¹⁸⁹. But while Minuscule 69 is classified by Aland as

¹⁸⁵ *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Encyclopedia Press, New York, USA, 1913, Vol. 13, p. 203.

¹⁸⁶ Cavallo, G., *Codex Purpureus Rossasensis*, Salerno Editrice, Rome, Italy, 1992 p. 69.

¹⁸⁷ Cockle, W.E.H., "P. Koln 4," Review of Kramer, B. *et al, Kolner Papyri*, Band 4, *Papyrologica Colonensia*, Vol. 7, in *Classical Review*, Vol. 35, No. 2, 1985, pp. 362-4, at p. 362

¹⁸⁸ Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, pp. xix-xx, xxix; Aland, K., *et unum, The Text of the NT* (translated by E.F. Rhodes, 1st edition, 1987, Eerdmans, Michigan, USA.), *op. cit.*, pp. 106 & 129 (thus classifying only Acts as Byzantine text).

¹⁸⁹ Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 2nd ed., 1994, pp. 6*-7*; Aland, K., *et unum, The Text of the NT* (1989), *op. cit.*, pp. 106 & 129 classifying 69 as "independent" in

independent text in the Pauline Epistles and Byzantine Text elsewhere, *supra*¹⁹⁰; from what I can tell of the relatively small sample I have examined in the Gospels, it is a mixed text type in Matthew and the early chapters of Mark (although I have not examined it beyond this).

Readings in Scrivener's, *The New Testament* (Cambridge University, 1881, Appendix, pp. 648-56) refers to variants from the Complutensian NT of 1514, Erasmus's editions of 1516, 1519, 1522, 1527, 1535, Stephanus's editions of 1546, 1549, 1550, and 1551, and Beza's editions of 1560, 1565, 1582, 1589, and 1598. I also now have the benefit of selections of *some* readings of Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598) and Elzevir (1633) as found in Scholz's *The Student's Analytical Greek Testament* (Bagster & Sons, London, 1894). When I refer to such readings, e.g., Stephanus's Greek NT (1550 & 1551) and Beza's Greek NT (1598), these works by Scrivener (1881), and Scholz (1894) are generally my secondary sources, and I have not usually checked the primary sources myself.

As discussed in Volume 2, after the original Volume 1, I gained ownership to my own copies of the 1516 and 1522 editions of Erasmus, which are thus also sometimes now featured in these commentaries¹⁹¹. And though I have not used it much for the revision purposes of Volume 1, of greater importance to future volumes, and to some extent in this revised Volume 1 (see Matt. 5:45 in Appendix 3), I now have a copy of Stephanus's 1550 text¹⁹². This replaces my former reliance on the readings in Stephanus's Greek NT (1550) found in an appendix to Tischendorf's *Novum Testamentum Graece* (2nd edition, Paris, 1842, "Lectiones Variantes").

I have also sometimes consulted Liddell & Scott (Henry Liddell and Robert Scott's *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 1843, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, UK, new ninth edition, 1940, with Supplement, 1996). So too, I have sometimes referred to the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968-82) (Editors P.G.W. Glare *et al* in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, UK, 1968-82).

For some of the old Latin Gospels, when not itemized in textual apparatuses, *supra*, I have found useful, the four gospel volumes of Adolf Julicher's and Kurt Aland's

"Paul[ine]" Epistles, "but" "elsewhere" "purely or predominantly Byzantine text."

¹⁹⁰ Preface section 1, "Textual Commentary Principles," section "* b) The Received Text (Latin, Textus Receptus)," subsection, "*ii) New Testament," citing Aland, K., *et unum, The Text of the NT*, 1989, *op. cit.*, pp. 106 & 129.

¹⁹¹ Textual Commentary Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Preface, "*Elzevir's 1624 Textual Apparatus."

¹⁹² Scrivener, F.H.A., *H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ Novum Testamentum Textus Stephanici A.D. 1550*, Deighton, Bell, & Co. Cambridge, and Whittaker & Co., London, 1877 (copy at Library of King's College, London University, UK).

Italia, Das Neue Testament (Walter De Gruyter & Co., Berlin, Germany, 1938-63). Augustine Merk's *Novum Testamentum* (Graece et Latine, 1933, Sumptibus Pontificii Instituti Biblici, Rome, 9th edition, 1964, see my comments on Merk's *Novum Testamentum, supra*), which uses as its main text, a revised Clementine Vulgate, has already been discussed, *supra*. While I used Merk's revised Clementine as the stated reading of the Clementine Vulgate for Volume 1, this changed from Vol. 2 on, and I now use as the stated reading Colunga and Turrado's Clementine Vulgate (Colunga, A., & Turrado, L., *Biblia Sacra*, Biblioteca de Autores Christianos, Matriti, 1965,) in conjunction with White & Wordsworth's textual apparatus on the Clementine for these purposes. And to help the internet user look up the Clementine for himself, unless otherwise stated, the Clementine text I employ shall conform to that used in Michael Tweedale's Electronic Internet Edition¹⁹³.

I have also consulted John Wordsworth and Henry White's *Nouum Testamentum Latine* (Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, UK, 1911), which uses as its main text, Saint Jerome's Vulgate. It is to this text that I have referred in isolating the NT reading of St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, and I also consult its textual apparatus on e.g., the Clementine. E.g., at Matt. 8:7, the Wordsworth & White edition lacks Latin, "Et (And)," at the beginning of the verse, and in this particular resembles the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron. But a rival Vulgate form includes "Et," and indeed it was adopted in the Clementine Vulgate. The Wordsworth & White textual apparatus is very useful for showing differences between the Vulgate's readings (4th / 5th centuries), and those of the Sixtinam Vulgate (1590) and Clementine Vulgate (1592). In this context, its textual apparatus is further useful for isolating some of the Latin texts behind some of these Latin readings.

Though I have consulted numerous Greek grammars, and reserve the right to sometimes refer the reader to one of these, there are three in particular that I sometimes refer the interested reader to. James H. Moulton's *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Vol. 1, 1906, 3rd ed. 1908; Vol. 2, J.H. Moulton & W.F. Howard, 1919-29; Vol. 3, N. Turner, 1963; Vol. 4, N. Turner, 1976; T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK), hereafter referred to as Moulton's *Grammar of NT Greek*, (cited in this commentary at e.g., Matt. 13:28,) is the least often referred to. Those who have studied Greek in their college / seminary / university days, may be interested to learn that the two most commonly cited Greek grammars are basically designed for second year Greek college students, and in this context I note that the Dr. Young of Young's *Greek, infra*, (who received his Doctorate from Bob Jones University, South Carolina, USA,) is *not* the same person as my old college teacher of Greek, Dr. Young (who received his Doctorate from Manchester University, England, UK). Though neither of these works are perfect, nevertheless, they are valuable as reference works. I refer to these two since for anyone who has studied Greek at college / seminary / university, they are generally readable and intelligible. Thus I find value in Daniel Wallace's *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (1996, Galaxie Software, Garland, Texas, USA), hereafter referred to as Wallace's *Greek*

¹⁹³ Michael Tweedale's Electronic Internet Edition, London, UK, 2005, (<http://vulsearch.source.forge.net/html/index.html>).

Grammar; and Richard Young's *Intermediate New Testament Greek* (1994, Broadman & Holman, Nashville, Tennessee, USA), hereafter referred to as Young's *Greek*.

As to some extent discussed in this commentary at Matt. 14:22a, I also sometimes refer the interested reader to Wheelock's *Latin* (Wheelock, F.M., *Latin Grammar*, 1956, 6th revised edition; Revised by Richard LaFleur, Harper-Collins, New York, USA, 2005).

Of great usefulness for consulting some of the ancient or mediaeval church writers, has been Jacques-Paul Migne's (1880-1875) *Patrologiae Curses Completus*, Series Graeca (Greek Writers Series), and Series Latina (Latin Writers Series)¹⁹⁴. As a Roman Catholic priest, Migne held a number of views that we Protestants would not agree with. Nevertheless, he also held a number of religious views that we Protestants would agree with, and this Frenchman exhibited many of the qualities Protestants think highly of. For these qualities, he incurred the wrath of the Roman Church. Whether one agrees or disagrees with his political views, Migne showed independence of thought by maintaining certain royalist political views contrary to the more democratic political views of his bishop, for which reason he fell out of favour with his bishop, and left his diocese of Orleans for Paris in 1833. He showed thrift, ingenuity, entrepreneurialism, and business skills, applied to a serious and non-frivolous task, by opening his own publishing house at Petit Montrouge in Paris, where he published various religious works. This led him to conflict with the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Paris, who was unhappy with the commercial aspect of Migne's work, and so suspended him from all priestly functions. Then Rome issued a decree condemning what it regarded as certain abuses, and named Migne as the chief offender. But neither the Roman Catholic Bishop of Orleans, Archbishop of Paris, nor the Pope of Rome, could stop or undo Migne's great publishing work, most especially, his *magnus opus*, *Patrologiae*.

A reprint of Migne was undertaken by *Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii*, Turnholt, Brepols, Belgium about 30 to 50 years ago. Migne's Greek Writers Series has recently been republished in facsimile form in the 1990s and 2000s, from various editions in *ELLENIKE PATROLOGIA* (*Patrologia Graeca*), Kentron Paterikon Ekdoseoēn (Centre for Patristic Publications), Athens, Greece. When either the Greek or Latin volumes of Migne are referred to, this is called, "Migne," followed by either "(Greek Writers Series)" or "(Latin Writers Series)." Since the Greek and Latin are two distinct sets, the volume numbers are used twice for many volumes, and so this reference to "Greek" or "Latin" is an important distinguisher. This is then followed in brackets by the 19th century edition, followed by "*PATROLOGIA*," together with relevant volume, pagination, and reference. E.g., at Matt. 8:8a, "St. Basil the Great in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1886 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 32, p. 352 (Epistle 42) (Greek)." An exception to this occurs with references to Gregory. Since a special feature of these commentaries from the time of Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20) on, and so including this revised Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) are citations of Gregory the Great from

¹⁹⁴ "Migne" is a French name, pronounced, "Marnya," in which the final "a" sound is pronounced in a very short or staccato fashion.

Migne, these are stated simply as a volume and page number, e.g., in the Preface Chart of “Scripture Citations of Bishop Gregory the Great in Matt. 1-14,” *supra*.

Also of value, and referred to, e.g., at Matt. 8:8a, are the English translations, usually Editor Philip Schaff’s (1819-1893) *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, or *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, first or second series (although they must be used with some caution as the accuracy of their English translations is of an uneven standard; and they inconsistently do not always enclose a Biblical quote in inverted commas). These very useful volumes from the late 19th century, were reprinted by Eerdmans (Michigan, USA) over several decades from the 1950s. However these and other English translations are only a small portion of what is contained in Migne, and this together with time constraints in trying to find an English translation means often only Migne will be cited.

I also sometimes make reference to the English translations of Tyndale (1526 & 1534), Cranmer (1539), the *Geneva Bible* (1557), the *Geneva Bible* (1560), and less commonly, Wycliffe (1380). The *Great Bible* is so named because it was 15 inches (38 cm) long and 9 inches (23 cm) wide. It was first published in 1539 by special command of His Majesty, King Henry VIII (Regnal Years: 1509-1547), as a key element of the first stages of the English Reformation; and in this context, it bore the Preface of the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer. Thus because of this Preface, the *Great Bible* is also known as *Cranmer’s Bible*; though it was no more translated by Cranmer than the King James Version was translated by King James. If Luther is the first man of the Reformation, and Calvin the second, then at least for Anglicans, Cranmer is regarded as the third man of the Reformation. Cranmer was a Marian martyr (martyred at Oxford, 1556), killed by the Roman Catholic queen, Bloody Mary, for his embrace of Protestantism. In memory of this great saint of God, I have followed the Hexapla, *infra*, in referring to the Great Bible as “Cranmer (1539).”

Other than Tyndale (1526) and the *Geneva Bible* (1560), these Bible editions come from *The English Hexapla* (1841, Samuel Bagster, London, UK; which also contains a copy of the Rheims-Douay NT, 1582, which like Wycliffe’s Version, is translated from the Latin). On my fifth trip to London (Sept. 08-March 09) I acquired a copy of Tyndale’s New Testament of 1526 which was on sale in the bookshop of the British Library¹⁹⁵. The *Geneva Bible* (1560) comes from the 1969 Facsimile edition (Wisconsin University Press, Wisconsin, USA). When quoting these editions, I may modernize the English spelling without specifically saying so. E.g., at Matt. 5:31 I say, “Tyndale in 1534 (‘It is said, Whosoever’ etc.), Cranmer in 1539 (‘It is said, whosoever’ etc.), ... the Geneva Bible in 1557 (‘It is said, whosoever’ etc.),” and the “Geneva Bible of 1560 ... ‘It hath been said also (*de*), Whosoever etc.” Before modernizing the English spelling, *The English Hexapla*, reads for Tyndale (1534), “It ys sayd, Whosoever;” for Cranmer (1539), “It is sayd, whosoouer;” and for the Geneva Bible (1539), “It is sayd, wosoouer;” and the Geneva Bible (1560) reads, “It hathe bene said also, Whosoouer” etc.

¹⁹⁵ *The New Testament*, Translated by William Tyndale, The text of the Worms edition of 1526 original spelling; edited for the Tyndale Society by W.R. Cooper with a Preface by David Daniell, The British Library, London, UK, 2000 (ISBN 07123-4664-3).

. But my interest in quoting these versions does not relate to such changes in English spelling, and so I modernize them where appropriate without specifically stating so at the time.

Though he was born 145 years before me, Constantine von Tischendorf (1815-1874) and I, share the same birthday; marked in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) as a black letter day, namely, St. Prisca's Day. (Prisca was a Christian Roman lady, martyred under imperial pagan Rome in the third century). I have often referred to Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72).

On the down side, Tischendorf, the discoverer of the Alexandrian Text, London Sinaiticus, did a great deal of damage to the truth of God as set forth in the Received Text. In 1844 he put his hand down a trash can, and found some dirty old Greek manuscripts at a Greek Orthodox Monastery in Arabia. He returned there in 1859, and was given the booby-prize of London Sinaiticus. Like Karl Lachmann's Greek NT (1831) before him, Tischendorf Greek NT text failed to recognize the teaching of the Divine preservation of Holy Writ, and so treated Greek NT manuscripts as he would treat uninspired Greek and Latin classics, applying to both alike the same textual rules he thought best. But on the up side, Tischendorf included a fairly comprehensive textual apparatus, whose detail on TR readings remains extremely useful to this day, and I have valuably consulted it a lot.

This same type of dichotomy is true for von Soden's work. Indeed, with the qualified exception of Majority Text works (which maintain a Burgonite belief in the Divine preservation of the Majority Text, as opposed to a historical Protestant belief in the Divine preservation of the Received Text,) none of these Greek NT works recognize the religiously conservative teaching of the Divine Preservation of Holy Writ. Though religiously liberal works, they may nevertheless be profitably consulted in the same way St. Jerome says the OT Apocrypha may be consulted i.e., by sifting the smaller amount of gold from the larger amount of dross. In fairness to them it must be said that their textual apparatuses contain a goldmine of valuable information. I only wish that an edition of the Received Text existed with a comprehensive textual apparatus incorporating all relevant variants, that could compare with Tischendorf's and von Soden's ones.

This commentary is intended for the widest possible usage. Hence e.g., the letters familiar to English readers are generally used, rather than Greek letters. I usually transliterate the Greek into English letters, and may do so even when discussing textual analysis (e.g., Matt. 6:25). (See "Transliterations of Greek letters into English letters," *supra*).

When I use a Greek script it generally approximates that generally found in Greek NT's published in modern times (though without the breathings) i.e., lower case letters are generally used (e.g., Matt. 1:25). Occasionally, a Greek script is required for textual analysis (e.g., I Tim. 3:16¹⁹⁶). As seen by the Rylands' Fragment of St. John's Gospel

¹⁹⁶ Burgon, J.W., *The Revision Revised*, John Murray, London, UK, 1883, pp.

(from Egypt), which shows parts of John 18 (Papyrus P 52; John Rylands Library, Manchester, England, UK, c. 135 A.D. +/- 5 years), capital letters (also called “unicals”) were sometimes used (see commentary at John 18:31-33,37,38), with spacing between the words; on a page, written on both sides. The capital “S” (sigma), which in modern Greek script looks like “Σ” is written as “C;” sometimes the capital Alpha is written as an “A” and sometimes something like a larger form of “α” (with a sloped taller right hand bar, that makes it look like something in between “A” and “α”). By contrast, Manuscript Washington (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), though written in capital letters (and likewise using “C” for capital sigma), lacks any spacing between the words (other than for stylistic paper spaces). It is also clear that this handwritten document is sometimes neater and easier to read, and sometimes harder to read. So too, the purple parchment Byzantine Text’s *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae* (6th century, Tirana, Albania; St. Matthew’s & St. Mark’s Gospels) is written in capitals / unicals in continuous script. The comments I make about ellipsis are even more acute and likely, if the manuscript being used is like *Codex Freerianus* or *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae*, and lacking spacing between the words.

On the reconstructions I make, whether in a modern lower case Greek script, or transliterating into English letters, I may put spacing between the words. But the reader should be aware that possibly no such spacing existed in the original, so that the instances of ellipsis I refer to may have been an even easier mistake to make than I state where I do not use continuous script. The reader should also be aware that the original was quite probably in capital letters. Nevertheless, I use transliterated English letters, or very occasionally I might use a lower case modern Greek script, so long as such factors do not impair the basic stylistic analysis I undertake. Unless otherwise specified, I consider the script I use to be *close enough* to what is required, to make the basic point of textual analysis for my purposes. Sometimes I may use capital letters without spacing to highlight a point (e.g., Matt. 6:34).

God has given different “spiritual gifts” (I Cor. 12:1) to different members of Christ’s body, the church. “For the body is not one member, but many” (I Cor. 12:14). On the one hand, I have tried to write this commentary in a way that allows as many brethren as possible to understand it. But on the other hand, I do not thereby wish to suggest that all, or even most brethren, have the skills of a neo-Byzantine textual analyst.

There are three levels of perception. The first level are those, who by the grace of God, understand how to compose the Received Text. Such are the 16th and early 17th centuries class of textual scholars found in men like Beza, the Elzevirs, and the King James translators. The second level are those, who by the grace of God, can understand the argument once it is presented to them, even though they cannot form the argument themselves. The third level are those who, lacking any element of this gift, can neither compose the TR, nor understand the argument for its composition, even when it is

98-105,424-7. Though his style is convoluted, I agree with his basic conclusion on how the text should read, and consider that this is one of Burgon’s better textual analyses.

explained to them. But even such persons on this third level may have the Holy Ghost confirm to them the accuracy of the *Textus Receptus* and the Authorized Version, through understanding and conviction of the Biblical doctrine of the Divine Preservation of Holy Writ (Matt. 5:18; I Peter 1:25).

Within these important qualifications, there is a sense in which this commentary is interactive with the reader if this is what he desires. Thus having given my reasons, in stating the rating “I would give” a reading, I allow the reader to think through the issues, and if he possess the requisite gifts, then humbly relying upon Almighty God, to make up his own mind, as to what *he would give* the reading, if he so wishes. Whether or not he does this, he knows how I arrived at this decision.

A textual commentary is necessarily selective. I have not discussed all variants. Generally, my selections tend towards those readings where the TR and neo-Alexandrian texts, most especially the contemporary NU Text as found in Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and the UBS 4th revised edition (1993), are in disagreement. Or where a more serious discussion appears to have occurred among members of NU Text Committees, as to whether or not the reading in the NU Text should follow the TR. But I also include other variants e.g., some discussion where the TR which was largely based on the 5th edition of Beza’s Text, decided not to follow Beza’s text.

So too, I have also sometimes included a variant due to its relationship to the Latin underpinning the Roman Catholic *Douay-Rheims Version* (1582 & 1609/10), such as Matt. 8:9. It should be remembered that the Protestant defence of the Received Text is nothing new. Before the Roman Catholic Church’s *Vatican Two Council* (1962-5), the Latin Church claimed that the Latin textual tradition (whether derived from textual analysis of Jerome’s Vulgate, Vulgate Codices, old Latin Versions, ancient or mediaeval Latin church writers, or manifested in the Clementine Vulgate), was superior to the Greek Text of the NT Received Text. Thus the Protestant-Roman Catholic debate on text types, centred around which was more accurate, the Authorized King James Version translated into English from the Hebrew (and Aramaic) Old Testament and Greek New Testament; or the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version translated into English from the Latin. In this battle, the name of “King James” (Regnal Years:1603-1625) stood as an *English speaking British* Protestant leader, being Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Ireland, on the *King James Version* translated from the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek; in contradistinction to the Clementine, being named after Pope Clement (Pope: 1592-1605), or the name of the *Douay-Rheims Version*, being named after the *foreign* Roman Catholic *French speaking* cities of Douay (Douai) and Rheims (Reims) in France, and translated from the Latin.

Unfortunately, there are so many variants, that textual analysis of all of them is not reasonably possible for me. However, I have still made a much wider and more detailed selection than e.g., the UBS NT textual commentary (1971, 1994), and a sufficient number in my first volume of Matthew 1-14 (2008 & 2010) and second volume of Matt. 15-20 (2009) to make the point that the TR is not only a trustworthy and reliable text; but the very best text available.

The work that I am, by the grace of God, undertaking, is encyclopaedic in nature and scope, and an important reference work for anyone looking at the TR i.e., they may largely use it on a verse by verse basis; although they may also choose to read through larger parts of it, or all of it, to better understand the *Textus Receptus*. *The choice is each individual reader's*. With regard to neo-Alexandrian texts such as the NU Text, it should also be understood that they have an unstable nature. Certain readings are regarded by different neo-Alexandrian advocates quite differently over time. This changing and variable nature of the neo-Alexandrian texts is writ large in the fact that the most recent UBS edition is the UBS 4th revised edition (1993), indicating a number of changes within the UBS text over time from previous editions; and the number of editions is even greater with the Nestle's edition, which since Nestle's 1st edition (1898) is now up to the Nestle-Aland 27th edition (1993). Such fluctuations over time among neo-Alexandrians as to exactly where and why they disagree with the Received Text, means that in dealing with a neo-Alexandrian Text, one is dealing with a slippery text that can change *yet again* whenever a new edition comes out; or can have *rival* editions circulating e.g., one neo-Alexandrian Text advocate might say he prefers the Nestle 21st edition (1952), and another may say he prefers the Nestle-Aland 27th edition (1993). This instability and confusion as to the precise reading of "the" neo-Alexandrian Text, when in fact there are a multiplicity of neo-Alexandrian texts, means that I consider wherever a more serious discussion appears to have occurred as to the reading of a neo-Alexandrian text, especially the NU Text, then it is desirable to discuss the TR reading and relevant variant or variants, since one cannot be sure where a new neo-Alexandrian Text will go in the future, or how neo-Alexandrian Text translations will use the NU Text data.

In dealing with this unstable feature of neo-Alexandrian texts, I thus also make reference to some classic neo-Alexandrian critical texts of yesteryear, namely, Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, together with the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). I.e., the NU Text *et al*.

A Textual Commentary such as this is necessarily selective, though I have sought to include all relevant readings when the issue of English translation is at stake. A Table of instance where Scrivener's Text does not in fact represent the TR of the AV, is found in Appendix 1 of each volume. Minor variants in the neo-Alexandrian Texts from the TR (or e.g., Beza's Text from the TR, since the TR was largely based on Beza's text of 1598), not affecting, or not necessarily affecting, the English translation are not generally discussed in the main part of this textual commentary. However an exception to this is sometimes made. For instance, though in Matt. 5 the AV translates both "*os an*" (Matt. 5:21,31) and *pas o* (Matt. 5:22,28) as "whosoever," so that there is no necessary difference in Matt. 5:32 from "*os an*" (TR) to "*pas o*" (NU Text), nevertheless, the AV's "whosoever" is changed in the e.g., ASV ("every one that") and NRSV ("anyone who") and this variant is discussed in the main part of this commentary.

The variants not affecting the English translation in Appendix 3 of Volume 1 & 2, might normally be passed over in a textual commentary. (Though not perhaps *genesis* or *genesis* at Matt. 1:18, which is an example of where a variant does not *necessarily* affect the translation, although if a translator wanted to, he could produce a different translation from it than what one finds in the AV based on the TR). But I include a sample of them, because I think they are important for better understanding the broader context of the NT text in general. They may also be important at the point of understanding the underpinning Greek nuance, even if this does not impact on the English translation. I have included some of them, though not in the same depth, in a list forming Appendix 3 of Volumes 1 and 2. However, this is only a selection; and for these purposes, in Vol. 1 inside Matt. 1-14, I have selected the first ten chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel for more detailed consideration, one chapter for each of the *Ten Commandments*. Though I will continue to discuss a *selection* of such more minor textual variants when I think it appropriate to do so from Matt. 11 onwards, this will not be as comprehensive as Matt. 1-10. Moreover, within this framework I have given greater detail on optional letters in the first seven chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, one chapter for each of the seven creation days (Gen. 1:2b-2:3; Exod. 20:11).

6) *The Motto of the Lutheran Reformation.*

Under God, the Duke of Saxony, Frederick the Wise, was Martin Luther's earthly protector. The first stage of the Reformation, also known as the Lutheran Reformation, proceeded in Germany because the Duke of Saxony and a number of his fellow German Protestant princes were prepared to do what the King had not done for John Huss of Bohemia, and support Luther. A similar thing happened in England with Henry VIII being prepared to support Cranmer, and so the Devils' hatred is focused on seeking to criticize Henry VIII in an unbalanced manner, that fails to give a fair overview of the man. While I do not claim he was perfect, and would criticize certain things he did myself, nevertheless, I thank God for Henry VIII, and also for Frederick the Wise, for without their backing Luther and Cranmer respectively would have fared no better than Huss.

I visited the Castle Church at Luthertown-Wittenberg (German: *Lutherstadt-Wittenberg*) in 2002. Work on the larger castle housing the church, was commenced by the Prince Elector, Frederick the Wise in 1489, and the church was completed in 1511. It was to the door of this church that Luther nailed his 95 Theses on the Eve of All Saints' Day in 1517. Among other things, the Church contains a statute of Frederick the Wise humbly kneeling in prayer, that dates from Luther's time. It also has another statue of Frederick the Wise holding up a sword, that was probably made around 1537. This Church also has the tombs of Luther and Melancthon.

Saint Jerome's Latin Vulgate reads at I Peter 1:25, "*Verbum* (the word) *autem* (but) *Domini* (of the Lord) *manet* (it endureth) *in* (into) *aeternum* (everlasting)" (i.e., *in aeternum* = forever), that is, "But the word of the Lord endureth forever." In 1522, Frederick the Wise adopted the Latin Motto, "*Verbum* (The word) *Domini* (of the Lord) *Manet* (endureth) *in Aeternum* (forever)." This was sometimes abbreviated through its

initials, V.D.M.I.AE. (or V.D.M.I.A.) e.g., Frederick the Wise had these letters sewn onto the right sleeve of the court's official clothing. It thereafter became the Motto of the Smalcadic League, used on e.g., banners, flags, and swords. It represented a key element of the Protestant Reformation, and so came to be used by the other Lutheran princes. Hence it became the Motto of the Lutheran Reformation.

The belief in the Divine preservation of Holy Writ that this Motto embraces, celebrates, and proclaims, is thus an irreducible element of the Protestant Reformation from its very outset. This belief means that not simply the autographs of Scripture, but the apographs of the Received Text are reliable. Thus the Protestants of the 16th century, realizing that God's text could be composed in any age, happily used 12th and later century Greek manuscripts. They were quite right to do so. Though these first two volumes of the commentary show we have since gotten access to much older manuscripts, it also shows that no change in the *Textus Receptus* is warranted in Matt. 1-14 (Revised Volume 1) or Matt. 15-20 (Vol. 2). I shall use this wonderful motto of the Lutheran Reformation, "*Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum*," throughout my commentary volumes. E.g., it is my intention that it will stand on the title page of every volume.

7) Degrees of degradation in some of the modern revisions.

While there are many "new versions" in English, all degraded relative to the AV, I shall here limit my comments to a sample of them to make the basic points. The issue of how degraded a version is relative to another degraded version, is not always easily and quickly gauged. Is the NIV less degraded than the NRSV, because the NIV upholds the Messianic Promise of Isa. 7:14 and Dan. 9:24-27, whereas the NRSV does not? Are the NIV and NRSV equally degraded since neither of them upholds the Messianic Promise of Micah 5:2? Is the NIV more degraded than the NRSV because e.g., at Matt. 12:6 the NRSV more accurately translates the erroneous neo-Alexandrian text than does the NIV (see commentary at Matt. 12:6)? Is the NIV more degraded than the NRSV because e.g., at Matt 12:4 the NRSV is more accurate than the NIV (see commentary at Matt. 12:4)? As seen by these types of comparisons and contrasts between the NIV and NRSV, it is clear that the issue of to what degree one version may be degraded relative to another degraded version, is not always as simple to work out as it may at first appear.

The NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV, all trace their lineage back through the ASV, which is a revision of the AV (via the RV). Consideration of this family of versions, from the grandfather ASV, through its two sons, the NASB and RSV, and grandsons via the RSV to the NRSV and ESV, shows an ever increasing degradation of Holy Scripture. Some consideration will also be made to the NKJV, which is also a revision of the AV.

The ASV's NT denied the superiority of the neo-Byzantine Received Text, and like all these neo-Alexandrian versions followed an inferior text. Like the originating Alexandrian Text, the neo-Alexandrian texts debase the NT by downplaying certain doctrines. Let the reader consider the following incomplete list of examples of where those of the modern neo-Alexandrian School have followed those of the ancient

Alexandrian School in pruning parts of Scripture. E.g., the removal of “through his blood” in Col. 1:14 downplays the atonement. This is a downplay of the teaching that Christ “suffered for our salvation” (*Athanasian Creed*); that it was, “For us men, and for our salvation” that “he suffered” (*Nicene Creed*); and hence the meaning of why, he “suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried” (*Apostles’ Creed*)¹⁹⁷.

There is nothing intrinsically wrong with referring to St. Joseph and St. Mary as the “parents” of Jesus, since Joseph was Jesus’ foster-father, and indeed reference in the TR at Luke 2:41. The Lucian qualification of Luke 3:23, “Jesus” “as was supposed” “the son of Joseph,” is contextually important. However, the corporate effect of first changing of “Joseph and his mother” (TR) to “his father and his mother” in Luke 2:33, and likewise “Joseph and his mother” (Luke 2:43) (AV & TR) to “his parents,” where two passages seem to go out of their way to say “Joseph and his mother” not “Joseph and Mary” so as to reinforce the virgin-birth, has the effect that Luke 2:33,43 in the neo-Alexandrian texts can be developed to try and deny the virgin birth, even though it does not have to be used this way. This downplays the teaching that the Son of God was “conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary” (*Apostles’ Creed*), or “was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary” (*Nicene Creed*). The words, “according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ” are removed in Acts 2:30, or his resurrection appearances in Mark 16:9-12 are either excised from Scripture, or doubt is cast upon them, thus downplaying the resurrection, i.e., “the third day he rose again” (*Apostles’ Creed & Nicene Creed*).

The danger of hell “fire” is downplayed (Mark 9:44,45b,46), thus downplaying one element in the realization that Christ “descended into hell” (*Apostles’ & Athanasian Creeds*). The Messianic Promise is downplayed by e.g., removing Mark 15:28; thus downplaying the teaching, “I believe in the Holy Ghost” (*Apostles’ Creed & Nicene Creed*), “who spake by the prophets” (*Nicene Creed*). “God” who “was manifest in the flesh” (I Tim. 3:16) is removed; and so the Divinity of Christ downplayed. Indeed, the entire Trinity upheld in all three creeds, *Apostles’*, *Athanasian*, and *Nicene*, is downplayed by the wicked removal of I John 5:7,8a.

The *Ten Commandments* are also downplayed. The sixth commandment is downplayed with the removal of “murders” (Gal. 5:21). The seventh commandment is downplayed with the removal of references to “fornication” (Rom. 1:29) and “adultery” (Gal. 5:19). The ninth commandment is removed from Rom. 13:9, “Thou shalt not bear false witness.”

Both an entire verse on the proper use of prayer in Matt. 17:21 (see Commentary Vol. 2 on Matt. 17:21); and an entire verse on the misuse of prayer in Matt. 23:14, are

¹⁹⁷ Article 7 of the Anglican *39 Articles* rightly says, “The three creeds, *Nicene Creed*, *Athanasius’s Creed*, and that which is commonly called the *Apostles’ Creed*, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture.”

omitted. This downplays the importance of prayer in the Christian's life. Perhaps then we ought not to be surprised, that the *Lord's Prayer* itself is attacked, with the doxology removed in Matt. 6:13.

While the neo-Alexandrian texts are worse on such matters than the Burgonite Majority Text, the latter of these is also a debasement of the Received Text. E.g., as seen by the NKJV's footnote, it too removes the blood from Col. 1:14, or the Trinity from I John 5:7,8.

The OT's Received Text is constructed on the same basic principles as the NT's TR. E.g., inside the closed class of OT sources, "dwell" in Ps. 23:6 was preserved in an Aramaic Targum, the Greek Septuagint, and Latin Vulgate (and outside the closed class of OT sources it is found in the Syriac Version). This reading is to be preferred over the Masoretic Hebrew reading of "return." But the number of such instances of repair work to the Masoretic Hebrew Text in the OT's TR is far less than the number of such instances of repair work to the representative Byzantine Text in the NT's TR. The modern versions also follow inferior OT texts, denying the OT Received Text (e.g., Isa. 54:9, NASB & S. of Sol. 8:6, NASB & NKJV footnote).

While we Protestants reject the sacramentalist abuse found in e.g., the Roman Church, we nevertheless uphold the true teaching of the sacraments of Baptism and Communion, which I maintain are God given symbols to be used and not abused. We are historically better known as those opposing an over-focus on the sacraments, with e.g., the idolatrous usage of the Lord's Supper by Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, or Puseyite Anglicans. E.g., the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* (29:6), Congregational *Savoy Declaration* (30:6), and *Baptist Confession* (30:6) are undoubtedly correct in saying that "transubstantiation" "is the cause" "of gross idolatries." So too, the Dutch Reform *Heidelberg Catechism* (1563) says that the "Mass is" "a denial of the one sacrifice and suffering of Jesus Christ and a condemnable idolatry" (Question & Answer 80). Or in striking down both transubstantiation and consubstantiation (the latter of which Lutheran Protestants believe in, although they do not use it to commit idolatry with the sacramental bread and wine as the Puseyite Anglicans adhering to consubstantiation do), the *Church of England Book of Common Prayer* (1662), says in the Final Rubric of "The Communion Service," "That ... no adoration ... ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine, there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very substances, and therefore must not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and 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."

However, the other side to the coin is that we must sometimes also defend the sacraments of Baptism and Communion against anti-sacramentalists, who in various ways also attack these God given ordinances of the new covenant. In this we follow in the footsteps of St. Paul and St. Sosthenes (I Cor. 1:1), who as "the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries (Greek, *musterion*; Latin, *mysteriorum* or *sacramentum*) of

God” (I Cor. 4:1), defended the sacraments of Baptism (I Cor. 1:10-17) and Communion (I Cor. 11:18-34).

The neo-Alexandrian Greek texts remove the final “Amen” at the institution of the ordinance of Christian baptism in Matt. 28:18-20. They further undermine the institution of this Christian sacrament by removing, or casting aspersions upon, Mark 16:9-20, which contains the words of Mark 16:12,16, “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every [human] creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.”

So too, the ordinance of the Lord’s Supper is downplayed in the neo-Alexandrian texts. The words of institution of this sacrament are pruned down, so that “new” is removed in Matt. 26:28 and Mark 14:24; “eat” is removed from Mark 14:22; “take eat” is removed from I Cor. 11:24; and “broken” is removed from I Cor. 11:24. See also “testament,” *infra*.

Thus the first degree of debasement occurs in the NT neo-Alexandrian or Burgonite Majority text itself; and (though far less frequent than NT departures from the TR,) departures from the OT Received Text. Hence the ASV based on a neo-Alexandrian text of Westcott and Hort, or the NKJV based on the Burgonite Majority Text, was necessarily a debasement from the neo-Byzantine NT *Textus Receptus* and also OT *Textus Receptus* and /or associated translation of the them in the Authorized Version.

A second degree of debasement was the AV’s loss of literary beauty. It uses assonance and alliteration well, in simple yet elegant language. The AV is a great piece of English literature; and this has not been matched, or even come close to, in any subsequent “revisions.”

A number of English translations simply *do not translate into English*. E.g., in English the singular is “cherub” (Exod. 25:19) and the plural is “cherubims” (Exod. 25:18). Yet the plural form found in modern versions of “cherubim” (Exod. 25:18, NRSV) leaves it in an untranslated state. The “im” ending may be a plural in Hebrew, *but it is not a plural in English*. As for Moffatt’s “kherub” and “kherubs” (Exod. 25:18,19, Moffatt Bible), though it at least uses an English plural ending, what is it but an unnecessary, unwarranted, and undesirable attempt to reinvent the English language?

What is the “Sheol” of so many modern versions (e.g., Ps. 16:10, NKJV), but an untranslated Hebrew word? It is this inability to translate that also gives them strange phobias about “Jehovah.” In *the context of reading an English translation* (I do not say in all contexts,) I do not generally care that the Hebrew is “YHWH” or “YHVH” (although in some Bible study contexts the matter may be relevant). It does not interest me to hear someone’s theory that “‘YaHWeH’ is more Hebraic” when I am reading my Bible, or listening to it read in public by a man (which is clearly an incorrect theory anyway, as seen in this very Hebraic vocalization of “YeHoWaH” or “YeHoVaH” used by the Jews in the Hebrew Masoretic Text at e.g., Exod. 6:3 and Isa. 11:2, although I note that the vocalization is different in the *Codex Leningrad* Text of *Biblia Hebraica*

Stuttgartensia). I speak and read in English, not Hebrew (other than when I am specifically studying the OT in Hebrew). And from the time of the Reformation we Protestants have transliterated “YHWH” or “YHVH” into the Anglicized form, Jehovah, in harmony with the vowel vocalization in the Hebrew Masoretic Text. In English, when we talk of the OT name of God, it is “Jehovah.” On the one hand, the clear usage of “Lord” or “God” for this Hebrew form in the NT means that we should normally render it “Lord,” as in the AV’s OT, and unlike the ASV’s OT which with great excess uses “Jehovah” throughout. But on the other hand, some usage of this form is found in the NT, primarily in the “ia” ending of the fourfold “Alleluia” of Rev. 19:1,3,4,6 (“Praise Jah”); and secondarily, in such names as “Elias” or “Elijah.” Thus I support the types of balance evident in the King James translators’ policy of a sparing use. I do not say the number of times “Jehovah” is used in the OT has to be exactly seven times as in the KJV, but this basic idea is manifested in the AV’s sevenfold use of “Jehovah” (Gen. 22:14; Exod. 6:3; 17:15; Judg. 6:24; Isa. 12:2; 26:4), and its usage of “Jah” in the Psalms (Ps. 68:4).

A third degree of debasement occurs with the downplaying of the OT Messianic Promise. Thus e.g., the ASV first put the heretical Arian view of Micah 5:2 in a footnote reading, and then this Arian interpretation was placed in the main text of the RSV, NRSV, and ESV.

A fourth degree of debasement occurred in the many unwarranted “corrections” to the text of e.g., the RSV, also evident in, for instance, the OT of the NIV. A fifth degree of debasement, found in NKJV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV, is the removal of the distinction between “you” singular (thee, thou, thy) and “you” plural (you, ye, your).

A sixth degree of debasement, found in NKJV, ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV, has to do with carefulness of translation. This matter cannot now be discussed in depth. But let us consider here one matter, relevant to the words of institution of the Lord’s Supper, and the reading of associated passages when in manifestation of “the communion of saints” (*Apostles’ Creed*) i.e., the fellowship of believers (I John 1:7), there is the celebration of Holy Communion. Here the AV’s “testament” or “covenant” used in the NT, has been generally replaced by just “covenant” in the new versions. E.g., at I Cor. 11:25, “This cup is the new testament in my blood” (AV) etc., becomes “This cup is the covenant in my blood” (ASV). This has led to a discernable difference in the words used in Communion services, in those churches following new versions such as e.g., the NKJV or ESV

The Greek word *diatheke* can mean covenant or testament. Let us consider Heb. 9:15-20. Whilst a covenant and a testament are two different things, they have one point of important commonality, namely, that they are legal documents which take effect from a specific event. In the case of a (last will and) testament, this is at the testator’s death. In the case of a covenant, this is at the time specified in the terms of the covenant. Notably, both the Old and New Covenants became operative from, and were ratified by, the spilling of blood at specified deaths. In the case of the Jewish Old Covenant, this ratification occurred when Holy Moses took the blood of animals sacrificed in

accordance with the old covenant, and sprinkled it on the altar and the Book of the (Old) Covenant (Exod. 24:6-8). In the case of the Christian New Covenant, this occurred with the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ (Matt. 25:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20 ; I Cor. 11:25).

Therefore, whilst the Bible makes reference to a number of different covenants, and most of these did not take effect from the spilling of blood at a specified death, the fact that both the Old Covenant inaugurated by Moses, and the New Covenant inaugurated by Jesus Christ did contain such specifications, means that there is a sense in which these Old and New Covenants can be referred to as the Old and New Testaments respectively. And indeed this is relevant to understanding Heb. 9:15-20, where Greek *diatheke* can mean either a covenant or a testament.

Because the Hebrew Scriptures contain (amongst other things) the Old (Jewish) Covenant, and the Greek Scriptures contain (amongst other things) the New (Christian) Covenant, it is reasonable for theological and stylistic reasons, to refer to them generically as the “Old” and “New Covenants” respectively. But there is a sense in which the first or old “covenant” (Heb. 9:15) can be referred to as the first or old “testament” (Heb. 9:15,18), i.e., the blood of the sacrifices pointed to the blood of Christ, and so symbolized his death with an actual typical death of an animal; and the new “covenant” (Heb. 9:15) can be referred to as the new “testament” (Heb. 9:15), in the blood of Christ. Thus their covenantal terms mean that like a (last will and) testament, they both took effect from the shedding of blood at specified deaths, the first typifying Christ’s death, the second fulfilling such imagery with the actual death of Christ (Heb. 9:15-20). Therefore it follows that the traditional designations “Old Testament” (OT) and “New Testament” (NT) may properly be retained.

It also follows, that because of the importance of the shedding of blood to the new covenant, for “without shedding of blood” there “is no remission” of sins (Heb. 9:22), the translation “testament” may be used interchangeably with “covenant” in the NT. This type of balance is found in the AV. This uses “testament” in the context of “blood” in Matt. 26:28; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20; I Cor. 11:25. It further uses “testament” in the context of a contrast between “the old testament” (I Cor. 3:14) and “new testament” (I Cor. 3:6), where the context is “the reading of the old testament,” since the reference is really to Old testament Scriptures containing the old testament or old covenant, in contrast with “the new testament.” The importance of the interchangeability of these terms in Heb. 9:15-20, warrants some use of “testament” in the surrounding sections with Heb. 7:22. But “covenant” is used elsewhere e.g., Gal. 4:24; Heb. 8:6,7,8,9,10,23; 9:1,4; 10:16,10:29; 12:34; 13:20. “Covenant” is used with “blood” in Heb. 10:29; 13:20. The usage of “covenant” in Heb. 10:29 is appropriate, in part to remind the reader that “blood” and “covenant” can still be used together, and even when “testament” is emphasized with blood, it is still one element of the greater meaning of *diatheke*. It is also important to create a wider contextual backdrop using “blood” and “covenant” at Heb.10:29 because these concepts come together in Heb. 13:20 where the primary meaning of *diatheke* is “covenant,” since the focus is on the everlasting covenant of grace, which is now administered through the new covenant in the blood of Christ.

Therefore the AV strikes a reasonable balance in its translation of *diatheke* as “testament” or “covenant.” One might e.g., argue the toss on its usage of “testament” in Rev. 11:19 or “covenant” in Gal. 3:15. Is it because the emphasis on the ark of the covenant in Rev. 11:19, has to do with what it contains i.e., the *Ten Commandments*, and the fact that men are to be judged by these, with special reference to the first and second commandments in the immediately context of Rev. 11:19; that the translation “ark of the testament” is appropriate i.e., in order to highlight the idea of *reading* the Decalogue (to some extent, on analogy with “testament” in I Cor. 3)? And / or is it because of the importance of the type of OT blood typing the “blood” of Christ (Rev. 1:5; 5:9) that “testament” is used in Rev. 11:19 i.e., so as to convey both the idea of *mercy* (the blood) and justice (the Decalogue), in the picture of judgment in Rev. 11:19?

At Gal. 3:15, the RSV & NRSV translators considered the primary meaning of *diatheke* was *testament*, and so e.g., the NRSV translated it here as “will” (NRSV). However, using the English “testament” or “will” destroys the explanatory parallelism with Gal. 3:17 where *diatheke* clearly means “covenant,” since the everlasting “covenant” of grace was “confirmed” in the Abrahamic Covenant, 430 years before the Sinai Covenant of works which “cannot disannul that “covenant” of grace (Gal. 3:17). Rather the two run parallel as options (Gal. 4:24-26), but if one selects the covenant of works option, one must ultimately fail (Gal. 3:10,11), for “the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith” (Gal. 3:24). Like the RSV translators, the NRSV translators place a footnote at “will” or testament in Gal. 3:15, stating, “Or ‘covenant’ (as in verse 17)” (NRSV), in order to maintain this stylistic parallelism between these two verses; even though it is clear from other elements of the translation of these verses that they do not properly understand them. Certainly I would consider that AV Study Bibles should have a comparable footnote at the AV’s “covenant” at Gal. 3:15, stating, “Or ‘testament,’ or ‘will,’ Greek *diatheke*, as in verse 17.”

I do not claim the AV translators were infallible or perfect men. But irrespective of some legitimate disagreement on *exactly* how to fine-tune the usage of “testament” and “covenant” for *diatheke* in the NT with respect to e.g., Gal. 3:15 or Rev. 11:19, the broad idea of the AV is sound. It is a development and outgrowth of Heb. 9:15-20. It is particularly apt in the context of the words of institution of the Lord’s Supper, to use the term “testament” as the AV does, because the context here is “blood,” and the new covenant was inaugurated by the atoning blood of Christ; and the red wine at Communion symbolizes the blood of Christ. Therefore the AV translators show both greater maturity of thought, proper understanding of covenant theology, and proper regard for the importance of the symbol of blood in the Communion wine. This thus stands in stark contrast with the “new” translations. This also has important ramifications for the citation of these passages in a Communion Service, with the AV translation of “testament” putting a greater emphasis on the importance of the “blood” in the new covenant or new testament, than the modern versions and associated modern liturgies; which evidently fail to grasp the fuller significance of Heb. 9:15-20.

This sixth degree of debasement, found in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV, has to do with carefulness of translation. This is apparent in numerous areas, but one of these is its removal of “testament” and replacement of it by “covenant” in passages dealing with the institution of the Lord’s Supper. This has the effect of downplaying the importance of the *blood* atonement of Christ; and the central importance of this to the new testament or new covenant in the blood of Christ.

A seventh degree of debasement, found in the ASV, NKJV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV is the perversion of Scripture to preterist or futurist prophetic readings on passages dealing with the Antichrist, thus denying the historicist interpretation. The Historical School of Prophetic Interpretation is the traditional Protestant interpretation. Thus the dedication to King James in the AV refers to the Roman Catholic Pope as “that man of sin” (II Thess. 2:3). E.g., the central Papal title and claim to power, is that he is “the “Vicar of Christ.” This is Latin, *Vicarius Christi*, in which *vicarius* can mean “instead of another,” a “substitute,” or a “deputy;” and *Christi* means “of Christ.” Thus the Papal title *Vicarius Christi* means the Pope puts himself *in the place of*, or *instead of*, *Christ*. But at this point we come to the very core of the meaning of the Greek word *antichristos* (antichrist), since the Greek *anti* also means *in place of* or *instead of*, and so an antichrist is one who puts himself *in the place of* or *instead of* Christ. I.e., as a vice-God, “he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God” (II Thess. 2:4).

It is crucial to the historicist view of Dan. 11:31, that there is a transition from the “horn” of “Grecia” (Dan. 8:9,21), Antiochus Epiphanes, acting as a type in parts of Dan. 11, to the fourth empire of Rome. This is done on the basis that while Antiochus Epiphanes did pollute the sanctuary and was a force “of desolation” (Dan. 8:13), he did not actually go so far as to make the temple “desolate” in a military sense. I.e., that Antiochus Epiphanes’ actions in the 160s B.C. constituted a “transgression of desolation” (Dan. 8:13) cannot be reasonably doubted. But the extent of his desolation was not such that he actually made the sanctuary “desolate” (Dan. 11:31) i.e., by totally destroying it the way the Romans did in 70 A.D. . The “desolation” (Dan. 8:13) wrought by Antiochus Epiphanes meant that he polluted the sanctuary and put it out of action, but it was not made “desolate” (Dan. 11:31), and so at the end of the 2300 days the Jews could cleanse, rededicate, and reuse the temple (Dan. 8:14), something they could not do after it was made “desolate” (Dan. 11:31) by the Romans.

On this basis, the words, “abomination that maketh desolate” in Dan. 11:31 (referring to “armies” of “desolation,” Luke 21:20) are the key words, to see that one goes from the lesser type of Epiphanes to the greater type of Rome, in and from Dan. 11:31. I.e., Dan. 11:31 uses the king of the south (Ptolemies), Antiochus Epiphanes’ *desecration* of the temple in the 160s B.C., as a type for the Roman *desolation* of the temple in 70 A.D. . The Roman king thus replaces the Grecian king in this transitional verse in which type (Rome) meets ante-type (Antiochus Epiphanes). However, since Rome is north, as part of this transition, it takes over as the new “king of the north” from the old “king of the south” inside this verse. Thus other than for this initial dual application in Dan. 11:31, Dan. 11:31-35 refers to Imperial Rome (as king of the north);

and then Dan. 11:36-39 to Papal Rome, and Dan. 11:40-45 to the yet future *Final Crusade* of the Pope. This interpretation has NT warrant from our Lord himself in the Gospels, for he here isolates the key words of Dan. 9:27b; 11:31; 12:11; and applies them to the Imperial Roman Empire in 70 A.D. (Matt. 24:15; Mark 13:14). *Thus Protestants have traditionally applied Dan. 11:36-39 to Papal Rome* as Papal Rome had become by the time of the Reformation, and still is, awaiting the Pope's Final Crusade as "the king of the north" against the infidel "king of the south" (who by God's common grace rightly refuses to engage in the Papal idolatry of Rev. 13:14-18) in Dan. 11:40-45.

E.g., Article 35 of the Anglican *39 Articles*, Book 2, Homily 2, "Against Peril of Idolatry" (Part 3), makes reference to the Roman Catholic "lewd distinction of Latria and Dulia" in their "worshipping" of "Saints." (I.e., "Latria" is used for worship of God, and "Dulia" for worship of angels and Saints, and when applied to Mary, "Dulia" is called, "Hyperdulia," as the highest form of "Dulia" worship.) The Homily further says, "What meanest it, that they, after the example of the Gentile idolaters, burn incense, offer up gold to images, hand up crutches, chains, and ships, legs, arms, and whole men and women of wax before images, as though by them or Saints (as they say) they were delivered from lameness, sickness, captivity, or shipwreck? Is not this [Latin,] *Colere* ['to worship,' present active infinitive, from *colo*] *imagines* [images], 'to worship images,' so earnestly forbidden in God's Word? If they deny it, let them read the eleventh chapter of Daniel the Prophet; who saith of Antichrist, 'He shall worship [a] god whom his fathers knew not with gold, silver, and with precious stone, and other things of pleasure' [Dan. 11:38], in which place the Latin word [in the Vulgate] is 'colet'." I.e., Latin, "*colet* ('he shall honour' or 'he shall worship,' future, 3rd person singular verb, from *colo*)," here contextually means, "he shall (will) worship," thus giving an ancient interpretation of the Hebrew, "*YeKaBBeD* ('he shall honour,' imperfect active¹⁹⁸, 3rd person singular piel verb, from *KaBeD*)," from St. Jerome¹⁹⁹.

¹⁹⁸ The Hebrew imperfect indicates *an incomplete action*, in which the verb's action occurs either at, or after the time of, speaking; and it is generally rendered by a present or future tense. (It can also be used for a customary / habitual action.) I agree with St. Jerome that the Hebrew here conveys what we would render as a "future" tense.

¹⁹⁹ In Dan. 3 (verse numbering includes Apocryphal additions), the Vulgate uses mainly Latin, "*adoro*" i.e., "adore" (Dan. 3:5,6,7,10,11,12,14,15 twice, 18,95). But it makes some usage of Latin, "*colo*" for what contextually means "worship," rather than "honour," in Dan. 3:12,14,17,18,33. E.g., the two are found in Hebraic poetical parallelism in Dan. 3:12, Latin, "*deos* (gods) *tuos* (thy) *non* (not) *colunt* ('they worship,' indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *colo*), *et* (and) *statuam* (statue) *auream* (golden) *quam* (which) *erexisti* (thou raised) *non* (not) *adorant* ('they adore,' indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *adoro*)," i.e., "they worship (*colunt*) not thy gods, and they adore (*adorant*) not the golden statue which thou hast set up." Thus the argument here used in the Homily, i.e., the Latin Vulgate's *colo* in Dan. 11:38 is an ancient instance where contextually "honour" in the verse is taken to mean, "worship," is in the wider context of the Book of Daniel as found in Jerome's Vulgate, *clearly a reasonable argument*.

Thus this Anglican Homily from Article 35 of the *39 Articles*, here applies Dan. 11:38b, to Roman Catholic forms of idolatrous worship, and regards Dan. 11:38b as identifying the Roman Papacy through reference to some form of invocation of saints and associated worshipping of images of Saints. This is harmonious with Article 22 of the *39 Articles*, which says, “The Romish doctrine concerning ... worshipping ... of images ..., and also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.” This application by the Homily of Dan. 11:36-39 to Papal Rome as it had become by the time of the Reformation, is classic historicism. It also accords with the clear words of Article 35 elsewhere, “the bishop of Rome ... ought ... to be called Antichrist” (Book 1, Homily 10, Part 3).

If the reader looks through traditional Protestant commentaries, he will find that though they may take a slightly different view as to some of the exact specifics²⁰⁰, they are agreed in the generality, namely, they endorse the Historical School of Prophetic Interpretation (Historicism), they apply Dan. 11:36-39 to the Roman Papacy, and they regard Dan. 11:38b as referring to some form of Popish idolatry. (Though not all historicists would agree with my specific interpretation, in harmony with an interpretation allowed, but not required in the Homily, *supra*, I think Dan. 11:38b is referring to *an intensive form* of dulia in the hyperdulia of Mariolatry.)

This being so, e.g., in Dan. 11:38a, “the God of forces” is traditionally understood as including reference to Papal Rome’s spiritual “forces (*ma’uzzim*),” such as various “Saint mediators,” who are invoked. (Also found among daughters of “the mother,” Rev. 17:5, e.g., the semi-Romanists of Eastern Orthodoxy or Puseyism Proper, who all look with favour on the idolatrous *Second Council of Nicea* in 787.) Thus whatever relatively minor differences of opinion may exist among we historicists as to the exact interpretation of Dan. 11:36-39, we are agreed on the reading of “forces” here. Yet the AV’s “forces” in Dan. 11:38a becomes “fortresses” in the ASV and other modern versions, all of which thereby seek to apply a preterist or futurist interpretation to it. This is not an issue of text type, since the OT Hebrew *Received Text* of the AV, here has the same Hebrew plural form of *ma’uz*, that one finds in the OT Hebrew *Codex Leningrad Text* of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* used by such modern versions. Thus this is an issue of modern versions adopting preterist or futurist interpretations in the false and misleading name of “modernizing” the English. This is an issue of debasing the Scriptures, and hiding their wonderful truths from the people.

Similar issues arise in e.g., Dan. 11:37a, “Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers” i.e., the Antichrist is an apostate, who does “not come, except there come a

²⁰⁰ E.g., one group of historicists traditionally connect Dan. 11:38b with invocation of saints and worshipping of images, as here in the Homily (my view); whereas another group of historicists traditionally find in Dan. 11:38b a reference to the Roman Mass, which is reserved in elaborate “tabernacles” and placed in ornate “monstrances” (to be adored by Papists).

falling away first,” and he then “sitteth in the temple of God” (II Thess. 2:3,4). He is then characterized as lacking “the desire of women” (Dan. 11:37a) i.e., “forbidding to marry” (I Tim. 4:3), as found in the various celibate orders of Roman Catholicism. The picture of Dan. 11:37a is thus of a king (a temporal power) in charge of a religiously apostate form of Christianity, who sets up a religious system inside the Church, characterized in its upper echelons by celibate orders. Once again, this basic historicist picture is changed in modern versions.

The AV’s “God of his fathers” becomes the ASV’s “the gods of his father” i.e., not a religious apostate (AV), but a pagan figure (ASV), a view also followed in a number of other modern versions, thus once again following preterist or futurist interpretations. The general reference to his celibate orders, evident in, “Neither shall he regard ... the desire of women” (AV), is also changed in e.g., the NRSV, to a singular form, “the one beloved by women” (NRSV). This is applied by preterists to the Tammuz cult abandoned by Antiochus Epiphanes, e.g., Moffatt’s Bible reads, “He shall not need the gods of his fathers or Tammuz” (Moffatt). Others claim the terminology means the Messiah, who was *beloved by Jewish women* who hoped to be his mother. Futurists seem to greatly disagree among themselves as to what these words mean, and some of them prefer the AV’s translation, “the desire of women,” but then give it a futurist interpretation saying e.g., it might mean Antichrist will be a homosexual.

All this confusion, botheration, and fuss over Dan. 11:37a, springs from the failure to walk in the great light of historicism, being the form of prophetic interpretation rightly embraced by historic Protestantism from the time of the Reformation. In the name of “modernizing the English,” here and elsewhere, the modern versions are in fact debasing the text of Scripture, and concealing from their readers the historicist truth of these passages. The Roman Papacy stands at the head of an extremely wily, cunning, dangerous, and deceitful counterfeit form of Christianity. The good Christian needs to be warned about it!

The Holy Spirit of God is Christ’s representative here on earth, sent by Christ (John 16:7-15). The claim of the Pope to universal jurisdiction in the church as “the Vicar of Christ,” thus constitutes a blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and an unpardonable sin (Matt. 12:21,32). It is this, that makes the Pope (like Judas Iscariot,) a “son of perdition” (II Thess. 2:3). The Devil thus has free access to possess any Pope, and he has simply moved from one Pope to the next since the formation of the Roman Papacy in 607 from the Bishopric of Rome under Boniface III (Bishop of Rome, 607; first Pope, 607), which thing was greatly opposed just before this time by that saintly Bishop of Rome, St. Gregory the Great (Bishop of Rome, 590-604).

Thus Luther equates the rise of the Papacy with the rise of Antichrist, and like the Anglican Homilies in Article 35 of the 39 Articles, Luther dates the rise of Antichrist to the decree of Phocas (in 607 A.D.). Luther says, “it is very easy to prove that the Pope is neither the commander or head of Christendom ... from ... the decrees of the ancient councils, from ... the writings of holy fathers, Jerome, Augustine, and Cyprian, and from all of Christendom before the first Pope, who was called Boniface III.” E.g., “St. Jerome

dared to say freely, ‘All bishops are equal, ...’ and adds the example, ‘as the bishop of a small city, like ... Rome, Regium and Constantinople, Thebes, and Alexandria.’” Luther says that when the title and notion of a “*universalis*” (Latin, “universal”) bishopric “was offered to him,” “St. Gregory ... sharply refused it and writes that none of his predecessors had been so bold as to accept or wish such a title, although the sixth council of Chalcedon had offered it to them.”

Luther refers e.g., to “when there were still bishops in Rome, before the Pope, the Antichrist,” when “the Nicene Council entrusted the Bishop of Rome with the care of the churches near Rome, but did not make him a Pope.” “Thus ... the Papacy did not exist before Emperor Phocas and Boniface III St. Gregory, pious ... bishop of the Roman church, condemned it and would not tolerate it at all.” “Thus” says Luther, “St. Gregory was ... bishop of Rome ... [for it] is certain ... that at the time of St. Gregory there was no Pope Boniface III ... persuaded the regicide Phocas that he should be Pope There we have the origin and beginning of the Papacy, when and by whom it was founded - namely, Emperor Phocas, the regicide, who had his lord, Emperor Maurice, and his wife and children, beheaded²⁰¹.”

Rome (Rev. 17:9) is “the hold of every foul” demon “spirit” (Rev. 18:2) i.e., the Devil organizes things all over the world from Rome, and the devils go to and from Rome to report to the Devil and get their orders. The description of the Devil with “seven heads and ten horns” (Rev. 12:3) is matched by the description of the Roman Papacy with “seven heads and ten horns” (Rev. 13:1). Why? Because since the formation of the Roman Papacy in 607 A.D., with the decree of the Emperor Phocas declaring the Bishop of Rome to be “universal bishop,” every Pope has been demon-possessed by the Devil himself. In addressing the Pope, one can address the Devil directly, as did Isaiah to the King of Babylon in Isa. 14, or Ezekiel to the King of Tyre in Ezek. 28. The Devil runs many false religions, but he only personally Devil-possesses the Pope. Others he leaves lesser devils to possess. Unlike God he is not omnipresent. He can only be at one place at one point of time. That place is generally Rome (Rev. 18:2). But the Devil may allow at least two other lesser devils to also run the Pope with him (Rev. 16:13), a fact that means he can sometimes leave the Pope’s body and go elsewhere on the earth for urgent business. However, he runs most things from Rome, via his minion devils, i.e., the one-third of angels who rebelled with him (Rev. 12:3,4,9).

According to tradition, Martin Luther was once directly approached by the Devil, who made a most unusual personal appearance to him in order to try a cut a deal that would end the Reformation. This occurred at the Wartburg Castle at Eisenach in Germany, where Luther was translating the Bible into German. Luther’s answer was unequivocal. He threw an ink-well at the Devil. When I inspected the Wartburg Castle in 2002, I saw a large hole in the wall where this had occurred, and subsequent tourists had picked a bit of the wall away to get part of the ink-spot as a souvenir. In his great hymn, which I reckon as my personal theme song, and most favourite hymn, “A Mighty

²⁰¹ *Luther’s Works*, Concordia, Fortress Press, Muhlenberg, USA, 1966, Vol. 41, pp. 290-300; citing e.g., St. Jerome’s Epistola 146, ad Evagrium; St. Gregory the Great’s Book 9 of the Epistles, Epistle 68, ad Eusebius Thessalonica.

Fortress is our God,” Luther says of the Devil, “On earth is not his equal.”

Good reader, do you really think that he who devil-possessed a beautiful snake in the Garden of Eden to deceive our first parents, would be so silly as to come as the Antichrist in some overtly obvious manner, rather than as the head of “the biggest Christian Church on earth”? If you do, good reader, then with all due respect to you, you greatly underestimate the subtlety, guile, and power of the Devil. “On earth is not his equal.” The Devil will support the lusts of man to e.g., procure an abortion (female lust), or read pornography (male lust). But if by God’s common grace, that person repents of their sin, he is there, waiting to say, “As Pope I have always opposed abortion. I always opposed pornography. You know, you really are meriting a lot of favour with God by doing the right thing now.” And so through justification by works, he will then spiritually hog tie that person, and have him bound over to be cast into the pits of hell upon his death. The Devil knows the end game. He’s been around for millennia. He’s not playing games. He’s playing for keeps. He knows what he’s doing. And he’s very good at it. “On earth is not his equal.”

At the *Hampton Court Conference* of 1604, King James I, started the process that in 1611 gave rise to the King James Version after seven years work. The Devil knew that these translators were not like the spiritual and intellectual dwarfs who undertook the modern translations which now plague us. These were not anti-natural law, anti-intellectual Puritans, incapable of composing the Received Text. These were not anti-natural law, anti-intellectual religious liberals, who simply feign intellectual competence in a circular manner by their “academic reputations.” These were not anti-Divine revelation Papists, incapable of understanding the gospel of justification by faith and other central gospel truths, whom the Devil could in various ways control. These were not weak men, who had not “crucified the flesh with the affection and lusts” (Gal. 5:23), and who had failed to mature in Christ through years of sanctification and holiness of living in the Holy Ghost. The Devil knew as holy angels flew around the King James Version translators, as cherubims with sleepless eyes stood over them, that he was up against the real thing. Through his Church of Antichrist, the Church of Rome, the Devil sought the regicidal murder of His Majesty King James I, with the reintroduction of Popery into England. But the Papists’ conspiracy under Guy Fawkes was thwarted in 1605, and this victory was thereafter annually celebrated in Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov.). For while “on earth is not” the “equal” of the Devil, “we have on our side “Christ Jesus,” and in the words of Luther’s Hymn, “he must win the battle.”

Our Authorized King James Versions were fine-tuned under the supervision of deeply spiritual and intellectual gifted godly men, most of whom were accustomed to living their lives under God’s directive will (and who also held in check any recalcitrants who lacked such full submission, such as Bishop Andrewes). They were regenerated by the power of the Holy Ghost, and humbly relying upon the blessing of Almighty God, they fine-tuned the English translation of the KJV in order that we might use the King James Version in spiritual battle with the Devil in ways that no modern translation is equipped to do. This includes the recognition of key historicist passages of Scripture. Let us not put down the sharp two-edged sword of our King James Versions and

exchange it for the blunted blade of these modern versions which are translated by intellectually and spiritually inferior men. “Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour” (I Peter 5:8).

An eighth degree of debasement found in the RSV, NRSV, and ESV, is the removal of italics for added words. Italics reflect the belief in the verbal inspiration of Scripture. Thus their removal acts to undermine the verbal inspiration of Scripture. In this context I also refer the reader to my discussion of Luke 1:3 at Preface section “9) Usage of ASV, RSV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NKJV, NIV & Moffatt Bible in this commentary,” *infra*.

A ninth degree of debasement occurred with the reintroduction of the Apocrypha inside the covers of Holy Writ by the RSV Common Bible and RSV Catholic Bible (a forerunner of this being found in the RV Apocrypha²⁰², although the ASV did not follow the RV here). This too has been followed in the NRSV.

An tenth degree of debasement found in the NRSV and ESV, is the usage of feminist language. In Scripture we are taught that all human beings are descended from Adam, and that Adam’s wife was made from a “rib” of Adam (Gen. 2:21-24; 3:20). Thus the Hebrew term *’adam* is used throughout the OT as one word for a man, i.e., an Adamite (singular), or men i.e., Adamites (plural). This is clearly patriarchal language, in which there is a nexus between the human race being called “man” (males and females) and the fact that all came from a first “man” (male).

A man (male) “is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man (*andros*). Neither was the man (*aner*) created for the woman; but the woman for the man (*andra*)” (I Cor. 11:7,8; cf. Gen. 2:21-24). This has moral ramifications in Biblical patriarchy, “that the head of every man (*andros*) is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man (*aner*): and the head of Christ is God” (I Cor. 11:3). Hence, e.g., “women” are to “keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law” in Gen. 3:16 and Esther 1:22. (Esther 1:22 is man made law, made under the higher laws of God requiring sexist discrimination in favour of patriarchy. “That every man should be the master in his own house and the one who speaks in the language of his own people, Esther 1:22, NASB).

The matter of sexist patriarchal language is also linked to important soteriological issues. “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive” (I Cor. 15:22). For “The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit” (I Cor. 15:45). We are lost in the fall of one man, Adam, and we are saved in the

²⁰² I sometimes use the RV Apocrypha, but like my copy of the AV Apocrypha, it is printed as a separate booklet. *I do not believe in putting the Apocrypha within the same covers as those of Holy Writ!* (even though this is sadly the case with my copy of the 1560 Geneva Bible, since it came only in this form, Hendrickson Publishers, Massachusetts, USA, 2007).

redemption of one man, the second Adam. This is also taught in Rom. 5. Because God “hath made of” meaning *from* “one blood” i.e., Adam (not that all are still of “one blood” e.g., Rev. 5:9), “all nations of men (*anthropon*)” (Acts 17:26), the Greek term *anthropon* here and elsewhere in the NT, from *anthropos*, thus points to man’s common origin in one man, Adam (Luke 3:38). It relates to the soteriological issue of our salvation through one man, Christ (who was fully God and fully man).

Thus we find a sustained and systematic debasing of Scripture, from the high point of the AV, to the ever increasing degrees of degradation found in e.g., the ASV and its subsequent revisions, and the NKJV. Here the levels of debasement may vary. E.g., the NKJV is debased one degree by its departures from the OT and NT TR, clearly seen in its NT Burgonite Majority Text; and a second degree by its lack of literary beauty. A third degree by its removal of the distinction between “you” singular (thee, thou, thy) and “you” plural (you, ye, your). It is debased a fourth degree by its lack of carefulness of translation e.g., “testament” and “covenant” *supra*, or Rev. 19:8 at 7e), *supra*. It is debased a fifth degree by its perversion of historicist Scriptures. But whereas the NKJV is debased to the fifth degree, the NRSV is debased to the tenth degree. Thus one can say that the NKJV is better than the NRSV. Indeed, one may say, “The NKJV is twice as good as the NRSV.” Nevertheless, it is also true that the NKJV is a much debased translation relative to the greater heights of the AV.

Let us be diligent and careful, not exchange the “fatted calf” (Luke 15:23) of the AV, for the “swine” “husks” (Luke 15:16) of the NKJV, or any of these other modern versions. Perhaps we can quote this or that portion or so of a verse here or there, since we do not claim the AV is an infallible translation, only that it is the best available English translation. But let us make sure the AV is our main translation. Let us not throw the baby out with the bathwater.

8) *AV stylistic matters: Anglicization of Words, formal & dynamic equivalence.*

The 1946 *Church of Scotland* General Assembly, sent a memorandum to numerous churches in the British Isles claiming the Authorized Version (1611) and Revised Version (1881-5) were outdated due to their *archaic language*, and seeking support for a new translation. The *Church of Scotland* General Assembly’s new “translation” later became under its Committee Chairman, C.H. Dodd, known as the *New English Bible* (NEB) of 1961-70. Whatever defects the AV might have, they pale into insignificance when compared with the defects of the NEB. The NEB is such a loose, liberal, and non-literal “translation,” that it was wisely banned from pulpits by [some] Protestants e.g., the *Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland*²⁰³.

²⁰³ McPherson, A. (Editor), A Committee Appointed by the Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, *History of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland* (1893-1970), Publications Committee in the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland, [dated to 1973/4 in the Preface], pp. 265-8.

The Protestant teaching of the Reformation was *not* that the Bible should be in the common language of the people. Rather, the teaching was that *the Bible should be in a language understandable by the people*. Scripture gives us two possible models for this. One model is found in the OT (*Option 1*), the other model is found in the NT (*Option 2*). One model (*Option 2*) is that like the NT which was written in *common* (Greek *koine*) Greek, one might use the contemporary language of the day. This style of using the contemporary modern English of the day characterized Tyndale's translation at the time of its publication in 1534. Another model (*Option 1*), is evident in the OT's usage of Aramaic in e.g., Dan. 2:4 to 7:28, and poetical sections e.g., the acrostic poem of Lam. 1. Here e.g., at Dan. 2:4-7:28 Aramaic was used as a literary device for those familiar with the Hebrew tongue. When *Option 1* was regarded as appropriate, an OT Hebrew listener was required to master a more educated form of language, in the very similar, but not identical, Aramaic tongue.

The King James Version of 1611 is an example of *Option 1*. The primary reason for the selection of this option related to the fact that to accurately translate the Word of God, one needs to be able to distinguish between the singular and plural "you." Since accuracy of translation is paramount, English speaking Protestants, humbly bowing before Almighty God, decided that *Option 2* was not viable in their situation, time, and place, and that therefore *Option 1* was the better choice.

The fundamental claim by e.g., the *Church of Scotland General Assembly* (1946), that the AV and RV (or by extension the ASV) ought to be replaced because they use archaic English, is a misplaced criticism and shows a lack of understanding of the AV's, RV's, and ASV's original English. When it was published in 1611, e.g., the AV's "thee," "thou," "ye," "gat," or "spake" *were already archaic*.

Like Shakespeare's plays, the King James Version was written in an educated English, but one which the common man could, with relatively little effort, learn and understand. The AV was based on the Protestant premise that the Bible should be in a language understandable to the people, but not on the NASB, NKJV, or NIV type of idea that it should be in the common "English as she's spoken, mate," language of the day. The AV translators deliberately used words which in 1611 were archaic in their day, but with which, with relatively little effort, men could learn. Though the primary reason for this relates to the need to distinguish between a singular and plural "you," the reasons were in fact manifold.

Firstly, they gave recognition to the work of the Protestant martyr, William Tyndale whose work is evident in between 60% and 80% of the Authorized (King James) Version (and who used what was contemporary English i.e., *Option 2*, at the time of his 1534 revised translation). Secondly, the usage of moderately archaic English was a deliberate literary device. The translators wanted to make the point that the words of God, found in the Bible, *are ancient words*²⁰⁴, "written aforetime for our learning" (Rom.

²⁰⁴ Bragg, M., *The Adventure of English*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, UK, 2003, pp. 105-115; "The Adventure of English" (TV Video Series), An LWT Granada Production, 2002.

15:4). “Thus saith Lord, Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein” (Jer. 6:16).

This technique was continued by the RV (1881-5) and ASV (1901) translators in the 19th and 20th centuries, thus making the point that this basic style can be used in any century, not just the 17th century. Indeed, one of the beautiful features of this technique is that it makes the work timeless, and not subject to this or that fade or change of tongue. It is a transportation device that allows transmission of the version over time. *It is never archaic, because it was always archaic. That is its genre.* In their OT Preface, the ASV translators said that their twentieth century task of semi-modernizing the English was made subject to the fact that “we desire to retain” “the antique flavor” of such moderate archaisms as *thee* and *ye*.

In the Latin language of French, the second person singular personal pronoun, *tu* (“you” singular), is used in a more informal way, indicating greater intimacy with e.g., friends; whereas the second person plural pronoun, *vous* (“you” plural), is used *both* in a more formal form of address to a person (singular), as well as to multiple persons (plural). E.g., to “betake yourselves” is to “*rendezvous*” (*rendez* + *vous*, see *rendre*). A similar type of distinction existed in the second person pronoun of the King James Version time.

E.g., Shakespeare’s *King Henry VIII* was written about 1612 or 1613, and so is contemporary with the King James Version of 1611. King Henry VIII broke with Rome on the issue of *Biblical authority verses Papal authority* because under Christian monogamy one element of “a man” “and” “his wife” being “one flesh” (Mark 10:8), is that one’s in-laws are in the same position as one’s blood relatives. Hence “John” the Baptist “said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother’s wife” (Mark 6:18). This Christian monogamous (Matt. 19:9; I Cor. 7:2; Titus 1:6) understanding of Lev. 18 & 20 is well captured in the words of the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession* 24:4, “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.” This same principle is rightly found in the Anglican *Parker’s Table*, drawn up by the Archbishop of Canterbury, His Grace, Matthew Parker, in 1563; and thereafter attached to the Anglican prayer book (e.g., maintained in England till 1946, and upheld in Australia till 1981, and Sydney Diocese till 1982).

The Pope had granted a “dispensation” to allow Henry VIII to marry his deceased brother’s wife, Catherine of Aragon. But he who reserves unto himself this right, “If a man shall take his brother’s wife, it is an unclean thing ..., they shall be childless” (Lev. 20:21), had unleashed his awesome power. The children of this union were consistently dying (and eventually, the lone survivor, Bloody Mary, would also die prematurely). Thomas Cranmer, who was the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, recognized the basic principle that while the Pope might “think to change ... laws” (Dan. 7:25), in fact, God’s law cannot be changed by any man or any Pope. Thus the Roman Catholic claim that the Pope could *set aside the very law of God himself*, and *allow a little bit of incest* by giving a Papal dispensation, was really an act of “sin” (II Thess. 2:3). It was an

“iniquity” oozing out of men’s sinfulness even in apostolic times (II Thess. 2:7), wherefore St. Paul said to the Corinthians, “It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you,” “purge out therefore the old leaven” (I Cor. 5:1,6).

In this broad context, let us consider Shakespeare’s stage-play, *King Henry VIII* at Acts 2, Scene IV, in the section between lines 174 and 241. King Henry poses the question in formal court with both the Romish Cardinal Wolsey and Archbishop Cranmer present, “whether our daughter,” “Mary,” “were legitimate, respecting this our marriage with the dowager,” Katherine (Catherine), “sometimes our brother’s wife.” For, he says, “This respite shook the bosom of my conscience,” and “enter’d me, yea, with a splitting power, and made to tremble the region of my breast.” In this, *the king’s great matter*, Henry VIII says, “methought I stood not in the smile of heaven; who had commanded nature, that my lady’s womb, if it conceived ... should do no more offices of life to’t than the grave does to the dead.” “This,” Henry says, “was a judgement on me.”

King Henry VIII says to Cranmer, “I then moved you [formal address, 2nd person plural pronoun used in the singular], My Lord of Canterbury, and got your [formal address, 2nd person plural pronoun used in the singular] leave to make this present summons” concerning the “marriage.” But then, with the stage direction, “Aside,” the King says to Cranmer aside, i.e., not in formal court, “I may perceive these Cardinals trifle with me: I abhor this dilatory sloth and tricks of Rome. My learn’d and well-beloved servant, Cranmer, Prithee [= ‘I pray thee,’ i.e., ‘thee’ in informal address, 2nd person singular pronoun], return; with thy [informal address, 2nd person singular pronoun] approach, I know, my comfort comes along” The transition between Henry VIII addressing Cranmer as “you” and “your” (lines 217 & 218) in court, to “thee” and “thy” (line 239) aside, is thus a clear example of how this distinction between the plural form of “you” and “your” was used in formal address, and the singular form of “thee” and “thy” was used in more intimate and friendly address, in the King James Version translators’ day.

Hence in the Dedicatory Preface of the *King James Version*, King James the First is addressed as “You” and “Your.” E.g., “Your Highness did ... go forward ... in maintaining the truth of Christ, and propagating it far and near, ... which hath so bound and firmly knit the hearts of all Your Majesty’s loyal and religious people unto You, that Your very name is precious among them: their eye doth behold You with comfort, and they bless You in their hearts And ... the zeal of Your Majesty toward the house of God doth not slack or go backward, but is more and more kindled, manifesting itself abroad in the farthest parts of Christendom, by writing in defence of the truth,” (James had formerly identified the Pope as the Antichrist, writing in “A paraphrase upon the Revelation of the Apostle S. John,” that e.g., Rev. 13 refers to “the Pope’s arising²⁰⁵,”)

²⁰⁵ James the First, *A Paraphrase Upon the Revelation*, in *Workes [Works]*, pp. 39,47,57; quoted in From, L.E., *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers*, Review and Herald, Washington, D.C., USA, 1948, Vol. 2, pp. 537-9. (This is a 4 volume work by a Seventh-day Adventist author, but most of volumes 1-3, and a small part of Vol. 4, may be profitably consulted for information on historic prophetic interpretations of the Roman Papacy as the Antichrist.)

“which hath given such a blow unto *that man of sin* [II Thess. 2:3], as will not be healed So that if . . . we shall be traduced by Popish persons . . . , we may rest secure, . . . supported within by the truth . . . before the Lord; and sustained without by the powerful protection of Your Majesty”

However, in the Bible translation of the *King James Version*, the second person singular and plural pronouns are *never* used this way. E.g., we read in Psalm 145 that “David” says of “my God” (Ps. 145, Title; 145:1), “I will speak of the glorious honour of thy majesty (‘thy majesty,’ Hebrew *howdeka*, 2nd person masculine singular, noun from *howd*)” (Ps. 145:5). This is clearly a formal context, and if the KJV translators were using the language of their day this would have read, “I will speak of the glorious honour or your majesty.”

Thus the KJV translators chose a form of English *that was archaic in its day*. They did so because *they put a premium on accuracy of translation*, and to accurately convey the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek into English, required that they could distinguish between singular and plural forms of the second person personal pronoun, i.e., “thee,” “thou,” and “thy” (“you” singular), and “you,” “ye,” and “your” (“you” plural).

Let the reader consider e.g., the words of our Lord to St. Peter in Luke 22:31,32. These read in the *New King James Version*, “Simon, Simon! Indeed, Satan has asked for you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for you, that your faith should not fail; and when you have returned to me, strengthen your brethren” (NKJV). An English reader or listener of this passage in the NKJV or other “modern version,” would naturally understand that our Lord has warned Simon that Satan has asked for him, but that Christ has prayed for him.

Let us now consider these same words in the *King James Version*, “Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you (‘you,’ Greek *umas*, 2nd person plural pronoun, in the accusative from *umeis*), that he may sift you (making the former *umas* work double-time) as wheat. But I have prayed for thee (‘thee,’ *sou*, 2nd person singular pronoun, in the genitive from *su*), that thy (‘thy’ or ‘of thee,’ *sou*, 2nd person singular pronoun, in the genitive from *su*) faith fail not: and when thou (‘thou,’ *su*, 2nd person singular pronoun, in the nominative from *su* to match ‘art converted’) art converted (‘having converted’ or ‘art converted,’ AV, *epistrepsas*, nominative singular masculine, active aorist participle, from *epistrephe*), strengthen thy (‘thy’ or ‘of thee,’ *sou*, 2nd person singular pronoun, in the genitive from *su*) brethren.”

Thus the reader of the KJV realizes that in fact, Christ first says, “Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you” i.e., the plural “you” meaning all the apostles, but that Christ has “prayed for thee” i.e., the singular “you” meaning Simon, and that when he is “converted,” he is then to “strengthen thy (singular) brethren” i.e., the plural apostles referred to in the first “you.” Thus it is clear from this, and other passages, that in fact far from making the meaning clearer, the “modern versions” obscure the meaning. Thus the *King James Version* translators wisely realized that *Option 1, supra*, was the only viable form of translation *into English* for those who recognized *the verbal*

inspiration of Scripture and absolute authority of the Bible, i.e., that a translation into English would require a translation that used moderate archaisms.

I now let the reader draw his own conclusion as to just how ridiculous the statement is that was made in 1946 by the *Church of Scotland* General Assembly, which claimed that work on the New English Bible (NEB) should proceed because the language of the AV was *archaic*. I let the reader likewise draw his own conclusion about similar claims underpinning various other “modern versions.” In the words of the wise maxim, *A little knowledge is a dangerous thing*.

Thus e.g., the *Trinitarian Bible Society* in the UK²⁰⁶, undertakes various work of translating the Bible into other languages around the world. It does not set about to look for some archaic form of the tongue it is translating into. Nor need it and nor should it. That is because *Option 2, supra*, is available to them i.e., the NT Biblical model of *common* (Greek *koine*) Greek. But when it comes to the English language, they will *only* support the Authorized Version. They are quite right to do so. They should support no other. That is because *Option 1, supra*, is the only option available to we Anglophones i.e., the OT Biblical model, evident in e.g., the Aramaic of Ezra 7:12-26, in which as a literary device for those familiar with the English tongue, the reader or listener is required to master a more educated form of language, in the very similar, but not identical, archaic English tongue.

For we Protestants do not say that *the Scriptures must be in the language of the swine boy* (although we allow this as one option), but rather, *the Scriptures must be in a language that the swine boy is capable of understanding*. Now I have known relatively uneducated persons whose second language is English, to understand the KJV. And I have known of young, not always too bright teenagers still in high school, to learn the meaning of such terms in Shakespeare’s works. I do not think the exertion required to understand the KJV is excessive, even though in this process I support the usage of dictionaries showing the meaning of some of the AV’s archaic words, e.g., the Trinitarian Bible Society’s *Classic Reference Bible* includes, “A Bible Word List” in an Appendix which usefully explains the meaning of various archaisms²⁰⁷.

9) *Usage of ASV, RSV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NKJV, NIV & Moffatt Bible in this commentary.*

²⁰⁶ *Trinitarian Bible Society*, Tyndale House, Dorset Rd, London, SW19 3NN, England, UK (www.trinitarianbiblesociety.org/).

²⁰⁷ Cambridge University Press, UK, ISBN 1 86228 138 6, 139 4, 140 8 (Black, blue, & red vinyl hardcover); ISBN 1 86228 141 6, 142 4, 143 2 (Black, blue, & red PVC imitation leather); ISBN 186228 144 0 (Black calfskin); ISBN 1 86228 145 9 (Black calfskin & zip); ISBN 186228 146 7 (Black bonded leather with metrical psalms); & ISBN 186228 147 5 (Black calfskin with metrical psalms).

Some new versions (e.g., TCNT, NEB, & REB) are also discussed in the Preface of Volume 2 (section “Here again, Gone again, versions”).

On the one hand, as a supporter of the OT Received Text and NT Received Text, I do not agree with either the OT or NT Text types on which the ASV *et al* are based; nor with the general usage of dynamic equivalents found in e.g., the NIV. But on the other hand, in my experience, among the more conservative Protestants who use NU Text Bibles, the NASB and ESV are the most generally accepted example of a literal (or formal equivalence) NU Text translation, although the ESV lacks italics for added words, and the NIV is the most generally accepted example of a dynamic equivalent NU Text translation; although the ESV also has a notable following in some quarters.

For example, both the NASB and NIV, especially the NASB, receive some endorsement by the American radio preacher, John MacArthur (b. 1939) of Grace Community Church and The Master’s College, California, USA. He endorses a neo-Alexandrian NT text. He has e.g., produced the NASB *MacArthur Study Bible* (1997 & 2006)²⁰⁸. John MacArthur is an independent Reformed Baptist, and stands at the more religiously conservative end of neo-Alexandrians²⁰⁹, whereas James Moffatt, *infra*, stands at the more religiously liberal end of neo-Alexandrians, and there is a range of neo-Alexandrians between these two types of men.

Among their neo-Alexandrian peers, the NASB, ESV, and NIV are thus the contemporary Bible leaders in their fields among the more conservative Protestants deceived by the neo-Alexandrians; although the ESV and NIV are perhaps more widely used than the NASB, which may enjoy a wider usage in North America than elsewhere. Where the 1st (1960-1975), 2nd (1977), and 3rd (1995) editions of the NASB are in agreement, I simply refer to the “NASB,” but where they differ, I give the different readings as NASB 1st ed., NASB 2nd ed., and NASB 3rd ed. . Likewise, where the NIV 1st (1978) and 2nd (1984) editions are in agreement, I refer simply to the “NIV,” but where they differ, I give the different readings as NIV 1st ed. and NIV 2nd ed. .

²⁰⁸ MacArthur, J., *The MacArthur Study Bible*, New American Standard Bible Updated Edition (1995), Nelson Bibles, USA, 1997, 2005. Though MacArthur sometimes also quotes the AV or NKJV in his voluminous works, I have heard him refer on radio in London (“Grace To You” broadcasts), to Alexandrian texts as, “the better” manuscripts. So too in his *MacArthur Study Bible*, he casts unwarranted doubts over e.g., Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11.

²⁰⁹ While these comments on John MacArthur were made in the original Volume 1, it so transpired that when I joined Sermon Audio (see Appendix 6 in Volume 2; and Appendix 5 in the Revised Volume 1), for the first month or so, reference is made to this at the Sermon Audio “Newest Broadcasters” web page. This showed “Gavin McGrath” for sermons from “Mangrove Mountain Union Church” having “Joined: 10/8/2009 [Oct. 8, 2009],” and interestingly the name immediately below mine was that of “John MacArthur” for sermons from “Grace To You” having “Joined: 10/5/2009 [Oct. 5, 2009].”

Some usage is also made of the ASV (1901), which like the UK revised equivalent, the RV (1881-5), was based on the Westcott-Hort NT Text (1881) (also sometimes referred to in this work). Both versions are generally the same. Till the 1950s and 1960s, both the RV and ASV had a wider circulation among some of the more conservative Protestants, than they do since that time. While neither translation are now used widely, in my experience, among the more conservative Protestants that continue to use them, the ASV is used more than the RV; although where used, the ASV tends to be a reference work, sometimes cited on a particular verse, or found in a home library, rather than generally used in local churches. (Although while visiting Australia as part of his wider USA based ministry, I came across one American Minister, a Jewish Christian, who still uses only the ASV, and so quotes it from the pulpit.) Of the two, in this work I cite usually the ASV. The ASV is more literal than the NASB, and stands at one end of the neo-Alexandrian spectrum being a very literal translation of the neo-Alexandrian text, and thus at the opposite end of the spectrum to the Moffatt Bible, *infra*. They are useful works to consider since they represent the two extreme ends of Bible translation techniques used by those not following the *Textus Receptus*.

The ASV is also important because the NASB was a revision of ASV that became the NASB. The NASB Preface speaks favourably of the ASV. E.g., the NASB's 1977 Preface says, "The American Standard Version (1901) ... is still recognized as a valuable tool for study of the Scriptures" (NASB 2nd ed.); or the NASB's 1995 Preface says, "the American Standard Version," or "ASV," "has been highly regarded for its scholarship and accuracy" (NASB 3rd ed). Likewise, the RSV also states in its Preface that it is a revision of the ASV. In turn, the NRSV is one revision of the RSV; and the ESV is another revision of the RSV. The ASV is thus the common ancestor to the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV. Copyright has now expired on the ASV (1901), and it may be freely quoted (and for connected reasons of there being no royalties, publishers are now more reluctant to promote it). This factor, together with its ongoing historical importance as the neo-Alexandrian version to which the subsequent NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV look to for their origins, means that for the purposes of manifesting a neo-Alexandrian text it is the most commonly quoted translation in this commentary. While it is often quoted after reference to the NU Text, it should be understood that when this is done, the Westcott-Hort Text upon which it is based is the same as the NU Text. Moreover, I often refer to "the NU Text *et al*" and "*et al*" here refers to a variety of other neo-Alexandrian texts, namely, Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, Nestle's 21st ed., and the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions.

I also make some reference to the NKJV which represents the Majority Text views of the nineteenth century Church of England's Dean, Dean John Burgon. When the Received Text came under attack with Westcott and Hort's text and the RV (which was even less critical of the two leading Alexandrian Texts than subsequent neo-Alexandrians); Burgon joined in the attack on the TR. But Burgon argued for a majority text which constituted a number count of all available Greek manuscripts. Since about 90% of the about 4,500 to 5,000 manuscripts are Byzantine, in general a Burgonite Majority Text equates the majority Byzantine Text, and if a Burgonite Majority Text

finds a significant split in its majority text, this will replicate a significant split in the representative Byzantine text. This remains so even though only a smaller broadly representative sample of these manuscripts are used for the majority text count, whether e.g., the *c.* 1,000 manuscripts of von Soden's (overwhelmingly and predominantly Byzantine Text) K group used in Robinson & Pierpont's Majority Text (1991 & 2005); or the *c.* 1,500 manuscripts of von Soden's K and I groups used in Hodges & Farstad's Majority Text (1982 & 1985). Since the TR's starting point is always the representative Byzantine Text, it follows that Burgon's Majority Text was closer to the TR than the neo-Alexandrian critical text of Westcott and Hort. In practice, Majority Text advocates have also been far more positive about the TR and AV than have neo-Alexandrian critical text advocates.

The Presbyterian, James Moffatt (1870-1944), was an ordained minister in the *United Free Church of Scotland*, and a college teacher at both the United Free College, Glasgow, Scotland (1915-1927), and Union Theological Seminary, New York, USA (1927-1939). He is rightly regarded as a disgrace to the name of "Puritan derived Protestant," among all good and godly Presbyterian Protestants known to me. The Moffatt Bible is the most religiously liberal Bible to ever gain some general popularity; although it was mercifully produced before the sex role perverts managed to promote feminist language, so that it lacks this element of debasement found in e.g., the NRSV. It is nevertheless a greatly debased version. When I have referred to them, cryptic symbols and Greek letters in Moffatt's footnotes have been translated or transliterated respectively, for ease of understanding by the reader.

Thus I have used a range of neo-Alexandrian translations, with the NASB at the more conservative end of neo-Alexandrian versions, and the NRSV at the more liberal end. In this context of a range of versions, I have thus also sometimes referred to Moffatt's Bible (1913-1926, 2nd ed. 1935). While in broad terms the Moffatt Bible can be characterized as neo-Alexandrian since its NT follows this type of thinking, most neo-Alexandrians Proper would no doubt want to distance themselves from Moffatt's basic text, which was that of Von Soden. However, Moffatt's text was to some extent eclectic, since he sometimes departs from Von Soden and e.g., follows the reading found in Westcott and Hort. Moffatt was actually a semi neo-Alexandrian rather than a neo-Alexandrian Proper. However, in the vast majority of instances he operates as a neo-Alexandrian on the NT text, and only in a relatively slim minority of instances as something else. I.e., while neo-Alexandrians generally have a major Alexandrian Text pincer arm and a minor non-Alexandrian Text pincer arm, their usage of the non-Alexandrian Text pincer arm is much less common than is the case with Moffatt. He is thus predominately a neo-Alexandrian, even though his Moffatt Bible uses the non-Alexandrian Text pincer arm more frequently than would a neo-Alexandrian Proper e.g., Moffatt's readings from the Western Greek Text.

Significantly though, he is more broadly representative of a certain type of religiously liberal textual form critic. He makes a number of religiously liberal textual rearrangements, of a type and kind that a number of other neo-Alexandrian theologians do, even though other neo-Alexandrian translations do not. Moffatt thus represents an

extreme end of religious liberalism. However, the textual rearrangements and changes that characterize his work are usually confined to liberal theologians in their lectures and commentaries, not to actual Bible translations. His textual work reminds me of the type of errors I have looked at in some of Bultmann's work.

Moffatt's "textual analysis" thus involved a two-armed pincer approach. One pincer was Moffatt's neo-Alexandrian pincer arm; and the other pincer was Moffatt's non-Alexandrian Text pincer arm. His neo-Alexandrian pincer is operative more than 90% of the time, and this arm is relatively stable and predictable within its given normatively, i.e., the normative neo-Alexandrian principles. On the one hand, among neo-Alexandrian textual critics, others also accept this two pincer arm approach. One can see a similar usage of a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm through reference to e.g., the Western and Syriac texts in the Westcott and Hort text at Matt. 13:33 (see commentary at Matt. 13:33), and the Westcott-Hort footnote alternative of Matt. 13:52 (see Appendix 3 at Matt. 13:52). Or through reference to the footnote reading adopted from e.g., Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the influence of the Western, Syriac Curetonian (& Syriac: Schaafius, 1708), and mixed text type texts not only in the Moffatt Bible, but also in the NASB at Matt. 13:34 (see commentary at Matt. 13:34). Or through reference to non-Alexandrian texts in Tischendorf's 8th edition or the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) at Matt. 10:25 (see commentary at Matt. 10:25). But on the other hand, neo-Alexandrians Proper who use this approach, such as Westcott-Hort at Matt. 13:33,52, or the NASB at Matt. 13:34, or both Tischendorf and the NU Text at Matt. 10:25, do so *with far less frequency than Moffatt*. To be sure, Moffatt was a past-master of this second non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, so that this technique is a *major* defining hallmark of the NT in his Moffatt Bible, whereas it is a *minor* defining feature of neo-Alexandrians such as Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort, the NU Text, or NASB.

Notably, Moffatt's non-Alexandrian text pincer arm was relatively unstable and unpredictable. His non-Alexandrian pincer arm is operative less than 10% of the time. This arm sprang from his religiously liberal form criticism in which he supports a "reconstructed" reading from thin air with absolutely no manuscript support (e.g., Matt. 5:21,22), or support from a clearly aberrant source e.g., one lone 10th century manuscript (Matt. 4:24) with no good textual argument in its favour. When following this "reconstruction" approach, Moffatt would accept conjectured "amendments" from any manuscript, for instance, Syriac, or Western Text. But he appears to have had an unusually high regard for the Western Greek Text, (and to a lesser extent the Syriac,) and when so operating, at times Moffatt seems to have used the Western Text as "the decider" between rival Alexandrian readings (e.g., Matt. 6:15), and sometimes preferred it over the Alexandrian reading (e.g., Matt. 11:16, Western & Syriac reading). When so operating, he would also accept conjectured "amendments" from thin air advanced by other religious liberals, or simply by himself, e.g., Moffatt's disturbing rearrangements of the position of so many verses and chapters in the Bible is a very clear testimony to this.

When operating on the basis of this non-Alexandrian pincer arm, in the final analysis, Moffatt's guiding principle appears to have been his own, highly subjective,

“feel” for the text. Unfortunately, Moffatt had a very bad “feel” for the Greek, and so making “the great brain of James Moffatt” the point of consultation, was necessarily fatal to his general accuracy; even if, by a sheer fluke, he occasionally arrived at the correct conclusion this way (e.g., Matt. 9:22). Hence while the NT of the Moffatt Bible is best characterized as primarily the manifestation of his neo-Alexandrian pincer arm; I would still refer to Moffatt as a semi neo-Alexandrian rather than a neo-Alexandrian Proper.

This classification may raise objections from some. Specifically, in theory “the pure” neo-Alexandrians such as Westcott and Hort, are largely a thing of the past, and even they sometimes used a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm; and most “more modern” Alexandrian textual critics such as e.g., Metzger, would theoretically be semi neo-Alexandrians also in that they sometimes follow non-Alexandrian Text readings. But given that even Westcott & Hort were not total purists in this matter of following the Alexandrian text, I think it better in general to simply recognize that neo-Alexandrians Proper occasionally follow a non-Alexandrian text reading, though *not to the same extent that Moffatt does*, who I would thus classify as semi neo-Alexandrian. I.e., while there is a range of usage for the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm among Neo-Alexandrians Proper, Moffatt’s usage of it is proportionally so much greater than the norm that he cannot reasonably be said to simply be at a higher end of this spectrum, but in fact goes into a different realm i.e., that of a semi neo-Alexandrian.

E.g., Westcott-Hort placed Matt. 9:34 in brackets as optional, even though it is found in both Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus (the latter omitting only one word of it). Thus in my opinion, the number of times that neo-Alexandrians like the NU Text Committee are prepared to depart from an Alexandrian reading for a non-Alexandrian reading are so relatively few and far between, that it is reasonable to refer to them as neo-Alexandrians Proper. By contrast, the frequency of Moffatt’s departures, though still relatively rare, are much greater, and in my opinion sufficiently common to classify him as a semi neo-Alexandrian. (I.e., the matter is thus one of degree, and in a much more limited way, I accept that technically most modern neo-Alexandrians are in fact also semi neo-Alexandrians²¹⁰.) E.g., at Matt. 25, both the Received Text and Alexandrian Text are in agreement with regard to the non-inclusion of the words, “and the bride” (Matt. 25:1, Moffatt Bible). With no good textual argument against this reading, who but Moffatt, would accept the conflated reading at Matt. 25:1, on the basis it was supported by the Western Text’s D (5th century), Theta (mixed text type, 9th century), X (Byzantine, 10th century), together with some Latin and Syriac Versions, *et al?*

Given that Moffatt’s non-Alexandrian text pincer arm was as unpredictable and incoherent as the shifting and unreliable mind of Moffatt himself, it follows that

²¹⁰ In comparison, I note that neo-Byzantine supporters of the Received Text will sometimes follow a reading from the Latin textual tradition and/or ancient or mediaeval church writers, that has no Byzantine manuscript support. However, this *only* occurs when textual analysis of the Byzantine Greek Text warrants it, and is remedied by it, so they are still fairly classified as neo-Byzantine, even when the reading comes from outside the Byzantine Textual tradition i.e., from a Greek church writer or from the Latin.

instability of textual approach is an irreducible element of his second pincer arm of textual criticism; and in effect acts to produce a more general instability and uncertainty as to how Moffatt will treat a given verse in the NT. However, this instability is militated against by the fact that the stable neo-Alexandrian pincer arm is the one he uses in more than 90% of his NT. The practical effect of this is that one must first look to see what Moffatt *has done* on any given verse; and see if, *as usual*, it is a manifestation of his neo-Alexandrian pincer arm; and if so, it will *usually* be fairly similar to a normative neo-Alexandrian Bible verse. But one can never be sure before one has looked, if in fact Moffatt has either pursued a neo-Alexandrian approach to a given verse; or employed a non-Alexandrian text approach. If the latter, then it is a case of “anything goes” for the reading he may have.

Moffatt’s non-Alexandrian pincer arm, which is guided primarily by religiously liberal form criticism, even if, some manuscripts are *sometimes* found in its favour; is a sad commentary on the low intellectual standards that have come to grip tertiary colleges; and the associated replication of power structures in them by those foolish enough to follow in these crazy footsteps. (A criticism I would also make of neo-Alexandrians Proper and Moffatt’s other neo-Alexandrian pincer arm.) The type of religiously liberal form criticism of men like Rudolph Bultmann and James Moffatt has done enormous spiritual damage to men’s souls. Its poison has e.g., been injected in theological colleges, and has stunted the spiritual growth and ministries of numerous clergymen. It is rightly rejected by Protestants such as Gerhard Maier in his work, *The End of the Historical-Critical Method* (1974 & 1977)²¹¹.

The Moffatt Bible is unusual in that it was a mechanism to promote this type of folly far more widely than it normally is in religiously liberal college teacher’s lectures and commentaries. The normal strategy has been to try to keep out of academic positions those who are opposed to this type of religious liberalism (or are opposed to neo-Alexandrian principles, to which Moffatt’s semi neo-Alexandrianism is a qualified exception, since it is primarily neo-Alexandrian in outlook). Then, via such tertiary colleges, to destroy the Biblical spirituality of those who are to become clergymen; and then let their congregations rot away as the gospel of Christ is destroyed by their religiously liberal minister. But in the case of the Moffatt Bible, such religious liberals took a far more aggressive stance in seeking to reach out, and provide people with a Bible that would directly entangle them in some of the worst and deadliest snares of religious liberalism.

²¹¹ Maier, G., *The End of the Historico-Critical Method*, 1974 (*Das Ende de Historisch-Kritischen Methode*), translated by E.W. Leverenz & R.F. Norden, Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, USA, 1977. Though I would classify Josh McDowell as a good Source Book compiler, rather than an intellectual writer in his own right, with the consequence that his work is only as good as the sources he puts together; nevertheless, I would also recommend his *More Evidence That Demands a Verdict*, Historical evidences for the Christian Scriptures, Campus Crusade for Christ, USA, 1975.

Indeed, a number of people from an earlier era have spoken to me over the years about the Moffatt Bible. E.g., I knew a now deceased clergyman who was sucked into some of the errors of religious liberalism, and this included listening to radio broadcasts by Moffatt on the Moffatt Bible, which he said were played in Australia sometime between World Wars One and Two. In these radio broadcasts, Moffatt promoted the Moffatt Bible. The Moffatt Bible did enormous spiritual damage to many people, helped to undermine the Authorized Version, and this heretic's negative influence lived on after he died in 1944.

With copyright on the Moffatt Bible expiring in 1994, we are now free to quote and criticize it without limitation. This same factor of expired copyright means publishers may now be more reluctant to promote it. In an era when there were relatively few "new" versions, the Moffatt Bible was promoted with some success. Paradoxically however, the fact that it has declined in popularity as a result of so many other "new" versions coming onto the market, means that religious conservatives may not feel the need to undertake the type comprehensive analysis now more readily facilitated by this expiration of copyright. Certainly any such comprehensive analysis of Moffatt's Bible is beyond the scope of this work, and indeed would constitute a work in its own right. Nevertheless, I have made some reference to it in this commentary, since it is representative of a certain type of religiously liberal textual criticism. The relatively limited usage I make of the Moffatt Bible, is more than enough to show that the man was methodologically unsound as a consequence of his religiously liberal paradigm.

It would be possible to make reference throughout this commentary to other versions, such as e.g., the RV (although this is generally the same as the ASV anyway); or the New English Bible (NEB) and its revision, the Revised English Bible (REB). But due to constraints of space and time, I only less commonly referring to another translation, if so, usually the NEB, REB, TEV, and TCNT. E.g., I cite *New English Bible* (1961 & 1970) at Matt. 14:16,27; or its successor, the *Revised English Bible* (1989) at Matt. 9:27a; or the *Today's English Version* which is also known as the *Good News Bible* (1976) at Matt. 14:26. Also introduced in the Preface of Volume 2, has been *The Twentieth Century New Testament*, (TCNT) (1898-1901, Revised Edition 1904).

I have limited my general selection to the ASV in the first instance, the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, and NKJV in the second instance, and the Moffatt Bible in the third instance. These are sufficient to manifest a neo-Alexandrian critical text, and the NKJV is often sufficient to manifest the ideas of Burgon's Majority Text; although because its textual apparatus is a much reduced selection of the Majority Text variants as found in Hodges & Farstad (1982 & 1985), a large number of differences between the Majority Text and the TR are not apparent in the NKJV's skimpy textual apparatus. Another reason for selecting the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV, and NKJV, is that all these translations claim to ultimately be revisions of the AV, and in a bad way, they are. Thus e.g., the title page of the ASV says it is "the version set forth A.D. 1611 ... revised A.D. 1881-1886" and "newly edited by the American Revision Committee A.D. 1901." Thus this focus is also connected with a defence of the AV.

A similar claim is made in the Preface in the RSV. The *American Standard Version* is also known as the *American Revised Version*, and so the RSV took the “Standard Version” of the ASV’s name, and the “Revised” of its alternative name as the American Revised Version and simultaneously the “Revised” and “Version” of the (English) Revised Version, to become the “Revised Standard Version.” The *NRSV* is a more liberal revision of the RSV that keeps the “RSV” as part of its title. Its preface states it is a “revision of the Revised Standard Version, published in 1952, which was a revision of the American Standard Version published in 1901, which in turn embodied earlier revisions of the King James Version, published in 1611.” The *English Standard Version* is a less liberal revision of the RSV, that takes the “English” from the “Revised Version” which is also known as the “English Revised Version,” and the “Standard Version” from the ASV and RSV. The ESV states their translators worked with the “RSV text providing the starting point for our work,” which they trace back in a line through the “Revised Standard Version of 1952 and 1971,” the “American Standard Version of 1901,” “the English Revised Version of 1885,” and the “King James Version of 1611.” So too, the NASB Preface depicts the NASB as a revision of the ASV and in turn the AV, with the NASB retaining the “American Standard” from the ASV in its name as the “New American Standard Bible.”

Likewise, the NJKV takes the name of the King James Version in its title. The ASV, RSV (and later follow up NRSV and ESV), NASB, and NKJV, were all designed to try and move people familiar with the King James Version, away from using the Authorized Version, and onto instead the ASV (or RV), RSV (or later NRSV or ESV), NASB, or NKJV. I find the NRSV and ESV to be most painful translations to read, in part because of their usage of feminist language, the NRSV being even more deeply into this evil than the ESV. Thus defence of the AV may properly include a higher level of reference to them. But there are *so many versions* just among these AV “revisions,” let alone other new versions, that the task of keeping up with them is like *a cat chasing its tail*.

Additionally, reference is sometime made to the Douay-Rheims Version (or less frequently again another Latin Version), to show a Latin translation. I also sometimes refer to the RSV [Roman] Catholic Edition, the Roman Catholic *Jerusalem Bible* (1966) (e.g., Matt. 11:8; 14:15), or its successor, the Roman Catholic *New Jerusalem Bible* (1985) (e.g., Matt. 6:25).

I do not make a lot of reference to the *Today’s English Version* in this commentary, but I make some. In doing so I note that it is a very religiously liberal “translation.” E.g., it attacks many of the wonderful prophecies of the OT. “For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost” (II Peter 1:21). This *Good News Bible* is certainly misnamed as being “good news.” Back in the 1970s, not long after the *Good News Bible* or *Today’s English Version* (TEV) first came out in 1976, I learnt that one of its translators, Robert Bratcher (b. 1920), the Chairman of the TEV Committee, would be speaking at Scots Presbyterian Church, Margaret Street, in the City of Sydney (near the Harbour Bridge). I had never met a Bible translator, and so somewhat excitedly, albeit

somewhat naively, I decided to go and listen to him. While I have not ridden a motor-bike for more than 25 years, in those days I used to ride a green Honda CB (commuter bike) 200 motor-cycle. (It had very good fuel economy which as a teenager I found affordable.) Unlike today, there used to be a generous amount of free parking provided for motor-bikes in the inner City²¹². After I had ridden into the city and arrived at Scots Church, the man I had come to listen to opened his copy of the *Today's English Version* (1976) and read Luke 1:1-4.

He then gave a most liberal interpretation of Luke 1:1-4 that undermined and attacked the Biblical teaching of the verbal inspiration of Scripture (II Tim. 3:16). Short notes I made of his address at the time say that e.g., he regarded as “historically inaccurate,” both Exodus 1, and the Gospel story of the demoniacs in which St. Matthew records “two blind men” (Matt. 20:30) whereas St. Mark (Mark 10:46) and St. Luke (Luke 18:35) record only one. Bratcher’s claims that the Bible is “historically inaccurate,” are entirely false. (See e.g., my comments in Volume 2, Matt. 15-20, at Matt. 20:17c, “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” “The First Matter.”) He specifically rejected the doctrine that the “Scriptures” were what he called “word for word” verbally inspired. A short booklet that I got at the time written by Bratcher, says that “Luke tells us quite plainly ... that he followed normal means of historical investigation in order to provide ‘an orderly account’ for his reader (Luke 1:1-4)²¹³.”

The key words read in the Authorized Version, “it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order” (Luke 1:3, emphasis mine). Various neo-Alexandrian versions have a reading akin to that of e.g., the New American Standard Bible, which reads, “it seemed fitting for me as well, having investigated everything carefully from the beginning, to write it out for you in consecutive order” (NASB, emphasis mine). This is not a textual issue between the neo-Alexandrian’s Greek text and the neo-Byzantine’s Received Text, both of which here read, “*parekolouthēkoti* (‘having had perfect understanding,’ masculine

²¹² In those day, NSW law allowed crash / roll bars on motor-bikes, and by the grace of God, these roll bars helped to protect me on several close scrapes I had. (Through these experiences, in my early 20s I came to conclude that I should stick to driving a car, which is a lot safer.) Sadly, NSW law came to later ban roll bars on the basis that motor-cyclists going through rows of cars at traffic lights sometimes scraped a car with them. While not condoning such negligent riding, what is more important, saving a man’s leg from being broken (or worse), or a chip of paint on a car? Such are the foolish priorities of those who “love” “the world” (I John 2:15).

²¹³ Robert G. Bratcher’s Olivier Beguin Memorial Lecture 1978, *The Authority & Relevance of the Bible in the Modern World*, Published by The Bible Society in Australia, Sydney, 1978 (National Library of Australia ISBN 0 647 19013 3), p. 3. I “rediscovered” this book, which I had forgotten about in my library in the intervening 2 years between Volume 1 and the Revised Volume 1; and thus can now identify this TEV translator as Bratcher; and also found in the front of this book some short handwritten notes I had made at the time on his address and had likewise forgotten about.

singular dative, perfect active participle, from *parakoloutheo*) *anōthen* (from the very first) *pasin* (all things)” i.e., “having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first” (AV).

The Greek, *parakoloutheo*, is a compound word made up of *para* (to) + *akoloutheo*. The Greek, *akoloutheo*, means “follow” or “go behind” someone, and this can mean “follow” in a physical sense or an intellectual sense. E.g., at *akoloutheo*, with regard to its usage in a physical sense, Liddell & Scott refer to e.g., Aristophanes’ *Plutus* 19 (5th / 4th century B.C.); and with regard to its usage in an intellectual sense to be “be guided by,” Liddell & Scott refer to e.g., Thucydides’ *Historicus* 3:38 (5th century B.C.), or to *follow the thread* of a discourse in Plato’s *Phaedo* 107b (5th / 4th century B.C.); or to *follow the analogy of* something in Aristotle’s *Historia Animalium* (4th century B.C.)²¹⁴. Kittel also makes this same basic distinction in meanings of *akoloutheo*²¹⁵.

In the Septuagint, on the one hand, to say, “the Ethiopians, and the Sabeans, men of stature, shall pass over thee, and shall be thy servants; and they shall follow after (*akolouthesousi*, indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *akoloutheo*) thee bound in fetters” (Isa. 45:14, LXX), clearly requires *akoloutheo* being used in the sense of a physical following. But on the other hand, when reference is made in Ezek. 29 to a time when the “Egyptians” (Ezek. 29:14, LXX) “shall no more be to the house of Israel a confidence bringing iniquity to remembrance, when they follow (*akolouthesai*, aorist active infinitive, from *akoloutheo*) after them; and they shall know that I am the Lord” (Ezek. 29:16, LXX), we cannot doubt that *akoloutheo* carries the sense of an intellectual and religious following.

In the NT, *akoloutheo* has the meaning, “follow,” in the physical sense in Jesus words to his disciples, “Go ye into the city, and there shall meet you a man bearing a pitcher of water: follow (*akolouthesate*, imperative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *akoloutheo*) him” (Mark 14:13). When Jesus says in Matt. 8:22; 9:9, “Follow (*akolouthei*, imperative active present, 2nd person singular verb, from *akoloutheo*) me,” though the immediate *prima facie* sense is a physical following, only the spiritually blind would deny a contextual *double entendre* in which the meaning is also an implicit intellectual and religious following of Christ. And when Christ says, “he that taketh not his cross, and followeth (*akolouthei*, from *akoloutheo*) after me, is not worthy of me” (Matt. 10:38), only a fool would deny that “followeth” here is used in the intellectual and religious sense of following Christ.

This therefore helps us to better understand the comparable diversity of meaning in the compound word made up of *para* (to) + *akoloutheo*, namely, *parakoloutheo*, which we shall ultimately consider in the context of Luke 1:3.

²¹⁴ Liddell & Scott’s *Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 52.

²¹⁵ See Gerhard Kittel’s *Theological Dictionary of the NT*, Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1969-1977, Vol. 1, pp. 210,213-4.

Liddell & Scott refer to the meaning of *parakoloutheō* as “follow or attend closely” in e.g., Aristophanes’ *Ecclesiazusae* 725 (5th / 4th century B.C.), or Plato’s *Sophista* (5th / 4th century B.C.). They also refer to the meaning of “follow with the mind” or “understand,” in e.g., Polybius’s *Historicus* 1:12:7 (2nd century B.C.), Arrianus’s *Historicus in Epicteti Dissertationes* 2:16:33 & 2:26:3 (2nd century B.C.); and “following with the mind” or “understanding” in e.g., Marcus Antonius’s *Imperator* 3:1 (2nd century B.C.)²¹⁶.

In the Septuagint, *parakoloutheō* has the meaning in II Macc. 8:11 (LXX, Apocrypha) of “to follow” in time i.e., “not expecting the vengeance that was to follow (*parakolouthesein*, future active infinitive, from *parakoloutheō*) upon him from the Almighty God.” And in II Macc. 9:27 (LXX, Apocrypha), it has the meaning of “understanding” i.e., “For I am persuaded that he understanding (*parakolouthounta*, accusative singular masculine, present active participle, from *parakoloutheō*) my mind will favourably and graciously yield to your desires.”

In the NT²¹⁷, *parakoloutheō* can have the sense of *to accompany* or *to follow*, as in, “shall follow” in, “And these signs *shall follow* (*parakolouthesei*, ‘they shall follow,’ indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb²¹⁸, from *parakoloutheō*) them that believe; in my name shall they cast out devils” etc. (Mark 16:17). But *parakoloutheō* can also mean following something one has understood i.e., “fully know,” as in, “thou *hast fully known* (*parekoluouthekas*, indicative active perfect, 2nd person singular verb, from *parakoloutheō*) my doctrine” (II Tim. 3:10); or “hast attained,” as in, “be a good minister,” “nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine, whereunto thou *hast attained* (*parekoluouthekas*, from *parakoloutheō*)” (I Tim. 4:6).

Thus in Luke 1:3, it is *prima facie* theoretically possible that *parakoloutheō* either could mean *to follow the matter* in the sense of *an investigation* i.e., “having traced the course of all things accurately from the first” (ASV), or “since I have investigated all the events ... from the beginning” (Twentieth Century New Testament); or it could mean to follow something one has understood or *fully known* (II Tim. 3:10) i.e., “having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first” (AV).

Since the Greek will allow either rendering, which one is correct? If on the one hand, Luke 1:3 is translated “having had perfect understanding” (AV), then this indicates the verbal inspiration of Scripture i.e., St. Luke “had perfect understanding” because he was the Holy Ghost’s pen man, and wrote what he was told to write, with the Holy Ghost selecting the relevant words from St. Luke’s vocabulary. If on the other hand, Luke 1:3 is translated as e.g., “I have gone carefully over them all myself” (Moffatt Bible), then

²¹⁶ Liddell & Scott’s *Greek-English Lexicon*, pp. 1313-1314.

²¹⁷ Kittel, *op. cit.*, pp. 215-216.

²¹⁸ With the neuter plural nominative noun, “*semeia* (signs),” the verb is in the singular, but means the plural, “they.”

this is Bratcher's type of view that "Luke tells us ... that he followed normal means of historical investigation in order to provide 'an orderly account' for his reader (Luke 1:1-4)²¹⁹." I.e., "I also, since I have investigated all these events with great care from their very beginning, have resolved to write a connected history of them for you" (Luke 1:3, TCNT).

At the end of the day, if we only had Luke 1:3, the matter could not be resolved, because the Greek will allow either translation, and there is no disagreement here on the basis of text-type between neo-Byzantines (TR) and neo-Alexandrians (e.g., NU Text). Therefore, this is an example of a Scripture where its correct translation can only be determined on the basis of a translator's theology i.e., there is no such thing as "a neutral theological translation" of Luke 1:3.

The Protestant Reformation proceeded in stages, as following the first or Lutheran stage of the Reformation, there came a second stage of the Reformation enjoyed by the Anglican Church. Internally, the Anglican Church had also gone through multiple stages of Protestant development from the time of Henry VIII, with important advances under Edward VI and Elizabeth I. (The Puritans believed in still further "third stage reforms.") One element of this was the greater understanding of how to translate Luke 1:3, so that we here find with the benefit of the second stage of the Reformation, the more matured reflection on Luke 1:3 found in the Authorized Version of 1611. From this post 1611 AV position, one might say, *Tell me how a man translates Luke 1:3, and I'll tell you whether or not he believes in the verbal inspiration of Scripture.* Applying this test, the verbal inspiration of Scripture is believed by e.g., the translators of the King James Version (1611) and New King James Version (1982). By contrast, verbal inspiration of Scripture is not believed by the e.g., the translators of the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, TEV, NEB, TCNT, & Moffatt. While I have not checked every neo-Alexandrian version on the market, of those that I have checked, and this includes all the neo-Alexandrian versions used in this commentary, *all of them fail this test. What does this tell us about neo-Alexandrian Bible translators?*

As one who upholds the verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture (Exod. 4:12,15; Isa. 51:16; Jer. 1:7; II Tim. 3:16; II Peter 1:21), I for one do not doubt that the correct translation of Luke 1:3 is that found in the neo-Byzantine's *King James Version*. Of the modern translations, as far as I know, the only one that follows the AV here is a non neo-Alexandrian version, to wit, the Majority Text Burgonites *New King James Version*.

Therefore, when the *Today's English Version* (TEV) translator, Robert Bratcher, claimed, "Luke tells us quite plainly ... that he followed normal means of historical investigation in order to provide 'an orderly account' for his reader (Luke 1:1-4)," he was fudging the facts. That is because he first took what is an ambiguous Greek passage capable of two quite different translations, and rendered it in a way that suited his religiously liberal views; and then he *hid behind this translation*, falsely holding it out as some kind of value free translation of what "Luke tells us quite plainly."

²¹⁹ Bratcher, R.G., *op. cit.*, p. 3.

These types of religious liberals confuse the fact that God works *with* man's will, *not against* man's will, to undermine verbal inspiration. E.g., it is possible that Ezra inspected an actual copy of the decree of Artaxerxes in Ezra 7:11-26. But if so, this does not invalidate the fact that Ezra wrote exactly what God told him to write in Ezra 7:11-26. God was good and generous to St. Luke to allow him to listen to some of the eyewitnesses of the events he wrote about in Luke-Acts (Luke 1:1,2). (Bible prophets sometimes asked questions about the things they were told to write, I Peter 1:10-12.) But God did not have to do so if he did not want to; and what St. Luke wrote in Luke-Acts was exactly what God told him to write (Luke 1:3). God chose the very words that St. Luke used, taking them from St. Luke's vocabulary and style, but it was God who said to him, as he did to Jeremiah, "whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak" (Jer. 1:7). For God clearly says to all his prophets, i.e., all who wrote every book of the Bible, that which he said to Isaiah, "I have put my words in thy mouth" (Isa. 51:16). For "all Scripture," not simply *some* Scripture, but "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (II Tim. 3:16).

Last decade, I knew a man who was then in about his mid 20s, and who worshipped at a Christian Brethren Church in Sydney. He used to speak to me very highly about Peterson's *The Message* (1993²²⁰) which first came out that same decade, although from the little I saw of it at the time I was never attracted to it. Having looked at it for the first time with any seriousness when I considered making some secondary reference to it in this commentary, I can now say that I find it to be a truly shocking "translation," and not one that I would want to have anything to do with. It is typical of the debased intellectual, moral, and spiritual society of the world that we find all around us, which has tragically infiltrated the church again and again.

Nevertheless, I considered including *The Message* (1993) for some occasional references in this commentary. E.g., *prima facie* it follows variants that omit: "the gate" (Matt. 7:13,14b), "the disciples" (Matt. 14:26b), and "him" (Matt. 14:36). But the problem is that this is such a loose "translation," with so many "dynamic equivalents," that one can never be sure if these changes are due to the underpinning Greek text, or due to the method of English "translation" adopted by Peterson. E.g., *prima facie* at Matt. 13:16, Peterson omits the "your" from "your ears" (AV), as does the variant Greek reading there. But *The Message* also omits "your" from the previous "your eyes" (AV), where the neo-Alexandrian text does not. Since Peterson makes this first omission of "your" for his own stylistic reasons, how can one reasonably tell whether Peterson is doing the same with the second "your," or whether he is following the variant at Matt. 13:16? Or *prima facie* at Matt. 13:33, *The Message* follows *Variant 2* in omitting, "spake he unto them" (AV). Yet just above this, Peterson omits some broadly similar words, "put he forth unto them, saying" (AV) at Matt. 13:31, where once again the neo-Alexandrian texts do not. Therefore, once again, I am left to ask, How can one know if at Matt. 13:31 Peterson is omitting "spake he unto them" (AV) on the basis that he is

²²⁰ Eugene Peterson's *The Message*, New Testament (Navpress, Colorado, USA, 1993), with Psalms & Proverbs (Christian Art Publishers, South Africa, 1996).

following *Variant 2* as his Greek text for *The Message*, or on the basis of the same English “stylistic” considerations that led him to omit, “put he forth unto them, saying” (AV) at Matt. 13:31?

I hope that these examples from Peterson’s *The Message*, help the reader to better understand part of the reason that I find *The Message* (1993) to be such a deeply frustrating translation to look at. I hope the reader might better understand how difficult it is to try and unravel some of these so called “dynamic equivalents” that one finds in a number of modern translations, and how in many ways one might fairly characterize them as *new* variants. I must conclude that *The Message* is such a *bad* message in terms of its ability to follow any text, whether a neo-Alexandrian text or some variant, that it is not possible for me to refer to it in this first volume dealing with Matt. 1-14, or any subsequent volumes. Suffice to say that it is a *bad* translations with a *bad* message, and only a very sadly misguided person would ever exchange the rich beauties of the Authorized King James Version and *Textus Receptus*, for this most inferior and debased version, whose accuracy, underpinning Greek, and standard of English, is as far away from the lofty heights of the King James Version, as the South Pole is from the North Pole.

10) *Miscellaneous Matters*

- a) *Christians: Professed Christians and True Christians.*
- b) *Commentary principles of simplicity.*
- c) *The die has been cast.*

a) *Christians: Professed Christians and True Christians.*

The Two Books of Homilies referred to in Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, use the term “Christian” in a variety of different ways in different contexts. I use the term with similar flexibility, and diversity of meaning, depending on context. In doing so, I am conscious of the fact that not all my fellow Christians agree with me on all such usages.

In the Book of Romans, in demonstrating one way that those who called themselves a “Jew,” and have “the law” (Rom. 2:17), violate the Third Commandment, *Thou shalt not take the Lord’s name in vain* (Exod. 20:7), St. Paul says, “the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you” (Rom. 2:24). I.e., by claiming to be a “Jew,” but by not being a true spiritual “Jew” (Rom. 2:29), their profession to be a “Jew” was a blasphemy against God. Yet for all that, St. Paul himself will still use the term “Jew” of them in other contexts (Rom. 3:1).

So too, I think there are many who profess and call themselves “Christian.” Yet their profession is a blasphemy of Christ’s name, and violates the third commandment (Isa. 52:5). Sometimes I might call them “heretics” or “Christian heretics.” But other times, I might in a broad sense call them “Christians,” since that is what they profess to be, though in doing so I do not doubt that they blaspheme the name of God. E.g., if I think a person was *probably* baptized, I might ask, “What is your Christian name?” But

in doing so, I might be well aware that their profession of Christianity is a blasphemy against God, and that they are quite irreligious.

I know a godly Reformed Baptist Minister who laboured for years as a missionary in Verona, Italy, (Joe Lenton of Gosford, NSW), who strongly disagrees with me on this matter, and thinks that the term “Christian” should only be used for a true Christian. Thus while I support his wonderful missionary work in bringing people out of Popery in Verona, I would with all due respect to him, not agree with him that I could never in any context refer to a Roman Catholic as a “Christian.” Although I would agree with him that Roman Catholics are not *true* Christians, unless of course they are there temporarily, awaiting to hear and act upon the call, “Come out!” (II Cor. 6:17; Rev. 18:4)

I shall not now undertake a comprehensive analysis of this matter in Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*. But I shall annunciate the principles I there find, with which I agree, that the reader may better understand my usage of “Christian” in this work. Whenever it is used, he needs to carefully consider the context I use it in. E.g., when on the one hand, I say at Matt. 6:4b,6, “The ‘reward’ we Christians receive is that which is procured for us by *Christ alone*,” or at Matt. 11:23a, “and certainly we Christians would consider this is authoritative,” I clearly mean the *true* Christian. But on the other hand, when I say at Matt. 7:10, “By the grace of God, let us be careful and diligent, not to take the glories of Christendom’s Received Text, being drawn from the glories of Eastern Christendom’s Byzantine Text, here supported in Matt. 7:9,10 by the glories of Western Christendom’s Latin Text; and exchange these glories for a couple of old, long lost, and only recently rediscovered, inglorious third rate manuscripts from the Land of Ham,” I am using the term “Christendom” with respect to the *profession to be Christian* by Eastern Orthodox (“Eastern Christendom’s Byzantine Text”) and Roman Catholics (“Western Christendom’s Latin Text”). Certainly I do not regard them to be *true* Christians.

For did St. Paul regard them to be a true “Jew,” who in “unbelief,” still had “committed” “unto them” “the oracles of God” (Rom. 3:1-3)? But of course, good Christian reader, the doctrine of *Divine preservation of Scripture* does not require that those unto whom are “committed” “the oracles of God” (Rom. 3:2) are necessarily true believers, although they may be. If this were not the case, we could have no Divinely preserved OT oracles in NT times, for NT Judaism was in sad apostasy and had been so since inter-testamental times. Yet what saith the same Christ who condemned apostate NT Judaism in e.g., Matt. 23? This same Christ saith, “Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law” (Matt. 5:18). Did NT Christians, who were mainly Gentiles, relieve NT Jews in apostasy of their textual copying out of the OT Oracles? As far as we know, they did not! For while to the Gentile race was committed the preservation of the NT Oracles (whether they be in apostasy or not), yet to the Hebrew race was committed the preservation of the OT Oracles in OT, intertestamental, and NT times (whether they be in apostasy or not), and this was then carried on after NT times mainly by Jews (who were in the apostasy of rejecting the Messiah), until the movement over to the printing in the 16th century.

Nor could we have any Divinely preserved OT oracles for the purposes of the OT Received Text, for these were recovered primarily from the Hebrew Text in the 16th century, having been preserved by the power of God and not man, in apostate Judaism. And neither could we have Divinely preserved NT oracles, recovered primarily from the Greek Text in the 16th century, having been preserved by the power of God and not man, in apostate Eastern Orthodoxy, and to a lesser extent, in apostate Roman Catholicism which mainly preserved the Latin.

But because I am conscious of how much some of my brethren in Christ dislike me using the term “Christian” for any but what is contextually the true Christian, I thought it best that I should give a relatively small number of examples of my view, from the Two Books of Homilies. The usages I make are consonant with the broader usage of “Christian” in the Homilies of this Article 35, the wider study of which I leave to the good reader’s pleasure.

Sometimes the Anglican Homilies of the 39 Articles, use the term “Christian” for any person who professes and calls themselves “Christian,” irrespective of the quality of that profession. E.g., in the Second Book of Homilies, Homily 2, “Against Peril of Idolatry” (Part 2). Here we find that in contradistinction to Mohammedans, both Roman Catholics and Greek Orthodox are referred to as Christians (emphasis mine). “Into what darkness and blindness of ignorance and idolatry *all Christendom* should fall by the occasion of images.” “And so rose a jealousy, suspicion, grudge, hatred, and enmity between the *Christians* and Empires of the East countries [i.e., primarily Eastern Orthodox] and West [i.e., Roman Catholics], which could never be quenched or pacified. So that, when the [Islamic] Saracens first, and afterward the [Mohammedan] Turks, invaded the *Christians*, the one part of *Christendom* would not help the other. By reason whereof at the last the noble Empire of Greece, and the city imperial of Constantinople, was lost [in 1453 A.D.], and is come into the hands of infidels; who now have overrun almost all *Christendom*, and possessing past the middle of Hungary, which is part of the West Empire, do hang over all our heads to the utter danger of *all Christendom*.”

“Thus we see what a sea of mischiefs the maintenance of images hath brought with it; what an horrible schism between the East and the West Church [in *The Great Schism* of 1054 A.D.]; what an hatred between *one Christian and another*; Councils against Councils, Church against Church, *Christians against Christians*, . . . , the tearing in sunder of *Christendom* and the Empire into two pieces, till the [Mohammedan] *Infidels, Saracens, and Turks, common enemies to both parts*, have most cruelly vanquished, destroyed, and subdued the one part, the whole Empire of Greece, Asia the Less, . . . and many other great and goodly countries and provinces, and have won a great piece of the other Empire, and put the whole in dreadful fear and most horrible danger.”

But on other occasions, these same Anglican Homilies and 39 Articles, make a distinction between *true* Christians and *false* Christians, in which the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox are not regarded as true Christians. E.g., in the Second Book of Homilies, Homily 21, “Against Rebellion” (Part 6) (emphasis mine). This says, “some . . . princes also suffer themselves to be abused by the Bishop of Rome, his Cardinals, and

bishops, to the oppressing of ... *true Christians*.” But what, according to these Homilies and Articles, is a “true Christian”?

Part of that answer is found in the Biblical teaching of orthodoxy. In Book 1, Homily 12, “Against Contention” (Part 1), we read, “There is but *one faith* ... , one faith ... joineth in an unity” “Christians.” “He that is faulty, let him rather amend than defend that which he hath spoken amiss, lest he fall by contention from a foolish error into an obstinate heresy.” What might be such “an obstinate heresy”? Article 19 of the 39 Articles, says the Greek Orthodox “Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred ... , not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.” Article 8, of the 39 Articles says, “The three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius’s Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles’ Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture.”

The *Athanasian Creed* says, “Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the catholick [universal] faith, Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. And the Catholick faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity; neither confounding the persons: nor dividing the substance” etc. . One sections reads, “The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made, nor created, but begotten.” This is known as *the double procession of the Holy Ghost* i.e. the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. This is taught in various Scriptures (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:7; Acts 2:17,32,33). Because “the Spirit of God” proceeds from the Father *and the Son*, he is called “the Spirit of Christ” (Rom. 8:9).

But at the time of the *Great Schism* in 1054, the Greek Orthodox Church split from Rome claiming that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *alone*. Like the other Eastern Orthodox Churches formed from them (e.g., Russian Orthodox or Serbian Orthodox), they deny the double procession of the Holy Ghost. Yet in e.g., Gal. 4:6, we read that “God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son.” Since the Spirit is called “the Spirit of his Son,” it follows that he proceeds from the Son, and since “God hath sent forth the Spirit,” it follows that he proceeds from the Father. Thus Gal. 4:6 teaches the double procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son. In this same Epistle, St. Paul says those in “heresies” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:20,21). Thus to claim on the basis of Gal. 4:6; 5:20,21, that those in the obstinate heresy of denying the double procession of the Holy Ghost, will in the words of the *Athanasian Creed*, “without doubt ... perish everlastingly,” is certainly very Biblical.

Thus the Anglican Homilies of Article 35 of the 39 Articles, teach us that the Greek Orthodox are one example of those who are not *true Christians*. Rather they are in “obstinate heresy,” denying the double procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *and the Son* (Latin, *filioque*) upheld in Article 8 of the 39 Articles.

But the Homilies of Article 35 of the 39 Articles provide another example of those who are not *true Christians*. In the First Book of Homilies, Homily III, “Of Salvation” (Part 2) (emphasis mine). Here we read, “we be justified by faith only, freely,

and without works This faith the holy Scripture teacheth ..., this whosoever denieth is not to be counted for *a true Christian man*, nor for a setter forth of Christ's glory, but for an adversary of Christ and his Gospel, and for a setter forth of men's vainglory." For as this First Book of Homilies, Homily IV, "Of Faith" (Part 3) (emphasis mine), further says, "good Christian people, ... Christ ... saith, 'The tree is known by the fruit' [Matt. 12:33]. Therefore let us do good work, and thereby declare our faith to be the lively [/living] *Christian* faith Thy deeds and works must be an open testimonial of thy faith; otherwise thy faith, being without good works, is but the devils' faith [James 2:19], the faith of the wicked, a fantasy of faith, and not *a true Christian faith*."

It is clear from this, that the Homily takes the Biblical position (Gal. 1:8,9; 3:11), that the "true Christian" must believe in justification by faith alone, and do good works, not in order to be saved, but because he is saved. This therefore excludes both Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox from the definition. E.g., in the wider 39 Articles, justification by faith is upheld in Articles 11,12, *et al*; Article 13 specifically rejects the teaching of the Roman Catholic "School-authors" which claims "works" "make men meet to receive grace;" and Article 14 specifically rejects the Roman Catholic teaching about "works of supererogation." Or Article 22 says, "The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons" and other things, "is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."

Understandably then, the First Book of Homilies, Homily 5, "Of Good Works" (Part 3), says, "King Henry the Eighth, ... put away ... superstitious and pharisaical sects of Antichrist invented and set up against the true Word of God and glory of his most blessed name" e.g., "Papistical superstitions," "Councils of Rome," and "laws of Rome." Indeed, Book 1, Homily 10, "Of Obedience" (Part 3), says, "the bishop of Rome ... ought ... to be called Antichrist." Book 2, Homily 16, "Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghost," (Part 2) says, "the Bishops of Rome and their adherents are not the true Church if Christ." "First, as touching that" "the Popes" "will be termed Universal Bishops and Heads of all Christian Church through the world, we have the judgment of Gregory [the Great] expressly against them, who, ... condemneth John Bishop of Constantinople on that behalf, calling him ... the forerunner of Antichrist 'Many (Matt. 24:5,24) shall come in my name,' saith Christ [And] ... all the Popes ... are worthily accounted among the number of ... 'false Christs' (Matt. 24:24)." For, says Book 2, Homily 21, "Against Rebellion" (Part 6), the "Bishop of Rome" is "the Babylonical beast of Rome" (Rev. 17).

Thus on the one hand, the Anglican Homilies and 39 Articles consider that the term "Christian" may sometimes be used of all those who call and profess themselves to be "Christian." Hence in referring to the Mohammedan attacks on Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholics, the Homilies refer to both Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholics as "Christians." But on the other hand, these same Anglican Homilies and 39 Articles, consider that when distinguishing between "true Christians" and those in "obstinate heresy," one can denounce the Greek Orthodox as hell bound heretics who "without doubt ... shall perish everlastingly" through reference to the *Athanasian Creed*. One can say of both Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic that because they do not believe "we

be justified by faith only, freely, and without works,” that they are “not to be counted for a true Christian” (unless of course God is in the process of calling them out of these false systems of religion, for we are clearly taught God does this in Rev. 18:4). Indeed, the Pope is denounced as the “Antichrist.”

As the Anglican Homilies and 39 Articles do, so do I. And I consider that the NT *Epistle to the Romans* acts to warrant this type of diverse usage depending on context. Therefore context alone should be consulted to see if by “Christian” I mean the true Christian (which in most instances I do), or those who profess and call themselves “Christian,” thereby blaspheming the name of God (which far less frequently I do).

b) *Commentary principles of simplicity.*

When I consider it relevant, I have occasionally gone to a more extended theological commentary on the passage in dealing with textual commentary (see Matt. 5:32b; Matt. 6:32 in Appendix 3 of St. Matthew’s Gospel, related to Matt. 6:33 commentary).

This commentary is intended for the widest possible usage among the brethren (and any other interested persons). Hence the normal labyrinth of cryptic symbols used in a textual commentary have been abandoned as an unwanted maze. So too, the letters familiar to English readers are generally used, rather than Greek letters. That is because the Greek letters may create an unnecessary barrier that inhibits the reader understanding the substance of the argument. So too, discussion of side-issue Greek or Latin technicalities have been avoided; to assist the reader understand and focus on the basic issues at stake.

The commentary is designed so that a reader may either read it in its entirety, or simply look up relevant passages of interest to him. By avoiding the usage of cryptic symbols, a person may quickly gain an understanding of the textual issues at a given text. Thus allowing the reader to more quickly understand the matters is an important feature of this commentary. E.g., a church pastor sitting with a member of his congregation who has a concern about a verse, or preparing a sermon that includes a relevant verse, may look up the verse in this commentary, and without spending unnecessary time deciphering a host of cryptic symbols, understand the basic issues and speak on them. Indeed, any Christian, whether an ordained Minister or not, may with relative ease likewise understand the basic issues by reading the relevant section; or reading through the entire work to better understand the *Textus Receptus*.

c) *The die has been cast.*

Like John Burgon, my first textual commentary is on chapters 1 to 14 of St. Matthew’s Gospel. But unlike Burgon who followed the Majority Text, I follow the Received Text of the King James Version. The issues of textual analysis and endorsement of the *Textus Receptus* that I maintain in this first volume of my work on the Received Text are still *matters for consideration* by many.

But as for me, they are matters to which I stand unequivocally committed. With the original first volume of 2008, I passed the Rubicon. Like the Roman General, Julius Caesar (c. 101-44 B.C.), when crossing the Rubicon in 49 B.C., I say, “*Alea iacta est!*”²²¹

²²¹ A Latin saying, “*Alea* (‘the die,’ = singular, i.e., a die in the game of dice) *iacta* (casting) *est* (it is),” meaning, “The die has been cast!” The Rubicon was a small river of northern Italy, that formed the boundary of southern Cisalpine Gaul that Caesar crossed *en route* to engage in his war with Pompey. He pursued him to Egypt, and then came to rule in Rome, e.g., establishing the Julian Calendar. He was assassinated in 44 B.C. . Elements of his story would later be told in fictionalized stage-play form in Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar* (c. 1601).