Matt. 15:2 "their" (TR & AV) {A}

The Greek of the *Textus Receptus* (TR), "*tas* (-) *cheiras* (hands) *auton* ('of them,' or 'their')," in the words, "for they wash not their (*auton*) hands (*tas cheiras*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), the purple parchment Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), and the purple parchment N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*manus* (hands) *suas* (their)," by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century for earliest Vulgate Codices in the Gospels), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, a variant omits "their (Greek, *auton*; Latin, *suas*)," thus making this read, "for they wash not the (Greek, *tas*) hands (Greek, *cheiras*; Latin, *manus*)." This reading is found in old Latin versions f (6th century) and g1 (8th / 9th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. The origins of the variant are speculative. Was its loss accidental? Certainly Manuscript Washington (W 032) shows that such short words could sometimes be accidentally omitted, since e.g., at Matt. 7:17, the Byzantine scribe first omitted "*agathon* (good)," (in "good tree",) and then realizing his mistake, wrote it in the side-margin with a marker showing where the word should go (perhaps initially losing *agathon* from ellipsis with the last two letters of the previous word, *dendron* / "tree"). So too here at Matt. 15:2, a scribe, probably Origen, may have likewise omitted "*auton* (their)," (perhaps losing *auton* from ellipsis with the last letter of the following word, *otan* / "when," a confusion possibly helped by the presence of the letter "t" / tau, two letters before the "n" / nu).

Alternatively, was its loss deliberate? If so, it may have been regarded as "redundant." In the first place, it should be observed that there is a very specific contextual grammatical focus on "the hands." In the Greek, the accusative is used as the grammatical case of *limitation* or *extent*, and so acts to limit a verb's action[1]. Thus here, the action of the verb, "they wash (*niptonai*)," is limited by the accusative to "the (*tas*) hands (*cheiras*, feminine plural accusative noun, from *cheir*)." I.e., this is not talking about a ceremonial washing of e.g., the whole body, but is limited to "the hands."

Moreover, referring to Christ's "disciples (*mathetai*, nominative masculine plural noun, from *mathetes*)," the Greek reads, "*ou* (not) *gar* (for) *niptonai* ('they wash,' indicative middle present, 3rd person plural verb, from *nipto*), "*tas* (the) *cheiras* (hands) *auton* ('of them,' masculine [cf. *mathetai*, *supra*] genitive, 3rd person plural personal pronoun, from

---

[1] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 178.

autos), *otan* (when) *arton* (bread) *esthiosin* ('they eat,' subjunctive active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *esthio*)." Since both "*niptonai* (they wash)" and "*esthiosin* (they eat)" are in the 3rd person plural form (they), grammatical context requires that "*tas* (the) *cheiras* (hands)" in question are those of Christ's "*mathetai* (disciples)." Therefore it is possible to argue that the Greek can be made to work double-time, with these 3rd person plural forms contextually supplying the same meaning as more expressly found in the TR's "*auton* (of them)." If so, the rendering that I give for the variant, *supra*, would be disputed. It would be said that the rendering of the variant should be exactly the same as the rendering from the TR which overtly has "their (*auton*)," i.e., it would be said that the rendering of both should be "their hands," and that (if one was using an English translation that employed italics,) "their" would not have to be put in italics as added, since it is in the Greek of the variant in a covert form.

What are we to make of this proposition, that a scribe should try to impose his *domination quickstep* onto the Greek? Should a scribe, probably Origen, who is like unto a Lieutenant who is a platoon commander (a platoon is *c.* 30 men), make the Greek of the *Textus Receptus* which is like unto a Field Marshall (a Field Marshall is the highest ranking General, known in the USA army as a "Five Star General"), *work double-time* against its will? Should a scribe say to the Received Text, "*Quick!, quick!, quick!, says the scribe, and step up the work; break into double-time, listen to my beat!; I've got the power in my hands of murk; and I've also got the load off my feet"?* "Gross insubordination," I hear you say. And you are absolutely correct!

Evidently St. Matthew, in his verbally inspired Gospel, and therefore ultimately, the Holy Spirit of God (II Tim. 3:16), did not agree with any such scribe either. For we read in Matt. 3:6 "they confessing (*exomologoumenoi*, masculine plural nominative, middle present participle, from *exomologeomai*) their (*auton*) sins." On this perverse logic, could not we here also remove the "their (*auton*)," for contextually they would scarce be confessing someone else's sins? Or in Matt. 6:2, we read, "They have received (*apechousi*, indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *apecho*) their (*auton*) reward." Now they would hardly have received another's reward, and so on this curious approach, could one not also omit "their (*auton*)" from here? The scribes did not do so in these instances, and perhaps this was because they thought it was "even clearer" in Matt. 15:2 "than usual."

Whatever their conjectured logic, if this was a deliberate change we cannot accept its logic. Of course, if the Holy Ghost wanted to make the Greek work double-time in a given passage, it would be entirely his business to do so, and we would certainly accept it as valid. But for a scribe to make this kind of "stylistic improvement" is quite another thing. If a deliberate "stylistic improvement," it was also possibly done as a semi-assimilation (with or without the optional "n" / nu,) to the "*chersi* / *chersin* (hands)" of Mark 7:2,5.

Was this change deliberate or accidental? We simply do not know. We only know for sure that the Received Text was here changed, since there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Greek reading. The TR's reading has solid support in the Greek and Latin, and the variant appears to have originated with Origen, whose standard is known to have been very uneven, fluctuating between very good, very bad, and everything in between. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:2 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:2, is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in that which the neo-Alexandrians call, "the queen of Minuscules," Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type); as well as Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent) and 157 (independent, 12th century); together with the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in all extant Syriac Versions.

However, the incorrect reading which omits, "their," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex 073 (6th century, Matt. 14:28-31; from the same manuscript as 084, 6th century, Matt. 14:19-15:8), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), Codex 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is further found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* This omission is also found in the Armenian Version (5th century).

The erroneous reading is found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952) (with both Tischendorf and Nestle having a footnote showing the TR's reading). However the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), places the "*auton* (their)" in square brackets, thus making its inclusion or exclusion entirely optional.

As discussed, *supra*, it is possible to render Matt. 15:2 as "their hands" from the Greek of the variant, on the basis that one makes the Greek do double-time with one or both of the 3rd person plural forms surrounding "hands (*tas cheiras*)." Thus the American Standard Version, following Westcott & Hort, still reads without any italics for "their" at Matt. 15:2, "for they wash not their hands" (ASV). So too, the correct reading, based upon the incorrect Greek text of the variant, is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Since the reading is the same either way, I would normally include this reading in Appendix 3 of this Volume 2 (Matt. 15-28). But I have not done so on this occasion, in part to point out to the reader that because I normally include such readings in an Appendix, does not thereby mean that I regard them as unimportant. It is simply done as a time and space saving device, since there are so many textual variants that do affect the English reading, I have prioritized these over the others for the purposes of this textual commentary. But I have also referred to this reading here, in order to point out to the reader that the situation of the neo-Alexandrian texts *is worse* than it may at first appear. That is because, not all the variants show up in an English translation. Without looking at the Greek, who would have known, e.g., that the ASV whose reading here is identical with the AV, i.e., "for they wash

not their hands" (Matt. 15:2, AV & ASV), is in fact different in the underpinning Greek? Who would have known that in the Westcott-Hort text underpinning the ASV there is a serious omission of a Greek word; and quite possibly an arrogant and impious spirit of a Greek scribe, probably Origen, who has taken it upon himself to make the Greek do double-time, contrary to the more elegant and serene Greek reading of the *Textus Receptus*?

Matt. 15:4a "commanded, saying" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century) reads, "*Nam* (For) *Deus* (God) *dixit* (said)," as does the Latin Vulgate at Matt. 15:4a. But the Vulgate reads at Mark 7:10, "*Moses* (Moses) *enim* (For) *dixit* (said)," and so it looks like the Diatessaron is probably taking this reading from Matt. 15:4a. While the likelihood is quite low that it was using a Latin Vulgate Codex that followed old Latin f, *infra*, at Matt. 15:4a, because one cannot rule out the possibility that it did, and that due to its Diatessaron formatting it is taking the "*dixit* (said)," from Mark 7:10, I make no reference to the Sangallensis Diatessaron *infra*. (A decision that those working on the balance of probabilities would no doubt disagree with me on.)

Outside the closed class of sources, the 19th century Latin translation of the Arabic, found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), reads, "*Deus* (God) *dixit* (said)." Once again, because of Diatessaron formatting one cannot with certainty know if this is coming from Matt. 15:4a or Mark 7:10, and so I also make no reference to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:4a, the TR's Greek, "*eneteilato* ('he commanded,' indicative middle first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *entell̲o̲*), *leg̲o̲n* ('saying,' nominative singular masculine, active present participle, from *leg̲o̲*)," in the words, "For God commanded, saying," (AV) etc., is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53; with variant spelling of "*enetilato*"), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century; with variant spelling of "*enetilato*"); E 07 (8th century), F 09 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); and Minuscules 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels); 1010 (12th century); 597 (13th century), 1242 (13th century), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). It is further supported as Latin, "*praecepit* ('he commanded,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *praecipio*) *dicens* ('saying,' nominative singular masculine, active present participle, from *dico*)," in old Latin version f (6th century).

However, a variant reads Greek, "*eipen* ('he said,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *leg̲o̲*)," making this read, "For God said." This is found as Latin, "*dixit* (indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *dico*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Ptolemy the Gnostic in Flora according to

Irenaeus (2nd century), Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (*c.* 395), Origen (d. 254), Amphilochius (d. after 394), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and the ancient church Latin writers, Ambrosiaster (d. after 384), Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was this an accidental change, flowing from a "reconstruction" following a paper loss? Though *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), is a continuous script manuscript, after the words, "*eneteilato* (he commanded), *legon* (saying)," there is a stylistic paper space of 2 to 4 letters, before the next line starts with, "*Tima* (Honour) *ton* (-) *pra* (with a line over it, abbreviating *patera*, father)" etc. . On the same page, this compares with e.g., stylistic paper spaces of about 2 letters between Matt. 15:1 and Matt. 15:2 which continues on the same line; or about 10 or 11 letters at the end of Matt. 14:36, before Matt. 15:1 starts on a new line; or about 18 to 20 letters at the end of Matt. 15:2, before Matt. 15:3 starts on a new line. (In the case of both Matt. 15:1 and Matt. 15:3, the first letter of the line is indented one space to the left of the page to further highlight the stylistic break.)

In the first place, this reminds us that the verse divisions we find in our Authorized Versions, which were first formally composed *with verse numbers* by Stephanus in 1551, quite often reflect a much older tradition of verse divisions that were followed by Stephanus, here found *without verse numbers* some 1100 years earlier in a 5th century Byzantine Manuscript. But in the second place, given such stylistic paper space gaps, if it was clear that the space containing "*eneteilato* (he commanded), *legon* (saying)" had been damaged, and so a paper loss had occurred, a scribe might have "reconstructed" "*eipen* (he said)" from Mark 7:10, where we read, "*Moses* (Moses) *gar* (for) *eipe* (he said[2])." If so, if his manuscript followed similar spacing to Manuscript Washington (W 032), he may simply have regarded this larger stylistic paper space as comparable to the type of thing found in the 10 or 11 letter spaces found in *Codex Freerianus* after Matt. 14:36.

Was this a deliberate change? Did a scribe, either seeking "a more succinct text," or seeking "gospel harmonization," or both, decide to "correct" the text by assimilating to it the "*eipe* (*eipen*)" of Mark 7:10? An accidental or a deliberate change? We cannot be sure, but either way it would appear to be an assimilation from the "*eipe* (*eipen*)" of Mark 7:10.

On the one hand, the reading of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) has rock solid support in the Greek, through time, and over time, from ancient times. With only one old Latin version supporting the TR, we here see an example of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. The words, "*eneteilato* (he commanded) … *legon* (saying)," are certainly Matthean Greek (Matt. 17:9); and there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading. But on the other hand, with a number of ancient church Greek and Latin writers, the representative Latin text follows the variant. Taking these competing considerations into account, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:4a a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

---

[2] I here simply follow Scrivener's Text which lacks the optional "n" (nu) at the end of *eipe*. For a discussion of optional letters, see Appendices in Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14).

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:4a, "commanded, saying," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is further found in the main text of the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; and Slavic Version (9th century).

However the incorrect reading, "said," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex 073 (6th century, Matt. 14:28-31; from the same manuscript as 084, 6th century, Matt. 14:19-15:8) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions, and in the margin of the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), Bohairic (3rd century), and Fayyumic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

With the two main Alexandrian texts split down the middle, and the "external support" looked for by some neo-Alexandrians found in both readings in e.g., the Syriac, both neo-Alexandrian texts and versions have divided over this reading. Preferring his discovered manuscript, London Sinaiticus, for the wrong reasons, the correct reading is found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). But preferring Rome Vaticanus, the incorrect reading is found in Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952) (with a footnote giving the correct reading), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) (both of which have footnotes giving the correct reading).

Following Westcott & Hort, the ASV follows the incorrect reading at Matt. 15:4a as, "For God said (*eipen*)," (ASV). The split between neo-Alexandrians is seen in the fact that the incorrect reading, following Rome Vaticanus is also found in the NASB, NRSV, NIV, NEB, & TEV. However, the correct reading, following London Sinaiticus, is found in the RSV and ESV (both of which gratuitously omit "saying"), and is referred to in the footnote reading of the NRSV. Though gratuitously omitting "For (*Gar*)" and "saying (*legon*)" from

Matt. 15:4a, Moffatt also follows the correct reading in his rendering, "God enjoined (*eneteilato*), 'Honour …'" etc. (Moffatt Bible).

Matt. 15:4b "thy" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter (The Latin Vulgate Text).

The text I use for the NT of Jerome's Latin Vulgate is that of Wordsworth & White (1911)[3]. But Latin Vulgate Codices are split over this reading. Hence while I follow Wordsworth & White in isolating the reading of St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate as supporting the TR; there is also a rival Vulgate form which follows the variant, and which may be found in some other editions of the Latin Vulgate, and which was also adopted in the Clementine.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting).

Inside the closed class of sources, at both Matt. 15:4b and Mark 7:10, the Latin Vulgate reads, "*Honora* (Honour) *patrem* (father) *tuum* (thy) *et* (and) *matrem* (mother)." Thus the reading of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, "*Honora* (Honour) *patrem* (father) *et* (and) *matrem* (mother)," evidently supports the variant at Matt. 15:4b since the presence of "*tuum*" after "*patrem*" at Mark 7:10 is found throughout the Latin textual tradition. Hence the Sangallensis Diatessaron which is a Latin Vulgate Codex formatted in Diatessaron style, must have here been following those Latin Vulgate Codices which differ from the ones underpinning Wordsworth & White's text, also evident in several old Latin versions, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, the reading of the Arabic Diatessaron, which in Ciasca's Latin translation is, "*Honora* (Honour) *patrem* (father) *et* (and) *matrem* (mother)," must likewise be following the variant, since it is not getting this form from Mark 7:10.

The Third Matter (Textual Data).

Julicher says old Latin f & g1 support the TR; whereas Tischendorf says old Latin f, g1, g2, & ff1 support the variant. Both agree that ff1 supports the variant. Therefore I make no reference to the disputed f & g1, *infra*. Given that I do not know who is making the error here, and Julicher does not include g2 in his list, I have decided to make no reference to this manuscript either, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:4b, the TR's Greek, "*sou* (thy)," is a minority Byzantine reading supported by W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), the purple parchment Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th

---

[3] Wordsworth, J., & White, H.J., *Nouum Testamentum Latine*, Secundum Editionem Sancti Hieronymi, Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, UK, 1911. See Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface section 5), "Greek and Latin Texts."

century), the purple parchment N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century), K 017 (*Codex Cyprius*, 9th century), M 021 (*Codex Campianus*, 9th century), U 030 (*Codex Nanianus*, 9th century), Y 034 (*Codex Macedoniensis*, 9th century), and Pi 041 (*Codex Petropolitanus*, 9th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*tuum* (thy)," in some editions of Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), being found in, for instance, Latin Vulgate Codices A (*Codex Amiatinus*, 7th / 8th century, Firenze), Q (*Codex Kenanensis*, 7th / 8th century, Dublin), Ma (*Codex Martini-Turonensis*, 8th century, Tours), R (*Codex Rushworthianus*, 8th / 9th century, Oxford), K (*Codex Karolinus*, 9th century, London), Th (*Codex Theodulfianus*, 9th century, Paris), and H (*Codex Hubertianus*, 9th / 10th century, London). It is also supported as Latin, "*tuum* (thy)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), s (7th / 8th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Ptolemy the Gnostic in Flora according to Irenaeus (2nd century) and Epiphanius (d. 403); and Origen (d. 254).

However, Greek, "*sou* (thy)," is omitted in the majority Byzantine Text e.g., E 07 (8th century), F 09 (9th century), S 028 (10th century), and Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). It is also omitted in some editions of Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), being omitted in, for instance, Latin Vulgate Codices J (*Codex Foroiuliensis*, Gospels 6th / 7th century, Cividale), Z (*Codex Harleianus*, Gospels 6th / 7th century, London), and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century); and is further omitted in old Latin versions e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), aur (7th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). From the Latin support for this reading, the omission is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century), Origen (d. 254), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

The representative Byzantine text here poses a fivefold textual problem. In the first place, the absence of at least one "*sou* (thy)," made to work double-time for both "father and mother," clangs on the ears as bad Greek. Such an abbreviation is too curt and imprecise. "Honour the father and the mother" of who? Oneself or another's parents, and if another's parents, whose?

The Septuagint Greek of both Exod. 20:12 and Deut. 5:16 reads, "*Tima* (Honour) *ton* (the) *patera* (father) *sou* (of thee) *kai* (and) *t*e*n* (the) *m*e*tera* (mother) *sou* (of thee)" (LXX); and in the Matthean Greek of Matt. 19:19 we read a reasonable abbreviation of this to, "*Tima* (Honour) *ton* (the) *patera* (father) *sou* (of thee) *kai* (and) *t*e*n* (the) *m*e*tera* (mother)" i.e., making the one "*sou* (of thee)" work double-time, so that "Honour thy father and thy mother" (Exod. 20:12; Deut. 5:16) becomes, "Honour thy father and mother." (See commentary at Matt. 19:19). (This abbreviation of Matt. 19:19 is also found at Mark 10:19; Eph. 6:2) Indeed, so extraordinarily incomplete and ambiguous is the abbreviation of the representative Byzantine text at Matt. 15:4b, "*Tima* (Honour) *ton* (the) *patera* (father) *kai* (and) *t*e*n* (the) *m*e*tera* (mother)," that nowhere else in the NT do we find this abbreviated form used for the 5th commandment either (Mark 7:10; 10:19; Luke 18:20; Eph. 6:2). (Cf. commentary at Matt. 19:19.)

In the second place, this concern is heightened by the following words, "and, He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death" (Matt. 15:4). For if an initial "*sou* (thy)" is present, it can now work quadruple-time to alert the reader to the fact "thy" "father," "mother," "father," "mother" that is meant in Matt. 15:4. But if this initial "*sou* (thy)" is

absent, we now have the confusion of who is meant by "Honour the father and the mother," confounded by the further confusion of whose "father or mother" is being referred to with respect to "he that curseth."

In the third place, this concern is further intensified by the words of Matt. 15:5, "Whosever shall say to the (*to*) father (*patri*) or (*e*) the (*te*) mother (*metri*), "It is a gift" etc. . For if we do not have that an initial "*sou* (thy)" to now work sextuple time, we are still wondering whose "father" and "mother" this is referring to. Thus confusion ("Honour the father and the mother") confounded ("He that curseth a father or a mother"), is now convulsed.

In the fourth place, the natural concerns that so curt, imprecise, and confusing a terminology raise, are confirmed to us by the fact that one then finally reads in Matt. 15:6, that such a man doth, "honour not the (*ton*) father (*patera*) of him (*autou*) or (*e*) the (*ten*) mother (*metera*) of him (*autou*)," i.e., "And honour not his father or his mother" (AV). At this point the original reader or listener of the Gospel, would then have to project back in his mind to reread, or rehear to Matt. 15:3-6 to understand it properly. *This is a very unlikely scenario.* Rather, it is more probable to conclude that the "*autou* (of him)" (twice) here, implies the presence of at least one earlier "*sou* (thy)."

In the fifth place, the grammatical structure of Matt. 15:6, "the (*ton*) father (*patera*) of him (*autou*) or (*e*) the (*ten*) mother (*metera*) of him (*autou*)," seems to presuppose that the original quote from the 5th commandment to which it so clearly refers, must have read with comparable clarity, either "*ton* (the) *patera* (father) *sou* (of thee) *kai* (and) *ten* (the) *metera* (mother) *sou* (of thee)," or "*ton* (the) *patera* (father) *sou* (of thee) *kai* (and) *ten* (the) *metera* (mother)," though which of these two options is correct one could not know from Matt. 15:6 alone. Nevertheless, one could rule out the representative Byzantine reading, which is neither. In view of the fact that a good deal of abbreviation is going on in Matt. 15:3-5, with the absence of "*sou* (thy)" in "He that curseth a father or a mother" (Matt. 15:4) and "Whosever shall say to the father or the mother" (Matt. 15:5), it is certainly reasonable to conclude that Matt. 15:6 could be referring to a single instance of an initial "*sou* (thy)," thereafter made to work sextuple time. Therefore, to resolve this textual problem, it is necessary to adopt the minority Byzantine reading of W 032 *et al*, namely, "*sou* (thy)."

The origins of the variant are speculative. Was it an accidental omission? Especially if the "*sou* (thy)" came at the end of a line, it could easily be lost by a paper fade. Moreover, Manuscript Washington reads, "*Tima* (Honour) *ton* (-) *pra* (with a line over it, abbreviating *patera*, father)" etc. . If e.g., there was a paper fade of the "*ra*" of "*pra* (fr)" and the following "*sou* (thy)" on a given line, a scribe might have "reconstructed" this "from context" as the non-abbreviated form of "father," i.e., "*patera*," and with no spaces then left, "concluded" that "the original must have lacked '*sou*'."

Was this a deliberate omission? If so, the scribe removing it to form "a more succinct text" must have been grossly incompetent. But of course, that is also possible. Evidently Origen who knew of both readings, and saw nothing wrong with using the variant, failed to detect the textual problem. Thus we cannot rule out the possibility that an earlier scribe might have likewise botched the text from his lack of requisite skills.

An accidental or deliberate change? I think the former more likely than the latter, but

we cannot be sure, because we do not know   the standard of scribe through whose hands the text passed.

On the one hand, textual analysis favours the TR's reading as the *most probable* reading, even though the variant reading is a *possible* reading.   Though a minority Byzantine reading, the TR's reading has clear support in the Greek textual tradition both over time and through time, dating from ancient times.   It also has excellent support in the Latin textual tradition both over time and through time, dating from ancient times.   With respect to the Vulgate, though the correct reading is found in the Latin Vulgate of Wordsworth & White, which manifests the reading of a number of Latin Vulgate Codices, this *prima facie* support of the Vulgate is largely neutralized by the fact that other Latin Vulgate Codices support the variant, and so the variant's reading appears in rival editions of the Vulgate.   Reference to the correct reading is also made by two ancient writers from the 2nd and 3rd centuries, although once again the effect of this is largely neutralized, in this case by the fact that in one instance this is reportive only by a writer who prefers the variant's reading (Irenaeus), and in the other instance, the writer is known to be erratic and uses both readings (Origen).

On the other hand, the incorrect reading is supported by the representative Byzantine text, some Latin texts, and several ancient church writers.   Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:4b, 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.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:4b is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).   It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.*   It is further found in all extant Syriac versions e.g., the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Version; and also the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century).

However, the incorrect reading which omits "thy," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century).   It is further found in Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent), 788 (11th century, independent), 579 (mixed text, 13th century); and also the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)*, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude).   It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect variant is found in the NU Text *et al*, and so it is the standard neo-Alexandrian reading. The incorrect variant is also found in Green's Textual Apparatus (1986), Robinson and Pierpont's *New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform* (1991), and Hodges and Farstad's *Greek NT According to the Majority Text* (1985); and so it is also the standard Burgonite reading. Neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites thus here unite in an alliance, hoping to blast the word, "*sou* (thy)," out of the NT Text. They are joined in a triple alliance by some, though not all Roman Catholic Latins, such as those of the Clementine Vulgate (1592). But neither these Latin Papists, nor the faulty Alexandrian texts of the neo-Alexandrians, nor the arrogant Puseyite brad of Burgon, "Again and again we shall have occasion to point out … that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction" "upon the" basis of the "majority of authorities[4]," can prevail against any kind of serious textual analysis of Matt. 15:4b. The Latin Papists of e.g., the Clementine Vulgate, the neo-Alexandrians, and the Burgonites, all fall down broken, but the neo-Byzantine Received Text stands upright. *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!* [5] "The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever!"

Admittedly, we cannot be sure as to where the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims (Douai-Rheims) Version (NT 1582) got its correct rendering from, "Honour thy father and mother." It might have come from either those Latin texts which contain "*tuum* (thy)," or it might have been based on the Latin texts omitting it and manifested in the Roman Catholic Clementine Vulgate (1592), and then supplied by the translators. Since the Douay-Rheims does not use italics for added words, we simply do not know, and nor do any of its readers.

Yet now we find an extraordinary thing. That which *with one hand* the neo-Alexandrians, Burgonites, and some Latin Papists take away in their NT texts, the English translators using these faulty texts *give back with the other hand*. Thus e.g., at Matt. 15:4b the American Standard Version reads, *without italics*, "For God said, Honor thy father and thy mother" (ASV). Here they supply not one "thy," but two! Now if the first one is not in their underpinning neo-Alexandrian Westcott-Hort text, to be sure the second one is neither in their nor any other neo-Alexandrian text, nor in the Burgonites' Majority Text, nor in the Latin Vulgate, and certainly it is not in our neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus*. So where does it come from? Though there is some small manuscript support for it[6], we cannot believe that this is their source. Rather, they have created it from thin air.

So too, at Matt. 15:4b, we find that both the first "*sou* (thy)," together with the ASV's

---

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

[5]   Latin Motto of the Lutheran Reformation, first used by Frederick the Wise in 1522, quoting I Peter 1:25.

[6]   Inside the closed class of sources it is a minority Byzantine reading, also found in some Latin texts. There being no good textual argument against the absence of the second "*sou* (thy)" in the representative Byzantine Text, this reading, found in the TR, is surely correct. Outside the closed class of sources, the incorrect addition also appears in some Syriac Versions.

second one, appears without neo-Alexandrian textual support in the neo-Alexandrians'
RSV, NRSV, ESV, and TEV; and we also find that the first "*sou* (thy)," reappears without
neo-Alexandrian textual support in the neo-Alexandrians' NASB – *again without italics*, as
well as the NIV, Moffatt Bible, NEB. The *Twentieth Century NT* (TCNT) (1904) says on its
title page that it is, "A translation into modern English made from … Westcott & Hort's
Text," yet when we turn to St. Matthew's Gospel we find that unlike the Westcott-Hort Text,
this Gospel is placed after St. Mark's Gospel, and unlike the Westcott-Hort Text, the verse
reads, "For God said – 'Honour thy father and mother'."

As for the Burgonites' *New King James Version*, we find it provides no footnote
stating that the first "*sou* (thy)" is absent in both the NU Text and Majority Text.

So what's going on? The answer is surely astounding! It seems that the neo-
Alexandrians and Burgonites have scratched the heads of their "great brains." This has
resulted in the conclusion that they "are smart enough" to see the difficulty created in an
English translation of Matt. 15:4 if their versions read, "Honour the father and the mother,"
whereas, "of course," "that silly Bible writer," Matthew, "obviously lacking our intelligence,
must not have realized this same fact." Such a "Bible blunder" must "therefore be corrected
in our Alexandrian" or "Burgonite" "version." As to the question of "whether or not we
should tell the reader that we are correcting the text at this point," they have evidently further
reached the conclusion in the negative.

Thus we have an interesting paradox. On the one hand, the correct translation at
Matt. 15:4b is found in e.g., the neo-Alexandrians' NASB, NIV, Moffatt Bible, and NEB, or
the Burgonites' NKJV. But on the other hand, they have done so with an attitude of arrogant
impiety, in the which they have worked from faulty texts lacking this "*sou* (thy)," but in
which they have, *to their curious minds*, been setting themselves *over the Word of God* as
they wrongly conceptualize it in their erroneous texts; and then, thinking that they have a
"wisdom" (I Cor. 1:20) greater than even that of God, they have "supplied a missing word"
that "God himself left out" (even though of course, he left out no such word at all). And so
too, with a similar impiety, both the first and then a second "*sou* (thy)" is added in the neo-
Alexandrians' ASV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and TEV.

For neither those who think of themselves as "adding one '*sou* (thy)'," nor those who
think of themselves as "adding '*sou* (thy)' twice," at Matt. 15:4b, will use italics to show the
difference between their "addition" and that of the text (as they wrongly conceptualize the
text in their faulty Greek texts). No, not even the ASV and NASB will "condescend" from
their high horses to do this, even though both the ASV and NASB hold themselves out as
versions so using italics! They thus produce a form of the fifth commandment (Exod.
20:12), that violates the eighth commandment, "Thou shalt not steal" (Exod. 20:15), as they
seek to rob God of the honour due to his holy name (3rd commandment), by claiming that
they, and not God, have come up with the idea of "adding in the first '*sou* (thy)'" at Matt.
15:4b.

"For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the
understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the
disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" (I Cor.
1:19,20) "These" "two" prophets of the Old Testament and the New Testament are "the two
candlesticks standing before the God of the earth." Of them it is said, "If any man will 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; cf. Ps. 119:105). Good Christian reader, Dost thou find this comment offensive? Then ring up heaven on the royal telephone and speak to God about it, because he said it in the Bible, not me!

Matt. 15:6a "And" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the reading of the Latin Vulgate at Matt. 15:6a, "*et* (and) *non* (not) *honorificabit* (he will honour) *patrem* (father)" etc., is found in the 9th century Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, and is quite different to the reading of the Latin Vulgate at Mark 7:12, "*et* (and) *ultra* (further) *non* (not) *dimittitis* (ye suffer) *eum* (him)," etc. . Though it looks very much as though the Sangallensis text is being drawn from Matt. 15:6a, it is nevertheless still possible that the Sangallensis Codex is getting the "*et* (and)" from Mark 7:12 due to its Diatessaron formatting, even though probably it is not. Therefore, I make no reference to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, the 12th-14th centuries Arabic Diatessaron formatters made a different selection, choosing to follow Mark 7:12 here, so that Ciasca's 19th century Latin translation reads, "*et* (and) *ultra* (further) *non* (not) *sinunt* (they suffer) *eum* (him)," etc. But once again, due to its Diatessaron formatting, the "*et* (and)" might be coming from Matt. 15:6a and / or Mark 7:12. Therefore, I make no reference to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

The Second Matter. Outside the closed class of sources, Nestle-Aland (27th ed.) shows the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contains Minuscule 788 following the TR; whereas Swanson shows it following the variant. Hence I make no reference to Minuscule 788, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:6a, the TR's Greek, "*Kai* (And)," in the words, "And (*Kai*) honour not his father" (AV) etc., is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), E 07 (8th century), K 017 (9th century), Gamma 036 (10th century), and Minuscule 2 (12th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*et* (and)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

However, "And (Greek, *Kai*; Latin, *et*)," is omitted in a variant reading, found in old Latin versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). This omission is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

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

is thus correct.   The origins of the variant are   conjectural.   Was this an accidental omission?   In e.g., Manuscript Washington, there is a one letter paper space before Matt. 15:6a in the continuous script, indicating that this is an ancient verse division, later known since 1551 (Stephanus) as verse 6.   If such a division was present, a paper fade of the "*Kai* (And)" could have been taken by a scribe as simply a larger stylistic paper space, i.e., marking the beginning of (the then unnumbered) verse 6[7].

Was this a deliberate omission?   A scribe, if so, probably Origen, may have considered that the omission of "*Kai* (And)," in the words, "And (*Kai*) honour not his father" etc., would make for "a more succinct text."   (Cf. commentary on Origen and the variant at Matt. 15:6b, *infra*.)   A deliberate or accidental omission?   We cannot be sure.   We can only know for sure that this variant is not original.

On the one hand, the TR's reading has rock solid support in the Byzantine Greek textual tradition from ancient times, and good support in the Latin textual tradition from ancient times, most notably, in St. Jerome's Vulgate.   But on the other hand, the Latin textual tradition also contains some ancient versions following the variant, which is further followed by a couple of ancient church writers.   In balancing out these competing considerations, and bearing in mind both the superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, and the unstable nature of Origen's mind, with whom this variant appears to have originated; on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:6a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading which includes "and" at Matt. 15:6a, is found in (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century).   It is also found in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al* (see preliminary textual discussion, *supra*).   It is further found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; and the Armenian Version (5th century).

However, the incorrect reading which omits "and" at Matt. 15:6a, is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), and 700 (11th century, independent), 1 (12th century, independent

---

[7]   This ancient verse division is recognized in the AV *et al*, but not Robinson & Pierpont's Majority Text, nor Tischendorf's 8th ed., nor the RSV & NRSV, all four of which include this terminology in the end of a revised verse 5.

text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere),   and 579 (mixed text, 13th century).   It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al*.   Hence the omission is found in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.   Let us thank God for our Authorized King James Versions, which are careful and diligent as well in small words such as this "And," as larger words and passages (such as Matt. 17:21), to give unto us, *the full Word of God*.

Matt. 15:6b "honour" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter.   Inside the closed class of sources, the issue of translation from Greek to Latin arises more pointedly at some times than others.   We know of only two Greek forms of this reading, the TR's subjunctive active aorist, and the variant's indicative active future.   Coming from these two possibilities, it looks to me as though the Greek subjunctive active aorist of the TR was rendered as a Latin indicative active perfect i.e., rendering the Greek aorist tense with a Latin perfect tense.   This is surely confirmed by the fact that if the only other underpinning Greek form were used, it would have had to have been put in the future tense (as in the Vulgate and other Latin texts following the variant, *infra*).

As to the question, Why was this not put into a Latin *subjunctive* i.e., "*honorificaverit* ('he may have honoured,' subjunctive active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *honorifico*)"?   I have no specific answer.   I for one regard the Greek subjunctive mood as contextually important here, and it can only be concluded that the Latin scribal tradition did not share my opinion as to its contextual significance, *infra*.   Nevertheless, such scholastic differences of opinion between these Latin scribes and myself aside, I maintain that whatever the reason, the fact that this was rendered into the Latin perfect tense, would surely indicate an underpinning Greek aorist text rather than a Greek future tense text was being used.   Thus I show old Latin a,e,b,d,ff2,aur,1,ff1, following the TR, *infra*.

The Second Matter.   The reader is also reminded near the start of this Volume 2 (Matt. 15-28), that I frequently pass over unimportant variants inside the closed class of sources that raise side-issues, without specifically referring to them.   E.g., here I make no reference to, "*honorificat* ('he honours,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *honorifico*), in old Latin versions f and c.

The Third Matter.   Outside the closed class of sources, Swanson shows Codex Delta 037 following the TR's reading, whereas Tischendorf shows it following the variant. Therefore I make no reference to it, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:6b, the TR's Greek, "*tim<u>ese</u>* ('he may honour,' or 'he honour,' subjunctive active first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *tima<u>o</u>*)," i.e., "honour" in the words, "and honour not his father" etc., is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century), F 09 (*Codex Boreelianus*, 9th century), G 011 (*Codex*

Seidelianus, 9th century), K 017 (*Codex Cyprius*, 9th century), M 021 (*Codex Campianus*, 9th century), U 030 (*Codex Nanianus*, 9th century), V 031 (*Codex Mosquensis*, 9th century), Pi 041 (*Codex Petropolitanus*, 9th century), S 028 (*Codex Vaticanus*, 10th century), X 033 (*Codex Monacensis*, 10th century), Gamma 036 (*Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus*, 10th century); and Minuscule 2 (12th century).   It is further supported as Latin, "*honorificavit* ('he honoured,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *honorifico*)," in old Latin versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), and 1 (7th / 8th century); and as Latin, "*honoravit* (indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *honoro*)," in old Latin versions e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century).

However, a variant reads, Greek, "*timēsei* ('he will honour,' indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *timaō*)," i.e., "will honour" or "shall honour" (future), thus making this read, "he shall not honour his father" etc. .   This is a minority Byzantine reading, found in e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century).   It is further found as Latin, "*honorificabit* ('he will honour,' indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *honorifico*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions q (6th / 7th century) and g1 (8th / 9th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must therefore stand.   Because of the promise, "the Word of the Lord endureth forever" (I Peter 1:25), the Received Text can be composed from manuscripts from any era.   E.g., Erasmus's Greek NT (1516) largely relied on a small number of late Byzantine Texts, none earlier than the twelfth century; and so too, Stephanus's Greek NT (1550) showing variants from more than a dozen Greek manuscripts, did not include any manuscripts earlier than the 12th century.   Yet both of these Greek NT texts are very accurate and highly reliable. Nevertheless, on the one hand, a representative Byzantine text reading with no textual problem will always get a rating of somewhere between A and C.   But on the other hand, it is desirable, if possible, to show textual transmission over time and through time, *for the purposes of increasing the rating of such a reading inside the C to A range*.   Given that the ancient support for this reading comes from the Latin, and given that this is not in the subjunctive mood (see preliminary textual discussion, *supra*), for the purposes of determining a rating inside the C to A range, I shall undertake more elucidation than usual.

The reading of the *Textus Receptus* is a subjunctive active aorist. Young dislikes Ward's description of the aorist as a grammatical mechanism for describing pinpoints in time, preferring to see the aorist as the speaker's overall perception of an event "in its entirety, or as a single whole."   Wallace likes to talk about the aorist a "snapshot" of the action (whereas the present and imperfect tenses are like a moving picture)[8].   Whatever one's preferred terminology or grammatical descriptive qualifications of the aorist, it seems to me that such writers often have a semantic diversity emanating from the natural differences of perception in the human mind, rather than a fundamentally different perspective (though some may disagree with me and claim that I am wrongly minimizing such differences).

---

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

Importantly then for Matt. 15:6b (TR & AV), the *aorist* subjunctive is a *momentary* action (as opposed to a *present* subjunctive which is a *continuous* action) i.e., Christ is saying *at that point in time* he may not "honour" his father and mother; not that he never *in any context* fails to honour his father or mother. Thus the TR's grammar is very specifically focused on the issue at hand. The fact that this is in the subjunctive mood acts to convey the idea of possibility i.e., by giving such a gift one may or may not dishonour one's parents, i.e., depending on what their financial needs are. But either way, the Jewish "scribes and Pharisees" (Matt. 15:1) do not care. Thus they put in place a mechanism that is contrary to the 5th commandment, "Honour thy father and mother," irrespective of whether or not, in a given instance, it does or does not (subjunctive mood), so dishonour them.

This element of the subjunctive mood is further brought out in the preceding Greek of Matt. 15:5 (and Mark 7:11). Here we also find the subjunctive mood in the words, "whatsoever (*o ean*) *thou mightest be profited* (*ophelethes*, subjunctive passive first aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *opheleo*) by me." This combination of *ean* with a subjunctive, acts to create an *indefinite relative clause* i.e., a clause in which the subjunctive's possibility *relates to the subject* of the sentence (rather than to the verb)[9]. Thus the focus here is on the "thou" (subject) who "mightest be profited." Given that this preceding clause of Matt. 15:5 is in the subjunctive mood, the following clause of Matt. 15:6 is most naturally in the subjunctive mood also, as in the representative Byzantine text underpinning the Received Text.

The interdependent relationship between the subjunctives of Matt. 15:5 and Matt. 15:6, is reminiscent of the type of thing one sees in Matt. 5:29,30 where "it is profitable for thee that one of thy members *should perish* (*apoletai*, subjunctive middle aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apollumi*), and not that thy whole body *should be cast* (*blethe*, subjunctive passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *ballo*) into hell. And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members *should perish* (*apoletai*, subjunctive middle aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apollumi*), and not that thy whole body *should be cast* (*blethe*, subjunctive passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *ballo*) into hell[10]." (Cf. Matt. 18:15,16.)

It is quite different to where a subjunctive aorist stands by itself, such as the definite reason why a prophecy "*might be fulfilled*" (*plerothe*, subjunctive passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *pleroo*, Matt. 1:22; 2:15; 4:14; 12:17; 21:4; or the 3rd person plural form, *plerothosin*, in 26:56); or "that *ye may know*" (*eidete*, subjunctive active perfect, 2nd person singular verb, from, *oida*, Matt. 9:6); or "that *they might accuse*" (*kategoresosin*, subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *katecho*, Matt. 12:10); or "lest *we should offend*" (*skandalisomen*, subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *skandalizo*, Matt. 17:27); or that "*he should put* his hands on them" (*epithe*, subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *epitithemi*, Matt. 19:13); or "he delivered him to *be crucified* (*staurothe*, subjunctive passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *stauroo*, Matt. 27:26)."

---

[9] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 478-9; Young's *Greek*, p. 138.

[10] See Commentary Vol. 1, at Matt. 5:30.

Or where there is an emphatic statement, e.g., "Judge not (*krinete*, imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *krino*)," followed by the contingency that then follows, "that ye be not judged (*krithete*, subjunctive passive aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *krino*)" (Matt. 7:1; cf. 14:15; 23:26; 26:5). Or in Matt. 19:16, the rich young ruler asks Christ a possibility, in order to emphatically know something of a certainty, "what good thing shall I do (*poieso*, subjunctive active aorist, 1st person singular verb, from *poieo*), that *I may have* (*echo*, indicative active present, 1st person singular verb, from *echo*) eternal life?"[11].

Thus Matt. 15:6b is a good example of where the nuance of the Greek so strongly favours the TR's reading, i.e., subjunctive clause ("and honour not his father" etc., Matt. 15:6b) matching proceeding subjunctive clause ("by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me," Matt. 15:5), that the Greek speaking Byzantine scribes would have fairly automatically side-lined the variant reading. Therefore for the purposes of the C to A rating, *infra*, that which the Received Text's reading lacks in ancient Greek manuscript support *per se*, or in ancient Latin manuscript support in the subjunctive mood, it more than amply makes up for in textual analytical support as the better Greek reading.

The origins of the variant are speculative. Was this an accidental omission? Possibly due to a paper fade / loss, the original "*timese* / *TIMHCH* (he may honour)," lost its last letter, looking something like, "*TIMHC:*". If so, a scribe may have "reconstructed" this "from context," in which he added the suffix, "*EI*", to form, "*TIMHCEI* / *timesei* (he will honour)." Certainly the capital letters (unicals) "*EI*" (epsilon & iota) could fit into the same space as "*H*" (eta).

Was this a deliberate change? With textual considerations so strongly against the variant reading, one might *prima facie* think this improbable. But to do so, one must first attribute a high level of competence to the scribe in question, and this is not a presupposition that one can simple just make. In this particular instance, the originating scribe is probably Origen, a man known to have an unstable mind, and whose standard is very uneven. Origen fluctuates from very good to very bad, and everything in between. Origen is the probable originator of another change to this verse (see commentary at Matt. 15:6a, *supra*). One could certainly not put it past Origen on one of his "bad days," or some other scribes either, to think of such a change as a "stylistic improvement," because e.g., "in making it a future tense, Christ shows a desire to prevent future sin before it is committed."

Whether an accidental or deliberate change, it is further possible, though by no means certain, to conjecture that such a scribe may have been influenced by the idea of a so called "gospel Greek" (as opposed to Matthean Greek, etc.). If subscribing to such a notion, (cf. commentary at Matt. 14:24), then perhaps the scribe noted the presence of "*timesei* (he will honour)" at John 12:26, in the words, "him will the Father honour (*timesei*)," or with "my" in italics showing that it is added, "him will my Father honour (*timesei*)" (AV).

---

[11] The NU Text misses this point. But the man wants to know the definite thing of "eternal life" from justification by works, and Christ points him to perfect Decalogue keeping (Matt. 19:18,19). There is just one problem. It cannot be done. Fallen man cannot keep a covenant of works. And thus the attempt is meant to drive the man to the covenant of grace (Gal. 3:21-26; 4:22-31), that he "might be justified by faith" (Gal. 3:24).

An accidental or deliberate change?   A change influenced by "the gospel Greek" of John 12:26?   We simply do not know the answers to these questions.   Nevertheless, we do know that that the variant is not original.

On the one hand, the reading of the *Textus Receptus* at Matt. 15:6b has solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine text.   That which it lacks in ancient Greek support from either manuscripts or ancient writers, or ancient subjunctive mood support in the Latin from either manuscripts or ancient writers, it more than amply makes up for as the better reading preferred by textual analysis.   But on the other hand, the variant has ancient Greek and Latin support, including the Vulgate.   Weighing these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:6b a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:6b, "honour," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); as well as Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century).

However, the incorrect reading, "he will … honour," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).   It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent).

The incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 15:6b.   Tischendorf tends to show a bias towards the Alexandrian text that he discovered, London Sinaiticus, and yet he did not here follow it in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72).   So too, this split in the Alexandrian texts was resolved in favour of the variant reading found in Rome Vaticanus by Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, long before it was also then adopted into the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).   This means that on the one hand, the neo-Alexandrian texts considered in this commentary have uniformly resolved a split between their two major Alexandrian texts, by following the variant found in Rome Vaticanus.   But on the other hand, textual analysis strongly favours the *Textus Receptus* reading also found in London Sinaiticus.   Thus the neo-Alexandrians want nothing to do with the correct reading here found in one of their two leading texts.   I hope that this sort of thing which simply manifests a much wider problem in the Neo-

Alexandrian School, helps the reader to better understand why a Neo-Byzantine School textual analyst such as myself, takes such a dim view of the textual analytical skills of neo-Alexandrians, and their inaccurate and unreliable neo-Alexandrian texts and Bible versions.

The incorrect reading at Matt. 15:6b is found in the ASV as, "*he shall* not *honour* his father" etc. .   This erroneous reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.   We defenders of the neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus* are no strangers to this variant translation.   It is the one we formerly defended the Received Text and King James Version (1611) against after it appeared in the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582), as "And *he shall* not *honour* his father" etc., being there derived from the Latin text, *supra*. Thus an old foe of the Received Text formerly championed by Papist Latins, now appears in a new form presently championed by neo-Alexandrians.

The variant, an *indicative active future* ("*he will* not *honour* his father" etc.), is rendered "need not honor" in e.g., the ESV or Moffatt Bible (with variant spelling, "honour").   The TR's reading, a *subjunctive active aorist* ("*he may* not *honour* his father" etc.), is also rendered "need not honor" in the NKJV.   We are here thereby reminded that even a good text such as the Received Text, can be crippled by a bad translation such as the Burgonites' NKJV.   The NKJV "translation" here, looks like something they picked up from a neo-Alexandrian source, and then like the proverbial square peg in the round hole, "rammed it" into their "translation" of the TR.   That they have no footnote here showing the difference between the TR and the NU Text is hardly surprising, since they do not appear to appreciate the difference!   Now I let the reader draw his own conclusions as to what sort of quality translators I think those of the NKJV to be.

Let us thank God that with our Received Text and Saint James Version, we can by the grace of God stand secure against all our foes, whether they be Papist Latins (Douay-Rheims), or neo-Alexandrians (ASV *et al*), or Burgonites (NKJV).   In the words of the Dedicatory Preface to that great white Protestant king, King James I, "if, on the one side, we shall be traduced by Popish persons …, or if, on the other side, we shall be maligned by self-conceited brethren, … we may rest secure."   For we know that a "loving nursing father" (in fulfilment of Ps. 2:10; Isa. 49:22,23,) in "King" "James," showed a great "desire of accomplishing and publishing of this work," the King James Bible.   When we see the low standard of these other texts and versions, we are reminded afresh that we should never take God's blessings for granted, but should humbly and heartily thank God for our King James Versions.

Matt. 15:6c "his father or his mother" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*ton* (the) *patera* (father) *autou* (of him) *e* (or) *ten* (the) *metera* (mother) *autou* (of him)," i.e., "his father or his mother" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), E 07 (8th century), K 017 (9th century), X 033 (10th century); and Minuscules 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation), 2 (12th century), 1010 (12th century), 597 (13th century), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark).   It is further supported as Latin, "*patrem* (father) *suum* (his) *aut* (or) *matrem* (mother) *suam* (his)," in old Latin versions f (6th century) and aur (7th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine

Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin, "*patrem* (father) *suum* (his) *vel* (or) *matrem* (mother) *suam* (his)," in old Latin version ff1 (10th / 11th century); and with a different conjunction as, "*patrem* (father) *suum* (his) *et* (and) *matrem* (mother) *suam* (his)," in old Latin versions q (6th / 7th century) and c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

However, another reading, *Variant 1*, omits the TR's final "*autou* (of him)." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels). This omission is further found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, omits the TR's first "*autou* (of him)." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionaries 1552 (985 A.D.) and 184 (1319 A.D.). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and the ancient church Latin writer, Ambrosiaster (d. after 384).

Yet another reading, *Variant 3*, omits the TR's Greek, "*e* (or) *ten* (the) *metera* (mother) *autou* (of him)." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex Omega 045 (9th century). This omission is further found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), and d (5th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; as well as the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental omission? In Manuscript Washington (W 032, *Codex Freerianus*), the text reads in continuous script capital letters (with a line on top where I have a line underneath, indicating an abbreviation) "*PRAAYTOY*" i.e., "*PRA*" is an abbreviation for "*PATERA* (father)" before "*AYTOY* (of him)." Possibly, a paper fade of "*PRAAYTOY*" left it looking like "*P*::::::::". If so, this might have been "reconstructed" by a scribe as "*PATERA*," and the remaining 2 letter spaces thought by the scribe to occur either because the word was at the end of a line; or if it occurred before the end of the line, taken to be a stylistic paper space to right hand justify the page.

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate omission? Possibly a scribe considered the omission of the second "*autou* (of him)" was a "stylistic improvement," in order to make "a more succinct text." If so, he may have considered that the first "*autou* (of him)" could be made to work double-time, since having first said, "*ton* (the) *patera* (father) *autou* (of him)," it follows that "*ten* (the) *metera* (mother)" must also be his i.e., "his father and mother."

Was *Variant 2* an accidental omission? Possibly a paper fade, especially, although not exclusively if it was at the end of a line, may have gone undetected by a scribe, since a scribe may only notice a problem if one or more letters of a word survive the paper fade. Was *Variant 2* a deliberate omission? Possibly a scribe considered the omission of the first "*autou* (of him)" was a "stylistic improvement," in order to make "a more succinct text." If

so, he may have considered that the second "*autou* (of him)" could be made to work double-time, since after hearing or reading, "*ten* (the) *metera* (mother) *autou* (of him)," it follows that "*ton* (the) *patera* (father)" must also be his i.e., "the father and the mother of him." If so, I think this is a very clumsy "abbreviation," since the reader must project back in his mind at the very end when he gets to the final "*autou* (of him)." But of course this possibility is in no way invalidated, simply because it means that the scribe was a clutz[12]. The probable origins of this variant with Origen, who was also aware of the TR's reading, means that we may once again be looking at a manifestation of the reveries in Origen's unstable mind.

Was *Variant 3* an accidental omission? Possibly after writing down, "*ton* (the) *patera* (father) *autou* (of him)," a scribe was distracted by an external stimulus, or had to leave his scribal work, and so left a marker generally pointing to the line he was up to, remembering he was up to the "*autou* (of him)." Upon returning, thinking in his head, "I'm up to the '*autou* (of him),' he glanced at the marker and saw the second "*autou* (of him)," and kept writing. Thus he might have inadvertently omitted, "*e* (or) *ten* (the) *metera* (mother) *autou* (of him)."

Was *Variant 3* a deliberate omission? Possibly e.g., a scribe considered that the words, "Honour thy father and mother" were "so well known, that its repetition in full is unnecessary." Thus as a "stylistic improvement," he may have considered reducing Matt. 15:6 to just "and not his father," was "a more succinct way to convey the obvious meaning." The probable origin of this variant with Origen, who was aware of the TR's reading and is also the probable originator of *Variant 2*, means that once again we may be looking at a manifestation of more reveries in Origen's tipsy-turvy head.

Were these variants deliberate or accidental omissions? We simply do not know. But we do know that they were changes to the *Textus Receptus* here faithfully preserved for us in the representative Byzantine Text. On the one hand, the TR's reading has solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading. It is also clear that the probable originator of *Variants 2 & 3* was Origen, who also knew of the TR's reading. But on the other hand, *Variant 2* is found in the Vulgate, and though followed by Cyril, he was also clearly aware of the TR's reading.

Whilst one must be cautious about citing Origen, when one considers these three facts: Origen knew of the TR's reading, the TR's reading has representative Byzantine text support, and there is no good textual argument against this representative Byzantine reading; then because of this support which is external of Origen, we can clearly show the TR's reading over time and through time from as early a time as any rival reading through reference to Origen. The combined power of these three considerations when tied together as a bundle, is greater than the strength of the individual addition of each of the three

---

[12] "Clutz" (colloquial for "a clot" or "clumsy person"), is probably of simultaneous derivation from the German *klotz* ("block") and Jews' Yiddish *klots* ("wooden beam"), although the English spelling, "clutz," (rather than "klutz," which is an alternative spelling also found in English,) possibly relates to its similarity to the English word, "clot." I.e., meaning something like, "a blockhead" (from the Gentile German tongue) or "a wooden-head" (from the Jewish Yiddish tongue).

arguments when considered in isolation. Thus the sum of the total argument is greater than the addition of its individual constituent parts, when weighed in autonomous isolation. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:6c an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:6c, "his father or his mother," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; and the Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 1, which omits the final "his" / "of him," and so reads, "his father or mother," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex 073 (6th century, Matt. 14:28-31; from the same manuscript as 084, 6th century, Matt. 14:19-15:8); together with Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

Variant 2, which omits the first "his" / "of him," and so reads, "the father or mother of him," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); together with Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in the Georgian "B" (5th century) Version; and Slavic (or Slavonic) Version (9th century).

Variant 3, which omits "or his mother," and so reads, "his father," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); and Georgian "1" Version (5th century).

Perhaps impressed by its early support from Origen, and its wider support in the Syriac and Ethiopic, the correct reading of the Received Text at Matt. 15:6c, was on this occasion adopted by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). But with the two major Alexandrian texts following *Variant 3*, which is also followed by the Western Text *et al*, other neo-Alexandrians took a different view. Hence the incorrect *Variant 3* entered the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), as it had the earlier UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and

Westcott-Hort (1881).

Reflecting this split among these neo-Alexandrian texts, on the one hand, the correct reading is found at Matt. 15:6c in the NASB (with a footnote in the 1st & 2nd editions referring to *Variant 3*). But on the other hand, the erroneous *Variant 3* is found at Matt. 15:6c in the American Standard Version which reads, "his father" (ASV), although a footnote says, "Some ancient authorities add 'or his mother'" (ASV ftn). This same format of *Variant 3* in the main text and a footnote referring to the TR's reading, is also found in the NIV. By contrast, the incorrect *Variant 3* is found without any footnote alternative in the RSV, ESV, and TCNT.

Fusing together *Variant 3*'s "his father" with *Variant 2* which omits the first "his," and in its footnote alternative, *Variant 1* which omit the last "his," the New Revised Standard Version reads "the father" (NRSV), and in a footnote says, "Other ancient authorities add 'or the mother'" (NRSV ftn).

Though neo-Alexandrians Proper have two pincer arms (e.g., Matt. 16:5, NIV), a fact e.g., here evident in the adoption for the wrong reasons of the TR's reading by Tischendorf, Nestle, and the NASB; nevertheless, the usage of the second non-Alexandrian text pincer arm is more pronounced with the semi neo-Alexandrian Moffatt than with neo-Alexandrians Proper. Moffatt's methodology for selecting a textual reading involves two pincer arms, i.e., one pincer arm operating more than 90% of the time is neo-Alexandrian, and the other pincer operating less than 10% of the time is not. Moffatt's non-Alexandrian text pincer arm is very much an "anything goes" arm, and emanating from an erratic mind it is highly unpredictable.

Moffatt here at Matt. 15:6c follows *Variant 1* in his reading, "his father or mother" (Moffatt Bible). (This remains so even if, as possible, he was simply abbreviating it this way into English, *in the same way* as he may have thought the scribe of *Variant 1* had abbreviated it in Greek; or later in time the non-literal and unreliable NKJV does.) What quirky reason for adopting this variant here lay in the dark recesses of Moffatt's mind is anybody's guess. Perhaps he was influenced by what the neo-Alexandrians like to call their "queen of Minuscules," namely, Minuscule 33 (9th century), *supra*. Moffatt worshiped some strange gods in violation of the first commandment (Exod. 20:2,3), such as the narcissistic god of his own mind with religiously liberal neo-Alexandrian and form critical worldly wisdom (I Cor. 1:20); or "the god of this world that hath blinded the minds of them which believe not" (I Cor. 4:4), who from the outset has casts aspersions on God's Word, questioning, "Hath God said?" (Gen. 3:2). Thus e.g., at I Tim. 5:23, Moffatt omits the entire verse simply because it takes his fancy to do so (see the Moffatt Bible's footnote at I Tim. 5:23.) As to why Moffatt would choose this *Variant 1* reading here at Matt. 15:6c, I can only conclude that as on so many other occasions in the Moffatt Bible, "Moffatt's gods must have been crazy."

Matt. 15:6d "the commandment" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron follows the exact form of the Vulgate at Matt. 15:6d, "*et* (and) *irritum* (of none effect) *fecistis* (have ye made) *mandatum* (the commandment) *Dei* (of God) *propter* (by) *traditionem* (tradition)

vestram (your)" i.e., "And ye have made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition." This is quite different to the Vulgate's Mark 7:8, "*Relinquentes* (relinquishing) *enim* (For) *mandatum* (the commandment) *Dei* (of God), *tenetis* (ye hold) *traditionem* (the tradition) *hominum* (of men)," etc., i.e., "For relinquishing the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men" etc. .

Therefore it seems to me that on the balance of probabilities the Sangallensis Diatessaron was following a Vulgate Codex in which it adopted Matt. 15:6d. Nevertheless, one cannot say beyond a reasonable shadow of a doubt that in fact the Codex at Matt. 15:6 read Latin, "*verbum* (the word)," and that due to Diatessaron formatting style, the "*mandatum* (the commandment)" was not brought across from Mark 7:8. Hence I make no reference to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

By contrast, outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic follows the Vulgate form of Mark 7:8, *supra*. While I make no reference to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*, for those interested in Diatessaron studies, this verse (like many others,) provides us with an interesting example of how different Diatessaron formatters, both following the basic categories of thought derived from Tatian's Diatessaron, used different Gospel verses in their application of Diatessaron formatting principles.

As to which reading Tatian himself here used in his original second century Diatessaron, that is anybody's guess. For while we remember Tatian as the one who created the Diatessaron format *genre* found in e.g., such Latin Vulgate Codices as the Sangallensis Diatessaron, we do not know what his original Diatessaron here read. And if at some point in the future we do, because an authentic copy of his Diatessaron turns up, it does of course, good reader, go without saying that unless it was in Greek (since none suggest it was ever in Latin,) and clearly conformed to the Byzantine Greek text type i.e., so there was nothing of consequence new in it; then such a document would *obviously* be outside the closed class of sources. It could have no impact on our view of the text, for any such document was most assuredly not preserved over time and through time, with any kind of reasonable accessibility to its textual tradition.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:6d, the TR's Greek, "*t*e*n* (the) *entol*e*n* (commandment)," in the clause, "Thus have ye made the (*t*e*n*) commandment (*entol*e*n*) of God of none effect by your tradition" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*mandatum* (commandment)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Chrysostom (d. 407) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

However, another reading, *Variant 1*, reads Greek, "*ton* (the) *nomon* (law)." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscules 1010 (12th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Ptolemy the Gnostic in Flora according to Irenaeus (2nd century), and Epiphanius (d. 403).

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, reads Greek, "*ton* (the) *logon* (word)," or Latin, "*verbum* (the word)."   It is found in old Latin versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century).   It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (*c.* 395), Origen (d. 254), and Eusebius (d. 339); and the ancient church Latin writer, Chromatius (d. 407).

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental change?   Possibly due to a paper fade of "*ten* (the) *entolen* (commandment)," the original continuous script, "*THNENTOLHN*" had come to look something like, "*T:N:N::::N*."   If so, a scribe may have taken the gap between the two Ns (nu & nu) as a stylistic paper space (or possibly it went over two lines with the original "E" / epsilon at the end of one line, or possibly a larger space in a non-continuous script,) and "reconstructed" this "from context" as "*TON NOMON*."   If so, he may have done so through some reference to the Matthean Greek of "*ton* (the) *nomon* (law)" at Matt. 5:17; and beyond this, possibly also some reference to what he took to be some kind of "Gospel Greek" through reference to Luke 2:22; John 7:19; 18:31; 19:7.

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change?   Its probable origins with Ptolemy the Gnostic means that this change may have been theologically motivated.   The gnostic heretics claimed to give a special theological "knowledge" (Greek, *gnosis*; hence, "gnostic").   Attempting to reach inside the head of a gnostic heretic like Ptolemy, and trying to second guess why he might make such a change, is like trying to work out the recipe of a mad woman's custard!   Really, "the sky is the limit" for why one particular gnostic, but possibly not any other gnostic, might claim that "special knowledge is conveyed by '*ton* (the) *nomon* (law)' here."   E.g., he might claim that "the rhyme between "*gnosis*" and "*nomon*" was "a secret word play in which Christ is simultaneously warning us not to reject gnostic knowledge."   Good reader, Do you think that sounds silly?   Well so do I!   But you must remember that when dealing with a gnostic heretic, "a more sensible" explanation presuming a more rational and logically sound mind, might well be incorrect.   We cannot even begin to guess all the type of queer slants a gnostic like Ptolemy might want to place on Matt. 15:6d.   But we can safely conjecture that he may well try to place some kind of kinky gnostic interpretation on it, in which he regarded the substitution of "*ton* (the) *nomon* (law)" for "*ten* (the) *entolen* (commandment)," as in itself, "a manifestation" of his "great gnostic knowledge."

Was *Variant 2* an accidental change?   If due to a paper fade of "*ten* (the) *entolen* (commandment)," e.g., in a continuous script manuscript the original continuous script, "*THNENTOLHN*" going over two lines, had come to look something like, "*T:N::*" (line 1) "*:O::N*" (line 2); or if in a non-continuous script it had come to look something like, "*T:N::::O::N*;" it might have been "reconstructed" by a scribe as, "*TON LOGON*."   If so, the scribe was probably influenced in his "reconstruction" of Matt. 15:6d by the nearby "*ton* (the) *logon* (word)" found in Matt. 15:12, where "this saying" (AV) is literally, "the (*ton*) word (*logon*)" i.e., "Then came his disciples and said unto him, Knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended, after they heard *this saying* (*ton logon*)?" (AV)   This probably "confirmed" in his mind, that "the same reading was being used here as in Mark's Gospel," where we also read at Mark 7:13, "*ton* (the) *logon* (word) *tou* (-) *Theou* (of God)."

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change? The words, "*ton* (the) *logon* (word) *tou* (-) *Theou* (of God)," is common NT terminology, used by a number of different writers (Luke 11:28; Acts 6:2; 11:1; 13:5; 18:11; II Cor. 2:17; 4:2; Col. 1:25; I Thess. 2:13, without the definite articles; Heb. 13:7; Rev. 1:2; 6:9; 20:4). Against this general backdrop, a scribe may have regarded it as a "stylistic improvement" of "harmonization," to assimilate Matt. 15:6d to the reading of Mark 7:13.

Were these variants deliberate or accidental changes? The definitive answer is lost to us in the unrecorded history of textual transmission. But the definitive reality that these were changes to the *Textus Receptus* is not lost to us. Praise God that Jesus declared the doctrine of Divine preservation, saying, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Matt. 24:35). They have continued to exist through time and over time, and so may be found in the Received Text over the ages.

The representative Byzantine reading has solid support in the Greek and Latin, being preserved in both the Byzantine Greek text and St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, together with other Latin texts. It is also supported by a number of ancient church Greek writers, including an old and holy doctor in St. Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, and an old godly bishop and doctor of the Church in St. Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:6d an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:6d, "the commandment," is found in (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), and without "*ten* (the)" in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further found in the main text of the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Georgian "A" Version (5th century); and some Armenian Versions.

Variant 1, "the law," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex 073 (6th century, Matt. 14:28-31; from the same manuscript as 084, 6th century, Matt. 14:19-15:8); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Slavic Version (9th century).

Variant 2, "the word," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and also Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions, and in the margin of the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian "1" & "B" Versions (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

With the two major Alexandrian texts split at Matt. 15:6d over *Variant 1* and *Variant 2*, neo-Alexandrians have not been sure as to which of the two erroneous readings they should follow, although they have tended to favour *Variant 2*. *Variant 1* was followed by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). By contrast, *Variant 2* was followed by Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993); although they all give footnotes referring to *Variant 1* as an alternative.

Reflecting this type of uncertainty at Matt. 15:6d, the American Standard Version's main text reads, "the word of God" (*Variant 2*) (ASV), but a footnote says, "Some ancient authorities read 'law'" (*Variant 1*) (ASV ftn). This same dichotomy of *Variant 2* in the main text and *Variant 1* in a footnote, is also found in the NASB (1st ed.), RSV, and ESV. *Variant 2* is found in the main text, with a footnote giving first *Variant 1* and then the TR's reading, in the NRSV. *Variant 2* without any alternative is found in the NASB (2nd ed. & 3rd ed.) and NIV.

Variant 2 without any alternative is also found in the Roman Catholic neo-Alexandrian versions of the Jerusalem Bible (1966) and its successor, the New Jerusalem Bible (1985). The fact that the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582) correctly reads, "the commandment of God" (Douay-Rheims), means that the pre-Vatican II Council (1963-5) Roman Catholic version based on the Latin at Matt. 15:6d, is more accurate than the post-Vatican II Council Roman Catholic version based on the neo-Alexandrian Greek text of *Rome Vaticanus*, an odd-ball manuscript found in the Pope's library at Rome. So much for the Roman Church's claim to be "*semper eadem*" (Latin, "always the same").

Variant 2 is "corrected" from the singular (masculine accusative), "*ton* (the) *logon* (word)" form of "*o* (the) *logos* (word)," to the plural (masculine accusative), "*tous* (the) *logous* (words)," by the TCNT which reads, "you have nullified the (*tous*) words (*logous*) of God on account of your traditions." Seemingly impressed by the fact that the Alexandrian text's London Sinaiticus can call on the added attestation of Ptolemy the Gnostic, *Variant 1* is followed by the NEB, its successor, the REB, and also Moffatt with no footnote alternative, e.g., Moffatt reads, "the law of God" (Moffatt Bible). Did the translators of the NEB, REB, and Moffatt Bible here feel that the mind of Ptolemy the Gnostic resonated with them as some kind of "symbiotic spirit"?

Matt. 15:8 "draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, *prima facie* the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron follows the variant reading. However, the same shorter reader, Latin "*populus* (people) *hic* (this)," found at the Vulgate's Matt. 15:8, is also found at the Vulgate's Mark 7:6. Since this Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, one cannot with certainty known from which of these readings the Diatessaron formatters were drawing from, and hence no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, similar problems arise with Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, whose 19th century Latin translation of the 12th-14th centuries Arabic also reads, "*populus hic*." Hence no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:8, the TR's Greek, "*'Eggizei* (draweth nigh[13]) *moi* (unto me) …*to* (-) *stomati* (with mouth) *auton* ('of them' or 'their'), *kai* (and)," i.e., "draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and" in the first two clauses of the verse, "This people *draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and* honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century, spelling first word, *eggizi*). It is further supported as Latin, "*Adpropinquat* (draweth nigh[14]) *se* (herself) *mihi* (unto me) … *ore* (with mouth) *suo* (with its) *et* (and)," i.e., "This people *draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and*" in old Latin version f (6th century); and as Latin, "*Adpropinquavit* (drew nigh[15]) *mihi* (unto me) … *ore* (mouth) *suo* (with its) *et* (and)," i.e., "This common people *drew nigh unto me with their mouth, and*" in old Latin version q (6th / 7th century).

---

[13] *Eggizei* is an indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb (from *eggizo*) i.e., literally, "he draweth nigh," not a 3rd person plural form, "they draweth nigh (*eggizousin*)." But the wider words read, "*'Eggilei* (he draweth nigh) *moi* (unto me) *o* ('the,' masculine singular nominative definite article, from *o*) *laos* ('people,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *laos*) *outos* ('this,' masculine singular nominative pronoun, from *outos*)," so that "(the) people" is a plural word in a singular declension. Thus the matching verb is also in the singular in Greek; but in English we would say, "they draweth nigh." An equivalent in English is found in some uses of "man" for the human race e.g., we would say, "Man *was* created by God in Genesis 1 & 2, *he* did not evolve," NOT "Man *were* created by God in Genesis 1 & 2, *they* did not evolve," even though "man" here is clearly a plural singular, referring to both of our parents from whom came the human race, Adam and Eve.

[14] *Adpropinquat* is also an indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb (from *adpropinquo*), and with the same logic as the Greek in the previous footnote, the Latin also reads in the wider words, "*populus* ('people,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *populus*) *hic* ('this,' masculine singular nominative pronoun, from masculine form, *hic*)."

[15] *Adpropinquavit* is an indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb (from *adpropinquo*), and with the same logic as the previous two footnotes, the Latin also reads in the wider words, "*plebs* ('common people,' feminine singular nominative noun, from *plebs*) *haec* ('this,' feminine singular nominative pronoun, from feminine form, *haec*)."

However, these words are omitted, so that this reads simply, Greek, "*o* (-) *laos* (people) *outos* (this)," in a variant. The omission is found in the Latin, which reads simply, "*Populus* (people) *hic* (this)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century). From the Latin support for this omission, this reading is also manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). This omission is further found in the Latin, which reads simply, "*plebs* (common people) *haec* (this)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), and c (12th / 13th century); "*populus* (people) *hic* (this)," in old Latin Version d (5th century); "*populus* (people) *iste* (this)," in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century); and "*plebs* (common people) *ista* (this)," in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century)[16]. It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Ptolemy the Gnostic according to Irenaeus (2nd century), Clement of Rome (*c.* 150), and Origen (d. 254).

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

Was this an accidental change? If this portion of the page had been badly damaged e.g., lost due to decay, or ruined due to a foreign substance spilling on it, then a scribe might have "reconstructed" the missing section from Mark 7:6. The TR's "*Outos* ('this,' word 1) *o* ('the,' word 2) *laos* ('people,' word 3)," is known to exist in word order 2,3,1, i.e., the same word order as *Variant 2* (Matt. 15:8) in the Vulgate as "*Populus* ('the people,' conveying words 2 & 3) *hic* ('this,' word 1)" (Mark 7:6), as well as a number of old Latin Versions. Under normal circumstances, to "reconstruct" three words where previously there were nine words would seem like an obvious error. It is possible that the damage occurred higher up than the bottom of the page, and e.g., this did not concern the scribe who was *none too bright*, and took this as a larger than normal series of paper spaces. Alternatively, a brighter scribe may well have realized that some words were missing after his "reconstruction" from Mark 7:6, but he may have been baffled as to what they might be, and so he may have just left paper spaces, which were removed by a subsequent scribe copying out this section from his manuscript. Alternatively, it is possible e.g., that this damage occurred at the bottom of a page, and the scribe reasonably enough took the subsequent paper space to represent the stylistic paper space left at the end of the page.

Was this a deliberate change? If so, this was probably "a harmonization" with Mark 7:6, which lacks these words. Possibly, such "a harmonization" was simply motivated by a desire to have the readings of Matt. 15:8 and Mark 7:6 more similar.

But other motivations are also possible. The Septuagint reading of Isa. 29:13 in this portion reads, "*'Eggizei* (draweth nigh) *moi* (unto me) *o* (-) *laos* (people) *outos* (this) *en* (with) *to* (-) *stomati* (with mouth) *auton* (their), *kai* (and)" (LXX). The only difference between this LXX reading of Isa. 29:13 and that part of the TR's reading here in focus at Matt. 15:8, is that whereas the Matt. 15:8 (TR) reading conveys the "with" of "with mouth"

---

[16]   The Latin pronoun, *iste-ista-istud*, found here in old Latin e & ff1, sometimes conveys a contemptuous force, e.g., at Matt. 26:9 the disciples' words regarding the "ointment" (Matt. 26:7), read in the Vulgate, "For this (Latin, *istud*) might have been sold for much, and given to the poor." Is this its intended connotation here at Matt. 15:8?

by usage of the dative (*to* = 'the,' neuter singular dative definite article, from *to*; *stomati* = 'mouth,' neuter singular dative noun, from *stoma*), the Isa. 29:19 (LXX) reading includes the preposition, "*en*," which with a dative can mean e.g., "with," as it does here. Possibly though by no means definitely then, this "harmonization" might also have been motivated by an anti-Old Testament bias wishing to "cut down on the usage of quotes" from the OT. (Cf. Marcion the heretic.)

Was this a deliberate or accidental change? If an accidental change, was it wrought as a "reconstruction" based on Mark 7:6 by a competent scribe dealing with a damaged manuscript at the end of a page? Or by an incompetent scribe not concerned that his "reconstruction" left so much vacant paper space? Or simply a bewildered scribe who "guessed" that the words of Mark 7:6 should be present, but did not know what the other missing words were? If a deliberate change, was it motivated by a "well intentioned" but very misguided desire to "harmonize" Matt. 15:8 more closely with Mark 7:6? Or was there a sinister motive of anti-OT bias here at work? The answers to these questions are lost in the historical dark age of unrecorded history whose blackness veils our knowledge of textual transmission. But we do know that these were changes to the *Textus Receptus*. And this means that "the Father of lights" (James 1:17) has graciously given us a sufficient knowledge and light for our purposes. For "if any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him" (James 1:5).

On the one hand, the TR's reading has solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, the further support of a couple of old Latin versions, and the variant looks like a "harmonization" with Mark 7:6. But on the other hand, the variant is followed by the Vulgate, and a number of old Latin versions. Though the variant is also followed by some ancient writers, this is militated against by the fact that Ptolemy the Gnostic and Origen must be used with caution, and on this occasion the textual argument is clearly against them. Balancing out these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:8 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:8, "This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

However, the incorrect omission which reads simply, "This people," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex 073 (6th century, Matt. 14:28-31; from the same manuscript as 084, 6th century, Matt. 14:19-15:8), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as

the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; all extant Egyptian Coptic Versions e.g., the Bohairic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect variant entered the NU Text *et al*. Hence at Matt. 15:8 the ASV reads simply, "This people." So too, this erroneous omission is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Matt. 15:9 "teaching [for] doctrines the commandments of men" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

No textual issue arises on this reading between the Greek *Textus Receptus* and any Greek variants either inside or outside the closed class of sources. The textual analysis thus focuses on a variant arising only in some parts of the Latin textual tradition. The matter relates to "an old swordfight" between white-knight Protestants wielding their "sword" (Heb. 4:12, Authorized Version), based on the superiority of the maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, in combat with black-knight Papist Latins wielding their "sword" (Heb. 4:12, Douay-Rheims Version), premised on the false claim that the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, should be most unnaturally and rebelliously elevated above its master maxim.

This "old swordfight" is thus *a blast from the past*. It reminds us that defence of the Received Text is nothing knew. We Protestants have historically defended the *Textus Receptus* against all comers. We have done so long before the era of modern history in the late 18th century commenced, and in it the unwelcome rediscovery of the Alexandrian texts in the 19th century. Whether fighting Papists, neo-Alexandrians, or both as seen in the post-Vatican II Council Roman Catholic's neo-Alexandrian versions, our fight is the same. It is, by the grace of God, nothing less than the fight for "the Word of truth" (II Tim. 2:15).

Due to the nature of this Protestant-Papist duel inside the closed class of sources, for the Pope "sitteth in the temple of God" itself (II Thess. 2:4), some of the normal stylistic forms used in this commentary, such as division between readings inside and outside the closed class of sources, shall not be followed here at Matt. 15:9 (for all textual readings referred to are inside the closed class of sources). As the black Papist knight, armed with his "two edged sword" (Heb. 4:12, Douay-Rheims Version) of the Clementine Vulgate's blade and Douay-Rheim's Version's blade, looks across at the white Protestant knight, armed with his "two-edged sword" (Heb. 4:12, King James Version) of the Received Text's blade and the Authorized Version's blade, and yells out to me, "ON GUARD!," I have no option but to defend the truth.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:9, the TR's Greek, "*didaskontes* ('teaching,' masculine plural nominative, present active participle, from *didasko*) *didaskalias* ('doctrines,' feminine plural accusative first declension noun, from *didaskalia*) *entalmata* ('commandments,' neuter plural

nominative 3rd declension noun, from *entalma*) *anthropon* ('of men,' masculine plural genitive 2nd declension noun, from *anthropos*)," is supported by the majority Greek text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), and Byzantine Minuscule 2 (12th century).   It is also supported by the Latin, "*docentes* ('teaching,' masculine plural nominative, present active participle, from *doceo*) *doctrinas* ('doctrines,' feminine plural accusative first declension noun, from *doctrina*) *mandata* ('commandments,' neuter plural nominative 2nd declension noun, from *mandatum*) *hominum* ('of men,' masculine plural genitive 3rd declension noun, from *homo*)," by the Latin Vulgate of St. Hierome (St. Jerome,) (4th / 5th centuries), and old Latin Versions d (5th century) and q (6th / 7th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   It is further supported by the ancient church Latin writer, that holy father and holy martyr of God, St. Cyprian (d. 258).

However, a variant adds Latin, "*et* (and)," between the first two nouns.   This reading is found in old Latin versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

The *Textus Receptus*' participle, Greek, "*didaskontes* (teaching)," indicates what is being done with the two nouns, i.e., "*didaskalias* (doctrines)" and "*entalmata* (commandments)," as it modifies the third noun, "men."   The Latin textual tradition supporting this does the same.   But the question arises as to how to translate this?

It is possible to translate the Greek at Matt. 15:9, with italics showing the translators italics, as "But in vain they do worship me, teaching *for* doctrines the commandments of men" (AV).   This type of translation is also found in Tyndale (1534), "But in vain they worship me teaching doctrines which are nothing but men's precepts;" or the Geneva Bible (1557) which reads, "But in vain they worship me, teaching *for* doctrines *which are but* men's precepts;" or Geneva Bible (1560), "But in vain they worship me, teaching *for* doctrines men's precepts."   It is also possible to translate the Latin this way, for the Roman Catholic Monsignor Knox, renders this in Knox's Bible (1945-9, 2nd ed. 1957) as, "Their worship of me is vain, for the doctrines they teach are the commandments of men."

Alternatively, it is possible to render the Greek at Matt. 15:9 as found in Cranmer (1539), "but in vain do they serve me, teaching the doctrines and precepts of men" (Great Bible).   It is also possible to translate the Latin this way, for the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582) reads, "And in vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines and commandments of men."

But while the TR's Greek or Latin Vulgate will allow either rendering, the Latin variant *requires* that the nouns, "*doctrinas* (doctrines)" and "*mandata* (commandments)" be understood conjunctively, since they are united by a conjunctive, "*et* (and)" i.e., "*doctrinas* (doctrines[17]) *et* (and) *mandata* (commandments[18])."   Thus evidently some Latin scribe added

---

[17]   Other than old Latin ff1 which reads, "*doctrinam* ('doctrine,' feminine singular accusative first declension noun, from *doctrina*)."

[18]   Other than old Latin e which reads, "*praecepta* ('precepts,' neuter plural

in the conjunction "*et* (and)" in order to remove the ambiguity and necessitate this rendering.

Let us look at this purely through the Latin.   Let us, for the sake of empathetic understanding, theoretically work on the invalid old Roman Catholic notion that the maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, should be given top priority.   One would naturally conclude that while the Vulgate *et al* allow either rendering, the fact that most of the old Latin versions, stemming from ancient times, contain the "*et* (and)," means that "the Latin has improved the Greek" by providing this "clarification."   Hence it is adopted and manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592); and this rendering is found in the Douay-Rheims Version.

By contrast, let us now look at this through the Greek.   Although in doing so, let us consider the Latin, and work through the Protestant maxims of the *Textus Receptus*, in which the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, is in perpetual ascendancy over the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*[19].   This means that because there is no textual problem in the representative Byzantine Greek text reading, it must stand as correct.   That is because, on Protestant Received Text principles, it is only if there is first a textual problem in the Greek, and then upon reconstruction of the Greek from the Latin, the Latin *solves that textual problem in the Greek*, that a Latin reading is adopted.   Hence the maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, stands in perpetual servitude to the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*; as indeed, well it should!   For while it is true that both Greek and Latin are Biblical languages (e.g., Luke 23:38), and that it was in these two languages that over time and through time God preserved the NT text, so that they alone are in the closed class of sources, manifesting the Divine promise, "the Word of the Lord endureth for ever" (I Peter 1:25); nevertheless, the priority must go to the Greek, *for the NT was written in Greek not Latin*.

Thus we here see the great value in recognizing the superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, and the danger posed by the old Latin Papists who elevated the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, to an unnatural position of rule over the master maxim.   This reading at Matt. 15:9 is a classic text book case example of how Roman Catholics of the Latin text and Protestants of the NT Received Text, use the maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, quite differently.   It is thus a useful passage for us to consider.

The translation of Monsignor Knox carries with it the Roman Catholic Imprimatur of Cardinal Griffin (1954).   This version says on the title page that it is, "A translation from the Latin Vulgate in the light of the Hebrew and Greek originals."   Monsignor Knox's Bible represents a transition phase inside the Roman Church, since on the one hand, like the old Latin Papists, he still believed in making a translation of the NT from the Latin, not the Greek; but on the other hand, unlike the older Latin Papists of the Clementine Vulgate and

---

nominative 2nd declension noun, from *praeceptum*)."

[19]   Roman Catholic neo-Byzantines, such as the Complutensians and Erasmus (d. 1536) also accepted these maxims; but since the *Council of Trent* (1545-63), the Roman Church closed down the work of these more enlightened Roman Catholic scholars; and by its other decrees, ensured that anyone who accepted Protestant Reformation truths would need to exit the Roman Church fairly quickly upon conviction of them.   Therefore these neo-Byzantine rules may now be fairly characterized as "Protestant."

Douay-Rheims Version, he clearly did not adhere to the notion that a top priority should be given to the maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*. This latter fact is evident in the words of his title page, and this is manifested in his rendering of Matt. 15:9. Following the Vatican II Council (1963-5), this transition phase in the Roman Church would ultimately culminate in the adoption of the religiously liberal neo-Alexandrian NT Greek school. This is evident in the New Testaments of the Roman Catholic neo-Alexandrian's *Revised Standard Version Catholic Edition* (1965), *Jerusalem Bible* (1966), and *New Jerusalem Bible* (1985).

But while we can see Monsignor Knox beating a hasty retreat for the Papists in the 1940s and 1950s, thus paving the way for the neo-Alexandrian Papists of the 1960s and later, the presence of the older Latin view of Roman Catholics evident in the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version at Matt. 15:9, still remind us that defence of the *Textus Receptus* and the *Authorized (King James) Version* based upon it, is nothing new. The old black Papist knights, stood against us with a two edged sword containing the blades of the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version, whereas the new black Papist knights stand against us with a two edged sword containing the blades of the neo-Alexandrian NT text and a Roman Catholic neo-Alexandrian Version. But we white Protestant knights stand unflinchingly with our two-edged sword of God's Word, containing the blades of the Received Text and King James Version. They are better blades, they are stronger blades, they are sharper blades, than those that either the old style or new style Papist black knights wield against us! Not by our own might, not by our own power, but by the grace of God, "They are brought down and fallen: but we are risen, and stand upright. Save, Lord: let the king hear us when we call," and "send … help from the sanctuary" (Ps. 20:2,8,9).

Matt. 15:12a "his disciples" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The wider words here read at Matt. 15:12, Greek, " …*proselthontes* (coming) *oi* (the) *math̲etai* (disciples) *autou* (of him), *eipon* (they said) *aut̲o* (unto him), …" etc., i.e., (supplying the "and" after the comma as part of translation,) "came his disciples, and said unto him," etc. (AV). In his 8th edition (1869-72), Tischendorf refers to a quote by John Chrysostom (d. 407), which reads, Greek, "*proselthontes* (coming) *gar* (for), *ph̲esin* (he says), *oi* (the) *math̲etai* (disciples) *aut̲o* (unto him) *eipon* (they said) *aut̲o* (unto him)," i.e., "'for came,' he said, 'the disciples unto him,' [and] they said unto him," etc. .

Tischendorf considers that this reading of Chrysostom supports the variant. But I disagree. There are a number of dissimilarities quite autonomously from the absence of the "*autou* (of him)" after "*oi* (the) *math̲etai* (disciples)." Thus at best, this is clearly a fairly free quote, and we cannot be sure from what underpinning Greek textual reading Chrysostom was drawing this from. Therefore I do not include it, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:12a, the Greek TR's, "*oi* (the) *math̲etai* (disciples) *autou* (of him)," i.e., "his disciples" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*discipuli* (the disciples) *eius* (of him)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th

century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592) (which prefers a "j" to an "i" in the synonymous form, "*ejus*[20]").

However, omitting "*autou* (of him)," thus making the reading, "*oi* (the) *math͟etai* (disciples)," is a minority Byzantine reading, found in Minuscule 245 (12th century). It is also omitted in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century) and d (5th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. The origins of the variant are speculative. (Cf. Matt. 16:5.)

Was this an accidental omission? In *Codex Freerianus* (or Manuscript Washington, W 032), in continuous script and capital letters (unicals), the "*AYTOY*" (*autou*, 'of him') comes at the end of a line, in which parts of the first and second "*Y*" (upsilon) and "*T*" (tau) have begun to fade, and the jagged right hand side of the page is not precision right-hand justified as it would be in a modern computer word-processor type-written page. The line starts with by receding one letter, "*T*" (tau) to the left of the left-hand justified page with "*TOTE* (Then)," indicating that as with so many other verses first numbered by Stephanus in 1551, verse 12 is actually an ancient unnumbered verse division. Yet on this same page of W 032, verse 8 beginning with "*EGGIZEI* (Draweth nigh)," is separated on the same line by a paper space of just one letter, also indicating that this is an ancient unnumbered verse division first numbered for us in 1551. If e.g., a scribe was working from a manuscript that indented the beginning of this verse 12 by one letter, (rather than receding it one letter like W 032), so that the last two letters of "*AYTOY*" (his) protruded to the right side of the page by two letters more than it now does in Manuscript Washington, (as indeed does the "*OI*" of "*KOILIAN*" / "belly" of verse 17 at the bottom of this page, with the "*LIAN*" ending found at the top of the next page of W 032,) and if the fade was complete, (rather than just started as in W 032,) then a scribe might well miss its absence as an undetected paper fade.

Moreover, such paper fades may have occurred autonomously on a number of occasions. Thus if e.g., in old Latin e, the "*discipuli* (the disciples) *eius* (of him)," had led to a paper fade of "*discipuli e:::*," then this might have led a Latin scribe to "reconstruct" this "from context" as "*discipuli* (the disciples) *et* (and)," which is the reading found only in this manuscript. Of course, other explanations are also possible, since it may also be that the "*et*" was here added "as a stylistic improvement to convey that which is necessarily implied."

Was this a deliberate omission? One finds the words "*oi* (the) *math͟etai* (disciples)" in parts of St. Matthew's Gospel (Matt. 9:14; 13:10; 17:6; 18:1; 21:6). Was this a deliberate "stylistic improvement" to "a shorter and more concise" text?

A deliberate or accidental omission? We do not know. But we do know that a

---

[20] At least so in Colunga and Turrado's Clementine Vulgate (1965) which I am now employing; for by contrast, Merk's revised Clementine Vulgate (1964) here prefers, "*eius*."

change was here made to the Received Text. The reading of the *Textus Receptus* is the representative Byzantine reading, has no good textual argument against it, and enjoys solid support in both the Greek and Latin textual traditions from ancient times. By contrast, the variant is a minority Greek and minority Latin reading. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:12a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:12a, "his disciples," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is further found in all extant Syriac versions; and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect reading which omits, "his," and so reads simply, "the disciples," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

The erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 15:12a. Hence the omission is found in the American Standard Version which reads, "Then came the disciples, and said unto him" etc. (ASV). This omission is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. However, perhaps influenced by the strong support for the TR's reading in the Syriac versions, and possibly confirmed in this view by its later presence in the Arabic Diatessaron, the TCNT chooses to depart from its underpinning Westcott-Hort text at Matt. 15:12a, and correctly reads, "his disciples."

Matt. 15:14a "they be blind leaders of the blind" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The UBS 4th revised edition (1993) textual apparatus divides the TR's reading into two readings on the basis that one reading follows the TR but in word order 3,2,1,4. With respect to the Greek following this word order in one Byzantine Minuscule, I would classify this as a distinction of no merit for my purposes since the meaning in English is identical. With respect to the proposition that the Latin Vulgate and a number of old Latin

versions follow this in their word order, whereas old Latin q does not, I must disagree on the basis that such changed word may well be as a consequence of translation from Greek to Latin.

Hence for the Greek, I include these under the TR's reading, but refer to the different word; and for the Latin, I simply show it as following the Greek TR, *infra*.

The same thing occurs with the variant reading.

The Second Matter. The Clementine Vulgate (1592) (like the Sixtinam Vulgate of 1590 before it,) here inserts "*et* (and)," reading, "*caeci* ('blind,' word 3) *sunt* ('they are' or 'they be,' word 2) *et* ('and,' added word), *duces* ('leaders,' word 1) *caeci* ('blind,' word 3) *caecorum* ('of the blind,' word 4)." This reading is found in the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582) as, "they are blind, and (*et*) leaders of the blind." It is possible that this addition is found somewhere in the Latin textual tradition, unknown to me.

But Merk's textual apparatus refers to it in the Harmonization of the Italian Diatessarons (there are Tuscan and Venetian Diatessarons), and the Harmony of the Dutch Diatessarons (there are Old Dutch Liege and Stuttgart Diatessarons). Therefore, as best I can tell *on the evidence presently available to me*, it appears to have been adopted from one or both of the Italian Diatessarons. If so, this is a most peculiar elevation of a Latin language to the status of *the* Latin language itself, and reflects the historic influence of Italy on Rome. Of course, such a reading is outside the closed class of sources. Hence if this is the source of the Clementine's reading, (and I stress that possibly I am wrong and there is some Latin textual support for it that I do not know of,) then it acts to highlight the fact made throughout this commentary, namely, that the Clementine Vulgate may be cited only in terms of the fact that *it manifests a demonstrated Latin reading*, and never in its own right as a proof that a reading is in the Latin textual tradition. No reference is made to the Clementine, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:14a, the TR's Greek, "*odēgoi* ('leaders,' word 1) *eisi* ('they are' or 'they be,' word 2) *tuphloi* ('blind,' word 3) *tuphlon* ('of the blind,' word 4)," i.e., "they be blind leaders of the blind" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century) (all three of which have the optional "n" / nu at the end of *eisi*). It is further supported as Latin, "*duces* ('leaders,' word 1) *sunt* ('they are' or 'they be,' word 2) *caeci* ('blind,' word 3) *caecorum* ('of the blind,' word 4)," in old Latin q (6th / 7th century). It is further supported in the Latin in word order 3,2,1,4, in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century, with variant spelling of word 4 as "*cecorum*"). It is also supported in word order 1,2,3,4, by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407). It is further supported in word order 3,2,1,4, by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in both the Greek and also a Latin translation, Basil the Great (d. 379), Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), and Theodoret of Cyrus (d. 460); the ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 258), Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a variant omits "*tuphlon* ('of the blind,' word 4)," reading simply, Greek, "*odegoi* ('leaders,' word 1) *eisi* ('they are' or 'they be,' word 2) *tuphloi* ('blind,' word 3)," i.e., "they be blind leaders."   It is found in word order, 3,2,1, as Latin, "*caeci* ('blind,' word 3) *sunt* ('they are' or 'they be,' word 2) *duces* ('leaders,' word 1)," in old Latin version d (5th century).   It is also followed in word order 1,2,3, by the ancient church Greek writer, Epiphanius (d. 403).

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

Was this an accidental omission?   There is a triple immediate "*tuphl*" and a larger quadruple "*tuphl*" in the words of this passage, "*tuphloi* ('blind,' word 3) *tuphlon* ('of the blind,' word 4), *tuphlos* ('the blind,' word 5) *de* ('and,' word 6) *tuphlon* ('the blind,' word 7) *ean* (if)" etc., i.e., the words in italics, "*blind* leaders *of the blind. And if the blind* lead *the blind*, both shall fall into the ditch" (AV).   It is possible that looking at this "… *tuphloi tuphlon tuphlos de tuphlon ean* …," that by ellipsis confusion, a scribe having written down "… *tuphloi tuphl*," possibly also being fatigued or working under a flickering candle-light, possibly being momentarily distracted, looked back and seeing the third "*tuphl*" in the "*tuphlos*," wrongly thought that was where he was up to, and so quickly wrote down the "*os*" ending and kept going.

The Latin of the Vulgate *et al*, which is in word order 3,2,1,4, possibly reflects a different Greek word order, although possibly it does not.   Either way, we find this Greek word order 3,2,1,4, among some ancient church Greek writers.   Perhaps a Greek scribe, recognizing this danger of ellipsis, *supra*, deliberately transferred word 3 back to alleviate this danger, and then put words 2 and 1 after it so as to increase the gap between the "*tuphl*" of "*tuphloi* ('blind,' word 3)" and the "*tuphl*" of "*tuphlon* ('of the blind,' word 4)."   The idea for this revised word order of 3,2,1,4, appears to have originated with Origen.   If so, "the great brain" of Origen only partially "solved the problem," since the text still read, *tuphlon* ('of the blind,' word 4), *tuphlos* (the blind) *de* (and) *tuphlon* (the blind) *ean* (if)," and if the omission was accidental, it would appear that from the form of the variant in word order 3,2,1, that by a "*tuphl*" ellipsis on " … *tuphlon tuphlos de tuphlon ean* …," the "*tuphlon* ('of the blind,' word 4)" was again lost.   If as seems likely the originator of this altered word order 3,2,1,4, was Origen, then he may have spotted a problem, since *when he was good, he was very good*, but his "solution" did not stand the test of time, *for when Origen was bad, he was very bad*.

Was this a deliberate omission?   Possibly "*tuphlon* ('of the blind,' word 4)," was removed as a deliberate "stylistic improvement."   If so, a somewhat highbrow scribe, may have decided to "remove such cumbersome and unnecessary wordage," in order to "create a more succinct text in keeping with the principles of grammatical simplicity."   If so, the scribe was also possibly influenced in his arrogant decision by the words of Matt. 23:16, "*Ouai* (Woe) *umin* (unto you), *odegoi* ('leaders' or 'guides,' same as word 1 in Matt. 15:14a) *tuphloi* ('blind,' same as word 3 in Matt. 15:14a)," i.e., "Woe unto you, ye blind guides" (AV, with "ye" in italics as added); and perhaps also Luke 6:39, "*tuphlos* ('a blind man' or 'the blind,' the same as word 5 in Matt. 15:14a) *tuphlon* ('a blind man' or 'the blind,' the same as word 7 in Matt. 15:14a) *odegein* (to lead)," i.e., "blind lead the blind?" (AV).   If so, "both" the scribe and those following his faulty text did most assuredly "fall into the ditch" of error (Matt. 15:14).

The reading of the *Textus Receptus* is the representative Byzantine reading and has no good textual argument against it. It is well supported in the Greek and Latin textual traditions, and has the support from ancient times of such godly Greek writing church fathers as St. Basil the Great and St. Cyril, and such godly Latin writing church fathers as St. Jerome and St. Augustine; as well as the support from early mediaeval times of the godly Latin writer, St. Gregory the Great. The variant is a minority Greek and Latin reading with slim support. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:14a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:14a, "they be blind leaders of the blind," is found in word order 1,2,3,4, in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is the most probable reading of (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century).

The correct reading is also found in word order 3,2,1,4, in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

The correct reading is also found in a number of translations, and though these vary between word order 1,2,3,4 (only the Slavonic Version), Ciasca's Latin (word order in the Arabic unknown to me), and word order 3,2,1,4 (all others), since this alteration in word order may be due to the act of translation, I group them together. Thus the correct reading at Matt. 15:14a, is further found in the Georgian Version (5th century); Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic: Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century), and some manuscripts of the Bohairic Version; as well as the Slavic Version (9th century). Though a Latin translation of the Arabic lacks the precision necessary to know the exact meaning of the Arabic (a language with which I am not familiar,) a form of it is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However the incorrect variant, which omits "of the blind," and reads simply, "they be

blind leaders," is found in word order 1,2,3, in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in word order 3,2,1, in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and also (the independent text type) Codex 0237 (6th century, Matt. 15:12-15,17-19).

This incorrect reading is also found in a number of translations, and though these are all in word order 1,2,3, this correct word order may be a fluke due to the act of translation. Hence the incorrect reading at Matt. 15:14a, is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions, and is the most probable reading of the Fayyumic (3rd century) Version although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain.

On the one hand, the obvious loss due to ellipsis, the split in the two major Alexandrian texts as to the word order, and the inclusion of the correct reading in the Syriac and Egyptian, appears to have combined to give neo-Alexandrians pause to think. Confusion reigns among the neo-Alexandrians, and five broadly different solutions have emerged amongst them. (*Neo-Alexandrian Solution 1*, *infra*.)

Neo-Alexandrian Solution 2: The correct reading is found in both Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). While Tischendorf's excellent textual apparatus virtually always show variants in footnotes, on this occasion, Nestle's 21st edition also showed the variant omitting word 4 in a footnote. *Neo-Alexandrian Solution 3:* Westcott-Hort (1881) adopted the erroneous reading in word order 3,2,1 in the main text. However, they included in a footnote the correct reading in word order 1,2,3,4, but placed word 4 in square brackets, thus making its inclusion or exclusion completely optional. *Neo-Alexandrian Solution 4:* The contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) adopts the correct reading in word order 3,2,1,4, but places word 4 in square brackets, thus making its inclusion or exclusion entirely optional.

Amidst this confusing disagreement and complex disgruntlement of neo-Alexandrian texts at Matt. 15:14a, neo-Alexandrian versions have jumped this way and that, as in their frustration they are evidently not really sure just what to do.

Neo-Alexandrian Solution 1: The correct reading is found in the NASB (3rd ed.), with no footnote referring to any alternative. The strength of the Syriac and Egyptian is clearly evident in the fact that this format is also followed in the Moffatt Bible which reads, "they are blind guides of the blind." *Neo-Alexandrian Solution 2:* The correct reading is found in the NASB (1st & 2nd ed.), with a footnote referring to the omission in the variant as an alternative reading. This format is also followed in the NRSV. *Neo-Alexandrian Solution 3:* The incorrect reading in the main text, with a footnote giving the TR's reading as an alternative, is found in the ESV, NIV, and NEB. (*Neo-Alexandrian Solution 4*, *supra*.)

Neo-Alexandrian Solution 5: The incorrect reading in the main text, without any footnote alternative, is the form found in the ASV which reads, "they are blind guides" (ASV). This format is also followed by the RSV. It was earlier found in the TCNT which gratuitously adds "but," and reads, "they are but blind guides." Let the reader note, that the *Twentieth Century NT* first removes a Received text reading, "of the blind," and then adds "but (*kai / de*)," since it suits its fancy to do so. At the same time, they thus both add to, and

subtract from, the Word of God.

All this fuming and frustration of the neo-Alexandrians could, and should have been avoided. After all, we have the serenity of a representative Byzantine text reading presenting no textual problems, put before us in the neo-Byzantine Received Text, and we have the King James Version translating it for us as the open Word of God. Why will such men simply not learn to just "walk humbly with … God?" (Micah 6:8).

Matt. 15:15 "this parable" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*ten* (-, word 1) *parabolen* ('parable,' word 2) *tauten* ('this,' word 3)," i.e., "this parable" in the words, "Declare unto us this parable" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), E 07 (8th century), G 011 (9th century), Gamma 036 (10th century); and Minuscules 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels), 2 (12th century), 597 (13th century), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). It is further supported as Latin, "*parabolam* (parable) *istam* (this)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin versions a (4th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin, "*similitudinem* (simile) *istam* (this)," in old Latin versions e (4th / 5th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil (d. 379) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

However, "this" (Greek, *tauten*; Latin, *istam*), is omitted in a variant, making the reading simply, Greek, "*ten* (the) *parabolen* (parable)." This omission is followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and ancient church Latin writer, Chromatius (d. 407).

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

Was this an accidental omission? In Manuscript Washington or *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), the "*tauten* (this)" is abbreviated as "*TAYTH*" (*taute*) with the final "H" (eta) written at half size and elevated like a footnote i.e., if (unlike this manuscript) I use * for H, as "*TAYT**". The right hand size of the page is jagged, and just three lines below, the "*OI*" of "*KOILIAN*" / "belly" (Matt. 15:17) at the bottom of this page, protrudes three letters further (with the "*LIAN*" ending found at the top of the next page of W 032). If e.g., the scribe was working from a manuscript in which "*TAYTH*" likewise protruded by three letter spaces, then a paper fade could easily go undetected.

Alternatively, there is a triple "*HN*" (*en*) ending to the three words, "*THN* (-) *PARABOLHN* (parable) *TAYTHN* (this)," and so a scribe looking at "*THN PARABOLHN TAYTHN*" might have first written "*THN PARABOLHN*," then quickly looking at his manuscript, due to ellipsis confused the final "*HN*" of "*TAYTHN*" with the final "*HN*" of "*PARABOLHN*," and kept writing from the next word on.

Was this a deliberate change?   Once   again this variant looks suspiciously like it has the murky fingerprint of Origen left on it, and so a deliberate change is certainly possible, though by no means certain.   If a deliberate change, then the scribe, probably Origen, may have undertaken a "stylistic improvement" by seeking "to harmonize it" with the reading of Mark 7:17, which reads, "*t<u>e</u>s* (the) *parabol<u>e</u>s* (parable)."

Some consider a scribe might have thought that removal of the "*taut<u>e</u>n* (this)" was a "stylistic improvement," because there is a break between the parable of Matt. 15:13, and Matt. 15:15 with the words of Matt. 15:14 (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 32; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 39).   *Prima facie*, this strikes me as unlikely since the short words of Matt. 15:14 do not, in my opinion, constitute a major break.   Nevertheless, the issue is not what do I think, but what did a scribe, probably Origen think, and perhaps in his benighted brain this was his "logic."   Certainly one would be mistaken to always try to attribute a more "sensible" rationale to the actions of an aberrant scribe (not that I wish to thereby in any way, shape, or form, infer or suggest that there is ever a *truly* "sensible" reason to tamper with God's holy Word).

Was this a deliberate or accidental change?   We simply do not know.   But we do know that a change was made, probably by Origen, to the Received Text.

The reading of the Greek *Textus Receptus* (TR) has rock solid support in both the Greek and Latin texts from ancient times, being found in the Byzantine Greek jewel of *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), and the Latin diamond of St. Jerome's Vulgate.   It enjoys the further support of four church fathers and doctors, in the Greek from St. Basil the Great and St. John Chrysostom, and in the Latin, from St. Jerome and St. Augustine.   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:15 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:15, "this parable," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century).   It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century).   It is also found in word order 3,2,1, in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Version, and a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Slavic Version (9th century).   It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect variant which omits "this" and reads simply, "the parable," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is the most probable reading of (the independent text type) Z 035 (6th century), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is further found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

The erroneous reading at Matt. 15:15, was adopted by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and (with a footnote showing the TR's reading,) Nestle's 21st edition (1952). But with wider attestation in the Syriac, Egyptian, and Ethiopic, other neo-Alexandrians became worried that *just maybe* the TR was correct. Hence the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) places "*tauten* (this)" in square brackets, a policy also found in the earlier UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions; so that the NU Text regards the inclusion or exclusion of "*tauten* (this)" as entirely optional.

This type of indecision among neo-Alexandrian textual critics, put neo-Alexandrians translators in an uncertain and unstable spot, as they scratched their heads and wondered which way they should dart. Confusion reigned. In the end, some went one way, and some went the other way.

Thus hesitant to e.g., exclude the wider witness of the Syriac, Egyptian, and Armenian versions, for generally the wrong reasons, the correct reading is found in the NRSV. On this occasion, the NRSV translators may also possibly have been influenced by the earlier decisions of the NEB[21], Moffatt, and the TCNT, which for the wrong reasons, likewise by a fluke adopted the right reading at Matt. 15:15. E.g., with a diminished view of a "parable," the TCNT reads, "Explain this saying to us;" and the Moffatt Bible reads, "Explain this parable to us."

However, the combined force of e.g., the two leading Alexandrian texts together with Origen, was enough to keep most of the neo-Alexandrian versions away from the TR's reading, "*tauten* (this)." Hence the incorrect reading is found at Matt. 15:15 in the American Standard Version as, "Declare unto us the parable" (ASV) The erroneous reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, and NIV.

Now "in all churches of the saints," "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace" (I Cor. 14:33), and so we have "the peace" of the reading found in the *Textus Receptus* and

---

[21] The reader should bear in mind that the Greek *tauten*, in masculine, feminine, and neuter forms respectively, from *outos-aute-touto*, though usually meaning "this," can also mean "that," as at I Cor. 6:6,8 (AV). (The Latin, *istam* from *iste-ista-istud*, may also mean "this" or "that.")

King James Version here at Matt. 15:15. But *outside* the true church, God gives no such guarantee. I leave the reader to draw his own conclusions as to why there is so much confusion among neo-Alexandrian texts and versions, both on this and other verses.

Matt. 15:16 "Jesus" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic reads, "*Ait* (he said)." Though *prima facie* this supports the variant, it is possible that due to Diatessaron formatting this reading was in fact influenced by Mark 7:18. Therefore, no reference is made to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:16, the TR's Greek, "*Iesous* (Jesus)," in the wider Greek words, "*o* ('the [one],' masculine gender, or 'he') *de* (And) *Iesous* (Jesus) *eipen* (he said)," i.e., "And Jesus said," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*Iesus* (Jesus)," in the wider Latin words, "*Iesus* (Jesus) *autem* ('but' or 'and'[22]) *dixit* (he said)," i.e., "And (But) Jesus said," in old Latin versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century).

However, a variant omits Greek, "*Iesous* (Jesus)," and so on reconstruction of the Greek from the Latin, it reads, Greek "*o* ('the [one],' or 'he,' masculine singular nominative definitive article, from *o / ho*) … *eipen* ('he said,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *lego*)," i.e., "he said." This is found as Latin, "*ille* ('that [one],' masculine singular nominative pronoun, from *ille*[23], or 'he') *dixit* ('he said,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *dico*)," i.e., "he said," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found as Latin, "*Quibus* (to which) *ait* (he said)," in old Latin ff1 (10th / 11th century).

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

---

[22] Though "but" is a more common meaning of "*autem*" (Woodhouse's *Latin Dictionary*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, UK, 1913), it can also mean e.g., "and" (Stelen's *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin*, Hendrickson, Massachusetts, USA, 1995). By contrast, in the variant, the Vulgate's "*At*" means "But," in "*At* (But) *ille* (that [one]) *dixit* (he said)," and this is quite possibly the meaning of "*autem*" here also.

[23] Some may prefer to write this as, *ille* (masculine), *illa* (feminine), *illud* (neuter), or *ille-a-ud*.

Was this an accidental omission? In *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) one finds in the capital letters and continuous script of Manuscript Washington, that "*Iesous* (Jesus)," or "*IHCOYC*" (with a line over it where I have a line under it, showing an abbreviation) is abbreviated to "*IC*". Due to a paper fade of two such letters, did it go undetected?

Was this a deliberate omission? Mark 7:18 reads, "*Kai* (and) *legei* ('he says,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *lego*) *autois* (unto them)," i.e., "And he saith unto them" (AV). Was this some kind of semi-assimilation to Mark 7:18 by a scribe seeking to make a "gospel harmonization"?

A deliberate of accidental omission? The matter is unknown to us. But what we do know is that it was a change to the Received Text. With no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, we here witness the natural superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. On the one hand, the TR has the support of the representative Byzantine text, with attestation from ancient times, together with the further support of a couple of old Latin versions. But on the other hand, the variant, though unknown in the Greek, is followed by the Latin Vulgate and most old Latin versions. Weighing up these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:16 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:16, "Jesus," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

However, the incorrect reading which omits "Jesus," and so simply reads, "he said," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; as well as the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 15:16, the incorrect variant entered the NU Text *et al*. But while neo-

Alexandrian texts are united against the TR's reading here, neo-Alexandrian versions are badly split over it. Seemingly influenced by its wider attestation in a number of mixed text types and independent text types, together with its presence in the Syriac Harclean Version, the correct reading is found in the TCNT, NEB, TEV, NASB (3rd ed), and NIV. But the erroneous reading is found in the ASV as, "And he said." The incorrect reading is also found in the NASB (1st ed. & 2nd ed.), RSV, NRSV, ESV, and Moffatt Bible.

In former times there was a line drawn in the ground between Protestant Authorized Version followers of the Received Text, with the reading, "And Jesus said" (Matt. 15:16, AV), and Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version followers of the Clementine Latin text, with the reading, "But he said" (Matt. 15:16, Douay-Rheims). To what extent, if any, this old battle-line influenced some neo-Alexandrians to stay with the TR's reading here, I simply do not know. But I do know, that the fight we once had to fight over this battle-line with the Papist Latins, we now have to fight with the neo-Alexandrian texts and some neo-Alexandrian versions such as the NRSV and ESV. Those who walked up to this battle-line of Matt. 15:16, and challenge the King James Version and *Textus Receptus* on it, may vary over time; but our answer to them is always the same, as we slay them with the Sword of the Spirit, *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!* [24]

Matt. 15:17 "not yet" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Tischendorf's 8th edition shows Origen using a similar reading to the variant with Greek, "*eti* (yet) *ou* (not)," on the basis that both contain "*ou* (not)." But it seems to me that it would be more correct to say that Origen here has a reading that is similar to the *Textus Receptus* since its meaning is the same as the TR's "*oupo* (not yet)."

As to why it was changed, in all likelihood by Origen, we cannot be sure. Possibly Origen was desirous of making a semi-assimilation with the "*ou* (not)" of Mark 7:18; and noting the presence elsewhere in St. Matthew's Gospel of "*eti* (yet)" (Matt. 5:13; 12:46; 17:5; 27:63 *et al*) and "*ou* (not)" (Matt. 5:14; 13:11; 17:9; 27:42 *et al*); decided to combine the two together here as a synonym for St. Matthew's "*oupo* (not yet)."

In Greek, "*ou* (not)" is used with questions where it is expected that that answer will be in the affirmative. Though the TR's "*oupo* (not yet)," is derived from "*ou*" meaning "not," and "*po*" meaning "yet" or "even," it is possible that Origen altered "*oupo* (not yet)" as a "stylistic improvement" to "*eti* (yet) *ou* (not)," in order to "make the '*ou* (not)' more pronounced as a separate word," and so *in his opinion*, "more clearly bring this out this '*ou* (not)' element of its meaning," which expects an affirmative answer. Of course, all this is highly speculative, and we really do not know why this unnecessary, unwarranted, and undesirable change was made.

We cannot be sure as to why Origen undertook what appears to be a deliberate change. But whatever his reasoning, it is clear that a new reading was created with a synonymous meaning to the old reading of the TR. Therefore, unlike Tischendorf, I show

---

[24] Latin, "The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever" (I Peter 1:25).

Origen as supporting the TR's reading with a   similar meaning reading, *infra*.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting).   Inside the closed class of sources, *prima facie* the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron follows the variant reading, "*non* (not)." However, this Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, and this same reading is also found in the Latin Vulgate at Mark 7:18.   Since as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting, it may have been gotten from either Matt. 15:17 or Mark 7:18, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, similar issues mean no reference is made to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:17, the TR's Greek, "*oupo* (not yet)," i.e., "not yet" in the words, "Do *not* ye *yet* understand?" (AV) etc., is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century).   It is further supported as Latin, "*Nondum* (Not yet)," in old Latin version q (6th / 7th century).   It is also supported with a similar meaning, as Greek, "*eti* (yet) *ou* (not)," by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

However, a Greek variant may be reconstructed from the Latin as omitting "yet," and so simply reading Greek, "*ou* (not)," i.e., "not" in the words, "Do ye *not* understand?" etc. . It is found as Latin, "*non* (not)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

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

Was this an accidental change?   A paper fade of the last two letters of the adverb, "*oupo* (not yet)," i.e., leaving it as "*ou::*", may have gone undetected, especially, although not exclusively, if it was at the end of a line.   Alternatively there may have been an obvious paper loss leaving "*ou::*", but through reference to Mark 7:18 and / or Matt. 16:11, *infra*, a scribe may have wrongly concluded that "no text was lost in the paper loss."

Was this a deliberate change?   Mark 7:18, Matt. 16:11, and the variant at Matt. 15:17 read, "*ou* (not) *noeite* (ye understand / perceive) *oti* (that)," i.e., "Do ye not (*ou*) understand, that" etc. .   Thus the Matt. 15:17 variant may well have been a "gospel harmonization" with Mark 7:18, with some further assimilation reference to Matt. 16:11.   Such a tendency towards assimilation of Matt. 15:17 to Mark 7:18 here, would arguably have been even *more* likely if a scribe was following Origen's faulty text which had already made the two readings both have "*ou* (not);" but this would by no means have been a required prerequisite, and if a deliberate change, the scribe was also quite possibly working from the TR.

A deliberate or accidental change?   We simply do not know.   But we do know that the variant was a change to the *Textus Receptus* (TR).   On the one hand, the TR's reading

has solid support in the Greek, as well as minority old Latin support in one old Latin version. Notwithstanding Origen's tampering with the text, it seems that he was aware of the TR's reading. But on the other hand, the variant has the support of the Vulgate and the most old Latin versions. Thus once again we see the natural superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:17 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:17, "not yet," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), and 157 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; and Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century).

The incorrect reading which omits "yet" and simply reads, "not," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); together with Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading entered the main text of the NU Text *et al*. Hence the erroneous reading is found at Matt. 15:17 in the ASV as, "Perceive ye not?" etc. . The incorrect reading is likewise followed in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, NEB, TEV, and the Moffatt Bible which reads, "Do you not see?" etc. .

Though the two major Alexandrian texts are split, both the neo-Alexandrian texts and neo-Alexandrian versions all favour the erroneous variant. Why do all these and other neo-Alexandrian versions line up so uniformly in opposition to the Received Text, when the two major Alexandrian texts are split down the middle? It is the same reason that the neo-Alexandrian texts all follow the variant. It is a good example of the stereotypical neo-Alexandrian bias *for the shorter reading*. For with this invalid neo-Alexandrian presupposition, e.g., the one way movement to a shorter text due to paper fades is side-lined, as is any deliberate pruning bias of "stylistic improvement" to "a more succinct text."

But as these "modern" neo-Alexandrians unite to attack the King James Version and *Textus Receptus* here at Matt. 15:17, we neo-Byzantines feel a sense of a "back to the future" debate.   For before such "modern" times, we neo-Byzantines fought the Papist Latins over this verse, which reads in the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582), "Do you not understand," for which it can claim the Latin support of the Clementine Vulgate (1592). We neo-Byzantines did not successfully fight off the Papist Latins on this verse, only to abandon it when attacked in "modern" times by neo-Alexandrians.   By the grace of God, we fight off our new adversaries, the neo-Alexandrians, just as we fought off our old adversaries, the Papist Latins.   We stand firmly and resolutely against both, knowing this, that when St. John the Divine wrote the last Book of the Bible, God sealed his completed Word with this warning.   "If any man will hurt" "the two candlesticks" of the Old Testament and New Testament, "standing before the God of the earth," then "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. 11:4,5; cf. Pss. 19:8; 119:105; Prov. 6:23).

Matt. 15:22a "cried" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter.   Though the main parts in the volumes of this commentary are of a more comprehensive size, as well they should be, nevertheless, as a means of reducing commentary size, in Appendix 3, I discuss variants far more briefly where there is no difference in English translation.   But as I have previously stated, I do not thereby regard them as unimportant, and for those studying the underpinning Greek, they may have some very different shades of meaning.   But sometimes I discuss one of these in the main part of the textual commentary, and to a large extent I am guided in this by what the English translations I am considering have done with the reading.

Here at Matt. 15:22, both the TR's reading and *Variant 1* are rendered the same in the AV (following the TR) and ASV (following the footnote alternative in Westcott-Hort) as "cried."   Were that the end of the matter, this variant would be placed in Appendix 3. However, most of the neo-Alexandrian versions, together with the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version based on the Latin, have tried to highlight a difference in meaning to the TR's translation as found in the Authorized (King James) Version, through reference to *Variant 2*.   On this occasion, I consider more detailed analysis of *Variant 1* is also warranted, because e.g., it may help to better explain the origins of *Variant 2*.

The Second Matter.   Inside the closed class of sources, Tischendorf's 8th edition shows the Latin, "*clamavit* ('she cried' or 'she cried out')" of the Vulgate *et al*, as supporting *Variant 1* (his preferred textual reading).   Though I do not think he is wrong to do so, *per se*; I do say that this Latin reading may equally have come from the Greek in the TR's reading as from the Greek in *Variant 1*, since in meaning, these are synonyms.   Therefore, I say that *this basic reading* in the Latin supports both the reading of the TR and *Variant 1*, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, Tischendorf likewise shows the Syriac Harclean Version as supporting only *Variant 1*.   Like other tongues outside the closed class of sources containing manuscripts of the NT (or OT), the Syriac language is regarded by the deluded neo-Alexandrians as important because they look to the Syriac in determining their NT texts.

I for one am not familiar with the Syriac tongue, a language which being outside the closed class of sources, is, like all the tongues of all the manuscripts outside the closed class of sources, at best, regarded by we neo-Byzantines as a language of only passing or secondary interest.   We can take or leave such languages.   For though we recognize that no tongue is without significance (I Cor. 14:10), nevertheless, *for our purposes* of determining the NT text, they are of no consequence to us.

For the purposes of the NT text, we neo-Byzantines care only for the Greek and Latin, the classic languages of learning.   By contrast, the neo-Alexandrians recognize no such distinction as a closed class of sources providentially protected over time and through time, with reasonable accessibility to this textual tradition; as opposed to other sources not meeting such requirements.   Thus for the neo-Alexandrians, tongues of such relatively minor historic importance to the larger civilized world of Europe and West Asia as e.g., Ethiopic, Egyptian, or Armenian, are regarded as far more important than they are to we neo-Byzantines.   We neo-Byzantines rightly see this elevation in the importance of manuscripts outside the closed class of sources as a downward intellectual force seeking to lower the spiritual tone, (i.e., by denying the doctrine of Divine Preservation,) and radically reduce the true academic standard of NT textual studies.

But although the neo-Alexandrians such as Tischendorf have a higher view of the Syriac and other tongues outside the closed class of sources than we neo-Byzantines, it seems to me improbable that a Syriac translation could be said to follow *Variant 1* but not the TR here, since the two Greek readings are synonymous.   However, on the one hand, in the final analysis we neo-Byzantines really do not care what these non-Greek and non-Latin manuscripts say anyway; and there may be something in the Syriac that I neither know or, nor consider it important to know of, that in some way links the Syriac reading to *Variant 1* but not the TR.   But on the other hand, there may be no such hook in the Syriac tongue.   Hence I have decided to omit all reference to the Syriac Harclean Version, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:22a, the TR's Greek, "*ekraugasen* ('she cried out' or 'she cried,' indicative active first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *kraugaz̲o̲*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), E 07 (8th century), G 011 (9th century), M 021 (9th century, with spelling, *ekraugazen*[25]), S 028 (10th century); Minuscule 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings).   Though not doing so in a way that it mutually exclusive of *Variant 1*, this *basic reading* is also supported in all the following Latin authorities.   It is supported as Latin, "*clamavit* ('she cried out' or 'she cried, indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *clamo*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is also supported as Latin, "*exclamavit* ('she cried out' or 'she

---

[25]   Though "s" (sigma) is the common / standard spelling, this "z" (zeta) spelling is also found in the Greek.   Cf. modern English diversity with e.g., "realise" or "realize."

cried, indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *exclamo*),” in old Latin version e (4th / 5th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Chrysostom (d. 407); as well as the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Augustine (d. 430).

However, another reading, *Variant 1*, is Greek, “*ekraxen* (‘she cried’ or ‘she cried out,’ indicative active first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *kraz*o).” Though not doing so in a way that it mutually exclusive of reading in the *Textus Receptus* (TR), this *basic reading* is also supported in all the following Latin authorities. It is supported as Latin, “*clamavit* (‘she cried out’ or ‘she cried, indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *clamo*),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported as Latin, “*exclamavit* (‘she cried out’ or ‘she cried, indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *exclamo*),” in old Latin version e (4th / 5th century). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407); as well as the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Augustine (d. 430).

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, is Greek, “*ekrazen* (either, ‘she was crying,’ / ‘she was crying out;’ or, ‘she began crying’ / ‘she began crying out,’ indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *kraz*o).” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is further followed as Latin, “*exclamabat* (either, ‘she was crying,’ / ‘she was crying out;’ or, ‘she began crying’ / ‘she began crying out,’ indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *exclamo*),” is found in old Latin version k (4th / 5th centuries); and as Latin, “*clamabat* (either, ‘she was crying,’ / ‘she was crying out;’ or, ‘she began crying’ / ‘she began crying out,’ indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *clamo*), in old Latin versions d (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

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

Variant 1 probably originated with Origen. Was *Variant 1* an accidental change? Possibly due to a paper fade or paper loss, the TR’s Greek, “*ekraugasen* (she cried),” had come to look something like, “*ekra:::::*”. Particularly if it came at the end of a line, Origen might not have realized that it had so many letters, and “reconstructed” it from context as “*ekraxen* (she cried).” If so, he captured well the sense of the original, since this is a synonym. He may also have well been influenced by the nearby presence at Matt. 14:30 of the “*ekraxe*” (or if it had the option “n” / nu at the end, “*ekraxen*”).

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? If so, was it motivated by a scribal desire to “harmonize” it with the reading of Matt. 14:30, so as “to more poignantly make a contextual comparison,” between “the Jew who ‘cried out (*ekraxe*)’” in Matt. 14:30, and “the Gentile who ‘cried out (*ekraxen*)’” in Matt. 15:22a?

If so, I would point out that this woman was of the accursed Canaanitish race, who for their progenitor Ham’s sin, manifest the Hamitic curse by God’s law declared through Noah,

"Canaan" "shall" "be" "servants" "unto" their Japhetic and Semitic "brethren" (Gen. 9:25-27). Hence when this woman "cried out" in Matt. 15:22a, it was very different to when St. Peter "cried out" in Matt. 14:30. For St. Peter did so having first put aside his sin, which in his instance was the sin of his unbelief referred to in Matt. 14:30. By contrast, the Canaanitish woman had not first put aside her sin, which in her instance was the sin of a Hamite seeking racial emancipation from servitude to Japhethites and Semites, for which reason Christ first requires that she sees herself as one of the "dogs" at her Jewish Semite racial "masters' table" (Matt. 15:26,27). Only when she had put away her sin of opposing all forms of racial discrimination (Matt. 15:27), did our Lord in recognition of the racial universality of the Gospel (Matt. 28:18-20), then declare that she had the right kind of "faith" (Matt. 15:28). (Our Lord dealt quite differently with the Japhethite Gentile in Matt. 8:5-13. For he who decreed Gen. 9:25-27 through Holy Noah, has no change or variableness in him.)

Was this a deliberate "stylistic change" by Origen, in order "to more poignantly make a contextual comparison," between "the Jew who 'cried out (*ekraxe*)'" in Matt. 14:30, and "the Gentile who 'cried out (*ekraxen*)'" in Matt. 15:22a? If so, Origen badly misunderstood the dissimilarity between these two instances of two people who both "cried out" to the Lord. Neither he nor anyone else, has any business tampering with God's Word because they either do not like what is says, or think that they can in some way "improve" upon it.

Was *Variant 2* an accidental change? Due to a paper fade, did the TR's Greek, "*ekraugasen* (she cried)," come to look something like, "*ekra::::::*"? If so, particularly if it came at the end of a line, did a scribe, not realizing that it had so many letters, "reconstruct" this as "*ekrazen* (she was crying)"? Alternatively, might a scribe have been working from a text with *Variant 1*, in which due to a paper fade, "*ekraxen* (she cried)" had come to look something like, "*ekra:en*"? If so, did a scribe then "reconstruct" this as "*ekrazen* (she was crying)"? Either way, was the scribe also influenced in his decision about this "reconstruction" of *Variant 2* at Matt. 15:22a, by the concept of "a gospel Greek"? Specifically, was he influenced by the presence of "*ekrazen*" at Mark 10:48 and Luke 18:39, where there is also a reference to "the Son of David"?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change? If so, was it done with some reference to the usage of "*ekrazen*" in Mark 10:48 and Luke 18:39, where there is also a reference to "the Son of David"? Before exploring this possibility further, we must first consider the difference in substance between, on the one hand, the meaning of both the TR's reading and *Variant 1*, which is the same, and on the other hand, the meaning of *Variant 2*. That is because, it is theoretically possible that a scribe who deliberately changed the text to *Variant 2*, might have been working from either the TR's text, or *Variant 1's* text.

At Matt. 15:22a, both the TR's "*ekraugasen* (she cried)," and *Variant 1's* "*ekraxen* (she cried)," are indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verbs. By contrast, *Variant 2's* "*ekrazen* (either, 'she was crying,' or, 'she began crying')," is an indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb. The difference between them, is thus the difference between an aorist (TR & *Variant 1*) and an imperfect (*Variant 2*). In Greek, whereas the aorist gives a simple snapshot picture of an action (TR& *Variant 1*), the imperfect gives a fuller moving or progressive picture of an action unfolding (*Variant 2*). The imperfect is more commonly found in St. Mark's Gospel, and less commonly found in St. Matthew's Gospel. This fact means that it looks like the scribe may well have been influenced by Mark 10:48 (and / or Luke 18:39), although of course, this is not certain.

Is the imperfect of *Variant 2* meant as an inceptive imperfect? The inceptive (ingressive / inchoative) imperfect tense, stresses the beginning of an action, and implies that it then continues for some time. It may be rendered with such words as "began" e.g., "she [began] crying out." If so used here, whereas *Variant 2's* reading would indicate that her action of "crying out" continued after she "began," the reading of the TR & *Variant 1* does not imply any such continuation in her action of "crying out." Is the imperfect of *Variant 2* meant as an iterative imperfect? The iterative imperfect has the sense of an action that had been repeated. If so used here, whereas *Variant 2's* reading would indicate that her action of "crying out" had been repetitious, the reading of the TR & *Variant 1* does not imply any such repetition of her crying out. It may be rendered here as e.g., "she was crying out"[26].

Therefore, a scribe prepared to undertake a deliberate "stylistic improvement," may e.g., have considered that he wanted to give a fuller moving or progressive picture of an action unfolding with *Variant 2's* imperfect tense, rather than simply a snapshot picture of the action as found in the TR's and *Variant 1's* aorist tense. If so, the scribe presumably considered that his "great brain" could safely make such a conclusion on the basis of analogy with Mark 10:48 and / or Luke 18:39.

Were these variants deliberate or accidental changes? We simply do not know. But by the grace of God, we do know that because they do not conform to the reading of the representative Byzantine Text, against which there is no good textual argument, that indeed these variants are both changes to the Received Text of Holy Scripture.

On the one hand, as the representative Byzantine text with no reasonable textual problem in it, the reading of the *Textus Receptus* has the strong support of the Greek. It also has the specific endorsement of the church father and doctor, St. Basil the Great. The basic reading of the TR is also consistent with most of the Latin textual tradition. But on the other hand, the basic reading of *Variant 1* is also consistent with most of the Latin textual tradition. Moreover, Chrysostom was aware of not only the reading of the TR, but also the readings of both *Variants 1 & 2*. *Variant 2* also has some old Latin support. Therefore on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:22a a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:22a, "she cried (*ekraugasen*)," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscule 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere). Though not doing so in a way that it mutually exclusive of *Variant 1*, this *basic reading* is also supported in the 19th century Latin translation of the Arabic as Latin, "*clamavit* (she cried)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

---

[26] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 541,544-7; Young's *Greek*, pp 113-115.

Variant 1, which is a synonym for the TR's reading, "she cried (*ekraxen*)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century); together with Minuscules 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. Though not doing so in a way that it mutually exclusive of the reading in the Received Text, this *basic reading* is also supported in the 19th century Latin translation of the Arabic as Latin, "*clamavit* (she cried)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

Variant 2, "she was crying" or "she began crying (*ekrazen*)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and 700 (11th century, independent); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Armenian Version (5th century).

With the two major Alexandrian texts split down the middle between two erroneous variants; and on the one hand, *Variant 1* followed by Origen *et al*; but on the other hand, *Variant 2* followed in the Syriac, Egyptian, and Armenian; there has correlatingly been a splitting headache created in the minds of neo-Alexandrians. This has been manifested in a two-way split between these two incorrect variants in both neo-Alexandrian texts and neo-Alexandrian versions; as the baffled neo-Alexandrians ponder whether or not they think Origen was right, or whether or not they think the Syriac, Egyptian, and Armenian was right?

At Matt. 15:22a, *Variant 1*, "*ekraxen* (she cried)," entered the main text of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). It is also found as a footnote alternative in Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993).

Variant 2, "*ekrazen* (either, 'she was crying' or, 'she began crying')," is found in the main text of Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

At Matt. 15:22a, *Variant 1* was adopted by the American Standard Version rendering it as "cried (*ekraxen*)," (ASV), which is thus the same rendering as the AV based on the TR which is also "cried (*ekraugasen*)" (AV). So too, *Variant 1* is followed in the TEV. But though the difference is not apparent in the English translations of these versions, a difference most certainly exists in the underpinning Greek.

Variant 2 is followed by most of the versions considered. But they divide between rendering it as an inceptive imperfect or an iterative imperfect. *Variant 2* is translated as an inceptive imperfect (action beginning and thereafter repeated) by the TCNT, NASB, and

NRSV. E.g., the TCNT which (gratuitously adding in "Jesus") reads, "a Canaanite woman of that district came out and began calling to Jesus," etc. .   Or showing the NASB's italics, "And a Canaanite woman from that region came out and *began* to cry out, saying," etc. (NASB).

Variant 2 is translated as an iterative imperfect (repeated action) by the NEB, ESV, and NIV, which follow in the footsteps of Moffatt's "wailing," i.e., "And a woman of Canaan came out of these parts, wailing" etc. (Moffatt Bible).   E.g., the ESV reads, "And behold, a Canaanite woman from that region came out and was crying," etc. (ESV).

So too, the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582), unlike the Clementine (1592), here follows several old Latin versions that have *Variant 2*.   (The Latin imperfect tense is like the Greek imperfect tense, in that it could mean e.g., either a *repeated* action or one *just starting*.[27])   Thus the Rheims NT here uses the idea of a repeated action in its reading, "And behold a woman of Canaan who came out of those coasts, crying out," etc. .

It seems we are fighting the same battle with the more modern neo-Alexandrians, that we historically fought with the older Papist Latins.   "Can … the leopard change his spots?" (Jer. 13:23)

Matt. 15:22b "unto him" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

As found in Julicher, the reading of old Latin d is that the woman was coming out "*post* (after) *illym* (?)."   The Latin alphabet script is the same as the English alphabet script (although the older Latin always uses "i" not "j").   In Greek, the lower case letter, upsilon, looks like our "u" (except the right hand bar is absent") i.e., υ, and the upper case upsilon, looks like our "Y."   Both Greek and Latin are the classical languages of learning.   Therefore a good Latin scribe should have known some Greek.   If the Latin scribe here used some form of what he regarded to be, a "Hellenized Latin lettering," making the upper case "Y" into a lower case "y" shape (rather than a "υ"), then he probably meant by Latin, "*illym*," what is normally written as Latin, "*illum* ('that [one],' singular masculine <u>accusative</u>, demonstrative pronoun from *ille* i.e., 'him')."

This conclusion also makes contextual sense because Latin, "*post*" with an accusative means "after" or "behind."   Thus this means the depiction in this old Latin version is that the woman calls out "*post* (after) *illum* (him)."   I shall take this to be the meaning, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:22b, the TR's Greek, "*aut<u>o</u>* (unto him)," in the words, "and cried unto him, saying" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings).   It is further supported as Latin, "*ei* (unto him)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions ff2 (5th

---

[27]   Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, pp. 32-33.

century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th /   13th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is also supported as Latin, "*ad* (unto) *illum* ('that [one],' masculine, i.e., 'him')," in old Latin version k (4th / 5th centuries); and as Latin "*ad* (unto) *eum* (him)," in old Latin versions f (6th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century).   A similar reading with respect to the usage of "him," is found with Latin, "*post* (after) *illym* (= *illum*, 'him')," in old Latin version d (5th century).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379).

However, Greek "*auto* (unto him)," is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading, found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century).   It is also omitted in Latin Vulgate Codices F (6th century), A (7th / 8th century), B (9th century), C (9th century), and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century); as well as old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and g2 (10th century).   This omission is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct.   The origins of the variant are speculative.   Was this an accidental omission?   If so, was this an accidental omission following an undetected paper fade?

Or was this an accidental omission by ellipsis?   In type written manuscript such as I use with the Trinitarian Bible Society's reprint of Scrivener's NT Text (1894 & 1902), Greek letters are clear and unambiguous.   In such a typed script there is an obvious difference between letters.   But this is not necessarily the case in a handwritten manuscript since writing styles and neatness can vary in them, just as it can in contemporary handwriting.   In Manuscript Washington (*Codex Freerianus*, W 032), a capital Alpha or "A," looks like, "A," and a capital Lambda or "L," (unlike the capital Lambda of modern texts such as Scrivener's NT which looks more like an upside down "V", "Λ") looks like a larger form of the modern lower case lambda, "λ."   But due to the scribe's handwriting, the letter "A" (alpha) sometimes looks very much like the letter "λ" (lambda).   E.g., a poorly formed alpha in "*autou* (of him)" at Matt. 15:6, rather than looking like, "AYTOY", in fact looks like, "λYTOY".   Here the first alpha ("A") looks the same as the lambda three lines down at Matt. 15:7 in "*kalos* (well)", which looks like, "KAλωC."

This same issue arises in *Codex Freerianus* here at Matt. 15:22b, where there is a poorly formed alpha ("A") at the beginning of "*auto* (unto him)."   This is then immediately followed in the continuous script writing of W 032 with the next word, "*legousa* (saying)," which I note has a further final poorly alpha ("A") on it which also looks like a lambda (λ) rather than an alpha (A).   Did a scribe using a manuscript with similar properties of a poorly formed handwritten alpha at the beginning of "*auto* (unto him)," become momentarily confused by an external stimulus as he thought in his head, "I'm up to the lambda," and then looking back quickly, by ellipsis pass over to the following word, "*legousa* (saying)," thereby accidentally omitting this word?

Was this a deliberate omission?   The probable origins of this variant with Origen, must heighten this possibility, though by no means make it certain.   Did a scribe, probably Origen, desire a "more succinct text," with the pruning away of "unnecessary wordage" such as this "*auto* (unto him)"?

A deliberate or accidental omission?   We do not know.   We cannot know, for the matter is shrouded in the darkness of unrecorded textual transmission history.   But I thank God that we can know that a change in the text occurred.

The reading of the Received Text has solid support in the Greek and Latin, and is supported by the learned church doctor, St. Basil the Great.   Amidst a textual divide in the Latin, the Clementine has on this occasion wisely chosen to follow the better reading of St. Jerome's Vulgate.   The variant has some stronger support in the Latin, and is a minority Byzantine Greek reading.   But the lack of any good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text, together with the relatively weak support for the reading in the Greek, together with the fact that the variant appears to have originated with Origen, all add up to mean that the variant can be safely dismissed.   (In saying this, I do not wish to deny that at times Origen is very good.   I merely recognize that when the other factors are against him, it becomes clear that this is one of those instances in which Origen is very bad.)   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:22b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:22b, "unto him," is found in (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century).   It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century); and the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.   It is further found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), where in a manner reminiscent of old Latin d's "*exiens* (coming out) *post* (after) *illym* (him)," *supra*, we read in Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic, "*Et* (And) *egressa* (calling out) *post* (after) *eum* (him)."

However, the incorrect variant omitting, "unto him," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century); and Minuscule 579 (mixed text, 13th century).   It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)*, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent).   It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Version; Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous reading entered the NU Text *et al*.   Hence at Matt. 15:22b, in the ASV "unto him" is omitted after, "and cried," and before, "saying," which thus reads, "and cried, saying" (ASV).   Likewise, this omission is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Matt. 15:22c "[thou] son" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Latin Vulgate *et al* here reads, "*Domine* ('O Lord,' masculine singular vocative noun, from *Dominus*), *fili* (Son of) *David* ('David,' indeclinable, variant spelling, '*Davit*' in old Latin k). The "O Lord" is clearly in the vocative and thus used for address. But Latin "*fili*" is the declension for the singular masculine noun, from *filius*, in both the vocative and genitive cases. One possible translation is found at Matt. 15:22c in the Douay-Rheims (NT 1582), "O Lord, thou son of David." Another possible translation of the Latin is found in Wycliffe's translation (1380), "Lord the son of David." Hence no reference is made to the Latin, *infra*. See my preliminary textual discussion comments at Matt. 9:27b in Vol. 1.

A complicating factor arises in the English translation of this passage because of the preceding Greek vocative case of "Lord." I.e., "*Kurie* ('O Lord,' masculine singular vocative noun, from *Kurios*)" found in both the TR's and variant's readings, is then followed in the variant here with "*Yios* ('Son,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *uios*) *Dabid* ('of David,' indeclinable, operating as a masculine singular genitive noun, from *Dabid*)." The earlier vocative means one could still render this, "Lord, thou Son of David." An earlier clear instance of this occurs inside the TR at Matt. 1:20, where we read, "'*Ioseph* ('Joseph,' masculine singular vocative noun, from '*Ioseph*), *uios* ('son,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *uios*) *Dabid* (of David)," which is rendered in the AV as, "Joseph, thou son of David" (AV); although it might have also been rendered, "O Joseph, son of David." But there is still a difference in English translation here at Matt. 15:22c, since in the AV the "O" of "O Lord" indicates vocative case, as does the "thou" of "thou son" i.e., there is a double vocative.

I also consider some of the issues raised here may be of some further interest for those wishing to compare and contrast this reading with that of Matt. 9:27b.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:22c, the TR's Greek reads, "*Yie* ('Son,' masculine singular vocative noun, from *uios*)," i.e., as a form of address, showing the italics of the AV, "*thou* Son of David" (AV). This reading is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., the purple parchment *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century), *Codex Basilensis* (E 07, 8th century), *Codex Cyprius* (K 017, 9th century), *Codex Campianus* (M 021, 9th century), *Codex Petropolitanus* (Pi 041, St. Petersburg, 9th century), *Codex Monacensis* (X 033, 10th century); Minuscule 2 (Basel, Switzerland, 12th century); *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 2378 (11th century) and *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

However, a variant, reading Greek, "*Yios* ('Son,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *uios*)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). It is also followed by Basil the Great (d. 379).

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

Was this an accidental alteration? (In the following instances, the Byzantine manuscripts put a line above the letters, where I put it below the letters, to indicate an

abbreviation.)   At Matt. 7:9; 12:8, Manuscript Washington (W 032) abbreviates "*YIOC*" (*Yios*, "son" in nominative case) to "*YC*".   This type of abbreviation is found in the wider Byzantine textual tradition[28].   E.g., at Matt. 7:9, M 021 (9th century) also abbreviates "*YIOC*" to "*YC*"; at Matt. 1:25 Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) abbreviates "*YION*" (*Yion*, "son" in accusative case) to "*YN*"; and here at Matt. 15:22c, K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century), and Omega 045 (9th century), all abbreviate "*YIE*" (*Yie*, "son" in vocative case) to "*YE*".   In W 032, the general shape of the "E" (Epsilon) is the same as the general shape of the "C" (sigma), except that there is a bar in the middle of the letter for an "E" (Epsilon).   Therefore, if due to a paper fade, the original "*YE*" had lost its middle bar, it would have looked like "*YC*", and so the variant may have been adopted as an undetected partial paper fade of the middle bar.

Certainly this is not the only possibility.   Was there a complete paper fade of the last letter, so that the original "*YE*" (*Yie*) looked like, "*Y:*" and this was "reconstructed" as "*YC*" (*Yios*)?   Or did a longer form of "*YIE*" fade to look like, "*YI*", and perhaps having a stylistic paper space afar it, or perhaps coming at the end of a line, the missing one letter was "reconstructed" as two letters, to become, "*YIOC*"?   With respect to either of these two "reconstruction" possibilities, was the scribe influenced by "*uios* (son) *Dabid* (of David)" at Matt. 1:20 (or perhaps Mark 12:35; Luke 20:44)?

Was this a deliberate change?   E.g., did a scribe copying out this text consider that because the immediately preceding "*Kurie* (O Lord)" is in the vocative case, *supra*, that the usage of a double vocative was "unnecessary" or "undesirable"?   If so, he would have considered such a deliberate change to be "a stylistic improvement."

A deliberate change or an accidental change?   We do not know.   But we do know that the variant constitutes a change to the original text.

Saint Jerome (*c.* 342-420) was surely correct when in his Letter to Tranquillinus, he says, "you ask me," "for an opinion" with regard to "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," "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)[29]."   Certainly at Matt. 15:22c, on this occasion with the representative Byzantine text behind him, and no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text, our approach to Origen is necessarily different to the view formed of him with regard to Matt. 15:22b.   With such powerful credentials on his side here at Matt. 15:22c, we can say that Origen is an early witness to the Received Text's reading.   So that whereas at Matt. 15:22b Origen was very bad, by contrast, here at Matt. 15:22c, Origen is very good.   *But that's Origen for you!*

The reading of the TR is supported by the representative Byzantine text, has no good

---

[28]   This important information may be found in the very useful textual apparatus of Swanson.

[29]   Wace, H. & Schaff, P. (Eds), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 6, St. Jerome: Letters & Select Works, 1893, pp. 133-4 (Letter 62:2).

textual argument against it, and has early support with Origen.   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:22c an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:22c, "*Yie* ('Son,' vocative case)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Codex Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century).   It is also found in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century).   It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

However the incorrect reading, "*Yios* ('Son,' nominative case)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Codex Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), and 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century).

With the two major Alexandrian texts split down the middle, the neo-Alexandrians have not been entirely certain where to go on this reading at Matt. 15:22c, although in their confusion they have consistently favoured the incorrect reading.   Most of the neo-Alexandrian texts we consider have favoured the erroneous reading of Rome Vaticanus in the main text, with a footnote giving the alternative reading of the TR as found in London Sinaiticus.   This is the format found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993).   This incorrect reading, with no footnote alternative, is also found in the main text of the UBS 3rd (1975), 3rd corrected (1983), and 4th revised (1993) editions.   And so the neo-Alexandrians who argue "the oldest discovered manuscripts are the best," on this occasion have forsaken such principles, not following the oldest reading which is Origen!   Why?   Because Origen supports the TR here!   So much for the vacillating claims of the neo-Alexandrians that "the oldest discovered manuscripts are the best."

But when we come to the neo-Alexandrian versions, an even more confusing picture emerges.   As stated in the preliminary textual discussion, *supra*, because the preceding "*Kurie* (O Lord)," is in the vocative case, one might still translate the variant with either an "O" or a "thou" to indicate vocative case.   But there is still a difference in English translation here at Matt. 15:22c, since in the AV the "O" of "O Lord" indicates vocative case, as does the "thou" of "thou son" i.e., there is a double vocative in, "*O* Lord, *thou* son of David."   By

contrast, as a single vocative derived from "*Kurie* (O Lord)," the variant would be either, "*O* Lord, son of David," or "Lord, *thou* son of David." Therefore, it seems that the ASV translators followed the correct reading of the TR found in the footnote (literally a side-note) of Westcott-Hort, in their rendering of Matt. 15:22c as, "O Lord, thou son of David" (ASV).

I consider Matt. 15:22c is a good example of how, when the archaic form "thou" is not used, as in the more "modern" versions such as e.g., the *New King James Version* (1982), *accuracy and clarity suffers.* That is because "modern" English would use not "thou" for a second vocative, and nor would it use a second "O" i.e., "Have mercy on me, *O* Lord, *O* Son of David." Rather, one would indicate the first vocative by rendering it as either, "O Lord, Son of David" (ESV), or "Lord, O Son of David!" (Moffatt Bible); and then one would have nowhere to go to indicate that there was or was not a second vocative case here present in the underpinning Greek. Thus even though the main text of the NKJV is from the TR, its rendering of Matt. 15:22c, "O Lord, Son of David!" (NKJV), is indistinguishable from the ESV, even though the ESV may or may not consider "Son" is in the vocative case. Clearly then, if the aim of e.g., the NKJV or ESV was to produce a more accurate translation, or one that was *more intelligible* to a competent reader, then they have failed badly; for they have produced a *far more unintelligible and unclear* translations than the *King James Version* (1611).

Thus as with the Burgonites (same Majority Text readings in the footnotes) NKJV, when we come to later neo-Alexandrian versions after the ASV, we find that such archaic features of the English language have been removed. Though they were archaic at the time the KJV was translated, they were retained because for the Protestant Christian *accuracy matters most* when reading the verbally inspired Word of God; yet these buffoons think themselves very clever when they discover that these are "archaisms" of the English tongue. Being ignorant persons they tend to say things like, "the King James was in good contemporary English in 1611, but it is not now in contemporary English so it must be revised." Another of their supercilious and inaccurate claims is this, "Part of the reason we had a Reformation was that Protestants taught the Bible should be in the common tongue of the people," when the truth is, that "part of the reason we had a Reformation was that Protestants taught the Bible should be in *a tongue that could be understood by the common people*," i.e., even if that meant that they had to learn some moderate archaisms to achieve that end. In non-English speaking lands where the problem of losing the "you" singular (thee, thou, thy) and "you" plural (you, ye, your) distinction from the language did not exist, *one option* was to put the Word of God in the common tongue of the people, like the Koine Greek of the NT. But *the other option*, used in the British Isles with the King James Version, was to put the Word of God in a tongue that could with relative ease be understood by the common people, like the Aramaic parts of the OT (and various Hebraic poetical sections).

But in modern English there is nothing equivalent to "thou" to indicate that the vocative case is being used i.e., that there is a direct address to the person being addressed, indicated by the "thou" of both the AV and ASV in the words, "O [first vocative case] Lord, thou [second vocative case] son of David" at Matt. 15:22c. Thus we find that at Matt. 15:22c, (even though in the NASB 1st & 2nd editions, RSV, ESV, and Moffatt Bible it is clear that one vocative case, namely, "Lord" is being used,) the reader of the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, and Moffatt Bible, is unaware if they are following the nominative case of

"Son" in Rome Vaticanus, or the vocative case of "Son" in London Sinaiticus and the TR.

All these versions are thus in the same deep ditch that the TCNT (1904) got itself into, when at the leading edge of abandoning such precisions of the English tongue, they came to render Matt. 15:22c as, "Take pity on me, Master, Son of David" (Twentieth Century NT). Well may we "take pity on" them. For what fool would forsake the clarity, the accuracy, and the literary grandeur of the King James Version's vocative forms, "O" and "thou" in, "Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou son of David" (AV); and exchange it for something as inaccurate, imprecise, and literarily mediocre as, "Take pity on me, Master, Son of David" (TCNT)? *To be sure, the standards have dropped considerably!*

Matt. 15:25 "she worshipped" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Julicher shows old Latin g1 supporting the variant, whereas Tischendorf shows it supporting the TR. Hence I make no reference to g1, *infra*.

The Second Matter. Though the translation into English is the same for both the reading of the TR and the variant, I have here exercised a discretion to include discussion of this variant in the main part of the commentary, rather than in Appendix 3. (By contrast, compare Matt. 18:25 in Appendix 3.) On the one hand, because the English translation is the same for both the TR's imperfect tense reading and the variant's aorist tense reading, one might argue that one cannot be sure which of the two readings the AV translators here used. Furthermore, the variant is the reading of e.g., Erasmus's 1516 and 1522 editions. But on the other hand, as manifested by convention in the more matured TR Greek texts that have used the imperfect tense here, the view that this is the correct reading of the Received text is a well established neo-Byzantine position.   Hence "*prosekunei* (she worshipped)" is found in e.g., Stephanus's Greek NT (1550).   Erasmus was a great neo-Byzantine textual analyst, but he was not infallible, and at this point later work improved upon his earlier work.

Thus from older times, Matt. 15:25 is a traditional demarcation line between the TR and representative Byzantine text; and in more modern times, it is a further demarcation line between neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus* and Burgonites of the Majority Text.   These factors surely make a wider discussion of this reading quite compelling.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:25 the Greek TR's, "*prosekunei* ('she worshipped,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *proskune̲o̲*)," is a minority Byzantine reading.   It is supported by the purple parchment Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), and M 021 (*Codex Campianus*, 9th century).   It is also supported as Latin, "*adorabat* (indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *adoro*)," in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

However a variant, "*prosekune̲sen* ('she worshipped,' indicative active aorist, 3rd

person singular verb, from *proskune<u>o</u>*)," is followed in the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). It is further followed as Latin, "*adoravit* (indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *adoro*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and 1 (7th / 8th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

The reading of the *Textus Receptus* is in the Greek imperfect tense (supported by the Latin imperfect tense), whereas the reading of the variant is in the Greek aorist tense (followed by the Latin perfect tense). Ward's description of the aorist as a grammatical mechanism for describing pinpoints in time is not much liked by Young, who prefers to see the aorist as the speaker's overall perception of an event "in its entirety, or as a single whole." Wallace likes to talk about the aorist a "snapshot" of the action. In contradistinction to the snapshot aorist, the imperfect tense is like a moving picture that shows an action progressively unfolding. The imperfect thus reveals an *internal aspect* of the action and is frequently *incomplete*, since it is focusing on the *process* of a particular action[30].

A particular textual problem here exists with the representative Byzantine reading at Matt. 15:25. *Prima facie* it is a possible reading, for it bears a definite similarity to the "*prosekun<u>e</u>sen* (he worshipped)" in Mark 5:6 where we read, "But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran and worshipped (*prosekun<u>e</u>sen*) him, and cried with a loud voice," etc. (Mark 5:6,7). Mark 5:6 is like Matt. 15:25 in that the aorist is used before the one who "worshipped (*prosekun<u>e</u>sen*)" speaks; and so it is quite different to e.g., John 9:38, where the man first "said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped (*prosekun<u>e</u>sen*) him;" or Acts 10:25 where, "as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped (*prosekun<u>e</u>sen*) him." Indeed, the fact that the imperfect is used less commonly in St. Matthew's Gospel and more commonly in St. Mark's Gospel, might under more normative circumstances, act to make this representative Byzantine reading the more likely one.

But set against all this are the realities of Matthean Greek, and St. Matthew's normative usage of the imperfect, "*prosekunei* ('he worshipped' or 'she worshipped')," in such instances. Thus we read at Matt. 8:2, "And, behold, there came a leper and worshipped (*prosekunei*) him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." Or at Matt. 9:18 we read, "While he spake these things unto them, behold, there came a certain ruler, and worshipped (*prosekunei*) him, saying, My daughter is even now dead: but come and lay thy hand upon her, and she shall live." And at Matt. 18:26 we also read, "The servant therefore fell down, and worshipped (*prosekunei*) him, saying, Lord, have patience with me, and I will pay thee all." Thus when we come to Matt. 15:25, our expectation is that we will read, "Then came she and worshipped (*prosekunei*) him, saying, Lord, help me."

Thus it is clear from Matt. 8:2; 9:18; 18:26, that *in the context of St. Matthew's Gospel*, though not necessarily in another context, that at Matt. 15:25 the aorist reading of the representative Byzantine text, "*prosekun<u>e</u>sen* (she worshipped)," clangs on the ears, *not as*

---

[30] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 540-1,554-5; Young's *Greek*, pp. 113,122.

bad Greek, but rather, *as not being Matthean   Greek*.   This really does look like it has been brought in from somewhere else, and while we cannot be sure of its source, the most likely suspect seems to be Mark 5:6.   The only way to cure the open sore of this textual difficulty at Matt. 15:25, is to adopt the minority Byzantine reading, "*prosekunei* (she worshipped)," and thus bring the health of Matthean Greek back into the verse.   For while it is true that God himself chose the very words that a Bible writer was to use, i.e., verbal inspiration, it is also true that he took those words from the writer's vocabulary, and not another's.

The origins of the variant are speculative.   Was this an accidental alteration?   If due to a paper fade, the original imperfect tense, "*prosekunei* (she worshipped)," had come to look something like, "*prosekun::*", and if it was either followed by a stylistic paper space or came at the end of a line, then a scribe may have "reconstructed" this as the aorist tense, "*prosekun̲e̲sen* (she worshipped)."   If so, he may well have been influenced by a comparison with "*prosekun̲e̲sen* (he worshipped)" at Mark 5:6,7.

Was this a deliberate change?   If so, not by a competent scribe who understood Matthean Greek.   But of course, one can never assume that such a scribe was particularly competent.   Perhaps e.g., a scribe thought it to be some kind of "stylistic improvement," to use "the more concise aorist to see this action as a single whole," rather than "portraying the action in a more summary and incomplete form with the imperfect tense."   If so, he may have been influenced in this decision "by the more succinct single whole action of the aorist in Mark's account of the 'man with an unclean spirit'' (Mark 5:2), at Mark 5:6,7.

Was this a deliberate or accidental change?   We simply do not know.   But that it was indeed a change to the Received Text is evident from the non-Matthean Greek fingerprint it left behind.

On the one hand, the reading of the *Textus Receptus* is strongly supported by textual analysis of the Greek.   There is attestation of the reading through time and over time as a minority Byzantine reading.   There is also good support for the reading in the Latin textual tradition, dating from ancient times.   Moreover, with textual analysis and such Greek and Latin witnesses in it favour, on this occasion, Origen evidently cites the correct reading, and so his attestation from early times is an example of when Origen is very good.   But on the other hand, the variant is the representative Byzantine reading, is followed by the Vulgate and several old Latin versions, and also an ancient church writer.   Weighing up these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:25 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.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:25, Greek, "*prosekunei* ('she worshipped,' imperfect tense)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century).   It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which

contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Armenian Version (5th century).

However, the incorrect reading, Greek, "*prosekunesen* ('she worshipped,' aorist tense)," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent) and 157 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and also as Latin, "*adoravit* ('she worshipped,' perfect tense)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

With the two major Alexandrian here in support of the correct reading, for the wrong reasons, the right reading was adopted by the NU Text *et al*, and thus the correct reading is in the underpinning Greek of the ASV which at Matt. 15:25 reads, "worshipped" (ASV). Other neo-Alexandrian versions would also be therefore based on the correct Greek here, such as the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

By contrast, the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582), "But she came and adored him," would historically be justified through reference to the Clementine Vulgate, which here reads, Latin, "*adoravit* (perfect tense)," and thus follows the erroneous variant. Likewise the Burgonites adopt the erroneous reading, Greek, "*prosekunesen* ('she worshipped,' aorist tense)," in Green's Textual Apparatus (1986), Robinson and Pierpont's *New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform* (1991), and Hodges and Farstad's *Greek NT According to the Majority Text* (1985); and so it is also the standard Burgonite reading. Though there is no footnote in the NKJV stating so at Matt. 15:25, it is thus the preferred underpinning Greek reading of this Burgonite version.

And so it is, that an older adversary of the King James Version and Received Text, namely, the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version as understood through the Clementine Vulgate; and a newer adversary of the King James Version and Received Text, namely, the New King James Version as understood through the Burgonites' Majority Texts; come together at Matt. 15:25 in a relationship that is *too close for comfort.* They are both *enemies from within*, for the Latin Papists would accept the Divine Preservation of the Latin textual tradition (albeit denying such Divine Preservation of the Byzantine Greek), and the Burgonites would accept the Divine Preservation of the Byzantine Greek textual tradition (albeit adding to this a relatively small number of spurious manuscripts from outside the closed class of sources). The Latin Papists ultimately derive from the Pope of Rome. The Burgonite Majority Text advocates ultimately derive from the Puseyite, Dean Burgon.

What are they both up to? What is it that both the Latin Papists and Burgonites here set their hearts on? It is nothing less than a union whose common aim is to strike down the *Textus Receptus* and thus the underpinning NT Text of the Authorized (King James) Version. Will they by such an unholy alliance succeed by their combined strength, to accomplish that

which neither acting individually might attain unto? Will they indeed strike down the *Textus Receptus* and render it ineffective in its God ordained task? To these questions echo back this one word, "No! No! No!" For the Word of God stands sure over time and through time. It has not changed from the time the Received Text was more formally and comprehensively composed in the 16th and 17th centuries, nor afore that time, and nor can it ever change.

For even as a man with a concealed coiled-up lash in his hand may, if attacked, suddenly uncoil that lash to thrash his attacker; so too, here at Matt. 15:25 the *Textus Receptus* suddenly, as if from no-where, is seen to unroll a hitherto concealed lash, and with it, thrashes both the Latin Papists and Majority Text Burgonites who thought to attack it with their spurious texts. That powerful and cutting lash is backed by, and administered under, nothing less than the doctrine of verbal inspiration itself. For the mighty *Textus Receptus* declares that while God himself chose the very words that a Bible writer was to use (Luke 16:17; 21:33); yet simultaneously, those words were chosen from the Bible writer's vocabulary as the Spirit of God worked with, and not against, the spirit of the Bible prophet (Luke 1:1-4). The whip of the *Textus Receptus* thus lashes the Latin Papists and Burgonites alike here at Matt. 15:25; and both would-be attackers being badly bloodied, are forced to back-off. And so this account of the stern thrashing and lashing that the *Textus Receptus* here gives to both the Latin Papists and the Burgonites who had thought to come against it in an alliance, might be subtitled, "The *Textus Receptus* strikes back."

Matt. 15:26 "it is … meet" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Matt. 15:26 is used in this commentary as a special case study illustrative of some interesting matters to do with the usage of optional letters, more fully discussed in Appendix 2 of this second volume. Hence a number of bracketed comments and footnotes refer to this, *infra*.

The Second Matter. The *Variant 1* reading by Eusebius (*Commentary on the Psalms*), is given as Greek, "*esti* (it is)" by Tischendorf, whereas UBS 3rd and 3rd corrected editions give it with the optional "n" (nu) at the end as "*estin* (it is)." Normally I am not concerned with such matters, but because I am using the readings at this verse a special case study to illustrate some matters of optional letters, *supra*, I will be following the reading "*esti* (it is)." This is the reading found in Migne[31].

The Third Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, that Latin Vulgate codex jewel of the Western Latin textual tradition which is especially highlighted in the Gospels of this commentary, namely, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century), reads, "*Non* (not) *est* (it is) *enim* (for) *bonum* (meet)," i.e., "For it is not meet." This is the same reading at the Vulgate's Mark 7:27, from which it was either drawn, or assimilated from with the Vulgate's Matt. 15:26 reading, "*Non* (not) *est* (it is) *bonum* (meet),"

---

[31] Eusebius in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1857 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 23, p. 210 (Commentary on Psalms, Ps. 21:17-23 LXX & Vulgate in Migne = Ps. 22:16-22, AV) (Greek).

i.e., "It is not meet." Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, the Latin translation of the Arabic, "*Non* (not) *est* (it is) *bonum* (meet)," i.e., "It is not meet," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), presents similar issues. I.e., due to Diatessaron formatting, who is to say if the reading came from Matt. 15:26, or Mark 7:27, or both? Therefore no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:26, the TR's Greek, "*esti* (it is) *kalon* (meet)," in the words, "*It is* not *meet* to take the children's bread" etc., is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, with the optional "*n*" at the end as, "*estin*"), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century, also as "*estin*"); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D. , twice in two different readings). It is also supported as Latin, "*est* (it is) *bonum* (meet)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, another reading, *Variant 1*, reads, "*gar* (for), *ph̲e̲si* ('he said' or 'he saith,' present indicative active, 3rd person singular verb, from *phemi*)," rather than, "*kalon* (meet)," i.e., "*Ouk* (not) *esti* (it is) *gar* (for), *ph̲e̲si* (he saith), *labein* (to take)" etc., i.e., "For it is not, he saith, to take the children's bread" etc. . This reading is followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339)[32]; and arguably by the ancient church Latin writer, Tertullian (d. after 220)[33].

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, reads, Greek, "*exestin* (it is lawful)," i.e., making the words, "*It is* not *lawful* to take the children's bread" etc. . This reading is followed as Latin, "*licet* ('it is lawful,' or 'it is permitted')," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen

---

[32] *Ibid.* Since the word following "*esti* (it is)" is "*gar* (for)," it starts with a consonant, and so on the principles manifested in Scrivener's Text the optional "n" (nu) would drop out before the consonant "g" (gamma), as it does here in Eusebius' reading (see App. 2).

[33] Though this conclusion is uncertain and may be disputed, it rests on two quotes. 1) "*Non* (not) *est* (it is) *auferre* (to take) *panem* (the bread) *filiis* (of children)" etc., Tertullian in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1844 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 2, p. 370 (Against Marcion, Book 4, 7:11,12) (Latin). 2) Of Prayer, ch 5. Roberts, A. & Donaldson, J., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1885, Vol. 3, p. 683 (Of Prayer, Chapter 5) (English). If the "he says" (Of Prayer, 5) is considered as part of the Biblical quote, then the combination of these two quotes may indicate that Tertullian was familiar with *Variant 1*.

(d. 254) and Basil the Great (d. 379)[34]; as well as the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Ambrose (d. 397), and Jerome (d. 420).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which is thus correct.

The TR's "*esti* (*estin*[35], 'it is,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *eimi*)," is a common Greek form and common Matthean Greek form (Matt. 1:20; 10:2; 15:20; 24:6; 26:18; 27:6), as is "*kalon* ('meet,' neuter singular nominative adjective, from *kalos-e-on*)," also (e.g., Matt. 3:10; 7:19; 12:33, *et al*). Nevertheless, one also finds *exesti* (*exestin*[36], 'it is lawful,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *exelko*) at Matt. 12:2 ("is … lawful"); 14:4 ("It is … lawful"); 19:3 ("Is it lawful …?"); 20:15 ("Is it … lawful …?"); 22:17 ("Is it lawful …?"); 27:6 (''It is … lawful'').

The origins of the variant are conjectural.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental omission? Was "*kalon* ('meet' or 'good')" at the end of a line, and drop out due to a paper fade? Or was *Variant 1* a deliberate omission for similar philosophical reasons as *Variant 2, infra*? Either way, was the "reconstruction" (if accidental) or "stylistic improvement" (if deliberate) at Matt. 15:26 of, "*gar* (for), *phesi* (he saith)," influenced by the "*gar*" at Matt. 14:3 and 15:2, and the "*phesin* (she said)" found at Matt. 14:8?[37]

Was *Variant 2* an accidental omission? If e.g., a scribe was looking at a continuous script manuscript that e.g., had the original "*esti* (it is) *kalon* (meet)" at the end of a line, and due to a paper loss or fade went from "*esti kalon*" to "*e:::::::::*", a scribe might have "reconstructed" this as "*exestin* (it is lawful)." Alternatively, in Manuscript Washington these two words go over two lines in continuous script, with one line reading, "*ECTINKA*" and the next line reading, "*LON*". Possibly, a manuscript also went over two lines, so that the original "*esti / estin* (it is) *kalon* (meet)," due to paper damage, may have gone from something like:

---

[34] The word following "*exestin* (it is lawful)" is "*labein* (to take)." Hence on the principles manifested in Scrivener's Text the optional "n" (nu) would drop out before the consonant "l" (lambda), and so this would be, "*exesti labein*" (see App. 2).

[35] The optional "n" at the end is found in Scrivener's Text at e.g., Matt. 1:20, "*estin* (is) *Agiou* (Holy)," in the words, "for that which is conceived in her *is* of the *Holy* Ghost;" see Appendix 2, of Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20). Cf. *estin* in Scrivener's Text at e.g., Matt. 2:2; 3:3; 5:3; 6:21; 7:9; 8:27; 9:5; 11:6; 12:6; 13:19; 14:2; 16:20; 17:4; 18:1; 19:10; 20:1; 21:10; 22:8; 23:8; 28:6.

[36] The optional "n" at the end is found in Scrivener's Text at Matt. 19:3, "*exestin* (Is it lawful) *anthropo* (for a man …?);" see Appendix 2, of Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-28).

[37] The word following "*phesin* (she said)" at Matt. 14:8 is "*ode* (here)." Hence on the principles manifested in Scrivener's Text the optional "n" (nu) is present before the vowel "o" (omega) (see App. 2).

.............................estikalo
n.........

to something like:

.............................e:::::::
n.........

If so, once again a scribe realizing the manuscript was damaged, might have "reconstructed" this as "*exestin* (it is lawful)." If so, the scribe was also possibly influenced in this "reconstruction" by the presence of "*exestin* (it is lawful)" at e.g., Matt. 14:4 or elsewhere in St. Matthew's Gospel, *supra*.

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change? If Tertullian's reading was known to Origen, he might have altered the "*estin*" (*Variant 1*) to "*exestin* (it is lawful)," as a "reconstruction correction." However, this likelihood is greatly diminished by the fact that he was aware of both the TR's reading and *Variant 2*. Indeed, with both readings clearly known to Origen, a man who spent a large part of his life in Alexandria, he is quite probably the originator of *Variant 2*. For any number of reasons, a scribe, if so, probably Origen, may have considered it to be "a stylistic improvement," to "depict Jesus as upholding a law, 'it is not lawful,' rather than stating a racist value, 'it is no meet to take the [Jewish] children's bread, and to cast it to [Hamitic] dogs'," such as this "woman of Canaan" (Matt. 15:22,26).

The origins of referring to Hamites in general, and Canaanites in particular, as "dogs" (Matt. 15:26,27; Mark 7:27,28) in this context of a Jewish "master" race (Matt. 15:27) being set over the "servant" race of "Canaan" (Gen. 9:25,26), seems to derive from the sin of Ham. He "saw the nakedness of his father" (Gen. 9:22), is Hebraic terminology which we also find in Lev. 20:17, "if a man … see her nakedness, and she see his nakedness," which means coitus. Therefore Ham was evidentially a bisexual, for though as a progenitor of the Hamites he was necessarily heterosexual (Gen. 10:6-20), he here approached his dead-drunk fast asleep father, went to non-consensual buggery with him, and when "Noah awoke from his wine, and" realized that while he had been asleep he had been buggered, he "knew what" "Ham," "had done to him" (Gen. 9:22,24)

This may infer that in antediluvian times Ham was known to be one who would engage in this vice; since it is clear that once Noah "knew" he had been buggered, that he immediately pointed the finger of blame at Ham (cf. Ezek. 14:14,20). Alternatively, Noah may have known this by a Divine revelation. (Either way, there is also a moral message and WARNING in this story about the dangers of drunkenness. I.e., in such an out-of-control state, followed by deep sleep, *anything might happen*. E.g., one might wake up from a drunken stupor with a "hangover" and one's wallet stolen; or worse still, one might, something like Noah, awake from a state of dead-drunk deep sleep with a sore groin and a used jar of vaseline next to oneself.)

Thus Noah's "younger son" (Gen. 9:24), this dirty boy, "Ham" (Gen. 9:22), was a sodomite. Now in Deut. 23:17,18, we find in lines 1b & 2b, a "sodomite" and a "dog" put in Hebraic poetical parallelism, thus indicating that they are synonyms (cf. I Cor. 6:9; Rev. 22:15); in the same way that "whore" is put in poetical parallelism in lines 1a & 1b.

Line 1a: "There shall be no *whore* of the daughters of Israel,
Line 1b: nor a *sodomite* of the sons of Israel.
Line 2a: Thou shalt not bring the hire of *a whore*,
Line 2b: or the price of *a dog*,
Next lines: into the house of the Lord thy God …: for …
              these are abomination unto the Lord thy God."

Therefore in the context of the Hamitic racial curse, such as here at Matt. 15:26,27, Hamites might be referred to as "dogs," in order to remind them that their servitude is a racial curse stemming from the homosexual sexual sin of their progenitor, Ham.   It is surely then conceivable, that a scribe, if so, probably Origen, wanted to militate the sternness of this; where Jesus' clearly endorses the racist sentiment, on the one hand, saying, "It is not meet (*kalon*)," or "good," "to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs," although, also indicating that humble Hamites who accept their status as a servant race to Jews and whites (Gen. 9:25-27) may enter the kingdom of heaven (Matt. 15:27,28).   I.e., the racial universality of the gospel (Matt. 15:28; 28:19; Gal. 3:28), is sometimes misused by people to create a broad anti-racist sentiment opposing all forms of racial discrimination, such as Jewish Semite or white supremacy (Gen. 9:25-27), or opposing race based nationalism (Gen. 10) and all forms of racial segregation (Gen. 11:1-9; Acts 17:26b; 21:17-33); in the same way the gospel's sexual universality to males and females (Gal. 3:28), is sometimes misused by people to create a broad anti-sexist sentiment opposing all form of sexual discrimination (Gen. 3:16; I Cor. 11:3-16; 14:34-36; I Tim. 2:8-3:13).

E.g., Gibson refers to Gen. 9:25-27 as a "nasty little story."   He asks rhetorically if anything can "justify" the racial curse of Canaan., and says, "I for one have no hesitation in answering, No!"   He observes that numerous Christians in e.g., the American Deep South, find in "white supremacy and apartheid" a "present-day equivalent."   But Gibson rejects Divine inspiration, and so he considers that the story "got into Scripture because of the prejudice of the author."   A religious liberal, he concludes that, "The distasteful story of the curse on Canaan *ought not to be in the Bible*[38]."

By contrast, e.g., the Reverend Dr. Robert Jamieson (1802-1880) of the *Jamieson, Fausset, & Brown* Bible Commentary, says at Gen. 9:27, "God shall enlarge Japheth - pointing to a vast increase in posterity and possession. Accordingly his descendants have been the most active and enterprising, spread over the best and largest portion of the world, all Europe and a considerable part of Asia. *He shall dwell in the tents of Shem* - a prophecy being fulfilled at the present day, as in India British Government is established and the Anglo-Saxons being in ascendancy from Europe to India, from India over the American Continent. What a wonderful prophecy in a few verses (Isa. 46:10; I Peter 1:25; II Peter 1:19)!"[39]   Or the Reverend Dr. Josiah Porter (1823-1889), says in *Brown's Study Bible* of "This remarkable prophecy," "that each blessing embodies, while it illustrates, the first curse.

---

[38]   Gibson, J.C.L., *Genesis*, Vol. 1, The Saint Andrew Press, Edinburgh, UK, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, USA, 1981, pp. 198, 201-202 (emphasis mine).

[39]   Jamieson, R., *Critical & Explanatory Commentary*, Old Testament, Genesis – Esther, William Collins & Sons, London & Glasgow, UK.

Canaan appears to be mentioned as the representative of the whole Hamites, the head of that section of the Hamitic race with which the Israelites came specially into contact. The whole prophecy has been remarkably fulfilled in the history of mankind since it was uttered. The Hamites as a race have been 'servants of servants,' … under the Shemitic Israelites, and the Japhetic Greeks, Romans, and Saxons. Japheth has been enlarged. His descendants occupy at this day the territories of Shem, and constitute the leading nations of the civilized world."

It is sometimes said that Noah's three sons were white (Japheth), brown (Shem), and black (Ham). The fact that e.g., only some of Ham's descendants were black indicates this word-play is a broad-brush impressionistic picture. Nevertheless, when taken with the fact that Shem is the *Patriarch of Asia* and Ham the *Patriarch of Africa*, this artistic summary, creates a *prima facie* presumption for determining a racial group's origins; which stands unless clearly proven otherwise. Hence because Capoids are both black and were historically in Africa, they are Hamitic; or because Mongoloids are both brown and were historically in Asia (going from there into the Americas via the Bering Strait), they are Shemitic.

In broad terms, on the *Table of Nations* Japheth is the Patriarch of Europe, Shem the Patriarch of Asia, and Ham the Patriarch of Africa. Since the population groups entering Australia and the Americas must have done so from Asia (and both have clear racial affinities with Asiatic groups), it follows that both groups are of Shemitic stock[40]. Thus both Doctors Jamieson and Porter, *supra*, are surely correct in seeing the expansion of Japhethites (in this

---

[40] On general principles, Japhethites went into Europe, Shemites into Asia, and Hamites into Africa. (Even though there are limited exceptions with regard to West Asia. For into Western Asia went the Hamite-Semite admixed Canaanites, Gen. 10:15-19. So too as an earlier fulfillment of Gen. 9:27, Japhethites e.g., the Medes / Madai, Gen. 10:2, went into West Asia. The Aryan / Iranian tribes of West Asia later pushed south, and through miscegenation with the Australoid Dravidians, created the admixed northern race of India in Central Asia.) Therefore the old maps used before the European discoverers improved them, in which the world was pictured on a disc containing three roughly equal sized continents, with Europe given to Japheth, Asia (thought to end in Central Asia with China) to Shem, and Africa (thought to end with North Africa) to Ham, were *in broad terms* correct, albeit incomplete, even though they failed to modify *general principles* with the specific variations in West Asia, *supra*. Thus *on general principles*, both the Mongoloids who went to the Eastern parts of Asia, and then the Americas; and the Australoids who went into Central Asiatic India, and then down to Australia, would have to be Shemitic (just as the Capoids of south Africa would have to be Hamitic). The Australoid secondary race has five tertiary races, subdivided into *Dravidic Australoids* and *Negritic Australoids*. One of these five races is the Australian Aborigines, and another of them is the Dravidians of India. Shem's son Elam is the Australoid progenitor (Gen. 10:22), for the Elamite and Dravidian languages came from the same parent language (McAlpin, D.W., "Proto-Elamo-Dravidian: The evidence and its implications," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 1981, Vol. 71, Pt. 3, pp. 1-155). The Elamite capital of Shushan or Susa was one of the five major cities of the Medo-Persian Empire, and included a "palace" (Neh. 1:1; Esther 1:2; Dan. 8:2). The picture in Rev. 18:11,13,15 includes the Dravidian "cinnamon" "merchants" of South India and Ceylon / Sri Lanka.

context, mainly Anglo-Celtic Aryans, but also other Aryans,) into both North America and Australia as a fulfillment of the words, "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem" (Gen. 9:27)[41].

The different attitudes in these commentaries on Gen. 9:25-27 between religious conservatives on the one hand, such as Jamieson and Porter; and religious liberals on the other hand, such as Gibson, is notable. If this change to the text here at Matt. 15:26 was deliberate, it may thus be an ancient form of these differences. I.e. a scribe taking the Gibson type view, *supra*, that Christ's teaching that Hamitic racial servitude is morally "good (or 'meet,' Greek *kalon*)," was "a distasteful story" that "ought not to be in the Bible," may have decided to prune away the word, "good (or 'meet,' Greek *kalon*)." Certainly those who do not submit to Scripture may seek to deny such racial blessings and curses. E.g., the religiously liberal, Bernard Ramm (who before his apostasy started out as a religious conservative,) wound up like so many religious liberals in denying the Adamic racial curse, known as original sin[42].

While it is true that in the "new heaven and ... new earth" (Rev. 21:1), "there shall be no more curse" (Rev. 22:3), so that both the racial curse of Adam (original sin with Adamic racial slavery to sin and death, Rom. 5-8) and the racial curse of Ham (Hamitic racial

---

[41] Some may prefer not to proceed beyond *broad general principles* with regard to the Mongoloids i.e., to simply leave the matter at the fact that they are Shemitic. (Certainly that is my position with the Capoid's progenitor, which on general principles I leave simply at Ham.) The old question, *From whence cometh the Mongolic group?*, has been greatly disputed. E.g., the suggestions of Japhetic Magog (Gen. 10:2), Hamitic Sineus (Gen. 10:17), or a mixed race from Magog and Sineus can be ruled out on general principles requiring Mongoloids be Shemitic. (Although before I realized this, I was attracted to the Magog-Sineus hypothesis.) The Mongoloids' Shemitic progenitor is not as clear as the Caucasian Caucasoid progenitor, Japheth; or the two Mediterranean Caucasoid progenitors in Shem (West Asian Semites) and Ham (Hamitic North Africans); or the Negroid progenitor in Cush; or the Australoid progenitor in Elam. Within the clear parameters of Shemitic stock, possibilities include e.g., Arphaxad, on the basis that "the earth divided" (Gen. 10:24,25) refers to the closure of the Bering Straits ice bridge (although I understand it to refer to the Tower of Babel, Gen. 11:1-9). While I am not dogmatic about the matter, and allow that I may be wrong *as to the specific* Shemitic progenitor, I consider the most probable explanation is that they are Shemitic via Aram's son, Mash (Gen. 10:23), a group that went into "the east" (Gen. 10:30), and whose name was arguably manifested in the Hebrew word for "silk" as *meshiy* (Ezek. 16:10,13). Certainly Scripture isolates them in the NT through reference to the great Silk Route stretching from Europe to China (Rev. 18:11,12).

[42] Forsaking his originally orthodox position that, "The sinnerhood of man is traced to a *historical* fall" (B.L. Ramm's *Protestant Christian Evidences*, Moody, Chicago, USA, 1953, reprint 1978, p. 245), Ramm came to typify religiously liberal efforts to deny the Bible a constitutive role in understanding the creation of man, original sin, and the racial curse of our progenitor, Adam on the human race. Ramm thus became semi-Pelagian (Ramm's *Offense To Reason*, Harper & Row, San Francisco, USA, 1985 e.g., pp. 27-28,51,76).

servitude to the white race and Jewish race, Gen. 9:25-27) shall be removed; it is also true that there will still be racial segregation of race-based "nations" drawn from different racial "families" (Zech. 14:16-19). This will evidentially then be on the principle of *separate and equal*. But these segregated nations will unite together when "all" racial "flesh" shall "come to worship before me, saith the Lord" (Isa. 66:23). Since in Scripture one element of a nation is always its identity as a specific racial group (Gen. 10) e.g., Greek *genos* from which we get our word, "gene," in Mark 7:26 ("nation"), or II Cor. 11:26 ("countrymen," cf. 11:22), or Gal. 1:14 ("nation"), the Scriptures unambiguously teach the continuation of such diverse "kindred" "and nation" (Rev. 4:9) in "the nations" of Rev. 21:26; 22:2 on the "new heaven and ... new earth" (Rev. 21:1). Hence some elements of racism contain an eternal element manifesting God's eternal purposes (a fact that miscegenationists would do well to remember, Gen. 6:1-4; Dan. 2:43,44; Matt. 24:37-39), and these racial groups will be found in the separate and equal nations of the new heaven and new earth, even though they will sometimes join together in acts of united worship of God.

Origen was a well known anti-racist. Thus he denied the Biblical teaching that redemption is limited to the human race or Adamic race (Rom. 5:12-21; I Cor. 15:22,45,47,49). Rather, he claimed that the orbit of redemption included those devils of the angel race who are fallen, Satan himself included. But the Biblically racist teaching clearly excludes from redemption any outside of Adam's race, so that those outside the human race can never go to heaven, whether they be devils, or (as the question is sometimes asked,) people's pet animals (Eccl. 3:21). Thus Origen's more general anti-racism may well also be the reason behind this change here at Matt. 15:26.

Therefore, a scribe, if so, probably Origen, may have wanted to depict Jesus as "hiding behind the rules." I.e., rather than have Jesus say, "It is not meet (or 'good,' *kalon*) to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs" (TR & AV), the scribe had Jesus say, "It is not lawful (*exestin*) to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs" (*Variant 2*). But if so, the scribe had an all too shallow approach. For it was God who spoke through Holy Noah in Gen. 9:25-27, and so the Lord made the rules. Does such a scribe think Christ to be so weak as to first *make the rules* and then *hide behind the rules*? The reality, of course, is that Christ first *makes the rules* and *happily upholds the rules*. He does not apologize for his holiness, for his hatred of sin, and for his just penalties against it. If a scribe thought he was somehow strengthening Christ's reply here at Matt. 15:26 by deliberating altering it to *Variant 2*, he was most assuredly very wrong to do so.

Was the change to the text at Matt. 15:26 deliberate or accidental? We do not know. But we do know that such a change was made.

On the one hand, the TR's reading has solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, solid support in the Latin with St. Jerome's Vulgate and several old Latin versions, and no good textual argument against it. It also has the further support of the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom. But on the other hand, while *Variant 1* can be safely dismissed as an omission, probably accidental due to a paper fade, *Variant 2* has the support of both a number of old Latin versions and ancient church writers. Nevertheless, with Origen using both readings, it seems likely that he is the originator of *Variant 2*, which was quite possibly, although not definitely, a deliberate "stylistic improvement" from Origen stemming from a philosophical aversion to depicting Jesus with too strong a racist sentiment, and a concomitant desire by Origen to *tone down* Christ's racist sentiment which regards

Hamitic racial servitude as being morally "good (or 'meet,' Greek *kalon*)." Therefore, weighing up these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading Matt. 15:26 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:26, "it is not meet," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 1071 (independent, 12th century); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500).

However, the incorrect reading, *Variant 2*, "it is not lawful," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions.

A notable rift has occurred among three groups of neo-Alexandrians here at Matt. 15:26. One group of neo-Alexandrians, represented by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), have adopted *Variant 2* (although as usual showing variants in his excellent textual apparatus). Another group, represented by Westcott-Hort (1881) and the UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), have adopted the TR's reading for the wrong reasons i.e., primarily because of its support in the Alexandrian texts. The third group is intermediate, placing the correct reading in the main text, but giving both *Variants 1 & 2* as alternative readings, a position represented by Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993).

The neo-Alexandrian thinking is very confused at Matt. 15:26. The UBS 3rd and 3rd corrected editions placed the correct reading in the main text, but took the view that "there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text or the apparatus contains the superior reading." This is thus a fairly weak endorsement of the correct reading. Metzger was one of these UBS Committee members, but in his textual commentary Metzger favours the correct reading more strongly than this. Although he refers to a view that the TR's reading is an assimilation from Mark 7:27 (a view some other UBS Committee members presumably thought more likely than he did), Metzger concluded that *Variant 2* was introduced to strengthen Christ's reply (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, pp. 39-40).

Given such disagreement among neo-Alexandrians over their divided preferences for

either the TR's reading or *Variant 2*, one cannot with certainty predict how neo-Alexandrian versions will treat Matt. 15:26 in the future. Nevertheless, at least to date, the correct reading has been clearly preferred by the neo-Alexandrian versions. Thus it is found in the ASV as, "It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs." The correct reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Matt. 15:30b "Jesus'" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

I refer to the Clementine following the variant. Starting with this Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), I favour Colunga & Turrado's Clementine Vulgate over Merk's (modified) Clementine Vulgate, unless otherwise stated. Colunga & Turrado's edition uses the later "j" spelling i.e., "*ejus* (his)," rather than the older "i" spelling of Merk's edition, i.e., "*eius* (his)." This makes absolutely no difference to the meaning. Latin originally had no letter "j," and some Latin writers still always use "i," whereas others (like myself) use a combination of "i" and "j."

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:30b, the TR's Greek, "*tou* (-) *Iesou* ('of Jesus' or 'Jesus'')," i.e., "Jesus'" in the words, "and cast them down at Jesus' feet" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), the purple parchment, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century), *Codex Guelferbytanus* (P 024, 6th century), and *Codex Seidelianus* (H 013, 9th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*Iesu* ('of Jesus' or 'Jesus'')," in *Codex Brixianus* (old Latin Version f, 6th century, Brescia) and *Codex Monacensis* (old Latin Version q, 6th / 7th century, Munich).

However a variant reading Greek, "*autou* ('of him' or 'his')," i.e., "his" in the words, "and cast them down at his feet," is a minority Byzantine reading, found in Minuscule 58 (15th century). It is further found as Latin, "*eius* ('of him' or 'his')," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

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

Was this an accidental omission? In *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042), and *Codex Guelferbytanus* (P 024), the "*tou Iesou* (Jesus')," or "*TOYIHCOY*" is abbreviated (with a bar on top where I have a bar below) as "*TOYIY*." Therefore, after a paper fade of the first four letters and the bar, this could have looked like something like, "*:::::Y*," and so possible "reconstructed" by a scribe as *AYTOY* (*autou* / his). Alternatively, if it was written out in full, if the "*TOY*" came at the end of one line, and the "*IHCOY*" at the beginning of the next line, then a paper fade of the "*TOY* ('the' = redundant

in English translation,)" may have been missed, and a partial paper fade of the "*IHCOY* (Jesus)" to "*::::OY*" might have been "reconstructed" as "*AYTOY* (his)." If so, was the scribe influenced in his decision by the "*autou*" at e.g., Matt. 15:5; 16:5,13? Might he have considered the words, "*tous* (the) *podas* (feet) *autou* (of him)" (Matt. 15:30b variant) some kind of "gospel Greek" through reference to the terminology of, "*tous* (the) *podas* (feet) *autou* (of him)" at Mark 5:22 and / or Luke 7:38 and / or Luke 17:16 and / or John 11:2?

Was this a deliberate change? (The concept of "verses" is ancient, though the numbering of them is 16th century.) Did a scribe consider this was a "stylistic improvement" since "the name of Jesus (*o Iesous*) is mentioned in the previous verse" (Matt. 15:29) "and two verses later" (Matt. 15:32), so that its mention in Matt. 15:30b was regarded by him as "unnecessarily repetitious"? If so, was he further influenced in this decision by what he considered to be "the more succinct" reading of, "*tous* (the) *podas* (feet) *autou* (of him)" at Mark 5:22 and / or Luke 7:38 and / or Luke 17:16 and / or John 11:2?

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

On the one hand, the reading of the TR has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading with no good textual argument against it. Its presence in the Greek clearly dates to ancient times with *Codex Freerianus*; and it has the further support of a couple of old Latin versions. But on the other hand, the variant is followed by the Vulgate and most old Latin Versions, together with a couple of ancient church writers. Balancing out these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:30b a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:30b, "Jesus'," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However the incorrect variant which reads, "his," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century) It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); the

Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Armenian Version (5th century).

The erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al.* But perhaps influenced by its presence in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 and Syriac Versions, the correct reading was adopted by the TEV. However, more commonly, the neo-Alexandrian versions have followed the variant. Hence the incorrect reading is found at Matt. 15:30b in the American Standard Version as, "and they cast them down at his (*autou*) feet" (ASV). The variant is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Matt. 15:31b "to speak, the maimed to be whole" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The UBS 3rd corrected edition (1983) and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), both show old Latin versions f, q, & d in support of the variant. By contrast, both the UBS 3rd (1975) and 4th revised (1993) editions, take the view that while in broad terms these three old Latin versions support the TR's reading, nevertheless, there are some minor differences between them and the TR. Amidst these back and forth vacillations of opinion by different UBS Committees, I take the view that old Latin versions f & q *clearly* support the TR's reading, *infra*; and *with the qualification* of minor differences i.e., the Latin scribe used a "dynamic equivalent," old Latin d was *clearly* translated from the TR's Greek reading, *infra*.

The Second Matter. I remind the reader that not all variants are considered. E.g., I do not discuss *Variant 4*, which is a conflation and expansion of *Variant 2* with the TR. It occurs in Sigma 042 and N 022, which reads, Greek, "*akouontas* (word 1b, 'hearing') *kai* (and) *lalountas* (word 1a, 'speaking'), *kullous* (word 2a, 'the maimed') *ugieis* (word 3a, '[to be] whole'). But for my purposes, they both contain the key words of the TR, and since that is what I am primarily interested, I refer to them under the TR, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:31b, the TR's Greek, "*lalountas* (word 1a, 'speaking' masculine plural accusative, present active participle, from *lale*o), *kullous* (word 2a, 'the maimed,' masculine plural accusative adjective, from *kullos*) *ugieis* (word 3a, '[to be] whole,' masculine plural accusative adjective, from *ugies*)," i.e., "to speak, the maimed to be whole" in the wider words, "the dumb to speak, the maimed to be whole" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), P 024 (6th century), and Lectionaries 1231 (10th century, Princeton, New Jersey, USA) and 1761 (15th century, St. Catherine's Greek Orthodox Monastery, Mt. Sinai, Egypt). It is further supported as Latin, "*loquentes* (word 1a, 'speaking,' masculine plural accusative, present participle, from *loquor*), *debiles* (word 2a, 'the maimed,' masculine plural accusative adjective, from *debilis*) *sanos* (word 3a, '[to be] whole,' masculine plural accusative adjective, from *sanus*)," in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century). It is also supported with minor differences as a dynamic equivalent with the same basic meaning as Latin, "*loquentes* (word 1a, 'speaking'), *sideratos* (word 2b, literally 'the stars,' by inference because stars are 'high' in the sky referring to 'the height,' and so figuratively here meaning 'the height' of different persons,'

masculine plural accusative adjective, from *sidus*) *incolumes* (word 3b 'entire,' masculine plural accusative adjective, from *incolumis*)," i.e., "the height [to be] entire" (because they were no longer maimed and so *bent over with a lower head height* as they walked,) in old Latin Version d (5th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a similar reading, *Variant 1* adds "and (*kai*)," and so reads, "*lalountas* ('to speak,' word 1a), *kai* ('and,' added word), *kullous* ('the maimed,' word 2a) *ugieis* ('to be whole,' word 3a)" i.e., "to speak, and (*kai*) the maimed to be whole." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 1188 (11th / 12th century).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, alters Word 1, but retains words 2a and 3a, thus reading, "*akouontas* (word 1b, 'hearing,' masculine plural accusative, present active participle, from *akouo*) *kullous* (word 2a, 'the maimed') *ugieis* (word 3a, '[to be] whole')," i.e., "to hear, the maimed to be whole." This a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 211 (12th century).

Yet another reading, *Variant 3*, omits words 2a and 3a, but retains word 1a, thus reading, "*lalountas* (word 1a, 'speaking')." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 184 (1319 A.D.). The omission is further found as Latin, "*loquentes* (word 1a, 'speaking')," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental change? If "*lalountas* (word 1a, speaking)," came at the end of a line, possibly with a paper space at the end of two or three letters in a typical non-right-hand justified handwritten page, and the next line started with "*kullous* (word 2a, the maimed)," a scribe may have wrongly concluded that "there had been a paper fade." If so, he may have "reconstructed" the "*kai* ('and,' added word)," "from context." Certainly "*kai* (and)," is a common Greek conjunctive, found e.g., at Matt. 15:31 (twice).

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? Did a scribe, looking at "*lalountas* (word 1a, 'to speak'), *kullous* (word 2a, 'the maimed') *ugieis* (word 3a, '[to be] whole'), *cholous* (the lame) *peripatountas* (to walk), *kai* (and) *tuphlous* (the blind) *blepontas* (to see), *kai* (and) *edoxasan* (they glorified) *ton* (the) *Theon* (God) *'Israel* (of Israel)," conclude that "the presence of '*kai* (and)' both before '*tuphlous* (the blind)' and '*edoxasan* (they glorified),' requires a similar presence of '*kai* (and)' before '*kullous* (the maimed)'"? If so, his logic was surely faulty, since there is actually a triplet without this conjunctive i.e., "[1] *kophous* (the dumb) "*lalountas* (to speak), [2] *kullous* (the maimed) *ugieis* ([to be] whole), [3] *cholous* (the lame) *peripatountas* (to walk)," at which point "*kai* (and)" is then added *for the last* fourth *item only*, " [4] *kai* (and) *tuphlous* (the blind) *blepontas* (to see)," and then the following "*kai* (and)" forms a stylistic breaker to a different thought, "*kai* (and) *edoxasan* (they glorified) *ton* (the) *Theon* (God) *'Israel* (of Israel)." But of course, to say a scribe "botched it," is no argument as to what his thinking may have been, since we cannot assume that all scribes

were entirely competent.   Indeed, the   evidence is that some of them left something to be desired.

      Was *Variant 2* an accidental change?   If due to a paper fade / loss, the original, "*lalountas* (word 1a, 'speaking'), *kullous* (word 2a, 'the maimed') *ugieis* (word 3a, '[to be] whole')," looked something like, "*::::::ntas kullous ugieis*," then a scribe may have "reconstructed" this as "*akouontas kullous ugieis*."   This "reconstruction" is possible because the prior text at Matt. 15:31b reads, "the dumb (*kophous*, 'dumb men,' masculine plural accusative adjective, from *kophos*)," but Greek, *kophos* can mean either "deaf" or "dumb." Thus if the scribe took it to mean, "deaf," he would "reconstruct" this as "*akouontas* (word 1b, 'hearing')," rather than the original "*lalountas* (word 1a, 'speaking')."   If so, was the scribe influenced by e.g., the nearby presence of *akouo* at Matt. 15:10 ("Hear" or "Ye Hear," *Akouete*, present imperative active verb, 2nd person plural, from *akouo*) and Matt 15:12 ("they heard," *akousantes*, masculine plural nominative, active aorist participle, from *akouo*)?

      Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change?   Did e.g., a scribe conclude that "the meaning of *kophous* (from *kophos*, *supra*) here" at Matt. 15:31b "had to be 'deaf' as a stylistic balance to *tuphlous* (masculine plural accusative adjective, from *tuphlos*) meaning 'the blind' because, for instance, earlier" at Matt. 11:5 we read of "the blind (*tuphloi*, masculine plural nominative adjective, from *tuphlos*) … and … the deaf (*kophoi*, masculine plural nominative adjective, from *kophos*)"?   If so, I think his analogy between *tuphlos* and *kophos* at Matt. 15:31b and, for instance, *tuphlos* and *kophos* at Matt. 11:5, to be strained, artificial, and improbable.   But of course, that is not to say that some admittedly incompetent scribe, with religiously liberal type tendencies, did not think that his "great brain" had "discovered" such "a stylistic balance" between these two words, thus leading to his alteration of the text at Matt. 15:31b.

      Was *Variant 3* an accidental change?   If due to a paper fade, the original "*lalountas* (word 1a, 'speaking'), *kullous* (word 2a, 'the maimed') *ugieis* (word 3a, '[to be] whole')," had come to look something like, *lalountas::::::::::::::*", then one might expect the size created by losing "*kullous ugieis*" to raise some question in the scribe's mind.   But the scribe may not have been especially competent, and so may have just ignored what he assumed was a large "stylistic paper space" and kept copying.   Alternatively, the missing words may have come at the end of a page on the last line, and so the scribe might have thought there was some reason for such a large stylistic paper space.   Alternatively, the scribe may have detected an absence, but unsure what to do, just left *a paper space*, perhaps a bit smaller than the original one, and over copies, this space may have gotten smaller and smaller as different scribes scratched their heads wondering what to do with it, and so in time, it may have been lost altogether.

      Was *Variant 3* a deliberate change?   St. Matthew here uses the beautiful symmetry of Hebraic (or Aramaic) poetical parallelism.   There is a threefold climatic parallelism in which firstly line 1, secondly both lines 2 and 3, and thirdly line 4, act to echo and carry forward to completion the same idea.   But within this, there is a poetical synonymous parallelism in lines 2 and 3.   I.e.,

Line 1: the dumb to speak,
Line 2: the maimed to be whole,
Line 3: the lame to walk,
Line 4: and the blind to see.

Did a "rough as guts" scribe, not sensitive to the grammatical symmetry of the synonymous poetical parallelism of lines 2 and 3, gruffly conclude that line 3 "was redundant," and so as "a stylistic improvement" he would "prune it away" in order to make "a more succinct text"?

Were the variants deliberate or accidental changes? We simply do not know such things. But we do know that they were changes to the original text of Matt. 15:31b.

Variants 1 & 2, may be safely dismissed as minority aberrant readings. On the one hand, the TR's reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine text with no good textual argument against it. It has support in both the Greek (W 032) and Latin (old Latin d) from ancient times, and has the further support of a couple of old Latin versions, together with the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom. But on the other hand, *Variant 3* is followed by the Vulgate, most old Latin versions, and a couple of ancient church writers. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:31b a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:31b, "to speak, the maimed to be whole," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent) and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is further found in the Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century) and Slavic Version (9th century). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), where it is rendered in Ciasca's Latin translation as, "*loquentes* (word 1a, 'speaking,'), *aridos* (word 2c, 'the dry' or 'the shrivelled,' masculine plural accusative adjective, from *aridus*) *sanos* (word 3a, '[to be] whole')."

Variant 1, "to speak, and the maimed to be whole," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century); together with the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions.

Variant 2, "to hear, the maimed to be whole," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is also found in Minuscules 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century) and 1071 (independent, 12th century).

Variant 3, "to speak," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London

Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Pell Platt edition).

At Matt. 15:31b, the incorrect *Variant 3* is adopted by Westcott-Hort (1881), which places both the correct TR's reading and incorrect *Variant 2* in a footnote (literally a sidenote) as alternative readings.

By contrast, the correct reading entered Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952) (both of which show footnote alternatives). It is also found in the NU text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and the UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). However, the UBS 4th revised edition places these three and other variants in the textual apparatus, and they say that "the Committee had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text." Metzger, a NU Text Committee member, says, "The reading adopted for the text is supported by a broad spectrum of attestation, including Wester (D) and Caesarean (Theta, Family 13) witnesses" who "also insert *kai*" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 40). I.e., the UBS Committee regarded *Variant 1* as basically supporting the TR's reading. Hence the Western Text's influence, coupled with "a cut and paste job" that removes reference to the Western Text's "*kai* (and)" was decisive in these neo-Alexandrian's minds. Their reasoning was certainly wrong, even though on this occasion they fluked the correct answer.

At Matt. 15:31b, the ASV disregarded Westcott-Hort's preferred reading, and adopted the correct reading, "speaking, the maimed whole" (ASV). The correct reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. However, while both the Roman Catholic's JB and NJB include these words, these new Papist neo-Alexandrians add footnotes saying that some manuscripts omit it.

Moreover, the incorrect *Variant 3* is followed by Moffatt, which like Westcott-Hort, *supra*, adopts this *Variant 3*, rendering this as "speaking" (Moffatt Bible). In both instances, it seems the wider attestation of *Variant 3* over *Variant 2*, particularly in the Syriac, led them to here favour London Sinaiticus (*Variant 3*) over Rome Vaticanus (*Variant 2*). Moffatt gives a footnote here, saying, "Leaving out the phrase *kullous* [the maimed] *ugieis* [whole]. Its insertion for harmonistic reasons is more likely than its omission" (Moffatt Bible footnote). My comments on a "rough as guts" scribe, *supra*, here appear to also be applicable to the religiously liberal Moffatt.

But for we neo-Byzantines, these kinds of claims by neo-Alexandrians such as Westcott, Hort, Moffatt, and the footnotes in the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles, seem to sound all too familiar. We have heard it all before. For before these neo-Alexandrians appeared holding Westcott-Hort in one hand, and e.g., Moffatt's Bible in the other hand, in order to attack the *Textus Receptus* at this point; the old Papist Latins, holding the Clementine Vulgate in one hand, and the Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582) in the other hand, used to appear to attack the Received Text and Authorized Version, likewise claiming Matt. 15:31b reads here just, "speak" (Douay-Rheims). Though such religiously liberal neo-Alexandrians

who deny the doctrine of Divine Preservation   of Scripture, may here join in an alliance with Latin Papists who accept the Divine Preservation of the Latin, but deny the Divine Preservation of the Byzantine Greek; nevertheless, they cannot ultimately succeed in their unrewarding goal of trying to undermine the TR.   "For the Word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword" (Heb. 4:12).   Here its power is used to slay both religiously liberal neo-Alexandrian and Latin Papist alike, for it says clearly, "the Word of our God shall stand forever" (Isa. 40:8).

Matt. 15:31c "the lame" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Latin of the Vulgate's "*clodos* (the lame)" is found here in the Clementine as "*claudos*."   The *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968-82) says "*clodos*" is a variant spelling of "*claudos*" (a masculine plural possessive adjectives, from *clodus* / *claudus*).   Hence in substance, though not in precise form, the Clementine is here manifesting the TR's reading as found in the Vulgate *et al*.

On the one hand, in the Latin manuscripts available to me, none of them use the Clementine's spelling form of "*claudos* (the lame)."   But on the one hand, I am open to the possibility that the Clementine is following some Vulgate codices here that I do not know about in using this variant spelling.   Alternatively, I am open to the possibility that the Clementine translators here altered the spelling.   If so, their reason for doing so is speculative.   E.g., did they alter what over time had become the less common form of *clodus*, to what had become the more common form familiar to them of *claudus*?   Or was *claudus* always the more common form, and *clodus* more common only in old ecclesiastical Latin? Either way, I note that in both Woodhouse's *Latin Dictionary* (1913) and Stelten's *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin* (1995), reference is made to *claudus* but not *clodus*.   Do these Latin dictionaries reflect this same wider reality?   Or was there another reason for the Clementine's different spelling?

In the absence of any clear evidence known to me that this variant spelling exists at Matt. 15:31c in the earlier Latin textual tradition, I cannot say that the Clementine's precise form is manifesting the Latin textual tradition, even though I accept that it is manifesting the same Latin meaning as the Vulgate *et al*.   Therefore on this occasion I have decided to make no reference to the Clementine Vulgate, *infra*.   That is because I wish to clearly make the point, that while the Clementine is generally very useful for the purposes of *manifesting* a Latin reading from within the closed class of Latin sources, it has no intrinsic standing in its own right.   It may *only* be cited on the basis that *from the Latin support* for a given reading, such a reading is then *manifested* in the Clementine.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:31c, the TR's Greek, "*cholous* (the lame)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century), H 013 (*Codex Seidelianus* also known as *Codex Hamburgensis*, 9th century), X 033 (*Codex Monacensis*, 10th century), and Minuscule 2 (12th century).   It is further supported as Latin, "*clodos* (the lame)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century),

g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century).

However another reading, adds Greek, "*kai* (and)," and so reads "*kai* (and) *cholous* (the lame)."   This is a minority Byzantine reading, found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), P 024 (6th century), and M 021 (9th century).   It is also found as Latin, "*et* (and) *clodos* (the lame)," in old Latin versions d (5th century) and f (6th century); and as Latin, "*et* (and) *clodis* (the lame)," in old Latin k (4th / 5th centuries).

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

Was this an accidental change?   If "*cholous* (the lame)," came at the end of a line, possibly with a paper space at the end of two or three letters in a typical non-right-hand justified handwritten page, and the next line started with "*peripatountas* (walking)," a scribe may have wrongly concluded that "there had been a paper fade."   If so, he may have "reconstructed" the "*kai* ('and,' added word)," "from context."   Certainly "*kai* (and)," is a common Greek conjunctive, found e.g., at Matt. 15:31 (twice).

Was this a deliberate change?   Did a scribe, looking at "*lalountas* (speaking), *callous* (the maimed) *ugaris* (whole), *cholous* (the lame) *peripatountas* (walking), *kai* (and) *tuphlous* (the blind) *blepontas* (seeing), *kai* (and) *edoxasan* (they glorified) *ton* (the) *Theon* (God) *'Israel* (of Israel)," conclude that "the presence of '*kai* (and)' both before '*tuphlous* (the blind)' and '*edoxasan* (they glorified),' requires a similar presence of '*kai* (and)' before "*cholous* (the lame)"?   If so, his logic was defective, since there is a contextual triplet without this conjunctive i.e., "[1] *kophous* (the dumb) "*lalountas* (speaking), [2] *kullous* (the maimed) *ugieis* (whole), [3] *cholous* (the lame) *peripatountas* (walking)," at which point "*kai* (and)" is then added *for the last* fourth *item only*, " [4] *kai* (and) *tuphlous* (the blind) *blepontas* (seeing)," and then the following "*kai* (and)" forms a stylistic breaker to a different thought, "*kai* (and) *edoxasan* (they glorified) *ton* (the) *Theon* (God) *'Israel* (of Israel)." Therefore any such scribe necessarily failed to grasp the grammatical style of this verse.   But of course, we cannot assume that all scribes necessarily had their wits about them.   Indeed, the evidence is that some of them were *something less* than *fully competent*.

On the one hand, the TR's reading has solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, with no good textual argument against it.   It also has ancient support in the Latin from St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, factors making it a likely candidate for an "A" rating providing there is no particularly strong attestation against it from elsewhere inside the closed class of sources.   In fact, elsewhere inside the closed class of sources, we find quite the opposite, for four old Latin versions from ancient times, together with half a dozen later old Latin versions support the TR's reading.   But on the other hand, the variant has some ancient support and is both a minority Greek and minority Latin reading.   Thus on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:31c an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:31c, "the lame," is

found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in the Armenian Version (5th century); and as the later Latin translation of the earlier Arabic, as Latin, "*claudos* (the lame)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect reading, "and the lame," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)*, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al*. Hence at Matt. 15:31c, the incorrect addition is found in the American Standard Version as, "and (*kai*) the lame walking" (ASV). This erroneous addition to the text of Scripture is also found in the NASB. On the one hand, the addition is absent in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. But on the other hand, it must be remembered that such translations are not sufficiently literal to be sure if this is because they have rejected the spurious reading, *which probably they have not*; or simply because they think that in rendering the passage into English, the "and (*kai*)" is redundant, *which is more probably their thinking*. Thus the more literal neo-Alexandrian versions of the ASV and NASB, in all likelihood, here show the preferred reading of all the neo-Alexandrian versions, even though the "and (*kai*)" does not appear in these generally less literal versions.

Matt. 15:33 "his disciples" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Outside the closed class of sources, the Latin of Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) reads, "*discipuli* (disciples) *eius* (his)," and so *prima facie* follows the TR. However, the reading of Mark 8:4 is also "his disciples," and so one cannot be sure if due to Diatessaron formatting the source is Matt. 15:33 or Mark 8:4. Therefore no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:33, the TR's Greek, "*oi* (-) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* ('of him' or 'his')," i.e., "his disciples" (AV), is supported by the Byzantine majority text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), and P 024 (6th century). It is further found as "*discipuli*

(disciples) *eius* ('of him' or 'his') in old Latin Versions d (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and c (12th / 13th century).

However, a variant omitting "*autou* (his)," and so reading simply, "*oi* (the) *math_etai* (disciples)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscules 237 (10th century), and 116 (12th century). The omission is also found in the Latin, which reads simply, "*discipuli* (the disciples)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

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

Was this an accidental omission? Inspection of the page containing Matt. 15:33 in *Codex Freerianus* (Manuscript Washington, W 032), is of some interest here. The page reveals a scribal tradition of sometimes, though not always, writing the "O" (omicron) quite small, relative to other letters. E.g., at Matt. 15:31d the "o" of "*EDoXACAN* (they glorified)" comes at the end of a line and is so written. Or at Matt. 15:30, six letters of the "*AYTOYC* (*autous* / them)" (in "and cast them down at Jesus' feet"), is written in four spaces as "*AYTY*" and then in the shadow of the arms of the right hand side of the "T" (tau) bar and left hand side of the "Y" (upsilon) bar is inserted a small "o" (omicron), and in the shadow of the right hand side of the "Y" (upsilon) bar is inserted a small "c" (sigma or "s"). Thus the "*AYToYc*" takes up four spaces, not six spaces.

This same feature is evident here at Matt. 15:33, which comes at the end of a line. In the shadow of the arms of the right hand side of the "T" (tau) bar and left hand side of the "Y" (upsilon) bar is inserted a small "o" (omicron), so that "*AYToY* (*autou* / his)" takes up about four letter spaces, not five letter spaces. If the "*autou*" was so written, a paper fade of about four letter spaces, may go unnoticed. This would be even more likely if the word jutted out to the right of the page, as does the "*AYToYc*" of Matt. 15:30 in W 032, in which the "*oYc*" clearly goes beyond the last letters of the line above and line below. If such a protrusion existed for "*AYToY*" in Matt. 15:33 at the end of a line, then it may appear to a scribe that e.g., only two letter spaces were missing, and this could then easily be regarded as simply a stylistic paper space naturally resulting form a non right-handed justified page.

Was this a deliberate omission? Was this a "stylistic improvement" by a scribe who e.g., considered the presence in the immediately preceding verse of the words, "*math_etas* (disciples) *autou* (of him)" (Matt. 15:32), meant the presence here at Matt. 15:33 of a further "*autou* (of him)" was "redundant"? If so, he may have deliberately "pruned it away" in order "to make a more succinct text lacking such unnecessary wordage."

A deliberate or accidental change? We just do not know. But we do know that this variant is a change to the original text.

On the one hand, the TR's reading has long and strong support in the Greek from ancient times, and further ancient support in the Latin, together with a few other old Latin versions. But on the other hand, the variant is a minority Byzantine reading, followed by

Vulgate and most old Latin versions from ancient times. Weighing up these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:33 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:33, "his disciples," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in what the neo-Alexandrians dotingly call their "queen of Minuscules," Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is further found in all extant Syriac versions, and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the incorrect reading, "the disciples," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Versions (3rd century), and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; as well as the Armenian Version (5th century).

At Matt. 15:33, the incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al.* But perhaps to some lesser extent influenced by their darling "Queen of Minuscules," Number 33, and to some greater extent by the presence of the correct reading in both the Syriac and Western texts, both the TCNT and the NIV adopted the right reading. By contrast, the incorrect reading is found in the ASV rendering of Matt. 15:33 as, "And the disciples say unto him." The erroneous reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV; as well as the Roman Catholic's Jerusalem Bible and New Jerusalem Bible.

Are we neo-Byzantines simply suffering from *de ja vu* when we think we have heard the enemies of God's Received Text sometime afore chanting the words of the *American Standard Version* (1901) at Matt. 15:33, "And the disciples say unto him"? Absolutely not! For the Roman Catholic *Douay-Rheims Version* (1582 & 1609/10) also reads, "And the disciples say unto him." Whether we are defending the *Textus Receptus* and Authorized Version from old Papist Latins or new neo-Alexandrians, the demarcation line here at Matt. 15:33 has been drawn in the sand and fought over again and again. In olden times, we did not kowtow down to the Papists waving Matt. 15:33 at us in their Clementine Vulgates and Douay-Rheims Versions; and in modern times we do not kowtow down to the neo-Alexandrians waving Matt. 15:33 at us in their neo-Alexandrian texts and versions. Instead, we bow down low to him who said in the First Commandment of the Holy Decalogue, "I am the Lord thy God." "Thou shalt have none other gods before me" (Deut. 5:6,7). Even the

God who also said, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it" (Deut. 4:2).

The God who said in the First Commandment, "I am the Lord thy God, *which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage*," etc. (Deut. 5:6), and who again says to us in the Fourth Commandment, "And *remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm*" etc. (Deut. 5:15), thereby reminds us in *The Ten Commandments* of his close proximity to us.   For we were in the bondage of a spiritual "Egypt" (Rev. 11:8), being enslaved in our sins, until we were "made free from sin" (Rom. 6:22).   For by the "blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. 26:28), even through him who came "to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28), we are able to have "faith" (Matt. 8:10; 23:23) and "repent" (Matt. 4:17).   Thus we pray the words of *The Lord's Prayer*, "forgive us our debts" (Matt. 6:11, AV), or "forgive us our trespasses" (Matt. 6:11, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662); and "Jesus seeing" this "faith," says, "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee" (Matt. 9:2).   And so through Christ, we have "the forgiveness of sins" (Article 11, *The Apostles' Creed*).   "Do we then make void the law through faith?   God forbid: yea, we establish the law" (Rom. 3:31).   Now then what saith the Word of the Lord about Scripture and such faith in God?   "Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him.   Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar" (Prov. 30:5,6).

Matt. 15:35,36a "he commanded … .   And he took" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, the reading of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, "*praecepit* (he commanded) … *et* (and) *accipiens* (taking)," could be drawn from Matt. 15:35,36a and / or Mark 8:6, since the Latin Vulgate contains these words at both places. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, the fact that at Mark 8:6 the verbal form of "*paraggello*[43]" can mean either "commanded" or "directed" (*pareggeile*, 'he commanded' or 'he directed,' aorist verb), and is coupled with "*kai* (and) *labon* ('taking,' aorist participle)," has the consequence that due to Diatessaron formatting, similar problems are presented in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron.   One cannot be sure as to where Ciasca's 19th century Latin translation of the 12th-14th centuries Arabic, "*praecepit* (he commanded) … *et* (and) *accipiens* (taking)," is coming from.   Therefore no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

---

[43]   By one convention a double "g" (gamma) is transliterated into English as "ng," of which a notable instance is the fact that Greek, "αγγελος" becomes "*angelos*" and hence our English word, "angel."   Another convention transliterates "gg" but pronounces "ng."   This written as opposed to oral distinction is found in Strong's Concordance of the AV, e.g., this word (Strong's word 3853), "παραγγελλω" is first transliterated, "*paraggello*," and then in the italics of pronunciation after this is written, "*par-ang-gel-lo*."   For my purposes, I generally follow the distinction found in Strong's Concordance as this better helps the reader understand the underpinning Greek letters.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:35,36a, the TR's Greek, "*ekeleuse* ('he commanded,' indicative active first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *keleuo*) … *kai* (and) *labon* ('taking,' masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *lambano*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), and P 024 (6th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*praecepit* ('he commanded,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *praecipio*) … *et* (and) *accipiens* ('taking,' masculine singular nominative, present active participle, from *accipio*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and 1 (7th / 8th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However a variant reads, Greek, "*paraggeilas* ('commanding' or 'directing,' masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *paraggello*) … *elaben* ('he took,' indicative active first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *lambano*)." This is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. What is the difference between these two readings?

In considering dependant verbal participles, adverbial (or circumstantial) participles are dependant on a verb like adverbs are. Hence the participle may provide the answer to the verb's *How?*, *Why?*, *or When?*, etc. . Thus in the TR's reading at Matt. 15:35,36a, the answer to the question as to *Why?* Christ "commanded" (aorist verb, *ekeleuse*) "the multitude to sit down," is answered in the fact that contemporaneously he is "taking" (aorist participle, *labon*) "the seven loaves, and the fishes" to feed them (Matt. 15:35,36)[44]. But in the variant's reading, the answer to the question as to *When?* Christ "took" (aorist verb, *elaben*) "the seven loaves, and the fishes," is answered by the fact that he did so contemporaneously with "commanding" or "directing (aorist participle, *paraggeilas*)" "the multitude to sit down[45]."

Thus the difference in Greek nuance between the TR and variant, is the difference between explaining *why* Christ unambiguously "commanded" (TR), and *when* Christ either "commanded" or "directed" (variant). The TR's reading portrays a stronger, more commanding, more majestic, and kingly Christ. One who has unambiguously "commanded" his subjects, and now reveals by miraculous power exactly *why* he has "commanded" them. By contrast, the variant portrays a less authoritative, less majestic, and less dynamic Christ. This is even more so, although not exclusively so, if one takes the variant's "*paraggeilas*" to mean "directing" rather than "commanding." Thus the picture of the variant is one of a weaker, less authoritatively commanding Christ, who after non-authoritatively "commanding" or perhaps simply just "directing" the people, weakly hangs around waiting

---

[44] So too this *Why?* structure is found at Mark 8:6, TR, with the aorist verb, "*pareggeile* ('he commanded' or 'he directed')" and the aorist participle, "*labon* (taking)."

[45] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 621-2,624-5; Young's *Greek*, pp. 152-3.

for them to comply, and then "took" bread   etc. *when* they had so complied.

On the one hand, the reading of the *Textus Receptus* thus has a stronger appeal to religious conservatives who find that in St. Matthew's Gospel, Christ is more generally presented in kingly terms.   E.g., "the wise men" (Matt. 2:7) who came at Christ's Epiphany were evidently three in number, since "*they* presented unto him" three "gifts," namely "gold, and frankincense and myrrh" (Matt. 2:11).   To fulfil their prophetic roles as types at the First Advent of those kings coming to Christ after the Second Advent, they were apparently a white Japhethite Gentile king "of Tarshish," a brown Gentile Semitic king "of Sheba," and a black Gentile Hamitic king of "Seba" (Ps. 72:10; cf. Gen. 10:4,7; 25:5); who brought their gifts such as "gold and incense" riding upon "camels" (Isa. 61:6; Isa. 61 is one of the readings for Mattins at the Feast of Epiphany, in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662).   For Christ is "King of Kings, and Lord of Lords" (Rev. 19:16).

But on the other hand, the reading of the variant has an equally stronger appeal to religious liberals, who consider that the Bible in general, and the Received Text in particular, has many errors in it.   And though the *true historical Christ* is the Biblical Christ, these religious liberals are philosophically attracted to the idea of a weak and anaemic Christ, whom they falsely call the "historical Christ," even one whom they "trim down" to be more like themselves.   A naturalistic figure, rather than a supernaturalistic figure.   They say things like, "I'm very smart.   I know that there were not 'three wise' men, since their number is not stated.   I know that they were not 'three Gentile kings,' 'one white from Europe' 'one brown from Asia,' and 'one black from Africa.'   I know that 'they did not come riding on camels.'   None of that's in the Bible.   It's just all made up.   I sure am very clever to know these things.   Not like those silly Christians who send Christmas cards showing a white king, a brown king, and a black king, riding on camels."   Indeed, some even go so far as to produce blasphemous films, parading such folly, for "they declare their sin as Sodom" (Isa. 3:9)[46].   These religious liberals believe in a far less powerful figure than the Biblical Christ.   Not one whom they "worship" "in the beauty of holiness" and godly "fear" (Ps. 96:6), but one who in their arrogance and impiety they think to bring down to their own low level.   For such benighted persons, in the dark recesses of their blackened mind, the variant reading "seems to make more sense."

The origins of the variant are speculative.

Was this an accidental alteration?   In Codex W 032 (like Codices Sigma 042 and N 022), the optional "n" (nu) is present and so the TR's first word is one space longer i.e., "*EKELEYCEN* (he commanded)."   Significantly, the "*KAI* (and)," of Manuscript Washington (W 032) is abbreviated to "*K*" on the bottom line of the page with a squiggle that looks something like an upside down and back-the-front question mark (i.e., "?") without the

---

[46]   Though I watch very little television (in most cases I think it is fairly designated as "the idiot box"), many years ago now, I ceased to watch a most horrendous film shortly after I started to look at it.   I turned off the TV when I saw at its beginning irreverent and shocking blasphemy on this matter of the three kings.   I consider that those who find such things worth watching are evidently very spiritually sick and sad persons.   In an era of many wicked films, this vile film which from the little I saw of it was some kind of parody on the Life of Christ, was entitled, Monty Python's "The Life of Brian" (1979).

dot on it, touching the bottom part of the "*K*" (kappa). This abbreviation symbol means that the main line simply reads, "*KLAB<u>ON</u>.*" But there is also a stylistic paper space before the "*K*" which is at the start of Matt. 15:36a, once again indicating that the verse divisions formally numbered by Stephanus in 1551, in fact tend to follow ancient unnumbered verse divisions dating from ancient times.

If due to the usage of an abbreviation such as one finds in W 032, due to a paper fade or loss the original "*KLAB<u>ON</u>*" had come to look something like "*:LAB:N*", then a scribe might have "reconstructed" this as "*ELABEN.*" If so, he was possibly influenced by the presence of "*elaben*" at Matt. 8:17 (*elabe*, Scrivener's Text; *elaben*, W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022), or perhaps the idea of a "Gospel Greek" usage of "*elaben* (he took)" with "*artous* (bread)" here at Matt. 15:36a and also at both Luke 6:4 and John 6:11. Thus with the "and (*kai*)" dropping out, an aorist participle (*lab<u>on</u>* / taking) (TR) may have accidentally become an aorist verb (*elaben* / he took) (variant).

If there was a simultaneous paper fade / loss of "*ekeleusen* (he commanded)," then particularly if this came at the end of a line, this aorist verb might have been "reconstructed" by the scribe as the aorist participle from *paraggell<u>o</u>*, i.e., "*paraggeilas* (commanding / directing)." If so, this was partially an unintentional assimilation from the aorist verb declined from *paraggell<u>o</u>* at Mark 8:6 (TR) i.e., "*par<u>e</u>ggeile* (he commanded / he directed);" and partially a change by the scribe from the aorist verbal form of *paraggell<u>o</u>* at Mark 8:6 (TR) to the aorist participle form of *paraggell<u>o</u>* at Matt. 15:35, which he justified on the basis of making "*paraggeilas* (commanding / directing)" a matching participle with the verb *elaben* (he took)" here at Matt. 15:35,36a.

Was this a deliberate change? Its likely origins with Origen means we cannot rule out this possibility. Origen held a mix of orthodox and unorthodox views. Among other heresies that he held, Origen denied the teaching in the Biblically sound (Article 8, Anglican *39 Articles*) *Athanasian Creed* (named after, not written by St. Athanasius). This entire creed is Biblically correct. Among other things, this most excellent creed says in harmony with e.g., Gen. 1:1,2,26; Ps. 90:2; John 1:1; 5:18; 10:30; Philp. 2:6; I John 5:7, "the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one: the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal," "The Father uncreate[d], the Son uncreate[d]: and the Holy Ghost uncreate[d]." "The Father eternal, the Son eternal: and the Holy Ghost eternal." "And in this Trinity none is afore, or after other: none is greater, or less than another; but the whole three Persons are co-eternal together: and co-equal" (Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662).

But contrary to John 5:18; 10:30; I John 5:7, Origen denied *the equality* of the three Divine Persons of the Trinity, horribly claiming that the Divinity of the Holy Ghost was inferior to the Divinity of the Son, and that the Divinity of the Son was inferior to the Divinity of the Father. Origen further wickedly denied that "the Lord" who is the "Spirit" (II Cor. 3:17) was truly "one" with "the Father" and "the Word" (I John 5:7), since Origen denied that "the Spirit of God" (Gen. 1:2), like the other Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity, was "from everlasting to everlasting" (Ps. 90:2). Rather, Origen mischievously claimed that the Son created the Spirit. In fact, far from being a creation, as one of the three Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity, "the Spirit of God" is Creator (Gen. 1:1,2,26), and in the words of the Biblically sound *Nicene Creed*, "the Holy Ghost" is the "giver of life," both physical and spiritual (Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662; Gen. 1:2; 2:7; Pss. 51:11; 104:30; Isa. 32:15; Ezek. 37:9-14; John 3:1-8). The Bible clearly teaches that both heathens who are

"unbelieving" (Rev. 21:8) and those who call themselves "Christians" but are in such "heresies" (Gal. 5:20,21), will go to hell. Thus the Biblically correct *Athanasian Creed* rightly says of heretics like Origen, "without doubt he shall perish everlastingly."

Under the circumstances, Origen may have disliked the nuance of the Greek in Matt. 15:35,36a explaining *why* Christ unambiguously "commanded" (TR), rather than *when* Christ either "commanded" or "directed" (variant) the people. Origen might have thought that the TR's reading which portrays a more commanding, majestic, and kingly Christ, *supra*, "put Christ on too high a pedestal," one that to his heretical mind "should only be given to God the Father." If so, Origen may have deliberately set about to "trim down" this depiction of the majestic kingly Christ in the Received Text, to the weaker Christ of the variant.

Were these changes at Matt. 15:35,36a deliberate or accidental? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that they are alterations to the text of Scripture preserved for us in the *Textus Receptus* (TR).

The reading of the TR has solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading with no good textual argument against it, and solid support in the Latin with St. Jerome's Vulgate and some old Latin versions. By contrast, the variant which appears to have originated with Origen, has a very weak following in both the Greek and Latin. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:35,36a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:35,36a, "he commanded (*ekeleuse*) … and (*kai*) he took (*lab<u>on</u>*, literally 'taking')," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

However the incorrect variant, "commanding" / "directing (*paraggeilas*) … he took (*elaben*)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

At Matt. 15:35,36a, the incorrect variant entered the NU Text *et al*. Four types of translation have been made.

The variant may appear in an English translation without any discernable difference (*Type 1*), and so the reading of the American Standard Version, based on the variant, is identical with the AV based on the Received Text, i.e., "he commanded … and he took" (ASV, supplying the "and" as part of translation).   So likewise *Type 1* is found in the NEB.

Though broadly similar to *Type 1*, *Type 2* has the difference that it lacks the ASV's "and" which the ASV added as part of English translation, *supra*.   The effect of this is that *Type 2* thus highlights one difference between the two readings i.e., the absence of "and (*kai*)" in the variant.   *Type 2* is found with the rendering in the Moffatt Bible, "So *he ordered* the crowd to recline on the ground. *He took* the seven loaves" etc. .

In *Type 3*, the variant's presence is made evident in the English by rendering the Greek participle, "*paraggeilas*," as an English participle, such as occurs in the RSV, or e.g., with "then ordering" in the NRSV, or "and directing" in the ESV.   Thus gratuitously adding "Jesus," the TCNT reads, "*Telling* the crowd to sit down on the ground, Jesus *took* the seven loaves" etc. .

Or in *Type 4*, the variant's presence is made evident in the English by giving the Greek, "*paraggeilas*" the weaker meaning of "directing" etc. .   This is the type of translation found in the NIV, or e.g., with "and he directed" in the NASB.

Given this diversity in English translation of the neo-Alexandrian versions, an unweary reader might think that the neo-Alexandrian texts are the same here as the neo-Byzantine's Received Text, with the AV simply manifesting a *Type 1* translation, since the AV and ASV read the same here.   However, in all such instances, whether using a *Type 1*, *Type 2*, *Type 3*, or *Type 4* English translation, the proper meaning of Matt. 15:35,36a is crippled in the underpinning neo-Alexandrian Greek text.   Thus a person studying the matter further from any neo-Alexandrian text based neo-Alexandrian version will necessarily be led astray into at least some elements in one of Origen's old errors.   Moreover, if he uses a neo-Alexandrian version following *Types 2-4*, there will be a difference also evident in the English, that semi-masks the even greater difference of nuance in the underpinning Greek.

Matt. 15:36c "gave" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Outside the closed class of sources, Nestle-Aland (27th ed.) claims the Family 1 Manuscripts follow the correct reading (*edoke*); whereas Tischendorf's 8th edition claims Minuscule 1 (inside Family 1) follows the variant, and Swanson also shows the the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)* following the variant (*edidou*).   Therefore I make no reference to the Family 1 Manuscripts, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:36c, the TR's Greek, "*edoke* ('he gave,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *didomi*)," i.e., "gave" in the clause, "and *gave* to his disciples" (AV), is supported by majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), and

P 024 (6th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*dedit* ('he gave,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *do*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However a variant is Greek, "*edidou* ('he was giving,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *didomi*)." It is found as Latin, "*dabat* ('he was giving,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *do*)," in old Latin Version d (5th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Chrysostom (d. 407) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428).

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

Was this an accidental omission? Among Byzantine Greek manuscripts, unlike, for instance, M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), and Y 034 (9th century), all of which, (like Scrivener's Text,) lack the optional "n" (nu) and read, "*edoke* (he gave);" in for instance, W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, and P 024, *supra*, the optional "n" (nu) is present and so these manuscripts read, "*edoken* (he gave)." If due to a paper fade or loss a manuscript originally reading, "*EDOKEN*" had come to look something like *ED::::*", then supplying the same number of letters, a scribe may have "reconstructed" this as "*EDIDOY*." If so, this "reconstruction" was probably made with reference to "*edidou* (he was giving)" at Mark 8:6.

Was this a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe, seeking a "gospel harmonization" between Matt. 15:36c and Mark 8:6, deliberately change "*edoke* (he gave)" at Matt. 15:36c to "*edidou* (he was giving)" so it would be the same as Mark 8:6? *If so, he was wrong to see a tension between these two accounts.* In Greek, whereas the aorist gives a simple snapshot picture of an action (TR), the imperfect gives a more fulsome moving picture of an action progressively unfolding (variant)[47]. While the meaning of "*edoke* (he gave)" at Matt. 15:36c is thus quite different to the meaning of "*edidou* (he was giving)" at Mark 8:6, it is simultaneously true that the two accounts *are not contradictory* of each other. Rather, it simply means that in St. Matthew's account the focus is on a specific "snapshot" when Jesus "gave (*edoke*)" the fish and bread "to his disciples" (Matt. 16:36c); whereas in St. Mark's account the focus is on a "rolling movie picture" of when Jesus "gave (*edidou*)" the fish and bread "to his disciples" (Mark 8:6, AV). Hence one could render Mark 8:6 as e.g., "and began giving to his disciples," although in common translation the imperfect may be rendered into English exactly the same as the aorist, i.e., "and gave to the disciples" (Mark 8:6, AV).

The TR's reading has solid support in the Greek from ancient times with *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), and solid support in the Latin from ancient times with St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate and several old Latin versions, together with some further old Latin versions from later times. By contrast, the variant is a slim minority reading in both the Greek and

---

[47] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 541 (imperfect), 554-5 (aorist); Young's *Greek*, pp. 113 (imperfect), 121-2 (aorist).

Latin, and has no good textual argument to   commend it.   Taking these factors into account, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:36c an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:36c, "he gave (*ed<u>o</u>ke*)," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century).   It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), and 1071 (independent, 12th century).   It is further found in the Armenian Version (5th century); and translated as Latin, "*dedit* (he gave)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect reading, "*edidou* ('he was giving,' or in common translation, 'he gave')," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century).   It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

The incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al*.   On the one hand, the rendering of the American Standard Version at Matt. 15:36c, based on the variant in Westcott-Hort, is the same as that of the Authorized Version based on the Received Text i.e., in English both may be translated as "gave" in "and *gave* to" (AV & ASV).   So too, there is no discernable difference of English translation in neo-Alexandrian versions based on the incorrect neo-Alexandrian text's variant in the renderings found in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.   But on the other hand, the difference of meaning in the variant is made explicit in the New American Standard Bible's rendering, "and *started giving*" (NASB).

Whether as in the NASB the difference is apparent in the English translation, or whether as in the ASV *et al* it is not apparent in the English translation, in the Greek of Matt. 15:36c there is an important difference in meaning between the correct TR and incorrect NU Text *et al*.   Thus those using neo-Alexandrian versions will always be misled if they seek to study the Greek text underpinning their neo-Alexandrian version at Matt. 15:36c.   But beyond this, we cannot ignore the precedent set by the NASB (and hence this variant is not placed in Appendix 3).   Whether or not in the future other neo-Alexandrian versions do or do not follow the more literal NASB in this rendering, the reality is that we here have one of the most literal neo-Alexandrian versions, highlighting in English translation the difference between the neo-Alexandrian text's incorrect "*edidou* (he was giving)" and the neo-Byzantine Received Text's correct "*ed<u>o</u>ke* (he gave)."

Matt. 15:36d "his disciples" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, *prima facie* the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron supports the TR's reading. However, the Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex, and in the Latin Vulgate the same reading, "*discipulis* (disciples) *suis* (his)," is found at both Matt. 15:36d and Mark 8:6. Therefore one cannot be sure if due to Diatessaron formatting it is coming from one or both of these readings. Hence no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, the same issue means that in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, we cannot be certain if Ciasca's Latin translation, "*discipulis* (disciples) *suis* (his)," is originating from Matt. 15:36d and / or Mark 8:6 in the underpinning Arabic. Hence no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:36d, the *Textus Receptus* (TR) Greek reading, "*autou* ('of him' / 'his')," of "*tois* (-) *mathetais* (disciples) *autou* (his)," i.e., "his disciples" in the wider clause, "and gave to his disciples" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), the purple parchment, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century), the purple parchment, *Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus* (N 022, 6th century), and *Codex Guelferbytanus* (P 024, 6th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*discipulis* (disciples) *suis* (his)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, a variant reading omits "his" (Greek, *autou*; Latin, *suis*), and so reads simply, Greek, "*tois* (the) *mathetais* (disciples)," or Latin, "*discipulis* (the disciples)." This is a minority Byzantine Greek reading found in Lectionary 547 (13th century). This omission is further found in old Latin versions d (5th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct. The origins of the variant are speculative. Was this an accidental omission? Possibly coming at the end of a line, was "*autou* (his)" lost in an undetected paper fade? Was this a deliberate omission? Did a scribe consider that the presence of "*autou* (his)" here at Matt. 15:36d, "was redundant because the passage starts with a reference to '*tois* (-) *mathetais* (disciples) *autou* (his)'" at Matt. 15:32, and / or "incongruous" as "a stylistic balance" with a purported "stylistic couplet" of "*oi* (the) … *mathetai* (disciples)" here at Matt. 15:36d? A deliberate or accidental omission? We simply do not know.

The reading of the TR has solid support in the Greek and Latin from ancient times. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:36d an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:36d, "his disciples," is found in the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), the margin of 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century), and a manuscript of the Bohairic Version; and the Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500).

However, the incorrect variant reading, "the disciples," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), the main text of 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Palestinian Version (*c.* 6th century); the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Georgian Version (5th century).

The incorrect variant was adopted at Matt. 15:36d by the NU Text *et al*. Hence the ASV reads, "and gave to the disciples" (ASV). The erroneous reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Matt. 15:36e "multitude" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

See commentary in Volume 1 at Matt. 8:18; Matt. 14:19c; or in Volume 2 at Matt. 15:31a in Appendix 3. A similar type of distinction among readings occurs at e.g., Matt. 15:31 as here at Matt. 15:36e. But I have included this one in the main part of the commentary because even though "multitude" is itself a plural form, so that one can talk about either "a multitude" or "multitudes," we find that e.g., the *American Standard Version* chooses to try and highlight the variant reading, a fact that we cannot ignore.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:36e, the TR's Greek, "*to* ('the,' masculine <u>singular</u> dative, definite article from *o*) *ochlo* ('multitude,' masculine singular dative noun, from *ochlos*)," is supported by

the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), P 024 (6th century), E 07 (8th century), F 09 (9th century), G 011 (9th century), H 013 (9th century), S 028 (10th century), X 033 (10th century); and Minuscule 2 (12th century).   It is further supported as Latin, "*populo* ('multitude,' masculine <u>singular</u> dative noun, from *populus*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is also supported as Latin, "*turbae* ('multitude,' feminine singular dative noun, from *turba*)," in old Latin version d (5th century).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant, Greek, "*tois* ('the,' masculine <u>plural</u> dative, definite article from *o*) *ochlois* ('multitudes,' masculine <u>plural</u> dative noun, from *ochlos*)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codices K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century); and Minuscule 243 (14th century).   It is also found as Latin, "*turbis* ('multitudes,' feminine <u>plural</u> dative noun, from *turba*)," in old Latin versions e (4th / 5th century), f (6th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century).

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

Was this an accidental alteration?   The Greek words, "*t<u>o</u>* (the) *ochl<u>o</u>* (multitude)," come at the end of verse 36 in the Greek as in the English.   In Manuscript Washington (W 032) there is a stylistic paper space of about one letter space, showing an unnumbered verse divisions.   Thus as is so often the case, we see that the verse numbers of our Bibles added in 1551 by Stephanus, in fact reflect much older Byzantine unnumbered verse divisions.   If due to a paper fade or loss, the original "*t<u>o</u>* (the)" came at the end of a line, and looked something like "*t:*", and the "*ochl<u>o</u>*" of the next line looked something like "*ochl:*" followed by a stylistic paper space of two or three letters (and in W032 there is e.g., a three letter stylistic paper space on this same page before verse 38), then a scribe may have "reconstructed" this as "*tois* (the) *ochlois* (multitudes)."   If so, he possibly did so with some reference to "*tois* (the) *ochlois* (multitudes)" in one or more other Matthean passages such as Matt. 11:7; 12:46; 13:34; 14:19; 15:35; 23:1; 26:55.   (If so, I note the presence of *t<u>o</u> ochl<u>o</u>* also in Matt. 27:15).

Was this a deliberate change?   Did a slip-shod scribe, finding numerous references in Matthean Greek to "*tois* (the) *ochlois* (multitudes)" (Matt. 11:7; 12:46; 13:34; 14:19; 15:35; 23:1; 26:55), and failing to take into account that St. Matthew also sometimes uses "*t<u>o</u>* (the) *ochl<u>o</u>* (multitude)" (Matt. 15:36e; 27:15), decide to "standardize" the text as some kind of purported "stylistic improvement"?

Was this a deliberate or accidental change?   We just do not know.   But we do know that it was a change to the original text of St. Matthew's Gospel.

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek both through time and over time as the representative Byzantine reading, stretching from ancient times on.   It has similar support in the Latin both through time and over time, and is found in St. Jerome's Vulgate.   It is cited by that ancient church father and doctor who was Archbishop of Constantinople from 398 to

407, St. John Chrysostom. By contrast, the variant has slim minority support in the Greek and Latin, and no good textual argument in its favour. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:36e an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:36e, "the (*t<u>o</u>*) multitude (*ochl<u>o</u>*)," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Version, some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and Armenian Version (5th century).

However, the incorrect reading, "the (*tois*) multitudes (*ochlois*)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and as the Latin translation, "*turbas* ('multitudes,' feminine <u>plural</u> accusative noun, from *turba*)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 15:36e. A rendering that could be based on either the TR or variant, although we can fairly confidently says is here based on the variant which is uniformly adopted in the neo-Alexandrian texts, is found in the NASB (3rd ed.) and NIV. E.g., from a plural Greek form (*tois ochlois*), this is rendered in the New American Standard Bible as "people" (NASB); which is the same as the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version which from a singular Latin form (*populo*), also renders this as "people."

By contrast, making a clear distinction with the Authorized Version's "multitude" based on the Received Text at Matt. 15:36e, the American Standard Version reads, "multitudes" (ASV). So too, this incorrect form is clearly found in the NASB (1st ed. & 2nd ed.), RSV, NRSV, ESV, and Moffatt which renders this as "crowds" (Moffatt Bible).

Matt. 15:38 "beside women and children" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Though I am always reluctant to find a Greek word order supported by a Latin word order, since I consider this type of thing may be changed as part of the act of translation; on this occasion I have decided to use the Latin word orders. That is because it seems unlikely to me that the Latin would have changed the more expected sequence of "women and children" (cf. Matt. 14:21), for something so unexpected as "children and women." Moreover, as noted below, this is a point of historical attack by both Latin Papists and neo-Alexandrians against neo-Byzantines.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 15:38, the TR's Greek, "*gunaik<u>o</u>n* ('women,' word 1) *kai* ('and,' word 2) *paidi<u>o</u>n* ('children,' word 3)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), P 024 (6th century), K 017 (9th century), X 033 (10th century); and Minuscules 2 (12th century), 1010 (12th century), and 1242 (13th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*mulieribus* ('women,' word 1) *et* ('and,' word 2) *parvolis* ('little [ones]' = 'children,' word 3)," in old Latin version f (6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant uses word order 3,2,1 and so may be reconstructed as Greek, *paidi<u>o</u>n* ('children,' word 3) *kai* ('and,' word 2) *gunaik<u>o</u>n* ('women,' word 1)." This is found as Latin, "*parvulos* ('children,' word 3) *et* ('and,' word 2) *mulieres* ('women,' word 1)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found as Latin, "*pueros* ('boys' or 'lads,' word 3) *et* ('and,' word 2) *mulieres* ('women,' word 1)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as Latin, "*pueris* ('boys' or 'lads,' word 3) *et* ('and,' word 2) *mulieribus* ('women,' word 1)," in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century); and as Latin, "*infantibus* ('infants,' word 3) *et* ('and,' word 2) *mulieribus* ('women,' word 1)," in old Latin Version d (5th century).

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

Was this an accidental change? In Manuscript Washington (W 032) at Matt. 2:17, a scribe looking at "*I<u>e</u>remiou* (Jeremy) *tou* (the) *proph<u>e</u>tou* (prophet) *legontos* (saying)," first wrote down, "*I<u>e</u>remiou*." Then by ellipsis, his eye jumped from the "*ou*" ending of "*I<u>e</u>remiou*" to the "*ou*" ending of "*proph<u>e</u>tou* (prophet)," and so after "*I<u>e</u>remiou*" he wrote down "*legontos* (saying)." Then realizing his mistake, he inserted a side-note marker indicating that "*tou* (the) *proph<u>e</u>tou* (prophet)" should be inserted between "*I<u>e</u>remiou* (Jeremy)" and "*legontos* (saying)." (Cf. my comments at Matt. 15:30a and Matt. 15:37 in Appendix 3.)

In a similar, though not identical way, did the eye of a scribe, perhaps suffering from fatigue, looking at "*gunaik<u>o</u>n kai paidi<u>o</u>n*," jump in ellipsis from the "*<u>o</u>n*" ending of

"*gunaikon*" to the "*on*" ending of "*paidion*,"   first write down "*paidion*"?   Then realizing his mistake, did he add back in, "*kai gunaikon*" after the "*paidion*"?   If so, the scribe's probably quite hasty conclusion that "the meaning is still the same" is actually incorrect.   He should have followed the wiser procedure of the W 032 scribe at Matt. 2:17, *supra.*

Was this a deliberate change?   The natural order is men, women, and children, so that the personhood of an adult male, the personhood of an adult female, and the personhoods of their children, *in some ways* acts to reflect the image of the three Divine Persons of the Trinity (Gen. 1:1,2,26-28).   I.e., in Gen. 1:26-28 the threefold form of man, woman, and children, reflects the image of a Trinitarian God. (There are limits as to how far one may go with this idea, since the Holy Ghost is only one Person, and more than one human child becomes more than one human person).   But while there is equality among the Persons of the Trinity, even as there is order in the Trinity, evident in the very names, "Father" and "Son," so likewise, on one level there is equality between a man, his wife, and their children, but as a matter of order, the parents rule over the children, and the man over his wife (Gen. 3:16).

That this reflects the Trinity is further taught in I Cor. 11.   Here we read, "that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God" (I Cor. 11:3).   Thus the natural order between a man and woman is as unalterable as the order between God the Father and God the Son; and by extension through reference to Gen. 1, the natural order between parents and children is as unalterable as the order between the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; for the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:7).   Hence the *Athanasian Creed* rightly says, "The Father is made of none: neither created, nor begotten.   The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created, but begotten.   The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding."

But even though the natural order is based in the creation and the fall (Gen. 1:1,2,26-28; 2:21-25; 3:16; I Cor. 11:1-16; I Tim. 2:8-3:13); and so transcends the cultural values of the day, those who set aside the Tenth Commandment of the Holy Decalogue, "Thou shalt not covet" (Exod. 20:17; Rom. 7:7), have sometimes sought to pervert these values.   E.g., while the ancient Greco-Roman pagan world knew of both pagan priests and priestesses, contrary to their pagan society's "ignorant practices" of having female priests, the Ante-Nicene church did not "ordain women priests," as this would "abrogate the order of creation" and "the constitutions of Christ" (*Apostolic Constitutions*, Book 3:1, 3rd or 4th century).

Or the OT Messianic prophet, Isaiah, declares what happens when the natural order is abrogated, and women put in charge of men, and children given power over adults.   (Which thing frequently now happens under "human rights" concepts of "equality" between males and females; and also under so called, "child protection laws," which give unruly children, especially adolescents, absurd powers with respect to their school teachers).   "For behold, the Lord, the Lord of hosts, doth take away … the mighty man, and the man of war, the judge, and the prophet [found in post-NT times in the Bible], and the prudent, and the ancient, the captain of fifty, and the honourable man, and the counselor, and the cunning artificer, and the eloquent orator.   And I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them.   And the people shall be oppressed, … the child shall behave himself proudly against the ancient, and the base against the honourable. … As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them.   O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths" (Isa. 3:1-5,12).

Did a scribe, whose perverted mind sought some kind of unnatural power or twisted emphasis on "children's rights," deliberately change the word order here at Matt. 15:38 as part of his philosophical desire to pervert the natural order of adults and children? If so, we see a similar thing today with e.g., the "feminist language" of the neo-Alexandrian's *New Revised Standard Version*, which seeks to pervert the natural patriarchal order.

A deliberate or accidental change? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that this is a change to the original text of Holy Scripture. The reading of the TR conforms in the immediate context of St. Matthew's Gospel with Matthean Greek, for we also read "*gunaikon* (women) *kai* (and) *paidion* (children)" in Matt. 14:21. It also conforms with the general theology of St. Matthew's Gospel which is patriarchal, evident in e.g., its patriarchal language, or Christ's selection of a male leadership in the apostolate (Matt. 10:2-4); and sees children as properly in a submissive role (Matt. 18:3; 27:25). Thus the variant clangs on the ears as bad Matthean Greek, since it fails to uphold the natural order.

The TR's reading is strongly supported in the Greek as both the representative Byzantine reading, and also the reading favoured by textual analysis. It is found in the Greek both through time and over time from ancient times, being cited by the church father and doctor, St. Chrysostom. Therefore, to the extent that the Vulgate and most old Latin versions follow the variant, it must be said that this is a good example of the natural superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin.* On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:38 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 15:38, "women and children," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); an Ethiopic Version manuscript (Pell Platt); and in Ciasca's translation of the Arabic as Latin, "*mulieres* ('women,' word 1) *et* ('and,' word 2) *parvulos* ('children,' word 3)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect word order 3,2,1, i.e., "children (word 3) and (word 2) women (word 1)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), Minuscules 579 (mixed text, 13th century) and 205 (independent in the Gospels &

Revelation, 15th century).   It is also found   in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (Rome, *c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The splitting of the two major Alexandrian texts over this reading at Matt. 15:38, coupled with support external to the Alexandrian texts for both readings, has created a splitting tension headache in the minds of neo-Alexandrians.   The incorrect variant entered the main text of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), and is found as a footnote alternative in Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993).

The correct reading is found in the main text of Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975), 3rd corrected (1983) and 4th revised (1993) editions, and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993).   But to this there is an important qualification found in the UBS 3rd edition (1975) and UBS 3rd corrected edition (1983), both of which say, "that there is a very high degree of doubt concerning the reading selected for the text."   These comments are a frank admission by neo-Alexandrians that on their benighted principles, they are largely groping around in the dark, uncertain what to do here at Matt. 15:38.

At Matt. 15:38, the correct word order is found in the ASV as "women and children." Likewise, the correct word order is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. However, this does not necessarily mean they accept the TR's reading, since they might also be putting the words in this order simply for the purposes of English translation.

By contrast, Moffatt wanted to clearly support the variant, and so he reads, "apart from the children and the woman" (Moffatt Bible).   With both Alexandrian readings able to claim further support from Syriac versions, "the clincher" argument for Moffatt in favour of the variant was probably its presence in the Western Text.   Moffatt was both a very bad textual analyst and a very bad Bible translator.   These proved to be two endearing qualities, that helped this religiously liberal neo-Alexandrian soar to the dizzy heights of academic acceptability and respectability.   For this is an era when the best brains have been excluded from academic positions in the recognized "halls of learning" for quite some time.

In fact, things have gotten so bad in the colleges and universities, that they even think men came from monkeys or apes, or monkey-like or ape-like creatures via Darwinian macroevolution.   Why?   In part because they do not distinguish between the laws of creation which are a *fait accompli* and so cannot be studied in the sense of presently observing them scientifically; and the laws of preservation, some of which may now be studied in the sense of presently observing them scientifically.   Thus they elevate laws of preservation to laws of creation.   (This includes elevating laws of minor adaptation that the Creator put into the genes of various creatures, by extrapolating them beyond genetically possible limits i.e., they blindly fail to recognize the inbuilt genetic limits of variability within a given species.)   If such men think that one less bright monkey slipped on a banana skin, hit his head on a nearby coconut tree, and was killed, so that his genes were eliminated via natural selection, and "man" was the result of "the smarter monkey" that was more cautious; then we cannot be surprised if men like Moffatt and the other neo-Alexandrians are hailed as the "King Kongs" of academia[48].

---

[48]   In the same way that the anti-supernaturalist neo-Alexandrians are rightly

But let us put all this monkey-business aside!   Good reader, have we neo-Byzantines not heard Moffatt's reading, "the children and the women" (Moffatt Bible) somewhere before?   Indeed we have!   For the Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582), based on the Latin, also reads, "children and women" (Douay-Rheims Bible).

This is a point of historical swashbuckling by Latin Papists against neo-Byzantines, now continued in the swashbuckling of neo-Alexandrians against neo-Byzantines.   In the olden times, the Papists holding the Clementine Vulgate in one hand, and the Douay-Rheims Version in the other hand, came with braggadocio claims about "the Latin being superior to the Greek" here at Matt. 10:38; even as in modern times the neo-Alexandrians e.g., holding Tischendorf's 8th edition in one hand, and the Moffatt Bible in the other hand, come with braggadocio claims about "the Alexandrian text being superior to the Byzantine text" here at Matt. 10:38.   The modern neo-Alexandrian enemies of we neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus*, fall down flat on their faces exactly where the old Latin Papists did.   Their blustering and bellowing lasts but a moment, for they fall prey to the words of Scripture, "Pride goeth before … a fall" (Prov. 16:18); since they deny the great Biblical truth, "every word of God is pure" (Prov. 30:5).

The good Christian reader can rest assured that the Word of God has been kept pure in every age, and a good textual analyst has been able to discern the Received Text.   This process was more formerly and comprehensively undertaken in the 16th and 17th centuries, and under God it unleashed, sustained, and was then further fuelled by, the great Protestant Reformation.   We thus have in the New Testament's *Textus Receptus* the "pure" "Word of God" (Prov. 30:5), which we maintain unsullied from both olden times Latin Papists and modern times neo-Alexandrians alike.   The neo-Alexandrians like to talk about their "new

---

criticized by the supernaturalist believing Burgonites who mingle truth (Divine Preservation) with error (majority text always equates correct text), and so wrongly assert that supernaturalism is opposed to even reasonable forms of godly reason; so likewise, the anti-supernaturalist Darwinists are rightly criticized by the supernaturalist believing Young Earth Creationists (arguing for a 6,000-10,000 year old earth) who mingle truth (creation not macroevolution) with error (young earth and global flood), and so wrongly assert that supernaturalism is opposed to such reasonable forms of godly reason as an old earth.   While I regard the connected issues of *creation not macroevolution* and *the authority of the Bible* as non-negotiable fundamentals of the faith, I nevertheless take the view that within these broad limits, the issue of how one understands Gen. 1 & 2 is a matter of private interpretation.   My own (old earth) creationist views are those of the local creation (Gen. 1:2b-2:3 = Eden, Gen. 2:10-14) gap school (undisclosed gap covering billions of years Gen. 1:1 = universe and most of earth's geological layers in different "worlds," Heb. 1:2; 11:3).   This is the gap school of e.g., the Congregationalist theologian, J. Pye Smith (d. 1851) and Anglican clergyman, Henry Alcock (d. 1915); although details may vary between us (e.g., I locate Eden in an area now under the waters of the Persian Gulf; and per the 1,000 generations of the covenant of grace in Ps. 105:8, I date Adam at a *prima facie c.* 105,000 B.C., plus or minus 53,000 years, on the lower ages of fathers in e.g., Gen. 11:12,14,20 and the upper ages of fathers in Gen. 5:3,6,9,12,15,18,21,25,28; which I then reduce to *c.* 52,000 B.C. to *c.* 68,000 B.C. on the basis of the Persian Gulf's regression of *c.* 70,000 years ago).

improvements" to the Received Text such as   the one here at Matt. 10:38, but all this is "a bit of a yawn" for we neo-Byzantines, as we declare, "We've heard it all before."   It is, as it were, the more recent neo-Alexandrian echo of the original Latin Papists' claim, which like all echoes, comes later in time but simply repeats that which was said earlier.

Matt. 15:39a "he took ship" (TR & AV) (discussed in Appendix 1).

Matt. 15:39b "Magdala" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek, "*Magdala* (Magdala)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text with its impressive numbers of *c.* 1,000 manuscripts in von Soden's K group (generally unical Codices in capital letters, and Minuscules in lower case letters,) e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), E 07 (8th century), H 013 (9th century), Gamma 036 (10th century); Minuscules 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation), 1010 (12th century, Byzantine), and 597 (13th century).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a minority Byzantine reading, *Variant 1*, reading Greek, "*Magdalan* (Magdalan)," is followed by W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), O 023 (6th century), M 021 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century); and Lectionaries 292 (9th century), 672 (9th century), 5 (10th century), and 514 (10th century).   It is also followed as Latin, "*Magdalan*," in old Latin version q (6th / 7th century).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, Greek, "*Magedan* (Magedan)," is followed as Latin, "*Magedan*," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). This reading is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339); and the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

Another reading, *Variant 3*, is found as Latin, "*Magadan*," in old Latin Version d (5th century).

Two other readings are Latin, "*Magedam*," in old Latin Versions a (4th century) and ff2 (5th century); and Latin, "*Mageda*," in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), and 1 (7th / 8th century).   Are one or both of these readings different Latin forms of *Variant 2*?   Or is one, or are both of these readings, one or two further variants?

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand.

St. Matthew records that Christ came from "the coasts of Tyre and Sidon" (Matt. 15:21) to the north-west of the Sea of Galilee, down to the Sea of Galilee (Matt. 15:29), where he first "went up into a mountain" (Matt. 15:29), and then "took ship, and came into the coats of Magdala" (Matt. 15:39).   We are then told he had "come to the other side" of the Sea of Galilee (Matt. 16:5); before he later went north from the Sea of Galilee and "came into … Caesarea Philippi" (Matt. 16:31).   St Mark records that Christ "departing from the coasts of Tyre and Sidon," "came unto the Sea of Galilee" (Mark 7:31).   He then "came into parts

(Greek, *ta* / 'the' + *mere* / 'region' or 'district') of Dalmanutha" (Mark 8:10). We are then told that he "departed to the other side" of the Sea of Galilee by "ship" (Mark 8:13), and while over on this "other side" (Mark 8:13) "he cometh to Bethsaida" (Mark 8:22); before he later went north from the Sea of Galilee "into … Caesarea Philippi" (Mark 8:27).

"Bethsaida" (Mark 8:22 cf. Matt. 11:21; Mark 6:45; Luke 9:10; 10:13; John 1:44; 12:21), can be positively identified as a city on the north-east coast of the Sea of Galilee. Therefore, because "Magdala" (Matt. 15:39b) in the region or "parts of Dalmanutha" (Mark 8:10), was on "the other side" (Matt. 16:5; Mark 8:13), it follows that that "Magdala" and Dalmanutha" were on the west coast of the Sea of Galilee. "Magdala" is from a Hebrew word meaning, "tower" (Hebrew, *migdal* / *migdalah*). The "Magdalene (Greek, *Magdalene*)" of "Mary called Magdalene" (Luke 8:2) or "Mary Magdalene" (Matt. 27:56,61; 28:1; Mark 15:40,47; 16:1,9; Luke 24:10; John 19:25; 20:1,18), indicates that she was evidently from "Magdala (Greek, *Magdala*) " (Matt. 15:39b).

The identification of the location of "Magdala" (Matt. 15:39b), beyond it being on the west coast of the Sea of Galilee, is a matter of some historical debate and uncertainty. However, it is of note that in the 19th century, the Reverend Barr and Reverend Easton, were able to report that there was at that time, "a small village called Mejdel, about 3 miles [or 5 kilometres] north of Tiberius, containing about twenty wretched hovels.[49]"

The origins of the variants are speculative.

Variant 1, "*Magdalan*," clearly retains the same basic etymological origins from the Hebrew, "*migdalah* (tower)," as the TR's reading. Was *Variant 1* an accidental change? In Greek, as in English, Greek "*Magdala* (Magdala)," comes as the last word of verse 39. Reminding us that the numbered verse divisions of Stephanus (1551) were frequently based on much older unnumbered verse divisions found in Greek manuscripts, we find that in *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) there is a stylistic paper space of about three letters at the end of Matt. 15:39 before the start of Matt. 16:1. Did a scribe, wrongly concluding that there had been "a paper fade," simply add a final "n" (nu) in because he thought that "was the correct form" of the word?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? Did a scribe, e.g., influenced by the desire to create a nearer homophone form to "Magdalene (*Magdalene*)," conclude that "an optional 'n' could be added here as in some other words"? Or did a scribe, with information that this was now called, "*Magdalan*," deliberately change the text?

Were *Variant 2*, "*Magedan*," and *Variant 3*, "*Magadan*" accidental changes? If due to a paper fade or loss, the original "*Magdala*," had come to look something like, "*Mag::::*," then a Greek scribe may have "reconstructed" this as "*Magedan*" (*Variant 2*), "*Magadan*" (*Variant 3*), or possibly "*Magedam*" or "*Mageda*" if these are not Latinized forms of *Variant 2*. Alternatively, the Latin forms may have derived from "*Magedan*" (*Variant 2*), as inside

[49]   Barr, J. & Easton, M.G., "The Bible-Reader's Assistant," in Brown's *Study Bible* (1778) with notes by the Reverend John Brown (1722-1787), (Gresham, London & Glasgow, [undated]), Revised Edition with the appended notes of the Rev. Dr. Henry Cooke (1788-1868) and Rev. Dr. Josiah Porter (1823-1889).

the Latin textual tradition, a paper fade or   loss of the final "n" of Latin, "*Magedan*," resulted in non detection and hence "*Mageda*" in some Latin manuscripts (old Latin e, b, & l), and the "reconstruction" by a Latin scribe of an "m" and hence "*Magedam*" in others (old Latin a, ff2).   Or if inside the Latin tradition, "*Magadan*" (*Variant 3*) may have arisen as a "reconstruction" after a paper fade or loss of the "e" in "*Magedan*" (*Variant 2*).

Accidental change may also have occurred due to confusion of the letters.   In *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) the Greek letter "D" or Delta, "Δ," sometimes looks very much like the Greek "A" or Alpha, "A."   Moreover, (unlike the capital Lambda of modern texts which looks like "Λ"), the ancient capital lambda looks like a larger form of the modern lower case lambda, "λ;" and sometimes a later mark on the page can make this "λ" look like an "A." E.g., here at Matt. 15:39b the manuscript shows these properties (although a small mark on the lambda here would be unlikely to get it confused with an alpha because the mark is fairly light).   Thus the Greek, "ΜΑΓΑΔλΑ," with a mark on the paper making the Lambda, "λ," look more like an Alpha, "A," and a paper fade of the cross-bar in the final "A," may have resulted in the "reconstruction" of "ΜΑΓΑΔΑΝ," after a scribe "added the missing right hand bar of the 'N' (nu)" from the "A" (alpha) that had lost its cross-bar.

Did Greek scribes in the case of *Variants 2* and 3, and possibly either Greek or Latin scribes in the case of "*Magedam*" or "*Mageda*" if these are not Latinized forms of *Variant 2*, deliberately alter the text to these forms?   If so, was it e.g., on the basis of "information" received from a source to the effect that places with such names existed on the Sea of Galilee?   Or was it e.g., because the original "Magdala," when filtered through some local dialect or other tongue, came to sound like this?   E.g., did perhaps comparison with the Latin "Madian (Midian)," play some role, or perhaps some other even closer comparative place name act as an undue influence in a scribe's mind?

Were these accidental of deliberate changes?   It is notable that we have no historical records of any places fitting the names of any of the variants at Matt. 15:39b.   *Prima facie* this supports the proposition of accidental change over deliberate change.   But given that such places may have existed and been forgotten about later, we cannot be dogmatic about this.   E.g., (notwithstanding rival explanations for the word, "Dalmanutha,") we do not have any clear and undisputed external records showing that the larger region surrounding "Magdala" (Matt. 15:39b) was called "Dalmanutha" (Mark 8:10), yet we who accept the authority of Scripture do not doubt that it was so called "Dalmanutha" (Mark 8:10).   Hence, though we cannot be sure as to whether these variants were accidental of deliberate changes, we can be sure that they are changes to the original text of Scripture.

On the one hand, the TR's reading has strong support in the Greek through time and over time as the representative Byzantine reading.   It also has clear ancient support from the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom.   But on the other hand, *Variant 2*, is followed by the Latin Vulgate and some ancient church writers; and although both *Variants 1* and *3* have relatively slim support, they too can both claim some ancient following.   Weighing up these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 15:39b a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources   the correct reading at Matt. 15:39b, "Magdala," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).   It is further found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century).   It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Slavic Version (9th century); and Ethiopic Versions (Rome, *c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 1, "Magdalan," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

Variant 2, "Magedan," is found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500).   Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) reads in the Latin translation of the Arabic, "*Magheda*," which is the same basic form as "*Mageda*," *supra*.   It thus poses the same question i.e., is this a form of *Variant 2*, or is this another variant?

Variant 3, "Magadan," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   The Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century) reads, "*Magdu*," thus posing the question, Is this a form of *Variant 3*, or is this another variant?

The incorrect *Variant 3* entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 15:39b, i.e., Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) (=N) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) (=U).   Given its very slim support outside the two main Alexandrian Texts, it seems that on this occasion, its following in the Western Text was decisive in the minds of the more modern neo-Alexandrians who look for external support for the Alexandrian text in a way that some earlier neo-Alexandrians e.g., Westcott and Hort, generally did not.   *This is significant* because we are reminded that in the 16th and 17th centuries, the great neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the *Textus Receptus* were able to safely exclude the Western Greek Text from the closed class of sources on the basis of its clear unreliability, in the same way that in the 21st century we neo-Byzantines can safely exclude the Alexandrian Greek Text that essentially came to light in the 19th century.   (Although earlier in the 16th century Erasmus safely excluded the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus after the Vatican Library Prefect advised him in 1533 it

disagreed with Erasmus's Greek text in   favour of the Latin Vulgate some 365 times. And earlier in the 17th century e.g., Elzevir safely excluded the Alexandrian Text's Acts to Revelation found in A 02, which had been stitched onto Byzantine Text Gospels, thus showing the presence of these two rival schools at Alexandria).

Thus there is a sense in which the neo-Byzantines battle against the "Magadan" reading of the Western Greek Text in the 16th and 17th centuries, has come back at us since the 19th century with the "Magadan" reading of the Alexandrian Greek Text.   (And we neo-Byzantines also historically opposed a similar reading, *Variant 2*, "Magedan," found in the Latin Papists' Douay-Rheims Version and Clementine Vulgate.)   Thus when the neo-Alexandrians talk about "new information" as to their preferred reading, they are in fact promoting *an old error* combated by neo-Byzantines in former times, but simply now presented again with a new spin put on it in more recent times by the neo-Alexandrians.

The erroneous *Variant 3* is found at Matt. 15:39b in the American Standard Version which reads, "Magadan" (ASV).   This incorrect variant is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV (with a footnote referring to the readings of the TR and Variant 1), ESV, and NIV. Only the NRSV gives so much as a footnote referring to the Received Text's reading.   It seems that like Moffatt, they have concluded that with *both* major Alexandrian texts *and* the Western Text in its favour, this very poorly attested to reading, for which there is no good textual argument, *just has to be* read as, "Magadan" (Moffatt Bible).   "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (Rom. 1:22).

The fundamental issue is very clear.   It is found in Article 9 of the *Apostles' Creed*, "I believe in the Holy Ghost."   It is elucidated on in the words of the *Nicene Creed*, "I believe in the Holy Ghost, … who spake by the prophets."   It forms the third "*sola*" in the threefold Reformation Motto, "*sola fide*, *sola gratia*, *sola Scriptura*" (Latin, "faith alone, grace alone, Scripture alone").   For we cannot truly say, "I believe in the Holy Ghost" (*Apostles' Creed*), if we do not also recognize the work of the Holy Spirit of God, both in the *inspiration* of Holy Scripture (II Tim. 3:16), and in the *preservation* of Holy Scripture (I Peter 1:25).   We see here at Matt. 15:39b and elsewhere, that the apographs of the *Textus Receptus* come to us via Divine Preservation, and are as reliable as the autographs which come to us via Divine Inspiration.   Let us not be like those of whom it is written, "This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me" (Matt. 15:8).   Rather, let us say "in faith and verity" (I Tim. 2:7), "I believe in the Holy Ghost."

> **Matt. 16:2,3** "When it is evening, ye say, It will be fair weather: for the sky is red. And in the morning, It will be foul weather today: for the sky is red and lowring. O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, there is a plethora of textual readings over so long a passage, as both minority Byzantine Greek readings, and also as Latin readings, here at Matt. 16:2,3.   For the sake of direct simplicity, I have not referred to most of these in the normal way.   Rather, initially, I have made a smaller selection than usual of manuscripts specifically

referred to for citation purposes.   Then I   have made some further references to relevant parts of manuscripts later on.   Moreover, I have only selected three variants which I think are of particular interest.   Thus my format here is somewhat different to usual.

Outside the closed class of sources, either the lack of more detail on variant readings in some manuscripts in e.g., the UBS textual apparatuses; or the detail found in e.g., Swanson indicating further variants in some manuscripts over and above the three I have isolated; means that as a net result I have made a smaller selection of manuscripts here than usual for the overall reading.   However, I have sometimes then referred to them at the specific *Variants 1 & 2*; as well as those which omit the reading at *Variant 3*.

The reader should not be unduly concerned about this   He should bear in mind that any manuscripts outside the closed class of sources are purely of passing interest only.   They have no impact on determining the text of Scripture.   All manuscripts outside the closed class of sources could be either totally ignored and omitted, or completely unknown of, and it would not have one bit of effect on the determination of the text of Scripture.   Thus we only ever look at manuscripts outside the closed class of providentially preserved Greek and Latin NT sources, in order to see "who got it right," and "who got it wrong," on a given occasion.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 16:2,3, the TR's Greek reads, "*Opsias* (Of evening) *genomenes* (coming on), *legete* (ye say), *Eudia* ([It will be] fair weather), *purrazei* (it is red) *gar* (for) *o* (the) *ouranos* (sky). *Kai* (And) *proi* (in the morning), *Cemeron* (today) *cheimon* ('[it will be] foul weather' / 'a storm'), *purrazei* (it is red) *gar* (for) *stugnazon* ([and] 'lowring' / 'lowering') *o* (the) *ouranos* (sky).   *Ypokritai* (O [ye] hypocrites), *to* (the) *men* (-)[50] *prosopon* (face) *tou* (of the) *ouranou* (sky) *ginoskete* (ye know [how]) *diakrinein* ('to discern,' combination of '*ginoskete diakrinein*' = 'ye can discern'), *ta* (the) *de* (but) *semeia* (signs) *ton* (of the) *kairon* (times) *ou* (not) *dunasthe* (ye can [discern]) ; (?)."   This reading is supported by the majority Byzantine text, e.g., H 013 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century, Hamburg, Germany & Cambridge, England), Pi 041 (*Codex Petroplitanus*, 9th century, St. Petersburg, Russia); or with minor differences as *Variant 2*, in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century, twice spelling *purrazei* with one "r" / rho, spelling *semeia* without the "e" / epsilon, and before *ou dunasthe* adding *pos* / 'how,' and after these words, adding *dokimazein* / 'to discern,' *infra*).

The *Textus Receptus* (TR) reading is also supported with minor variation (adding the second, 'ye say,') as Latin, "*Facto* (having come) *vespere* (evening), *dicitis* (ye say), *Serenum* (fair weather) *erit* (it will be), *rubicudum* (red) *est* (it is) *enim* (for) *caelum* (sky). *Et* (And) *mane* (in the morning) *dicitis* (ye say), *Hodie* (today) *tempestas* ('[it will be] foul weather' / 'a storm'), *rutilat* (it is red) *enim* (for) *triste* ([and] 'lowring' / 'lowering') *caelum* (sky). *Hypocritae* (O [ye] hypocrites), *faciem* (the face) *ergo* (then) *caeli* (of the sky) *diiudicare* (to discern) *nostis* (ye know [how]), *signa* (signs) *autem* (but) *temporum* (of the times) *non* (not) *potestis* (ye can)?" is supported by old Latin Version f (6th century).

However, *Variant 1*, omits, "O [ye] hypocrites."   This omission is a minority

---

[50]   Here redundant in English translation, it is used to indicate a contrast and so is grammatically here connected with the following "*de* (but)."

Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th   century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, which here contains other variants also), and Minuscule 262 (10th century). It is also found in the Latin textual tradition, e.g., it is here omitted in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century).   Even though this omission is *not found* in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), f (6th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); nevertheless, from the Latin support that there is for this omission, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

The ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407), has the entire quote of the TR with two variants[51].   Firstly, in the place of the TR's "*diakrinein* ('to discern,' active present infinitive, from *diakrino*)," Chrysostom reads, "*diakrinai* (active infinitive first aorist, from *diakrino*);" but present and aorist infinitives are usually translated the same in English, and so this would not affect English translation.   (Was "*diakrinai*" a "reconstruction" following a paper fade of the "*ein*" ending of "*diakrinein*"?)   Secondly, Chrysostom's quote lacks "*Ypokritai* (O [ye] hypocrites);" and so he follows *Variant 1*.

Another reading, *Variant 2*, adds "to discern" (Greek, *dokimazein*) or "to know" (Latin, *scire*) i.e., turning it from a rhetorical question into a statement.   While Greek, "*dokimazein* (active infinitive present, from *dokimazo*)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); a variant form of this as "*dokimazete* ('ye discern,' imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *dokimazo*)," is a further minority Byzantine reading found in S 028 (10th century).   The *Variant 2* addition is also found in old Latin versions aur (7th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century).   Even though this addition is *not found* in old Latin versions d (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century); nevertheless, from the Latin support that there is for this addition, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

A third reading, *Variant 3*, entirely omits all of these words.   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in X 033 (10th century).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and in a number of manuscripts according to the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading here at Matt. 16:2,3, which is thus correct.   The origins of the variants are speculative.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental omission?   In Manuscript W 032, which omits "*YPOKRITAI* (O [ye] hypocrites)," there is a small stylistic paper space of about one letter before the next words, "*TO* (the) *ME* (with a line on top rather than underneath the epsilon, an abbreviation for *MEN*)," showing that while this is not a verse division in our Bibles as numbered by Stephanus from 1551, this was regarded as an ancient stylistic point of division, which might have become, although did not become, a separate verse.   Therefore, if "*Ypokritai* (O [ye] hypocrites)," was lost due to a paper fade, a scribe might have though that the missing space was simply a longer stylistic paper space, and so in copying it out may have then reduced the space to something smaller as in W 032.

---

[51]   St. Chrysostom in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1858-60 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 58, p. 528 (Gospel of St. Matthew, Homily 53:2) (Greek); Schaff, P., (Editor), *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, [first series,] 1887, reprint Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1975, Vol. 10, p. 328 (Gospel of St. Matthew, Homily 53:3).

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate omission?   E.g., did a scribe consider it was "a stylistic improvement," to "have a symmetrical balance" between the words of, "ye can discern the face of the sky" on the one hand, and "but can ye not discerns the signs of the times?" on the other hand?   Did this scribe considered it had "a better sound to it," when it was "uninhibited by the introductory words, 'O ye hypocrites," which he considered "throws out this "symmetrical balance"?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental addition?

Another reading, *Variant 2*, adds "to discern" (Greek, *dokimazein*) or "to know" (Latin, *scire*).   A form of the broad idea of *Variant 2*, ("*dokimazein*," active infinitive present, from *dokimazo*), is found in W 032 ("*dokimasai*," active infinitive first aorist, from *dokimazo*[52]), where it comes as the last word of the line.   There is then a paper space of about three letters after Matt. 16:3 till the beginning of Matt. 16:4 on the next line, reminding us that the verse divisions of Stephanus which he numbered in 1551, are often more ancient verse divisions.   Then on the same page in Manuscript Washington (W 032), we find that at the end of Matt. 16:5, there is a large paper space numbering a baker's dozen of letter spaces, before Matt. 16:6 starts at the beginning of the next line, but then only a stylistic paper space of about 2 letters at the end of Matt. 12:6 and beginning of Matt. 12:7.

Therefore, if at the end of Matt. 16:3, there had been a long paper space, comparable to that which we now find at the end of Matt. 16:5 in W 032, a scribe, puzzled by Matt. 16:3's meaning, may have wrongly concluded that "there had been a paper fade."   If so, probably through some reference to Luke 12:56, which reads, "… ye can discern (*dokimazein*, this is the form found in Sigma 042, *supra*) the face of the sky and of the earth; but how is it that ye do not discern (*dokimazete*, 'ye do discern,' this is the form found in S 028, *supra*) this time?", he may then have "reconstructed" "*dokimazein* (to discern)," "from context."

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate addition?   Did a scribe, e.g., seeking "to harmonize" Matt. 16:3 with Luke 12:56, by semi-assimilation add in "*dokimazein* (to discern)" or "*dokimazete* (ye discern)"?

Was *Variant 3* an accidental omission?   Was there a massive paper loss due to damage?   If so, did the scribe "throw his hands up in the air" and exclaim, "The thing is insoluble!   I shall just leave a paper space to show something has gone wrong."   If so, did then a later scribe, seeing a large empty space, "throw his hands up in the air" and exclaim, "The scribe who copied this was so wasteful with paper space leaving such a large paper space.   What on earth was he trying to accomplish anyway?   Was he just a dunderhead?   Or

---

[52]   *Prima facie* one might allow for this to be imperative active present, 2nd person singular, i.e., *dokimase*, in which W 032 has interchanged the "*e*" suffix for "*ai*" (see "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The First Matter," at Matt. 16:8b).   But context here favours the view that this is an active infinitive aorist in which no such vowel interchange has occurred.

did he want to draw in a picture here?"   If   so, the subsequent scribe may then have reduced this paper space, and so an undetected omission may have entered this textual line of manuscripts.

Was *Variant 3* a deliberate omission?   The probable origins of this variant with Origen, makes this a more probable possibility, although still not a definite certainty.   If so, what might Origen's thinking have been?   Some like e.g., Scrivener, have conjectured that scribes in climates such as those one finds in e.g., Egypt, where when "the sky is red" "in the morning," this does not indicate "foul weather" for the day (Matt. 16:3), may have deliberately removed Matt. 16:2,3[53] i.e., as some kind of "cultural adaptation of Scripture." We find a not dissimilar thing of so called "cultural adaptation" today with e.g., the perversion of Scripture by feminist language in, for instance, the NRSV and REB.

But when it comes to Origen, this is certainly not the only possible speculation for *Variant 3*.   The writings of Origen (d. 254) contain a mix of orthodox and unorthodox views. Though his writings must be used with caution, parts of them are still valuable, and have historically been consulted by the orthodox.   E.g., on the one hand, St. Jerome (d. 420) says in his "Preface to the translation of Origen's two homilies on the Song of Songs," that, "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[54]."   But on the other hand, St. 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. 9:11,13)[55]."   Likewise, St. Jerome fairly describes Origen's denial of a *bodily* resurrection as "poison[56]."

In the context of *Variant 3*, it may be relevant that contrary to Rom. 8:22,23 ("whole creation" = "whole *human* creation" i.e., Jew and Gentile, cf. Mark 16:15; Col. 1:23); I Cor. 15:35-57; Philp. 3:21; I John 3:2, Origen denied the first section of Article 12 in the *Apostles' Creed*, "I believe in … the resurrection of the body."

Here at Matt. 16:2-4, Christ refers to "the signs of the times" in general, and "the sign of the prophet Jonas" in particular.   The "sign of the prophet Jonas" (Matt. 16:4) was that he "was in the belly of" "a great fish" "three days" (Jonah 1:17).   He says, "out of the belly of hell cried I" (Jonah 2:2), but since it would be too much to say that "the belly of the fish"

---

[53]   Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 41; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 33.

[54]   Wace, H. & Schaff, P. (Eds), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, James Parker & Co., Oxford and Christian Literature Co., New York, USA, Vol. 6, St. Jerome: Letters & Select Works, 1893, p. 485 (Jerome to Damasus, 383 A.D.).

[55]   *Ibid.*, p. 284 (Letter 144).

[56]   *Ibid.*, p. 436 (Pamachius 25) cf. e.g., pp. 428,432-6.

(Jonah 1:17) was the same thing as "hell"   (Jonah 2:2), it follows that Jonah was thus a prophetic type of the Messiah who was to spend "three days" in "hell" (Jonah 1:17; 2:2). The words, "yet thou brought up my life from corruption" (Jonah 2:6) thus indicate the resurrection of the body.   The passage thus has a number of similarities with Ps. 16:9,10, where because it is to much to say that the "soul" of David was "in hell," or that his body did not "see corruption" (Ps. 16:10), it follows that he too was a type of the Messiah whose "soul" was to go down to "hell," but who was not to be dead for so long that his body would "see corruption" (Ps. 16:10).

We cannot doubt that Christ fulfilled these prophetic passages (Luke 24:44,46), and "that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption" (Acts 2:25-31).   Thus the orthodox uphold the words of the last section of Article 4 in the *Apostles' Creed*, "he descended into hell."   I understand Christ's descent into hell to be an element of Christ "triumphing" (Col. 2:15) in a triumphal march through hell.   In this triumphal march he "preached unto" in the sense of *preached at* "the spirits in prison" from "the days of Noah" (I Peter 3:19,20), thus showing the Lord of heaven is also Lord of hell (Ps. 139:8), for God and not the Devil runs hell.   Christ thus here showed his continuing holy anger at the antediluvians wickedness and vice found in such sins as trying to destroy the races of man he had made with Cain's race and Seth's race via miscegenation (Gen. 6:1-4; 9:1; 10 & 11)[57], and also murderous "violence" (Gen.6:11,13; 9:6).   But other orthodox have a different view of what is meant by the words of the *Apostles' Creed*, "he descended into hell[58]."

---

[57]   Unlike Cain's race (Gen. 4:16-24), Seth's race (Gen. 5:1-32) is here called "the sons of God" (Gen. 6:2) due to racial election.   Such racial election also later applied to Israel, of whom God said to Pharaoh, "Let my son go," "and if thou refuse to let him go, behold, I will slay thy son, even thy firstborn" (Exod. 4:23), which thing he then did (Exod. 11:5; 12:29).   But we also read that "with many of them God was not well pleased" (I Cor. 11:5).   That is because *racial election* as a *holy nation* was always a distinctive from the work of the covenant of grace, which was always with individuals such as Holy Noah, who "found grace" under the "covenant," and "was" made "just" (Gen. 6:8,9,19) (justification by faith), manifested in holiness of living (sanctification).   For though sinless perfection is not possible (Gen. 9:20,21), Noah was "perfect in his" racial "generations" (Gen. 4:9) i.e., he had no half-caste or mixed-race children, and did not agree with the "violence" (Gen. 6:11,13). Thus as in Hosea 13:12,13, while those of the elect race could on one level be called "the sons of God" (Gen. 6:2); this should not be confused with the issue of salvation, where such election was always individualistic.   Thus in these spiritual terms, most of these "sons of God" in Seth's race (Gen. 6:2), proved to be *spiritual* children of the Devil, and so after they died, their "spirits" were put "in" the "prison" (I Peter 3:19) of "hell" (Acts 2:27,31).

[58]   Berkhof's *Systematic Theology*, p. 342.   What Berkhof here claims is the Anglican view, is historically only one view; and what he calls the Lutheran view of a triumphal march was historically also a common view among Anglicans. See Pearson on *the Creed*, James Nichols edition, *An Exposition of the Creed* by Bishop John Pearson (1612-1686), Bishop of Chester (1672-86), 1659,1683, Ward, Lock, & Co., London, UK, 1854 reprint, pp. 326-365.   The three main Protestant views of the last section of Article 4 of the *Apostles' Creed*, are: Christ's triumphal march through hell (e.g., Melancthon, Lutherans, & many Anglicans), Christ experiencing hell in his penal sufferings on the cross (Calvin & the Dutch Reformed Church, *Heidelberg Catechism*), and Christ being truly dead (Presbyterians, *Westminster Larger & Shorter Catechisms*).   These three main-line Protestant views thus

In the Trinitarian debates with the Apollinarian heretics (named after Apollinarius of Laodicea, d. 392)[59], the orthodox used Christ's descent into hell to prove that his humanity consisted of "flesh" (body) and a "soul" (Ps. 16:9,10; Acts 2:26,27). He clearly had a soul; for we read that God "wilt not leave" his "soul in hell" (Acts 2:27), not his "body" or "Divinity (Logos)" in hell. *Therefore he must have had a soul that was distinct from both his human body and his Divinity, whose motion went into hell.* Hence e.g., we read in the *Athanasian Creed* (named after, not written by, St. Athanasius), that Christ is "man: of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting." The Apollinarian heresy was condemned at the second General Council of Constantinople (381). Moreover, at the fourth General Council of Chalcedon (451), we also read that Christ was "truly man, consisting" therefore "of a reasonable soul and body."

Among Protestant Christians, this historic argument is more important to Anglicans and Lutherans, for whom the three creeds, ancient church writers, and Trinitarian formulas of the first four general councils[60], are held in higher regard than they are by some of their fellow Protestants, who nevertheless believe in the same essential doctrine that Christ was both fully God *and fully man*. This meant that for both Lutherans and Reformed Anglicans, any view of the meaning of the words of the *Apostles' Creed*, "He descended into hell," should give serious consideration to this Biblically sound Christological Trinitarian argument. That is because it was this specific Biblical argument for Christ's full humanity i.e., that he is a man with *both* body *and soul*, that proved to be *the knock down blow* which routed the Apollinarian heretics, and put them to flight!

In part, this Lutheran and Anglican view keeps faith with that which is good in the past, and under God honours and identifies with the orthodox who defended the Trinity against the Apollinarians. And in part, this ensures that if the Apollinarian heresy returns, either directly, or *indirectly in some associated matter*, then a tested and proven Biblical argument is in place as an established article of faith in the *Apostles' Creed* to deal with this. E.g., this dichotomy of "flesh" (body) and a "soul" requires that Christ's "soul" was reunited

---

historically stood in contrast with a minority Protestant view of limbo (where it is said the saved are in an intermediate state of the dead in limbo till Christ's Second Coming; and which unlike the Roman Church, finds no place for purgatory or prayers for the dead). The three main-line Protestant views, together with some minority Protestant views, all stand in contrast with the Roman Catholic view of limbo with *Limbus Patrum* (Latin, 'Limbo of the Fathers'), *Limbus Puerorum* (Latin, 'Limbo of Children,' a view recently jettisoned; thus once again showing the bogus nature of the claim that the Roman Church is "*semper eadem*," Latin, "always the same"), with its associated notions of purgatory and "prayers for the dead."

[59] Bettenson's *Church Documents*, pp. 44-5,51,335.

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

with his "flesh" (body) which God did not   allow "to see corruption"(Acts 2:26,27). Hence this view of Article 4 requires a belief in the *bodily* resurrection of Christ, and so clearly qualifies this as the meaning of Article 5 of the *Apostles' Creed*, "the third day he rose again from the dead."   However, this is denied by some religious liberals, who claim that only his soul was raised to life, and that his body rotted away to dust[61].

We thus find that "this sign of the prophet Jonas" at Matt. 16:3 is an important teaching with respect to the fact of *Christ's bodily resurrection*, and historically this teaching of Christ's bodily resurrection was connected with the words of the Creed, "he descended into hell."   But more than this, Christ here refers to a capacity to "discern the signs of the times" (Matt. 16:3).   This is significant because with reference to the Second Advent he also refers to "great signs … from heaven" (Luke 21:11), such as "signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations with perplexity the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of heaven shall be shaken" (Luke 21: 25,26).   And what follows this?   "And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory.   And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for you redemption draweth night" (Luke 21:27,28).   Now what is this "redemption" (Luke 21:28)?   It is none other than "the redemption of our body" (Rom. 8:23).

Thus through reference to the concept of "the signs of the times" (Matt. 16:3,4), there is a linkage between the idea of *Christ's bodily resurrection* in Matt. 16:4, *being a type* of the more general *resurrection of the body*.   Though it is not stated in as overtly clear terms as St. John and St. Paul use, it is the same concept.   I.e., St. John saith, "it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him" (I John 3:2); and St. Paul saith, "Jesus Christ … shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body" (Philp. 3:20,21).

Certainly Origen's heretical views denying the bodily resurrection do not sit well with these verses at Matt. 16:2-4.   Therefore, given that Origen denied the first section of Article 12 in the *Apostles' Creed*, "I believe in … the resurrection of the body," did he here at *Variant 3* of Matt. 16:2,3, seek to break this nexus between Christ's bodily resurrection and the more general resurrection of the body at the Second Advent, by seeking to expunge Matt. 16:2b,3 from Holy Scripture?   If so, then both he and any persons sympathetic to this type of thing, would do well to remember the words found in Article 9 of the *Apostles' Creed*, "I believe in the Holy Ghost."   For what saith the Holy Spirit of God?   Though the Scriptures be "cut" out "with" a "penknife, and cast" "into" a "fire;" yet still "the word of the Lord" declares, to take "another" manuscript "roll," and write upon it "the words of" God's "book." For the words of God are indestructible! (Jer. 36:23,27,32).

Were *Variants 1,2, & 3* deliberate or accidental changes?   At the end of the day, we just do not know.   But we do most assuredly know that they were changes to the original text

---

[61]   Another example of an indirectly associated matter, is the denial by Seventh-day Adventists and Jehovah's Witnesses of the constitutional nature of man as consisting of a body and soul (Ps. 139:14,15; Eccl. 12:7 cf. Gen. 3:19); and the conscious state of the dead (Luke 16:22-31; Philp. 1:23,24; 3:12; Heb. 12:23).   This understanding of Ps. 16:10; Acts 2:27,31, also demolishes that erroneous view.

of Matt. 16:2,3.

On the one hand, the reading of the TR is well supported in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading.   This includes the disputed, Greek, "*Ypokritai* ('O [ye] hypocrites,' masculine plural vocative noun, from *ypokrit<u>e</u>s* or with the common ' breathing, *hypokrit<u>e</u>s*)," which is majority Byzantine Text e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), E 07 (8th century), Pi 041 (9th century), and S 028 (10th century).   Notwithstanding a plethora of relatively minor variants, the TR's text at Matt. 16:2,3 was clearly known in ancient times. E.g., though incomplete, there is enough of it in the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367), to show its general existence[62].   It is also found e.g., in old Latin version b (5th century) (which unlike *Variant 1* includes, "O [ye] hypocrites," as Latin, "*Hypocritae*;" but which follows *Variant 2* in adding, "to know," as Latin, "*cognoscere*").   Indeed, in ancient times, other than for, "O [ye] hypocrites," the quote is supported by both St. Chrysostom in the Greek and St. Jerome in the Latin Vulgate, *supra*; and "O [ye] hypocrites," then has clear ancient support as Latin, "*Hypocritae* ('O [ye] hypocrites,' masculine plural vocative noun, from ecclesiastical Latin, *hypocrita*)," in both old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century) and b (5th century), *supra*.

But on the other hand, there are a number of internal variants.   E.g., *Variant 1* is found in the Latin Vulgate.   *Variant 2* is followed from ancient times with old Latin Version b.   And *Variant 3* is referred to as being in existence, although not supported or followed by, Jerome, who includes all but "O [ye] hypocrites" (*Variant 1*) in the Vulgate.

Weighing up these various considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 16:2,3, a middling "B" (in the range of 69% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 16:2,3, is found in e.g., some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

The words, "O [ye] hypocrites," are found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent) and 700 (11th century, independent); as well as Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).   However, *Variant 1*, which omits, "O [ye] hypocrites," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century).   It is further omitted in Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type); the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The *Variant 2* addition of *Variant 2*, "to discern" (Greek, *dokimazein*), is *not* found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), nor in (the

---

[62]   St. Hilary in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1844 Paris Edition Paris; series reprint undated: Turnhout, Belgium, Vol. 9, 1979), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 9, pp. 1007-8 (Commentary on Matthew, 2:32) (Latin).

independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century),   and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).   However the *Variant 2* addition, "*dokimazein* (to discern)," is found in Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type); and the variant form of this as "*dokimazete* (ye discern)," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century).   It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The *Variant 3* complete omission of these words at Matt. 16:2,3, is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).   This complete omission is further found in Minuscules 157 (independent, 12th century) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; as well as the Armenian Version (5th century).

The TR's reading, with the *Variant 1* omission of "*upokritai* (O [ye] hypocrites)," is placed in square brackets, thus making its inclusion or exclusion entirely optional, in the main text of: Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952) (with both Tischendorf and Nestle referring to the reading, "*upokritai*" in footnote readings), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

The UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions Committee took the view "that there is a very high degree of doubt concerning the reading selected for the text" in these brackets; whereas the UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) Committee said, "the Committee had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text" found in the square brackets.   It is also notable that Westcott-Hort (1881), the UBS 3rd (1975), 3rd corrected (1983), and 4th revised (1993) editions, and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), make no reference to the reading "*upokritai* (O [ye] hypocrites)," in even a footnote, but simply omit it outright.

Four stylistic approaches have been adopted by the neo-Alexandrian Versions at Matt. 16:2,3.   Because the ASV and NASB use italics, it is clear that they do not adopt *Variant 2*. In the case of the other neo-Alexandrian versions, the absence of italics means that we cannot be sure as to whether or not the RSV, does or does not adopt *Variant 2*; although the absence of *Variant 2* in all the neo-Alexandrian texts, *supra*, indicates that they *probably* did not. The absence of italics in these neo-Alexandrian versions, thus once again show the confusion and frustration generated by these very bad versions.

Stylistic Approach 1.   The type of approach found in these neo-Alexandrian Greek texts, is perfectly replicated in the TCNT.   This both encloses Matt. 16:2,3 with *Variant 1* in square brackets, and makes no reference to the TR's reading, "*upokritai* (O [ye] hypocrites)." It thus reads, "[In the evening you say 'It will be fine weather, for the sky is as red as fire.' But in the morning you say 'To-day it will be stormy, for the sky is as red as fire and threatening.'   You learn to read the sky; yet you are unable to read the signs of the times!]" (TCNT).

Stylistic Approach 2 adopts the option of including Matt. 16:2,3 with *Variant 1* in the main text, makes no reference to the TR's reading, "*upokritai* (O [ye] hypocrites)," and has no footnote stating that these words are omitted by certain manuscripts. This approach is found in the NASB (2nd ed. & 3rd ed.).

Stylistic Approach 3. This approach includes Matt. 16:2,3 with *Variant 1* in the main text, makes no reference to the TR's reading, "*upokritai* (O [ye] hypocrites)," and has a footnote stating that these words are omitted by certain manuscripts, misleadingly called "authorities" in the ASV. E.g., the ASV reads (using italics where it does, "when it is evening, ye say, *It will be* fair weather: for the heaven is red. And in the morning, *It will be* foul weather to-day: for the heaven is red and lowering. Ye know how to discern the face of heaven; but ye cannot *discern* the signs of the times" (ASV). A footnote then read of these "words," that they "are omitted by some of the most ancient and other important authorities" (ASV footnote). *Stylistic Approach 3* is also followed by the NASB (1st ed.), RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Stylistic Approach 4 adopts the option of omitting Matt. 16:2,3 in the main text, makes no reference to the TR's reading, "*upokritai* (O [ye] hypocrites)," and has a footnote stating that these words are included in certain manuscripts. E.g., the Moffatt Bible simply reads, "He replied" at Matt. 16:2, and then immediately goes to the words of Matt. 16:4. A footnote then says, "Some uncials, including C D L W Theta, the old Latin, Latin and Syriac Vulgates, and the Diatessaron, insert the following after 'He replied' in v[erse] 2: 'When evening comes, you say, 'It will be fine,' for the sky is red; in the morning you say, 'It will be stormy to-day,' for the sky is red and cloudy. You know how to distinguish the look of the sky, but you cannot read the signs of the times!'" (Moffatt Bible footnote). *Stylistic Approach 4* is also followed by the NEB and REB.

The Papists' post Vatican II Council neo-Alexandrian Jerusalem Bible (1966) and New Jerusalem Bible (1985), both adopt *Stylistic Approach 3* (as does the RSV, *supra*, which has a Roman Catholic edition, 1965). This makes them inferior translations at this point to the old Latin Papists' Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582), which used *Stylistic Approach 2*. I.e., while *Stylistic Approach 2* is incorrect, by degrees, it is not *as bad* as *Stylistic Approach 3* which is *even worse*.

Nevertheless, we find that as in the old Latin Papists' Douay-Rheims Version, the neo-Alexandrians are very shy about so much as even referring to the words of Jesus, "O ye hypocrites" (Matt. 16:3). It seems that in varying degrees, both the Latin Papists and neo-Alexandrians want to "trim down" the Biblical Christ. Some find that by "trimming down Christ" so that he does not so strongly denounce sin, with the words "O ye hypocrites," they have gone far enough, and dare not tamper with the Word of God any further (Douay-Rheims, NASB 2nd ed. & 3rd ed.). Others, in varying degrees seek to cast more doubt on the Biblical Christ, up to, and including, the exclusion of all of Christ's words here (Moffatt, NEB, & REB).

What is it about this man from Nazareth that they all find so offensive? He who claimed the sinless human of nature of Adam before the fall, saying, "which of you convinceth me of sin?" (John 8:46), spoke also of a "world of sin," "of sin, because they believe not on me" (John 16:8,9). He graciously held out to men the opportunity "for the remission of sins" through his "blood" (Matt. 16:28), saying he came "to give his life a

ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28); and as he   hung his head on the cross in death, he said of this atonement as "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29), "It is finished" (John 19:30).   Though he declared, "I will have mercy," "for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance" (Matt. 9:13); he also pointed to the Ten Commandments for the purposes of isolating sin (Matt. 19:18,19).   He called upon men to "repent" (Matt. 4:17) and have "faith" in him (Matt. 8:10; 9:2) as "the Son of God" (Matt. 27:54) and "the Lord" (Matt. 22:44; quoting Ps. 110:1); being "the Lord," declared John the Baptist, whom Isaiah calls, "Jehovah" (Matt. 3:3; quoting Isa. 40:3).

Here at Matt. 16:2,3 Jesus is about his business of isolating sin, that men might repent and believe the gospel.   He evidently had a hard time of it back then, and he still has a hard time of it now, as Bible translators either wishing to dodge his stern words, "O ye hypocrites" (Matt. 16:3), or his other uncompromising words of Matt. 16:2,3, in varying degrees seek to put these words of Christ aside.   But all is to no avail.   For he who said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Matt. 24:35), and "if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out" (Luke 19:40), raised up neo-Byzantine textual analysts in the 16th and 17th centuries in order to more formally compose the entire Received Text of the NT than it had been done before.   From this great work we have our King James Bibles and the full word of God here at Matt. 16:2,3.   Latin Papists may come and go, neo-Alexandrians may come and go, but they ultimately cannot prevail, for "the Word of our God shall stand forever" (Isa. 40:8).   Let us then thank God for the *Textus Receptus* and our King James Bibles!

Matt. 16:4 "of the prophet" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*tou* (of the) *proph<u>e</u>tou* (the prophet)," in the clause, "but the sign of the (*tou*) prophet (*proph<u>e</u>tou*) Jonas (*'I<u>o</u>na*)" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century).   It is also supported as Latin, "*prophetae* (of the prophet)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), f (6th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and (with a variant spelling) as Latin, "*profetae* (of the prophet)," in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), ff2 (5th century), and q (6th / 7th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested as "*prophetae* (of the prophet)" in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, these words are omitted, making the clause read, "but the sign of Jonas (*'I<u>o</u>na*)," in a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 262 (10th century).   This omission is further found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions d (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century).   It is also found in the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

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

Was this an accidental omission?   In *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) there is a stylistic paper space of about two letters after, "*I<u>o</u>na* (of Jonas) *tou* (of the) *proph<u>e</u>tou* (the prophet);" before the next clause containing the sentence, "*Kai* (and)" etc. .   Thus while in the verse division we have from Stephanus (1551) the sentence, "And he left them and departed," is at

the end of verse 4, it could have been   reckoned as a separate verse by someone seeking shorter verses than we have from Stephanus in our King James Versions.   But on the same page, we find that after verse 5 there is a gap of about 13 letter spaces till the end of a line, with verse 6 starting at the beginning of the next line, with the first letter of verse 6 protruding one letter space to the left of the left hand justified page in order to accentuate the fact that this is a new verse.   Was the original "*tou* (of the) *prophetou* (the prophet)" lost in a paper fade, with the subsequent copyist scribe simply concluding that this was a larger stylistic paper space than it actually was before the "*Kai* (and)" of the next sentence?

Was this a deliberate omission?   Did a scribe prune this away as "unnecessary wordage"?   If so, why did he not also do so at Matt. 12:39?   Was it because it was a different scribe who copied out this section?   Or was it the same scribe, and he considered that "one reference to 'the prophet Jonas'" at Matt. 12:39 was "desirable," but that to then have "the prophet Jonas" at Matt. 16:4 was "unnecessarily repetitious"?

A deliberate or accidental change?   The answer is lost in a historical dark age with respect to the finer details of such textual transmission history.   But either way, we know that a change was made to the text of Scripture, and for our purposes that is enough information.

The reading of the *Textus Receptus* is well supported in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading.   It has further support in old Latin versions dating from ancient times.   It also has the impressive support of the church doctor and bishop, who was the Archbishop of the Greek speaking Byzantine Empire's capital city of Constantinople, namely, St. John Chrysostom, in his 53rd Homily on St. Matthew's Gospel[63].   Under the circumstances, it means that on this occasion, the fact that it is also found in Origen's writings acts to give it a further witness from antiquity.   I think the combination of these factors is so overpoweringly strong, that notwithstanding the presence of the variant in the Vulgate and an ancient Latin writer, we can treat this reading with great confidence.   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 16:4 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 16:4, "the prophet Jonas," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).   It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 1071 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is further found in all extant Syriac

---

[63]   St. Chrysostom in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1858-60 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 58, p. 528 (Gospel of St. Matthew, Homily 53:2) (Greek); Schaff, P., (Editor), *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, [first series,] 1887, reprint Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1975, Vol. 10, p. 328 (Gospel of St. Matthew, Homily 53:3).

Versions e.g., the celebrated Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However the incorrect reading, which omits "the prophet," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); and Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century).

Manifesting typical neo-Alexandrian flawed principles *in favour of the shorter text*, a maxim that greatly appeals to the simplistic mind set of the neo-Alexandrians, at Matt. 16:4 the variant reading is found in the NU Text *et al*. Hence the American Standard Version reads simply, "the sign of Jonah" (ASV). The incorrect reading at Matt. 16:4 is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Matt. 16:5 "his disciples" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*Kai* (And) *elthontes* ('coming' = 'when … they were come' or 'when … were come,' AV, masculine plural nominative, active aorist participle, from *erchomai*) *oi* (-) *math<u>e</u>tai* (disciples) *autou* (of him)," in the words, "And when *his disciples* were come to the other side" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*Et* (And) *cum* (when) *venissent* ('they were come[64]' or 'were come,' subjunctive active pluperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *venio*) *discipuli* (the disciples) *eius* (of him)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported by a similar reading, either derived directly as a less literal Latin translation from the TR's Greek, or derived indirectly as a more literal Latin translation of a less literal Greek manuscript line derived from the TR's Greek in which some alterations had occurred. The similar reading, Latin, "*Et* (And) *cum* (when) *venisset* ('he [i.e., Christ] was come,' subjunctive active pluperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *venio*) …, … *discipuli* (the disciples) *eius* (of him)," is found in old Latin versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). The TR's reading is further supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

---

[64] English has no equivalent to the pluperfect, which is found in both Greek (Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 583-586; Young's *Greek*, pp. 129-130) and Latin (Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, pp. 78,202-203). The Latin pluperfect subjunctive, *supra*, is rendered differently depending on the wider grammatical sequences of tenses it is found among. The basic idea of the pluperfect is something that was previously completed from the time-frame of a past time. E.g., "Yesterday I went on the return Circular Quay to Manly picturesque trip on the ferry (past time), and ten minutes before the Sydney ferry left Circular Quay *I bought a return-ticket* (pluperfect)."

However, a variant omits Greek, "*autou* (his)," and reads simply, Greek, "*Kai* (And) *elthontes* ('coming' = 'when … they were come') *oi* (the) *math<u>e</u>tai* (disciples)."   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 184 (1319 A.D.).   It is further found in a similar reading as Latin, "*Et* (And) *cum* (when) *venissent* (they were come) …, … *discipuli* (the disciples)," in old Latin version e (4th / 5th century); and another similar reading as Latin, "*Et* (And) *cum* (when) *venients* ('coming,' masculine plural nominative, active present participle, from *venio*) …, … *discipuli* (the disciples)," in old Latin version d (5th century). It is also found in ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct.   The origins of the variant are speculative.   See comments on "his disciples" at Matt.15:12a.   Was it a deliberate or accidental change?   We cannot be sure.   But we can be sure that it is a change.

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading from ancient times; and strong support in the Latin from St. Jerome's Vulgate and most old Latin versions, also dating from ancient times.   The fact that St. Hilary was aware of both readings shows the antiquity of both the TR's reading and the variant.   Nevertheless, overall the variant has only slim support in the Greek and Latin, and has no good textual argument to commend it.   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 16:5 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 16:5, "his disciples" is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century).   It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century).   It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.   It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500).

However, the variant which omits "his" and so reads, "the disciples," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is also found in a similar reading, omitting "*autou* ('of him,' word 5)," in word order, 1,2,6,7,8,9,3,4,10 as, "*Kai* ('And,' word 1) *elthontes* ('coming' = 'when … they were come,' word 2) *eis* ('to,' word 6) *to* ('the,' word 7) *peran* ('other side,' word 8), *epelathonto* ('they forgot,' word 9) *oi* ('the,' word 3) *math<u>e</u>tai* ('disciples,' word 4) *artous* ('bread,' word 10) *labein* ('to take,' word 11)," in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   The variant is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th

century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is also found in a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and the Armenian Version (5th century).

The incorrect variant entered the NU Text *et al.* Thus at Matt. 16:5 the ASV reads, "And the disciples came to the other side" etc. . The erroneous reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV.

The incorrect reading is also found in the NIV which follows the similar reading of e.g., the Western text, *supra*, which its translators evidently here preferred. We are thus reminded that the type of wild two-arm pincer approach used by the wild Scotsman, James Moffatt, is also used by other neo-Alexandrians, albeit generally with a much lower frequency than Moffatt (e.g., Matt. 9:22; 10:25; 13:34). But to the extent that the NIV here exhibits a Moffatt like, "anything goes" pincer arm in support of the Western Text and parts of the Latin text, *infra*, we are reminded that the errors more frequently adopted by Moffatt, live on in a reduced form among later neo-Alexandrians. The NIV here shows an embrace of the Western Text deemed an anathema by the great neo-Byzantine textual scholars of the 16th and 17th centuries who rightly dismissed it as a spurious Greek text.

At Matt. 16:5, the NIV follows the rearranged word order of the Western Text, i.e., word order, 1,2,6,7,8,9,3,4,10 and also omitting word 5. As part of its defective English translation style, it also omits word 1, "*Kai* ('And,' word 1). Moreover, though there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Greek reading of words 7 & 8, "*to* ('the,' word 7) *peran* ('other side,' word 8)," the NIV here gratuitously adopts the Latin reading of the Vulgate *et al*, "*trans* (across) *fretum* (the sea)." It thus reminds us here of the old Latin Papists' Douay-Rheims Version, which reads at Matt. 16:5 "were come over the water." In what I can only describe as a hopeless mix of the unreliable Western Greek Text and faulty Latin text, the *New International Version* (NIV) thus here reads at Matt. 16:5, "[Word 1, gratuitously omitted] When they went [word 2] across [substituting Latin reading for Greek word 6] the lake [substituting Latin reading for Greek words 7 & 8], the [word 3, in Western text order] disciples [word 4, in Western text order] forgot [word 9] to take [word 11] bread [word 10]."

To be sure, here at Matt. 16:5, the NIV is a higgledy piggledy mess, as it fuses and confuses the Latin and Western Texts, and weaves them into its own most unsatisfactory *Nutty Insane Version (NIV)*. What a contrast this is to the Authorized Version's (AV) clear, accurate, and reliable translation of the Greek, that we find in our *A-grade Versions (AV)*, which read, "And when the disciples were come to the other side, they had forgotten to take bread" (AV). Let us thank God for the clarity and accuracy of our neo-Byzantine Saint James Bibles, which are to be much preferred over the rest. Among English translations of the Bible, the King James Version stands as the leader of the pack, so why should we adopt another version, and thereby take, what at best, is second best?

Matt. 16:8a "unto them" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek, "*eipen* (he said) *autois* (unto them)," is supported by the majority

Byzantine text e.g., Codices E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century), F 09 (*Codex Boreelianus*, 9th century), G 011 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century), H 013 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century), U 030 (*Codex Nanianus*, 9th century), V 031 (*Codex Mosquensis*, 9th century), and Gamma 036 (*Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus*, 10th century); and Minuscule 2 (12th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*dixit* (he said) *illis* ('unto those [ones],' i.e., 'unto them')" in old Latin Version a (4th century); and as Latin, "*dixit* (he said) … *ad* (unto) *illos* (those [ones],' i.e., 'them')," in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century).

However, a variant omitting Greek, "*autois* (unto them)," and so simply reading, Greek, "*eipen* (he said)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century), S 028 (10th century), and X 033 (10th century). This omission is further found as Latin, "*dixit* (he said)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and ancient church Latin writer, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370).

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

Was this an accidental omission? At Manuscript Washington (W 032), we see at the same page as Matt. 16:8, that the last word of Matt. 16:18 on this page, "*lego* (I say)," protrudes four letter spaces. Moreover, in Manuscript Alexandrinus (A 02, Byzantine Gospels, incomplete) we find that on a number of occasions in the Gospels, that the last letters of words are made smaller near the end of the line to help right hand justify the column of a two column page e.g., column 2 of the page 27b containing Matt. 26:46-26:73. Did one of these two possibilities occur in a given manuscript with "*autois* (unto them)" at the end of a line, with the consequence that its loss by a paper fade went undetected by a later copyist?

Was this a deliberate omission? Its probable origins with Origen make this a stronger possibility. Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, prune away "*autois* (unto them)," as a "stylistic improvement" to "remove unnecessary wordage" and create "a more succinct text"?

A deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that it is an omission from the original text.

On the one hand, the Received Text's reading has good support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading. It can be shown to have existed through time and over time back to ancient times, for it is found in the 300s A.D. in old Latin Version a. But on the other hand, the variant is found in the Vulgate, some other ancient manuscripts, and in a couple of ancient church writers. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 16:8a, a middling "B" (in the range of 69% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 16:8a, "he said unto them," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); Minuscule 1071 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Version; and the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Version. It is also found in Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic as, "*dixit* (he said) *eis* (unto them)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect reading which omits "unto them," and simply reads, "he said," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al.* Hence at Matt. 16:8a, the American Standard Version reads, "and Jesus perceiving it said," etc. (ASV). The erroneous omission is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

But fact is sometimes stranger than fiction. On this occasion, it seems the presence of the TR's reading in both the Syriac Curetonian and Egyptian Bohairic Versions, together with its witness in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04, led to some neo-Alexandrians wanting to exercise their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm. Thus for the wrong reasons, the right reading was adopted by the NEB and TEV.

Matt. 16:8b "ye have bought no" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter.

The comments I here make are based on my study of St. Matthew's Gospel, with the aid of both my facsimile copy of W 032 and Swanson's very useful listing of manuscript readings and textual apparatus. I have not looked beyond St. Matthew to the rest of the NT, and so comments I make such as e.g., "Less commonly in W 032," or "a minority scribal tradition, which is more pronounced in W 032 than in some other manuscripts," *infra*, should be understood to be made both inside the limits of St. Matthew's Gospel, and also inside the limits of those manuscripts whose knowledge I here have from Swanson's textual apparatus.

Manuscripts sometimes have their own characteristic peculiarities. When I first considered Matt. 10:8, and I first saw in W 032 *egeiretai*, I simply thought it was a present indicative middle (deponent middle voice acting as an active voice), 3rd person singular, from *eigeiro* i.e., "he raises" as opposed to the TR's reading, "ye raise (*egeirete*, present active imperative, 2nd person plural, from *eigeiro*)." I did not consider it in the detail, *infra*. Though it struck me as a change to the text, we know that scribes sometimes alter things,

their standard varies, and at the time to me   the main thing was that it was clear that Manuscript Washington (W 032) used *eigeiro* at Matt. 10:8.   For my immediate purposes at Matt. 10:8 that was the significant thing, i.e., it was clearly a reading in some way supporting the TR.   Hence I did not investigate the matter in the greater depth that I subsequently have.

But I have now read over more of the Matthean Byzantine text sections of *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), and it seems that my initial assumption that at Matt. 10:8 the "*etai*" suffix on *eigeiro* indicated a present indicate middle (deponent, active), 3rd person singular verb at Matt. 10:8, was in fact incorrect.   Going back more generally over W 032, I have now found a number of instances in it, where a 2nd person plural *ete* (or equivalent e.g., *sete* in the TR's subjunctive active first aorist verb of Matt. 5:46; or commentary at Matt. 20:7; see Appendix 3 on Matt. 19:28a) suffix of the TR i.e., "ye," becomes in W 032 an *etai* suffix. In other words, the final epsilon (e) becomes and alpha (a) iota (i) (e.g., Matt. 3:2,9; 5:14,44,46; 6:8,14,15,19,20,25,28,31,33; 7:1,2,6,7,12,15,23; 8:26; 13:14,18; 18:18, *et al*).

E.g., in Matt. 13:17 we read, "For verily I say unto you, That many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which *ye see* (TR, *blepete*, indicative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *blepo*; W 032, *blepetai*), and have not seen them; and to hear those things which *ye hear* (TR, *akouete*, indicative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *akouo*; W 032, *akouetai*), and have not heard them" (AV).   Or at Matt. 16:2 we read, "…When it is evening, *ye say* (indicative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *lego*; W 032, *legetai*) … ."

Or using the same word, "*echete* (ye have)," found in the variant of Matt. 16:8b, *infra*, we read at Matt. 6:1, "… otherwise *ye have* (TR, *echete*; W 032, *echetai*) no reward … ."   Or at Matt. 16:8-11, which includes the passage we are here considering of Matt. 16:8b, we read, "… Jesus … said unto them, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because *ye have brought* (TR, *elabete*, indicative active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *lambano*; W 032, *elabetai*) no bread?   Do ye not yet understand, neither *remember* ('remember ye,' TR, *mnemoneuete*, indicative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *mnemoneuo*; W 032, *mnemoneuetai*) the five loaves of the five thousand, and how many baskets *ye took up* (TR, *elabete*; W 032, *elabetai*)?   Neither the seven loaves of the four thousand, and how many baskets *ye took up* (TR, *elabete*; W 032, *elabetai*)?   How is it that *ye do* not *understand* (TR, *noeite*, indicative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *noeo*; W 032, *noeitai*) …?"

Swanson's textual apparatus says that at Matt. 16:2, the "*legetai*" reading of W 032 is also found in Byzantine Codices E 07 (8th century) and H 013 (9th century).   Or at Matt. 16:8,9, the "*elabetai*" and "*mnemoneuetai*" readings of W 032 are both also found in Minuscule 2 (12th century, Byzantine).   Or at Matt. 6:10, the "*elabetai*" reading of W 032 is also found in Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century, Byzantine).   Such usage is also found outside the Byzantine Greek textual tradition, e.g., we find that at Matt. 16:2, the "*legetai*" reading of the Byzantine Text's W 032, also appears outside the closed class of sources in the Western Greek Text's D 05 (5th century).

Less commonly in W 032, it goes the other way, and a suffix ending in alpha (a) iota (i), becomes an epsilon (e) in W 032.   E.g., at Matt. 19:9 Christ says, "… Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, *committeth adultery* (TR, *moichatai*, indicative passive present, 3rd person singular verb, from *moichao*; W 032 *moichate*); and whoso marrieth her which is put away *doth commit adultery* (TR, *moichatai*;

W 032 *moichate*).” Thus *moichatai* (TR) twice becomes *moichate* (W 032), but the contextual meaning is evidently the same. Outside the closed class of sources, the Alexandrian Text’s London Sinaiticus also uses *moichate* twice here at Matt. 19:9.

Therefore it would seem that in a minority scribal tradition, which is more pronounced in W 032 than in some other manuscripts where a scribe also sometimes followed this tradition, in a 2nd person plural suffix (“ye”) ending with epsilon (e), the final epsilon (e) becomes an alpha (a) iota (i), and *vice versa*. Thus the “e” and “ai” endings were regarded as interchangeable. I regard this as an unfortunate development since it means that at e.g., Matt. 10:8, *supra*, what *prima facie* looks to be a present indicative middle 3rd person singular verb, *egeiretai* (W 032), “he raises,” is in fact a present active imperative, 2nd person plural, equating, *egeirete* (TR), “ye raise[65].”

Similar issues also sometimes arise in Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, Sydney University) and 1968 (1544 A.D., Sydney University).   E.g., in Lectionary 1968 the “*e*” suffix of “*oudepote* (never)” in, “Charity (love) *never* faileth” (I Cor. 13:8, AV), becomes an “*ai*” suffix with “*oudepotai*.”   Or as referred to in this commentary at Matt. 17:21, in Lectionary 2378 the “*ai*” suffix of “*ekporeuetai* (it goeth out),” in “Howbeit this kind *goeth* not *out* but by prayer and fasting” (AV), becomes an “*e*” suffix with “*ekporeuete*.”

Given the confusion that this inter-changeability of “e” and “ai” on a suffix generates, it might be reasonably asked why anyone would want to do it?   The answer appears to be found in the issue of local dialect Greek pronunciation.

E.g., in ancient documents of Egyptian Greek, there are a number of interchanges between *ai* (alpha-iota) and *e* (epsilon)[66]. It would seem that in some parts of the ancient Greek speaking world, the “ai” sound in a suffix came to be pronounced the same as “e” (epsilon).   Thus e.g., the scribe of W 032 was evidently not thinking in terms of formal Greek grammar in the wider Greek speaking world, but in terms of phonetic sound as Greek was spoken in ancient Egypt i.e., how *it sounds in Egypt* not *how it reads in the wider Greek speaking world*.   Since to his ears the two sounded the same, like other Greek speaking ancient Egyptians, he used them interchangeably. (Cf. commentary at Matt. 20:23b.)

This also raises some interesting hypothetical questions.   Did the scribe of W 032 copy from one written manuscript to another?   Or did one scribe dictate to him, and another scribe write that which was dictated?   If the latter occurred on even some occasions, then this may account for a number of different spelling variants as accidental, rather than deliberate changes.   Alternatively, if a scribe was copying from one manuscript to another, then the spelling changes were deliberate from a scribe who thought “it did not matter” since “they were both pronounced the same anyway,” and “that’s the way we do it in Egypt.”   He may have seen it as some kind of “desirable local dialect modification.”

---

[65] A complicating factor is that this is a general, not absolute rule in W 032, see the reference to W 032 in “Principal Textual Discussion” at Matt. 16:2,3.

[66] Horrocks, G., *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*, Longman, London, England, & New York, USA, 1997, p. 63.

On the one hand, even though such Byzantine texts as e.g., W 032, E 07, and H 013, *supra*, sometimes make this change, *once this confusing spelling variant has been unravelled*, it turns out that this is not a change to meaning. Thus compared to the more prodigious changes to the text that one finds in the Western Text and Alexandrian Text, this is a relatively minor change. It should also be said that, *as far as I am aware*, this change is limited to a relatively small number of Byzantine manuscripts.

Moreover, while *two wrongs do not make a right*, it must be said that this scribal alteration is also found on some occasions outside the closed class of sources in both the Western Text (e.g., Matt. 20:4, "Go ye;" TR, *Ypagete*, imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *upago*; = D 05, *Ypagetai*) and Alexandrian Text (e.g., Matt. 13:12, "it shall be given" = "shall be given," AV; TR, *dothesetai*, indicative passive future, 3rd person singular verb, from *didomi*; = London Sinaiticus, *dothesete*), and elsewhere e.g., the mixed text type Codex, C 04 (Matt. 20:22, "ye ask," TR, *aiteisthe*, indicative middle present, 2nd person plural verb, from *aiteo*; = C 04, *aitisthai*, in this instance also showing a spelling variant of iota / "i" for epsilon + iota "ei").

But on the other hand, I consider that *on this issue*, Byzantine scribes such as those of W 032 or E 07, or their predecessor scribes whom they were copying from, possibly from Egypt, *were too complacent* about the need to preserve God's Word *without alteration*. I am unaware to what extent this interchange was used in general, though it clearly existed outside of 5th century Egypt's W 032, being found to some extent in Lectionary 2378 from 11th century Constantinople, and in Lectionary 1968 from 16th century Cyprus. We preserve an archaic form of English in our King James Bibles because it is more accurate; and it seems to me that these scribes should likewise have acted to ensure that they perfectly preserved the original text in its pure Greek form. If that meant using the non-local dialectic form of Greek, i.e., standard NT Koine Greek, then in my opinion that is what they should have done.

If the consequence of that was that those in 5th century Egypt (W 032), 11th century Constantinople (Lectionary 2378), 16th century Cyprus (Lectionary 1968) or anywhere else, had to learn the difference between their local dialect and standard Greek on *ai / e* interchanges, then so be it. They should have learnt those differences, just like the OT Hebrews had to learn Aramaic to understand parts of the OT, or we have to learn English archaisms to understand parts of our Authorized Version Bibles. They should have realized that suffixes are very important in Biblical Greek, that changing an *e* ending to an *ai* ending makes the Greek manuscript *prima facie* look like it is using quite a different declension, and therefore it was an unwise spelling variant, one that could lead to unnecessary confusion. Moreover, if the change was due to these endings being homophones, those listening to the manuscript being read would not have known the difference anyway, and so the matter would have been largely an issue for the more educated scribal elites who were literate and writing out these manuscripts.

Hence unlike those who would simply see this as "an innocuous adaptation to a local dialect," or "a normative permissible spelling variation of no consequence," my own view is that these scribes were negligently lax on this matter, and in the longer term, accordingly responsible for the creation of unnecessary confusion over the text of Scripture. The importance of different suffixes in Greek, and the fact that some 2nd person plural suffixes were made to look like 3rd person singular suffixes, or *vice versa*, in my opinion should have given these scribes cause for serious pause and reflection about what they were doing.

I consider they needed to think carefully about the words of Christ, who made it clear that the preservation of Scripture includes everything right down to "one jot or one tittle" (Matt. 5:18).   In saying this, I remind the reader that while we neo-Byzantines have an overall very high view of the Byzantine scribes and Byzantine textual tradition, we sometimes find that a textual problem in the representative Byzantine text requires that some repair work be done to it from either the Latin textual tradition or the records of church writers, especially, although not exclusively, ancient church writers.   Hence I consider this issue at hand here at Matt. 16:8b *et al*, is simply a proof positive example of the fact that Byzantine scribes sometimes left something to be desired in their level of scribal professionalism.

We know from the presence of the notoriously bad Alexandrian School of scribes who produced the Alexandrian text, that ancient Alexandria in Egypt was some kind of "free'n'easy going" environment for a lot of scribes.   The Alexandrian School of scribes clearly had a "lay-back," "near enough is good enough" attitude.   Seemingly, something of this complacent and lax attitude, also rubbed off onto the Byzantine School of scribes at Alexandria, albeit at a radically reduced level, but nevertheless still evident in this practice of vowel interchanges found in W 032.   We need to remember that our standards should not be determined by the world, but by God's Book.   It is not good enough to say, "We'll I'm pretty good compared to these horrible sinners all round me."   We need to constantly check our standards by God's laws, not man's, and not "pat ourselves on the back" for not being "as other men are" around us.   Rather, looking to God's perfect standard, we need to recognize our imperfections, and cry out to God for "mercy" and grace, not just to be saved (Luke 18:11,13), but also to live victorious Christian lives.   Justification is important (salvation); but so is sanctification (holiness of living).   Thus e.g., the Ten Commandments have multiple roles, being important for the initial isolation of sin leading to repentance and justification by faith through the gospel (I Tim. 1:8-11); but they also have a role in sanctification for the believer after his justification (Rom. 13:8,9).

But lest my comments here be misinterpreted, let me hasten to add that the Byzantine text scribes were so far ahead of the Greek Western text scribes or Alexandrian text scribes or other non-Byzantine Greek text scribes, that these latter three groups of Greek scribes are simply not even in the race.   Any criticisms we neo-Byzantines would make of the Byzantine scribes, and of course, it was only a small minority of Byzantine scribes who made these *ai / e* interchanges, pales into insignificance compared to the criticisms we would make of the non-Byzantine Greek scribes.   Moreover, we cannot doubt that as a package deal, Matthew 1-28 and Luke 8:13-24:53 in W 032 (5th century) are jewels of the Byzantine text, *for which reason in this commentary I am specially featuring W 032 in Matt. 1-28 and Luke 8:12-24:53*.   I say this, not to excuse the complacency and laxity sometimes found among some Byzantine text scribes, but rather to contextualize it into the bigger picture in order to prevent misinterpretation.   For one truth, taken selectively, and used to deny another truth, is an abuse of truth, that makes "the truth" an "untruth," and is potentially most dangerous.

Hence the working hypothesis that I shall now proceed on is that quite commonly either the scribe of W 032 or the predecessor scribe whose manuscript line he was copying from, and less commonly among some other scribes, such as those of our two Sydney University Greek Lectionaries 2378 and 1968, the "ai" and "e" suffix endings were used inter-changeably, probably on the basis that they were oral homophones in the local dialect of

Greek that he spoke. In doing so, without warrant such scribes set aside the formal rules of wider Greek grammar, thus causing unnecessary confusion by their complacency in maintaining the pure Word of God without alteration, addition, or subtraction. Their *raison d'etre* thus appears to have been conforming the text of Scripture to regionalized Greek forms found in their local dialect of Greek. Thus these negligently lax scribes altered the text of Scripture. I again draw the reader's attention to my qualifications, *supra*. I am prepared to revisit, review, and revise this working hypothesis, or any elements of it, if receipt of further relevant information so warrants it[67].

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting).

Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron *prima facie* follows the variant at Matt. 16:8b, reading, Latin, "*habetis* (ye have)." That neo-Byzantine Latin jewel featured in the gospels of this commentary, the Sangallensis Diatessaron, is a Latin Vulgate Codex, and indeed all the codices of the Vulgate are neo-Byzantine jewels; even though on this particular reading here at Matt. 16:8b, it must be admitted that the Vulgate and most old Latin Versions are "rough diamonds" when compared to the finely polished and beautiful neo-Byzantine Greek jewels found in the Matt. 16:8b reading of the representative Byzantine Greek diamonds. Although to this it must be added that here at Matt. 16:8b, old Latin f is also a finely polished and beautifully glistening diamond. The Latin Vulgate has this same reading at both Matt. 16:8b and Mark 8:17. Since one cannot be sure if Matt. 16:8b was modified to the Mark 8:17 reading as part of Diatessaron formatting, no reference is made to of the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron is a dispensable document. We can take it or leave it. Like other documents outside the closed class of sources, it has no impact on our determination of the neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus*. Ciasca's rendering also reads in the later 19th translation of the earlier Arabic, Latin, "*habetis* (ye have)." Similar issues here arise, and so in the section dealing with manuscripts outside the closed class of sources, no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 16:8b, the TR's Greek, "*ouk* (no) *elabete* ('ye have brought,' indicative active second aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *lambano*)," in the clause, "ye have brought no bread," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, *elabetai*) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*accepistis* ('ye have brought,' indicative active perfect, 2nd person plural verb, from *accipio*)," in old Latin version f (6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant reading Greek, "*ouk* (no) *echete* ('ye have,' indicative active

---

[67] E.g., to date I have only read in detail the readings of Lectionaries 2378 and 1968 in Matt. 1-20 passages. Thus my general impression that this occurs, but with much less frequency in these two lectionaries, is largely although not exclusively, based on this limited sample of Matt. 1-20 readings. Therefore further study of them may change this picture.

present, 2nd person plural verb, from *echo*),"   making the clause, "ye have no bread," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 1604 (13th century).   It is further followed as Latin, "*habetis* ('ye have,' indicative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *habeo*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is also followed by the ancient church Latin writer, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct.   Indeed, there is a strong textual argument in favour of the representative Byzantine reading here.   For in Matt. 16:7,8 we read, "And they reasoned among themselves, saying, It is because *we have taken* (*elabomen*, indicative active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *lambano*) no bread.   Which when Jesus perceived, he said unto them, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because *ye have brought* (*elabete*, from *lambano*) no bread?"   Since those here first reason, "*we have taken* (*elabomen*, from *lambano*) no bread," it most naturally follows that Christ would then say, "why reason because *ye have brought* (*elabete*, from *lambano*) no bread?"

The origins of the variant are speculative.   Was this an accidental change?   If e.g., in a continuous script manuscript, the end of one line read, "*elab*" and the start of the next line read "*ete*;" then after a paper fade / loss of the first line which had come to look something like, "*e::*," it may have been "reconstructed" to "*ech*."   Since the right hand side of the page was generally not right-hand justified with great precision, the difference in letters may not have mattered in the scribe's mind.   Hence the variant, "*echete*," may have been arisen as a scribal "reconstruction."   If so, the scribe was in all likelihood influenced by the "parallel gospel account" in Mark 8:17, which reads, "Jesus … saith …, Why reason ye, because *ye have* (*echete*) no bread?"

Was this a deliberate change?   Did a scribe undertake a "stylistic improvement," in which he sought to "harmonize" Matt. 16:8b (*elabete*, 'ye have brought') with Mark 8:17 (*echete*, 'ye have'), by "assimilating" the Marcan reading to the Matthean one?   A deliberate or accidental change?   We cannot be certain.   But we can be certain that this variant was a change to the original text.

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, and though it has the support of one old Latin version, in broad terms it manifests the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*.   It also has the support of a few ancient writers, including, St Chrysostom, and on this occasion, the fact that both stylistic analysis and the representative Byzantine text supports the reading, means that its support from Origen acts as a further proof of its antiquity.   Though the variant has the support of the Vulgate and most Latin versions, together with an ancient writer; these considerations are amply negated by the textual argument specifically in favour of the TR's reading.   Taking these factors into account, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 16:8b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 16:8b, "ye have brought," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1071 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further followed by the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century).

However the incorrect reading, "ye have," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century), Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Version; Armenian Version (5th century); and Georgian "2" Version (5th century).

The strength of the textual argument in favour of the TR's reading, coupled with the fact it is followed in the Syriac versions, was enough for the correct reading to be adopted in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). But the paper-tiger strength of the two leading Alexandrian texts, and further support, including the Western Text, was enough for the incorrect reading to be adopted in Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

The deep divisions among neo-Alexandrians on Matt. 16:8b, are further seen in the fact that on the one hand, the Committee on the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions took the view that, "there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text" i.e., the variant in the main text, "or the apparatus" i.e., the TR for the same sort of reasons as referred to at Tischendorf, *supra*, "contains the superior reading." But on the other hand, with a change of UBS Committee, the Committee on the UBS 4th revised edition (1993) were so cock-sure about the variant that they included it without any footnote alternative.

Further reflecting these type of divisions, for the wrong reasons, the right reading was adopted by the Moffatt Bible and New English Bible, although the incorrect reading was then adopted in the revised NEB, known as the Revised English Bible (REB). E.g., at Matt. 16:8b Moffatt reads, "*you have brought* no bread." By contrast, the incorrect reading at Matt. 16:8b is found in the ASV as, "*ye have* no bread." The erroneous reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, and Roman Catholic's JB and NJB. Like the UBS 4th revised edition, none of these neo-Alexandrian versions so much as provide a footnote referring to the TR's reading.

We neo-Byzantines have done battle at this spot before. The bloodstains of old

sword battles between Protestants and Papists have left their lasting stain here on the ground, at Matt. 16:8b. We have trod this battle-ground, and wielded the Sword of the Lord here afore. Translating from the Latin as found in the Clementine Vulgate, the old Latin Papists' Douay-Rheims Version reads at Matt. 16:8b, "*you have* (Latin, *habetis*) no bread." The neo-Byzantines rejected this reading when in the 16th century they rejected the Western Greek Text as unreliable and outside the closed class of providentially preserved sources. Yet here at Matt. 16:8b, most of the neo-Alexandrians now seek to do that which neither the Latin Papists nor Western Greek text scribes could ever do, namely, to strike down the reading found in the Protestant's hated neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus*, and render it ineffectual.

But like the old Latin Papists who formerly fought us here at Matt. 16:8b, or the old Western Greek text scribes coming afore them, the modern neo-Alexandrians coming after them, cannot succeed. For "if any man will hurt" "the two candlesticks" of the Old and New Testaments, "fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth" him (Rev. 11:5). The glory of victory goes to God, *for there is power in the Word*; and so it is God who strikes down those who seek to strike down his Word! Though both olden time Western text scribes, olden time old Latin Papists, and new time neo-Alexandrians all seek to do battle with the Received Text here at Matt. 16:8b, our neo-Byzantine answer is same. It is the answer given in the Latin Motto of the Lutheran Reformation drawn from I Peter 1:25, *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!* (The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever!)

Matt. 16:11b "that ye should beware" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Outside the closed class of sources, Tischendorf's 8th edition says the Syriac Curetonian Version follows the TR's reading; whereas Nestle-Aland's 27th edition says it follows *Variant 2*. Thus no reference is made to the Syriac Curetonian Version, *infra*.

The Second Matter. Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic is, "*sed* (but) *ut* (to) *caveatis* ('beware,' subjunctive active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *caveo*)." On this occasion, I think one would need direct access to the Arabic to meaningfully see which reading, if any, the Arabic Diatessaron is following. As one who is neither familiar with Arabic, nor has any interest in Arabic nor the many other tongues of manuscripts outside the closed class of sources, on this occasion, no reference is made to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), *infra*.

It matters not, for all those non-Byzantine Greek and non-Latin manuscripts that are outside the closed class of NT sources were not providentially protected by God, over time and through time, with reasonable accessibility to them or to their general text type. We look at them not for guidance in discovering the Received Text of the NT, but merely to see whether or not they did or did not accurately translate from a TR reading on a given occasion. At the end of the day, *we can take 'em or leave 'em*, it simply does not matter. They have no impact whatsoever on the NT text of Holy Scripture.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 16:11b, the TR's Greek, "*prosechein* ('to beware,' active present infinitive, from *prosecho*)," in the reading, "*ou* (not) … *eipon* (I said) *umin* (to you) *prosechein* (to beware) *apo* (of) *tēs* (the) *zumēs* (leaven)" etc., in the verse, "How is it that ye do not understand that I spake (*eipon*) it not (*ou*) to you (*umin*) concerning bread, *that ye should beware* (*prosechein*) of (*apo*) the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees?" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, Washington, D.C., USA), E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century, Basle / Basel, Switzerland), K 017 (*Codex Cyprius*, 9th century, Paris, France), X 033 (*Codex Monacensis*, 10th century, Munich, Germany); together with Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark, Paris, France) and 2 (12th century, Basle / Basel, Switzerland).

However, *Variant 1* reads, Greek, "*prosechete* ('beware,' imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *prosecho*) *de* (but)," making the verse, "How is it that ye do not understand that I spake it not to you concerning bread? *But beware* of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees." This is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

A second reading, *Variant 2*, similar to *Variant 1* but lacking the "But (Greek, *de*; Latin, *autem*[68])," of *Variant 1*, is found as Latin, "*Cavete* ('Beware,' imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *caveo*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further found as Latin, "*Attendite* ('Beware,' imperative active present, 2nd person plural verb, from *attendo*)," in old Latin versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also found in the ancient church Latin writer, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370).

A third reading, *Variant 3*, first reads, Greek, "*ou* (not) … *eipon* (I said) *umin* (to you) *prosechein* (to beware)" (TR) and then reads, Greek, "*prosechete* (beware) *de* (but)" (*Variant 1*) etc. . This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century).

A fourth reading, *Variant 4*, similar to *Variant 3* but lacking the "But (Greek, *de*; Latin, *autem*)," of *Variant 3*, is found as Latin, "*adtendere* ('to beware,' active present infinitive, from *adtendo*) *Attendite* (Beware)," in old Latin version q (6th / 7th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct. Indeed, there is a good contextual argument in favour of it here. We read in Matt. 16:11,12, "How is it that ye do not understand that I spake it *not* (*ou*) to you concerning

---

[68] Latin, "*autem*," is a postpositive conjunction, and so if one was rendering this as a separate sentence with "*autem*," it would have to read Latin, "*Cavete* (Beware) *autem* (but)," since postpositive words cannot be used as the first word of a sentence. (Such a Latin rendering would preserve the Greek word order of the variant.) Of course, there are other non-postpositive Latin conjunctions that might also be used e.g., *sed* (but) or *at* (but) (although because *at* expresses a difference more emotively than *sed*, differences of opinion may emerge as to its appropriateness here) (Wheelock's *Latin*, pp. 14,34,71,126).

bread (*artou*), *that ye should beware* (*prosechein*) of (*apo*) the (*tēs*) leaven (*zumēs*) of the (*tōn*) Pharisees (*Pharisaiōn*) and (*kai*) of the Sadducees (*Caddoukaiōn*)? Then understood they how that he bade them not (*ou*) *beware* (*prosechein*) of (*apo*) the (*tēs*) leaven (*zumēs*) of bread (*artou*), but of the doctrine of the (*tōn*) Pharisees (*Pharisaiōn*) and (*kai*) of the Sadducees (*Caddoukaiōn*)" (AV). The four disputed readings in Matt. 16:11,12 that all have the support of the representative Byzantine text with no good textual argument against them, namely, "bread (*artou*)" (Matt. 16:11a[69]), "beware (*prosechein*)" (Matt. 16:11b), "the (*tēs*) leaven (*zumēs*)," and bread (*artou*)" (Matt. 16:8, for last two see commentary at Matt. 16:8, *infra*), if taken together as the four correct readings, are like a bundle of four sticks, which when tied together have a greater combined strength making them even more solid that they would have been individually. This is not a case of making four weak TR readings strong, but rather, of making four strong TR readings into super-strong readings.

What is that combined super-strength? Simply this. It is clear that the words of Matt. 16:12 are quite a literal quote from Matt. 16:11, and so this enhances the likelihood that as in the four representative Byzantine Greek readings, i.e., "bread (*artou*)" (Matt. 16:11a), "beware (*prosechein*)" (Matt. 16:11b), "the (*tēs*) leaven (*zumēs*)," and "bread (*artou*)" (Matt. 16:8), these individual words are therefore also part of this quoting. This then acts as an internal stylistic confirmation in favour of the TR's reading in all four instances. Now (even if some dispute this logic for *artou* by making it on *both* occasions, *artōn*, nevertheless,) for our purposes here at Matt. 16:11b, this is a powerful argument in favour of the representative Byzantine reading, since were it anything other than the infinitive "*prosechein* (to beware)," it would be the only major word change referred to that was not part of what is on all other occasions quite a literal quote in Matt. 16:12 of Matt. 16:11. Thus the reading of the imperative, "*prosechete* (beware)" clangs on the ears as bad contextual Greek.

The origins of the variants are conjectural.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental alteration? If "*prosechein* ('to beware,' infinitive)," came at the end of a line, and due to a paper fade or loss looked something like, "*prosechē::*," then it might have been "reconstructed" by a scribe as "*prosechete* ('beware,' imperative)." If so, the scribe probably did so with reference to Luke 12:1, "*Beware ye* (*prosechete*, imperative) *of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy*" (AV). If so, the scribe evidently then considered that he should also add in a "*de*" on the semi-intellectual grounds that "*prosechete* ('beware,' imperative) *de* (but)," is "Matthean Greek" as "seen by the usage of it" at Matt. 10:17, "*prosechete* (beware) *de* (but) *apo* (of) *tōn* (-) *anthrōpōn* (men)." If so, the scribe was very selective, since we find that "*prosechete* (beware)" clearly does not have this addition at Matt. 6:1 (TR); 16:6.

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate alteration? Its probable origins with Origen make this a higher probability. Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, first confuse Matt.16:11b and Luke 12:1 as "parallel gospel readings"? Did Origen then undertake the "stylistic improvement" of assimilating the "*prosechete* (beware)" of Luke 12:1 to Matt. 16:11b, in order "to

---

[69] At Matt. 16:11a, a minority Byzantine reading e.g., M 021 (9th century) & S 028 (10th century), substitutes the TR's and representative Byzantine's Greek reading, "*artou* ('bread,' singular)," for "*artōn* ('bread,' plural)." See Appendix 3 at Matt. 16:11a.

harmonize" these two readings? Did Origen then add the "*de* (but)" after "*prosechete* (beware)" on the basis that Matt. 10:17 "compels the conclusion that this is the Matthean Greek form"? Did Origen then compliment himself on his "great brain"?

Was Latin *Variant 2* originally in the Greek? Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration? Did a scribe using a *Variant 1* manuscript, fail to detect a paper fade of so small a word as "*de* (but)"? Was *Variant 2* a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe remove "*de* (but)," perhaps as part of translation in the case of the Latin manuscripts, on the basis of "redundancy"?

Variants 3 and 4 are clearly conflations. *Variant 3* conflates the readings of the TR and *Variant 1*, whereas *Variant 4* conflates the readings of the TR and *Variant 2*. Why did any scribe consider that such a confusing and clumsy conflation was a "stylistic improvement" that "solved the problem" of the diverse ("divers," AV) readings?

Were *Variants 1 & 2* deliberate or accidental changes? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that all four variants were changes to the original text of Scripture.

On the one hand, the Received Text's reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading. This Greek reading both dates from ancient times (W 032) and is favoured by textual analysis, *supra*. But on the other hand, all the variants, which in one way or another appear to be derivatives of what is probably Origen's original *Variant 1*, were clearly followed in ancient times, and are found e.g., in the Vulgate and Latin textual tradition. Hence *prima facie*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading here at Matt. 16:11b a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

However, when we bear in mind that all the variants appear to be derivatives from Origen's original *Variant 1*; and when we take into account the general unreliability of Origen, whose vacillating standard varies from very good to very bad and everything in between; when coupled with the fact that textual analysis clearly shows a positive argument in favour of the TR's reading; then this acts to cancel out these factors of support for the variants. The TR's reading is clearly attested to in ancient times (and while this is not necessary for its adoption, it does enhance the rating on the A to E scale since it means one can show preservation of the reading more comprehensively over time and through time). Therefore on this occasion we can reasonably have a higher level of certainty about this reading. Hence on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 16:11b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 16:11b, "that ye should beware (infinitive, 'to beware')" is found in Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; and Armenian Version (5th century).

Variant 1, "Beware (imperative) but," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in

(the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 2, "Beware (imperative)," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Version; and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

Variant 3, "to beware (infinitive, from TR); beware (imperative) but (last two words from *Variant 1*)," is found in Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type).

At Matt. 16:11b, the erroneous *Variant 1*, "But beware," entered the NU Text *et al.* Hence the American Standard Version reads, "How is it that ye do not perceive that I spake not to you concerning bread? But beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (ASV). The incorrect *Variant 1* is also found at Matt. 16:11b in the NASB and NIV.

Prima facie, *Variant 2*, which lacks the "But" of *Variant 1*, is found at Matt. 16:11b in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, NEB, REB, TEV, and TCNT, together with the Papists' JB and NJB. E.g., the TCNT reads, "How is it that you do not see that I was speaking about bread? *Be on your guard* against the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees." However, given the clear neo-Alexandrian preference for *Variant 1* in the neo-Alexandrian Greek texts, *supra*, it seems likely that some, if not all of these neo-Alexandrian versions, are in fact following *Variant 1* here. But they are such loose, liberal, and imprecise versions, that their "translators" would think nothing about not translating the "But." Are these loose, liberal, neo-Alexandrian versions, following *Variant 1* or *Variant 2* here? We do not know for sure. We can only guess. But we are not alone in this neo-Alexandrian generated confusion. For guessing at what the underpinning Greek is here meant to be, is likewise all that their benighted followers who use these versions can do. When contemplating these neo-Alexandrian versions, they, like us, are left to exclaim, "Vanity of vanities, … all is vanity" (Eccl. 1:2).

But methinks I have heard of these neo-Alexandrian protests against the *Textus Receptus* afore. Elzevir's textual apparatus (1624) refers to *Variant 1* (Gospel manuscript i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17). And consider the words of the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version, translated from the Latin here at Matt. 16:11b. "Why do you not understand that it was not concerning bread I said to you: Beware (Latin, *Cavete*) of the leaven of the Pharisees and the Sadducees?" (Douay-Rheims). This *Variant 2* reading from the old Latin Papists, reads like most of the neo-Alexandrian versions, *supra*, and like the remaining neo-Alexandrian versions of the NASB and NIV which follow *Variant 1*, it supports the usage of the imperative, "Beware," over the TR's usage of the infinitive, "to beware."

Does the protest against the Received Text here at Matt. 16:11b, come in the Douay-Rheims Version from the apostate "lady" (or church) (II John 2) of Rev. 17:5 i.e., the Roman Church, which teaches an "other gospel" (Gal. 1:8,9) than, "The just shall live by faith" (Gal. 3:11), and which also commits idolatry in "adoration" of the sacramental bread, Mariolatry, and other things?   Or does the protest against the Received Text here at Matt. 16:11b, come in one of the neo-Alexandrian texts or versions, from neo-Alexandrians in a number of apostate "lady" churches (II John 2) i.e., the spiritual daughters of this "mother" (Rev. 17:5), being those who give her spiritual recognition (II John 10,11), and so partake of her spiritual "fornication" (Rev. 17:2)?   For we see those apostate Protestant neo-Alexandrians of the NU Text Committee are in the "ecumenical" compromise with Papists such as Cardinal Martini, who together with Metzger and Aland was a Committee member of the contemporary NU Text.   Doth the protest here at Matt. 16:11b come from the old Latin Papist "lady" or some apostate Protestant-Papist allied neo-Alexandrian "lady"?   Either way, in the words of Shakespeare, "Methinks" "the lady protests too much" (*Hamlet*, Act III, Scene 2, Line 240).

Matt. 16:12 "the leaven of bread" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

If *Variant 2* were the only major concern at Matt. 16:12, then it might be discussed where Matt. 16:11a is, to wit, in Appendix 3.   But whereas English translation dispute of Matt. 16:11a is relatively limited in the neo-Alexandrian versions, finding its way into an erroneous American Standard Version footnote which is also replicated at Matt. 16:12; by contrast, the greater dispute over Matt. 16:12 is not simply limited to *Variant 2*.   This is evident in e.g., both Tischendorf (*Variant 4*) and the Moffatt Bible (*Variant 3*), *infra*, and compels me to consider this variant in the main part of the textual commentary.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 16:12, the TR's Greek, "*tou* ('of the' = 'of,' masculine singular genitive, definite article from *o*) *artou* ('a loaf' or 'bread,' masculine singular genitive, noun from *artos*)," in the wider words, "*tēs* (of the) *zumēs* (leaven) *tou* (of) *artou* (bread)," in the verse, "Then understood they how that he bade them not beware *of the leaven of bread*, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, Washington, D.C., USA); the magnificently illuminated purple parchment, Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century, Rossano, Italy); and the purple parchment with attractive silver writing and golden illumination, O 023 (*Codex Sinopensis*, St. Matthew's Gospel, 6th century, Paris, France).   It is also supported as Latin, "*panis* ('of a loaf' or 'of bread,' masculine singular genitive, noun from *panis*)," in the wider words, "*a* (of) *fermento* (the leaven) *panis* ('of a loaf' or 'of bread,' masculine singular genitive, noun from *panis*)," in old Latin Versions f (*Codex Brixianus*, 6th century), q (*Codex Monacensis*, 6th / 7th century), and c (*Codex Colbertinus*, 12th / 13th century).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writer, Gaudentius (d. after 406).

However, *Variant 1* omits Greek, "*tēs* (of the) *zumēs* (leaven)," and reads, "*ton* ('of the' = 'of,' masculine plural genitive, definite article from *o*) *artōn* ('loaves' or 'bread,'

masculine plural genitive noun, from *artos*).” This reading is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254). It is also found, omitting Latin, “*fermento* (the leaven),” and reading, “*a* (‘of,’ preposition with an ablative, from *a*) *panibus* (‘loaves’ or ‘bread,’ masculine plural ablative noun, from *panis*),” in old Latin Version e (Africa, 4th / 5th century).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, is Greek, “*tes* (of the) *zumes* (leaven) *ton* (‘of,’ plural) *arton* (‘loaves’ or ‘bread,’ plural).” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionaries 292 (9th century), 514 (10th century), 1552 (985 A.D.), 387 (11th century), 48 (1055 A.D.), 211 (12th century), 184 (1319 A.D.). It is further found as Latin, “*a* (of) *fermento* (the leaven) *panum* (‘of loaves’ or ‘of bread,’ masculine plural genitive, noun from *panis*),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

Yet another reading, *Variant 3*, omits what on reconstruction of the Latin with reference to the TR’s reading is Greek, “*tou* (of) *artou* (bread),” and reads simply, “*tes* (of the) *zumes* (leaven).” This is found, omitting Latin, “*panis* (of bread,’ singular),” and reading simply, “*a* (of) *fermento* (the leaven),” in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), and ff2 (5th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Latin writer, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370).

Yet another reading, *Variant 4*, is Greek, “*tes* (of the) *zumes* (leaven) *ton* (of the) *Pharisaion* (Pharisees) *kai* (and) *Caddoukaion* (Sadducees).” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 185 (11th century), which contains Matt. 16:12 on more than one occasion, with the readings differing from each other on different occasions, so that this Lectionary contains a multiplicity of different readings for Matt. 16:12, of which this reading is only one. It is also found as Latin, “*a* (of) *fermento* (the leaven) *Pharisaeorum* (of the Pharisees) *et* (and) *Sadducaeorum* (the Sadducees),” in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. As discussed at Matt. 16:11b, *supra*, there is a good stylistic argument in favour of this reading. That it because Matt. 16:12 looks in all undisputed areas to be a quite literal quote of Matt. 16:11. Hence the internal stylistic balance created in broad terms, means that in particular terms one would expect to read, Greek, “*tes* (of the) *zumes* (leaven) *tou* (of) *artou* (bread)” in Matt. 16:12, because of the mirror-image words in Matt. 16:11 of Greek, “*artou* (bread) … *tes* (of the) *zumes* (leaven).” On the one hand, this is not a textual argument that can be used against *Variant 2* when “*arton* (‘loaves’ or ‘bread,’ plural)” is used in both Matt. 16:11,12; so that in this instance we rest primarily on the fact that there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is “*artou* (‘bread,’ singular).” But on the other hand, this argument of stylistic balance in the context of what is clearly quite a literal quote of Matt. 16:11 in Matt. 16:12, is a powerful phalanx for demolishing *Variants 1,3, & 4* (in the case of *Variant 4* since the double repetition of “the Pharisees and Sadducees” is incongruous with this stylistic balance).

The origins of the variants are speculative.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental change?   E.g., was the original, "*te̲s* (of the) *zume̲s* (leaven)," of, "*te̲s* (of the) *zume̲s* (leaven) *tou* ('of,' singular) *artou* ('bread,' singular)," first reduced by ellipsis to, "*te̲s* (of the)," when the eye of a copyist jumped from the "*e̲s*" (eta, sigma) ending of "*te̲s* (of the)" to the "*e̲s*" (eta, sigma) ending of "*zume̲s* (leaven)"?   If so, did a subsequent scribe then remove the "*te̲s* (of the)" as "the bumbling error of a former scribe"?   As a consequence of a paper fade, did the remaining and original "*tou* (of) *artou* (bread)" look something like, "*t::: art::*," so that this was then "reconstructed" by a scribe as *Variant 1's* "*to̲n* ('of,' plural) *arto̲n* ('bread,' plural)"?

Alternatively, due to a very obvious paper loss / damage, did the original, "*te̲s* (of the) *zume̲s* (leaven) *tou* ('of,' singular) *artou* ('bread,' singular)," simply appear as a long hole in a piece of parchment?   If so, did a scribe, unclear about what he should do, "reconstruct" this "from context" as simply, "*to̲n* ('of,' plural) *arto̲n* ('bread,' plural)," possibly with some reference to the "*arto̲n* ('bread,' plural)" of what he considered to be some kind of "gospel Greek" (Mark 4:4; Luke 15:17; John 6:13)?   In Manuscript Washington (W 032) there is a stylistic paper space of about 2 letter spaces after "*artou* (bread)," and before the "*alla* (but)" of the next clause, "but (*alla*) of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees."   Did a scribe see the gap created after his "reconstruction" as simply a longer form of such a stylistic paper space as one finds in W 032?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change?   Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, decide that the "*te̲s* (of the) *zume̲s* (leaven)," of, "*te̲s* (of the) *zume̲s* (leaven) *tou* ('of,' singular) *artou* ('bread,' singular)," was "unnecessary wordage," and that "a more concise rendering that omits the redundant '*te̲s* (of the) *zume̲s* (leaven)' was to be preferred"?   Having first "pruned away" the "*te̲s* (of the) *zume̲s* (leaven)," did this arrogant scribe then further conclude that "to complete" his "stylistic improvements," he should change the singular "*tou* (of) *artou* (bread)," to the plural form, "*to̲n* ('of') *arto̲n* (bread)," on the basis that at Matt. 16:8-10 a plural form of "bread" is found in Christ's words, "ye have brought no bread (*artous*, masculine plural accusative noun, from *artos*)" (Matt. 16:8), "the five loaves (*artous*)" (Matt. 16:9), and "the seven loaves (*artous*)" (Matt. 16:10)?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental change?   Due to a paper fade of loss, did the original "*te̲s* (of the) *zume̲s* (leaven) *tou* ('of,' singular) *artou* ('bread,' singular)," look something like "*te̲s zume̲s ::: art::*"?   If so, did a scribe then "reconstruct" this as, "*te̲s* (of the) *zume̲s* (leaven) *to̲n* ('of,' plural) *arto̲n* ('loaves' or 'bread,' plural)"?   If so, was he influenced in this "reconstruction" by knowledge of *Variant 1*, or did he guess at a plural "reconstruction" on the basis of the plural form "*artous* (bread)" at Matt. 16:8-10 (thrice), *supra*?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change?   Did a scribe make a "stylistic improvement" by changing the singular "*tou* (of) *artou* (bread)," to the plural form, "*to̲n* ('of') *arto̲n* (bread)," on the basis of the plural form "*artous* (bread)" at Matt. 16:8-10 (thrice), *supra*?

Was Latin *Variant 3* originally in the Greek?   Was *Variant 3* an accidental change?   E.g., was the original, "*tou* ('of,' singular) *artou* ('bread,' singular)," of, "*te̲s* (of the) *zume̲s* (leaven) *tou* ('of,' singular) *artou* ('bread,' singular)," first lost by a paper fade?   Did a subsequent scribe, simply conclude that this was "a stylistic paper space," and so "close the gap" in his copy.   Did the subsequent scribe make such a conclusion because his own competence left something to be desired?   Or was it because the latter scribe concluded that the competence of "the former scribe," who had left so large "a stylistic paper space," left

something to be desired?

Notably, in Manuscript Washington (W 032), one sometimes finds serious parchment / paper damage going though the entire leaf of the page. It was evidently present when the scribe wrote the script, since he avoids the large space, writing each side of it (e.g., Matt. 21:7 on p. 75 and Matt. 21:15 on p. 76). Here at *Variant 3*, did a latter scribe conclude that a former competent scribe had left such a space for such a necessary reason, and that a subsequent less competent scribe had then just kept this as a "stylistic paper space"?

Was Latin *Variant 3* originally in the Greek? Was *Variant 3* a deliberate change? Did a scribe make a "stylistic improvement" by removing "the unnecessary and redundant wordage of '*tou* (of) *artou* (bread)'," in order "to produce a more succinct and improved text"?

Was *Variant 4* an accidental change? In Manuscript Washington (W 032), one sometimes finds that the scribe has added words in a sidenote that he accidentally omitted (e.g., Matt. 2:17; 7:17). If due to evident damage, the original, "*tes* (of the) *zumes* (leaven) *tou* ('of,' singular) *artou* ('bread,' singular)," coming at the end of a line, had come to look something like, "*tes zumes::::::*," with the rest of the right-hand side near this also missing due to damage, did a scribe conclude that "some missing words were probably written as a side-note." If so, did he then "reconstruct" these at Matt. 16:12 as, "*ton* (of the) *Pharisaion* (Pharisees) *kai* (and) *Caddoukaion* (Sadducees)," on the basis that at Matt. 16:11 one reads of, "*tes* (of the) *zumes* (leaven) *ton* (of the) *Pharisaion* (Pharisees) *kai* (and) *Caddoukaion* (Sadducees)"?

Was *Variant 4* a deliberate change? In view of the presence of the words, "*tes* (of the) *zumes* (leaven) *ton* (of the) *Pharisaion* (Pharisees) *kai* (and) *Caddoukaion* (Sadducees)" at Matt. 16:11, did a scribe regard it as a "stylistic improvement" to "perfectly replicate this same terminology" at Matt. 16:12? If so, he failed to appreciate that this then created a double repetition of "the Pharisees and Sadducees," which is incongruous with the stylistic balance of Matt. 16:11,12, *supra*.

Were *Variants 1,2,3, & 4* accidental or deliberate changes? There can be no clear resolution to such questions about largely unknown scribal copyists whose characters and competences we can only guess at. But we can make a clear textual resolution in favour of the representative Byzantine reading here at Matt. 16:12, and that is clearly the more important thing to firmly resolve.

On the one hand, the reading of the *Textus Receptus* has solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument. The reading has clear support in ancient times from the eastern bishop, Archbishop John Chrysostom (Archbishop of Constantinople, 398 to 407), and his friend (Chrysostom's Epistle 184[70]), the western bishop, Bishop Gaudentius (Bishop of Brescia / Brixia, northern

---

[70] St. Chrysostom in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1858-60 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 52, pp. 715-716 (Epistle clxxxiv, To Gaudentius Bishop of Brixia, *c.* 406) (Greek with an accompanying Latin translation).

Italy, *c.* 387 to *c.* 410).   But on the other   hand, neither the Vulgate, nor a number of old Latin versions, nor some ancient church writers, support the TR's reading.   *Prima facie* on the system of rating textual readings A to E, this would give the TR's reading at Matt. 16:12 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

But closer scrutiny must modify this *prima facie* rating.   Though *Variant 2* has the support of the Vulgate and a few later old Latin Versions, this is amply counterbalanced by the TR's support from Greek Manuscript Washington (W 032) and both Archbishop Chrysostom in the Greek, and Bishop Gaudentius in the Latin, together with a few later old Latin Versions.   This factor does not raise the TR's *prima facie* rating above a "B," but it creates a parity of neutralizing factors of a type and kind, that means that if some additional argument can be reasonably advanced in favour of the TR's reading over *Variant 2*, then the rating of the TR with respect to *Variant 2* may be increased.

The support for *Variant 1*, though ancient, is meagre, and comes from a source whose standard varies considerably, in Origen.   Though *Variant 3* has some ancient support, and *Variant 4* some limited support, at the end of the day, the textual argument against *Variants 1,3, & 4*, *supra*, acts to further heighten the case against them.   This factor means that the rating of the TR with respect to *Variants 1,3, & 4* may be reasonably increased.   The fact that *Variant 2* looks like it was in some way influenced by Origen's erroneous *Variant 1*, also acts to further diminish the credulity of *Variant 2*.   This factor means that the rating of the TR with respect to *Variant 2* may also be reasonably increased.

Weighing up the effect of these factors which act to further diminish the credulity of *Variants 1,2,3, & 4*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 16:12 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 16:12, "the leaven of bread (*artou*, singular)," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century).   It is also found in Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century).   It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; as well as the Georgian "A" Version (5th century); Slavic (Slavonic) Version (9th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

Variant 1, "of the bread (*art<u>on</u>*, plural)," is found in Minuscule 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.

Variant 2, "of the leaven of bread   (*art<u>o</u>n*, plural)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); together with Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 157 (independent, 12th century).   It is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 3, "of the leaven," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscule 565 (9th century, independent); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and the Georgian "1" (5th century) and "B" (5th century) Versions.

Variant 4, "of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is also found Minuscule 579 (mixed text, 13th century); and the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century).

With the two major neo-Alexandrian texts split between *Variants 2 & 4*, and external support from the Western Text for *Variant 3*, and yet other support outside the closed class of sources for different variants, the neo-Alexandrian texts have been in a state of perpetual confusion, disagreement, and uncertainty.

A curious mix of *Variant 2 & 3* are found in both Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952), which places "*t<u>o</u>n* ('of,' plural) *art<u>o</u>n* ('bread,' plural)" in square brackets, thus making its inclusion or exclusion entirely optional.   Hence both Westcott & Hort as well as Erwin Nestle, allow equally for either *Variant 2* or *Variant 3*.

The UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), all place *Variant 2* in their main text.   But of this variant, the UBS 4th revised edition Committee, i.e., the NU Text Committee (for there is the same NT Greek text in Nestle-Aland's 27th ed. & UBS's 4th revised ed.), says with regard to the TR's reading and all five variants (*Variant 5* from the neo-Alexandrian's "queen of minuscules," is referred to in the next paragraph), that they "had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text."   And the UBS 3rd and 3rd corrected editions Committee says with regard to the TR's reading and all five variants in their textual apparatus, "that there is a very high degree of doubt concerning the reading selected for the text."

Variant 4 entered Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72).   This is perhaps best accounted for on the basis that he was overly fond of his "discovery" of London Sinaiticus, since even on faulty neo-Alexandrian principles, the reading is fairly poorly attested to. However, Tischendorf seeks to bolster the marginal support that exists for *Variant 4* by qualified reference to Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type), which reads, "*t<u>e</u>s* (of the) *zum<u>e</u>s* (leaven) *t<u>o</u>n* (of the) *Pharisaion* (Pharisees)" (*Variant 5*).   (The textual argument against *Variants 1,3, & 4*, *supra*, is also applicable to *Variant 5*.)

At Matt. 16:12, *Variant 2* is adopted in the American Standard Version, which reads, "of the leaven of bread," and a footnote says at "bread," "Gr. 'loaves'" (ASV ftn.). Though there is no such footnote alerting the reader to the fact that the plural form "of (*t<u>on</u>*) bread (*art<u>on</u>*, plural)," is being used, given their reliance on neo-Alexandrian texts, *Variant 2* is evidently the preferred reading also in the neo-Alexandrian versions of the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

On the one hand, these modern time neo-Alexandrian versions thus remind we neo-Byzantines of our olden time debates with the Latin Papists, who through reference to the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version also claimed that Matt. 16:12 reads, "the leaven of bread (Latin, *panum*, plural)" (Douay-Rheims & Clementine Latin). But on the other hand, there is no necessary English translation difference between those following the TR and AV here and those following *Variant 2*. Thus with the exception of the ASV footnote at Matt. 16:12 (and Matt. 16:11a), the matter, though important, has largely been one of a more esoteric debate. (Cf. Appendix 3 at Matt. 16:11a.)

The first edition of the religiously liberal, *New English Bible* (NEB 1st ed., 1961), here makes a translation at Matt. 16:12 that was jettisoned by the religiously liberal NEB (2nd ed., 1970) and its religiously liberal successor the REB (1989). Although the NEB (2nd ed.) and REB could be taken to follow either *Variant 2* or *3* depending on how one interprets their dynamic equivalents and non-italicised words, in their darkened minds, they probably were here struggling to convey the idea that they wanted to follow *Variant 3*, but doing so in a way that makes the English sound more like *Variant 2*. The net effect of this type of NEB and REB approach, is that for those looking to seriously study the matter relative to the Greek, the NEB and REB have the struggling clarity of a mentally retarded child.

The NEB (1st ed.) could be interpreted as following either *Variants 2, 3* or *4*, depending on how one interprets their non-italicized words, and how one interprets the origins of their dynamic equivalents. Though trying to reach into the confused minds of the NEB (1st ed.) translators and work out their perverse logic is a painful thing, on the balance of probabilities I would guess that they here preferred *Variant 3*, but deliberately played around with the English in such a way as to give something to those who preferred *Variant 2* or *4*. The NEB (1st ed.) is thus even less clear than the NEB (2nd ed.) and REB.

Those sadly misguided people who think this NEB (1st ed.) policy, or NEB (2nd ed.) and REB policy a good thing, may praise the NEB and REB translators here for being "crafty fellows." By contrast, those who do not think this is a good thing, and prefer the straightforward clarity of a literal translation such as the AV, may criticize the NEB and REB translators here for being "crafty devils," who were "too smart by half," in that their craftiness simply creates confusion. Either way, we can agree that the NEB and REB translators here were quite "crafty." Thus they remind me of the Old Testament prophet Daniel's words, spoken in the 6th century B.C., as in Daniel chapter 8 the prophet looked forward in time over the centuries with the prophetic telescope to when in the 160s B.C., Antiochus Epiphanes would reek havoc on the sanctuary in Jerusalem. Describing him, Holy Daniel said, "And through his policy … *he shall cause craft to prosper* in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart" (Dan. 8:25).

Variant 3 is adopted by the religiously liberal Moffatt Bible. At Matt. 16:12, Moffatt

reads, "Then they realized that what he told them to beware of was not *leaven* but the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees." Moffatt then adds this footnote at "leaven," "Omitting *t<u>on</u>* [the] *art<u>on</u>* ['bread,' plural] after *zum<u>e</u>s* [leaven], with strong support from the Old Latin and Syriac versions, as well as from [the Western Text's] D and [the mixed text type] Theta" (Moffatt Bible ftn.).

Upon finding that the OT "Jews … had married wives of Ashdod" and elsewhere (Neh. 13:23), Holy Nehemiah "separated from Israel all the mixed multitude" (Neh. 13:3), and ethnically "cleansed" the land "from all strangers" (Neh. 13:30). Hence in the *double entendre* of the Hebrew, it was simultaneously said of their mixed race leader (who typifies and personifies his wider group), "a bastard shall dwell in Ashdod" (Zech. 9:6, AV & ASV), and of the mixed race that came from the mixed marriages, "a bastard race shall dwell in Ashdod" (Zech. 9:6, ASV ftn). For in God's law if the marriage is invalid, the descendants are bastards (Deut. 5:9; 23:2).

So too, religious liberals such as the NEB translators and Moffatt here at Matt. 16:12, intermingle that which should not be intermingled. They take parts of the Word of God which are true and inspired, but then, via their religious liberalism, intermingle them with extraneous things that are not part of God's Word. Men like the NEB translators and Moffatt might seek to prey upon church people, I regret to say, with some success, when there is no neo-Byzantine textual analyst in the land to give a specific textual rebuttal to their claims. But the people of God are still protected in the interregnum by their trusting faith in God's providential protection of the *Textus Receptus*. For this they know, *nothing can happen to a true believer in Christ, unless God either permits it, or directs it*.

Nevertheless, it appertaineth to the purity of God's holy Word in the church, that when a neo-Byzantine textual analyst passes through the land, enquiry be made of those who have subverted the truth of the Received Text, and that their offences be examined, and old scores be settled by dealing with the matters they have raised in greater detail. On the upside, Moffatt accurately renders the sense of the Hebrew *mamzer* as "bastard" at Deut. 23:2, and captures one element of its multiple shades of meaning in his translation "a half-breed race" at Zech. 9:6 (Moffatt Bible). But on the down-side, in his intermingling of truth and error, Moffatt badly distorts Scripture here at Matt. 16:12 and elsewhere. Even as Holy Nehemiah cast out the half-castes that came from the mixed marriages, so too we must cast out half-breed versions such as e.g., the New English Bible, Revised English Bible, and Moffatt Bible.

Matt. 16:13 "I" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The reader is reminded of the principles I state in Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface (s. 2 & s. 5), where I state that the Latin Vulgate I use is that of Wordsworth & White (1911). Hence I refer to the variant as "Jerome's Latin Vulgate," *infra*, and the TR's reading in "Vulgate Codices," *infra*. But this is simply a matter of following the established standard form used in this commentary. It does not mean that I am passing a judgment on which is "the true Vulgate reading," from the rival Vulgate codices; although in this particular instance at Matt. 16:13, the fact that e.g., we know Jerome followed the variant elsewhere, means that there is a reasonable possibility, though not a definite certainty (since

the same writer sometimes cites more than one reading), that *Variant 2a* was the original Vulgate reading.

The Second Matter.   I do not think one can safely say what the underpinning word order was in translations of the TR or *Variant 1*, and there being no difference in English translation between the two, I show all such translations as following the TR.   The same policy is adopted for *Variant 2* in which I do not consider one can safely use translations to distinguish *Variants 2a & 2b*, since word order can easily change as part of the act of translation.

The Third Matter (Diatessaron formatting).   Inside the closed class of sources, in the Vulgate's readings at Mark 8:27 and Luke 9:18 Christ refers to himself as Latin, "*me* (I)." Therefore even though the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron *prima facie* includes "*me* (I)" in its usage of Matt. 16:13, one cannot be sure as to whether this is due to the fact that it was using a Vulgate manuscript line following the TR at Matt. 16:13, or whether due to Diatessaron formatting it is brought in from Mark 8:27 and Luke 9:18.   Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, similar issues mean I make no reference to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), which in translation of the Arabic, also contains the Latin, "*me* (I)."

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 16:13, the TR's Greek, "*me* (I)," in the words of Christ, "*Tina* ('Whom,' word 1) *me* ('I,' word 2) *legousin* ('they say' = 'say,' AV, word 3) *oi* (-, literally, 'the' = redundant in English translation, word 4) *anthrōpoi* ('men,' word 5) *einai* ('to be,' word 6, active infinitive from *eimi* = 'am,' AV) i.e., "Whom do men say that I (*me*) the Son of man am?" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), O 023 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported with no difference in English translation in word order 1,3,2,4,5,6, in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) (*Variant 1a*).   It is also supported as Latin, "*me* (I)," in Vulgate Codices J (*Foroiuliensis*, 6th / 7th century), O (*Oxiensis*, 7th century), Z (*Harleianus*, 7th century), L (*Lichfildensis*, 7th / 8th century), T (*Toletanus*, 8th century), B (*Bigotianus*, 8th / 9th century), E (*Egertonensis*, 8th / 9th century), and R (*Rushworthianus*, 8th / 9th century); and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century).   It is the most probable reading by the ancient church Greek writer, Adamantius (d. 4th century), where stylistic and contextual factors do not permit complete certainty.   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Epiphanius (d. 403), Chrysostom (d. 407), Severian (d. after 408), Marcus-Eremita (d. after 430), (in 3 of 6 references) Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), and Theodotus-Ancyra (d. 5th century).

However, another reading, *Variant 2*, omits word 2, "I (Greek, *me*; Latin, *me*)."   This is found as *Variant 2a* in word order, 1,3,4,5,6 as a minority Byzantine reading in Lectionary 1353 (9th century).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), and (in 2 of 6 references) Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).   With no difference in English translation, *Variant 2* is found as *Variant 2b* in word order, 1,4,5,3,6 in the ancient church Greek writer,

(in 1 of 6 references) Cyril of Alexandria (d.   444).   *Variant 2* is further found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   *Variant 2* is also found in the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420); and the early early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

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

Was *Variant 1a* an accidental change?   In *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), we find that a word is sometimes left out, and then realizing his mistake, the scribe adds it back in as a sidenote showing its correct location (e.g., Matt. 7:17).   E.g., at Matt. 24:2, we find that a short Greek word, "*ode* (here)," was accidentally left out, and realizing his error in time, the scribe then inserted the word in the space between the lines, thus showing its correct position. This factor may also account for some changes in word order.   I.e., did a scribe, with a manuscript from the scribe of W 032 or one in its predecessor line, first accidentally omit the short word, "*me* ('I,' word 2)," and then realizing his error, simply put it back in after word 3 on the basis that "the meaning is still the same"?

Was *Variant 1a* a deliberate change?   Did a scribe here make "a stylistic improvement," in which in his strange mind he thought that "the force of '*me* (I),' is grammatically heightened when the reader first hears, '*legousin* (they say)'"?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental change?   Was *Variant 2a* lost as an undetected paper fade, in which it was either taken to be a stylistic paper space designed to help better right-hand justify the page; or possibly coming at the end of a line was not so detected?   Did a scribe copying out *Variant 2a* in word order, 1,3,4,5,6, perhaps suffering from fatigue, first miss word 3, then after he had written word 5 suddenly realize his mistake, and then reinsert word 3 on the basis that "the meaning was still the same," thus giving rise to the word order of *Variant 2b* as 1,4,5,3,6?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change?   Did the scribe of *Variant 2a*, probably Origen, deliberately omit word 2, '*me* (I),' on the basis that it was "unnecessary wordage and so redundant?"   Did the scribe of *Variant 2b*, deliberately place words 4 and 5, "the (*oi*) men (*anthropoi*)," after word 1, "Whom (*Tina*)," for "stylistic reasons" in which he thought "it sounds better to first place the subject of the sentence, 'the men,' before the direct object of the sentence, 'the Son of man'"?   If so, was the scribe of *Variant 2b* working from a manuscript reading *Variant 2a*, or did he additionally remove word 2, '*me* (I),' on the basis that it was "unnecessary wordage and so redundant?"

Were these deliberate or accidental changes?   We simply do not know.   But we do know that these were changes to the original reading, providentially preserved for us in the representative Byzantine reading, against which there is no good textual argument.

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading.   It can be shown to date from ancient times with a number of ancient church writers, and the basic reading is found in *Variant 1a* from ancient times also.   The reading also has good support in the Latin from ancient times, and a number of Vulgate Codices further support it.   The fact that Cyril of Alexandria refers to *Variants 1a,2a, & 2b*, reminds us that

there were both orthodox scribes and unorthodox scribes at Alexandria, and that the good and bad can be intermingled in the church at the same time. This same reality is further brought out in the fact that a number of Vulgate Codices also follow *Variant 2a*. *Variant 2b* looks like it was a modification of *Variant 2a*, which can be traced to Origen, whose general scribal quality exhibits erratic traits. Nevertheless, if it clear that Jerome and a number of Vulgate Codices followed *Variant 2a*.

Taking into account the TR's strong support in both the Greek and Latin manuscripts, together with a number of ancient church writers, and the fact that *Variant 2* looks suspiciously like it originated as the handiwork of Origen, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 16:13 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 16:13, "I," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is further found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found as *Variant 1b* in word order 1,2,3,6,4,5, in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. The reading of the TR or *Variant 1* is further found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); and Armenian Version (5th century).

Variant 2, which omits the "I," is found as *Variant 2a* in word order, 1,3,4,5,6 in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is also found as *Variant 2c* word order 1,4,5,6,3, in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found as *Variant 2b* in word order, 1,4,5,3,6 in Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). *Variant 2* is also found in the Syriac Palestinian Version (*c.* 6th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Ethiopic Versions (Rome, *c.* 500; Pell Platt edition; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 2 is found at Matt. 16:13 in the word order of *Variant 2a*, i.e., word order 1,3,4,5,6, in the NU Text *et al*.

The neo-Alexandrians think they have some kind of crushing textual argument against the TR' Greek, "*me* (I)," at Matt. 16:13, on the basis that different manuscripts place it in different positions coupled with its presence in Mark 8:27 and Luke 9:18 (Metzger's *Textual*

Commentary, 1971, p. 42; 2nd ed., 1994, p.   34).   With respect to their second argument, it is true that assimilations can occur (see e.g., my comments on the Sangallensis Diatessaron at "Preliminary Textual Discussion," *supra*).   But the neo-Alexandrians here (and elsewhere) great abuse this concept by harnessing it to the concept in their first argument.

Their first argument means that they add insult to injury, since if for reasons of accident or unwarranted design, enough scribes are prepared to fiddle with or fudge a reading, the neo-Alexandrians then hail this as some kind of proof against the original TR's authenticity.   Thus the more a passage has been maligned in the past, whether by accident or design, the more readily the neo-Alexandrians are prepared to "jump on the band-wagon" and also attack it.   *Such is the folly of neo-Alexandrian "textual analysis" principles.*

And here I also note that under strict scrutiny they apply these neo-Alexandrian principles with great arbitrary selectiveness indeed, for their preferred *Variant 2* is found in three different word order forms.   Yet they do not, on that basis, then conclude that *Variant 2* is unreliable on the basis of their first argument, *supra*.   They do not further harness this to their second argument, *supra*, and claim that because the word order in Mark 8:27 is 1,2,3,4,5,6, "therefore the word order" of *Variant 2a*, less word 2, "was assimilated from Mark 8:27."   Rather, they assert that *Variant 2a* should be adopted.   *Such is the folly of neo-Alexandrian "textual analysis" principles.*   Their silly neo-Alexandrian "textual analysis" rules for determining the Greek, are not the linguistic rules for determining the tongue of the Europeanized "Greeks" found in the NT, but rather sound like the rules of some uncivilized group of "Barbarians" (Rom. 1:14).   Alas, in general the wild Barbarians have overrun the formal institutions of academia.   In the words of Shakespeare, "O cruel, irreligious piety! Was ever Scythia half so barbarous?" (*Titus Andronicus* I:I:130-131).

The erroneous *Variant 2* is found in the American Standard Version, which at Matt. 16:13 reads, "… Who do men say that the Son of man is?" (ASV), although it refers to the TR's correct reading in a footnote.   This same format is found in the NEB.   But over time, men may become emboldened in their sin.   The incorrect *Variant 2*, *without a footnote reference to the TR's reading*, is also found in the ASV's revisions of the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV; the NEB's revision of the REB; and also the NIV; together with the new neo-Alexandrian Papists' JB and NJB.

These modern neo-Alexandrians in fact are continuing the old debate we neo-Byzantines used to have with the old Latin Papists, whose new neo-Alexandrian Jerusalem Bible and New Jerusalem Bible maintain their old errors here at Matt. 16:13.   I shall not now enter the ongoing debate as to whether or not the "who" / "whom" (objective case) distinction continues to exist in modern English.   Certainly both Greek, *tina*[71], and Latin, *quem*[72], are in the accusative and hence objective case.   And so it was, that with the Clementine Vulgate in one hand, and the Douay-Rheims Version in the other, the old Latin Papists likewise used to say that Matt. 16:13 reads, "…Whom do men say that the Son of man is?" (Douay-Rheims).

Thus on the one hand, neo-Alexandrians say Matt. 16:13 reads, "Who do men say that

---

[71]   *Tina* = Greek masculine singular accusative pronoun, from *tis*.

[72]   *Quem* = Latin masculine singular accusative pronoun, from *qui*.

the Son of man is?" (ASV); and old Latin   Papists say Matt. 16:13 reads, "Whom do men say that the Son of man is?" (Douay-Rheims).   But on the other hand, we neo-Byzantines say Matt. 16:13 reads, "Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?" (AV).

The title, "Son of man," that we here find at Matt. 16:13, is a Messianic title (e.g., Matt. 26:64; John 1:51; 3:13; 6:42,53).   Those in the Babylonian court recognized that "an excellent Spirit was in" the OT prophet Daniel (Dan. 6:3), which in their heathen ignorance they called "the Spirit of the" "gods" (Dan. 4:8,9,18; 5:11,14); but which for those who know that Daniel's "god is a God of gods" (Dan. 2:47), know to be the Third Divine Person of the Holy Trinity, i.e., the "Spirit of the Lord" (e.g., II Sam. 23:2; II Kgs 2:16).   In a 6th century B.C. vision given by the Third Divine Person, the Holy Ghost, to Daniel, he sees the Second Divine Person, "the Son," and the First Divine Person, the Father.   Holy Daniel says, "I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like *the Son of man* came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him" (Dan. 7:13)

Now "Messias" (Messiah), "is, being interpreted, the Christ" (John 1:41), so that "Christ" (Greek *Christos*, "Anointed") means "Messiah" (Hebrew *Maschiyach / Mashiach*, "Anointed," Hellenized to *Messias*).   Hence the word, "Christ," in Article 2 of the *Apostles' Creed*, "I believe … in Jesus *Christ* … our Lord," is among other things, a profession of faith that "Jesus" is the promised OT Messiah ("Christ").   While the broad meaning of Matt. 16:13 may still be apprehended from the Papists' old Douay-Rheims or the neo-Alexandrians modern versions following the faulty variant, its greater clarity is diminished with the unwarranted removal of the "I," where Jesus clearly identifies himself as the Christ by saying, "Whom do men say that *I* (Greek, *me*) the Son of man am?" (AV).   I do not say that at Matt. 16:13 these Latin Papist and neo-Alexandrian versions go so far as to deny this element of Article 2 of the *Apostles' Creed*, but I do say that they act to obscure the clearer meaning of Matt. 16:13 found in the *Textus Receptus* and our King James Versions, which most clearly upholds this great teaching that indeed, Jesus is the "Christ."

Matt. 16:19a "And" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*Kai* (And)," at the beginning of the verse, i.e., "*Kai* (And) *doso* (I will give)" etc., is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is also supported as Latin, "*Et* (And)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339); the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, the "And" (Greek, *Kai*; Latin, *Et*), is absent in a variant.   This variant is found in old Latin Versions d (5th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand.   The origins of the variant are speculative.   Did this variant originate in the Greek, and was then translated into the Latin, or did this variant originate in the Latin?   Did

this variant arise on multiple unrelated occasions, or is the manuscript line of old Latin ff1 influenced either directly from, or through a common ancestor line with, old Latin d? Was this an accidental loss due to an undetected paper fade? Or was this a deliberate change as "a stylistic improvement" removing "the unnecessary wordage" of "a redundant word"?

The reading of the *Textus Receptus* has solid support in the Greek and Latin, and cannot be seriously doubted in any way. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 16:19a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 16:19a, "And," in the words, "And I will give," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h Version (616); and some of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Versions.

However, the variant which omits "And" at the beginning of the verse, is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* The omission is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; some of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Versions; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

At Matt. 16:19a, the erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al.* Thus the ASV reads, "I will give" etc. . So too, the incorrect reading which omits "And," is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Matt. 16:20a "charged he (*diestelleto*)" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The matters raised here might be placed in *Appendices 2* or *3*, although if so, I think it should be *Appendix 3* since the weight of evidence offers no real suggestion that the AV translators followed the variant here. But even though both the TR's reading and the variant may be rendered, "he charged," in harmony with the AV's "charged" at Matt. 16:20a, I have decided to include discussion of this variant here. In doing so, I wish

to make the point that I do not regard   readings placed in the Appendices as unimportant, and the reader should not ignore the readings in the Appendices.   The priority I give to readings which are translated differently into English is a purely arbitrary device I use in order to make these commentaries less lengthy.   At all times, I reserve the right to discuss one of these readings in greater detail, either in one of the Appendices or the main part of the commentary.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting).   Inside the closed class of sources, *prima facie* the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron supports the reading of the TR.   But this is a Vulgate Codex, and at both Matt. 16:20a and Luke 19:21 the Vulgate uses "*praecepit* (he commanded)," so one cannot be entirely certain if this reading was brought in from Luke 19:21 as part of Diatessaron formatting.   Therefore, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt 16:20a, the TR's Greek, "*diesteilato* ('he charged' or 'he commanded,' indicative middle first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *diastell__o__*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, spelling variant, "*diestilato*") and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century).   It is further supported as Latin, "*praecepit* ('he commanded,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *praecipio*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is also supported as Latin, "*imperavit* ('he commanded,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *impero*)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), and c (12th / 13th century).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).   This is the Greek reading found in the 16th century texts of Stephanus, Beza, *et al*.

However a variant, Greek, "*epetim__e__sen* ('he rebuked' or 'he charged,' indicative active first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *epitima__o__*)," is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).   It is also found as Latin, "*increpavit* ('he rebuked,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *increpo*)," in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century); and as Latin, "*comminatus est* ('he threatened,' indicative passive perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *commino*[73])," in old Latin Version d (5th century).

---

[73]   The combination of a perfect passive participle ('threatened,' *comminatus*, masculine singular nominative, perfect passive participle, from *comminor*,) with the verb *sum* ('to be,' here found in *est*, 'he is,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *sum*), is a passive periphrastic conjugation into the perfect passive system.   Hence this *roundabout way* (periphrastic) conjugation makes this an indicative passive perfect, 3rd person singular verb (Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, p. 157).   It thus has the same meaning as *comminatur* (indicative passive perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *comminor*).   The Latin, *comminor*, a deponent verb (passive in form, active in meaning), means *to threaten*, and so the meaning here is, 'he threatened.'   In the Greek, *epitima__o__* may be used as a *rebuke* (Luke 17:3) that stands in *contextual contrast* to the uttering of *threats*, e.g., "this *severe check* caused no repentance within him, but he departed with *bitter threatenings*" (III Macc.

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is thus correct.   Indeed, there is a good argument in favour of the representative Byzantine reading here.

The Greek, *epitimao*, of the variant, is from *epi* meaning "upon" etc.; and *timao* meaning to *value* something.   E.g., in Matt. 27:9 we read, "… And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the *price* (*timen*, feminine singular accusative noun, from *time*) of him *that was valued* (*tetimemenou*, masculine singular genitive, perfect passive participle, from *timao*), whom *they* of the children of Israel *did value* (*etimesanto*, indicative middle aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *timao*)."   When the two are put together in the word, *epitimao*, the Greek cultural thinking is thus literally the idea, to *tax upon* someone, from which derivatively one then gets the idea of *scolding*, or *admonishing*, or *rebuking*, or *commanding* someone.

Hence on the one hand, when in Matthean Greek the meaning of *epetimesen* is "he rebuked," there is a clear contextual reason for the "rebuke."   Thus because "there arose a great tempest" (Matt. 8:24), Christ "rebuked (*epetimesen*) the winds" (Matt. 8:26).   Or "Jesus rebuked (*epetimesen*) the devil; and he departed out of him; and the child was cured" etc. (Matt. 17:18).   Or, "the multitude (*ochlos*, masculine *singular* nominative noun, from *ochlos*) rebuked ('it rebuked,' *epetimesen*) them" (Matt. 20:31).   But on the other hand, the usage of *epetimesen* in the sense of the variant here at Matt. 16:20a, is found at Matt. 12:16 where Christ "charged (*epetimesen*) them that they should not make him known."

The Greek, *diastello*, of the representative Byzantine's reading, is from *dia* meaning "through" etc.; and *stello* meaning to *repress*, from which comes the idea of *avoiding* or *withdrawing oneself.*   When the two are put together in the word, *diastello*, the word means, to *charge* or *command*, but as used in the NT the etymological loading indicates an element of aloofness i.e., as a superior, to some extent contextually distancing oneself from the person he is giving a command to.   Where this background nuance of *diastello* is exploited, as it is in the NT, it makes it a very apt word in those contexts (e.g., Mark 8:15; Acts 15:24; Heb. 12:20).   For our purposes here, let us consider three instances, Mark 5:43; 7:36; 9:9.   (Like Matt. 16:20, the three passages of Mark 5:43; 7:36; 9:9, are instances of *diastello* followed by a negative clause.   Hence they could all be rendered, "he prohibited," *infra*, although this is not necessary, and indeed none of them are so rendered in our AVs.)

E.g., in Mark 5:43 we read of Christ, "*he charged* (*diesteilato*) them straitly that *no man should know it*; and *commanded* (*eipe*, or 'he said,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *lego*) that something should be given her to eat."   The nuance here is that on the one hand, Christ is to some extent *withdrawing himself* when "*he charged* (*diesteilato*) them*," since he is putting a greater distance between himself and "them" i.e., the inner three

_____

2:24, LXX, Pseudepigrapha).   But *epitimao* may also be used with a different sense to mean a *threat*, e.g., "And many *charged* him that he should hold his peace: but he cried out the more a great deal" etc. (Mark 10:48).   Though I think he was wrong to do so here at Matt. 16:20, the Latin scribe of old Latin d, evidently took this meaning of the Greek *epitimao* found in Mark 10:48, to here produce his Latin translation meaning, "he threatened."

disciples of Peter, James, and John (Mark   5:37).   The reason for this seems to be in part to draw attention to Christ's hierarchical position over them as *master* (Matt. 10:24; 26:18; John 13:13); and in part *as an example* for they in turn are to ensure "that no man should know it."   By contrast, he simply "commanded" (AV) or "said" that "something should be given" to "the damsel" "to eat" (Mark 5:42,43), indicating a more relaxed and less hierarchically emphasized command.   I.e., seemingly here (although not necessarily in a different context in which *eipe* is used,) using *eipe* as *a contextually contrasting example* in which they too were to be more proximate in spirit to this damsel in distress, specifically, by giving her something "to eat" (Mark 5:43).

Or in Mark 7:36 we read of Christ, "And *he charged* (*diesteilato*) them that *they should tell no man*, but the more *he charged* (*diestelleto*, indicative middle aorist, 3r d person singular verb, from *diastello*) them, so much the more a great deal they published it."   Those who did this publishing may have thought that they were doing Christ some kind of favour. But Christ was *perfect man*.   He suffered from no sense of false humility.   He who was God incarnate and *perfect man*, did not want news of what he had done to be published at that time, and *his orders should have been obeyed*.   Once again, we find at Mark 7:36 that the nuance of *diastello* is used here, since Christ is putting a greater distance between himself and "them" i.e., "the multitude" (Mark 7:33) who knew of Christ's miracle in opening the ears and loosing the tongue of the deaf'n'dumb man (Mark 7:31-35).   Once again, the reason for this seems to be in part to draw attention to Christ's hierarchical position over them; and in part *as an example* for they in turn are to ensure "that they … tell no man," but also as a reminder that if they do, Christ will be aloof from them in their actions.   Hence when we read, "the more *he charged* (*diestelleto*) them, so much the more a great deal they published it," we also realize that the nuance is that Christ puts a greater distance between himself and them, incrementally correlating to the degree to which they disobey his holy command.   *We do not know better than God, even if someone is silly enough to think he does.   Obedience to God is important, even if we do not understand the reason!*

Or at the Transfiguration (Mark 9:2-10), Christ is again with the inner three disciples (Mark 9:2).   Then in Mark 9:9,10, we read, "and as they came down from the mountain, *he charged* (*diesteilato*) them that *they should tell no man* what things they had seen, till the Son of man were risen from the dead.   And they kept that saying with themselves, questioning one with another what the rising from the dead should mean."   Thus once again, at Mark 9:9 this nuance of *diastello* is aptly used, for Christ is putting a greater distance between himself and "them" i.e., the inner three (Mark 9:2,9); and once again, seemingly in part to draw attention to his hierarchical position over them; and in part as an example for they in turn are to ensure "that they … tell no man" (Mark 9:9).   Here we find in Mark 9:10 that the inner three disciples, Peter, James, and John, were careful to obey Christ's holy command.

Therefore, when we come to Matt. 16:20a, and we read, "Then *charged he* (*diestelleto*) his disciples that *they should tell no man* that he was Jesus the Christ," we find that this usage of "charged he (*diestelleto*)" is within the normative bounds of aptness evident elsewhere in the NT, *supra*.   We find that Christ is here putting a greater distance between himself and "his disciples," and once again, seemingly in part to draw attention to his hierarchical position over them, and in part as an example for they in turn "should tell no man" (Matt. 16:20a).   Given these stylistic features, the usage here of *diastello* is expected and congruous with the nuance evident elsewhere in NT Greek.

Though Matt. 16:20a is *prima facie* similar to Matt. 12:16, it is distinguishable on the basis that one does not have the added emphasis at Matt. 12:16 that they "should tell no man" (Matt. 16:20). Rather, Christ simply "charged (*epetim<u>e</u>sen*) them that they should not make him known" (Matt. 12:16). Without this added level of stylistic emphasis, that they "should tell no man," the lack at Matt. 12:16 of the more aloof and hierarchical term, *diastell<u>o</u>*, is stylistically intelligible and understandable. By contrast, were Matt. 16:20a to use *epitima<u>o</u>* it would clang on the ears as bad Greek in the broader context of NT Greek.

This then raises a pointed question. If the representative Byzantine Greek reading, "*diesteilato* (he charged)," has no good textual argument against it, and indeed a good textual argument in its favour, why then did Origen "correct" the text to the reading he did, *supra*, and Griesbach adopt it, *infra*? Though we cannot be certain, it would seem to me likely that they did so because while St. Matthew uses "*epetim<u>e</u>sen* (he rebuked' or 'he charged')," on a number of occasions (Matt. 8:26; 12:16; 16:22; 17:18; 19:13; 20:31), this usage at Matt. 16:20a is the only time he uses *diastell<u>o</u>*. Hence they presumably concluded that *diastell<u>o</u>* was not Matthean Greek and so brought in from elsewhere in the NT, following a paper fade / loss.

This however is certainly not correct. In the Book of Hebrews, there is only one reference to *diastell<u>o</u>* (Heb. 12:20). Are we to likewise remove it? Absolutely not! Though not common Matthean terminology, the context of Matt. 16:20 makes it appropriate here (and e.g., at Heb. 12:20). Seemingly a deliberate "correction" of the text, first Origen, *supra* and then Griesbach, *infra*, failed to give due consideration to this important issue of the Matthean context at Matt. 16:20, and its associated contextual aptness relative to the wider NT Greek usage of *diastell<u>o</u>*. Rather, they seem to have simply considered the more common usage of "*epetim<u>e</u>sen*" in Matthean Greek, and probably thought it was brought in from Marcan Greek. Since Adam's fall, none of us, Christ except, has ever been perfect, and so unlike Christ we all mistakes. E.g., the great 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines produced revised editions of their NT texts making refinements and corrections. By contrast, both the scope and frequency of the textual errors we find with Origen are *far too common* for us to have any comparable sympathy with him. As for Griesbach, see below.

The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was this an accidental change? As a consequence of a paper fade, did the original "*diesteilato* (he charged)," look something like, "*::e:::i:::::*"? If so, did a scribe then "reconstruct" Matt. 16:20a as "*epetim<u>e</u>sen* (he charged)"? If so, did he do so with reference to the nearby Matt. 16:22, where Christ "began *to rebuke* (*epitiman*, active present infinitive, from *epitima<u>o</u>*)" "Peter"? Or was he influenced by the superficial similarity to Matt. 12:16, *supra*; or "*epetim<u>e</u>sen*" in the "parallel" reading at Mark 8:30?

Was this a deliberate change? Origen refers to both readings, and the variant's probable origins with Origen must increase this probability. E.g., did Origen regard it as a "stylistic improvement," or perhaps "a restoration of the text," to use the more common Matthean word of *epitima<u>o</u>*? If so, to what extent did he make reference to *epitima<u>o</u>* in e.g., Matt. 12:16 and 16:22? Or did he seek to "harmonize" Matt. 16:20a with "*epetim<u>e</u>sen*" in the "parallel" reading at Mark 8:30?

The reading of the TR has strong support in the Greek and Latin. Not only is there no good textual argument against it, there is a good textual argument in its favour. On the

system of rating textual readings A to E, I   would give the TR's reading at Matt. 16:20a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 16:20a, "charged he (*diestelleto*)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).   It is further found in Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent) and 1071 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

However, the incorrect reading, "charged he (*epetimesen*)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).

As noted in the Preface to this Volume (see "*Old Papists & New Papists: The Clementine Vulgate & Neo-Vulgate*"), Tischendorf owed much to Griesbach.   Writing long before Tischendorf's work, the Anglican clergyman, Frederick Nolan said in 1815, "… To the manuscripts of the Alexandrine class … the highest rank is ascribed by … Griesbach; the authority of a few of these outweighing in his estimation that of a multitude of the Byzantine. … To the authority of Origen he however ascribes a paramount weight …; he [Greisbach] has thus formed his Corrected Text of the New Testament" as opposed to "the Received Text."   Frederick Nolan rightly concludes, "in his predilection for the Alexandrine Text, which he [Greisbach] conceives he has discovered in the works of Origen, I am far from acquiescing … ."   (Nolan' *An Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate or Received Text of the New Testament*, London, 1815).

In their more modern form, Griesbach (d. 1812) helped start religiously liberal ideas denying Divine Inspiration by e.g., claiming St. Mark's Gospel was derived from St. Matthew's and St. Luke's Gospels (though later religious liberals have jumped the other way and claimed St. Mark's Gospel was the first one).   He also denied Divine Preservation. Griesbach the "grease-back" was a slippery'n'slimy character who attacked God's Word by trying to introduce its conceptualization through anti-supernaturalist categories of thought. As seen by his adoption of the minority reading here at Matt. 16:20a, which is typical of his more general "skills" (or rather, lack thereof,) of a "textual analyst," he was very much the intellectual inferior of any competent textual analyst, such as those which composed the Received Text.   However, his godless paradigm appealed to the lusts of the secularists and other ungodly, so that in time the seeds of destruction that he helped to sow were more fully evident in the work of Tischendorf who is the father of the Neo-Alexandrian School as we basically know it.   *"Grease-back" is one of the "grease monkeys" of the Neo-Alexandrian School.   We want none of his "monkey-business" monkeying around with the text of*

Scripture!

With such a split in the two major Alexandrian texts, the incorrect variant, "*epetim̲esen* (charged he)," entered the main text of Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952); both of which have footnotes referring to the TR's reading, albeit for the wrong reason that it is followed by London Sinaiticus.   By contrast, for the wrong reasons, the correct reading entered Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), with footnote alternatives to the Rome Vaticanus reading in Tischendorf (as almost always) and Nestle-Aland.

Since both readings may be translated the same, the neo-Alexandrian versions necessarily sound correct in English at Matt. 16:20a.   But given the fact that the *American Standard Version* is based on Westcott & Hort, we are left to wonder what the underlying Greek is meant to be in its reading, "charged he" (ASV).   Similar issues of uncertainty arise with renderings of the RSV, NRSV, and ESV.   Both the NASB and NIV seem to prefer the variant, "*epetim̲esen*."   E.g., the *New American Standard Bible* translates "*epetim̲esen*" as "he warned" in Matt. 16:20 (NASB)[74].

For the wrong reasons, Moffatt here followed the correct reading.   When *diastell̲o* is followed by a negative clause, such as occurs at Mark 5:43, "And *he charged (diesteilato)* them straitly that *no man should know it*" (AV), then it is possible to render it as a prohibition.   Moffatt does this at Mark 5:43, "But he strictly *forbade* them to let anyone know about it" etc. (Moffatt Bible).   (Cf. "Jesus *forbade* them to tell anyone about it," Mark 7:36, Moffatt Bible; and "he *forbade* them to tell anyone what they had seen," Mark 9:9, Moffatt Bible.)   A similar grammatical construction exists here at Matt. 16:20, "Then *charged he (diesteilato)* his disciples that *they should tell no man* that he was Jesus the Christ" (AV); and Moffatt once again renders this as, "He then *forbade* the disciples to tell anyone that he was the Christ" (Moffatt Bible).

The erroneous variant, "*epetim̲esen*," which probably originated with Origen, and which *prima facie* may seem to be consonant with Matthean Greek, has claimed a number of later victims, including such generally bad textual scribes as the Alexandrian text scribe of Rome Vaticanus, and Western text scribe of D 05; together with such generally bad neo-Alexandrian textual analysts as Westcott & Hort or Nestle.   It seems that here at Matt. 16:20a, Origen constructed a carefully spring-loaded and well greased trap door, which if a man, like Griesbach stands on, opens under his weight, and he falls into the pit of error. Next to that trap-door at Matt. 16:20a, we need to clearly erect a sign and write on it these

---

[74]   Both *diastell̲o* (Ezek. 3:18,20,21, LXX) and *epitima̲o* (Mark 8:30) might be used to mean a *warning*, and so the proposition that the NASB and NIV are here following the variant is open to some dispute.   But while I am prepared to revise my working conclusion on the matter if furnished with further information to the contrary, given the split among neo-Alexandrians here, evident in both the usage of "*epetim̲esen* (charged he)" in the main text of e.g., Nestle's 21st edition and the footnote alternative of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition, coupled with the NASB's and NIV's proclivity to render *epitima̲o* as a *warning* in Matt. 12:16, NASB & NIV; Mark 3:12, NASB; Mark 8:30, NASB & NIV; Luke 9:21, NASB & NIV, it seems to me that on the balance of probabilities the NASB and NIV are here following the variant.

words, "WARNING: Origen was here. SCRIBES & TEXTUAL ANALYSTS: BEWARE!!!"

Matt. 16:20b "his disciples" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*autou* (of him / his)," in "*tois* (-) *math<u>e</u>tais* (disciples) *autou* (his)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*discipulis* (disciples) *suis* (his)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

However, a variant omits "his (Greek, *autou*; Latin, *suis*)," and thus reads, Greek, "*tois* (the) *math<u>e</u>tais* (disciples)," or Latin, "*discipulis* (the disciples)." This omission is found in old Latin Version d (5th century). The omission is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are speculative. Was this an accidental omission, lost in an undetected paper fade? Origen refers to both readings, and is the variant's probable originator. Was this a deliberate change as a "stylistic improvement," pruning away "unnecessary wordage" in order to create "a more succinct text"?

The Received Text's reading has strong support in both the Greek and Latin. The variant has weak support in both Greek and Latin, and appears to be the handiwork of Origen, a copyist of most uneven standard, unpredictable integrity, and massive quality swings. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 16:20b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 16:20b, "his disciples," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type, minuscule damaged but at this point reading, "*::utou*," and thus originally, "*autou*"); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in all extant Syriac versions; Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant that omits "his," and so reads, "the disciples," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); and Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and the Armenian Version (5th century).

The erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. But on this occasion, seemingly influenced by e.g., its strong uniform attestation in all Syriac Versions, as well as the Bohairic version, for the wrong reasons, the correct reading was adopted by the TCNT, NEB, REB, TEV, and NIV. But at Matt. 16:20b, the ASV follows the erroneous variant, "the disciples." The incorrect reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and Moffatt Bible.

The Papists here exhibit a decline in accuracy standards following their Vatican II Council (1962-5). The old Latin Papists, using the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version, considered that at Matt. 16:20b the TR's reading was correct, and so accurately read, "his disciples" (Douay-Rheims). But the new neo-Alexandrian Papists, using a neo-Alexandrian text and the RSV Catholic edition, Jerusalem Bible, or New Jerusalem Bible, here adopt the erroneous variant.

Matt. 16:20c "Jesus" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek, "*Iesous* (Jesus)," in the words, "he was Jesus the Christ," is supported by the majority Byzantine text, e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), E 07 (8th century), F 09 (9th century); G 011 (9th century), H 013 (9th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), V 031 (9th century), Y 034 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); and Minuscules 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation), 2 (12th century), and 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles). It is also supported as Latin, "*Iesus* (Jesus)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions d (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and c (12th / 13th century, which places it after, rather than before, "*Christus*"); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century, with alternative spelling, "*Ihesus*"). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

However, a sizeable minority Byzantine reading[75], omits "*Iesous* (Jesus)," making the

---

[75] Neither Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) nor Robinson and Pierpont's *New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform* (1991), regard the variant as sufficiently important to refer to it, and on their general Majority Text principles this means the support for the TR's reading in von Soden's K group is very strong. But while Hodges and Farstad's *Greek NT According to the Majority Text* (1985) says the TR's reading has the stronger support, it also says there is substantial support for the variant, and on their general Majority Text principles most of this would be from Byzantine texts inside von Soden's K and I groups. Going to the source of these three von Soden based aids, von Soden (1913)

reading simply, "he was the Christ." This minority Byzantine reading is found in, for instance, Codices X 033 (10th century) and Gamma 036 (10th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts), 1010 (12th century), 597 (13th century), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); together with Lectionaries 813 (1069 A.D.), 68 (12th century), 673 (12th century), and 1223 (13th century). The omission is further found in some Vulgate manuscripts, and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Ambrose (d. 397).

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

Was this an accidental loss? Notably, in Codex W (W 032), the "*IHCOYC*" is abbreviated (with a line on top where I have a line underneath,) to *IC*. (Though a non-abbreviated form is found in F09; this same abbreviation of *IC* is also found here in E 07, G 011, H 013, K 017, M 021, U 030, Y 034, S 028, and 2. I do not know its form in the other Byzantine references, *supra*.) Especially, although not exclusively, if it was in this abbreviated form, "*IC*," was it lost in an undetected paper fade?

Alternatively, (with a line on top where I have a line underneath,) W 032 reads, "*ICOXC*" i.e., an abbreviated form of "*IHCOYC* (*Iesous*, 'Jesus') *O* (*o*, 'the') *XPICTOC* (*Christos*, 'Christ')." (Though a non-abbreviated form is found in F09; this same abbreviation of *XC* is also found here in E 07, G 011, H 013, K 017, M 021, U 030, Y 034, S 028, and 2. I do not know its form in the other Byzantine references, *supra*.) Therefore, was the "*IC*" lost as the eye of a copyist seeing "*ICOXC*", first moved forward in the line and then back, and in some state of confusion or distraction, as his eye moved back alone the line from right to left, remembering he was "up to the sigma (*C*)," did he then see the "*OXC*" and think that was the spot he was up to, and so wrote this down?

Was this a deliberate change? The variant appears to have originated with Origen. Was this a "stylistic improvement" by Origen? Was he perhaps influenced by some general references in St. Matthew's Gospel to "*o* (the) *Christos* (Christ)" (Matt. 1:16; 2:4; 23:10; 24:5; 26:63); and sought to "bring" Matt. 16:16 "into line" with the relative rarity of the combination of words, "Jesus" with "Christ" in St. Matthew's Gospel (Matt. 1:1,16,18;

---

shows the K group generally supporting the TR here, with one K1 subgroup Byzantine manuscript and the Kr subgroup following the variant. This means that *c.* 190 completely Byzantine manuscripts out of *c.* 914 completely Byzantine manuscripts in the K group i.e., *c.* 21% +/- *c.* 2.1% of the K group, follow the variant. Thus the majority Byzantine text here has *c.* 80% or 4/5ths manuscript support. (On the Kr group, see commentary at Matt. 20:15c, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The First Matter.")

27:17,22)?   Or was Origen perhaps   influenced by the specific reference of Matt. 16:16, "Thou art the (*o*) Christ (*Christos*)" (cf. Mark 8:29)?   Did he think that by pruning away "the unnecessary wordage" of "Jesus" here at Matt. 16:20, that he was thereby "more clearly connecting this" to the earlier words of Matt. 16:16, "Thou art the (*o*) Christ (*Christos*)"?

A deliberate or accidental change?   We simply do not know.   But we do know that it was a change to the original text.

On the one hand, the TR's reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, some good support in the Latin, and the further support of the ancient church fathers and doctors, St. Hieronymus and St. Austin.   But on the other hand, the variant is a sizeable minority Byzantine reading (*c*. 20% or 1/5th of Byzantine manuscripts in von Soden's K group), has some ancient and later Latin support, and is followed by several ancient church writers.   Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 16:20c, a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 16:20c, "Jesus," in the words, "Jesus the Christ," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); and Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century).   It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions, together with a manuscript of the Sahidic Version; the Georgian "1" Version (5th century); some manuscripts of the Slavic Version (9th century); and Ethiopic Versions (*c*. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which omits, "Jesus," and so reads simply, "the Christ," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); together with Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), and 700 (11th century, independent).   It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.*   It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian "2" Version (5th century); some manuscripts of the Slavic Version (9th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

Knowledge of this variant was certainly known to Elzevir, for it is referred to in Elzevir's textual apparatus (1624) (Gospel manuscript w, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 16). But that which was rightly rejected in the neo-Byzantine Received Text, came to be accepted in the neo-Alexandrian texts. The erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al*. (Cf. comments on the Alexandrian scribes at Matt. 16:21, *infra*.) Hence at Matt. 16:20c, the ASV reads simply, "that he was the Christ." The incorrect reading, favoured under flawed neo-Alexandrian rules such as e.g., "the shorter reading is the better reading," is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV (reflecting e.g., its wider Egyptian and Syriac support, with a footnote referring to the TR's reading), ESV, and NIV.

The word "Christ" means "Messiah." The Gospel here at Matt. 16:20c makes it clear that "Jesus" is "the Christ." While this meaning may still be apprehended from general context in the neo-Alexandrian versions, when we have *the full Word of God* found in the Received Text and our Authorized Versions, we find that the Spirit of God has put a special emphasis on this in the close proximity of the words "Jesus" and "Christ" here at Matt. 16:20c, i.e., "that he was Jesus the Christ" (AV). This forms one element "in the apostles' doctrine" (Acts 2:42), set forth for us in Article 2 of the *Apostles' Creed*, "I believe … in *Jesus Christ* … our Lord." Let us not stray from this Gospel truth.

Matt. 16:21 "Jesus" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," in the words, "*erxato* (he began) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," i.e., "began Jesus" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*Iesus* (Jesus)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

However another reading, *Variant 1*, omits "*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," and so reads simply, "he began (*erxato*)." This reading is followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (*c.* 395); and the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. The origins of *Variant 1* are speculative. Moreover, we cannot be certain as to how accurate the later Latin translation of Irenaeus' work is.

Was this an accidental loss? In the upper case (unical) continuous script of *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), the "*OIHCOYC* (*o Iesous*, 'Jesus')" is abbreviated (with a line on top where I have a line underneath,) to "*OIC*". Was this lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was this a deliberate change? E.g., was the Latin translation of Irenaeus dating to *c.* 395, altered by the Latin translator in the late 4th century, so as to conform to the Origen reading? If so, did a scribe, probably Origen, undertake a "stylistic improvement" here to

create "a more succinct text" that removed   "unnecessary wordage"?

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, and strong support in the Latin from St. Jerome's Vulgate *et al.* Origen was aware of both readings, and quite possibly, though not definitely, the originator of the variant; with the later Latin scribe who translated Irenaeus's earlier Greek work into Latin, modifying the reading to "the correct" reading as found in Origen, or an Origen influenced source. But even if the variant was around in the time of Irenaeus, it would ultimately make no difference. The support for the TR's reading in both the Greek and Latin is very impressive, and has the additional support of the ancient church father and doctor, St. Augustine of Hippo. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 16:21 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 16:21, "*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," is found without the definite article, "*o* (-)," in both the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), and Minuscule 157 (independent, 12th century). Though the "*o* (the)," is redundant in English translation, it is more accurately found with the definite article, "*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," i.e., "Jesus," in the words, "began Jesus," in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian "1" Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

Variant 1, which omits "Jesus," and so reads, "he began," is found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the Georgian "2" Version (5th century).

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, adds "*Christos* (Christ)," at Matt. 16:21, and so reads, "*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus) *Christos* (Christ)." This reading is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century).

It might be remarked at this point, that on the one hand, as occurs at some other passages, *Variant 2* here shows us the stronger permeation of the Alexandrian School's influence inside of Egypt. In it we see the Alexandrian School spreading its poisoned tentacles to the geographically more proximate parts of Egypt, including in its immediate sting both the Bohairic Version, and some copies of the Sahidic Version. But on the other hand, the fact that a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version both follow the Received Text's reading, is also a poignant reminder to us of the salient fact, also evident in e.g., the stitching together of Byzantine text Gospels (Matt-John) and Alexandrian text Acts to Revelation in *Codex Alexandrinus* (A 02, 5th century), that there was also a Byzantine School of scribes at Alexandria.

Thus people made choices between these rival Alexandrian and Byzantine text types both then and now. But the lack of geographical spread of the Alexandrian School appears to imply that when the personal factors of this or that Alexandrian scribe's "hypnotic charm" waned, so did the Alexandrian Text. I.e., though personal factors of "a haggling Alexandrian Text salesman" were present in the more proximate parts of Egypt; the haggler's influence diminished as one left the area of Egypt, and the power of the Alexandrian text correspondingly declined. It looks like the Alexandrian text could "make a fist of it" so long as extraneous inter-personal factors of hagglers inside of Egypt could hold some sway, but it found it much harder to gain acceptance beyond the geographical boundaries of Egypt, where among Greek speaking peoples, scholars, and scribes; cooler heads, applying more dispassionate analysis prevailed, and understandably they preferred the Byzantine School's text over the Alexandrian School's text coming "from those funny people in Africa" who "were perhaps suffering from sunstroke."

The origins of *Variant 2* are conjectural. Was it an accidental loss? Following a paper loss or fade, was the original "*IHCOYC*" lost? If so, did the Alexandrian School scribes "guess" from the long space, that it was "*IC XC*" i.e., the abbreviation (with lines above where I have them underneath) for "*IHCOYC* (Jesus) *XPICTOC* (Christ)"? Was it a deliberate change? If so, was it a "stylistic compensation" for the omission of "*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)" from Matt. 16:20c; so that "the full name, "*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus) *Christos* (Christ)" would by transference be found at Matt. 16:21, rather than Matt. 16:20c?

Given the Alexandrian School's general, though not absolute, preference for shorter readings, it seems to me unlikely, though not impossible, that they would have made a "reconstruction" of "*IC XC*." This improbability is further heightened by the general rarity of some form of "*IC XC*" in St. Matthew's Gospel (Matt. 1:1,16,18; 27:17,22) (see comments below). Therefore on the balance of probabilities, I think we can conclude that in this particular instance at Matt. 16:21, *Variant 2* was a deliberate "stylistic improvement" by scribes of the Alexandrian School. It was quite probably, though not definitely, connected with their removal of the "*Iesous* (Jesus)" of "*Iesous* (Jesus) *o* (the) *Christos* (Christ)" in the preceding verse. I.e., a "stylistic decision" was made to "keep a full reference to "*Iesous* (Jesus)" "*Christos* (Christ)," by adding in "*Christos* (Christ)" at the "more appropriate" sectional starting point of Matt. 16:21, after having pruned away the "*Iesous* (Jesus)" of "*Iesous* (Jesus) *o* (the) *Christos* (Christ)" at Matt. 16:20c in accordance with "the preferred reading of Origen."

Another point of interest that emerges from these variants is the integrity, or lack

thereof, found among scribes of the Alexandrian School. The Alexandrian scribes evidently lacked scruples about changing the NT text when it gripped their weird imagination, or suited their fleeting fancies, to do so. Sometime this was a "correction," and sometimes this was a "fudge," but either way, it shows an "easy going" attitude to altering the NT text if they thought, rightly or wrongly, "it seemed like a good idea" to do so "at the time." Bearing in mind the notorious lack of textual analytical skill that generally characterizes the scribes in the Alexandrian School, it is clear, that even when they got it right, such as in the case of the final scribal alteration of *London Sinaiticus*, *infra*, this was a scribal fluke. The fact that *London Sinaiticus* remains riddled with errors, shows that this correcting scribe was not in general a competent textual analyst, even if on the odd occasion, such as here, with a punter's gambling "luck," he "guessed" the right answer.

Given that we have only two major Alexandrian texts (and some lesser Alexandrian texts), the fact that the two major Alexandrian texts both went through a good deal of "scribal modification" is accordingly significant. In the case of *London Sinaiticus*, it started as *Variant 2*. Then an Alexandrian School scribe decided to "fudge it," and make it read *Variant 1*. Then a later Alexandrian School scribe, learning of the correct reading, decided he should put the correct reading into the text, and so as a second alteration changed *London Sinaiticus* to the correct reading of the Received Text. In the case of *Rome Vaticanus*, it too started as *Variant 2*. Then a later scribe altered this by erasing the added "*Christos* (Christ)," but still leaving out the definite article "*o* ('the,' redundant in English translation)" before "*Iesous* (Jesus)." Did the later altering scribe of *Rome Vaticanus* here make a "stylistic improvement," in which he deliberately wanted the definite article "*o* (the)" removed before "*Iesous* (Jesus)"? Or did the later altering scribe of *Rome Vaticanus* here rely on a faulty text such as one finds in Codex D 05 and Minuscule 157, *supra*? Or after learning the correct reading, did a bumbling Alexandrian scribe not realize that the definite article "*o* (the)" was missing from *Rome Vaticanus*? Whatever the reason, the Alexandrian text's *Rome Vaticanus* thus ended up looking like the Western text's D 05.

Here at Matt. 16:21, the neo-Alexandrians found themselves squeezed this way and squealing that way, in a painful two-way push'n'pull between two different neo-Alexandrian principles. One neo-Alexandrian rule strongly favours the Alexandrian texts, and where Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus texts agree, such as here at Matt. 16:21, they do not like to follow any other reading. But another neo-Alexandrian rule considers "the shorter reading" is usually "the better reading." The neo-Alexandrian tension was then further heated, and their frustration further exacerbated, through reference to a third neo-Alexandrian rule, followed more by some neo-Alexandrians (e.g., the contemporary NU Text) and in varying degrees less by other neo-Alexandrians (e.g., Westcott-Hort), which looks for "external support" beyond the leading Alexandrian texts, especially beyond the region of Egypt e.g., to Syriac versions. For those following this latter rule, there here seemed to be a 2:1 argument favouring the TR's reading i.e., the TR's reading was the shorter reading, and what little external support the longer reading has, comes from Egypt. Thus for the wrong reasons, they favoured the right reading.

Reflecting some limited level of textual analytical ability, the neo-Alexandrian, Bruce Metzger (d. 2007), refers to another reason why the NU Text adopted the correct reading, namely, the relative rarity of the terminology, "*Iesous* (Jesus) *Christos* (Christ)" in the Gospels (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 43). But if allowed to stand with Metzger's lack of qualification, this means that what may be relevant in some contexts is here

misused to again reinforce the neo- Alexandrian idea of a preference for the shorter reading. Thus a good textual point, is here misused by Metzger; and while he achieves the correct result at Matt. 16:21, his neo-Alexandrian lack of qualifications means that he creates unnecessary problems elsewhere. (The NU Text is uncertain about the TR's "Jesus Christ" at Matt. 1:18 which e.g., the 1983 UBS 3rd corrected edition, whose Committee included Metzger, said "there is a considerable degree of doubt" over, relative to variants they show in the "apparatus," which includes one that omits "Jesus").

But for other neo-Alexandrians, the idea of departing from these two Alexandrian texts which had some limited external support from Egyptian texts, was regarded as at best undesirable. And in the case of Westcott and Hort, they probably regarded it as *almost* "unthinkable." Thus the brain-pain caused by Matt. 16:21 to the neo-Alexandrians, resulted in a painful division amongst them, as on flawed neo-Alexandrian principles they became confused and confounded as to which way they should jump.

In the end, the right reading, was adopted for the wrong reasons by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). However the wrong reading was adopted by Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952) (with Nestle including a footnote reference to the TR's and other readings).

A similar division emerged among the neo-Alexandrian versions. For the wrong reasons, the correct reading at Matt. 16:21 is found in the ASV as "began Jesus." The correct reading is also found in the NASB (3rd ed., 1995), RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. However, the incorrect *Variant 2* is found in an *American Standard Version* footnote, which at Matt. 16:21 reads, "Some ancient authorities read 'Jesus Christ'" (ASV ftn). When the ASV (1901) was revised by the *New American Standard Bible* translators, this incorrect *Variant 2* was elevated from a footnote into the main text without any footnote alternative, in the NASB (1st ed., 1960-71, & 2nd ed., 1977). It was likewise earlier found in the neo-Alexandrians' *Twentieth Century NT* (1904). Thus the TCNT reads at Matt. 16:21, "At that time Jesus Christ began to explain to his disciples" etc. .

Thus we find that e.g., the TCNT omits "Jesus" at Matt. 16:20c, but then adds it in at Matt. 16:21. Why all this chopping and changing to the text of Scripture? If the Spirit of God says he wants the name of "Jesus" in, such as at Matt. 16:20c, the scribes of the two leading Alexandrian texts, and the neo-Alexandrians of Westcott-Hort, Nestle's 21st edition, the NASB (1st ed. & 2nd ed.), and the TCNT, say they want it out. But if in the next verse the Spirit of God says he does not want to use the name of "Jesus" at Matt. 16:21, these same scribes of the two leading Alexandrian texts, and these same neo-Alexandrians of Westcott-Hort, Nestle's 21st edition, the NASB (1st ed. & 2nd ed.), and the TCNT, then immediately switch around and say they want it in.

Why do these unsettled Alexandrian scribes of Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus, whom all the neo-Alexandrians love to dote over, jump around and switch around so much here at Matt. 16:20c,21? Why do they *just want to say the opposite* to whatever God says? It is "because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So that they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Rom. 8:7-9). Good Christian

brethren, let us heartily declare, "I believe in   the Holy Ghost" (*Apostles' Creed*), and "I believe in the Holy Ghost, … who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, … who spake by the prophets" (*Nicene Creed*).   For the Holy Ghost who spake by the prophets, says this through the holy prophet, Isaiah, "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the Word of our God shall stand forever" (Isa. 40:8).

Matt. 16:26 "is … profited (present tense)" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*opheleitai* ('is … profited,' AV, indicative passive present, 3rd person singular verb, from *opheleo*)," i.e., "For what *is* a man *profited*" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century, with variant spelling "*ophelitai*").   It is also supported as Latin, "*prodest* ('profits' or 'doth it profit,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *prosum*)," i.e., "For what *doth it profit* a man[76]," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Justin Martyr (d. *c.* 165), Clement of Rome (*c.* 150), Clement of Alexandria (d. *c.* 215); the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a variant reads, Greek, "*ophelethesetai* ('will' / 'shall be profited,' indicative passive future, 3rd person singular verb, from *opheleo*)," i.e., "For what *shall* (*will*) a man *be profited*," or "For what *shall* (*will*) *it profit* a man" (future tense).   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 184 (1319 A.D.).   It is also found in the future tense as Latin, "*proderit* ('will' / 'shall be profiting,' indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *prosum*)," in old Latin versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century); and as Latin, "*proficiet* ('will' / 'shall be profiting,' indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *proficio*)," in old Latin version e (4th / 5th century).   It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

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

---

[76]   When the verb is in the passive voice (Greek, *opheleitai*), the inactive (or passive) subject passively receives, permits, or suffers, the action of the verb.   I.e., in the words, "For what is a man profited?" (AV), "what" "profit" here comes to "a man (the subject)" who passively receives it?   By contrast, when the verb is in the active voice (Latin, *prodest*), the active (or non-passive) subject takes the action of the verb.   I.e., in the words, "For what doth it profit a man?," "what" "profit" here "doth" "a man (the subject)" actively go out to get?   But for my purposes here, the significant thing is that the Latin of the TR is in *the present tense*, as opposed to the variant which is in *the future tense*.   This same issue also arises in the Greek (passive) and Latin (active) of the variant.   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 410 (active), 431 (passive); Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, pp. 2,118 (active & passive).

Was this an accidental change? If the original "*opheleitai* ('is … profited,' present tense)," came at the end of a line, and due to a paper loss looked something like, "*ophel:::::::::*," a scribe may have "reconstructed" this as "*ophelethesetai* ('will' / 'shall be profited,' future tense)."   Alternatively, if "*opheleitai* ('is … profited,' present tense)," was written in continuous script over two lines, the first line might have ended with "*ophelei*" and the next line started with "*tai*."   If due to a paper fade / loss the first line had come to look like "*ophel:::::*", it is also possible that a scribe then "reconstructed" this first line as "*ophelethese*," thus making the entire thing read, "*ophelethesetai* ('will' / 'shall be profited,' future tense)."   In either instance, the scribe may well have been influenced by the reading at Mark 8:36, which is also in the future tense, and reads, "*ophelesei* ('will' / 'shall it profit' AV, indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *opheleo*)," i.e., "For what *will it profit* a man," or "For what *shall it profit* a man" (AV).

Was this a deliberate change?   The probable origins of the variant with Origen make this a distinct possibility.   Origen's heretical views on pre-existent souls meant that he considered that there had been a pre-temporal fall (also known as a premundane fall), in which the fall of spirits / angels preceded the fall of Adam.   At this point Origen is still inside the parameters of orthodoxy, and this element of a pre-mundane fall was also followed by e.g., a fellow Alexandrian, St. Athanasius of Alexandria (d. 373).

But Origen becomes unorthodox when he then develops this to mean that there were some angels who were not as good as the good angels in heaven who sided with God, but not as bad as the bad angels who sided with the Devil.   Origen claimed that the material creation of the temporal universe was the mechanism whereby they could get back into heaven, specifically, because these pre-existent "souls" or "spirits" become the "soul" of a man at his conception.   On this thinking, the best "souls" became the angels, the intermediate ones enter men at conception, and the worst ones experience life on earth "as devils."   But in the end, on his universalism, Origen considered all, including Lucifer, would go to heaven.

On this crazy theory of Origen's, it follows that Adam had to fall because he had the "soul" / "spirit" of one of these fallen angels.   Thus Origen denied the clear Scriptural teaching that God created Adam with his own "soul" (Gen. 2:7); and that, "The first man Adam was made a living soul" (I Cor. 15:45), *not* "inherited a living soul from a fallen angel who was morally intermediate."   Origen thus also denied the clear Biblical teaching that "God made man upright" (Eccl. 7:29, ASV), i.e., with *original righteousness*.   There are other problems that I shall not now discuss with regard to Origen's heretical teachings here.

These unorthodox ideas of Origen's about the soul, may have affected his view of Matt. 16:26.   Matt. 16:26 reads, "For what *is* a man *profited* (present tense), if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?   Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" When Origen looked at the present tense reading of the TR here at Matt. 16:26, his befuddled mind may have thought something like this.   "Such a man *presently* is profited because this is what Adam did when at the time of the temporal fall he did 'gain the whole world,' but he was still 'profited' because he was still living as a 'reincarnated' angel.   And Adam's temporal fall in which he chose to 'gain the whole world' and thereby 'lose his own soul' for a certain period of time, still 'profited' him in the present tense of his act, because it was necessary so as to start the process whereby he and the other fallen angels waiting around as pre-existent souls to be born into humans could get the process going of getting back into heaven.   But by contrast, such a man *in the future* will not be profited if he permanently

should 'lose his own soul,' because he will   then have failed in his chance to get back into heaven, following his pre-temporal fall as an angel."

On this type of heretical basis, Origen may then have made a "stylistic improvement" to Matt. 16:26.   In doing so, he may have considered that he would "put it in the future tense, the same as in Mark's Gospel" (Mark 8:36).   If so, Origen's "stylistic improvement" then became, "For what *shall* (future tense) a man *be profited.*"

Was this a deliberate or accidental change?   We cannot be sure.   But either way, if as seems likely, the scribe was influenced by the future tense of Mark 8:36, *supra*, he was very selective indeed, for he could have found the same form as the TR, in the present tense, at Luke 9:25.   The reality is, that either on the same occasion in elucidation, or on different occasions, Christ often said similar things.   Putting a slightly different emphasis on the question, our Lord asked both, "what *is* a man *profited* (present tense)" (Matt. 16:26; Luke 9:26), and "what *shall it profit* (future tense) a man" (Mark 8:36), "if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" (Matt. 16:26; Mark 8:36).

We need to remember that our soul is a most precious thing.   It is not, as Origen claimed, the soul of some fallen angel.   Rather, it is our own unique soul, which we each got at conception.   I believe God gave to each of us our own soul at conception, for as touching upon the soul's origins, I am a soul creationist (like Calvin), rather than a soul traducianist (like Luther)[77].   King David could say that his "soul knoweth right well" that he was "fearfully and wonderfully made" when his "substance was not hid" from God, and he "was made in secret" (Ps. 139:14,15).   I believe he could say this with a special reference to the soul and God putting it into an unborn child because God is "the Father of spirits" (Heb. 12:9).   If a man fails to recognize the importance of his soul, and he is not redeemed through the blood of Christ (Eph. 1:7), he loses out both *in the present* (Matt. 16:26; Luke 9:26) and *in the future* (Mark 8:36).

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, and strong support in the Latin with St. Jerome's Vulgate, most old Latin versions, and St. Gregory.   It is also supported from very ancient times by Justinus (Justin) and Clemens Romanus (Clement of Rome) in the mid second century.   By contrast, the variant is a minority Greek and Latin reading, and appears to have originated with Origen.   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 16:26 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 16:26, "is … profited (present tense)," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent) and 1071 (independent, 12th century).   It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; and Armenian Version (5th century).

---

[77]   Berkhof's *Systematic Theology*, pp. 196-201.

However, the incorrect reading, "shall be profited (future tense)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in all extant Egyptian Coptic Versions, such as the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

Elzevir's textual apparatus (1624) says "*opheleitai* ('is … profited,' present tense)" is supported by a number of manuscripts (Gospel manuscripts: w, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 16; and H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum). Tischendorf's 2nd edition (1842) specifically criticizes Stephanus (1550) for following the reading "*opheleitai* ('is … profited,' present tense)" (Lectiones Variantes, p. 5), although we cannot doubt that in this matter Stephanus was right and Tischendorf was wrong.

At Matt. 16:26, the incorrect variant so favoured by Tischendorf, is found in the NU Text *et al*. Hence the erroneous future tense reading is found in the American Standard Version as, "For what *shall* a man *be profited*" etc. . The incorrect future tense reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Matt. 17:2b "the light" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, the Latin Vulgate uses "*nix* (snow)," at both Matt. 17:2b and Mark 9:3. Therefore, since due to Diatessaron formatting either of these may have been the source for the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron which is a Vulgate Codex, no reference is made to this Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 17:2b, the TR's Greek, "*to* (the) *phos* (light)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), O 023 (*Codex Sinopensis*, St. Matthew's Gospel, 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). It is also supported as Latin, "*lumen* (the light)," in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), Asteris (d. 341), Chrysostom (d. 407), Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), Hesychius (d. after 450), and Theodoret of Cyrus (d. 460).

However, a variant reads, Greek, "*chion* (snow)." It is followed as Latin, "*nix*

(snow)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). This reading is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Epiphanius (d. 403) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Chromatius (d. 407), and Jerome (d. 420).

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

Was this an accidental change? If due to a paper fade / loss, the original "*to* (the) *ph<u>o</u>s* (light)," in continuous script as "*toph<u>o</u>s*," looked something like, "*:::<u>:o</u>:*" or "*::::::*", did a Greek scribe "reconstruct" this as "*chi<u>o</u>n* (snow)" on the basis of Mark 9:3? Or is its origins in the Latin? Due to a paper fade / loss of "*lumen* (the light)," if so, probably coming at then end of a line, did a Latin scribe "reconstruct" this as "*nix* (snow)" on the basis of Mark 9:3?

Was this a deliberate change? If so, did a Greek or Latin scribe seek to "harmonize" the two readings by assimilating Greek, "*chi<u>o</u>n* (snow)," or Latin, "*nix* (snow)," from Mark 9:3? Alternatively, did a Greek or Latin scribe assimilate Greek, "*chi<u>o</u>n* (snow)," or Latin, "*nix* (snow)," from Matt. 28:3, in order to interpret Matt. 16:28 to Christ's resurrection through a link between Christ in Matt. 17:2b and the angel in Matt. 28:3? And / or did a Greek or Latin scribe assimilate Greek, "*chi<u>o</u>n* (snow)," or Latin, "*nix* (snow)," from Rev. 1:14, in order to interpret Matt. 16:28 to the glorified post resurrection Christ through a link between Christ in Matt. 17:2b and Christ in Rev. 1:14?

A deliberate or an accidental change? We do not know. We only know that the text was changed.

On the one hand, the reading of the TR has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, and is well attested to by ancient church Greek writers. But on the other hand, the variant has strong support in the Latin, including the Vulgate, as well as several ancient church Greek and Latin writers. Weighing up these competing considerations, and bearing in mind that in broad terms we here see the natural superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 17:2b a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 17:2b, "the light," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243

(independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac: Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500); Georgian "1" (5th century); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the incorrect reading, "snow," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and Georgian "2" Version (5th century); some editions of the Armenian Version; a manuscript of the Slavic Version; and Ethiopic Versions (Takla Haymanot *c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

For the wrong reasons, at Matt. 17:2b the correct reading entered the NU Text *et al*, although footnote alternatives to the incorrect variant are found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) (the latter of which considers the TR's reading here "is certain").

The correct reading at Matt. 17:2b is found in the American Standard Version which reads, "and his garments became white as "the (Greek, *to*) light (Greek, *ph<u>o</u>s*)" (ASV). The correct reading is found in the ASV, NASB, RSV, ESV, and NIV.

As for the NRSV and TEV, their usage of dynamic equivalents makes the matter hard to gauge. Both have a similar "translation" of Matt. 17:2b. What e.g., is one to make of the New Revised Standard Version's "his clothes became dazzling white" (NRSV)? Were they *dazzling* because they were *glistening* like "snow (*chi<u>o</u>n*)"? Or were they *dazzling* because they were *shining* like "the (*to*) light (*ph<u>o</u>s*)"? To these questions, the NRSV (and TEV) make our eyes dim. We cannot see. So too, every reader of the NRSV and TEV is left to declare, "Oh, my eyes are dim; Oh, I cannot see. I did not bring my KJV with me! Oh! I did not bring my AV with me!!!"

Also left in the dark, is the old Latin Papists' Douay-Rheims Version. Being based on the Latin evident in the Clementine Vulgate, *supra*, this reads, "and his garments became white as snow (Latin, *nix*)." On the one hand, the Douay-Rheims Version may be commended at Matt. 17:2b for having a simple clarity lacking in the neo-Alexandrian's NRSV and TEV. But on the other hand, the Douay-Rheims Version may be fairly criticized at Matt. 17:2b for having the wrong reading, because the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, was unnaturally elevated above its lord and master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. The result of this unnatural act? A perverse result in the erroneous reading of the Douay-Rheims. What a contrast there is between the Douay-Rheims and our Authorized Version's here at Matt. 17:2b. For only of the AV may it be said, "The entrance of thy

words giveth light" (Ps. 119:130).

Good Christian reader. Let us not grope around in the dark with vague and woolly neo-Alexandrian versions such as the NRSV or TEV; nor fumble and stumble over flat out erroneous versions such as the Latin Papists' Douay-Rheims Version. Rather, let us thank God for our Authorized King James Versions, giving hearty and humble thanks unto Almighty God through Christ our Lord for his open Word unto us, for "The entrance of thy words giveth light; it giveth understanding unto the simple" (Ps. 119:130).

Matt. 17:3 "there appeared" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Under normal circumstances the TR and variant at Matt. 17:3 would be placed in Appendix 3, without the degree of elucidation upon it that one finds hereunder. That is because the English translation of the *Textus Receptus* and variant are here the same. But of primary importance, I consider certain theological issues are of such significance in this instance as to warrant its inclusion in the main commentary. And though of secondary importance, I consider comparative analysis between the grammatical rules of the Latin and Greek here at Matt. 17:3, is a most interesting and informative example to set forth before the reader for the better understanding and appreciation of both. (By contrast, compare Matt. 18:25 in Appendix 3.)

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Latin Vulgate reads, "*apparuit* ('appeared,' singular)," at both Matt. 17:3 and Mark 9:4. As a Vulgate Codex, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron may have gotten this reading from either source due to Diatessaron formatting. Therefore, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra.*

The Third Matter. With respect to the Latin, I here advise the reader of one of the books in my library, Allen's *Latin Grammar* (1898). Originally designed for school teachers to use as a textbook with their high school students, I regard this as a very good and useful work. While much of the work is like a first year tertiary College / university / seminary grammar, such as Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, I find e.g., that much of the material in its "Supplementary Rules & Examples" section might, if it were designed for tertiary College / university / seminary students, be regarded as an intermediate Latin grammar, and entitled something like, *Latin Grammar Beyond the Basics*[78].

Born in 1845, John Barrow Allen came from the Victorian Era (Queen Victoria, Regnal Years: 1837-1901), and first published this work in 1874. The Preface to this first edition was given at "Birmingham, [England,] June, 1874," and in it, John Allen says this is a "School Grammar" for a "boy" studying "Latin." In this context, he says he has drawn on "the School Manuals now in use" in England, and gives "thanks" "to his friends," two learned school teachers, "for having "revised the proof sheets and offered many valuable suggestions." The first of these two "friends" was "Henry St. John Read, Head Master of the

---

[78] Allen's *Latin Grammar*, sections 197-393, pp. 148-188.

Godolphin School, Hammersmith[79]." The second was "Michael Seymour Forster, Head Master of Oswestry Grammar School[80]."

The work is known by its short title, Allen's *Latin Grammar*, and the reader should not be misled by the modest sounding form of its long title, *An Elementary Latin Grammar*[81]. Allen's usage of "elementary" for some portions of his Latin grammar is reminiscent of another Victorian, Sir Arthur Doyle, who created the fictional Sherlock Holmes in 1887. This mastermind detective likes to say that the conclusion to a certain chain of his fictional logic is just, "elementary."

E.g., in "Terror By Night" (Universal Picture Company Movie, 1946)[82], with Basil Rathbone as Sherlock Holmes and Nigel Bruce as Dr. Watson, after the well-known words of Holmes, "Elementary my dear Watson," Holmes makes three statements as to how he identified a certain person as being a false identity. Of a more deductive nature were the facts that the false identity, masquerading as a Police Officer, failed to put handcuffs on a criminal; and the fact that he also failed to put up a strong fight against the criminal. But of a truly elementary quality was the fact that Holmes happened to know the real Police Inspector being impersonated. Thus "elementary" is here used for a mix of both truly elementary and more advanced forms of reasoning.

So too, the reader will find much that is useful in Allen's *Latin Grammar*, and while all of it is non-fiction, some of it is "elementary" in the normal type usage of the word, and some of it is "elementary" in a more advanced, elitist type usage of the word. As seen by my comments at *The Fourth Matter*, *infra*, there are certainly some matters found in this high school textbook of Allen's *Elementary Latin Grammar*, that one will not necessarily find in some other Latin grammars with less modest sounding titles, and written for those first

---

[79]   A London boys' boarding school built in 1861, from 1905 it became an independent girls' day school and renamed as the Godolphin and Latymer School.

[80]   Founded in 1407, and making provision for the teaching of Latin, Greek, and English grammar; in 1577 this school was granted 40 shillings per annum by Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth I (Regnal Years: 1558-1603). Oliver Cromwell described its headmaster as being a "delinquent" on the basis that he was a Royalist. Does this indicate that Cromwell's grip on the English language left something to be desired? Or does this simply indicate that the addled brain of the unrepentant murderer, Cromwell, could no longer sufficiently determine right from wrong, to reasonably know what a "delinquent" really was? Oswestry Grammar School was historically a boys' school but became co-educational in 1972. One of its former students, Ivor Roberts-Jones, was the sculptor of a statue well-known to Londoners of Sir Winston Churchill, at Parliament Square, Westminster, London. The school is located at Shropshire in south-west England, not far from the foothills of the Welsh mountains.

[81]   Allen's *An Elementary Latin Grammar* (1874, 1898, 1930). The short title, "Allen's *Latin Grammar*," is used in the 1930 "Preface to New Edition," reproduced in the 1962 reprint (Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, UK) at p. iii. Though I am pleased to say I have a copy of the 1962 reprint, I am disappointed to say that there has been no further reprints of this valuable work in almost five decades.

[82]   Virgin Vision Videos, Australia, 1989.

learning Latin at e.g., a tertiary college /   university / seminary.

The Fourth Matter.   The issue at Matt. 17:3 is between the plural (TR) and singular (variant) readings, and in this sense for my purposes here, I simply refer to various Latin texts using either a singular or plural verb, without regard to any other differences between them. (Cf. my footnote comments at Matt. 16:26, *supra*.)

At Matt. 17:3, the Received Text's Greek form of the verb is in the plural, whereas the variant verb is in the singular.   It appears to be this fact that leads Tischendorf in his 8th edition (1869-72) to say that old Latin f, q, & ff1 (plural Latin verb) support the TR's reading (plural Greek verb); and that old Latin b, e, g1, & c (singular Latin verb) support the variant's reading (singular Greek verb).   He is not alone.   This same logic appears to underpin the view of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) that the TR's reading (plural Greek verb) is followed by old Latin f, q, & ff1 (plural Latin verb); and that the variant's reading (Greek singular verb) is followed by "the Vulgate and a part of the old Latin tradition."

A plural form in the Latin, "*apparuerunt* ('they appeared,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *appareo*)," is found in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is also found as Latin, "*visi sunt* ('they were seen,' indicative passive perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *viso*[83])," in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century).

A singular form in the Latin, "*apparuit* ('he appeared,' here meaning, 'they appeared,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *appareo*)," is found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century).   Or as Latin, "*paruit* (indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *pareo*)," in old Latin Version d (5th century); or as Latin, "*visus* (masculine singular nominative, perfect passive participle, from *viso*)," in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century).

Thus to simplify things from this point onwards; on the one hand, the Latin manifested in the Clementine may thus be used to represent the plural Latin verb reading, considered in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), as following the reading of the Greek *Textus Receptus*, "*ophthesan* (they appeared)," *infra*. And on the other hand, the Latin of the Vulgate may thus be used to represent the singular Latin reading, regarded in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), as following the reading of the Greek variant, "*ophthe* ('he appeared,' here meaning, 'they appeared')," *infra*.

The Latin of the Vulgate and Clementine reads at Matt. 17:3, "*Et* (And) *ecce*

---

[83]   The combination of a perfect passive participle ('saw,' *visi*, masculine plural nominative, perfect passive participle from *viso-visere-visi-visus*), with the verb *sum* ('to be,' here found as *sunt*, 'they are,' indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *sum*), is a passive periphrastic conjugation into the perfect passive system.   Hence this *roundabout way* (periphrastic) conjugation makes this an indicative passive perfect, 3rd person plural verb (Wheelock's *Latin*, p. 157).

(behold)" followed in the Vulgate by "*apparuit* ('he appeared,' here meaning, 'they appeared,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *appareo*)," or in the Clementine by "*apparuerunt* ('they appeared,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *appareo*)," followed in both by, "*illis* ('unto those [ones]' = 'unto them') *Moses* (masculine *singular* nominative noun, from *Moses*) *et* ('and,' a conjunction) *Helias* (masculine *singular* nominative noun, from *Helias*)" i.e., "And behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias" etc. .

We thus here have a compound subject (sometimes called a composite subject), i.e., "Moses (*Moses*, singular noun) and (*et*) Elias (*Helias*, plural noun)." In Latin, a compound subject formed from two or more nouns, generally takes a plural verb. Thus the reading of the Clementine is normative as it fits the general rule. But if the reading of the Vulgate is followed, this compound subject has a singular verb, "*apparuit*." For the fuller details of different exceptions, I refer the reader to Allen's *Latin Grammar*[84].

But of importance for our present discussion, one exception to the general rule is that where *the persons* in a compound subject are different entities, then *the verb follows the prior person* (I dare not say, "the first person," lest this be misunderstood to mean "I" or "we," hence I say, "the prior person"). (I shall not now consider a related matter, not of direct relevance to us in this particular example, namely, that there is also a tendency for the verb to agree with the nearest noun to it in the compound subject.)

Applying this exception to the case at hand with Matt. 17:3 in the Vulgate, this simply means that the Vulgate is using the singular verb, "*apparuit*," because the prior person in the compound subject is a singular noun, "*Moses*." This means, that *there is no fundamental difference in meaning* between the Latin usage of a singular verb here (Vulgate), or the Latin usage of a plural verb here (Clementine). Both are possible under general rules of Latin grammar, and they do not denote a difference in basic meaning. By contrast, in the Greek, *infra*, there is a difference of meaning in the usage of a singular verb (variant) and a plural verb (TR). Thus e.g., it would be quite possible to argue that both the singular verbal and plural verbal Latin readings were made from the same Greek TR's plural verb form.

Since the nuance of the Latin variation between a singular and plural verbal form with a compound subject, in no way mirrors the nuance of the Greek variation between a singular and plural verbal form with a compound subject, the Latin cannot be safely used here at Matt. 17:3 as a manifestation of the Greek forms in the way Tischendorf and Nestle-Aland claim. Under the circumstances, I make no reference to the Latin readings in the "Principal Textual Discussion," *infra*.

---

[84] The general rule of Latin that a verb agrees in person and number with its subject, is stated in the 3rd edition (1963) of Wheelock's *Latin* (Wheelock, F.M., *Latin*, 1956, 3rd ed., Barnes & Noble Books, a Division of Harper & Row Publishers, New York, USA, p. 9), and not improved upon by La Fleur in the 6th edition revised (2005) of Wheelock's *Latin* (p. 13). (Nevertheless, La Fleur made a generally useful revision and hence I use this as the standard Latin grammar reference work in these commentaries.) A host of Latin grammars likewise do not go beyond this general rule. F.L. Moreland *et unum* are a slight improvement on this (*Latin*, California Univ., USA, 1977, reprint 1990, p. 400). A much better treatment of this matter is found in Allen's *Latin Grammar* (1898), e.g., sections 217-219, pp. 153-154.

Now the lest the reader think that I am, by this fact, making Greek and Latin sound like *two totally different languages*, let me say, that in more general terms, there are striking grammatical similarities between these two great tongues in the Aryan Linguistic Family. For if one of the Japhetic tongues be known to a man, having learnt it from a grammatical methodology, then he can, by the grace of God, pick up the other of the Japhetic tongues with *comparative* ease (I do not say "with ease," *per se*).   For though there be grammatical differences between the two (such as the Latin ablative, or the nuances here referred to at Matt. 17:3), nevertheless, overall they are strikingly similar tongues in much of their grammar.   And so one can certainly understand one of the reasons as to why the Imperial Roman Empire was prepared to use three languages wherever it went, namely, the Latin, the Greek, and the local tongue of the area e.g., Hebrew in Judea (Luke 23:38).   For the Latin and the Greek are most compatible tongues, and match up together very well indeed.

(It is possible that a similar error to the claim that the Latin follows the Greek, was also made by Nestle-Aland outside the closed class of sources.   Nestle-Aland is my source for the Syriac Versions, *infra*.   I have no familiarity with, nor interest in acquiring knowledge of, the Syriac tongue.   Because such readings outside the closed class of sources are of no consequence anyway, since they have no impact on how the text of Scripture is discovered and composed, I shall, at least on this occasion, follow these possibly incorrect references to the Syriac Versions found in Nestle-Aland's 27th edition, *infra*.)

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 17:3, the TR's Greek, "*ophthesan* ('they appeared,' or 'they were seen,' indicative passive first aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *orao*)," i.e., "there appeared" in the words, "there appeared unto them Moses and Elias" (AV) etc., is supported by the majority Byzantine text, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

However, a variant reads, Greek, "*ophthe* ('he appeared,' or 'he was seen,' here meaning, 'they appeared,' indicative passive first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *orao*)."   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 244 (12th century); as well as Lectionary 184 (1319 A.D.).

In Greek, a verb (here "*ophthesan*," "they appeared,") generally agrees with its subject in number i.e., a singular subject has a singular verb, and a plural subject has a plural verb.   Here the subject is a compound subject i.e., two subjects, each in the singular "Moses (*Moses*, masculine *singular* nominative noun, from *Moses*)" and "Elias / Elijah ('*Hlias*, masculine *singular* nominative noun, from '*Hlias*)," are joined by the conjunction, "and (*kai*)."   In such circumstances, the verb is usually in the plural, so that the TR's reading is the normal and expected one.

However, a plural subject (here the compound subject, "Moses and Elias"), may take a singular verb.   Greek grammarians dispute among themselves as to what this means.   On the one hand, both Wallace and Blass & Debrunner, consider that when a compound plural subject takes a singular verb, this means that the writer wishes to highlight the first subject

(*Rule 1*).   E.g., in John 3:22 we read,   "*elthen* ('he came,' meaning 'they came,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person *singular* verb, from *erchomai*) *o* (-) *Iesous* ('Jesus,' masculine *singular* nominative noun, from *Iesous*) *kai* ('and,' a conjunction) *oi* ('the,' masculine *plural* nominative, definite article from *o*) *mathetai* ('disciples,' masculine *plural* nominative noun, from *mathetes*)," i.e., "After these things came (singular verb) Jesus (singular subject) and (conjunction) his disciples (plural subject) into the land of Judea" (AV).   The effect of putting the verb in the singular at John 3:22, is that *the stress* is placed on "Jesus" as *the significant element* in the compound subject of "Jesus and his disciples."

Therefore, if that is what is happening here at Matt. 17:3 in the singular verbal form of the variant, then in the compound subject, "Moses and Elias," the first of these two figures is being stressed i.e., "Moses."   Moses here symbolizes the Pentateuch that he wrote, and Elijah the rest of the Old Testament since he was one of the prophets.   Thus the presence of "Moses and Elias" is a symbol of "the law (Pentateuch, Genesis to Deuteronomy) and the prophets (Joshua to Malachi on our OT arrangement)" (Luke 16:16).   If the meaning of the variant is that Moses is stressed, then this leads fairly naturally into the heresy of "degrees of inspiration," in which it is claimed that "the Pentateuch" is somehow "more inspired" than the rest of the OT.   An extreme form of this heresy was found in New Testament times with the Samaritans, who accepted only the Pentateuch (and a textually corrupt form of it at that).

But a second possible meaning of a plural compound subject taking a singular verb, is argued by Blass & Debrunner.   These grammarians take the view that this is done when both of the subjects are to be viewed *equally*.   Commenting on this, Wallace says he agrees with Blass & Debrunner's position with respect to *non-personal* compound subjects, such as is found at Matt. 5:18, "*parelthe* ('it pass' here meaning 'they pass,' subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person *singular* verb, from *parerchomai*) *o* ('the,' masculine *singular* nominative, definitive article from *o*) *ouranos* (masculine *singular* nominative noun, from *ouranos*) *kai* ('and,' a conjunction) *e* ('the,' feminine *singular* nominative, definite article from *e*) *ge* ('earth,' feminine *singular* nominative noun, from *ge*)," i.e., "heaven (singular subject) and earth (singular subject) pass (singular verb)," in the words of Christ, "For verily I say unto you, Till *heaven and earth pass*, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law" etc. (Matt. 5:18, AV).   (I am happy to use Wallace's reference to Matt. 5:18, but I do so with a qualification that he lacks, discussed in the footnote referring to Moulton's Grammar, *infra*.)

But Wallace says he disagrees with Blass & Debrunner's position with respect to *personal* compound subjects.   I.e., he limits this possibility only to *non-personal* compound subjects.   In this context, Wallace says he is unconvinced by the examples Blass & Debrunner use in so arguing for *personal* compound subjects, namely, John 18:15; 20:3[85].   Certainly I would agree with Wallace that in these two verses the case is not successfully made out for *personal* compound subjects being viewed *equally*.

E.g., John 18:15 reads, "*Hkolouthei* ('followed,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person *singular* verb, from *akoloutheo*) *de* (And) *to* ('the,' masculine *singular* dative, definite

---

[85]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 401-2; referring to, Blass, F, & Debrunner, A., *A Greek Grammar of the NT & other early Christian Literature*, translated by R.W. Funk, Chicago University Press, Illinois, USA, 1961, p. 75.

article from *o*) *I<u>e</u>sou* ('Jesus,' masculine   *singular* dative noun, from *I<u>e</u>sous*[86]) *Cim<u>o</u>n* ('Simon,' masculine *singular* nominative noun, from *Cim<u>o</u>n*) *Petros* ('Peter,' masculine *singular* nominative noun, from *Petros*), *kai* ('and,' a conjunction) *allos* ('another,' masculine singular nominative pronoun, from *allos-<u>e</u>-o*) *math<u>e</u>tes* ('disciple,' masculine *singular* nominative noun, from *math<u>e</u>tes*)."   Thus in reading, "And *Simon Peter* (singular subject) followed (singular verb) Jesus, *and* (conjunction) [so did] another *disciple* (singular subject)," the compound plural subject takes a singular verb; but in Wallace's opinion, and mine, this really conforms with the above pattern, where the effect is to *highlight* the first named figure, i.e., Simon Peter.   This is confirmed by e.g., the fact that the other disciple is not even named.   The same is true of John 20:3, "Peter (singular subject) therefore *went forth* (*ex<u>e</u>lthen*, indicative active aorist, 3rd person *singular* verb, from *exerchomai*), and (*kai*, conjunction) that other disciple (singular subject)."

But while I agree with Wallace about these example of John 18:15; 20:3; I think Wallace then throws the baby out with the bathwater.   Fundamentally, it seems to me that the point made by Blass & Debrunner is correct, their bad and inaccurate examples notwithstanding.   Indeed, the point that Blass & Debrunner would prove, is I consider, shown by another verse they refer to, to which they append the extraordinary comment that they think this type of rule is lacking in it[87].   Unlike Blass & Debrunner who consider "such reasons are lacking" in Luke 8:19; I think that this verse actually proves the point that Wallace denies, and Blass & Debrunner argue for with a truly appalling set of examples as to when they think it does (John 18:15; 20:3) and does not (Luke 8:19) apply.

Luke 8:19 reads, "*Paregenonto* (indicative middle aorist, 3rd person *singular* verb, from *paraginomai*) *de* (Then) *pros* (to) *auton* (him) *<u>e</u>* ('the,' feminine *singular* nominative, definite article from *<u>e</u>*) *m<u>e</u>ter* ('mother,' feminine *singular* nominative noun, from *m<u>e</u>ter*) *kai* ('and,' a conjunction) *oi* ('the,' masculine *plural* nominative, from *o*) *adelphoi* ('brothers' or 'brethren,' masculine *plural* nominative noun, from *adelphos*) *autou* (of him)," i.e., "Then *came* (singular verb) to him [his] *mother* (singular subject) and (conjunction) his brethren (plural subject)" (AV).   In the compound subject, "mother and … brethren," the first subject is "mother," and so if these two subjects are not being treated equally, then there is a highlighting emphasis on "mother."

But this is not contextually sustainable.   If this were the intent of Luke 8:19, we would *prima facie* expect to *probably* read, "Mary and his brethren," although this is a rebuttable expectation if general context indicated that "mother and his brethren" was meant to have such a highlighting emphasis.   More significantly then, is the broad context of the passage.   This places *an equality* between all believers, so that Christ's earthly "mother and his brethren" (Luke 8:19), do not enjoy any special privileged position of access to Christ because of their biological relationship.   I.e., neither Mary who as a pure virgin was privileged to be the God-bearer (*Theotokos*, Matt. 1:23, *Theos* / "God" + *texetai*, from *tikto*, / "she will bear"), nor his half-siblings that came from the sexual union of Joseph and Mary

---

[86]   Because the Greek form of "Jesus" is transliterated from Aramaic, it is a quasi second declension noun, i.e., nominative = *I<u>e</u>sous*; vocative, genitive, and dative = *I<u>e</u>sou*; and accusative = *I<u>e</u>soun*.

[87]   Blass & Debrunner, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

after Christ's birth (Matt. 1:25) i.e., Mary's   "firstborn" (Matt. 1:25; Luke 2:7), have any special access to Christ, so that when they "stand without" (Luke 8:20), they cannot e.g., act as some kind of mediators for anyone else.   Rather, says Christ, "My mother and my brethren are these which hear the Word of God, and do it" (Luke 8:21).

This contextual emphasis on the equality of believers here at Luke 8:19-21 (cf. Luke 11:27,28), is at stylistic variance to any proposition that the Greek here is putting a highlighting emphasis on Christ's "mother."   Therefore, we can with confidence say that Luke 8:19 acts to demonstrate the proposition stated by Blass & Debrunner, but argued so badly by Blass & Debrunner that Wallace thought he could safely deny it on the invalid presupposition that because Blass & Debrunner used bad examples, that they must not have properly understood the relevant rules of Greek grammar.   I.e., we can with confidence say that as with *non-personal* compound subjects, so also with *personal* compound subjects, the rule is that a plural compound subject taking a singular verb means that both of the subjects are to be viewed *equally*; providing this is harmonious with general context (*Rule 2*)[88].

Since the selection of *Rule 1* or *Rule 2* hangs on context, a circular problem will necessarily arise if there is a disagreement as to what the context indicates.   This issue is evident with the variant reading here at Matt. 17:3.   I.e., if the reading of the variant, "*ophthe* ('he appeared,' here meaning, 'they appeared')," were used here at Matt. 17:3, an orthodox person could argue that since *Rule 1* is not the meaning here, it follows that *Rule 2* requires that the meaning of Matt. 17:3 is that both "Moses" and "Elijah" are to be viewed *equally*, since they are symbols of the Pentateuch (Moses) and rest of the OT (Elijah), and there is no such thing as "degrees of inspiration."   (This would be the view of "*ophthe*" that I would hold for Mark 9:4.)   But since this is a conclusion that is derived from a theological rational, it also follows that a heretic could disagree, and claim that "because there are degrees of inspiration," he considered that *Rule 2* "just could not apply," and so "*Rule 1* was the correct one to use to understand" this variant reading at Matt. 17:3.

---

[88]   A further issue that I shall not now discuss, but simply refer the interested reader to, is the issue of personal writing styles in those areas where standard Greek rules either did not exist, or the Greek "rule" existed among some but was not regarded by others as a "standard" rule of Greek grammar.   Yet another issue I note with regard to Wallace's usage of Matt. 5:18, *supra*, is that both Blass & Debrunner and Moulton's Grammar also state that the singular verb is used regularly when the compound subjects are connected by the conjunction, *e*, such as at Matt. 5:18.   E.g., at I Cor. 14:24, we have the *personal* compound subject with *e* in, "*eiselthe* ('come in,' subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person *singular* verb, from *eiserchomai*) *de* (and) *tis* ('one,' masculine *singular* nominative pronoun, from *tis*) *apistos* ('unbeliever,' or 'that beleiveth not,' AV, masculine *singular* nominative adjective, from *apistos*) *e* ('or,' conjunction) *idiotes* ([one] 'unlearned,' AV, masculine *singular* nominative, noun from *idiotes*)," etc., i.e., "and there come in (singular verb) one that believeth not (singular subject), or (conjunction *e*) that believeth not (singular subject)" (AV). Moulton's *Grammar of NT Greek*, Vol. 3 (Turner), pp. 314-5.   (Turner's use of "lax" is anachronistic and inappropriately judgmental.   That is because such variation may simply reflect diverse writing styles in earlier eras when standard rules of grammar were not established or universally accepted.   Nevertheless, he raises some matters of interest that the interested reader may wish to consider critically and cautiously.   Cf. my comments at Matt. 17:6, Appendix 3.)

But in answer to both, we neo-Byzantines of the Received Text, seeing that there is no clear and obvious textual problem with the representative Byzantine Greek text reading at Matt. 17:3, reply that the correct reading is therefore "*ophthesan* (they appeared)." On this basis, we can do what the orthodox defender of Divine inspiration who uses the variant reading cannot do. I.e., we can definitively state for Greek textual reasons here at Matt. 17:3, that the doctrine of "degrees of inspiration" is most assuredly NOT taught in this Scripture (nor anywhere else). (Thus Matt. 17:3 also acts as a clarification for Mark 9:4.)

The origins of the variant here at Matt. 17:3 are speculative.

Was this an accidental change? If so, the original "*ophthesan* (they appeared)," may due to a paper fade, have come to look like "*ophthe::.*" Especially if this came at the end of a line, it may have been undetected by a copyist scribe, although even if not at the end of a line, it might have been mistaken for a stylistic paper space to help loosely right hand justify the page. Thus the reading "*ophthe* ('he appeared,' here meaning, 'they appeared')," may have arisen. Alternatively, if more than this was lost due to a paper fade / loss, a scribe may have "reconstructed" "*ophthe*" from "the parallel reading" at Mark 9:4.

Was this a deliberate change? If so, a scribe seeking "a gospel harmonization" between "parallel readings" may have assimilated the Matt. 17:3 reading to Mark 9:4. Alternatively, the scribe may have considered this was a "justifiable stylistic change," because he wanted to bring out either the meaning of *Rule 1* or *Rule 2*, *supra*, and so long as Matt. 17:3 stood he could not do this either here or at Mark 9:4, so he "corrected" and "improved" the reading at Matt. 17:3.

The reading of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, and the further support of the ancient church doctor and Bishop of Alexandria, St. Cyril. The minority Byzantine reading has no good textual argument to commend it, and is not well supported. Therefore, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 17:3 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 17:3, "*ophthesan* (they appeared)," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions.

However the variant, "*ophthe* ('he appeared,' here meaning, 'they appeared'), is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century);

and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century).

The erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al*. The matter does not affect English translation, and so at Matt. 17:3 the ASV correctly reads in English, "And behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elijah" etc. (ASV). So too, a correct English rendering is found in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

But while there may be no difference in English translation, there is a difference in the underpinning Greek. And that difference is of great potential consequence. That is because in the first instance, one may reasonably argue that the meaning of the singular verb with the compound subject at Mark 9:4, is that both of the subjects are to be viewed *equally*. One may fairly do so on the basis of general principles evident elsewhere in Scripture, namely, that "*All* Scripture is given by inspiration of God" (II Tim. 3:16), and since "Moses" here represents the Pentateuch, and "Elias" the rest of the OT Scriptures[89], they are to be viewed equally. Moreover, one can then argue that this view is consonant with the Received Text's reading at Matt. 17:3. Thus so long as one has both the Received Text's reading of Matt. 17:3, "*ophthesan* ('they appeared,' plural verb)," and the Received Text's reading of Mark 9:4, "*ophthe* ('he appeared,' singular verb, here meaning, 'they appeared')," then one has a further inbuilt protection device against the heresy of "degrees of inspiration[90]." Hence the TR's reading at Matt. 17:3 is a spiritual landmark.

But if the TR's reading at Matt. 17:3 is removed, as occurs with the variant, then an important protection device safeguarding against possible misinterpretation of Mark 9:4 is thereby removed. For while it still remains possible for a man to argue the orthodox position, nevertheless he does so from a weaker Biblical position when he is without the added support of Matt. 17:3 (TR & AV). Thus the effect of adopting the variant in the neo-

---

[89] Both the Hebrew OT and our English OT start with the Pentateuch (Genesis to Deuteronomy) and the Prior Prophets (Joshua to II Kings). The Hebrew OT is arranged as Pentateuch, Prophets (divided into Prior Prophets and Latter Prophets), and Hagiographa; so that II Chronicles is at the end (Luke 11:51). But these same Hebrew (and Aramaic) books are arranged in our English Bible as Pentateuch, Historical Books (Joshua to Esther), Poetical Books (Job to Song of Solomon), and Prophets (divided into the Major Prophets, Isaiah to Daniel; and the Minor Prophets, Hosea to Malachi).

[90] James Orr's writings should be considered with a degree of caution. On the one hand, he was a religiously conservative champion of orthodoxy on a number of apologetics issues (Berkhof's *Systematic Theology*, p. 60, quoting from Orr, J., *Side-Lights on Christian Doctrine*, p. 26). But on the other hand, he held some religiously liberal unorthodox opinions e.g., he claimed "varying degrees of inspiration" in Scripture. Thus, for instance, he incorrectly claims, "Pekah's twenty years in II Kings 15:27 ... is shown by the Assyrian synchronisms to be a mistake" (Orr's *Revelation and Inspiration*, Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1952, pp. 171-5,180,215; referred to in Cairns, A., *Apostles of Error*, Faith Free Presbyterian Church, Greenville, South Carolina, USA, 1989, & Let the Bible Speak, 55 Market Street, Ballymoney, Northern Ireland, UK, 1989, pp. 30-4,38).

Alexandrian texts is to weaken an important   Biblical truth, intrinsically and inseparably part of the third element in the threefold Reformation motto, namely, *sola Scriptura* (Latin, "Scripture alone").

In the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), we read in the *Commination Service* used on the First Day of Lent, Ash Wednesday (and other times), "the general sentences of God's cursing against impenitent sinners, gathered out of the seven and twentieth chapters of Deuteronomy, and other places of Scripture."   Among other things, the "Minister" says, "Cursed is he that removeth his neighbour's landmark," and the people "answer," "Amen." This particular curse comes from Deut. 27:17, and we cannot doubt that it forms part of the moral law, continuing to bind Christians from New Testament times onwards, for it may be characterized under the 8th commandment of the Holy Decalogue, "Thou shalt not steal (Exod. 20:15; Matt. 19:18; Rom. 13:9).

Nor can we doubt that in the first instance, Deut. 27:17 refers to property rights.   And thus e.g., we may properly use this injunction to condemn as immoral the actions of socialists and communists, e.g., in North Korea, who do not recognize such property rights.

Yet its meaning is not thereby exhausted.   For the OT prophet, Hosea, declares, "The princes of Judah were like them that remove the bound: therefore I will pour out my wrath upon them like water" (Hosea 5:10).   And what was the landmark that these princes removed?   'Twas not the literal "bound" of a real property landmark, but rather, the spiritual "bound" of theological landmarks e.g., they broke down God's barrier against miscegenation (Gen. 6:1-4; Ezra 9 & 10 – Holy Ezra refers to both racially and religiously mixed marriages, the orbit of his concerns including both racial "seed" and religious "abominations" in Ezra 9:1,2).   Thus the people of Hosea's time were no longer antithetical to e.g., the creation of half-castes and quarter-breeds.   They were no longer repulsed by such things.   Therefore the prophet, Holy Hosea, says, "They have dealt treacherously against the Lord: for they have begotten strange children" (Hosea 5:7).   Hence they removed a spiritual and moral landmark. (Cf. Prov. 22:28; 23:10.)

And so, good Christian reader, when we read, or if we be Anglicans using the 1662 prayer book, we hear and reply on Ash Wednesday to the words of Deut. 27:17, "Cursed is he that removeth his neighbour's landmark. … Amen;" the orbit of this curse is not to be limited to real property rights, although it most assuredly includes real property rights.   But rather, the fuller orbit of this commination is against those who would set about to remove theological landmarks.   And in this context, I note that *two* landmarks are here removed at Matt. 17:3 by the neo-Alexandrian texts.   Firstly, they remove the landmark teaching, "the Word of the Lord endureth forever" (I Peter 1:25), since they do not uphold the teaching of Divine Preservation, but rather, seek to undermine it with their neo-Alexandrian Texts.   And secondly, they remove the landmark of Matt. 17:3's reading which acts as an additional inbuilt Biblical protection device against misinterpretation of Mark 9:4, with reference to the heresy of "degrees of inspiration."

Now what, good Christian reader, does God in his infallible Book say about such neo-Alexandrians?   Among other things, this: "Cursed be he that removeth his neighbour's landmark.   And all the people shall say, Amen" (Deut. 27:17).

Matt. 17:4 "let us make" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter.   Migne says of a quote here by Gregory, that it is from "Matth. xvii, 4; Luc. ix. 33."   But before the key word, "*faciamus* (let us make)," the Bishop Gregory quote, like the Vulgate, reads, "*si* (if) *vis* (thou wilt)."   By contrast, Mark 9:5 and Luke 9:33 reads in the TR, Greek, "*kai* (and) *poiesomen* (let us make);" and so too, the Vulgate reads at Mark 9:5 and Luke 9:33, Latin, "*et* (and) *faciamus* (let us make)."   Therefore on the balance of probabilities Gregory here seems to be following a quote from Matt. 17:4, for which there is no evidence of assimilation from Luke 9:33; and so I show Bishop Gregory following the TR, *infra*.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting).   Inside the closed class of sources, the Latin Vulgate reads "*faciamus* (let us make)," at Matt. 17:4; Mark 9:5; and Luke 9:33. *Prima facie* the same argument used for the Bishop Gregory citation, *supra*, could be applied here, since once again the "*faciamus* (let us make)" is preceded by "*si* (if) *vis* (thou wilt)." But the two citations are not really analogous, since unlike Gregory who is simply citing Scripture, we know that the Sangallensis Diatessaron is more generally following a Diatessaron formatting methodology in which such assimilations could and did occur more generally as part of its normative operations.   Therefore, since the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, in its particular instance we cannot be sure if its reading was adopted from Matt. 17:4 and / or Mark 9:5 and / or Luke 9:33 due to its Diatessaron formatting.   Thus no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 17:4, the TR's Greek, "*poiesomen* ('let us make,' subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *poieo*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), O 023 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*faciamus* ('let us make,' subjunctive active present, 1st person plural verb, from *facio*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Basil of Seleucia (d. in / after 458); the ancient church Latin writers, Chromatius (d. 407) and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, there is a reading, *Variant 1*, which upon reconstruction of the Greek from the Latin, reads Greek, "*poieso* (1st person singular verb, from *poieo*; either, 'I shall make' or 'I will make,' indicative active future; or as further discussed, *infra*, *poieso* may have been misinterpreted by the Latin scribe as the indicative active future, when it was actually, 'let me make,' subjunctive active first aorist)[91]."   This is found as Latin, "*faciam* ('I shall make,'

---

[91]   Whenever discussing such reconstructions of the Greek from the Latin in these commentaries, I follow the scenario that I think to be the most likely possibility or possibilities, not necessarily, all possibilities.

indicative active future, 1st person singular   verb, from *facio*),” in old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century).   It is also followed by some Vulgate manuscripts, and the ancient church Latin writers, Chromatius (d. 407) and Jerome (d. 420).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, reads Greek, “*poiesomen* (‘we shall make’ or ‘we will make,’ indicative active future, 1st person plural verb, from *poieo*).”   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 866 (1174 A.D.) and Minuscule 1292 (13th century, Byzantine other than General Epistles).

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental alteration?   Due to an undetected paper fade, did the Greek, “*poiesomen* (let us make),” lose its last three letters, and looking like “*poieso::*” survive as an undetected paper fade by a subsequent Greek scribe?   Or was its origin in the Latin textual tradition?   Due to an undetected paper fade, did the Latin, “*faciamus* (let us make),” lose its last two letters, and looking like “*faciam::*” survive as an undetected paper fade by a subsequent Latin scribe?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration?   Due to a paper fade / loss of the omega (*o*) in “*poiesomen* (let us make),” did a scribe “reconstruct” “*poies:men*” as “*poiesomen* (we shall make)”?   If so, was he influenced by its presence at Matt. 28:14?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change?   The Greek, “*poiesomen* (let us make),” or the Latin, “*faciamus* (let us make),” though found in the Greek Received Text and Latin Vulgate respectively in both the same accounts at Mark 9:5; Luke 9:33, and elsewhere (Rom. 3:8), is nevertheless not as common as the Greek, “*poieso* (‘I shall make’ or ‘let me make’),” or Latin, “*faciam* (‘I shall make’ {or, as a subjunctive active present, ‘I may make’}).”   These singular forms are respectively found in both the Greek Received Text and Latin Vulgate more commonly both in St. Matthew’s Gospel (Matt. 4:19; 19:16; 20:32; 27:22) and elsewhere (e.g., Mark 1:17; 10:17; 15:12; Luke 12:17,18; 16:3,4; 18:40; 20:13; John 14:13,14; 17:4).   Did a Greek or Latin scribe, wishing to make Peter look “more assertive,” decide that a “stylistic improvement” would be to make this, “I shall make” (indicative)?   Or did a Greek scribe, so wishing to make Peter look “more assertive,” decide that a “stylistic improvement” would be to make this, “*poieso*,” not meaning, “I shall make” (indicative, cf. Matt. 4:19), but rather, meaning, “let me make” (subjunctive, cf. Matt. 19:16; 20:32; 27:22)?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change?   Did a scribe consider, “we shall make” was more “Matthean terminology” on the basis of Matt. 28:14 (*poiesomen*, “we will persuade,” AV)?   Or did he think it “a more accurate” reading since St. Peter was looking at doing this in the future?

Deliberate or accidental changes?   We do not know.   But we do know that these variants were a change to the original text of Matt. 17:4.

On the one hand, at Matt. 17:4, the TR’s reading has good support in both the Greek and Latin texts, being found in both the representative Byzantine Greek text, and St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate and most old Latin Versions.   It has the further support of some ancient church

writers, including two ancient church bishops from Asia Minor, Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople (398 to 407), and Basil, Bishop of Seleucia (432-437) (at Isauria, in the old Roman province of Galatia). Though Basil of Seleucia at first disgraced himself by failing to adequately oppose the monophysitist heresy, (and possibly even supporting it for a time,) in the end he came good. In 458 A.D. he joined with other bishops in an appeal to the emperor, Leo I, to advance the Trinitarian decrees in the anti-monophysitist *Council of Chalcedon* (451). We are thus reminded that we all sin and make mistakes (II Chron. 6:36), and that the appropriate response to earlier error, is correction; with a humble confession of our sins at the throne of grace (I John 1:9)[92]. The TR's reading is also supported by the early mediaeval writer, Gregory the Great, who before there were Popes of Rome from 607, was the Bishop of Rome in that bishopric's better days (590-604). But on the other hand, while *Variant 2* may be fairly quickly dismissed; by contrast, *Variant 1* has some ancient minority support in the Latin textual tradition.

Weighing up these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 17:4 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 17:4, "let us make," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Slavic Version (9th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the incorrect *Variant 1* reading, "I shall (will) make" (indicative) or "let me make" (subjunctive)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent).

Moreover, the erroneous *Variant 2*, "We shall (will) make," is found in Minuscule 565 (9th century, independent); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain

---

[92]   We hear no more from Basil of Seleucia after this time, and so he is sometimes considered to have died in, or shortly after, 458. However, it is also possible that he lived on for longer than this, if so, in quiet retirement.

Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent   text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.*   It is further found in the Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500).   It is also referred to in Elzevir's textual apparatus (1624) (Gospel manuscripts z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

The incorrect *Variant 1* entered the NU Text *et al.*   Hence at Matt. 17:4, the ASV reads in the indicative, "… I will make here three tabernacles … ."   So too, the erroneous reading is found rendered into English in the indicative in the NASB, RSV, NRSV (with a footnote referring to *Variant 2*), ESV, NIV, NEB, TEV, TCNT, and Roman Catholic's JB and NJB.   A NKJV footnote says the NU Text follows *Variant 1*, and also renders it in the indicative.

Based on the Latin, "*faciamus* (let us make)," the Douay-Rheims Version of the old Latin Papists correctly renders Matt. 17:4 as, "if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles" (Douay-Rheims).   But following the Vatican II Council the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the Jerusalem Bible adopted *Variant 1*.   Thus the old Papists' Latin text of the Clementine is more accurate here than is the new Papists' neo-Alexandrian Greek text.   Perhaps feeling a twinge of conscience, the Jerusalem Bible (1966) has a footnote referring to the correct reading of St. Jerome's Vulgate.   But time dimmed their conscience.   That footnote was removed in the New Jerusalem Bible (1985).

The Greek of *Variant 1*, "*poieso*" is generally understood by those following it as, "I shall make" i.e., indicative active future, 1st person singular verb, from *poieo*.   But in Greek, the declension is the same for the subjunctive active first aorist, 1st person singular verb, from *poieo*.   Whereas the indicative mood expresses an action as a certainty / reality, the subjunctive mood expresses a probable possibility or desire, rather than a fact[93].   Moffatt takes the view that *Variant 1* (*poieso*) is in the subjunctive mood, not the indicative mood (ASV, NKJV footnote, *et al*).   Hence he renders Matt. 17:4 as, "*let me put up* three tents here" (Moffatt Bible, subjunctive), not, "*I will make* here three tabernacles" (ASV, indicative).   In my opinion the subjunctive mood fits better with the preceding conditional clause found in the Greek words, "*ei* (if) *theleis* ('thou wilt' or 'thou desirest')," and indeed the Received Text is understandably in the subjunctive mood ("let us make").   Hence on this occasion, I think Moffatt has better captured the Greek nuance of *Variant 1*, than has the ASV, JB, NKJV ftn., *et al*, *supra*.   (Even though in Moffatt's broader rendering, "pray let me put up three tents here," the protasis and apodosis, *infra*, is not brought out as clearly as it should be with his "pray," in place of the AV's "if thou wilt.")

The Papists of the Spanish Inquisition were notorious for their gratuitous cruel usage of torture.   They would keep going till they got their necessary "confession."   E.g., we read in *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* that under "the Spanish Inquisition," the "Pope gave the inquisitors the most unlimited powers."   For even though the Office of Inquisition was generally set up and administered through specific State governments such as that of Roman Catholic Spain, rather than directly under the Pope, these State regimes clearly operated with Papal support, consent, and approval.   (An exception to this where there was direct papal

---

[93]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 448 (indicative), 461 (subjunctive); Young's *Greek*, pp. 136 (indicative), 137 (subjunctive).

control occurred in the Papal States. But since the time of the Dan. 7:25 "judgment" which occurred around the end of the 1260 years starting in 607 and on inclusive reckoning ending in 1866 as marked e.g., by the Papist killed Protestant martyrs of Barletta, Italy, i.e., from 1860-1870, these papal states became part of modern day Italy; except, of course, for the Rev. 13:3 "healed" "deadly wound" of the Vatican City State since 1929.) We learn of these earlier times during the 1260 years from 607 to 1866 when Daniel prophesied the Pope "shall wear out the saints of the most High" (Dan. 7:25), that the "officers of the Inquisition … carry on their process with the utmost severity. A Protestant is seldom shown any mercy[94]."

So too, we find that some Bible translators carry on a linguistically painful process, in which instead of simply asking the Greek, "What dost thou mean?," they torturously demand of the Greek, "What canst thou mean?" Thus they do not accept that which the Greek most naturally *does mean*. Rather, they demand to know what in an unnatural and forced manner the Greek *might mean*, or *might be made to mean?* Thus they keep on torturing the Greek till they get the answer they want, and having gotten such a "confession" from the Greek, then make this their "translation." We find an interesting example of this torture technique here at Matt. 17:4 in the *Revised English Bible* (REB, 1989) rendering of *Variant 1*, which is a revision of the *New English Bible* (NEB, 1961 & 1970).

If following *Variant 1,* the relevant section here at Matt. 17:4 exhibits a classic textbook example of the Greek conditional sentence. This contains two semantically matching halves, namely, an "if," grammatically known as the "protasis," with a corresponding "then" consequence, grammatically known as the "apodosis." In such grammatical constructions, only the protasis is conditional, so that if the protasis is fulfilled, it necessarily follows that the apodosis will also be fulfilled. Here with *Variant 1* at Matt. 17:4, this is achieved through a cause-effect relationship[95].

I.e., "if (*ei*) thou wilt" (ASV) = the protasis, and "let me put up three tents here" (Moffatt Bible) = the apodosis. Thus following this natural construction, we find that of those versions following the erroneous *Variant 1*, the correct recognition of the protasis and apodosis in a sentence construction is found in those mistranslating it in the indicative, *supra*, e.g., the ASV reads, "If thou wilt" (protasis), "I will make here three tabernacles" (apodosis).

Now under the circumstances, it would clearly be a torturous act, to pummel the Greek, doing violence unto it, in order to contort a "confession" out of it that this *Variant 1* might really be put as a question. I.e., to render it something like, "Wouldest thou desire me to make three tabernacles?" etc. . Certainly one might occasionally find a conditional question, e.g., at Matt. 26:15, "What (*ti*) will ye give me, *and I* (*kago*) will deliver him unto you?" (AV). Or, "What are you willing to give me, *if I* betray Jesus to you?" (TCNT). Moreover, it is true that the Greek, "*ei* (if)," might indicate a question e.g., at Matt. 19:3, "*Ei*

---

[94] Bramley-Moore's *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (1867), pp. 88-91. In God's grace, "those days" of 1260 years (see day-year prophetic principle in Num.14:34; Ezek. 4:4-6) were "shortened" in parts of north-west Europe by the Protestant Reformation, lest "there should no flesh be saved" (Matt. 24:22).

[95] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 682-9.

(if) *exestin* (it is lawful)" = "Is it lawful?," in   the wider question, "*Is it lawful* for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" (AV). But this type of usage of the Greek, "*ei* (if)," as a conditional conjunction, is clearly not applicable here at Matt. 17:4, where the protasis and apodosis of *Variant 1* most naturally results in a conditional statement, not a question, i.e., "if (*ei*) thou wilt" (ASV), "let me put up three tents here" (Moffatt Bible).

Yet such a strained, unnatural, and unlikely rendering as the question form, "Wouldest thou desire me to make three tabernacles?" etc., is exactly the type of thing we find in the linguistically painful form of *Variant 1* found in the REB.   Of course, in fairness to the REB translators, it must be said that for any group of translators who are prepared to so radically torture the Greek that they habitually and constantly get feminist language out of it[96], this "little bit of torture" of the Greek here at Matt. 17:4 probably seems to them to be "just like child's play" in comparison.   It seems old torturers like those of the Spanish Inquisition do not disappear with time, they just alter their form of torture from people to Greek grammar, and thus become neo-Alexandrian Bible "translators" such as those of the REB. *But their ultimate target is still "those hated Protestants."   And it must be admitted, that though the form of torture is different, IT STILL HURTS!*

Matt. 17:8 "save Jesus only" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

A similar reading to that of the TR, but which omits the "*ton* ('the,' redundant in English translation)" is found in W 032, which reads (with a line on top, rather than underneath, *IN*,) "*EI MH* ('save' or 'except') *IN* ('Jesus,' abbreviating *IHCOYN*) *MONON* (alone)."   In this particular instance, the meaning is not changed whether or not the definite article, *TON*, is present.   Was this an accidental omission?   E.g., did the eye of a scribe, confused by the ellipsis of *TON IN*, jump forward along the line and then back, confusing the last two "N's" (nu), and so accidentally omit *TON*?   Was this a deliberate alteration?   I.e., as part of the process of abbreviating "*TON* ('the') *IHCOYN* (Jesus)" to "*IN*," did the scribe of W 032, or one his predecessors in the manuscript line he was copying out, deliberately omit the definite article?   If so, I certainly do not support this scribal policy of omitting the definite article, *ton*, and regard it as a *bad practice*.

A deliberate or accidental change?   Either way, it is reasonable to conclude that W here supports the TR with minor differences of no consequence for our immediate purposes.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 17:8 the TR's Greek, "*ei me* ('save' or 'except,' words 1a & 1b = composite word 1) *ton* (-, word 2) *Iesoun* ('Jesus,' word 3) *monon* ('alone,' word 4)," i.e., "save Jesus only," in the wider words, "they saw no man, save Jesus only" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codex Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and (in both instances abbreviating "*Iesoun*" to "*in*") Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is

---

[96]   They are not alone in this torture of the Greek, for such sex role perverts' language is also found in the NRSV and ESV.

also supported with minor differences of no   consequence for our immediate purposes of textual analysis, by W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). It is further supported as Latin, "*nisi* ('save' or 'except,' word 1) *solum* ('only,' word 4) *Iesum* ('Jesus,' words 2 & 3)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century, reversing the order of the 2nd & 3rd words), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century, words 2 & 3, "*Ihesum*"). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

There is certainly no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading here, which as far as we know, is universally supported by both the Greek and Latin textual traditions.   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 17:8 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 17:8, "*ei me* ('save,' composite word 1) *ton* (-, word 2) *Iesoun* ('Jesus,' word 3) *monon* ('alone,' word 4)," i.e., "save Jesus only," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century, in word order, 1,4,2,3).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century).   It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

However, a variant omits word 2 and inserts "*auton* (himself)," thus reading, "*ei me* ('save,' composite word 1) *auton* ('himself,' inserted word A) *Iesoun* ('Jesus,' word 3) *monon* ('alone,' word 4)," i.e., "save Jesus himself alone."   This variant is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century, in word order 1,A,3,4) and London Sinaiticus (4th century, in word order 1,3,A,4).   It is also found in word order 1,A,3,4 in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century) and Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent).

The origins of the variant are speculative.   Was this an accidental change?   The simultaneous omission of word 2, "*ton* (the)," and addition of "*auton* (himself)," indicates a nexus between the two.   If there was a stylistic paper space before "*ton* (the)," did a scribe, perhaps influenced by the nearby "*auton* (himself)" of Matt. 17:10 in, "And his disciples asked him (*auton*)," think that due to a paper fade a similar "*au*" had been lost at Matt. 17:8,

and so "reconstructed" Matt. 17:8 as "*auton*   (himself)"?

London Sinaiticus follows word order 1,3,A,4 i.e., it reads, "*ei me* ('save,' composite word 1) *Iesoun* ('Jesus,' word 3) *auton* ('himself,' inserted word A) *monon* ('alone,' word 4)."   In the case of this rearranged word order 1,3,A,4 of London Sinaiticus, did the eye of a scribe using such a faulty manuscript line, jump by ellipsis from the "*on*" ending of "*auton* (himself)" to the "*oun*" ending of "*Iesoun* (Jesus)," and then, realizing his mistake, add "*auton* (himself)" back in?   An incompetent scribe?   Alas, the Alexandrian School of scribes were notoriously second rate (and some may think that I am here being overly-generous, on the basis that they were really third rate).

Was this a deliberate change?   Did a scribe consider e.g., on the basis of "*auton*" elsewhere in St. Matthew's Gospel (e.g., Matt. 3:5; 4:5; 5:15; 6:8; 7:11, *et al*), that it would be "a stylistic improvement" to alter the reading at Matt. 17:8 to "*auton* (himself)"?   If so, was this a characteristic belief of some Alexandrian scribes, who prided themselves on the idea that, "great minds thinks alike"?   Does this mean that the variant word order of London Sinaiticus acts to reflect this proclivity?   An arrogant group of scribes?   Alas, the Alexandrian School of scribes were notoriously second rate (and some may think that I am here being overly-generous, on the basis that they were really third rate).

On this occasion, Tischendorf thought it too risky to embrace the variant.   Two more normative neo-Alexandrian reasons for such a decision would be that he was influenced by the variant's internal disagreement between the word order reading of Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus; and he was further influenced by the variant's very poor external attestation, *supra*.   A third quirky reason, unique to Tischendorf, the discoverer of London Sinaiticus, may have been that he was a little bit miffed'n'muffed by the fact that his "darling" London Sinaiticus, of which, even by more normative neo-Alexandrian standards he was overly fond of, indicated a bungle if one was going to follow this Alexandrian School reading.   I.e., rather than say London Sinaiticus bungled, why not say both London Sinaiticus and Rome Vaticanus bungled on the basis of the first two factors, *supra*?   And so the incorrect variant is not found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72).

By contrast, with the support of both Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus, the erroneous variant in the word order of Rome Vaticanus, entered most of the neo-Alexandrian texts.   The change in word order in London Sinaiticus looks like a fairly typical example of ellipsis loss and subsequent scribal correction, so that notwithstanding Tischendorf's evident misgivings, *supra*, this explanation appears to have satisfied most of the neo-Alexandrians.   Thus the reading of Rome Vaticanus is followed in Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

While it is possible that some neo-Alexandrian version translators agreed with Tischendorf, I think this to be generally unlikely, albeit, not impossible, especially in the case of a "loose gun" like Moffatt, whose loose rendering reads, "except Jesus all alone" (Moffatt Bible).   Where did Moffatt's "all" come from?   But in most neo-Alexandrian versions, "himself" is regarded as redundant in English translation.   Hence at Matt. 17:8 it is absent in the ASV, RSV, ESV, and NIV.   E.g., the *American Standard Version* reads, "they saw no one, save Jesus only" (ASV).   But it is rendered in some of the neo-Alexandrian versions, and hence it is found at Matt. 17:8 in the TCNT, NASB, and NRSV.   E.g., the *Twentieth*

Century NT reads, "they saw no one but   Jesus himself alone."

Matt. 17:10 "his disciples" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek, "*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (of him)," i.e., "his disciples" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th century), and M 021 (9th century); together with Minuscules 2 (12th century), 1010 (12th century), and 1242 (13th century).   It is also supported as Latin, "*discipuli* (the disciples) *eius* (of him)," in old Latin Versions ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), and q (6th / 7th century).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant omits, Greek, "*autou* (of him)," thus making the reading, "*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples)."   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53).   The omission is also found in the Latin, "*discipuli* (the disciples)," of Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

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

Was this an accidental omission?   On the same page at Matt. 17:10 in Manuscript Washington (W 032), is Matt. 17:5b-15.   The scribe of *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) often used the same verse divisions that we find first numbered for us by Stephanus in 1551.   But in this Byzantine Text that predates Stephanus by about 1,000 years, we find that these verse divisions are always unnumbered.   Thus on this page of *Codex Freerianus*, after Matt. 15:5 a space is left of about 8 letters, so that verse 6 starts at the beginning of a new line.   Then in this continuous script manuscript, a paper space of about 2 letters is left before verse 7, about 3 letter spaces are left before verse 8, and 2 letter spaces before verse 9, verse 10 starts on a new line, a paper space of about 5 letters is left before verse 11, a paper space of about 3 letters is left before verse 12, both verses 13 and 14 start on a new line, and a paper space of about 2 letters is left before verse 15.

It is clear that the scribe of W 032 wanted to use basic verse divisions.   At the end of one line comes the "*AYTOIC*" (*autois*) of Matt. 17:13, in the wider statement that Christ "spake *unto them* (AYTOIC) of John the Baptist."   Unlike the English translation, in the Greek this comes at the end of the sentence, and the scribe of Manuscript Washington obviously wanted to start verse 14 on a new line, the first letter of which he projects one letter space to the left of the left-hand side justified page.   The problem was that he was coming to the end of a line, and parchment space being at a premium.   What was he going to do? His solution, (a technique also found elsewhere in the Byzantine Gospels of *Codex Alexandrinus*), was to write the last letters much smaller, and to let it project out further to the right than normal.   Thus what would normally be about three letter spaces till the end of the line, came with a slight protrusion to the right of where the line might otherwise end, to look

something like, "*AYToιc* ".

Yet simultaneously, we find just two lines above, that at the end of verse 12, about 2 letter spaces are left on the end of a line, so that verse 13 can start on a new line.   Though the technique of "squeezing in a word" was here used with respect to verse divisions (cf. "squeezing in" the *soi* / 'thee' at the end of Matt. 18:29, in W 032), another scribe might be motivated by some other reason, such as simply saving on parchment space.   Therefore, here at Matt. 17:10, did a scribe first try to "squeeze in" the "*AYTOY* (*autou*, 'of him')" at the end of the line, so that it looked something like, "*AYToY* ", and then, when it was lost in a paper fade, did a subsequent scribe simply think this was a small paper space left by the previous scribe, and so it went undetected?

Was this a deliberate omission?   The probable origins of this variant are, SURPRISE! SURPRISE!, *once again* with Origen!   E.g., did Origen conclude that since "the disciples" of Matt. 17:10 contextually had to be those of "Jesus" (Matt. 17:11), that this usage of "*autou* (of him)" here at Matt. 17:10 for "his disciples," was "redundant"?   If so, did he then prune away "*autou* (of him)" as a "stylistic improvement" to create "a more succinct text"?   Did e.g., Origen perhaps think that this was "better in keeping with the more advanced and direct way we third century Christians think in our time, evident in our more direct speech and writing, compared to those less advanced first century Christians of New Testament times"?[97]

A deliberate change from "the great brain" of Origen?   Or an accidental change? We cannot be sure.   But we can be sure that this variant was a change to the text of Scripture.

On the one hand, the reading of the TR has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, some ancient support in old Latin ff2 (Paris, France, 5th century), together with the support of the "golden-mouthed[98]" preacher, St. John Chrysostom (*c.* 347-407), whose See of Constantinople in Asia Minor, later had built in it the beautiful Cathedral of Hagia Sophia (Cathedral of Holy Wisdom) under the Byzantine Emperor, Justinian the First (Regnal Years: 527-565).   (When the sword of Islam ruthlessly advanced the locust plague of Mohammedans to whom Constantinople fell in 1453, this Cathedral was closed to, and to this day remains closed to, public Christian worship.)

But on the other hand, the variant has the support of the Latin Vulgate, most old Latin versions, and a couple of ancient church writers.   Weighing up these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 17:10 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 17:10, "his disciples,"

---

[97]   On my usage of the term, "Christian," see Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, section 10a.

[98]   Greek *chrysostomos* (golden-mouthed) is from *chruseos* (golden) and *stoma* (mouth).

is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Codices C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the variant, "the disciples," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and 700 (11th century, independent); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Palestinian Version (*c.* 6th century); the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); and Georgian Version (5th century).

With a clear division between the two major Alexandrian texts, a split emerged between neo-Alexandrians as to what to do. In the case of the neo-Alexandrian Greek texts, *the ridiculous circular reasoning neo-Alexandrian rule in favour of the shorter text* evidently proved to be "the clincher" argument. Thus the variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al* i.e., Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

But from the neo-Alexandrian perspective both readings having "external support," i.e., beyond the Alexandrian texts in e.g., Syriac Versions. This may make it harder for at least some neo-Alexandrians to decide which reading to follow, if they think that an omission here might have occurred here. Reflecting this uncertainty, on the one hand, at Matt. 17:10, for the wrong reasons, the correct reading of Rome Vaticanus was followed by the ASV and NASB. E.g., the American Standard Version reads, "his disciples." But on the other hand, the incorrect reading of London Sinaiticus was adopted by the RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, and Moffatt Bible. E.g., the Moffatt Bible reads, "The disciples."

Unlike the Roman Catholic Clementine Vulgate, at Matt. 17:10 the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version follows the minority Latin reading here. Hence the Douay-Rheims correctly reads, "And his disciples asked him," etc. . By contrast, the Papists' Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles adopt the same reading as the NU Text and omit "his." Thus the old Latin Papists were more accurate here than the new neo-Alexandrian Papists.

Matt. 17:11a "Jesus" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 17:11a the Latin Vulgate reads, "*ille* ('that [one],' masculine = 'he'), and at Mark 9:12, the Vulgate reads, "*ait* (he says)."   Therefore it seems unlikely that the scribe of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron would have "reconstructed" "*ille*" on the basis of Mark 9:12.   Rather, it would be more harmonious with the principles he used of Diatessaron formatting, to adopt the form of words found at Mark 9:12 if he wanted to omit "*Iesum* (Jesus)."   Hence I think one can fairly say the Vulgate Codex of the Sangallensis Diatessaron follows the variant, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 17:11a, the TR's Greek, "*Iesous* (Jesus)," in the wider words, "And Jesus answered" etc. (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), U 030 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century); and Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), and 2 (12th century).   It is further supported as Latin, "*Iesum* (Jesus)," in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century).

However, a variant omitting "*Iesous* (Jesus)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53).   The omission is also found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

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

Was this an accidental omission?   Was the original "*IHCOYC*" (*Iesous*, 'Jesus') written in abbreviated form, (with a line above where I have it underneath,) as "*IC*"?   If so, especially although not exclusively, if it came at the end of a line, was it lost in an undetected paper fade?   Was this a deliberate omission?   Did a scribe, seeking a "gospel harmonization" with Mark 9:12, deliberately omit "*Iesous* (Jesus)" at Matt. 17:11a?

On the one hand, the reading of the *Textus Receptus* has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, and further support in a couple of old Latin versions. But on the other hand, the variant has ancient support from the Greek in W 032, and from the Latin in the Vulgate and several old Latin versions, together with some later old Latin versions.   Weighing up these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 17:11a a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 17:11a, "Jesus," is

found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04   (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).   It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century), which is celebrated as *frequently* a *more* accurate translation, and Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; as well as the Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the incorrect variant which omits "Jesus," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is also found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century).   It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.   It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); and the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

The erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al*.   Hence at Matt. 17:11a the ASV reads, "And he answered."   The incorrect variant is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV.

But seemingly influenced by the wider attestation of the TR's reading in both the Syriac and Armenian, the correct reading is found at Matt. 17:11a in the NIV, TEV, and TCNT.   E.g. the TCNT reads, "'Elijah indeed does come,' Jesus replied," etc. .   Tischendorf says that in the Armenian version, "Jesus" is placed after "answered" (AV) (rather than before "answered" in the TR).   This however may simply be due to the act of translation into the Armenian.   Notably this is also where the TEV places it.   Is this simply a quaint coincidence due to the English translation style of the TEV, or might this indicate that the TEV translators regarded the "Caesarean" text type's support in the Armenian Version as some kind of "clincher" argument?   We cannot be sure, and nor can their benighted readers.

Matt. 17:11b "unto them" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, at Matt. 17:11b the Vulgate reads, Latin, "*eis* (unto them)," and at Mark 9:12 (some number this as Mark 9:11,) the Vulgate reads, "*illis* ('unto those [ones]')."   It would appear that due to Diatessaron formatting, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron adopted its "*illis*" from the Vulgate's Mark 9:12.   Thus no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 17:11b, the TR's Greek, "*autois* (unto them)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century); and Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), and 2 (12th century). It is further supported as Latin, "eis (unto them)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions 1 (7th / 8th century) and g1 (8th / 9th century); and as Latin, "*illis* ('unto those [ones]' = 'unto them')," in old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and aur (7th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, a variant omitting "*autois* (unto them)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). This omission is also found in the Latin text of old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century).

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

Was this an accidental omission? At Matt. 17:10, *supra*, I refer to the fact that at this same page of *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), at the end of one line comes the "*ΑΥΤΟΙC* (*autois*)" of Matt. 17:13. But the scribe sought to "squeeze it in" at the end of the line so that it looks something like, "*ΑΥΤοιc* ". If lost by a paper fade, such an omission here at Matt. 17:11b may have gone undetected by a subsequent scribe. It is perhaps notable that on this same page of Manuscript Washington (W 032), a paper space at the end of the line exists at this very spot of Matt. 17:11b, which has three letters over it in the above line, and one and a half letters underneath it in the following line. Might this evidence such a paper fade, in which the scribe of W 032 was following the same paper spaces as he found in the earlier manuscript he was copying out from, and thus he inadvertently recorded what had happened?

Was this a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe, considering that the inclusion here of "*autois* (unto them)," was "unnecessary wordage," undertake a "stylistic improvement" in which he pruned away these words?

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

On the one hand, the reading of the TR enjoys strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, and has further support as an ancient reading found in St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, together with the later support of several old Latin versions. But on the other hand, the variant has ancient support in both the Greek and Latin, and the following of most old Latin versions. Weighing up these competing considerations, and taking into account the impressive ancient support for this reading from St. Jerome's Vulgate, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 17:11b a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 17:11b, "unto them," i.e., making the reading, "and said unto them," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century).   It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 13 (13th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century).   It is also found before "said" (AV) (*eipen*, "he said"), rather than in the TR, after "said," in the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)*, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude). It is further found in the Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which omits "unto them," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 788 (11th century, independent).   The omission is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

The two Alexandrian texts are split on this reading, with both showing what the neo-Alexandrians regard as "external" support, i.e., external to the Alexandrian texts.   But as they usually, though not always do, on this occasion the neo-Alexandrian texts and versions opted for the shorter reading.   Thus at Matt. 17:11b the incorrect variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al*.   Hence the ASV simply reads, "and said."   So too, this omission is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

On the one hand, the old Latin Papists of the pre-Vatican II era, on this occasion followed the correct Latin reading of the Clementine *et al*, and so follow the TR in their Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582).   Thus at Matt. 17:11b the Douay-Rheims reads, "said to them."   But on the other hand, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the post Vatican II (1962-5) era, follow the incorrect variant which omits "to them" (Douay-Rheims), and so this omission is found in the Jerusalem Bible (1966) and New Jerusalem Bible (1985).   We thus see how on this occasion at Matt. 17:11b, the old Latin Papists were closer to the truth than are the new neo-Alexandrian Papists.

Matt. 17:11c "first" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Greek word, "*pr*o*ton* (first)," gives rise to our English scientific word, "proton," referring to a fundamental particle carrying a unit positive charge of electricity, and generally forming part of the atomic nucleus.   (The exception is hydrogen, where the proton forms all of the atomic nucleus.)   It has a mass number of 1, hence the name, "proton," meaning "first."   Thus this ancient and Biblical Greek word is known to modern English speakers.

Matt. 17:10 and Mark 9:11, both read, in "*Hlian* (Elias) *dei* (must) *elthein* (come) *proton* (first)" i.e., "Elias must first come?" (AV).   Matt. 17:11c reads, Greek, "*Hlias* (Elias) *men* (truly) *erchetai* (shall come) *proton* (first)" i.e., "Elias truly shall first come" (AV).   And Mark 9:12 reads, "*Hlias* (Elias) *men* (verily) *elthon* (cometh) *proton* (first)" i.e., "Elias verily cometh first" (AV).

In Greek, the rule is that adjectives agree with nouns in gender, number, and case. Since "*protos* (first)" is an adjective, it may be declined as masculine-feminine-neuter from *protos-e-on*.   Here at Matt. 17:11c in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) the noun is "*Hlias* ('Elias' or 'Elijah,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *Hlias*)," and the reading of the adjective is "*protos* (masculine singular nominative adjective, from *protos* in *protos-e-on*)." Thus noun and adjective of Christ's words here match in gender (masculine), number (singular), and case (nominative).

At the reading of both Matt. 17:10 and Mark 9:11, the disciples ask why "Elias (*Hlian*, masculine singular accusative noun, from *Hlias*) must first (*proton*, neuter singular accusative adjective, from *proton*) come" (AV), and so there is not a matching of noun and adjective in gender (masculine noun and neuter adjective), although they match in number (singular), and case (accusative)."   Likewise at both Matt. 17:11c (TR) and Mark 9:12, we read Christ's words, "*Elias* ('Elias,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *Hlias*)" comes "first (*proton*, neuter singular accusative adjective, from *proton* in *protos-e-on*)" (AV) i.e., the noun is masculine nominative, but the adjective is neuter accusative.

At Matt. 17:10 and Mark 9:11 there is an infinitive, "come (*elthein*, active second aorist infinitive, from *erchomai*)."   The aorist infinitive does not have the sense of past time, but the idea of a single action, rather than a continuous action.   Hence aorist infinitives are usually rendered into English the same as present infinitives.   Infinitives are a verbal noun. Because an infinitive is a verbal noun, it is capable of grammatically functioning in a number of different ways[99].   Thus at Matt. 17:10 and Mark 9:11, in "*Hlian* (Elias) *dei* ('it behoves' = 'must,' AV) *elthein* ('to come,' = 'come,' AV) *proton* (first)," the "*proton* (first)," is acting as an adverb with the verbal noun (infinitive), "to come."   This is why at Matt. 17:10 and Mark 9:11 the *prima facie* adjective (*proton*) does not match the noun (*Hlian*).

In Matt. 17:11 there is a verb, "*erchetai* ('he comes,' indicative middle present, 3rd person singular verb, from *erchomai*)," i.e., "shall … come" (AV), followed by *proton*.   Here the adjective, "*proton* (first)," is acting as an adverb.   This is relatively common for some adjectives, of which *proton* is one.   This neuter accusative declension form i.e., here *proton*, is also idiomatically normative for an adverbial usage such as one finds in Matt. 17,10,11[100]. This is why at Matt. 17:11 the *prima facie* adjective (*proton*) does not match the noun (*Hlias*).

At Mark 9:12, there is a participle, "*elthon* ('having come' / 'coming' = 'cometh,' AV, masculine singular nominative, active second aorist participle, from *erchomai*)," acting

---

[99]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 590-611; Young's *Greek*, pp. 165-176.

[100]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 293; Young's *Greek*, p. 82.

as a verbal participle[101]. Thus once again, the adjective, "*proton* (first)," is acting adverbially. Hence it is once again a neuter accusative in harmony with idiomatic usage. This is why at Mark 9:12 the *prima facie* adjective (*proton*) does not match the noun (*Hlias*).

Therefore, at Matt. 17:11c it would appear that the scribe of Sigma 042, or an antecedent scribe in the manuscript line that he was copying out, changed the declension of the adjective, *protos-e-on*, from what when it acts as an adverb is the idiomatically normative "*proton* (first)," with a neuter singular accusative suffix (*on*). Thus it acquired the suffix (*os*) of a masculine singular nominative adjective to become, "*protos*," in order to make the adjective match the noun, "*Hlias* (Elias)," which is also a masculine singular nominative. Was this an accidental alteration following a paper fade of the last letter of "*proton*," or a deliberate change?

At Matt. 17:11c, the meaning of the TR's "*proton* (first)," is that the emphasis is on *the coming* of Elias which is *first* in time, "and" then he shall "restore all things" (Matt. 17:11). I.e., "Elias truly *shall first come*, and restore all things." (Cf. *proton* at Matt. 5:24; 6:33; 7:5; 8:21; 12:29; 13:30; 17:27; 23:26) The meaning of Sigma 042's "*protos*," is that the emphasis is on *Elias* who is the *first* to come, "and" then he shall "restore all things" (Matt. 17:11). I.e., "*Elias* truly *first* shall come, and restore all things." (Cf. *protos* as "first" or "chief," AV, at Matt. 10:2; 20:27; 21:31; 22:25; or the singular nominative adjective in the feminine gender at Matt. 22:38, *prote*.)

Thus there is a fine line in the meaning of the two readings of Matt. 17:11c found in the TR and representative Byzantine text (*proton*), and the minority Byzantine reading of Sigma 042 (*protos*). The diverse (old English, "divers,") meaning is one of a different emphasis, depending on what "first (*proton* / *protos*)" is modifying. But it is clear that the reading of Sigma 042 must be a corruption of the TR's reading, rather than a corruption of the variant, *infra* (which omits *proton*). Therefore, taking into account such factors, I think it reasonable for me to say that *in broad terms* the reading of Sigma 042 here supports the reading of the TR, albeit with minor differences, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 17:11c, the TR's Greek, "*proton* (first)," in the words, "Elias truly shall first come" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century, with minor differences, *supra*), E 07 (8th century), H 013 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); and Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), and 2 (12th century). It is further found as Latin, "*primum* (first)," in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century).

However, a variant omits "first (Greek, *proton*; Latin, *primum*)." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Lectionary 184 (1319 A.D.). It is further found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin

---

[101] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 621-2; Young's *Greek*, pp. 160-2.

Diatessaron (9th century).   From the Latin   support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   The omission is also found in the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

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

Was this an accidental alteration?   Was it lost due to an undetected paper-fade, especially if it came at the end of the line in a manuscript, perhaps with "*proton*" squeezed in at the end of the line to look something like, "*pr<u>o</u>ton*"?

Was this a deliberate change?   Did a scribe undertake "a stylistic improvement"? Did he arrogantly conclude that since "his disciples" first asked, "Why then say the scribes that Elias must *first* come" (Matt. 17:10), that it was therefore "redundant unnecessary wordage" to repeat "first" at Matt. 17:11?

A deliberate or accidental omission?   We just do not know.   But we do know that it was a change to the text of Scripture, here preserved for us in the *Textus Receptus*.

On the one hand, the reading of the TR has solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, and some further support in a couple of old Latin versions. But on the other hand, the variant has the overwhelming support of the Latin textual tradition. Considering these competing factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the New Testament master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 17:11c a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 17:11c, "first," is found in found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century, placed two words later than in the TR), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century).   It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions

However, the incorrect reading which omits, "first," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels

and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.*   The omission is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Armenian Version (5th century).

The incorrect variant entered the NU Text *et al.*   Hence at Matt. 17:11c, the American Standard Version reads, "Elijah indeed cometh" (ASV).   So too, the erroneous reading is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

James Moffatt renders this part of Matt. 17:11 as a rhetorical question, "He replied, '*Elijah to come and restore all things?*   Nay, I tell you Elijah has already come'" etc. (Moffatt Bible).   Moffatt's reason for regarding this as a rhetorical question is conjectural. But possibly he was influenced by the fact that "restore" (AV & Moffatt Bible) is in the future tense as "*apokatastesei* ('he shall restore,' indicative active <u>future</u>, 3rd person singular verb, from *apokathistemi*)."   I.e., if Elias is to "restore all things" in the *future* (Matt. 17:11), how can Christ then immediately say as a *past* event, "Elias *is come* (*elthe*, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *erchomai*) already" (Matt. 17:12)?   It was possibly thus to relieve what Moffatt thought of as an incongruity created by Christ's usage of a future tense in Matt. 17:11, that he rendered the variant as a rhetorical question.

Yet this is certainly not the only solution to this grammatical matter.   In Greek, there is what is called, the *gnomic future*.   It may be used to convey a timeless truth, or a true to life event, or what is simply always so.   E.g., in Matt. 4:4, our Lord referring to Deut. 8:3 says, "It is written, Man *shall* not *live* (*zesetai*, indicative middle <u>future</u>, 3rd person singular verb, from *zao*) by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God"[102].   Thus here at Matt. 17:11, Christ may be simply stating what on the basis of Mal. 4:5, "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord," had contextually become a culturally timeless truth, i.e., "Elias … *shall* … *come* (future tense)" (Matt. 17:11).   This conforms with the translation found in the Authorized Version, and in my opinion this is the more probable construction.   Thus there is no necessity to use the form of a rhetorical question such as found in the Moffatt Bible.

In the Greek, rhetorical questions that imply an affirmative response may commence with *ou*, whereas rhetorical questions that imply a negative response may commence with *me* (e.g., I Cor. 12:29,30)[103].   E.g., if the *ou* (which can also mean "not") at the beginning of Matt. 24:2 is taken to mean "not," then we have the question, "See ye *not* (*ou*) all these things?" (AV).   But if the *ou* at the beginning of Matt. 24:2 is taken to mean that an affirmative response is intended, then the rendering is, "You see all this?" (Moffatt Bible). But the absence of *ou* here at Matt. 17:11 is not fatal for Moffatt's construction of this as a rhetorical question since this is not an essential element of a question (e.g., Luke 14:3).

Unlike Moffatt, I think the more expected and natural sense of the Greek is as a statement rather than a question.   I do not consider a rhetorical question here at Matt. 17:11 is a likely construction since Christ clearly wants the disciples to accept the scribes teaching founded on Mal. 4:5,6, that "Elias" is to "first come" (Matt. 17:10,11).   Thus it would strike

---

[102]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 571; Young's *Greek*, p. 119.

[103]   Young's *Greek*, pp. 224-5.

me as confusing to these ends, and a strained and unnatural sense of the passage, to propose that Christ first asks a rhetorical question, "Elijah [first] to come and restore all things?" (Moffatt Bible). Such a question would unnecessarily throw the disciples chain of thinking out, and does not in my opinion fit well with the general flow of the passage's meaning. Rather, I think the more natural sense of the passage is that Christ commends with the word, "truly (*dei*)," the teaching of the scribes here, but then builds on this base a better understanding. Thus first he picks up and commends this basic teaching, "Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things." Then he develops this, "But I say unto you, That Elias is come already" (Matt. 17:11,12) etc., because "John the Baptist" (Matt. 17:13) came "in the spirit and power of Elias" (Luke 1:17).

On the one hand, I think Moffatt's construction of a rhetorical question here at Matt. 17:11, "Elijah to come and restore all things?" (Moffatt Bible), is an unlikely, awkward, and quirky sounding reading. It jars on my mind as incongruous with the general flow of the passage. Evidently most English translators have agreed with me. But on the other hand, what strikes my mind as an improbable and quirky kind of rhetorical question, struck Moffatt's mind as something that resonated with his psyche and persona, so that he thought of it as a likely and good sounding reading. Certainly Moffatt's rendering of the variant is not an impossible English construction of the Greek. Such are the diversities of men's minds. Such are the diversities in English translations of the Greek. For Moffatt's view here reminds us that English translations may sometimes vary where there is no hard'n'fast grammatical rule(s) requiring this or that rendering. Such diversity here thus to some extent reflects the different perceptions that often occur among men. For it is the common experience of man that in any group of people, such differences of perception may arise.

Matt. 17:15 "sore vexed" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Greek adverb, *kak<u>os</u>*, can have the sense of "severely" or "grievously" or "vehemently" or "grievously vexed" (e.g., "grievously vexed" at Matt. 15:22), and this is its sense in the AV's rendering of the TR's reading. But it can also simply have the meaning of being "ill" or "sick," e.g., at Matt. 4:24, "*tous* ('the [ones]' = those) *kak<u>os</u>* ('sick' = sickness) *echontas* (having)" = "those sickness having" = "sick people," AV), and this is its sense in the reading of the variant. On such matters, context is everything.

Both the Latin and the Greek are members of the Aryan Linguistic Family, and Aryan or Japhetic tongues (together with the Caucasic tongues of the Caucasus region) were given by God to the sons of Japheth, the great progenitor of the white (Caucasian) race (Gen. 10). Illustrating what *in general* are the strikingly similar grammatical properties of the Latin and the Greek (I do not say always identical, see my comments at Matt. 17:3), a similar contextual pliability exists for the Latin adverb, "*male*," as one finds with the Greek adverb, "*kak<u>os</u>*," *supra*. Hence here at Matt. 17:15 the Vulgate reading is "*male* (grievously) *patitur* (he suffers)." By contrast, when e.g., rendering Greek, "*tous kak<u>os</u> echontas*" at Matt. 4:24; 14:35, the Vulgate reads, "*male* ('sick' = sickness) *habentes* ('having,' plural)" = "sick people" (cf. Matt. 8:16; 9:12).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 17:15, the TR's Greek, "*kak<u>os</u>* ('sore' or 'severely' or 'grievously') *paschei* ('he suffers,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *pasch<u>o</u>*)," i.e., "sore vexed" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*male* ('badly' or 'grievously') *patitur* ('he suffers,' indicative present deponent [= active][104], 3rd person singular verb, from *patior*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin, "*male* (grievously) *torquetor* ('he is being tortured,' indicative passive present, 3rd person singular verb, from *torqueo*)," in old Latin Version b (5th century); and Latin, "*male* (grievously) *vexatur* ('he is being vexed,' indicative passive present, 3rd person singular verb, from *vexo*) in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, another reading, (*Variant 2*), reads Greek, "*kak<u>os</u>* (sickness) *echei* ('he has,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *ech<u>o</u>*)," i.e., "he is sick." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407). A similar reading (*Variant 1*), Greek, "*kak<u>os</u>* (sickness) *echein* ('to have,' active present infinitive, from *ech<u>o</u>*)," is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are speculative. Both readings were known to Chrysostom, but the variant seems to have originated with Origen in its different form.

Was this an accidental change? Was a partial paper fade of "*paschei* (he suffers)," to "*::chei*," then "reconstructed" by a scribe "from context" as *Variant 2's* "*echei* (he has)"? If so, was he influenced by the presence of "*echei*" elsewhere in St. Matthew's Gospel (e.g., Matt. 5:23; 13:12; 21:3)? Or did a scribe working on a manuscript using an Origen influenced *Variant 1* reading of "*echein* (to have)," fail to pick up an undetected paper fade that made it read, "*echei:*"?

Concerning *Variant 1*, "*echein* (to have)," was this a "reconstruction" by Origen following a paper fade of "*paschei* (he suffers)," which coming at then end of a line, made it look something like "*:::chei* "? If so, was he influenced by the presence of "*echein*" elsewhere in St. Matthew's Gospel (Matt. 13:5; 14:4)?

Was this a deliberate change? Was *Variant 1* some kind of "dynamic equivalent" by Origen, who in the looseness of his mind simply considered that "it means the same thing anyway"? Was *Variant 2* some kind of "stylistic improvement" to "a more simple"

---

[104] In Latin there are a number of deponent verbs i.e., verbs with a passive ending but an active meaning (Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, pp. 234ff).

terminology?

Was this some kind of combination?   E.g., did Origen first make a deliberate change from "*paschei* (he suffers)" to "*echein* (to have)" (*Variant 1*); and then an undetected paper fade in a manuscript line using "*echein*" which made it look like "*echei:*", later gave rise to "*echei* (he has)" (*Variant 2*)?

Were *Variants 1 & 2* deliberate or accidental changes, or some combination of the two?   We simply do not know.   But we do know that they are changes to the original text.

The reading of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) has strong support in both the Greek and Latin from ancient times.   Both *Variants 1 & 2* have slim minority support in the Greek, and nothing to commend them in terms of any textual defect in the representative Byzantine text being remedied by either of them.   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 17:15 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 17:15, "sore vexed," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century).   It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 1071 (independent, 12th century).   It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Georgian Version (5th century).

However, the incorrect reading of *Variant 2*, "he is ill," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and is the most probable reading of (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), although the reading of this manuscript cannot be determined with absolute certainty.   It is also found in Minuscule 579 (mixed text, 13th century).

At Matt. 17:15, a division over the reading of the TR and *Variant 2* has occurred among the neo-Alexandrians.   On the one hand, the fact that *Variant 2* is found in both major Alexandrian texts, and has *some* "external" support, has led some neo-Alexandrians to support it.   But on the other hand, the stronger support for the TRs' reading in e.g., the Syriac Versions, and the ambiguity of the Sahidic and Bohairic Coptic Versions whose reading is unclear, has led some neo-Alexandrians to prefer the TR's reading.   They consider *Variant 2*

may have arisen on the basis it was "a more   idiomatic Greek expression or because" the TR's reading "was thought to be pleonastic" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 43).

Thus on the one hand, the correct reading of the TR is found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), the UBS 3rd (1975), 3rd corrected (1983), and 4th revised (1993) editions, as well as Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993).   But on the other hand, the incorrect *Variant 2* is found in Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952), in both instances with footnotes referring to the TR's reading.   However, even among those following the TR's reading, considerable doubt may exists as to whether it is the correct reading.   For while the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions put the correct reading in the main text, and place the variant in a footnote, they then say, "that there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text or the apparatus [i.e., the variant] contains the superior reading."

On the one hand, the correct reading of the TR at Matt. 17:15 is followed by the ASV, NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, and NIV.   But on the other hand, we cannot ignore the neo-Alexandrian claims of the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions that there is "a considerable degree of doubt whether" this or the variant is "the superior reading."   Nor can we ignore the fact that the variant was placed in the main text of both Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952).   Such factors means it certainly remains possible for the variant to be adopted in future neo-Alexandrian versions.   Hence it is a case of, "watch this space" at Matt. 17:15 in future neo-Alexandrian "revisions" or "new" versions.

Matt. 17:20a "Jesus said" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter (Diatessaron formatting).   At Matt. 17:20a, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron reading, "*dicit* ('he saith,' word 2b) … *Ihesus* ('Jesus, word 1)," *prima facie* supports *Variant 2*.   But it is possible that due to Diatessaron formatting, the "*dicit*" comes from the Vulgate's Mark 9:19, and the "*Ihesus*" comes from the Vulgate's "*Iesus*" at Luke 9:41.   Therefore, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

The Second Matter.   The *Family 13 Manuscripts* of the NU Text Committee, contain outside the closed class of sources, Minuscules 788, 346, 543, 826, 828, 983, 13, *et al*.   The *Family 13 Manuscripts* of Swanson contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 and 13.

Nestle-Aland's 27th edition says the *Family 13 Manuscripts* support *Variant 3*, whereas Swanson says Minuscule 788 follows *Variant 3*, but otherwise his *Family 13 Manuscripts* follow *Variant 2*.   The issue thus becomes, What is the reading of 13 (13th century, independent), the minuscule that gives its number to this family?   While Tischendorf's 8th ed. says 13 follows the "saith" of both *Variants 2 & 3*, he does not says what its reading is with respect to the presence or absence of "Jesus."   Therefore, outside the closed class of sources, I shall not refer to Minuscule 13, *infra*.   Moreover, I shall divide the remaining Minuscules of the NU Text *Family 13 Manuscripts* when they are referred to outside the closed class of sources, rather than grouping them together as *Family 13*, and show them following *Variant 3*.

The Third Matter.   Outside the closed class of sources, some sources support a part of

a reading only.   Rather than further divide   the variants which already number three, and which together with the TR's reading already constitute four different readings, on this occasion, I make no reference to these bits'n'pieces sources.   This is no great loss, for like all sources outside the closed class of sources, they are not of any importance for determining the NT text anyway.   For we consider such sources only as a matter of passing interest, not as a matter of any consequence for the NT text.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 17:20a, the TR's Greek, "*Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 1) *eipen* ('he said,' word 2a, indicative active second aorist, 3rd person singular, from *lego*)," i.e., "Jesus said" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.) (in both instances the Lectionaries abbreviate *Iesous* / *IHCOYC* to *IC* with a line on top).   It is further supported as Latin, "*Iesus* (Jesus) … *dixit* ('he said,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular, from *dico*)," in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in word order 2,1, as, "*Dixit* ('said,' word 2) …*Iesus* ('Jesus,' word 1)," in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

But another reading, *Variant 1*, omitting word 1, but retaining word 2a, may be reconstructed from the Latin as Greek, "*eipen* ('he said,' word 2a)," i.e., "he said."   This is found as Latin, "*dixit* ('he said,' word 2a)," in old Latin Version a (4th century).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, may be reconstructed from the Latin as Greek, "*Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 1) *legei* ('he saith' / he says,' word 2b, indicative active present, 3rd person singular, from *lego*)," i.e., "Jesus saith."   This is found as Latin, "*Ait* ('he saith,' word 2b, indicative active present, 3rd person singular, from *aio*) … *Iesus* (Jesus)," in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), and c (12th / 13th century).

Yet another reading, *Variant 3*, omitting word 1, but retaining word 2b, Greek, "*legei* ('he saith' / he says,' word 2b)," i.e., "he saith," is a minority Byzantine reading.   It is found in e.g., Minuscules 880 (11th century) and 119 (12th century).   It is further found as Latin, "*Ait* ('he saith,' word 2b)," in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century).   It is also found as Latin, "*Dicit* ('he saith,' word 2b, indicative active present, 3rd person singular, from *dico*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century).

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

Was *Variant 1*, "he said," an accidental omission?   In Manuscript Washington (W 032), Matt. 17:20a reads in capital letters (unicals) and continuous script, with a line above the two letters I place a line under, "*ICEIPEN*."   I.e., "*IHCOYC* (*Iesous*)," is abbreviated to "*IC*."   Did a paper-fade of these two letter go undetected by a Greek scribe copying out this line, who thought the space was a stylistic paper space inserted to help right-hand justify the page, or possibly because the "*IC*" came at the end of a line?   Or did a paper fade of the Latin, "*Iesus*," at the end of a line, go undetected by a Latin scribe copying out this line?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? Did a Greek or Latin scribe consider "Jesus (Greek, *I̲e̲sous*; Latin, *Iesus*)," was "unnecessary wordage" as "Jesus" is named just two verses before at Matt. 17:18? Or did a Greek or Latin scribe prefer to remove "Jesus" here as a "gospel harmonization" with Luke 17:6 which reads, Greek, "*eipe* (he said) *de* (and) *o* (the) *Kurios* (Lord)" (TR), or Latin, "*Dixit* (he said) *autem* (and) *Dominus* (the Lord)" (Vulgate), i.e., "And the Lord said" (AV), on the erroneous basis that there was "a conflict" between the readings at Matt. 17:18 ("Jesus") and Luke 17:6 ("the Lord")?

Was *Variant 2*, "Jesus saith," an accidental change? If the original Greek, "*I̲e̲sous* (Jesus) *eipen* (he said)," had due to a paper fade, come to look something like, "*I̲e̲sous :::e:*," did a Greek scribe "reconstruct" this "from context" as, "*I̲e̲sous* (Jesus) *legei* (he saith)"? If so, was he influenced by the presence of "*legei*" in other Matthean passages (e.g., Matt. 15:34; 16:15; 18:22)? If the original Latin, "*Iesus* (Jesus) ... *dixit* (he said)," had due to a paper fade, come to look something like, "*Iesus ... :::it*," did a Latin scribe "reconstruct" this "from context" as "*Iesus ...ait*," and rearrange the word order as, "*Ait ... Iesus*"? If so, was he influenced by the presence of "*ait*" in other Matthean passages (e.g., Matt. 15:34; 16:2; 17:11,17,24, Vulgate)?

Or did the original, "*I̲C̲EIPEN*" i.e., when "*IHCOYC* (*I̲e̲sous*)" is abbreviated (with a line on top where I have one underneath,) to "*I̲C̲*," looking in the Greek as, "*I̲C̲EIΠEN*" undergo a paper fade in which the "Π" ("p" / pi) lost its right-hand bar to look something like a gamma ("g") "Γ", and a partial paper fade of the "N" (nu) meant it lost its two right-hand bars to look something like an iota ("i") "Ι"? If so, the line looked something like, "*I̲C̲:::ΓEI::*". Did a scribe then "reconstruct" this as "*I̲C̲ΛEΓEI*" (*I̲e̲sous legei*)? If so, *Variant 2* must have originally been in Greek.

Was *Variant 2*, a deliberate alteration? Did a Greek or Latin scribe undertake this as some kind of perceived "stylistic improvement" in the Greek or Latin?

Was *Variant 3*, "he saith," an accidental change? Did it originate as an undetected paper fade of "*IHCOYC* (*I̲e̲sous*)," when abbreviated to "*I̲C̲*," in a *Variant 2* manuscript line? If so, this indicates that *Variant 2* originated as a Greek variant and was later adopted into the Latin. If so, was this an accidental change (*Variant 2*) followed by an accidental change (*Variant 3*), or a deliberate change (*Variant 2*) followed by an accidental change (*Variant 3*)?

Was *Variant 3* a deliberate alteration? Was this a "stylistic improvement" of *Variant 2* which "removed the redundant 'Jesus'," which was "unnecessary" because "Jesus" is mentioned by name two verses earlier in Matt. 17:18? If so, was this an accidental change (*Variant 2*) followed by a deliberate change (*Variant 3*), or a deliberate change (*Variant 2*) followed by another deliberate change (*Variant 3*)?

Or was this a simultaneous change of words 1 and 2? I.e., was this a direct "stylistic improvement" of the Received Text's "*I̲e̲sous* ('Jesus,' word 1) *eipen* ('he said,' word 2)," in which first the name of "Jesus" was removed as "redundant" because of the earlier Matt. 17:18 reference; and then the "*eipen* (he said)" was changed to "*legei* (he saith)" because it appealed more to the quirks of a particular scribe?

Were these three variants deliberate or accidental changes, or some combination thereof? We do not know. But we do know that they were changes from the original Greek

text preserved for us in the representative   Byzantine text, which presents no clear and obvious textual problem in its reading.

On the one hand, the Received Text's reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, and may be traced to ancient times in *Codex Freerianus* (W 032). The only variant directly appearing in the Greek is *Variant 3*, and here it has only slim support in one lone late manuscript from the 1400s. The TR's reading has further support in a couple of old Latin versions; and interestingly, though their standard of textual analysis is quite uneven, it was regarded as the more probable construction by the composers of the Clementine Latin Vulgate. But on the other hand, the three variants all have support in old Latin versions, and in particular, *Variant 3* has stronger support with the Vulgate *et al.* Weighing up these considerations, most especially the strength of *Variant 3*, and considering the superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 17:20a a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 17:20, "Jesus (*I͡esous*) said (*eipen*)," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

Variant 2, "Jesus (*I͡esous*) saith (*legei*)," is found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.

Variant 3, "he saith" or "he says (*legei*)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); together with Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), and 983 (12th century, independent).

The incorrect *Variant 3* entered the NU Text *et al*. Thus here at Matt. 17:20, the American Standard Version reads, "he saith." *Prima facie* Moffatt might appear to follow *Variant 1*, since the Moffatt Bible reads, "He said." The same may be said for the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. But the reality is that in rendering *Variant 3*, which is clearly the reading favoured by the neo-Alexandrian texts, most versions lack the accuracy of the ASV's "he saith;" and so are clearly rendering "*legei*" here as e.g., "He said" (Moffatt Bible). Therefore the most natural construction is to say that all these neo-Alexandrian versions are in fact following the erroneous *Variant 3*. Is the TEV here following the TR on the basis of

the Syriac; or *Variant 2*; or *Variant 3* and to   its translator's minds, themselves supplying word 1?

Matt. 17:20b "unbelief" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*apistian* ('unbelief,' feminine singular accusative noun, from *apistia*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century), *Codex Sinopensis* (O 023, St. Matthew's Gospel, 6th century); *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 2378 (11th century), and *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is also supported as Latin, "*incredulitatem* ('unbelief,' feminine singular accusative noun, from *incredulitas*)," in *Versio Vulgata Hieronymi* (Jerome's Vulgate Version, 4th / 5th centuries), and *Codex Vercellensis* (old Latin Version a, 4th century), *Codex Palatinus* (old Latin Version e, 4th / 5th century), *Codex Veronensis* (old Latin Version b, 5th century), *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (old Latin Version d, 5th century), *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff2, 5th century), *Codex Brixianus* (old Latin Version f, 6th century), *Codex Monacensis* (old Latin Version q, 6th / 7th century), *Codex Aureus* (old Latin Version aur, 7th century), *Codex Rehdigeranus* (old Latin Version 1, 7th / 8th century), *Codex Sangermanensis* (old Latin Version g1, 8th / 9th century), *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff1, 10th / 11th century), and *Codex Colbertinus* (old Latin Version c, 12th / 13th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420), Augustine (d. 430), and Speculum (d. 5th century).

However, a variant reads, Greek, "*oligopistian* ('little faith,' feminine singular accusative noun, from *oligopistia*)."   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 924 (12th century).   It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

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

Was this an accidental alteration?   In a continuous script manuscript, did "*apistian* (unbelief)," go over two lines, with the "*a*" at the end of one line, and the "*pistian*" on the next line?   Did the first line become damaged at the end with a paper loss?   Did a scribe then "reconstruct" this as "*oligopistian* (little faith)"?   If so, while the feminine noun, *oligopistia* (*oligos* / little + *pistis* / faith) is found nowhere else in the NT, nevertheless, was the scribe possibly influenced by the presence of the adjective, "*oligopistos* (*oligos* / little + *pistis* / faith)" at Matt. 14:31 (*oligopiste*, "little faith," masculine singular vocative adjective), or Matt. 6:30; 8:26; 16:8 (*oligopistoi*, "little faith," masculine plural vocative adjective)?   (Cf. the contextual usage of the adjective, *apistos* / "faithless", in Matt. 17:17; with the noun, *apistia* / "unbelief," Matt. 17:20b.)

Was this a deliberate change?   The variant appears to have originated with Origen. Origen was a universalist who believed in a form of purgatory, and considered all human beings, and all devils, Lucifer himself, would ultimately be saved.   The proposition that Christ died for any outside of Adam's race i.e., the human race (Gen. 2:21-23; 3:20), is contrary to the teaching of the *Nicene Creed* that Christ came "for *us men* and *our salvation*"

(Rom. 5:12-19; I Cor. 15:45,49). Concerning Lucifer, we are specifically told in prophecy that after the millennium, "And the Devil … was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, … and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever" (Rev. 20:10). With respect to man, Origen's claims of universalism are contrary to Article 7 of the *Apostles' Creed*, which says Christ "shall come to judge the quick and the dead;" and Article 4 of the *Apostles' Creed*, which recognizes the reality of "hell" (Luke 16:23; Acts 2:27,31). It is clear from such passages as Matt. 25:31-46, that at his Second Advent (Matt. 25:31), Christ will make a division to "separate" (Matt. 25:32) between one group of saved persons and one group of damned persons, so that "the righteous" "shall go" "into life eternal," but the unrighteous "shall go away into everlasting punishment" (Matt. 25:46).

Given Origen's unorthodox universalist views, did Origen conclude that to say at Matt. 17:20b that the disciples were in "unbelief (*apistian*)," was "too strong a term," and that "it would be better to tone it down to, 'little faith' (*oligopistian*)"? If so, was he influenced in this selection by Matt. 6:30; 8:26; 14:31; 16:8, *supra*?

If this was Origen's thinking, then it was certainly quite wrong. The Greek noun, "*apistia*," whether declined as at Matt. 17:20b as an accusative, "*apistian* (unbelief)" or e.g., as a nominative, "*apistia* ('unbelief,' feminine singular nominative noun, from *apistia*)," does not necessarily refer to an absence of saving belief or belief in Christ *per se*, although it may do so (Matt. 13:58; Mark 6:6; cf. *apistia* in I Tim. 1:13). E.g., the cry, "Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief (*apistia*)," shows that "unbelief" may be a lesser form of disbelief held by a person with some belief in Christ. This is clearly also the case at Mark 16:14, where we read that after the resurrection, Jesus "appeared unto the eleven" disciples and specifically "upbraided them" because of "their unbelief (*apistian*) and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen" (Mark 16:14). If this was a deliberate change by Origen or any other scribe, then rather than tampering with the Word of God, he should have studied the Bible further, *and placed himself under the authority of the Bible, rather than trying to place himself over the authority of the Bible*.

The TR's reading has rock solid support from ancient times in both the Greek and Latin. Its support in the representative Byzantine text includes such shining and glistening Byzantine Greek jewels as the beautifully illustrated purple parchment, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century), and the purple parchment with silver writing and gold illumination, *Codex Sinopensis* (O 023, St. Matthew's Gospel, 6th century). It also enjoys the support of the ancient church fathers and doctors, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine. By contrast, the variant is an obscure reading, found only in a slim number of Byzantine manuscripts, and appears to have originated with Origen, quite possibly, although not definitely, as a deliberate change emanating from his heretical universalist views. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 17:20b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 17:20b, "unbelief," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine

elsewhere), 1243 (independent outside of the   General   Epistles,   11th   century),   157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century).   It is further found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Slavic (Slavonic) Version (9th century).

However, the incorrect reading, "little faith," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).   It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 579 (mixed text, 13th century).   It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Palestinian (*c*. 6th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (*c*. 500; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 17:20b, the erroneous reading entered the NU Text *et al*.   Thus e.g., the American Standard Version and Moffatt Bible both read, "little faith."   So too, the incorrect reading is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Now good Christian reader, think in your mind of those hundreds and hundreds of Byzantine Greek manuscripts from von Soden's K group (to say nothing of those further Byzantine text manuscripts in his I group,) that we have in support of the reading of the *Textus Receptus*, *against which there is no good textual argument*.   Think of the support that this reading has from such learned church doctors as St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine.   Think of some of the exquisitely beautiful Byzantine manuscripts that support the reading of the Received Text, such as the magnificently illustrated purple parchment, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century), and the glorious silver writing and gold illumination of the purple parchment, *Codex Sinopensis* (O 023, 6th century).   Not that we neo-Byzantines say that their artistic beauty necessarily makes them correct on this or that reading, but in broad terms, their artistic beauty certainly reflects the overall great care taken in copying them out.   And thereafter the TR's reading can be shown to have existed over time and through time, by reference to, for instance, the two Sydney University Lectionaries written in brown ink with colourful bright red illumination of key letters and section markers, to wit, Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*).

Now compare and contrast this image with the relatively small number of manuscripts following what is clearly the wrong reading in the variant.   Think of those trashy Alexandrian texts that virtually no-one had heard of for over a 1,000 years, till in the 16th century the dark pages of Codex Vaticanus being considered by Erasmus for just long enough for him to realize it was a badly corrupted text, were again slammed shut.   Then after about another three centuries, Codex Vaticanus was again opened, this time in conjunction with the

discovery of Codex Sinaiticus which came   from some obscure, dark, and dusty corner of a monastic library on the Arabian Peninsula in the 19th century.   Think of the likely origins of this variant with the heretic, Origen.   Was it an accidental change, with the baffled Origen scratching his head and fumbling around wondering what the correct reading was, before he came up with the variant?   Or was it a deliberate change, with Origen sitting down and quite possibly setting about to deliberately alter the text of Scripture to make it conform to his unorthodox views?

Now ask yourself this question.   "What one-eyed cyclops would be so stupid as to prefer the variant over the reading of the Received Text?"   And back, good Christian reader, can only come this answer.   "The spiritually part-blinded, one-eyed, neo-Alexandrians!"

Matt. 17:21 "Howbeit this kind goeth not out
                            but by prayer and fasting" (entire verse) (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*touto* (this) *de* (Howbeit) *to* (-) *genos* (kind) *ouk* (not) *ekporeuetai* (it goeth out) *ei me* (but) *en* (by) *proseuche* (prayer) *kai* (and) *nesteia* (fasting)," i.e., "Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), O 023 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, with a localized spelling variant of *ekporeuete* for word 6) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is also supported as Latin, "*Hoc* (this) *autem* (Howbeit) *genus* (kind) *non* (not) *eicitur* (it goeth out) *nisi* (but) *per* (by) *orationem* (prayer) *et* (and) *ieiunium* (fasting)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century).   From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).   It is further supported in similar Latin readings rendering the same Greek in old Latin Versions d (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century). The same reading with the addition of either "of devils" or "of devil" after "kind (*genus*)," is also found in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century, "*demoniorum*," plural), and old Latin Versions a (4th century, "*daemonii*," singular) and b (5th century, "*daemonium*," plural); and in a similar Latin reading rendering the same Greek in old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century, "*daemonii*," singular).   It is further supported in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Asterius the Sophist (d. *c.* 341), Basil the Great (d. 379), Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Ambrose (d. 397), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

However, this entire verse is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 253 (1020 A.D.).   It is further omitted in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century).   It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339).

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

Was this an accidental loss?   In Manuscript Washington (W 032), we find that the verse division formally numbered by Stephanus in 1551, manifests a more ancient unnumbered Byzantine verse division.   Thus a space of about 5 or 6 letters is left at the end of verse 20 in order to start verse 21 on a new line; and so too, at the end of verse 21 which takes up two lines, we find that about 3 or 4 letter spaces are left in order to start verse 22 on

a new line.   Thus verse 21 was clearly   conceptualized as a stylistic unit of one (unnumbered) verse in ancient times.   Bearing in mind that some scribes were less adroit, if these two lines came at the very bottom of a page, might their loss from a damaged manuscript, go unnoticed by an all too vague scribe?   Or bearing in mind that some scribes were more adroit, might their evident loss from e.g., a manuscript covered with some substance spilt over it at the bottom, have left a scribe baffled and puzzled as to what was missing, so that e.g., he left a paper space to indicate a loss, which a subsequent scribe then took to be an unnecessarily large stylistic paper space which he omitted in his subsequent manuscript line?

Was this a deliberate change?   Was this a scribal semi-assimilation to Mark 11:23 and / or Luke 17:6, on the basis of which a scribe considered the words of Matt. 17:21 to be "redundant"?

Or was this a removal due to a theological objection?   Three different theological objections, the latter two of which are essentially two forms of the same basic theological objection, one a more extreme form (libertinism), and the other a less extreme form (semi-libertinism), might have lay behind such a "justification" for pruning away the text of Scripture here.

The first theological objection may have come from some deluded person who thought of himself and / or those known to him, as *bona fide* exorcists.   Some such persons like to "cast a demon out with a word."   They are shallow persons, greatly deceived as to the efficacy of their "ministry."   They dabble in they know not what (Matt. 7:21-23; 12:44,45).   This type of person is not subject to the Word of God, and would e.g., claim "on the basis of experience," that some long process of "prayer and fasting" (Matt. 7:21) was "not necessary." "I deal with this type of thing all the time," such a man once claimed to me, and in his impious arrogance thought he knew better than the Word of God; for he liked to parade his "powers" around as some ego trip in order that foolish persons might fawn over him.   Such persons are really the play things of both their own sinful lusts and also the devils they think they exorcise (Acts 19:13-16).

Another theological objection comes from some heretics who claim that the gospel allows absolute libertinism (Rom. 3:8, 31; 7:7; Jude 12).   Such a scribal copyist may have sought to prune away Matt. 17:21.   Yet I think this unlikely here at Matt. 17:21, since such a heretic would also have surely pruned away many other parts of St. Matthew's Gospel. Therefore I think that *if* this is what happened here, the more likely scenario would be a scribe pursing the third theological objection i.e., a more moderate form of the second theological objection.

Thus a third theological objection, which is the same idea as the second objection in a more moderate form, may also have lay behind a deliberate desire to prune away Matt. 17:21. This is an inability to distinguish between the abuse of keeping God's law for the purposes of justification by works, as opposed to the keeping of God's law, not in order to be saved or merit some favour with God, but because we are saved and seek to do God's will.   This type of view then *selectively* seeks to "abolish" various laws, when it finds some justification by works abuse of them itemized in the NT.   An example of it is Campbellism, found in the American denomination, *Churches of Christ* (also known as *Disciples of Christ*, Alexander Campbell, d. 1866, was one of its two main 19th century founders).   Though not as extreme

as Marcion (d. 2nd century A.D.), the Campbellites have historically been relatively anti-Old Testament, in the false name of being, "New Testament Christians."

Personally, I think anyone who properly understands the NT, e.g., the Book of Romans which frequently cites the OT as authoritative, must necessarily have a very high view of the OT.   My own view is this, "The Old Testament is not contrary to the New: for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only mediator between God and man, being both God and man.   Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises.   Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man is free from obedience of the commandments which are called Moral" (Article 7, Anglican *39 Articles*).

Thus e.g., by contrast we find that a Welsh member of the Campbellite Church, Lloyd George, supported the disestablishment of the *Church of England* in the Welsh part of the old Kingdom of England with the 1914 Disestablishment Act[105], whose supporters were a mix of anti-Anglican Puritan-type Protestants, secularists and other anti-Christians.   Then when he became Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, with great Puritan-type Non-Conformist relish, Lloyd George (Prime Minister 1916-22), gleefully ensured the application of this Act be delayed no longer, and that the Anglican Church be disestablished in Wales in 1920. After all, the principal basis for Christian Church establishment are *Old Testament texts* dealing with Gentile kings (and judges) in the Christian era, Gen. 17:5,6; 35:11; Pss. 2:10-12; 72:10,11; Isa. 49:22,23; 52:14,15; 60:3,10.   And, of course, we all know how much the Jews abused their *Old Testament* given church-state religious powers in *New Testament* times, going so far as to kill Christians with them under Saul of Tarsus (Acts 7:54-8:1).

I have certainly come across this type of confusion among certain professed Christians, who e.g., claim that the Holy Decalogue is no longer binding on Christians, and for their "proof texts," refer to the condemnation of NT Judaizers who thought the keeping of the law to be meritorious before God, and that by keeping it they could earn their salvation (Gal. 3:23-26).   They miss the point of the contrast between "the two covenant," the covenant of works from "Sinai," and the covenant of grace found as a covenant inside a covenant, i.e., a covenant (the one, eternal, covenant of grace, Heb. 13:20) administered in another covenant e.g., the covenant of "Abraham" (Gal. 3:12-22; 4:19-31); although now administered under the New Testament covenant.   E.g., they may like to use such verses as Rom. 10:4, "Christ is the end of the law."   In fact, contextually this clearly means "for righteousness" i.e., justification by works; as compared to those "that believeth" (Rom. 10:4) i.e., justification by faith.   And St. Paul in this same Epistle clearly upholds the Ten Commandments (Rom. 7:7; 13:9).   (The multi-functional Decalogue is also used to isolate

---

[105]   The three Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, first became the Kingdom of Great Britain (with a flag containing the cross of St. George for England and Cross of St. Andrew for Scotland,) and Kingdom of Ireland from 1707 to 1800; and then became the United Kingdom of Great Britain & Ireland in 1800 (or UK of Great Britain & Northern Ireland from 1922).   Hence the three flags of the three national saints of the three kingdoms form the Union Jack.   Since Wales was a Dominion of the old Kingdom of England, it was part of the *Church of England*.

sin   of   relevance   to   repentance   and   conversion, I Tim. 1:8-11.)

Yet in my experience, these same persons are usually semi-libertines, for they then turn around and argue for most of the Ten Commandments, usually omitting only the fourth, on the basis of other Scriptures.   With all due respect to them, I believe that they do not rightly understand the words of the New Testament, for in the double *entendre* of the Greek, Christ rose on "the first of *the week*" or "the first of *the sabbaths* (*sabbat<u>on</u>*)" (Mark 16:2, *et al*).   Thus Christ made Sunday the Sabbath, and those who do not "keep it holy" (Exod. 20:8), but "profane the sabbath" (Matt. 12:5), are guilty of being, "unholy and profane" (I Tim. 1:9).

Yet this is not the only form of semi-libertinism.   For the Puritans did not historically claim that the Sabbath was abolished.   And while some of them have been and are Biblical Sabbath keepers, by contrast, some of them have gone the other way into an overly strict form of Sabbatarianism in their keeping of Sunday.   Some of them have thus made, and still make, crazy allegations about Sabbatarian Anglicans "breaking the sabbath," for they are bound up in the same type of extremism our Lord encountered with the Jews in Matt. 12:1-8 and Mark 2:23-28.   These Puritans are right to uphold the broad principles of the fourth commandment, but they are wrong to interpret one place of Scripture so that it be repugnant to another (Matt. 4:6,7).   They need to not "judge" "in respect of an holyday, … or of the sabbath days" (Col. 2:16), i.e., beyond the broad and clear guidelines of Scripture that are followed by their fellow, less strict, Sabbatarian brethren.   For we must put together the different Scriptures, to get the right Biblical balance.

In the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer (1662)*, the "Tables and Rules" say that, "All the Fridays in the year, except Christmas-day," are "days of fasting, or abstinence." Such "abstinence," is traditionally understood as a voluntary deprivation of certain foods, specifically, all red meats and white meats other than fish.   The "Tables and Rules" also itemizes "the forty days of Lent" for selective "abstinence," which in practice is usually interpreted to mean deprivation of some delicacy e.g., ice-cream or chocolate in desert, or milk in tea.   If fasting is permissible, then certainly the lesser form of it in a voluntary deprivation of certain foods also is.   But such fast / abstinence days are purely voluntary.

Other holy days are not so designated as fast days.   E.g., in 1662 prayer books published under Queen Elizabeth the Second, one often finds attached the Act, "Primo Elizabethae" from the first year of Queen Elizabeth the First.   This comes from the earlier 1559 prayer (slightly modified under King James in 1604).   In the third paragraph if refers to "the Feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist" (24 June).   Like other such feast days, one would not fast on this day.   By contrast, in the 1662 prayer book, (before 1859,) the Office of King Charles the Martyr (30 Jan.) is said to be a "fast" day (by which may also be meant a day of abstinence, *supra*), although since 1962 in Canada, 1978 in Australia, and 1980 in England, the Anglican Calendar has included *Charles I's Day* as a black letter (with an official option in England to keep it as a red-letter day).   And so those who remember it as a black-letter day, such as myself in general, (or others who keep it as a red-letter day, such as myself occasionally), do not in general keep it any longer as a fast day (although a private individual may still do so if he wishes, in which instance, transferring its observation to Monday 31 Jan., if it falls on a Sunday, since all Sundays are feast days.)

Historically, some Reformed (Evangelical) Anglicans have kept these fast days,

whereas others have not; and Puritan derived   Protestants have not kept them.   "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."   "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord: and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it.   He that eateth, eateth to the Lord," "and he that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not" (Rom. 14:5,6).   I admit that the precise meaning of Rom. 14:5,6 may be disputed, and reflecting this fact, I confess that my own views on the passage have changed over the years.   But I now understand these words to apply to the keeping of both religious feast and fast days.

Certainly all Protestants have historically quite rightly condemned the Romish form of fastings (I Tim. 4:3-5), which is connected with works righteousness (Gal. 2:16; 3:11). E.g., when the Papists of the *Vatican II Council* (1962-5) said that Papists should keep a "fast … on Good Friday, and where possible" this "should be prolonged throughout" the following "Saturday" i.e. Easter Even[106], they do so in the mistaken belief that fasting somehow merits them favour with God.   They think they have some good "works" to "boast" of (Eph. 2:8), like the Jews of Jesus' day who prayed, "God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are," "I fast twice in the week" (Luke 18:11,12).   For this reason, contrary to e.g., Mark 16:16; Eph. 2:11,12 ("strangers from the covenants of promise, *having no hope*"); Rev. 21:8 ("unbelieving"), the old "false prophet" (Matt. 24:24; Rev. 13:11-18; 16:13; 19:20; 20:10)[107], speaking as the *Vatican II Council*, further claimed that, "the plan of salvation also includes those who acknowledge the Creator … amongst those whom are the Moslems," saying "those too may achieve eternal salvation[108]."

---

[106]   Flannery, A. (Ed.),   *Vatican Council II, The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, Costello, New York, USA, 1977, p. 31, *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, 110.

[107]   In the same way that the Popes of Rome from 607 on can be called either "antichrists" or "false Christs" (plural, Matt. 24:24) since they are a succession of men, or the "man of sin" (singular, II Thess. 2:3), or the Roman "Antichrist" (singular, I John 2:18) since they form *one office* of the papacy; so likewise, the "ecumenical" or "general councils" starting from 681 and continuing in their lesser form from 553, and in their greater form from 1123, up till 1962-5 with the *Vatican II Council*, can be called either "false prophets" (plural, Matt. 24:24, n.b., this passage includes reference to other false prophets as well e.g., Mohammed,) since they are a succession of councils, or "the false prophet" (singular, Rev. 16:13; 19:20; 20:10,) since they form *one office* in the Roman hierarchy.   (N.b., the Trinitarian doctrine of the 553 and 681 councils was sound, and so e.g., the *Third Council of Constantinople* in 681 was correct to condemn the monothelite heresy.   But this and the *Second Council of Constantinople* in 553 intermingled error on other matters.   Thus the 553 council erred in claiming Mary was "ever-virgin."   Then after the Roman Papacy and Office of Antichrist was formed in 607 under the first Bishop of Rome to be Pope, Boniface III, the first false prophet was formed to work with him in 681, for that council claimed the prophetic power of "inspiration" for such councils, using for them the same root Greek word rendered "inspiration" in II Tim. 3:16, where we read "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God").

[108]   *The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, *op. cit.*, p. 367, *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, 16.   Contextually this section 16 is qualified to "Moslems … who, through no fault of their own, do not know the Gospel …, but who nevertheless seek God with a sincere heart … ."

Now logically speaking, if the Roman Church were right to claim that fasting somehow merits favour with God amongst Papists, then some such tolerance towards the Mohammedans becomes understandable. For if fasting is, as the Roman Church claims, meritorious before God, then obviously it goes to save not just Christians, but also e.g., Mohammedans, or the Jew of Luke 18:12. And so the "false prophet," speaking as the *Vatican II Council*, further said, "The [Roman] Church has a high regard for the Muslims. They … highly esteem an upright life and worship God, especially by way of prayer, alms-giving, and fasting[109]." And what saith another false prophet, Mohammed, in the *Koran*? Mohammed says, "… fast … and as for those who are able to keep it [the fast], and yet break it [by not fasting], *the expiation* [righteousness by works] of this shall be *the maintenance of a poor man* [almsgiving]" (*Koran*, Sura 2:180)[110].

Now good Christian reader, does this kind of references by the Roman Catholic false prophet (i.e., "ecumenical councils" from 681 in lesser form, and from the *Lateran I Council* of 1123 in greater form, such as the *Vatican II Council*) and the Muslim's false prophet (i.e., Mohammed in the *Koran*), about *prayer, alms-giving, and fasting*, sound familiar to you? It sounds to me very much like the type of justification by works heresy that the inter-testamental and New Testament Jews fell into, and which the NT very specifically addresses.

In inter-testamental times (*c.* 400 years from *c.* 400 B.C. to 4 B.C.), the Apocryphal *Book of Tobit* says, "Prayer is good with fasting and alms and righteousness" (Tobit 12:8, *Apocrypha*). Now while, *prima facie*, that is true, the implication here in Tobit that prayer *without* such fasting and alms is not "good," is certainly not true. Thus the passage continues, "For alms doth deliver from death, *and shall purge away all sin. Those that exercise alms and righteousness shall be filled with life*" (Tobit 12:9, *Apocrypha*). Since Tobit 12:8 understands by "righteousness" such acts as "fasting and alms," it follows that the teaching of atonement by good works, in which "those that exercise … righteousness" are said to "purge away all sin," contextually includes, though is not exhausted by, "prayer" with "fasting and alms" (Tobit 12:8, *Apocrypha*).

So too in the *Book of Sirach* (Ecclesiasticus), Sirach thinks good works atone for sins. E.g., regarding the Ten Commandments he says, "Whoso honoureth his father *maketh an atonement for his sins*: and he that honoureth his mother *is one that layeth up treasure*," for which reason he thinks one should, "'Honour thy father and mother'" (Sirach 3:3,4,8, *Apocrypha*; quoting Exod. 20:12). So too Sirach says of alms-giving, "alms maketh an atonement for sins" (Sirach 3:30, *Apocrypha*). And of fasting, Sirach refers to "a man that fasteth *for* his sins" (Sirach 34:25, *Apocrypha*), and says three verses later, "to forsake unrighteousness is a propitiation" (Sirach 35:3, *Apocrypha*). I.e., Sirach claims the mere act of turning away from "unrighteousness" e.g., "a man that fasteth *for* his sins," is intrinsically meritorious and so constitutes "a propitiation" for sins (Sirach 34:25; 35:3, *Apocrypha*).

With this understanding of the apostate condition of inter-testamental and NT

---

[109]   *Ibid.*, pp. 739-40, *Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions*, 3.

[110]   *The Koran*, translated by J.M. Rodwell, 1909, J.M. Dent & Sons, London, England; reprint: Everyman's Library, London, UK, 1974, p. 357.

Judaism, we can thus better understand   certain NT passages.   We can e.g., understand the type of misusage being made of the Ten Commandments by the Judaizers at Galatia, to whom the holy Apostle, St. Paul, replies, "by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified" (Gal. 2:16).   "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith" (Gal. 3:11; quoting Hab. 2:4).   We can better understand the justification by works error of the "Pharisees" who "*prayed* thus with himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners [violence, see 6th commandment & theft, see 8th commandment, Exod. 20:13,15], unjust [see Exod. 20:1-17], adulterers [see 7th commandment, Exod. 20:14], or even as this publican.   *I fast* twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess.   And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, *God be merciful to me a sinner* [see Gen. 15:6; Pss. 31:1; 32:1,2; 51; Hosea 6:6].   I tell you, this man went down to his house justified rather than the other …" (Luke 18:11-14, emphasis mine).

        But for all that, it is also the case that Scripture upholds the keeping of the Ten Commandments by the Christian (e.g., Rom. 13:9; Jas. 1:25; 2:7-12)   E.g., St. Paul says, "Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right.   Honour thy father and mother" (Eph. 6:1,2; quoting Deut. 5:16).   "What shall we say then?   Is the law sin?   God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not know lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet" (Rom. 7:7; quoting Exod. 20:17).   "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good" (Rom. 7:12).   So too, the giving of alms every Sunday is commended (I Cor. 16:1,2).

        And so likewise, Scripture allows fasting (e.g., Esther 9:31; Matt. 6:16-18; 17:21; Mark 2:20), not for the purposes of works righteousness (Isa. 58:3-5; Luke 18:12), but in order to humble ourselves before God because of our sins (Isa. 58:6,7; Joel 1:13,14; 2:12-17). E.g., we read in the holy Gospel, of how the "multitude" at "Galilee," voluntarily underwent "three days" of "fasting" as part of their religious devotions in listening to the teachings of Christ (Matt. 15:29,32).   The references in St. Matthew's and St. Mark's Gospels to "fasting (*nesteis*, masculine plural accusative adjective, from *nestis*)" for "three days" (Matt. 15:32; Mark 8:2,3), are altered to simply being "hungry" in the neo-Alexandrian's Twentieth Century NT (Matt. 15:32, TCNT; Mark 8:2, TCNT), and this type of rendering may also be found more generally in both neo-Alexandrian (NASB, RSV, & NIV) and Burgonite (NKJV) Versions.   The Matthean passage is even more perverted by the mad rat, Moffatt, who renders it, "starving" (Matt. 15:32, Moffatt Bible).

        I do not dispute that Greek, *nestis*, can refer to "fasting," "hunger," or "starving" (Liddell & Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*).   But I consider the contextual meaning is "fasting."   For if on the one hand, our Lord were simply concerned that the "multitude" were "hungry" (or worse still, "starving"), it seems inconceivable that he would have waited "three days" to feed them (Matt. 15:32; Mark 8:2,3)[111].   But if on the other hand, they were

---

        [111]   On inclusive reckoning, "three days" may not have been the modern 72 hours. I.e., the multitude may have first come to Christ on the evening of e.g., a Tuesday (day 1), been with him on Wednesday (day 2), and the miracle may then have been performed on the morning of the Thursday (day 3).   Certainly this is the type of way "three days" is used with Christ's death and resurrection i.e., Christ died on Friday afternoon around 3 o'clock (day 1), his body lay in the grave on Saturday (day 2), and he arose Sunday morning (day 3).   Did Christ here also wait till the third day so that this would symbolize his dead body's three days

"fasting" (AV) in the proper Biblical way,   and doing so in conjunction with the spiritual experience of listening to our Lord's teaching, then it makes a great deal of sense that our Lord would have waited "three days" before feeding them, so that "they faint" not on "the way" home (Matt. 15:32; Mark 8:3).   Now while I freely admit that I am not one much given to fasting, at most engaging in the relatively mild partial fast of abstaining from some food delicacy, and rarely doing even that; nevertheless, I maintain that we must not pervert the Word of God to suit our own preferences and fancies.   I thus maintain the accuracy of the reading, "fasting" in the AV at Matt. 15:32 and Mark 8:3, against both neo-Alexandrian and Burgonite versions alike.

But from time to time one finds extremists who wish to "throw the baby out with the bathwater."   They do not make these kind of Biblical distinctions with respect to fasting, and do not walk in the teaching of Rom. 14:5,6, *supra*, to be tolerant to different viewpoints and practices on this kind of issue.   They are rightly and genuinely concerned to oppose the abuse of such things as fasting by e.g., the Papists, but in this pursuit, they lose the Biblical balance.   Hence unlearned and ignorant men, who were sincere Puritans, were greatly misled by the leaders of the Puritan republican revolutionaries of 1640-60.   They went to these unlearned and trusting men, and told them that Anglican practices such kneeling to receive Communion, or such religious actions as the sign of the cross at baptism (which symbolic pictorial arm actions are akin to such Jewish symbolic arm actions as the one who "smote upon his breast") (Luke 18:13), or the keeping of certain feast and fast days (Rom. 14:5,6), were "Romish" practices.   Thus under Oliver Cromwell's republic, both the keeping of such fast days as Good Friday, and the keeping of such feast days as Christmas Day, were made "illegal[112]."

These extremist Puritans thus failed to distinguish between the proper use of such

---

in the grave (Mark 2:20)?

[112]   Lest the good Christian reader be inadvertently led astray by this selective excerpt from church history, let me say that before the Puritan Revolution, Anglicans under Laud's folly forced Puritans to go to Anglican churches under fines, and so likewise from 1662 to 1689.   Thus Anglicans also set aside the teachings of Rom. 14:5,6 (prayer book observance of holy days other than Sunday), and Col. 2:16 (Sunday observance in Anglican churches). Therefore both Anglicans and Puritans disgraced themselves by not submitting to the authority of Scripture on these matters, and giving proper tolerance to other Protestants as their fellow Christian brethren.   Hence I am critical of Charles I for not restraining Laud's folly (but I do not say that "two wrongs make a right," and repudiate the later sedition against the Crown); and I am also critical of Charles II for assenting to the Act of Uniformity without first ensuring there were adequate provisions of toleration for Puritan Protestants (although I support the ejection of the non-Anglican Ministers who did not subscribe to the 1662 prayer book and 39 Articles from Anglican Churches).   I am also pleased to say that from 1689 the Act of Toleration *finally* recognized these Biblical principles; and in that year Anglicans and Puritan Presbyterians also *finally* recognized that the established church in the Kingdoms of England and Ireland was properly the Anglican Church, and the established church in the Kingdom of Scotland was properly the Presbyterian Church.   Why do Christian men sometimes take *so long* to submit to the authority of Scripture and apply godly reason that is consonant with, but never contrary to, the Bible?   (Jer. 17:9; Ps. 51:10-12).

optional practices by those who held to the Protestant Reformation teaching of justification by faith (Rom. 1:17; 14:5,6), and their misuse for justification by works such as found in Romanism or Mohammedanism (Luke 18:9-14; Gal. 2:16; 3:11; Eph. 2:9)[113].   And so the poor Anglican Protestants, right up to the Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church himself, good King Charles I, found these very sincere, but very misguided and mainly *English* Puritans *under bad leadership*, (unlike most Scottish Puritans,) coming at them with sticks'n'stones and knives'n'guns, quite literally seeking to kill them.   So much for the 6th commandment, "Thou shalt not kill" (Rom. 13:9; quoting Exod. 20:13)!   Indeed, King Charles himself was martyred at Puritan hands in 1649.

And if the reader doubts how much some of the Puritan-types prance and prattle about such things, let him consider the words of the Scotsman, Robert Chambers (1802-1871). Less than five years after the fast day of *King Charles the Martyr* (30 Jan.) had been regrettably removed from the Anglican prayer book in 1859, Chambers is bold to say, "the anniversary of the execution of Charles I is very justly no longer celebrated with religious ceremonies in England."   And he thinks he makes out his case by this story referring to "the great Oliver Cromwell."   He refers to "a story … regarding a Miss Russell, great-grand-daughter of Oliver Cromwell, who was waiting-woman to the Princess Amelia, daughter of George III [Regnal Years: 1727-1760] … .   While engaged in her duty one 30th of January, the Prince of Wales came into the room, and … said, 'For shame, Miss Russell!   Why have you not been at church, humbling yourself with weepings and wailings for the sins on this day committed by your ancestor?'   To which Miss Russell answered, 'Sir, for a descendant

---

[113]   E.g., one Puritan writer referred to Anglican's "heathenish manner of keeping those feasts."   Further describing them as "Popish feasts" e.g., "Christmas day, … Epiphany … Annunciation …, All Saints … , Michaelmas and All Angels, … Easter and Whitsuntide, … Ascension Day and Trinity Sunday … .   Of … Sundays, though they have commandment both in … the fourth commandment, and in the New Testament … to keep the first day of the week, … after the manner of the heathen they abuse it, in dedicating it unto, and naming it after, the chief idol of the pagans, the Sun … . [I.e., calling it "Sunday," although it is also called "Sabbath" in the Homilies, and "Lord's Day" in the later Office of King Charles the Martyr.   Anglicans thus used all three terms, but this Puritan propagandist falsely claimed that Anglicans were worshipping the sun, and hence used the term "Sunday."   N.b., Christ is "the Sun of righteousness," Mal. 4:2.   If this Puritan was correct, then it would follow that e.g., St. Luke and St. Paul, "worshipped the pagan goddess, *Ath<u>ene</u>*," on the basis that the Greek city of "Athens" was named after her, and both were happy to use this name, Acts 17:15,16a,22; 18:1; I Thess. 3:1.   But how silly is that?   Acts 17:16b; I Thess. 1:9.]   … "What warrant or proof have these [Anglicans] … in the Word of God, … to solemnize the birth [Christmas, 25 Dec.,], circumcision [1 Jan.], resurrection [Easter], Ascension of Christ upon their several days with their set *fasts*, worship, and *feasts* … " (Puritan's *Brief Description of the False Church*, with spelling changes, in *Hierurgia Anglicana*, J.H. Parker, Oxford, 1848, p. 93, emphasis mine.)   N.b., Puritans look for a specific warrant to do something in worship, whereas Anglicans consider that if the church finds a practice to be useful and good, they may use it if it is not specifically contrary to anything in the Word of God.   Hence e.g., Christmas and Easter.   But I would also maintain that in the NT, Rom. 14:5,6; Col. 2:16 urged tolerance on these type of issues, e.g., Jewish Christians keeping certain days (Acts 20:6,16), but Gentile Christians not.

of *the great Oliver Cromwell*, it is humiliation sufficient to be employed as I am, in pinning up the tail of your sister!' (Rede's Anecdotes, 1799)."

Now Chambers likes to develop this type of thing with a specific dig at the Anglican practice of *fasting* on *Charles I's Day* (which is no longer generally practiced on this day, although it was more common before 1859). To this end, he delights to tell a story by which he attacks what he calls, "the superstitious veneration" of the "memory of Charles I." He thinks he has a powerful proof for his case in this story about the father of "the first Lord Holland [1705-1774, 1st Baron]," "Sir Stephen Fox." When Sir Stephen was a boy, "during the whole of the 30th of January, the wainscot of the house used to be hung with black, and *no meal of any sort was allowed till after midnight*." But with respect to such "fasting," Chambers tells with great delight, of how, "the housekeeper, apprehensive that" "the children" "might suffer from so long an abstinence from food, used to give" them "clandestinely as many comforts and sweet-meats as they could eat[114]."

On the one hand, I think the tradition of hanging up some black drapery around the house on *King Charles the Martyr's Day* is a most commendable practice. Though I do not normally do it, I did so on the 360th anniversary of King Charles' martyrdom in 2009, as part of a larger London commemoration of *Charles I's Day* that year. This may be done whether or not one has a lower part of a wall made of wood panelling i.e., a wainscot, or not. (My London lodgings did have a wainscot, but my Australian lodgings do not.) Of course, a special argument can be made out for doing this annually if one has children in the house. How wonderful it is for young children to be told, "Now help mummy hang up some black drapes around the house for *King Charles Martyr's Day*." (This tradition of black drapes may also be profitably kept by those who remember the day as a black letter day, providing the day does not fall on a Sunday, in which case the hanging of black drapes must be transferred to Monday, 31 January.)

But on the other hand, let me say I have some sympathy for these children not fasting on the day. Personally, if I was to organize such a fast for 30 January, or advise a family on the keeping of such a fast on 30 January or some other day, I would certainly not subject children to anything harder than a partial fast of abstinence i.e., no meat other than fish, together with normal fruit and vegetables etc., together with a prohibition on sweets. In fact, for the purposes of a day of abstinence i.e., a partial fast, any restraint will do e.g., just no sweets (a practice which some follow in Lent; although this practice for 30 Jan. would still require either transferring it to Mon. 31 Jan. if it fell on a Sunday, or not doing it in a year when the day fell on a Sunday). That is because I think that if a full fast be done, it should be by those much older, who consciously *choose* to *voluntarily* undertake such a full fast for the day. Indeed, as one who by temperament is ill-suited to ascetic food rules, e.g., Puritan scruples against the moderate consumption of alcohol resonate no kind of sympathetic cord in me, I confess I would not much like the full fast for myself either. Thus I would think it perfectly adequate for the adults to also keep the day as such a partial fast (i.e., day of abstinence), rather than a full fast.

However, in saying this I also fully respect and defend the right of my fellow

---

[114] Chambers, R., *The Book of Days*, in 2 volumes, W & R Chambers, London & Edinburgh, UK, 1862-4, Calendar at 30 January.

Anglicans in Christ, who being older than these above children, *voluntarily* opt for a full fast on this or some other day. I also defend the right of my fellow Anglicans in Christ who remember this purely as a black letter day, and do not engage in either a full or partial fast on *Charles I's Day*. Moreover, with respect to the issue of fasting, I accept that there are times when an exorcist may need to undertake a full fast.

Nevertheless, we see in Chambers' words how much some of these Puritan-types love to criticize Anglicans for keeping fast days (whether as a full fast or a partial fast), especially *Charles I's Day*. Now this same Robert Chambers, who thus so much delighted in his attack on this Anglican holy day, may be better known to the reader for his much wider attack on Christianity. For this same wicked man produced a book promoting macroevolution, not creation, entitled, *Vestiges* (1844), at first anonymously. It was anonymous so as to act as a cloak behind which he hid, for *he who worked overtly by day to more narrowly attack Anglican Christianity, worked covertly by night to more widely attack Biblical Christianity.* Chambers was thus a shady character who was a past master of the cloak'n'dagger technique, secretly concealing his most fatal dagger attack on creation. In 1851 he united with John Chapman to attack the Biblical teaching of creation by promoting the theory of macroevolution in the *Westminster Review*. In time, the seeds of his horrible deeds bore fruit. For when the ungodly anti-supernaturalist Charles Darwin launched his broadside attack on creation in his ridiculous work, *Origin of Species* (1859), he says in his "Historical Sketch," that "The 'Vestiges of Creation' … 1844" in its "tenth … edition (1853)," "has done excellent service … calling attention to the subject, … and in … preparing the ground for the reception of analogous views," i.e., those of Darwin.

Now if we conclude that the omission "fasting" in I Cor. 7:5 was deliberate (and this is only one possibility), then we have further evidence that some scribal heretics who copied out manuscripts were opposed to fasting, *per se*. Certainly the Received Text's "fasting" at 1 Cor. 7:5 is supported by the representative Byzantine text, and with no good textual argument against it is surely correct. Thus the correct reading at I Cor. 7:5 is "fasting and prayer." Therefore, we must pose this question. Were the omissions of "fasting" at Matt. 17:21 and I Cor. 7:5 deliberate in one or both instances? If so, did a heretical extremist Puritan type of scribe, concerned not to encourage the misuse of fasting in a works' righteousness type of way, decide to remove "fasting" here at Matt. 17:21? If so, in order to do so, unlike the scribe of I Cor. 7:5 who omitted only "fasting," did he then decide that "it was best" to simply omit the entire verse?

A deliberate omission of Matt. 17:21 by an extremist Puritan type scribe who failed to distinguish between justification by works fasting as opposed to fasting by those who maintain justification by faith? A deliberate omission by a libertine type scribe who just disliked the idea of "fasting"? A deliberate omission by a deluded person who considered exorcism was easily done by a quick "word," and "on the basis of experience" considered that such "prayer and fasting" was "unnecessary"? A deliberate omission by an assimilationist scribe seeking a semi-assimilation with Mark 11:23 and / or Luke 17:6? An accidental omission by a less adroit scribe who failed to note a damaged manuscript with Matt. 17:21 at the bottom of the page? An accidental omission by a more adroit scribe who recognized a damaged manuscript with Matt. 17:21 at the bottom of the page, but did not know how to "reconstruct" it, so he deliberately left a blank space, which a later scribe accidentally omitted as "unnecessary paper / parchment space wastage" in his copying out of the passage? Was Matt. 17:21 a deliberate or accidental omission? Was it some

combination of the two (last scenario, *supra*)? We do not know. But we do know that it was an omission of the original verse, preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text, against which there is no good textual argument. Praise God! "The Word of the Lord endureth forever" (I Peter 1:25).

The variant has slim support in both the Greek and Latin texts, and no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading to commend it. By contrast, the reading of the TR has strong support from ancient times in both the Greek and Latin e.g., St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate. The antiquity of this reading is widely attested to by both heretic (Origen & Asterius) and orthodox (Basil, Chrysostom, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, & Austin) alike. For on the one hand, we find it in e.g., the writings of Asterius the Sophist (d. *c.* 341), an Arian heretic; but on the other hand, we find it in e.g., the writings of St. Hilary of Poitiers (*c.* 315-367) in Gaul (France), whose defence of the Trinity against Arian heresy, meant that this western Bishop of Poitiers (from *c.* 353) was exiled (356-360) by the emperor to Phrygia (Asia Minor) in the east. St. Hilary had been exiled for refusing to condemn the great anti-Arian champion, St. Athanasius of Alexandria (*c.* 293-373) in the East; and upon his return to Gaul (France) in western Europe, his continued defence of the Holy Trinity against Arian heretics earned him the honourable title, "the Athanasius of the West."

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 17:21 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 17:21, "Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Versions (Takla Haymanot *c.* 500 & Pell Platt edition); Georgian "B" (5th century) Version; and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the entire verse of Matt. 17:21 is omitted in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further omitted in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also omitted in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th

century), and Palestinian (*c.* 6th century)   Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century), and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Ethiopic Version (6th century Rome & Paris Manuscript of the 13th – 14th centuries); and the Georgian "1" (5th century) and "A" (5th century) Versions.

The erroneous variant which omits Matt. 17:21 was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Matt. 17:21 is placed in square brackets in the New American Standard Bible, by which the NASB translators erroneously mean, "words probably not … original … ."   Matt. 17:21 is omitted in the American Standard Version, although a footnote reading says, "Many authorities, some ancient, insert ver. 21 'But this kind goeth not out save by prayer and fasting.'   See Mk. 9:29" (ASV ftn).   Likewise, Matt. 17:21 is omitted with a footnote reference to the TR's reading in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.   Matt. 17:21 is omitted without so much as a footnote reference to it in the TCNT and Moffatt Bible.

Because of its strong attestation in the Latin, as manifested in the Clementine, the old pre-*Vatican II Council* Latin Papists dared not stoop to expunge Matt. 17:21 from Holy Writ. Thus it is found in the Douay-Rheims at Matt. 17:21 (Matt. 17:20) as, "But this kind is not cast out but by prayer and fasting."   But the new post *Vatican II Council* neo-Alexandrian Papists are more bold in their defiant attack of the Received Text's reading on this verse of Holy Scripture.   Thus it is removed from the main text, and reduced to a footnote reference, in both the Roman Catholic Jerusalem Bible and New Jerusalem Bible.   So much for the claims of the Roman Church to be, "*semper eadem*," i.e., "always the same" (Latin).

Application of Matt. 17:21.   Contrary to the claims of some professed Christians, God gives different gifts to different Christians (I Cor. 12:27-30; Eph. 4:11,12).   E.g., some years ago now, I used to engage in what was a never-ending debate with a friend of mine, who considered all Christians should be evangelists.   While it is true that all Christians should by their life and beliefs be *witnesses* for Christ of e.g., his saving power unto them (justification) and ongoing presence in holiness of living (sanctification) (e.g., Rev. 20:4), I do not believe that all Christians are called to be evangelists.   But I do think we should all pray for evangelists and their work.   Certainly if a person feels impressed by God to witness to someone about the faith that is in him, and to present the gospel to another person, then I would not want to stand in his way nor discourage him.   But if he does not feel so impressed, I would not want to "push him" in this direction on the basis that "all" are meant to be "evangelists."   For "if they were all one member, where were the body?" (I Cor. 12:19).   As I used to repeatedly say to my friend, "And he gave … *some*" to be "evangelists" (Eph. 4:11), not *all*.

E.g., this heresy is found in the Jehovah's Witnesses cult.   The Jehovah's Witnesses are Arian heretics who deny the Divinity of Christ, and indeed deny the Trinity *per se*.   They also teach a heretical doctrine of justification by works.   They further teach the heresy that *all* are evangelists, and so they require their members to undertake a certain amount of "evangelistic work" every month.   Hence e.g., the well known phenomenon of Jehovah's Witnesses knocking on one's door, *yet again!*

This matter is relevant to the gift, "discerning of spirits" (I Cor. 12:10).   Since the Devil and his army of devils are to operate up until the Second Coming (II Thess. 2:9; Rev. 18:2), it follows that the church has an ongoing need for exorcists who "in" the "name" of Christ, "cast out devils" (Mark 16:17).   This has certainly been the experience of the church

throughout the ages. We need to be careful   to remember that not all are exorcists, but only those so called by God. A good exorcist knows that some devils may take some time to be exorcised. "Howbeit," saith Christ, "this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting" (Matt. 17:21; cf. Mark 9:29). For in the same way that a minister dealing with the sin of homosexuality must undertake "a fishing expedition" i.e., research, into the antecedent sin(s) of idolatry that a person first committed before "God … gave them up to uncleanness" (Rom. 1:24; I Kgs 14:23,24), and ensure that they repent of all and any such sins of idolatry (e.g., perhaps "covetousness, which is idolatry," Col. 3:5, led them to make a god out of a focus on "sex, sex, sex[115];" or perhaps narcism; or perhaps they engaged in adoration of the consecrated Communion elements, or Mariolatry, like so many Roman Catholic and Puseyite priests given over to homosexual practices); so likewise, the exorcist must undertake "a fishing expedition" to find out how the devil or devils first got access to that person, and ensure that all and any such sins are repented of.   (E.g., they might have played with astrology, or dabbled with ouija boards, Deut. 18:9-12; Isa. 8:19,20; Gal. 3:1; 5:20; Rev. 21:8.)

Now before 607 A.D., there were some good, godly, and saintly men who held the Bishopric of Rome, such as Bishop Silvester (Bishop of Rome, 314-355) or Bishop Gregory

---

[115]   Marriage has both a personal element and corporate element.   The corporate element requires that the man and woman be of the same race and religion so as to protect their communities.   For in God's law racial families (Gen. 10; Deut. 32:8; Acts 17:26b) and the church (I Cor. 7:39) are protected by the basic unit of the family (Ezra 9 & 10; Neh. 13); so that the family, not the individual, is the base unit (although an individual who is celibate and morally upholds this general structure is permissible, I Cor. 7:32-38).   Thus if mixed marriages are generally tolerated between persons of discernibly different racial groups e.g., white Caucasians and Mongoloids, or brown Asiatic Indians, or black Negroids; or with those outside of the Christian gospel; then this indicates that those involved think selfishly and / or shallowly of only the personal element in marriage.   They consider such matters "a personal choice" and "no-one else's business." *Therefore a good indicator of whether any group or society is over-sexed, is their attitude towards miscegenation* (Gen. 6:1-4; Dan. 2:43,44; Matt. 24:37-39).   If they are generally tolerant of mixed marriages betwixt persons of diverse seed, then they either are, or shortly will be, involved in all manner of other lust.   Hence when table fellowship rules for Jewish and Gentile Christians were laid down, this included a prohibition on "fornication," Acts 15:20,29; 21:25.   And since there is only one kind of "fornication" that can occur when Jewish and Gentile Christians comes together, but not when they are apart, it follows that this was a prohibition on the two groups dating or marrying one another.   (I do not say submission to God's racist laws will *ipso facto* cure a Western society's problems, but I do say that it is an essential prerequisite to such a remedy.) A more recent case study we have of this phenomenon is the tolerance towards suchlike in the post World War Two era 1940s and 1950s, connected with desegregation and immigration of coloureds.   Once again, common grace being spurned, "the Lord said, My spirit shall not always strive with man" (Gen. 6:3), and there then ensued the moral mess that now envelopes us, and is everywhere apparent.   For miscegenationists "declare their sin as Sodom, they hide it not" (Isa. 3:9)   How can they?   For it is even stamped upon their half-caste and quarter caste spawn, "for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me" (Deut. 5:9; cf. 23:2-8).

(Bishop of Rome, 590-604).   (I do not say   all Bishops of Rome before 607 were so saintly, as seen by the antecedent lust some had to be "universal bishop," a lust specifically repudiated and condemned by St. Gregory[116].)   But then came the full manifestation of the "falling away" (II Thess. 2:3), i.e., *the formation of the Roman Papacy*.   Scripture tells us that since the formation of the Roman Papacy, with the first Pope, Boniface III (Bishop of Rome, 607; First Pope, 607), who got a decree from Phocas making him "universal bishop," the Roman Pope is "the son of perdition" (II Thess. 2:3).   This term, also used of Judas Iscariot (John 17:12), tells us that every Pope since 607 has committed the unpardonable sin of "blasphemy against the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 12:31).   For in claiming to be "the vicar of Christ" with "universal" jurisdiction in the church, he usurps the position of the Holy Ghost (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:13-15).   Thus every Pope since 607 has been devil possessed by Lucifer himself (Rev. 12:3; 13:1; 16:13).   No surprise then, that we see in Popery "the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders" (II Thess. 2:9), for example, the stigmata phenomenon exhibited in Francis of Assisi (d. 1226), the founder of the Roman Catholic monastic order of Franciscans.   Any attempt to exorcise the Pope would be futile and counter-productive.   One would come up against Lucifer himself (cf. Isa. 14:4,12-15; Ezek. 28:12-19), and he has an unbreakable hold on the Pope.   Christ and Christ alone shall deal with the Pope, for upon his return, there shall be the spectacle a battle-royal, when "the Lord" "shall destroy" him "with the brightness of his coming" (II Thess. 2:8).

A good exorcist is a Biblically based exorcist.   The attempt to remove Matt. 17:21 is an attempt to remove an important Scripture that an exorcist must take guidance from.   For if he thinks he can just exorcise all devils with ease, the devil can "play dumb" and leave temporarily.   But then he can "return."   And "then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first" (Matt. 12:44,45).   Given the importance of this Scripture to a proper understanding of exorcism, we must ask, "What role, if any, did devils play in its removal?"   We do not know the answer.   But we may be suspicious.   And we may also ask, "What role, if any, did devils play in its promotion in neo-Alexandrian texts and Bible versions?"   Once again, we do not know the answer.   But once again, we may be suspicious.

Matt. 17:22 "while they abode" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter.   At Matt. 17:22, the reading of the Vulgate *et al* is Latin, "*conversantibus* (word 1) *autem* (word 2, 'And') *eis* (word 3) (word 1, *conversantibus*,

---

[116]   The rise of the Roman Antichrist came in the form of a *prophetic type* with the Bishops of Rome from 533 to 565 starting with John II (Bishop of Rome 533-5) in 533, when Justinian referred in his Code to the Bishop of Rome as "the head of all the churches."   But this was only in a letter.   Though this was both a *temporary* position (held only till the end of Justinian's reign), and a *titular* universal primacy, it manifested one element of the hankering for universal primacy that some Bishops of Rome had been seeking in the Rome-Constantinople controversy, in which Rome sought, but did not attain, primacy over the Patriarchate of Constantinople.   But the pre-533 position prevailed from 565 to 607, and indeed during this time such claims were repudiated as the teachings of "Antichrist" by St. Gregory when he was Bishop of Rome (590-604).   These claims were then successfully revived by Boniface III in 607.

masculine plural ablative, present active participle, from *converso* + word 3, *eis*, masculine plural ablative, pronoun from *is*).” This precise reading is found in the Vulgate and old Latin versions f & g1. The same basic reading is found with minor differences in old Latin aur (with word 3 as “*illis* / ‘those [ones]);” old Latin q (with word 3 as “*ipsis* / themselves);” and old Latin a, b, d, ff2 (in word order 3,2,1). It is also found in the Sangallensis Diatessaron Vulgate Codex, together with Hilary, Jerome, and Austin; and the Vulgate’s reading is also manifested in the Clementine.

Conversantibus is a Latin participle from *converso*, which means to “turn around.” E.g., it is so used by Cicero (106-43 B.C.) in *Timaeus* 27, and *Annaeus Seneca* (5 B.C. – 65 A.D.) in *Epistulae* 62:1. If this is the meaning of “*conversantibus*” here, then it supports *Variant 1*, *infra*.

However, *conversor* (indicative passive present, 1st person singular verb, from *converso*), can refer either to “conduct” or “behaviour” (meaning 1), or have the sense of to “live” or “abide” somewhere (meaning 2). E.g., it is used with meaning 1 by Apuleius (b. *c.* 123 A.D.) in *Apologia* 87; and it is used with meaning 2 by Pliny II (*c.* 23-79 A.D.) in his *Natural History* 10:6.[117] If meaning 2 is the connotation of “*conversantibus*,” here, then it supports the reading of the TR. Indeed, it was in development of this idea that Matt. 17:22 was rendered in the Douay-Rheims as, “when they abode together.”

E.g., at Acts 23:1, St. Paul says, “I *have lived* (*pepoliteumai*) in all good conscience” (AV). The Greek indicative middle perfect verb, “*politeuomai* (I have lived),” is translated in the Vulgate by *converso* as a perfect passive participle, put in the singular masculine nominative i.e., “I have lived (*conversatus*)[118].”

Quite significantly for our passage here at Matt. 17:22, we find a number of NT passages in which Latin *converso* is used for translating Greek *anastrepho*. E.g., in II Cor. 1:12, St. Paul says, “we have had our conversation (Greek, *anestraphemen*, indicative passive aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *anastrepho*) in the world.” This reads in the Vulgate, “we have lived (Latin, *conversati*, nominative plural masculine, perfect passive participle, from *converso*).” Or at Eph. 2:3, St. Paul says, “we all” lived or “had our conversation (Greek, *anestraphemen*, from *anastrepho*).” This reads in the Vulgate, “we all lived (Latin, *conversati*, from *converso*).” Or at I Tim. 3:15, “how thou oughtest to behave (Greek, *anastrephesthai*, middle present infinitive, from *anastrepho*) thyself,” is rendered by the Vulgate’s “*conversari* (passive present infinitive, from Latin *converso*).”

So too in the Book of Hebrews, at Heb. 10:33 we read, “of them that were so” living or “used (*anastrephomenon*, masculine plural genitive, present passive participle, from Greek *anastrepho*);” which is translated in the Vulgate as “*conversantium* (masculine plural genitive, present active participle, from Latin *converso*).” And at Heb. 13:18, “in all things

---

[117] *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968-82), p. 439 (*converso* & *conversor*).

[118] Showing its variability depending on context, inside the Epistle to the Philippians, *converso* is used in the Vulgate for both “conduct” (Phil. 1:27) and “living” (Phil. 3:6).

willing to live (*anastrephesthai*, passive   present infinitive, from Greek *anastrepho*) honestly;" is found in the Vulgate as "*conversari* (passive present infinitive, from Latin *converso*)."   (Cf. St. Peter at I Peter 1:17; II Peter 2:18.)

We thus have clear instances at II Cor. 1:12; Eph. 2:3; I Tim. 3:15; Heb. 10:33; 13:18; and I Peter 1:17; 2:18, of the Latin *converso*, being used for the Greek *anastrepho*.   This not only clearly shows that the Vulgate might be translating Matt. 17:12 from the Received Text, but in my opinion, makes this the more probable possibility.   Hence at Matt. 17:12 I agree with the Douay-Rheims, and equate the reading of the Vulgate *et al* with the *Textus Receptus*.

By contrast, developing the idea of "turned around" with a connotation of, *turning around in order to gather together*, Tischendorf's 8th edition, the UBS 3rd, 3rd corrected, & 4th revised editions, and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition, consider that Latin, "*conversantibus*" + plural ablative pronoun, instead supports the reading of the Greek variant's participle, "*sustrephomenon* (+ *auton*, 'while they were gathering together' or 'while they were crowding around')."   On this construction of the Latin, "*conversantibus*," the Vulgate *et al* basically follow *Variant 2* reading.

We find the Vulgate's reading at Acts 11:26 uses a perfect passive participle, from *converso* ("*conversati*"), to translate a Greek passive aorist infinitive from *sunago* ("*sunachthenai*").   The Greek *sunago* means "bringing together," hence the AV's "they assembled themselves."   Here were find both the idea of *gathering together*, found in the variant of Matt. 17:22; and the purpose of *abiding together* (in church fellowship), found in the TR of Matt. 17:22.   The Douay-Rheims renders Acts 11:26, "And *they conversed* there in the church," meaning *they dwelt* or *they kept company* together.   Thus Acts 11:26 (Vulgate) illustrates the elasticity of the Latin *converso* to potentially be translating either the Received Text (inside the closed class of sources) or *Variant 2* (otherwise outside the closed class of sources) at Matt. 17:22.

On the balance of probabilities I think the Vulgate *et al* supports the reading of the Greek *Textus Receptus* at Matt. 17:22, i.e., Latin *converso* for Greek *anastrepho*, since this is harmonious with II Cor. 1:12 *et al*, *supra*.   Nevertheless, given the elasticity of the term evident in Acts 11:26, (and also seen in a different view to mine taken by Tischendorf *et al*, *supra*), we cannot be entirely certain of this conclusion.   Therefore, since it is possible to argue that the "*conversantibus*" reading of the Vulgate *et al* supports the TR (my view), or *Variant 1*, or *Variant 2* (Tischendorf's view), it follows that on this occasion, I think it best to omit all reference to the Latin reading of "*conversantibus*" + plural ablative pronoun, *infra*.

Furthermore, concerning the remaining old Latin versions at Matt. 17:22, Tischendorf's 8th edition with regard to ff1 and e; the UBS 4th revised edition with regard to ff1, e, and c; and UBS 3rd & 3rd corrected editions together with Nestle-Aland's 27th edition with regard to ff1 and c, and what they classify as a similar reading from e; all take the view that the Latin in these remaining old Latin versions support the TR's reading.   But this also requires scrutiny.   We find the Latin reading, "*redeuntibus* (+ plural ablative pronoun, 'when they were coming,' or 'when they were returning,' masculine plural ablative, present active participle, from *redeo*)," in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century).   The Latin reading, "*revertentibus* (+ plural ablative pronoun, 'when they were returning,' masculine plural ablative, present active participle, from *revereto*)," is in old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century).   And the similar Latin reading, "*regrederetur* ('when he returned,' see comments

below on the subjunctive in <u>a subordinate</u> <u>clause</u>, <u>subjunctive</u> imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *regredior*),” i.e., “when he returned,” is found in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century).

The Latin, “*redeo*,” meaning to *come or go back*, is used by e.g., Macius Plautus (d. 184 B.C.) in *Cistellaria* 704, or by Julius Caesar (*c.* 100-44 B.C.) in *de Bello Gallico* 5:58:6. “*Revertor*” with the meaning of to *turn around* or *go back* is used by e.g., Tullius Cicero (106-43 B.C.) in *Cluentio* 24, or by Vergilius Maro (70-19 B.C.) in *Aenis* 2:750. And “*regredior*,” is also used to mean *return* by e.g., Cornelius Tacitus (b. *c.* 55 A.D.) in *Historae* 3:70.[119]

The common idea of old Latin e, ff1, and c, in Latin *redeo*, *reverto*, and *regredior*, is the idea of returning. For instance, *reverto* (cf. English, “revert”), is found in St. Matthew’s Gospel in the Vulgate, e.g., as “*revertatur* (subjunctive passive present, 3rd person singular verb),” meaning, “it may be returned” (Matt. 10:13), or “let him [not] return” (Matt. 24:18); or “*revertar* (indicative passive future, 1st person singular verb),” meaning, “I shall be returned” (Matt. 12:44). Thus this is really a contrast with the reading of the TR, “while they were abiding” in the Greek participle, *anastrephomen<u>o</u>n* + plural pronoun. Therefore these Latin readings really constitute another distinctive variant, i.e., *Variant 1*. Thus I shall refer to old Latin ff1 and c as *Variant 1a*, and old Latin e as *Variant 1b*. As a textual analyst of the *Neo-Byzantine School*, under normal circumstances I would be unlikely to discuss these minor Latin readings of *Variant 1*. But in view of the usage made of it by those of the *Neo-Alexandrian School*, I shall discuss *Variant 1*, *infra*.

Therefore, it looks like Tischendorf as seen in his 1869-72 edition, created a flawed paradigm in which *Variant 2* was said to have the Latin support of the Vulgate *et al*, and the TR’s reading was said to have the Latin support of *Variant 1*. This made for a simple duality. Then in the academic normativity of the neo-Alexandrian school, this flawed paradigm was simply repeated again and again in subsequent neo-Alexandrian texts such as that of UBS (1975, 1983, & 1993) and Nestle-Aland (1993). Of course, the hyper-normative neo-Alexandrians that generally control the tertiary schools, could, if they wanted to, break with this particular flawed paradigm at Matt. 17:22, while still remaining inside the wider normativity of the *Neo-Alexandrian School* paradigm. But to date, they have not done so.

The Second Matter. *Variant 1* is of such relative insignificance that it would not normally even need to be referred to in neo-Byzantine school textual discussion. But as occurs on other occasions, it is referred to because of the usage made of it by the neo-Alexandrian school. Having decided that *Variant 1* should in fact be included, then raises the issue of its reconstruction(s) into Greek. Particularly with regard to *Variant 1b*, the reader may wonder how a Greek active aorist would become a Latin subjunctive imperfect. Why not e.g., reconstruct the Latin as Greek, “*epistreps<u>e</u>* (‘he returns,’ subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *epistreph<u>o</u>*),” or Greek, “*upostreps<u>e</u>* (‘he returns,’ subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *upostreph<u>o</u>*)”?

Certainly this would contextually be bad Greek and I would not do so. That is

---

[119] *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968-82), p. 1589 (*redeo*), pp. 1601-1602 (*regredior*), p. 1646 (*revereto*).

because the subjunctive mood in the Latin and the Greek is not identical, although it is usually the same. In the Greek, the subjunctive mood has the idea of contingency, or possibility, or uncertainty, or the hypothetical[120]. As a general rule, the Latin subjunctive is the same[121]. But this connotation is clearly lacking here at Matt. 17:22.

However, the Latin sometimes has a different nuance to the Greek in the subjunctive[122]. (Cf. commentary at Matt. 2:11; 6:5c; 8:5; 9:4a; 14:29; 14:32, variant 3; 16:5.) Subordinate clauses such as the one here at Matt. 17:22, commonly are put in the Latin subjunctive. In broad terms, a subordinate clause consists of a group of words, which firstly contains a finite verb. A finite verb (or the finite form of a verb), serves as a complete verb for the subject e.g., "he walks" is a complete statement and so a finite verb, whereas "to walk" is incomplete and so this infinitive verb would require an addition to become a complete statement e.g., "*he wants* to walk." Here at Matt. 17:22, the *Variant 1b* Greek indicative active aorist, "he returned (*epestrepsen*)" is a finite verb.

Secondly, a subordinate clause does not in itself form a complete message i.e., *it depends* on the rest of the principal clause to which it is subordinate, and hence could not be written so as to form an independent sentence in its own right. Rather, it extends the meaning of the rest of the principal clause, either by giving extra information, or in some way modifying the principal clause. Here at Matt. 17:22, the clause of *Variant 1b*, "And when he returned to Galilee," is clearly a subordinate clause to the following principal clause, "Jesus said unto them," etc. .

Thus the reader should not be concerned at what may *prima facie* appear to be the incongruity of my Greek reconstruction of Matt. 17:22. That is because while the Greek and Latin are very similar languages, they are not identical tongues, and the Latin subjunctive is not identical with the Greek subjunctive, even though generally they are the same. To help highlight the issue, here at Matt. 17:22 I exercise a discretion to put the *prima facie* subjunctive translation in brackets after the Latin word, "*regrederetur*," and then explain its contextual meaning which is different, in the "Principal Textual Discussion," *infra*. By contrast, to more quickly focus on the issue of *Variant 1b* being similar to *Variant 1a*, I exercise discretion to put the meaning of the "*regrederetur*" in the brackets, followed by the words, "subordinate clause," in the "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "First Matter," *supra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 17:22, the TR's Greek, "*Anastrephomenon* (word 1) *de* ('And,' word 2) *auton* (word 3) ('while they were abiding,' word 1, *anastrephomenon*, masculine plural genitive, present passive participle, from *anastrepho* + word 3, *auton*, masculine genitive, 3rd person plural pronoun, from *autos*)," i.e., "while they abode" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th

---

[120] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 461-480; Young's *Greek*, pp 137-145.

[121] Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, p. 186.

[122] Allen's *Latin Grammar*, pp. 148-152 (sections 196-207); Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, p. 189.

century), O 023 (*Codex Sinopensis*, St. Matthew's Gospel, 6th century), E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century), F 09 (*Codex Boreelianus*, 9th century), G 011 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century), H 013 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century), K 017 (*Codex Cyprius*, 9th century), Pi 041 (*Codex Petropolitanus*, 9th century), X 033 (*Codex Monacensis*, 10th century), and Gamma 036 (*Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus*, 10th century); together with Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation), 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels), 2 (12th century), 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts); 1010 (12th century); 597 (13th century), 1242 (13th century), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); as well as Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, another reading, *Variant 1*, is found only in the Latin. Upon reconstruction from the Latin, *Variant 1a* probably read, either Greek, "*epistrephomenon … auton* ('while they were returning,' word 1a, *epistrephomenon*, masculine plural genitive, present passive participle, from *epistrepho* + word 3, *auton*)," or Greek, "*upostrephomenon … auton* ('while they were returning,' word 1a, *upostrephomenon*, masculine plural genitive, present passive participle, from *upostrepho* + word 3, *auton*)," i.e., "as they were returning." This is found as Latin, "*redeuntibus* (word 1a) *…illis* (word 3) ('when they were returning,' word 1a, *redeuntibus*, masculine plural ablative, present active participle, from *redeo* + word 3, *illis*, masculine plural ablative pronoun, from *ille*)," in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century); and as Latin, "*Ipsis … revertentibus* ('when they were returning,' word 3, *ipsis*, masculine plural ablative pronoun, from *ipse* + word 1a, *revertentibus*, masculine plural ablative, present active participle, from *revereto*)," in old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century).

Upon reconstruction from the Latin, *Variant 1b* probably read either Greek, "*epestrepsen* ('he returned,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *epistrepho*);" or Greek, "*upestrepsen* ('he returned,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *upostrepho*)" i.e., "when he returned." This is found as Latin, "*regrederetur ipse* ('he would / might return,' *regrederetur*, subjunctive imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *regredior + ipse*, nominative singular masculine, pronoun from ipse)," i.e., part of a subordinate clause, *supra*, here meaning, "when he returned," is found in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text, which must thus stand. The origins of the variant in its two forms are speculative.

The very form of the Greek variants are conjectural. But it seems to me that the speculation that they were originally in the Greek, best accounts for the variant Latin forms from three different Latin words. Hence for my purposes I shall work on the presupposition that the change occurred first in the Greek, and was later followed in the three Latin forms.

Was *Variant 1a* an accidental change? Due to a paper fade, did e.g., the TR's "*anastrephomenon … auton* (while they were abiding)," come to look something like "*:::strephomenon … auton*"? If so, was this "reconstructed from context" by a scribe as "*epistrephomenon … auton*" or "*upostrephomenon … auton*" (while they were returning)?

Was *Variant 1a* a deliberate change? Did e.g., a scribe, wishing to highlight the

frequent presence in St. Matthew's Gospel   of Jesus "of Galilee" (Matt. 21:11; 26:69), both when he was in Galilee before this time (Matt. 2:22; 3:13; 4:12,15,18,23,25; 15:29), and by such an emphasis, also after this time (Matt. 19:1; 26:32; 27:55; 28:7,10,16), make "a stylistic improvement" to "better focus on this important matter," and so deliberately change "*anastrephomenon*" to *Variant 1a*?

Was *Variant 1b* an accidental change?   Did e.g., a scribe working from a manuscript line containing *Variant 1a*, "*epistrephomenon de auton*" or "*upostrephomenon de auton*" (and while they were returning), due to a paper fade, if so, probably, although not definitely, with the "*auton*" coming at the end of a line, see something like, "*epistre:::::::de:::::*" or "*upostre:::::::de:::::*"?   If so, did he "reconstruct this from context" as "*epestrepsen de*" or "*upestrepsen de*" (he returned)?   If so, significantly, such a possibility acts as implied evidence for the antiquity of *Variant 1a*.

Was *Variant 1b* a deliberate change?   Did e.g., a scribe working from a manuscript line containing *Variant 1a*, "*epistrephomenon... auton*" or "*upostrephomenon … auton*" (while they were returning), wishing to highlight the frequent presence in St. Matthew's Gospel of "Jesus of Galilee" (Matt. 26:69), "the prophet … of Galilee" (Matt. 21:11), *supra*, make "a stylistic improvement" to "better focus on this important matter," and so deliberately change this to *Variant 1b*?   If so, significantly, such a possibility acts as implied evidence for the antiquity of *Variant 1a*.

Were these deliberate or accidental changes?   We do not know.   We only know that they are changes to the original reading, preserved for us in the Received Text.

With the support of the representative Byzantine text, the TR's reading has rock solid support in the Greek.   This dates from ancient times with e.g., the support of the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom of Constantinople.   By contrast, in both of its forms, *Variant 1* is clearly an aberrant reading with very slim support.   On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 17:22 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 17:22, "while they abode," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century, changing word order 1,2,3 of this clause to 3,2,1).   It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).   It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century).   It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.   It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic

Sahidic Version; Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500); and Slavic Version (9th century).

Variant 1a is not found outside the closed class of sources. However, Minuscule 579 (mixed text, 13th century), reads "*Ypostrephonon* (word 1) *de* ('And,' word 2) *auton* (word 3) ('while they were abiding,' word 1, *upostrephonon*, masculine plural genitive, present active participle, from *upostrepho* + word 3, *auton*, masculine genitive, 3rd person plural pronoun, from *autos*)." This reading is referred to by both Swanson and the UBS 4th revised edition. The UBS 4th revised edition regards this as a separate variant in its own right. On one level it is. But it also seems to me that its origins are best explained as a corruption of *Variant 1a*.

Was this an accidental alteration? Was "*upostrephomenon*" written in continuous script over two lines, with "*upostrepho*" on the first line, and "*menon*" on the second line, perhaps at the start of a new page. If so, due to an undetected paper fade of the "*me*" at the start of the second line possibly on the top of a new page, was this paper space taken to be a stylistic indentation at the start of a new page, and thus did it go undetected by a copyist scribe who then wrote "*upostrephonon*"? Or did it simply go undetected over two lines on the same page at the hands of a copyist scribe whose attention to detail left something to be desired? (One ought not to assume that all scribes were fully competent, or incapable of doing silly things.) Alternatively, might this have been a deliberate change as a perceived "stylistic improvement" from the passive to active voice?

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, Greek, "*sustrephomenon* ('while they were gathering together,' or 'while they were crowding around,' masculine plural genitive, present passive participle, from *sustrepho*)," i.e., "while they gathered together," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version.

Was this an accidental alteration? Sometimes in Manuscript Washington (W 032), a new verse starts with the protrusion by one letter space, and sometimes it does not. E.g., on the same page in W 032, Matt. 17:22 starts on a new line with no such protrusion, but above it, Matt. 17:17 starts with such a one letter space protrusion. The first word of Matt. 17:22 is "*Anastrephomenon*," and so if this was protruding by one letter space, then following a paper fade of the first three letters, "*Ana*," this might have been "reconstructed" by a scribe with "the missing two letters" of "s" (sigma) and "u" (upsilon), as "*sustrephomenon*."

Alternatively, did a scribe, perhaps influenced by the wider presence of *sustrepho* in the NT (Acts 28:3, *sustrepsantos*, 'gathering' or 'having gathered,' masculine singular genitive, active aorist participle, = "had gathered," AV), consider that it was some kind of "stylistic improvement" to depict them as "crowding around" in Galilee? Given that the meaning of the Greek here at Matt. 17:22 is probably "crowded around," might this quirky scribe have thought he was thus promoting some kind of "commendable sentiment" whereby in emulation Christians ought to "all press together" or "crowd around" each other? If so, something like the straight black-haired, slanty-eyed, four big fat Japanese sumo wrestlers all trying to fit into a mini-minor car; we might all squint-up our round Aryan eyes, and exclaim with an Oriental accent in reply to this scribe, "Ah-so, little bit squeezy."

The admittedly strange and curious reading of *Variant 2* was enthusiastically embraced by the admittedly strange and curious neo-Alexandrian textual critics. Thus *Variant 2* is found at Matt. 17:22 in the NU Text *et al* i.e., Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

Not without good cause, the ASV translators appear to have balked at such an unlikely reading, putting the TR's reading in their main text at Matt. 17:22, "while they abode" (ASV), and then saying in a footnote, "Some ancient authorities read 'were gathering themselves together'" (ASV ftn.). But persistence in folly acts to desensitize one to its stupidity. Why else do so many debased white Westerners now act like those pagan black savages that put bones through their noses, by putting studs in their noses (like heathen Hindus), tongues, eyebrows, backs of their necks, and belly-buttons? Why else do so many of those blinded by the god of this world think nothing of "having fun" with the Devil by supporting a witch's festival like Halloween? On the same principle, in time, the neo-Alexandrian translators came to lose the more hesitant reluctance of the ASV translators to this reading. Thus the ASV's order (i.e., Dancing with the Devil, *Step 1*,) was reversed, with *Variant 2* placed in the main text, and the TR's reading placed as a footnote, in the RSV, NRSV, and ESV (i.e., Dancing with the Devil, *Step 2*). Worse still, some lost all hesitant reluctance about this reading, for *Variant 2* is found in the main text without any footnote alternative in e.g., the NASB, NIV, Moffatt Bible, and TEV (i.e., Dancing with the Devil, *Step 3*).

Matt. 17:25 "when he was come into" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

In order to reduce the larger complexity of multitudes of minority variants to a more manageable size, and zero in on the relevant textual variants in dispute, large numbers of minor variants with small fractional support from this or that aberrant manuscript, that both neo-Byzantines and neo-Alexandrians accept are corruptions of the text, are most commonly not dealt with in this commentary. E.g., *Variant 2*, is referred to in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17), but neither neo-Byzantine nor nor-Alexandrian follows it.

But I make an unusual exception here at Matt. 17:25, so that the reader may better understand the large range of variants that can and in fact do arise. Yet even here, in order to reduce the number of large, clearly incorrect variants, I shall discuss only those that either occur in the Greek inside the closed class of sources (TR & *Variants 1 to 5*), or are followed outside the closed class of sources

+ in the the *Family 13 Manuscripts* (*Variant 6*), or in

in one of the two main Alexandrian texts (*Variant 5*) or leading Western Text (*Variant 7*). In doing so and discussing these eight readings (the TR and seven variants), as I do elsewhere (usually without specifically saying so,) I shall omit reference to even still more

variants[123].

Though unusual, the extra time and space necessary to discuss so many minor variants is done for the interested reader's benefit, that he might better understand the many type of minor variants that can and do arise in this and that odd Greek (and Latin) manuscript, and which being of no real significance, are not usually mentioned. *I hope the reader enjoys this special Greek treat.* "*Qu'ils mangent de la brioche* (Let them eat cake)." *Bon Appétit!*[124].

The selection I make here at Matt. 17:25, though limited, also helps the reader to better contextualize the fact that the kind of aberrant readings found in Tischendorf's 8th ed. i.e., *Variant 4*, or the NU Text, i.e., *Variant 5*, or given as alternatives in Westcott-Hort i.e., *Variants 4 & 5*, are within a normative range of aberrant readings. The amazing thing is not that e.g., *Variants 4 & 5* exist. Rather, the amazing thing is that because a handful of manuscripts outside the closed class of sources, which can be essentially reduced to two leading Alexandrian texts, suddenly turn up from the obscurity of nowhere in the 19th century[125], neo-Alexandrians choose to follow either *Variants 4 & 5* (which also have representation inside the closed class of sources), preferring these erroneous variants over the representative Byzantine text reading. "And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch" (Matt. 15:14).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 17:25, the TR's Greek, "*ote* ('when,' a conjunction) *eiselthen* ('he was come into,' 'he had come into,' 'he had gone into,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *eiserchomai*, = *eis* / into + *erchomai* / 'come' or 'go') *eis* (into)," i.e., "when he was come into" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*cum intrasset* (= *cum* / when + *intravisset*, 'when he was come into,' 'or

---

[123]   Inside the closed class of sources, *Variant 8*, old Latin a reads, Latin, "*intrantes* (a present active plural participle from *intro*, meaning "entering" or "going into) *in* (into)." Outside the closed class of sources, *Variant 9*, Minuscule 33 reads, Greek, "*elthonton auton* (*elthonton* = an active aorist participle, from *erchomai* + *auton*, a 3rd person plural pronoun, from *autos*; meaning 'when they were come' or 'when they came') *eis* (into); and *Variant 10*, in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron reads, Latin, "*cum* (when) *Cephas* (Cephas) *intrasset* (was come into)."

[124]   "*Bon Appétit*," French, meaning "Enjoy your meal." The saying, "Let them eat cake" is much older than the French queen, Marie Antoinette (d. 1793); but it has sometimes been falsely attributed to her, usually in an untrue setting in which she allegedly says this cruelly and sarcastically of the starving French people. My own more generous and kind usage of it, draws on its older form, and should not be confused with this later myth.

[125]   While it is true that something of *Codex Vaticanus* was known in the 16th century to Erasmus via the Vatican Library's Prefect, who learnt enough about it to know it was an unreliable and corrupt text, it was then generally out of sight and out of mind till it was "rediscovered" in the 19th century.

when he had gone into,'[126] subjunctive active pluperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *intro*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century); Latin, "*cum intrasset* (when he was come / gone into) *in* ('in,' redundant in English translation)," in old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century), from which it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592); as Latin, "*cum introisset* (= *cum* / when + *introivisset*, a syncopated perfect, 'when he was come / gone into,' subjunctive active pluperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *introeo*)," in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century) and aur (7th century); and as Latin, "*cum introisset* (when he was come / gone into) *in* ('in,' redundant in English translation)," in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century).

Variant 1, reads Greek, "*ote* (when) *eiselthen* (he was come into) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus) *eis* (into)," i.e., "when Jesus was come into."   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53).   It thus supports and follows the TR's reading, but with the addition of "*o* (the) *Iesous* (Jesus)."

Variant 2, reads Greek, "*ote* (when) *eiselthon* ('they were come into,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *eiserchomai*) *eis* (into)."   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in U 030 (9th century).

Variant 3, reads Greek, "*ote* (when) *elthon* ('they were come,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *erchomai*) *eis* (into)."   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 27 (10th -14th century).

Variant 4, upon reconstruction reads Greek, "*eiselthonta* ('coming into,' or 'going into,' masculine singular accusative, active aorist participle, from *eiserchomai*) *eis* (into)." This is found as Latin, "*ingresso in* ('having come into,' *ingresso*, singular masculine ablative, perfect participle, from *ingredior*, + *in*, ablative preposition from *in*)," in old Latin Version d (5th century).

Variant 5 reads Greek, "*elthonta* ('coming,' or 'going,' masculine singular accusative, active aorist participle, from *erchomai*) *eis* (into)."   This is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).   It is further found as Latin, "*intranti in* ('coming into,' or 'going into,' *intranti*, singular masculine ablative, present active participle, from *intro*[127], + *in*, ablative preposition from *in*)," in old Latin Versions b (5th century) and ff2 (5th century); although it would also be possible to argue that these Latin readings came from *Variant 5*.

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

Was *Variant 1*, "*o* (the) *Iesous* (Jesus)," an accidental change?   In Manuscript

---

[126]   The syncopated perfect may drop the "v," and as here, quite often also contract the vowels, so that its shortened form is thus, *intrasset*.   Cf. my comments at Matt. 8:5; 16:5; and Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, pp. 78,205.

[127]   Re: "Intro," cf. our English word, "introduce" = Latin "*intro*" + "*ducere*" (from *duco* meaning "lead").

Washington (W 032) where this variant is found, it is written in the normative abbreviated form, with a line on top where I show one underneath, as "*OIC*" (= *O IHCOYC*). As it is found in W 032, it is directly above the "*OIC*" that comes later in verse 25. Especially if this came at the end of a line, if the following "*OIC*" was likewise written under it, might a scribe have thought on the basis of "context," that a "*OIC*" was "lost in a paper fade," and so "reconstructed" it here?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change?   Did a scribe consider that the, "he was come into," referred "to Jesus, not Peter," and so added this in as a scribal "clarification"?

Was *Variant 2*, "*ote* (when) *eiselthon eis* (they were come into)," an accidental change?   Due to a paper fade / loss, did "*eiselthen eis* (he was come into)," look something like, "*eiselth:n eis*," and then this was "reconstructed" by a scribe "from context" as "*eiselthon eis* (they were come into)"?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change?   Did a scribe consider it was "a stylistic improvement" to change the aorist verb from a singular "he" to a plural "they," on the basis that "not just Peter, but also Christ here entered the house"?

Was *Variant 3*, "*ote* (when) *elthon eis* (they were come into)," an accidental change? Did "*eiselthen eis* (he was come into)," go over two lines with "*eis*" at the end of line 1, and "*elthen eis*" at the start of line 2?   If so, due to paper fades / losses, was the "*eis*" at the end of line 1 missing, and did line 2 look something like "*elth:n eis*"?   If so, did a scribe then "reconstruct" this "from context" as "*elthon eis* (they were come into)"?

Was *Variant 3* a deliberate change? Did a scribe consider it was "a stylistic improvement" to change the aorist verb from a singular "he" to a plural "they," on the basis that "not just Peter, but also Christ here entered the house"?   Did he also think "it was best to remove the" prefix "*eis*" as this "was redundant" given the following "*eis*"?

Was *Variant 4*, "*eiselthonta eis* (coming into)," an accidental change?   Did e.g., the original "*ote* (when) *eiselthen* (he was come into) *eis* (into)," go over two lines, with "*ote*" on line 1, and "*eiselthen eis*" on line 2 with a stylistic paper space between these two words so as to help loosely right hand justify the page?   If so, due to paper fades / losses, was line 1 lost, and did line 2 come to look something like, "*eis:lth:n eis*"?   If so, did a scribe "reconstruct" this "from context" as "*eiselthonta eis* (coming into)"?

Was *Variant 4* a deliberate change?   Did a scribe consider an aorist "participle here" was "a more appropriate" reading here than an aorist "verb"?

Was *Variant 5*, "*elthonta eis* (coming into)," an accidental change?   Did e.g., the original "*ote* (when) *eiselthen* (he was come into) *eis* (into)," go over two lines in continuous script, with "*oteeis*" on line 1, and "*elthen eis*" on line 2 with a stylistic paper space between these two words so as to help loosely right hand justify the page?   If so, due to paper fades / losses, was line 1 lost, and did line 2 come to look something like, "*:lth:n eis*"?   If so, did a scribe "reconstruct" this "from context" as "*elthonta eis* (coming into)"?

Was *Variant 5* a deliberate change?   Did a scribe consider an aorist "participle here" was "a more appropriate" reading than an aorist "verb"?   Did he further consider that the

prefix "*eis*" here "was redundant," given the   following "*eis*"?

Were these variants accidental or deliberate changes? We do not know. But we do know, that the same Creator who made his creatures with a capacity to sustain a certain amount of injury e.g., non-fatal cuts'n'bruises, also designed the Received Text's method of perseveration. He ensured that the starting point was the representative Byzantine text, and so allowed for some scribes to either deliberately or accidental make the kind of changes we find in *Variants 1-6*, without damaging the overall integrity of the text. Thus we see the great wisdom of Almighty God. His great genius also ensured, that if, perchance, all or most scribes did follow a bad reading, which occasionally, although relatively rarely, they do, then by textual analysis the change could be spotted, and the correct reading, preserved elsewhere in the Greek or Latin texts, brought back in to repair the Received Text.

O "the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" in our God (Col. 2:3). Has he not said it? Will he not do it? "O Praise the Lord!" "For his merciful kindness is great toward us" (the everlasting covenant of grace), "and the truth of the Lord endureth for ever" (Divine preservation of Scripture). "Praise ye the Lord" (Ps. 117:1,2).

On the one hand, the *Textus Receptus* (TR) reading has strong support in the Greek and Latin, being found from ancient times in e.g., St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate. On the other hand, all the variants have slim support, and none have any good textual argument to commend them based on any clear and evident problem in the representative Byzantine text. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 17:25 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 17:25, Greek, "*ote* (when) *eiselthen eis* (he was come into)," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Armenian Version (5th century).

Variant 2, Greek "*ote* (when) *eiselthon eis* (they were come into) (into)," is found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century).

Variant 3, Greek, "*ote* (when) *elthon eis* (they were come)," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century).

Variant 4, Greek, "*eiselthonta eis* (coming into)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in Minuscule 579 (mixed text, 13th century).

Variant 5, reads Greek, "*elthonta* ('coming,' or 'going,' masculine singular accusative, active aorist participle, from *erchomai*) *eis* (into)." It is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is further found in Minuscule

892 (9th century, mixed text type); as well   as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.   It is also found in the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 6, Greek, "*eiselthont<u>on</u> eis* (coming into)," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

Was *Variant 6*, "*eiselthont<u>on</u> eis* (coming into)," an accidental change?   In a continuous manuscript with "*ote* (when) *eis<u>el</u>then* (he was come into)" coming at the end of one line, and "*eis* (into)," at the start of a second line, due to paper fades, did line 1 look something like, "*:::eis:lth:n*"?   If so, did a scribe take the first missing section to be a "stylistic paper space," and then "reconstruct" this "from context" as "*eiselthont<u>on</u> (coming into)*"?

Was *Variant 6* a deliberate change?   Did a scribe consider it was "a stylistic improvement" to change the aorist verb from a singular "he" to a plural "they," on the basis that "not just Peter, but also Christ here entered the house"?   Did he thus also consider an aorist "participle here" was "a more appropriate" reading than an aorist "verb"?

Variant 7 has the same basic meaning as *Variant 4* to which it is quite possibly related.   It is Greek, "*eiselthonti* (masculine singular dative, active aorist participle, from *eiserchomai*) *eis* (into)."   It is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).   Was *Variant 7* an accidental change?   E.g., was it a "reconstruction" of a manuscript line following *Variant 4* a paper fade of the last letter?   Or was it a deliberate change as e.g., a "stylistic improvement" on a reading in manuscript line following *Variant 4*?

Amidst this plethora of variants at Matt. 17:25, *Variant 4* is adopted by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) (with his normal very useful textual apparatus showing different readings).   In the division between the two leading Alexandrian texts, Tischendorf tended to favour his "darling" discovery, London Sinaiticus, of which this is one such example. *Variant 5* is adopted by Westcott-Hort (1881), with a footnote (all footnotes are literally sidenotes in Westcott-Hort,) giving *Variant 4* as an alternative; Nestle's 21st edition (1952), with a footnote giving *Variant 4* as an alternative; and in Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), with a footnote giving the Received Text and *Variants 1,3,4,6* as alternatives.   *Variant 5* is also adopted by the UBS 3rd (1975), 3rd corrected (1983), and 4th revised (1993) editions, with no alternatives shown.

The neo-Alexandrian preference for *Variant 5*, or less commonly *Variant 4* (Tischendorf), is a preference for the reading of an aorist masculine singular participle.   On the one hand, it is possible to translate such an aorist masculine singular participle the same way one would translated the aorist 3rd person singular verb of the TR's reading.   Thus the reading of the *American Standard Version* at Matt. 17:25, is "And when he came into the house" (ASV).   This could have been rendered from the TR.   So likewise, though based on

an inaccurate Greek text, the English   rendering is not discernibly incorrect in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV (like *Variant 10*, *supra*, without textual warrant adding Cephas's name[128]).

But on the other hand, it is also possible to translate the participle with "*eis* (into)" of *Variants 4 & 5* more literally as, "coming into" or "going into."   This is done in the *Twentieth Century New Testament* which renders Matt. 17:25 as "But, *on going into* the house" (TCNT).   At this point there is then a clear inaccuracy in the English rendering of a neo-Alexandrian version which is obviously not following the TR.

Therefore the precedent has been set in a neo-Alexandrian version for a more literal rendering of these variants (we cannot be sure which one was followed in the TCNT, since it is based on Westcott-Hort, and this shows *Variants 4 & 5* as the two alternatives).   Whether or not future neo-Alexandrian versions follow the TCNT in such a literal rendering is presently unknown, but they may well do so.   Either way, they are using an inaccurate Greek text.   Therefore with respect to future neo-Alexandrian versions, or revisions of present neo-Alexandrian versions, it is simply a case of, *watch this space* at Matt. 17:25.

Matt. 17:26 "Peter saith unto him" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), agree with my assessment that old Latin q supports the TR's reading, whereas old Latin f has a similar reading.   By contrast, UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) puts this the other way around, and claims old Latin f supports the TR's reading, and old Latin q has a similar reading.   It can only be assumed that this is a typographical error by the compiler of the UBS's 4th revised edition.   We all make such typographical mistakes from time to time, but the likelihood of it is increased, when as in the UBS and Nestle-Aland editions, the Latin reading is not specifically quoted.   While the detail of all Latin readings is not always given, in general, the reader of this commentary examining the Latin thus has a great benefit over the reader of these cryptic NU Text editions.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 17:26, the TR's Greek, "*legei* ('he says' or 'he saith' = 'saith,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *lego*) *auto* (unto him) *o* ('the' = redundant in translation) *Petros* (Peter)," i.e., "Peter saith unto him" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is further supported as Latin, "*dicit* ('he saith,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *dico*) *ei* (unto him) *Petrus* (Peter)," in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th

---

[128]   The Latin translation of the Arabic in *Variant 10*, reads in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), "*cum* (when) *Cephas* (Cephas / Peter) *intrasset* (he was come into)."   It seems unlikely that the NIV is following this reading found only in the Arabic.   Therefore, it is presumably following *Variant 5*, but like *Variant 10*, gratuitously adding in the name of Cephas.

century); and also supported in a similar   reading, Latin, "*Et* (And) *dixit* ('he said' = 'said,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *dico*) *ei* (unto him) *Petrus* (Peter)," in old Latin Version f (6th century).   It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great.

However, another reading, *Variant 1*, may be reconstructed as Greek, "*legei* ('he says,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *lego*) *auto* ('unto him,' masculine singular 3rd person dative pronoun, from *autos*)[129]."   This is found as Latin, "*dicit* ('he says,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *dico*) *illi* ('unto that [one],' = 'unto him,' masculine singular dative pronoun, from *ille*)," i.e., "he saith," in old Latin Version d (5th century).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, reads, "*eipontos* ('saying,' masculine singular genitive, active aorist participle, from *lego*) *de* (and) *tou* (-) *Petrou* (Peter)," i.e., "And when Peter said," is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), in both the Greek and also a Latin translation.

Yet another reading, *Variant 3*, "*eipontos* ('saying,' masculine singular genitive, active aorist participle, from *lego*) *de* (and)," i.e., "And when he said," is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).   A similar reading is found as Latin, "*Et* (And) *ille* ('that [one],' masculine, = 'he') *dixit* ('he said,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *dico*)," i.e., "And he said," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century); and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). Another similar reading is found as, "*At* (But) *ille* (he) *dixit* (he said)," i.e., "And he said," in old Latin Versions ff1 (10th / 11th century) and c (12th / 13th century).

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental change?   Did a scribe, work from a TR line manuscript, originally reading, "*legei* (he saith) *auto* (unto him) *o* (-) *Petros* (Peter)"?   Were these words all on one line, with "*tou* (-) *Petrou* (Peter)" at the end, possibly with the last part "squeezed in" at the end?   If so, due to a paper fade, did his "*LEGEIAYTOOPETROC*" come to look something like, "*LEGEIAYTO::::::*"?   If so, was this then taken by a subsequent scribe to simply be "a stylistic paper space" and ignored?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change?   Did e.g., a scribe, working from a TR line manuscript, consider that the words, "*o* (-) *Petros* (Peter)" were "superfluous and redundant," and so as a "stylistic improvement" decide to simply prune them away as "too flowery"?

---

[129]   Though old Latin d is part of a Greek-Latin diglot, and there is often a relationship between the two, the two parts do not necessarily correlate, and the Greek part (D 05) is outside the closed class of sources.   Therefore a reconstruction of the Greek must always be made from the Latin of old Latin d, and this may or may not correlate with the Greek of D05.

Was *Variant 2* an accidental change? Was the TR's reading originally over two lines in a given manuscript, with line one ending, "*legei* (he saith) *auto* (unto him) *o* (-)," and line 2 starting "*Petros* (Peter)"? If so, due to a paper fade, did line 1, "*legeiautoo*," come to look something like, ":::::::::*o*", and line 2, "*Petros*" come to look something like, "*Petro:*"? If so, did a scribe then "reconstruct" this "from context," as "*eipontos* (saying) *de* (and) *tou* (-) *Petrou* (Peter)"?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, who we know was aware of the TR's reading, consider in his sometimes quirky mind, that it was a "stylistic improvement" to change the verbal form (TR) to the participle form (*Variant 2*)? Sadly, the evidence is that this was very much the type of thing that Origen was prepared to do, if and when it took his fancy to do so.

Was *Variant 3* an accidental change? Did e.g., a scribe, work from a *Variant 2* line manuscript, originally reading "*eipontos* (saying) *de* (and) *tou* (-) *Petrou* (Peter)"? Were these words all on one line, with "*tou* (-) *Petrou* (Peter)" at the end, possibly with the last part "squeezed in" at the end? If so, due to a paper fade, did his "*EIPONTOCDETOYPETROY*" come to look something like, "*EIPONTOCDE:::::::*"? Was this then simply taken by a scribe to be "a stylistic paper space" and ignored?

Was *Variant 3* a deliberate alteration? Did e.g., a scribe, working from a *Variant 2* line manuscript, consider that the words, "*tou* (-) *Petrou* (Peter)" were "superfluous and redundant," and so as a "stylistic improvement" decide to simply prune them away?

Deliberate or accidental changes? We do not know. But we do know that these were changes to the original reading of the Received Text.

On the one hand, the TR's reading has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument. Its support in the Greek clearly dates from ancient times both with *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), and also the church father and doctor, St. Basil the Great. It is also known in the Latin textual tradition. But on the other hand, while *Variants 1 & 2* have only slim support, *Variant 3* is followed by the majority Latin text, and also one ancient Greek writer. Balancing out these factors, and bearing in mind the superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 17:26 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 17:26, "*legei* (he saith) *auto* (unto him) *o* (-) *Petros* (Peter)," i.e., "Peter saith unto him," is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent

text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; a manuscript of the Ethiopic Version; Georgian "2" Version (5th century); and Slavic Version (9th century). It is also found in a similar reading, translated into Latin as, "*dixit* (he said) *ei* (unto him) *Simon* (Simon)," i.e., "Simon said unto him," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

Variant 1, "*legei* (he saith) *auto* (unto him)," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century); and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

Variant 2, "*eipontos* (saying) *de* (and) *tou* (-) *Petrou* (Peter)," i.e., "And when Peter said," is found in the margin as an alternative reading in Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type).

Variant 3, "*eipontos* (saying) *de* (and)," i.e., "And when he said," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Palestinian Version (*c.* 6th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century), and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

Another reading, *Variant 4*, reads, "*o* (he) *de* (and) *ephe* ('he [Peter] said,' or 'he saith,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *phemi*), *Apo* (From) *ton* (the) *appotrion* (strangers), *eipontos* (saying) *de* (and)," i.e., "and he [Peter] saith, 'From the strangers,' and when he said," etc. . *Variant 4* is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and a manuscript of the Ethiopic Version.

Was *Variant 4* an accidental alteration? It is clear from Codex W 032 that many of the verse divisions adopted by Stephanus in 1551, manifest much more ancient unnumbered verse divisions. Thus e.g., Matt. 17:26 comes at the start of a new line in W 032. Did a scribe working from a manuscript with the *Variant 3* reading, find a very large stylistic verse paper space following Matt. 17:25 i.e., so done in order to start Matt. 17:26 on a new line? Did he misunderstand this and think that there had been a paper fade? If so, did he then "reconstruct" these added words "from context"? E.g., from the "*ephe* (he [Jesus] saith) *auto* (unto him) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," i.e., "Jesus saith unto him" (Matt. 17:26), did he get the idea of using "*ephe* (he saith)," which he may have then refined by reference to the Matthean terminology, "*o* (he) *de* (and) *ephe* (he saith)," at Matt. 13:28 (cf. Matt. 25:21; 27:12)? Did he then get the idea of the "*Apo* (From) *ton* (the) *appotrion* (strangers)," from the presence of this terminology both immediately before, and immediately after, this insertion?

Was *Variant 4* a deliberate change? Did an Alexandrian scribe regard the addition of these words as "a stylistic improvement" that "more fully brought out the meaning"? If so,

did he get the idea of using "*ephe* (he saith)," from the "*ephe* (he [Jesus] saith) *auto* (unto him) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)" (Matt. 17:26), and then refine this by reference to the Matthean terminology, "*o* (he) *de* (and) *ephe* (he saith)," at Matt. 13:28 (cf. Matt. 25:21; 27:12)?   Did he then get the idea of the "*Apo* (From) *ton* (the) *appotrion* (strangers)," from the presence of this terminology both immediately before, and immediately after, this insertion?   While as a general rule Alexandrian scribes tended to be prunists, because he had become accustomed to tampering with the Word of God at whim, did this Alexandrian scribe of London Sinaiticus decide on this occasion he would give "an amplified version" rendering?

With a major split between the two main Alexandrian texts, the neo-Alexandrians preference for the shorter reading prevailed here at Matt. 17:26.   Thus *Variant 3* was adopted by the NU Text *et al*, on this occasion with even Tischendorf in his 8th edition (1869-72) forsaking the longer reading of his beloved London Sinaiticus.

At Matt, 17:26, *Variant 3* was followed by the American Standard Version which reads, "And when he said" (ASV).   The erroneous *Variant 3* was also adopted by the NASB (1st & 2nd editions), RSV, NRSV (which reads like *Variant 2* but has a footnote stating it is following *Variant 3*), and ESV.

But *prima facie*, *Variant 2*, "And when Peter said," is followed by the NASB (3rd edition) and NIV.   This reading has very slim support.   Nevertheless, were the NASB and NIV translators here prepared to follow *Variant 2* because they held a high regard for Origen?   Or were the NASB and NIV translators, like the NRSV translators, really following *Variant 3*, but unlike the NRSV translators, were they simply too slack to provide a footnote stating this?   We do not know.   And nor do their readers.