**Appendices to St. Matthew's Gospel**
**Matt. 15-20.**

*Appendix 1: A Table of some instances where Scrivener's Text does not represent*
*the properly composed Received Text.*

*Appendix 2: Minor variants between Scrivener's Text and the Majority Byzantine*
*Text (MBT) (or another possible reading), including references*
*to the neo-Alexandrian Text in those instances where the neo-Alexandrian*
*Texts agree with the MBT in such an alternative reading to Scrivener's*
*Text; where such alternative readings do not affect, or do not necessarily*
*affect, the English translation, so we cannot be certain which reading the*
*AV translators followed.*

*Appendix 3: Minor variants between the NU Text and Textus Receptus (or another*
*relevant text and the TR) not affecting, or not necessarily*
*affecting, the English translation (some more notable*
*variants in Matt. 15-20).*

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

*Appendix 5: Dedication Sermon (5 November 2009).*

**Appendix 1**

**A Table of some instances where Scrivener's Text**
**does not represent**
**the properly composed Received Text.**

As seen by the following itemized instances, Scrivener's Text is not, as it claims, the TR, although in general it is very close to the TR.

Matt. 17:9a, Scrivener reads, "*apo*" rather than "*ek*."
Matt. 17:14b, Scrivener reads, "*auto*" rather than "*auton*."
Matt. 17:27b, Scrivener reads, "*anabanta*," rather than "*anabainonta*"
Matt. 18:6, Scrivener reads, "*epi*," rather than "*peri*."
Matt. 18:12b,13 Scrivener reads, "*ennenekontaennea*" (twice)
rather than "*enenekonta ennea*" (twice).
Matt. 18:28b, Scrivener reads, "*o ti*," rather than "*ei ti*."
Matt. 18:31b, Scrivener reads, "*auton*" rather than "*eauton*."
Matt. 19:5b, Scrivener reads, "*ton patera*" rather than "*ton patera* [*autou*],"
i.e., with square brackets indicating the usage or non-usage
of "*autou*" is entirely optional.

Matt. 19:5c, Scrivener reads, "*proskoll<u>e</u>th<u>e</u>setai*," rather than
　　　　　　"[*pros*]*koll<u>e</u>th<u>e</u>setai*," i.e., with square brackets indicating the
　　　　　　usage or non-usage of the prefix "*pros*" is entirely optional.
Matt. 19:9a, Scrivener reads, "*ei m<u>e</u>*," rather than "*m<u>e</u>*."
Matt.19:26, Scrivener adds "*esti*" to TR.
Matt. 20:2, Scrivener reads, "*sumph<u>o</u>n<u>e</u>sas de*," rather than, "*kai sumph<u>o</u>n<u>e</u>sas*."
Matt. 20:3, Scrivener reads, "*t<u>e</u>n trit<u>e</u>n*," rather than "*trit<u>e</u>n*."
Matt. 20:4, Scrivener reads, "*kakeinois*," rather than "*kai ekeinois*."
Matt. 20:5b, Scrivener reads, "*ennat<u>e</u>n*," rather than "*enat<u>e</u>n* (ninth)."
Matt. 21:11, Scrivener reads "*Nazareth* (Nazareth)," not "*Nazaret* (Nazareth)"
　　　　　　(discussed in revised Volume 1, at Matt. 4:13, Appendix 1).
John 21:3, Scrivener reads "*aneb<u>e</u>san* ('went up')" rather than "*eneb<u>e</u>san* ('entered
　　　　　　into,' AV & ASV)," discussed at Matt. 15:39a, *infra*.


　　　　In my references to "trademarks," *infra*, I remind the reader that these first originated from scribes in handwritten Byzantine Greek manuscripts. (A similar scribal phenomenon may also be found in the textual transmission history of the Old Testament Hebrew Masoretic Text.) Thus while I generally refer to various "trademark" readings which do not affect the meaning of the text as those of the neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the 16th and 17th centuries, since they adopted or continued such usage, it should also be understood that they were thereby continuing an older tradition. For while some of these changes that appear as minority Byzantine readings may have been "reconstructions" by a scribe following a paper fade / loss, they appear to have sometimes been created as a "scribal trademark." Therefore, the adoption of such minority Byzantine readings mean that the neo-Byzantine selections *in toto* were unique to a particular neo-Byzantine text, or a particular neo-Byzantine text line.

　　　　*Matt. 15:39a* (referring to John 21:3 where Scrivener is incorrect).


　　　　As noted in the Preface ("Determining the representative Byzantine Text"), the eight gospel manuscripts specifically referred to in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) would certainly not have constituted the full range of texts he consulted. E.g., he would have also considered the variants in Stephanus's 1550 edition. Nevertheless, in Appendix 1, I may undertake a numbers count of just these eight manuscripts where I think it appropriate to do so.

　　　　*AT MATT. 15:39a, THE* representative Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided between "*eis* (into)" after the reading of the TR (found in Scrivener's text), Greek, "*eneb<u>e</u>* ('he got into,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *embain<u>o</u>*)," e.g., Omega 045 (9th century) and S 028 (10th century)[1]; and "*eis* (into)" after the variant,

---

[1]　　Swanson considers S 028 follows this reading, whereas Tischendorf thinks it probably does, but he is not certain. The manuscript is evidently difficult to read here.

"*anebe* ('he got up into,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *anabaino*)," e.g., W 032 (5th century), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and Chrysostom[2].

We cannot doubt that elsewhere in both St. Matthew's Gospel and other parts of the NT, *embaino* (with the preposition *eis* / into,) is normatively used to describe those who *enter* or *get into* a boat / ship (Matt. 8:23; 9:1; 13:2; 14:22,32; Mark 4:1; 5:18; 6:45; 8:10,13; Luke 5:3; 8:22,37; John 6:17; Acts 21:6 – *epebemen* = *epi* + *baino*; cf. Acts 27:2 – *epibantes* = *epi* + *baino*). By contrast, *anabaino* is used in St. Matthew's Gospel when Jesus "went up" from the water (Matt. 3:16), or "he went up into a mountain" (Matt. 5:1; 14:23). Elsewhere in the NT there are other non-boat uses e.g., *going up* to a location such as "Judea" (Luke 2:4), "a mountain" (Luke 9:28), "a sycomore tree" (Luke 19:4), or "Jerusalem" (John 2:13).

To this there are only two *prima facie* exceptions, John 21:3 and Mark 6:51. At John 21:3, following the Greek text of e.g., Stephanus (1550), Scrivener's text reads, "They went forth, and *got up into* (*anebesan eis*) a ship." This is a slim minority Byzantine reading[3], found in Codex Lambda 039 (Luke & John, 9th century), Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.)[4], and the Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444). By contrast, the majority Byzantine reading at John 21:3 is, "They went forth, and *entered into* (*enebesan eis*) a ship" (e.g., A 02, 5th century; N 022, 6th century; P 024, 6th century; & Lectionary 2378, 11th century[5]).

Of the eight gospel manuscripts specifically referred to in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624), by a majority of 7:1 (excluding Gospel manuscript: P2, Evangelistarium, Parham), the representative Byzantine reading, "*auton* (him)," is referred to as the majority reading (found in Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge; L, Codex Leicestrensis; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

---

[2]   The MBT reading is regarded by Robinson and Pierpont as *enebe*; and the majority text reading is regarded by Hodges & Farstad as *anebe*. The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Majority Text Apparatus says, "the evidence is about evenly divided (40-60% support)," and "we cannot be certain which reading" is the majority (Greek) text reading.

[3]   The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Majority Text Apparatus says 0%-5% of all (Greek) manuscripts follow this reading.

[4]   Lectionary 1968, p. 210b.

[5]   Lectionary 2378, p. 121b.

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading at John 21:3, which must thus stand. The absence of any factor such as e.g., a reference to *a ramp going up* or *a tall ship*, means that the representative Byzantine reading, "*eneb<u>e</u>san* ('they entered,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *embain<u>o</u>*)[6]," is as expected and natural at John 21:3, as is "*embantes* ('entering,' masculine plural nominative, active aorist participle, from *embain<u>o</u>*) at John 6:17. Hence there is no warrant to depart from this and adopt the minority Byzantine reading.

Certainly the reading of the AV is harmonious with this MBT reading, from which it may be conjectured (and disputed) that seemingly the AV translators shared my preference for the representative Byzantine reading. As a package deal, men like Stephanus of Geneva and the Elzevirs of Leiden were greater textual analysts than I, but with all due respect to them, I think they erred in following this minority Byzantine reading at John 21:3. Hence the first *prima facie* exception, John 21:3, must be eliminated, since upon closer examination it is found to conform with the other NT verses, *supra*, in reading, "entered into (*eneb<u>e</u>san eis*) a ship."

At Mark 6:51 we read, Greek, "*Kai* (And) *aneb<u>e</u>* ('he went up,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *anabain<u>o</u>*) *pros* (unto) *autous* (them) *eis* (into) *to* (the) *ploion* (ship)," i.e., "and *he went up into* (*aneb<u>e</u> eis*) the ship" (AV). We cannot doubt that the text here is correct (MBT e.g., A 02, N 022, and Sigma 042). Here the distinction with the other passages about entering ships is that at Mark 6:51 Christ is specifically *going up* "unto them" i.e., stepping up onto the boat to reach his disciples from the lower point of the water line. On the one hand, it would be entirely correct to simply say here that Christ *entered* (*embain<u>o</u>*) the ship; although we are here given some extra detail, namely that "he went up … into" (*anabain<u>o</u>* + *eis*) the ship.

Thus we find that there is a possible (Mark 6:51), though not necessary (Matt. 14:32), exception to the usage of *embain<u>o</u>* for entering a ship, namely, that when one is lower than the ship one may (Mark 6:51), although one certainly does not have to (Matt. 14:32), use *anabain<u>o</u>* for a contextual emphasis on the fact that the ship is in some way higher than the person(s) in question.

Recognizing these facts, when we come to Matt. 15:39a there is a *prima facie* presumption in favour of *embain<u>o</u>*, here found as the aorist verb, "*eneb<u>e</u>* (he got into)," over *anabain<u>o</u>*, here used as the aorist verb, "*aneb<u>e</u>* (he got up into)." There is certainly no contextual factor that would lead one to even suspect that one may find the Mark 6:51 *anabain<u>o</u>* exception to the general *embain<u>o</u>* rule here for entering a ship. The context simply says that Christ, "sent away the multitude, and *took* ship, and came into the coasts of Magdala" (AV)[7]. Indeed, there is no reason to consider that this ship is in any

---

[6]   Both major Alexandrian Texts and Western Text follow the TR here, which is also found in the NU Text *et al*. Hence the reading "entered into" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

[7]   Cf. Acts 21:6, where with "*eis* (into)" after the reading "*epeb<u>e</u>men* ('we entered

fundamental way different to e.g., the "ship" referred to earlier in Matt. 14:22, where we read, "And straightway Jesus constrained his disciples *to get* (*emb<u>e</u>nai*, active aorist infinitive, from *embain<u>o</u>*) into (*eis*) a ship." (Even though the context at Matt. 14:32 of being lower down in the water would allow *anabain<u>o</u>*, the text here also reads, *embain<u>o</u>*. See Vol. 1 commentary at Matt. 14:32).

Thus the absence of any clear evidence of an exception to the general rule that one *enters* (*embain<u>o</u>*) a ship, means that the preferred reading here at Matt. 15:39a is "*eneb<u>e</u> eis* (he got into)" the ship. This is the reading of Stephanus (1550) and Scrivener (1902). Therefore in my opinion, this reading of "*eneb<u>e</u> eis* (he got into)," found in Stephanus (1550), is to be preferred over the reading, "*aneb<u>e</u>* (he got up into)."

I further note that at Matt. 15:39a the NU Text *et al*, following both major Alexandrian Texts, London Sinaiticus and Rome Vaticanus, together with their "queen of Minuscules," Minuscule 33, have the same reading as the TR. *But appearances can be deceptive.* For though the reading of the TR and NU Text is the same here at Matt. 15:39a, the rationale for the adoption of this reading is quite different under neo-Byzantine textual analysis, than it is under neo-Alexandrian principles, or Burgonite rules of a simple "number count" (which here leaves them fumbling and floundering to get the uncertain exact number, as seen in the difference between Robinson and Pierpont' *eneb<u>e</u>*; and Hodges & Farstad's *aneb<u>e</u>*.).

The fact that neo-Byzantines and neo-Alexandrians, here at Matt. 15:39a happen to agree that the reading is "*eneb<u>e</u> eis* (he got into)" the ship, is thus nothing more than a quaint coincidence. The reality is that Matt. 15:39a provides us with a clear example of how neo-Byzantines, neo-Alexandrians, Burgonites, and Latin Papists[8], all approach the same text quite differently.

*AT MATT. 17:9a, SCRIVENER'S* Text, like that of Stephanus (1550), reads "*apo* (from)," in the words, "from (*apo*) the mountain." But the preposition, *ek*, with a genitive, may also be rendered, "from," and the MBT (e.g., W 032, 5th century & Lectionary 1968, 1544 A.D.,) reads, "*ek* (from) *tou* ('the,' neuter singular genitive, definite article from *to*) *orous* ('mountain,' neuter singular genitive noun, from *oros*)."

Of the eight gospel manuscripts specifically referred to in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624), by a majority of 5:3 (excluding Gospel manuscripts: L, Codex Leicestrensis; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & P2, Evangelistarium, Parham), the representative Byzantine reading, "*ek* (from)," is referred to as the majority reading (found in Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge

---

into,' indicative active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *epibain<u>o</u>*)," the AV also reads, "we took ship."

[8] The Douay-Rheims here reads, "he went up into a boat," following the Latin reading, "*ascendit* (he ascended)," found in the Vulgate *et al*.

University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

The reading of Stephanus & Scrivener at Matt. 17:9a is a slim minority Byzantine reading, found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th century) and Origen. Outside the closed class of sources, "*apo* (from)" is also found in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century)[9].

In Matt. 8:1 we find the words, "*apo* (from) *tou* (the) *orous* (mountain)," and this also occurs at Mark 9:9; Luke 9:37, in both instances, also after the Transfiguration. Such usage with "*orous* (mountain)," is certainly more common in the NT (cf. Luke 19:37; Acts 1:12; Gal. 4:24). It was presumably this factor of common usage that led Stephanus *et al* to adopt the minority reading. (If the change was deliberate, does this same factor; or if the change was accidental, a "reconstruction" of the normative *apo* form following a paper fade / loss of the *ek* form, which possibly came at then end of a line; account for the origins of the "*apo*" reading?)

But it must also be said that St. Matthew uses not only *apo* with a genitive (e.g., Matt. 1:17; 2:1; 3:4); but also *ek* with a genitive (e.g., Matt. 1:3; 2:6; 3:9). Certainly I do not consider that any clear and obvious textual problem requiring a remedy is here presented by the representative Byzantine text at Matt. 17:9a. Thus on this occasion, I concur with the MBT that *ek* is the better reading.

It makes no difference to the English translation of the Authorized Version, and so one cannot be entirely sure which of the two readings the King James Version translators followed (for which reason, these alternatives should arguably be placed in Appendix 2, rather than Appendix 1). Nevertheless, in this particular instance, together with the MBT, I consider the reading *ek* is the correct reading, and so I hold that Scrivener's Text does not here properly represent the *Textus Receptus*.

*AT MATT. 17:14b, THE* reading of Scrivener's Text, following e.g., Stephanus (1550) "*gonupeton* ('kneeling down to,' masculine singular nominative, present active participle, from *gonupeteo*) *auto* ('unto him,' masculine singular dative, 3rd person pronoun, from *autos*)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 2378 (11th century), Minuscule 2 (12th century), and Origen. However, the reading, "*gonupeton* (kneeling down to) *auton* ('him,' masculine singular accusative, 3rd person pronoun, from *autos*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & Lectionary 1968).

Of the eight gospel manuscripts specifically referred to in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624), by a majority of 6:2 (excluding Gospel manuscripts: L, Codex

---

[9] The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Majority Text Apparatus says about 0%-5% of all manuscripts follow this reading.

Leicestrensis; & P2, Evangelistarium, Parham), the representative Byzantine reading, "*auton* (him)," is referred to as the majority reading (found in Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

The minority Byzantine reading is also found in Minuscule 157 (independent text type, 12th century); and the MBT reading is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, and it thus entered the NU Text *et al*. Irrespective of which reading is followed, it has no impact on fundamental meaning or necessary translation. In either instance the meaning at Matt. 17:14b is, "kneeling down to him" (AV), or "kneeling to him" (ASV). Thus we cannot definitively say which of the two readings the King James Version translators followed.

Any argument in favour of the minority Byzantine reading is conjectural. E.g., was an argument made that because we first have a <u>verb</u> with <u>a dative</u> i.e., "there came near (*pros<u>e</u>lthen*, 'he came near,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular <u>verb</u>, from *proserchomai*) to him (*aut<u>o</u>*, masculine singular <u>dative</u>, 3rd person pronoun, from *autos*)," that to follow this with <u>a participle</u> (*gonupet<u>o</u>n*, 'kneeling down to,') and <u>a dative</u> (*aut<u>o</u>*, 'to him' / 'unto him'), was in some sense "more stylistically compatible." If so, I think this a *very lame* argument for the minority Byzantine reading, and a most unwise one to advance.

The reality is that this type of construction is certainly inside of Matthean Greek. Thus St. Matthew says at Matt. 8:5, "there came (*pros<u>e</u>lthen*, 'he came near,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular <u>verb</u>, from *proserchomai*) unto him (*aut<u>o</u>*, masculine singular <u>dative</u>, 3rd person pronoun, from *autos*) a centurion, beseeching (*parakal<u>o</u>n*, masculine singular nominative, present active <u>participle</u>, from *parakale<u>o</u>*) him (*auton*, masculine singular <u>accusative</u>, 3rd person pronoun, from *autos*)."

There is no clear and obvious textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must thus stand. The reason for the adoption of the minority Byzantine reading at Matt. 17:14b by, for instance, Stephanus, Elzevir, and Scrivener is necessarily speculative. I find it hard to believe that the conjectured argument given above would have held any weight with the great textual analysts of the 16th and 17th centuries. Therefore, I think the most likely construction is that Scrivener's *aut<u>o</u>* (unto him) was adopted via Origen, in order to use it as a textual "trademark" that did not affect the fundamental meaning of the text.

If we "track it down," we find this reading first appears in Erasmus's 1516 edition by which we can tell that e.g., Stephanus and Elzevir were here following an Erasmus derived text as their main source. This past master of the Neo-Byzantine School, Erasmus, would thus smile that one of his textual "trademarks" can be so used. I greatly admire the textual analytic skills of Erasmus, and as a package deal acknowledge him to be very much by better. But I bow my knee low to Almighty God whose text this is. I understand what Erasmus has here done, and greatly respect him. Nevertheless, I do not

viii

support this reading, and consider that the better reading is that of the representative Byzantine text, "*auton* (him)"[10].   In reaching this conclusion, I emphasize that the English reading of the AV is entirely correct, and needs no alteration whatsoever.

*AT MATT. 17:27b, SCRIVENER'S* Text reads, "*anabanta* ('coming up,' masculine singular accusative, active aorist participle, from *anabaino*)."   This is a minority Byzantine reading, found in e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); E 07 (8th century), H 013 (9th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.).   It is followed in ancient times by Origen (d. 254), Basil the Great (d. 379), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).   It was followed by e.g., Stephanus (1550).   It also forms part of the NU Text *et al*, being found outside the closed class of sources in the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus & London Sinaiticus, and Western Text's D 05.

By contrast, the majority Byzantine text (MBT), reads, "*anabainonta* ('coming up,' masculine singular accusative, active present participle, from *anabaino*)[11]."   This is found in e.g., W 032 (5th century), F 09 (9th century), G 011 (9th century), S 028 (10th century), X 033 (10th century), Gamma 036 (10th century), and 28 (11th century).   It is also supported in ancient times by Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

Importantly, *there is no difference in English translation between these two readings* here at Matt. 17:27b.   Therefore we cannot be sure which one was followed by the King James Version translators.

Participles are sometimes called, *verbal adjectives*, because they have characteristics of both verbs and adjectives.   Like adjectives, they agree with the noun (or pronoun) in gender, number, and case.   E.g., here at Matt. 17:27b the participle in both readings is masculine (gender), singular (number) accusative (case), as is both the noun and adjective modifying the noun in, "*ton* ('the,' masculine singular accusative, definite article, from *o*) *anabanta* / *anabainonta* ('coming up,' both masculine singular accusative participles, from *anabaino*) *proton* ('first,' masculine singular accusative adjective, from *protos*) *ichthun* ('fish,' masculine singular accusative noun, from *ichthus*) *aron* ('thou take up,' imperative active aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *airo*)," i.e., "and take up the fish that first cometh up" (AV).

---

[10]   See Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), "Primary & Secondary Rules of Neo-Byzantine Textual Analysis" in the "Introduction" to the Appendices; and also the first Appendix.

[11]   The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Majority Text Apparatus says, "61-79% of all manuscripts support" the MBT reading (*anabainonta*); and so (in broad approximate terms) about 21-39% follow the reading of Scrivener's text (*anabanta*).   The vast majority of these texts are Byzantine, thus making Scrivener's text a strong minority Byzantine reading.

As a general rule, the time of the participle is relative to that of the main verb i.e., a *present* tense participle in one that takes place *simultaneously with* the main verb, whereas an *aorist* tense participle takes place *prior to* the main verb. Young does not think this is occurring as a rule of Greek grammar, but simply happens by context. Thus a present tense participle indicates that the action is in progress, whereas an aorist tense participle indicates the action is being viewed as a whole. He considers that the relative position of participle and verb is more significant, with a participle preceding a verb indicating prior time, and a participle after the verb indicating later time[12]. If so, what happens to simultaneous actions such as this one here at Matt. 17:27? Nevertheless, it is clear that even on Young's view, one can say that the general rule is *a general indicator*.

Therefore, here at Matt. 17:27b, it would be reasonable to say that because the participle action of "coming up (*anabaino*)," is occurring simultaneously with the main verb, "*aron* (thou take up)," the *normal expectation* would be that this would be a *present* tense participle i.e., the MBT reading, "*anabainonta*." Given that *the more expected* reading is that of the representative Byzantine text, one could not only say that there is *no clear and obvious textual problem* with it; but one could also say there is an argument in its favour. Under the circumstances, in my opinion, "*anabainonta* (coming up)," is thus the correct reading.

Was this an accidental change? E.g., did the original "*anabainonta* (coming up)," go over two lines, with "*anabaino*" on one line, and "*nta*" on the next? If so, due to a paper fade, did the first line come to look something like, "*anaba:::*"? Was this an undetected paper fade that thus gave rise to the reading, "*anabanta* (coming up)"?

Was this a deliberate change? Did e.g., a scribe, probably Origen, think it "more stylistically pleasing" or "harmonious" to having the action viewed as a series of snapshots of the whole action (the function of an aorist) by having a succession of "matching" *active aorists*? I.e., in "and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up" (AV), was this Origen's view of "*bale* ('thou cast,' imperative active aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *ballo*) *agkistron* (an hook), *kai* (and) *ton* (the) *anabanta* ('coming up,' masculine singular accusative, active aorist participle, from *anabaino*) *proton* (first) *ichthun* (fish) *aron* ('thou take up,' imperative active aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *airo*)"?

Of the eight gospel manuscripts specifically referred to in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624), four supported the representative Byzantine reading, "*anabainonta* (coming up)" (Gospel manuscripts: v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8); and Elzevir says one did not (Gospel manuscript: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17). Thus Elzevir in 1624 had a similar type of conclusion as Hodges & Farstad in 1985 when they put "*anabainonta*" in the main text, with a footnote

---

[12]   Young's *Greek*, p. 147.

stating that the majority text was divided, with a greater part supporting this reading, and a lesser part supporting the variant, "*anabanta*."    The variant was early adopted by Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and followed by e.g., Stephanus (1550).   Why?

I leave the reader to ponder two questions.   The first one is a "kite" I sometimes like to fly.   What role, if any, did Greek Lectionaries play in the adoption of this reading in various neo-Byzantine texts?    The second question, is one I do not like raising, but I do so when I think I should.    In doing so, I also remind the reader that there is no difference in translation between these two variants, so that translation into English or another tongue is not compromised by adopting the variant.    What role, if any, did the idea of "trademarks" play in the adoption of the minority Byzantine reading here at Matt. 17:27b in various neo-Byzantine texts?[13].

*AT MATT. 18:12b,13 (TWICE) SCRIVENER'S* Text reads, "*ennenekontaennea* (ninety-nine)."  This is a compound word i.e., *enenekonta* (ninety) + *ennea* (nine) = *ennenekontaennea* (ninety-nine).   But the same components with a space between them, (and unlike Scrivener's spelling variant, with the first word having only one "n" / nu after the "e" / epsilon,) reading "*enenekonta* (ninety) *ennea* (nine)," is the MBT reading[14].

This matter illustrates the difficulty of unravelling continuous script manuscripts. *Prima facie* Scrivener's Text is the reading of e.g., Manuscript Washington (W 032, but with only one "n" after the first "e"), but W 032 is a continuous script codex in which words are commonly joined together, so one could not actually say that it supports Scrivener's reading as such, though nor could one say that it rules out Scrivener's reading.   Thus e.g., Swanson takes the view W 032 supports the MBT reading[15].   (The MBT reading is also found in the two leading Alexandrian Texts and leading Western Text, and was adopted in the NU Text *et al.*)

---

[13]    See Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), "Primary & Secondary Rules of Neo-Byzantine Textual Analysis" in the "Introduction" to the Appendices; and also the first Appendix.    Cf. Matt. 18:1 where the MBT rightly followed by Stephanus and Scrivener reads, "*ora* (time)," whereas a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscule 24, 11th century) which probably originated with Origen (who uses both readings), reads, "*emera* ('day' or 'time')."   Was the mediaeval scribe of Minuscule 24 adopting this reading as a textual "trademark"?   Or is another explanation to be preferred?

[14]    The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Majority Text Apparatus says 95-100% of all manuscripts follow the MBT reading.   Thus (on these approximate figures which do not include von Soden's 10% error margin which would here only be a maximum of 0.5%,) only 0%-5% of all (Greek) manuscripts follow the minority Byzantine reading of Scrivener's Text.

[15]    Swanson, R., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts* (1995), Matthew's Gospel, pp. 173,174.

Both Lectionaries 2378 and 1968 are also continuous script. But the spelling in Lectionary 2378 is (twice i.e., at both verses 12 & 13), "*enenikontaennea*", which though following the MBT with only one "n," also has a localized dialect spelling replacing the "*e*" (eta) with an "i" (iota) with two dots on top of it (both parallel with the bottom of the page, so that if the two dots were joined, they would form a "T" bar shape with the iota). By contrast, Lectionary 1968 (twice i.e., at both verses 12 & 13) simply follows the standard one "n" (n) spelling of the MBT.

Certainly there is no difference in meaning between the two readings at Matt. 18:12b,13, both of which may equally be rendered into English as "ninety and nine" (AV, twice). Nevertheless, since on general principles one follows the representative Byzantine reading unless there is a good textual argument against it which is resolved by a reading inside the closed class of sources, it follows that I must support the MBT reading of "*enenekonta* (ninety) *ennea* (nine)" or "*enenekontaennea* (ninty-nine)." Of course, for those who believe in textual "trademarks," one might here adopt the reading found in Scrivener's Text, and claim some support for it on the basis of unravelling continuous script Byzantine texts in such a way as to support it. But such an argument holds no appeal to me. (Cf. comments at Matt. 20:5b, *infra*.) Nevertheless, to the extent that we do not on this occasion know if this should be put as one or two words, I will partially defer to the Erasmus (1516) reading which used two words (but unlike myself a double "n" for the first one,) and so follow "*enenekonta* (ninety) *ennea* (nine)."

*AT MATT. 18:28b SCRIVENER* and Stephanus read, "*o* ('what' or 'that,' neuter singular accusative pronoun, from *os*) *ti* ('what [thing],' neuter singular accusative, pronoun from *tis*)," i.e., "Pay me *that* (*o* + *ti* = 'what' / 'that') thou owest" (AV). The exact level of manuscript support for this reading is unclear, but certainly less than 5%[16]. The reading has better support in the Latin textual tradition, and possibly Stephanus *et al* "reconstructed" it from the Latin Vulgate. While old Latin q reads, "*si* (if) *quid* (anything)" (cf. MBT, *infra*); in harmony with Scrivener's text, old Latin d reads, *quae* ('that' / 'what'), and likewise the Vulgate and multiple old Latin versions (a,e,b,ff2,h,f,aur,1,g1,ff1, & c) read, "*quod* ('that' / 'what')."

The MBT reading (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042) at Matt. 18:28b is "*ei* ('if,' conjunction) *ti* ('anything,' neuter singular accusative, pronoun from *tis*)," but the translation is, "Pay me *that* (*ei* + *ti* = 'what' / 'that') thou owest" (AV). The usage of Greek, "*ei* (if)," makes this a *conditional sentence*. Significantly though, we here find the "*ei* (if)," is used with an indicative, "*opheileis* ('thou owest,' indicative active present, 2nd person singular verb, from *opheilo*)." When "*ei* (if)" is used with such an indicative,

---

[16]   Tischendorf's 8th ed. refers to "many" unnamed manuscripts in support of the reading, but the vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Majority Text Apparatus says 0%-5% of all (Greek) manuscripts follow this reading.

there is *an assumption of truth for the sake of argument*[17].   I.e., here at Matt. 18:28b, the "*ei* (if)" does not mean, "if" thou dost happen to owe me "an hundred pence," *then* "pay me."   Rather, the grammar here means the "*ei* (if)" + indicative (*opheileis* / thou owest) = a reality.   Hence in translating this into English, one would render it "Pay … *that* thou owest" (AV & TR) or "Pay *what* thou owest" (ASV & W-H, Greek *ei ti*)[18].

To the extent that the translation is the same, we cannot be sure which of these two Greek forms the AV translators preferred.   But it is clear that the reading of Scrivener's Text was a popular reading among the 16th and 17th century Greek NT text composers e.g., Erasmus's 1516 text reads "*o ti*[19]."   E.g., of the eight manuscripts itemized in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624), we read that seven of them had "*ei to*" rather than "*o ti*" (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; L, Codex Leicestrensis; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

There is certainly no clear and obvious textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading here (*ei ti*), raising the question as to why this alternative reading (*o ti*) was adopted?   It seems to me the answer lies in the fact that both have the same meaning.   I.e., this appears to have been a cleverly wrought "trademark."   My own view on the desirability of such "trademarks" is very different to that of my fellow neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the 16th and 17th centuries.   Personally, I do not like these identifier "trademarks."   Therefore I think that printed editions of the Received Text

---

[17]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 675,680-712, at pp. 689-694 (structural category: first class).   Daniel Wallace has written a very useful Greek grammar, and so in broad general terms, I am happy to recommend and cite it.   However, it is tarnished by such ugly features as its usage of feminist language and support of Neo-Alexandrian School principles.   Moreover, the story of bodily mutilation at p. 681 is unfit for publication, and it is suffice to say something like, e.g., "Matt. 5:29,30 uses metaphoric language and does not teach bodily mutilation."   I think we should avoid unnecessarily gory detail and horror stories (Eph. 5:12; Col. 3:2).   I remind the reader, that if he does not learn to sift the gold from the dross in the Apocrypha, he will need to learn this technique with some other work, for the only perfectly written book is the Bible.

[18]   In old Latin q, the reading is, "*si* (if) *quid* (anything) *debis* ('thou owest,' indicative active present, 2nd person singular verb, from *debeo*)."   In Latin, the usage of "*si*" with an indicative (*debis* / thou owest) in a conditional sentence, means the condition is *stated as a fact* and *is more likely* to be one that is realized (Allen's *Latin Grammar*, p. 189, section 394; Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, p. 228).   Thus on the one hand, the Latin of q; and on the other hand, the Latin of the Vulgate *et al* and the meaning of both Greek readings, are *different* but *quite similar*.

[19]   This same reading was retained in Erasmus's 1522 edition; and is also found at Matt. 18:28b in Stephanus's 1550 edition.

should more accurately read, "*ei ti*" at Matt. 18:28b, rather than Scrivener's "*o ti*."   But *I stress*, the matter does not affect English translation or fundamental meaning.

*AT MATT. 18:31b, FOLLOWING* the Greek text of e.g., Stephanus (1550), Scrivener's text reads, Greek, "*auton* ('of them' = 'their,' masculine genitive, 3rd person plural pronoun, from *autos*)."   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in H 013 (9th century), S 028 (10th century), and Minuscule 2 (12th century).   By contrast, the MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042) reading, is "*eauton* ('of themselves' = 'their,' masculine genitive, 3rd person plural pronoun, from *eautou*)."   In either instance, the reading is "their" in the words, "and came and told unto *their* lord all that was done" (Matt. 18:31).

In Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624), he lists five manuscripts in favour of the MBT reading, (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; & P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18); and one in favour of the minority Byzantine reading (Gospel manuscript: z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

The adoption of the minority Byzantine reading here at Matt. 18:31b, looks like a typical "trademark" usage of the minority Byzantine reading by, for instance, Stephanus (1550), which is later reflected in Scrivener.   By going to a combination of such readings, it was possible to trace the origins of a text something like, though not the same as, a modern "copyright," and trace from whom the text was originally coming from through a combination of different "trademarks."   E.g., though in his 1516 edition Erasmus used "*auton*," we find in his 1522 edition this verse reads, "*eauton*[20]," and so its original usage in 1516 was later dropped by Erasmus as a textual "trademark," although the idea of so using it evidently also appealed to, for instance, the later Stephanus.

If there was such a thing as the "Gavin Basil McGrath trademark," and let me say, *there is not*, then it would be to apply the primary rules of neo-Byzantine textual analysis to this area of secondary rules, and so conclude that the MBT reading stands unless there is a good textual argument against it.   I.e., the notion that if a reading inside the closed class of sources *means exactly the same thing*, that it can be substituted, and a combination of such "trademarks" used to identify a specific text, is not a proposition that I support.   Thus the "Gavin Basil McGrath trademark" is *to have no such textual trademarks*, although I accept that this is an area of secondary rules where we neo-Byzantines may disagree with each other, while still all holding to the same fundamental primary rules and methods of the Neo-Byzantine School.   Let the text therefore stand at Matt. 18:31b as in the MBT and Erasmus's 1522 edition!

*AT MATT. 19:5c, BOTH THE* reading "*kollethesetai* ('he shall cleave,' indicative passive future, 3rd person singular verb, from *kollao*) *te* ('to the,' feminine singular

---

[20]   Since I only have Erasmus's 1516 and 1522 editions, I cannot say if he first dropped it 1519 or 1522, nor if he later reintroduced it in a later edition.   But for my purposes of illustration this does not matter.

dative, definite article from *e*), *gunaiki* ('wife,' feminine singular <u>dative</u>, noun from *gune*) *autou* (of him)" (*Reading 1*, e.g., W 032); and the reading of Scrivener's Text, "*proskollethesetai* ('he shall cleave unto,' indicative passive future, 3rd person singular verb, from *proskollao* = *pros* / unto + *kollao*) *te* (to the), *gunaiki* (wife) *autou* (of him)" (*Reading 2*, e.g., Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968, & Chrysostom); have substantial support in the Byzantine Text. Because "the wife" is a Greek dative, i.e., "*to* the wife," there is no impact on translation, and both readings may be rendered, "shall cleave to his wife" (AV).

The vast majority of manuscripts used in the Majority Text are Byzantine, and both readings are said by Hodges & Farstad (1985) to have the part support of the Majority Text, though the fact that like Robinson & Pierpont (1991) they place *Reading 2* in their main text, indicates their count favours this reading. The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) regards the two readings as "alternatives." I.e., "the evidence is about evenly divided (40-60% support)," and so on his Majority Text principles, Pierpont "cannot be certain which reading represents the original – but it must be one of the two."

Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) says *Reading 1* is supported by three of his eight manuscripts (Gospel manuscripts: v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; L, Codex Leicestrensis; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum); whereas *Reading 2* was supported by one of his manuscripts (Gospel manuscripts: w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16).

There is no clear and obvious textual problem with either *Reading 1* or *Reading 2*. On the one hand, it is possible that *proskollethesetai* was an assimilation to Mark 10:7 (and possibly also Eph. 5:31); but on the other hand, it is possible that the "*pros*" of "*proskollethesetai*" was either lost in a paper fade or pruned away to form "*kollethesetai*" on the basis of its "redundancy." Thus both *Reading 1* and *Reading 2* have about half the Byzantine manuscripts behind them; neither reading presents any clear and obvious textual problem; and textual arguments might be reasonably adduced for either an addition or a subtraction from the text.

Under the circumstances, the evidence for the two readings is about equally divided, so that we cannot be entirely certain as to which is the better reading (50% certainty). Nor are we sure which of the two readings was preferred by the AV translators, since there is no impact on translation irrespective of which reading is followed. Therefore both readings are "passable." Since either have a 50:50 chance of being correct; I think that in printed editions of the Received Text, the prefix "*pros*" should be placed in square brackets signifying this uncertainty, and thus making its usage or non-usage entirely optional i.e., written as "[*pros*]*kollethesetai*." However, it must be clearly understood that in either instance, the translation found in the AV would be the same, "shall cleave to his wife" (AV).

*AT MATT. 19:9a, SCRIVENER'S* Text, following e.g., Stephanus (1550) reads, "*ei* ('if,' a conjunction) *me* ('not,' a participle) *epi* ('for,' a preposition + dative) *porneia*

('fornication' / 'unchastity' / 'immorality,' feminine singular <u>dative</u> noun, from *porneia*);" i.e., (with "it be" in italics showing it as added by the translators,) "except it be for fornication" (AV)

On the one hand, the reading with "*ei*" is a minority Byzantine reading (W 032, with spelling variant of *porneia* as *pornia*). It is also cited by St. Basil the Great. But on the other hand, the vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Majority Text Apparatus says 0%-5% of all (Greek) manuscripts follow this reading. Reflecting this, in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624), Elzevir says six of his eight selected manuscripts lack the "*ei*" (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

By contrast, at Matt. 19:9a the reading "*m<u>e</u>* ('not,' a participle, here meaning, 'except') *epi* (for) *porneia* (fornication)," i.e., (with "it be" in italics showing it as added by the translators,) "except *it be* for fornication" (AV) is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042, N 022, & Lectionary 2378, all with spelling variant of *porneia* as *pornia*; and Lectionary 1968 with the MBT spelling, *porneia*).

The Greek "*ei*," may be used to introduce a conditional clause[21]. I.e., on a very literal rendering of Matt. 19:9a in Scrivener's Text, "*ei* (if) *m<u>e</u>* (not)." The Greek, "*ei m<u>e</u>*," is certainly Matthean Greek, as seen by, e.g., Matt. 5:13 (2nd "but") or Matt. 12:4 ("but"). But it is also Matthean Greek to use "*m<u>e</u>*" without the conjunction, "*ei*," to mean something like, "except," as seen by Matt. 5:29,30. In these two verses, Christ twice says, "*kai* (and) *m<u>e</u>* (not)," i.e., "and (*kai*) not (*m<u>e</u>*) thy whole body should be cast into hell" (AV), but the meaning is clearly, "*lest* (*m<u>e</u>*) even (*kai*) thy whole body should be cast into hell[22]." Interestingly, we also find, "*m<u>e</u>* (not) *kai* (also)," at Gal. 6:1, where St. Paul says, "lest (*m<u>e</u>*) thou also (*kai*) be tempted."

Or in Mark 13:5, we read, "Take heed lest (*m<u>e</u>*) any man deceive you" (AV); and Mark 13:36, we read, "Lest (*m<u>e</u>*) coming suddenly he find you sleeping" (AV). (Cf. e.g., Acts 13:40; 23:10.) In this context, I Cor. 10:12,13 is an interesting passage, for here we see the two expressions used in close proximity. St. Paul says, "wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed *lest* (*m<u>e</u>*) he fall. There hath no temptation taken you *but* (*ei m<u>e</u>*) such as is common to man" etc. (AV).

---

[21]  Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 675.

[22]  After the Second Advent, disembodied souls in hell are given some kind of body (Rev. 20:12-15), so that punishments in hell are sometimes referred to as, "their worm shall not die" (Isa. 66:24), or "their worm dieth not" (Mark 9:44,46,48). I.e., the punishing "worm" (Mark 9:44) keeps gnawing into the "whole body" (Matt. 5:29,30).

Therefore, here at Matt. 19:9a, the translation, "except," in "except it be for fornication" (AV), may be rendered the same, irrespective of whether one is translating from the MBT reading, "*me*" or the minority reading, "*ei me*."   E.g., it is rendered "except" in the ASV, where the underpinning Westcott-Hort text clearly reads "*me*" in agreement with the MBT.   Hence we do not know which of these two readings was preferred by the AV translators.

There is no clear and obvious textual problem with the MBT reading, "*me*," here at Matt. 19:9a, and so on general principles I hold that it must stand.   Why then was the synonymous minority Byzantine reading, "*ei me*," so commonly used in 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantine texts, as reflected in the fact that it ultimately came to be used in Scrivener's Text?   Methinks I here see an olden time neo-Byzantine trademark, originating with Erasmus's 1516 edition, much liked and much used, probably with a smile on the face of my neo-Byzantine betters and seniors from the 16th and 17th centuries, in order to, in conjunction with other such trademarks, identify a particular text.   With all due respect to them, I cannot agree with them on this matter.   *Let the representative Byzantine Text here stand!*

*AT MATT. 19:26*, "*esti* ('they are*[23]*')," is found in Scrivener's text in the words, "all things *are* possible."   As constructed from von Soden's textual apparatus (1913), Hodges & Farstad (1985) state the Majority Text lacks "*esti*," although Robinson & Pierpont's Majority Text (1991) places the *esti* in square brackets, indicating a fairly even division of all Greek manuscripts (i.e., those both inside and outside the closed class of sources).   However, on the actual count, the vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) says "61-79% of all manuscripts support" the reading that lacks *esti*.   Therefore, the MBT lacks the *esti*, although a strong minority Byzantine reading, somewhere in the order of 30% +/- 10% contains the *esti*.

Stephanus (1550) includes the "*esti*," whereas the MBT does not, *infra*.   Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624), which is only a selections of the manuscripts he consulted, says the "*esti*" is present (with the optional "n" at the end as *estin*,) in four of his manuscripts (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8); and absent in two of them (Gospel manuscripts: w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; & L, Codex Leicestrensis).

---

[23]   More widely, this reads, "*panta* ('all things,' neuter plural nominative adjective, from *pas* [masculine] *pasa* [feminine] *pan* [neuter]) *dunata* ('possible,' neuter plural nominative adjective, from *dunatos*) *esti* ('it is,' indicative active present, 3rd person <u>singular</u> verb, from *eimi* = 'they are' = 'are')."   In Greek, a neuter plural subject usually has singular verbs, and so the singular "*esti* (it is)," here has the plural meaning, "they are."   By contrast, it is found here in the Vulgate and all old Latin Versions as, "*omnia* (all things) *possibilia* (possible) *sunt* ('they are' = 'are,' indicative active present, 3rd person <u>plural</u> verb, from *sum*)."

More widely, at Matt. 19:26, the MBT lacking the "*esti*" is found in e.g., W 032 (5th century), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), H 013 (9th century), and X 033 (10th century). It is further supported in the Greek by Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407). However, the minority Byzantine reading including the "*esti*" is found in e.g., E 07 (8th century), F 09 (9th century), and G 011 (9th century).

Did the AV translators agree with the representative Byzantine reading or the minority Byzantine reading of Stephanus's text?

*Prima facie*, it might be argued that they followed the minority Byzantine reading because the "are (*esti*, literally, 'they are')" is not in italics at Matt. 19:26 in, "all things are possible" (AV). E.g., at Matt. 22:4 where the Greek reads, "*kai* (and) *panta* (all) things) *etoima* (ready)," the AV reads with "are" in italics, "all things *are* ready." Or in Mark 14:36, where the Greek reads, "*panta* (all things) *dunata* (possible) *soi* (unto thee)," the AV reads with "are" in italics, "all things *are* possible." Examples of the AV so placing "are" in italics could be multiplied (e.g., Matt. 5:3-10; 9:37; 13:16; 22:4 – twice, 24:8).

However, this argument is not conclusive since the AV translators were not consistent in this matter. Sometimes they added the verb, "to be" as part of English translation, and did not so use italics. E.g., at Matt. 5:15 the Greek reads, "*kai* (and) *lampei* (it giveth light unto) *pasi* (all) *tois* (the [ones]) *en* (in) *t̲e̲* (the) *oikia* (house)." Yet without using italics, the AV translators add in "that are" before "in the house," with their rendering, "and it giveth light unto all that are in the house" (AV). Likewise the AV translators add in "that are" without the use of italics at Matt. 11:11 and Matt. 19:30.

Therefore any argument based on the absence of italics for the AV's "are" at Matt. 19:26 is not conclusive. That is because the AV translators sometimes used italics for a supplied verb, "to be," and sometimes did not. Thus the issue of whether or not at Matt. 19:26 the AV translators agreed with Stephanus (who includes the "*esti*") or the MBT (which lacks the *esti*), may be open to some debate because the AV's rendering of Matt. 19:26 could be based on either Greek text.

Which of these two readings then is the correct one? On general neo-Byzantine principles, one accepts the representative Byzantine reading, unless there is a clear and obvious textual problem with it.

On the one hand, it is possible to argue that the minority Byzantine reading has "a greater stylistic balance" between the two couplets. I.e., (a) "*Para* (With) *anthrōpois* (men) *touto* (this) *adunaton* (impossible) *esti* (is)," "stylistically balances" with, (b) "*para* (with) *de* (but) *The̲o̲* (God) *panta* (all things) *dunata* (possible) *esti* (are)." But on the other hand, one cannot claim that such a "stylistic balance" is required inside Matthean Greek, i.e., on this particular occasion its absence would not necessarily pose a textual problem. This is clear from Matt. 22:14 where we read *without any such "stylistic*

*balance*" between the two couplets, (a) "*polloi* (many) *gar* (For) *eisi* (are[24]) *kletoi* (called)," then (b) "*oligoi* (few) *de* (but) *eklektoi* (chosen)," i.e., using italics where the AV does, "For many are called, but few *are* chosen" (AV).

Therefore I conclude that here at Matt. 19:26, on this occasion the MBT rather than e.g., Erasmus's, Stephanus's, or Scrivener's text, is in fact the Received Text reading. My position is straightforward, *Let the representative Byzantine Text stand* here at Matt. 19:26. As to why the minority Byzantine reading which does not necessarily effect English (or other language) translation was adopted by e.g., Stephanus, I can only remind the reader of the tradition of using "trademarks," whereby, through reference to a number of readings that do no effect translation, one might determine the original neo-Byzantine composer of the text, and /or give credit to him by following his textual reading. Here I note that the "*esti* (they are)" may be traced to Erasmus's 1516 edition. On the one hand I honour the name of Erasmus of Rotterdam. But on the other hand, my position at Matt.19:26 is emphatic, Scrivener's (generally very good) text should here be corrected.

*AT MATT. 20:2, THE* MBT (e.g., E 07, 8th century, G 011, 9th century, X 033, 10th century; Lectionaries 2378, 11th century & 1968, 1544 A.D.; & Chrysostom, d. 407), reads, "*Kai* ('And,' word 1a) *sumphonesas* ('agreeing,' word 2, = 'when he had agreed')," i.e., "And when he had agreed" (AV). However, Scrivener's Text, like the texts of Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550), follows a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042; Cyril of Alexandria, d. 444), "*sumphonesas* ('agreeing,' word 2, = 'when he had agreed') *de* ('And,' word 1b, replacing word 1a)," i.e., "And when he had agreed" (AV). It is *prima facie* possible that the AV translators followed either reading, since the translation into English is identical either way.

The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Majority Text Apparatus (1986) says 95-100% of all manuscripts follow the MBT reading. Thus only approximately 0%-5% of all (Greek) manuscripts follow the minority Byzantine reading of Stephens's Text (1550) and Scrivener's Text (1894 & 1902). Of the eight gospel manuscripts specifically referred to in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624), one is said to follow another minority variant here at Matt. 20:2, and a majority of five are listed in support of the MBT reading (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18).

There is no clear and obvious textual problem here with the representative Byzantine reading, which therefore must stand. On this occasion, I thus prefer the MBT over Erasmus and Stephanus.

*Was this an accidental change?* Manuscript W 032 often has a stylistic paper

---

[24] "They are" = "are," indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *eimi*.

space before that which Stephanus later listed as our verse numbers. E.g., here at Matt. 20:2, such a stylistic space exists in W 032. Furthermore, the pages are not right hand justified with precision in W 032. Did a manuscript ending on a line with "*Kai* (And) *sumphonesas* (agreeing)," in which the line ended a couple of letter spaces differently to the lines above and below, suffer a paper fade of "*Kai*"? Did a scribe, taking this space as a stylistic paper space, then "reconstruct this" with a "*de* (And)," after the "*sumphonesas* (agreeing)"? Or *was this a deliberate change*, based on the whims of some scribe?

This variant also appears outside the closed class of sources in e.g., the Alexandrian Text's *Rome Vaticanus* and *London Sinaiticus*; together with the leading Western Text, D 05. Thus it has been adopted by the NU Text *et al*. But the repetition of an error does not somehow make it right. Whether appearing in Scrivener's Text or the NU Text, the reading of the variant is wrong. Scrivener's Text should here be amended.

*AT MATT. 20:3, THE* MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; Cyril of Alexandria, d. 444) reads, "*triten* ('third' = 'the third')," i.e., "the third" in the words, "about the third hour" (AV). But a variant which is a minority Byzantine reading (V 031, 9th century), reads, "*ten* (the) *triten* (third)," i.e., "the third" in the words, "about the third hour" (AV). Though the matter has no impact on English translation, the variant is followed in Scrivener's Text[25], as it had been earlier in Stephanus's Text (1550), Beza's Text (1598), and Elzevir's Text (1633)[26]. Whose textual "trademark" is this variant followed in Scrivener's Text? It is first found in Erasmus's 1516 edition. He would be not doubt pleased that we can trace it back to him.

On the one hand, it must be admitted that when giving an hour of the day, it is certainly possible to have the definite article with the number such as here in the variant reading at Matt. 20:3 Thus in St. Matthew's Gospel we read of, "*ten* (the) *endekaten* (eleventh) *oran* (hour)" at Matt. 20:6 (cf. comments at Matt. 20:6a) & 20:9. But on the other hand, this is not necessarily so. Thus also in St. Matthew's Gospel we read of, "*ekten* ('sixth' = 'the sixth') *kai* (and) *enaten* ('ninth' = 'the ninth,' see Matt. 20:5b, *infra*) *oran* (hour)" at Matt. 20:5; or "*ektes* ('sixth' = 'the sixth') *oras* (hour)" at Matt. 27:45.

It is also possible for a short word, such as the definite article "*ten* (the)" here, to drop out. This point is made in the fact that here at Matt. 20:2, in Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.), the "*peri* (about)" is followed in continuous script by the last three letters of the

---

[25] The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Majority Text Apparatus says 95-100% of all manuscripts follow the MBT reading. Thus only *c.* 0%-5% of all (Greek) manuscripts follow the minority Byzantine reading of Scrivener's Text.

[26] See the textual apparatus of Scholz (1894).

"*triten* (third)," so that the script reads, "*periten*." But the scribe of Lectionary 1968 then realized his mistake, and so he put three dots in the shape of a triangle over the "r" (rho) of "*peri*" (even this was a bit sloppy, he should have put the 3 dots further right), and then a matching set of three triangular dots in the left margin reads, "*tri*," so that the corrected reading is "*peri* (about) *triten* (third)." But to say such a thing *could* have happened, is not to say that the evidence indicates such a thing *did* contextually happen.

There is certainly no clear and obvious textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading here at Matt. 20:3, which therefore is correct.

Of the eight gospel manuscripts specifically referred to in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624), six are listed in support of the MBT reading which was then *not* followed by Elzevir's 17th century Text (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; L, Codex Leicestrensis; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

Historically, a number of trades "have their secrets." It seems difficult to put any construction on this adoption of "*ten* (the)" by Elzevir here at Matt. 20:3, other than he was here continuing "the tradition of a well established secret trademark of the trade, one that harkens back to Erasmus." In doing so, Elzevir, like Stephanus and Beza, would in the coded esoteric language of 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines have also been "paying their respects to the great Erasmus," and those who came after him i.e., in the case of Elzevir, also "paying his respects to, for instance, Stephanus and Beza." *I join them in this sentiment, but I pay my respects a different way.* Though I doff my hat to the great 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantine textual analysts such as Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and Elzevir, who as a package deal I acknowledge and recognize to be very much my textual analytical betters and superiors; nevertheless, I do not agree with these learned scholars on this matter. This is one "secret of the trade" that I do not endorse (other than where we do not know what the MBT is, such as in the case of optional letters, or if there is one compound word or two separate words when unravelling a series of continuous script manuscripts). I thus maintain that Scrivener's Text should here be corrected at Matt. 20:3.

*AT MATT. 20:4 THE* MBT (e.g., W 032; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) reads, "*kai* (and) *ekeinois* (unto them)," i.e., "And … unto them" (AV). However a variant, "*kakeinois* ('and unto them' = *kai* / 'and' + *ekeinois* / 'unto them')," i.e., "And … unto them" (AV), found in Scrivener's Text, is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042). The majority and minority Byzantine readings have synonymous meanings here, so there is no difference in English translation between them.

The MBT reading is found in Erasmus's Text (1516 & 1522); whereas the variant is found in Stephanus's Text (1550), and then followed in Scrivener's Text (1894 & 1902). Of the eight gospel manuscripts specifically referred to in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624), Elzevir shows four following the MBT reading (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; L, Codex

Leicestrensis; & H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum), and one following the variant (Gospel manuscript: P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18)[27].

Certainly St. Matthew uses *kakeionos* elsewhere (Matt. 15:18; 23:23[28]), although he also uses both *kai* (e.g., Matt. 24:49; 26:22) and *eikonos* (e.g., Matt. 24:46; 26:24). However, there is no good textual argument against the representative reading here at Matt. 20:4, which therefore must stand. Hence on this occasion, I prefer Erasmus over Stephanus. Scrivener's Text should be amended accordingly.

Various types of abbreviations, especially for more common words, can be adopted by scribes in the manuscripts they copy out. E.g., in Lectionary 2378 (11th century), the scribe sometimes uses the modern equivalent of "&" for "and" by abbreviating "*kai*" to a shape that looks like a back-the-front question mark joined to a "u," i.e., something like ى (e.g., Matt. 10:37,38[29]). Here at Matt. 20:4 we find the scribe of Lectionary 2378 using this abbreviation, and so his script reads, "ى *ekeinois*". The variant of Scrivener's Text may well have originated as a similar scribal abbreviation.

*AT MATT. 20:5b THE* spelling of the MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042 & Lectionary 1968) reading is, "*enaten* (ninth);" and this is followed by Erasmus (1516)[30]. But a variant spelling with a double "n" (nu), i.e., "*ennaten* (ninth)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in G 011 (9th century), Gamma 036 (10th century), and Lectionary 2378 (11th century); as well as at the hand of a later "corrector" scribe of Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) (which before the "corrector" came was missing verse 5). The variant spelling was followed by Stephanus's Text (1550) and Scrivener. There is no impact on English translation irrespective of which spelling is followed.

Of the eight gospel manuscripts specifically referred to in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624), the spelling of the MBT is itemized as being in three of them (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; L, Codex Leicestrensis; & H,

---

[27]   The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Majority Text Apparatus says 95-100% of all manuscripts follow the MBT reading. Thus only *c.* 0%-5% of all (Greek) manuscripts follow the minority Byzantine reading of Scrivener's Text. Because on this occasion the correct reading was preserved in the two major Alexandrian Texts, it is also found in the NU Text *et al*.

[28]   In both instances this is, "*kakeina*" i.e., the feminine form of the conjunction, *kakeinos* (masculine) – *kakeina* (feminine) – *kakeino* (neuter). By contrast, here at Matt. 20:4 it is declined in a masculine plural dative form.

[29]   Lectionary 2378, p. 26a.

[30]   The minority reading with a double "n (nu)" is found in Erasmus's 1522 edition. We thus here see a growing development in the trade of the text "trademark."

Harleian. 5598, British Museum); and the variant is itemized as being in one of them (Gospel manuscript w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16). The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Majority Text Apparatus says 95-100% of all manuscripts follow the MBT reading. Thus only about 0%-5% of all (Greek) manuscripts follow the minority Byzantine reading of Scrivener's Text.

On the one hand, in the NT for Greek, "*ennea* ('nine,' indeclinable)," the MBT and TR uses a double "n" (nu) and reads, "*ennea* ('nine,' masculine plural nominative adjective, from *ennea*)" at Luke 17:17; and this form is also found in the "*enenekonta* (ninety) *ennea* (nine)" of Matt. 18:12b,13 and Luke 15:4,7. (Cf. comments at Matt. 18:12b,13, *supra*.) But on the other hand, in the NT for the Greek, "*enatos* (ninth)," the MBT uses a single "n" (nu), found as, "*enatos* ('ninth,' masculine singular nominative adjective, from *enatos*)" (Rev. 21:20); "*enaten* ('ninth,' feminine singular accusative adjective, from *enatos*)" (Matt. 20:5b; 27:46; Acts 3:1; 10:3,30); "*enates* ('ninth,' feminine singular genitive adjective, from *enatos*)" (Matt. 27:45; Mark 15:33; Luke 23:44); and "*enate* ('ninth,' feminine singular dative adjective, from *enatos*)" (Mark 15:34). Whatever the logic for the movement from a single to a double "n" (nu) for *enatos* is speculative. But was the movement to a double "n" (nu) for *enatos* influenced by the double "n" (nu) of *ennea*? I.e., was this an attempt to produce "a standard double 'n' (nu) spelling for 'nine' and 'ninth'"?

Whatever the logic for the origins of the variant here at Matt. 20:5b, there is clearly no good textual argument against the MBT reading. Hence on this occasion I prefer Erasmus (1516) over Erasmus (1522) and Stephanus (1550). Scrivener's Text should be amended accordingly to follow Erasmus (1516) and the MBT reading[31].

## Appendix 2

**Minor variants between Scrivener's Text
and the Majority Byzantine Text (MBT)
(or another possible reading),
including references to the neo-Alexandrian Text in those instances
where the neo-Alexandrian Texts agree with the MBT
in such an alternative reading to Scrivener's Text;
where such alternative readings do not affect,
or do not necessarily affect, the English translation,
so we cannot be certain which reading the AV translators followed.**

*1) General.* In various passages, *infra*, reference is made to the Greek NT Text as set forth by Scrivener, in which optional letters are left off, usually, the optional "n" is not added at the end of certain words; although less commonly another optional letter

---

[31] Because the two leading Alexandrian texts both have the correct reading here, "*enaten* (ninth)" is found at Matt. 20:5b in the NU Text *et al*.

such as "s" at the end of a word, or "e" at the beginning of a word.   In such instances I have followed Scrivener's Text as "the TR," which may be "right" or "wrong," depending on one's ideological views.   We do not have the information available to check such a detail since von Soden's work cannot be generally used for such purposes. As previously discussed in the Appendix "Introduction," under "Primary & Secondary Rules of Neo-Byzantine Textual Analysis," in Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), this issue touches upon the secondary rules of neo-Byzantine textual analysis where some diversity occurs between neo-Byzantines.   Certainly the matter is not one that affects English translation.

At Matt. 16:12, "*alla* (but)," is a Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042); whereas Scrivener reads, "*all'* (but)."   The next word after "*alla* (but)" is "*apo* (from / of)."   I.e., Scrivener's form appears to lack the optional alpha (a) at the end, because "*alla* (but)" is followed by a vowel.   Or at Matt. 17:12, "*alla* (but)" is a Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032), though Scrivener follows "*all'* (but)" which is also a Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042).   At Matt. 7:12 it is followed by a word starting with a vowel, "*epoiesan* (they have done)."   Which is the best reading to follow in such instances? Why?

At Matt. 16:28b (cf. comments on Matt. 16:28b in Appendix 3, *infra*), Scrivener's Text follows Stephanus's Greek NT (1550) in reading, "*ton* (- , masculine plural genitive definite article, from *o*) … *estekoton* ('standing,' masculine plural genitive, perfect active participle, from *istemi*)."   This is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., K 017, 9th century; M 021, 9th century; & Clemens Romanus).   It is referred to in Elzevir's 1624 Textual Apparatus (Gospel manuscripts: w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

Alternatively, at Matt. 16:28b, "*ton* (-) … *estoton* ('standing,' masculine plural genitive, perfect active participle, from *istemi*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century; U 030, 9th century; S 028, 10th century; & Origen).

Alternatively again, at Matt. 16:28b, the representative Byzantine reading is "*estotes* ('standing,' masculine plural nominative, perfect active participle, from *istemi*)," (e.g., W 032, 5th century; E 07, 8th century; G 011, 9th century).   It is referred to in Elzevir's 1624 Textual Apparatus (Gospel manuscript: H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum).

At Matt. 16:28b the wider passage is preceded by, "*tines* ('some,' masculine plural nominative, pronoun from *tis*)."   The combination of the plural *tis* in the nominative (for the subject,) coupled with the genitive (for ownership), is how one generally finds *tines* used both in St. Matthew's Gospel (Matt. 9:3; 12:38; 27:47) and elsewhere (e.g., Mark 2:6; 7:1; 8:4; Luke 6:2; 9:27; *et al*).

But this is a general, not absolute rule, and it might be found with e.g., the nominative in Mark 14:4 where we find, "*tines aganaktountes* ('saying,' masculine plural nominative, present active participle, from *aganakteo*)" i.e., "some (*tines*) saying (*aganaktountes*)."   Thus this reads, "And there were some (*tines*) that had indignation

within themselves, and said (*aganaktountes*)" (AV). (See e.g., Luke 8:2; 24:17; John 12:20. Cf. Luke 13:1.)

Here at Matt. 16:28b, did the AV translators disagree with e.g., Stephanus and Elzevir, and the view that the absence of the more normative form of *tines* and a genitive created a stylistic tension requiring resolution? If so, they would have followed the representative Byzantine Text. Alternatively, did the AV translators agree with e.g., Stephanus and Elzevir, that the absence of the more normative form of *tines* and a genitive created a stylistic tension requiring resolution with a genitive form? If so, did they prefer the "*estekoton* ('standing,' genitive)" of Stephanus (cf. Mark 9:2; 11:5; Luke 9:27), or the "*estoton* ('standing,' genitive)" of Elzevir (cf. Matt. 27:47)?

However one resolves these issues, one thing is very clear. Matt. 16:28b reads, "Verily I say unto you, There be some *standing* here," in the wider context of Matt. 16:27,28 which reads, "For the Son of man *shall* (*mellei*, indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *mello*, here used before the infinitive to indicate a future event) *come* (*erchesthai*, middle present infinitive, from *erchomai*) in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, There be some *standing* here, which shall not taste of death, till *they see* (*idosi*, subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *eidos*) the Son of man *coming* (*erchomenon*, masculine singular accusative, middle present participle, from *erchomai*) in his kingdom."

There is thus a contrast here between the *future* coming (*mellei erchesthai*) of Christ at the Second Advent (Matt. 16:27; cf. Matt. 25:31-46), and the witness by "some standing here" (Matt. 16:28) i.e., "some" (Matt. 16:28) of "his disciples" (Matt. 16:24), who would "see" the start or beginning of Christ's "coming (present, not future tense) in his kingdom." I.e., while the foretaste of Matt. 16:28 was still future, the stress on the *present* tense in Matt. 16:28 when contrasted with the *future* tense in Matt. 16:27, contextually acts to further manifest the fact that these are two different, but related events, in which Christ's "coming in his kingdom" prophetically types when "the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels." What then was this "coming in his kingdom" foretaste (Matt. 16:28) of when "the Son of man shall come" at the Second Advent (Matt. 16:27), that only "some" (Matt. 16:28) of "his disciples" (Matt. 16:24) would be privileged to see? It is an earlier type of his "power" (Mark 9:1) and "glory" (Matt. 16:27); and not only in Matt. 16:27-17:8, but also in Mark 9:1-10 and Luke 9:27-36, these words are contextually placed immediately before the Transfiguration.

Therefore Christ here teaches that "some standing here" (Matt. 16:28), i.e., the inner three disciples, "Peter, James, and John" (Matt. 17:1), in seeing Christ "transfigured before them," at which time, "his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light" (Matt. 17:2), in the presence of "Moses and Elias" (Matt. 17:3), and "a bright cloud" which "overshadowed them: and" "a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: hear ye him" (Matt. 17:5); by that privilege did see "the Son of man coming in his kingdom" (Matt. 16:28). I.e., they saw the

*starting* point of this in the Transfiguration, which thing, was a prophetic type of the much greater "power" (Mark 9:1) and "glory" (Matt. 16:27) that will be evident at the Second Advent (Dan. 7:9-14; Matt. 16:27; 26:64; Rev. 1:7).

In harmony with e.g., Matt. 16:27, "and then he shall reward every man according to his works," the *Athanasian Creed* says, "he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies: and shall give account for their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting: and they that have done evil into everlasting fire." This in no way, shape, or form, teaches justification by works, or any idea that by our "good works" we act meritoriously in our salvation, or in any other way somehow "put God in our debt," which thing no man can do. Rather, as the tree is known by its fruit (Matt. 7:15-20), so likewise, if we are justified by faith (Gal. 3:11) under the "gospel" of "grace" (Gal. 1:6); then as a "fruit of the Spirit" (Gal. 5:22-26), we do good works (Matt. 25:34-40), not in order to be saved, but because we are saved (I Cor. 6:9-11). Our deeds are thus used in a purely evidential way at the final judgement, manifesting our saving faith in Christ, or lack thereof. "For by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified" (Gal. 2:16). Rather, "The just shall live by faith" (Gal. 3:11).

*2) Consideration of Spelling variants: a) Optional Letters in Scrivener's Text, and b) Special case study on treis.*

*2a) Optional Letters in Scrivener's Text.* Optional letters may simply reflect a scribe's preferences, or possibly localized preferences of a given region at a given time, or a particular school that the scribe comes from. Even in our own era of common dictionaries, minor spelling variations may occur e.g., American English ("whites and coloreds") as opposed to Australian English ("whites and coloureds"); so how much more might this type of thing happen in an olden era before common dictionaries?

Whether a scribe's individualized preference, or a scribe's localized cultural or school's preference, an example of this is the dropping out of "e" (epsilon) in some words; although standard Greek grammar always includes such epsilons, which as seen through reference to Matt. 15:32b, *infra*, may act to give greater *immediate* clarity. E.g., at Matt. 5:32 "*porneias* (rendered 'fornication' in the AV, feminine singular genitive noun, from *porneia*)" (TR) = "*pornias*" (W 032). (This Greek word is related to the English word, "*porno*graphy," used to describe immoral, dirty, and disgusting, sexually explicit exhibition in e.g., books or films. The unpleasant topic referred to by this word, is sometimes abbreviated to "porn," or in the context of films, "porno films.")

Or at Matt. 15:32b, "fasting" in, "I will not send them (*autous*) away fasting (*nesteis*)," Greek, "*nesteis* (fasting)" = "*nestis*" in a minority of manuscripts (von Soden's Kr group, or Hodges & Farstad's Mr group; e.g., Minuscule 998, 12th century, von Soden's ε 1385 in his I' group). Though taking the same form as a nominative singular, "*nestis*" here is clearly a plural evident in the matching pronoun, of "*autous* ('them,' <u>masculine plural accusative</u> pronoun, from *autos*) *nesteis* / *nestis* ('fasting,' <u>masculine</u>

<u>plural accusative</u> adjective, from *n<u>e</u>stis*)[32]."

In the Volume 1 Appendices to St. Matthew's Gospel (Matt. 1-14) I discuss optional letters, and give a comprehensive list of their usage in Matt. 1-7. My understanding of the MBT here was based on Robinson & Pierpont's Byzantine / Majority Textiform, although the fact that it often differs on such matters with Hodges & Farstad indicates uncertainty and lack of accurate information on the matter. E.g., there may be an optional "n" (nu) or "s" (sigma) at the end of a word.

I state in Vol. 1 that "it may not always be" "easy to determine a representative Byzantine reading on these" "matters of optional letters." (In general, we simply do not have the manuscript data on these; although see my comments at Matt. 20:27a, *infra*.) "E.g., at Matt. 15:35,36, the majority Byzantine text of Robinson & Pierpont has the optional 'n' at the end of three words, that the majority text of Hodges & Farstad does not." And because manuscript data is not available to know what the representative Byzantine reading is on these, as a matter that does not affect English translation, I there say, "I just follow Scrivener."

Nevertheless, at times the matter takes on a greater significance. Thus the reader will see in the main part of the commentary at Matt. 15:35 and Matt. 15:36c, that the presence of the optional "n" (nu) is relevant for understanding a possible "reconstruction" following a paper fade, with respect to the letter "n" itself (Matt. 15:35) or the number of letter spaces so left (Matt. 15:36c).

On the one hand, neo-Byzantines do not appear to have formulated any hard and fast rules on optional letters, if by that is meant, a belief that the apographs here necessarily reflects the precise form of the autographs. But on the other hand, a rule has arisen, evident in Scrivener's text, of interest to neo-Byzantines. Some neo-Byzantines may wish to follow it, although not being obligated to do so within broad neo-Byzantine guidelines or primary rules, other neo-Byzantines may choose not to follow it. I.e., as previously discussed in Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14, Appendix "Introduction," "Primary & Secondary Rules of Neo-Byzantine Textual Analysis"), there are secondary rules that neo-Byzantines may or may not wish to follow. Whether or not one follows the rule evident in Scrivener's Text on this matter, is thus an example of such a secondary rule. Either way, I think all neo-Byzantines should be at least aware of it.

In Greek, a number of third person singular or plural forms that end with an "n" (nu), may optionally lose that "n" (nu). Why e.g., at Matt. 1:23 does Scrivener's Text's

---

[32] Adjectives and nouns match in gender (here *masculine*), number (here *plural*), and case (here *accusative*). Pronouns are sometimes used instead of a noun, and are commonly personal pronouns. E.g., instead of saying, "After reading John's (noun) King James Bible, John (noun) took John's (noun) Bible when John (noun) went to John's (noun) bookcase, and put it in on the bookshelf;" one might say, "After reading his (pronoun) King James Bible, John (noun) took his (pronoun) Bible when he (pronoun) went to his (pronoun) bookcase, and put it in on the bookshelf."

and Hodges & Farstad read "*esti* ('it is,' or 'is' AV, indicative present active, 3rd person singular verb, from *eimi*); whereas "*estin*" is the reading in both the NU Text & Robinson & Pierpont?   Or why at Matt. 2:5, does "*out̲o̲* ('thus' in the AV, an adverb)," lack the optional "s" in Scrivener's Text's and Hodges & Farstad; but have it in the NU Text & Robinson & Pierpont which thus read "*out̲o̲s*"?   Von Soden's work, upon which both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont are based, cannot be used for this issue.

The reason lies in a tradition that everyone admits is not part of the formal grammatical rules of Greek, whether Septuagint Greek, NT (Koine) Greek, or classical Greek.   But it is a rule that is relevant for understanding the history of the *Textus Receptus* once it was more formally compiled as a completed entity.   It is a rule relevant to understanding Scrivener's Text.   Basically, the optional letters in the suffix were used before a vowel.   Thus the distinction parallels that in English of using "a" before a consonant, and "an" before a vowel or vowel sound.

Thus e.g., at Matt. 18:14 Scrivener's text reads, "*out̲o̲s* (so) *ouk* (not)" (in, "Even *so* it is *not* the will of your Father"), because of the vowel "o" (omicron) of "*ouk* (not);" whereas at Matt. 17:12 Scrivener's text reads, "*out̲o̲* (Likewise) *kai* (also)" (in, "*Likewise* shall *also* the Son of man suffer of them"), because of the consonant "k" (kappa) in "*kai* (also)."   By contrast, e.g., both Tischendorf's 8th edition and the NU Text use "*out̲o̲s*" for both Matt. 17:12 and Matt. 18:14.   The trend to move away from the rule of using such optional letters before a vowel, found in e.g., Tischendorf or Robinson & Pierpont, is certainly not incorrect Greek.   Nevertheless, it is a different usage of this discretion of optional letters, which in the tradition evident in Scrivener's text *is regulated by a later rule*, rather than *unregulated* as a scribal discretion.

In order to better understand this interesting feature found in Scrivener's text, and dealing with usage of optional letters before vowels, I have made *two special case studies* in Volume 2.   A shorter special case of it is made at Matt. 15:26, where the reader will find some instances of it in the main part of the commentary.   A longer special case study is here made of it with respect to the Greek number "three (*treis*)" in Byzantine manuscripts for St. Matthew's Gospel.   This longer case study on "*treis*" additionally deals with the issue of variant spellings evident in "*treis*" / "*tris*."

*2b)   Special case study on treis.*   In Greek, a numeral qualifying a noun is an adjective, put in the matching gender and case of the noun.   If in masculine or feminine gender, the nominative and accusative for "three" is *treis*, and if neuter gender, the nominative and accusative is *tria*.   Whether masculine, feminine, or neuter, the genitive is *tri̲o̲n* and the dative is *trisi(n)*.

In overview of the NT, *treis* occurs as a masculine plural nominative adjective (Matt. 18:20; Luke 12:52; I Cor. 10:8; 14:29; I John 5:7,8; Rev. 21:13); a feminine plural nominative adjective (Rev. 6:6); a masculine plural accusative adjective (Luke 1:56; 11:5; John 2:6; Acts 7:20; 10:19; 11:11; 19:8; 20:3; 28:11; I Cor. 14:27; James 5:17); and a feminine plural accusative adjective (Matt. 12:40; 15:32; 17:4; 27:63; Mark 8:2,31; 9:5; Luke 2:46; 9:33; Acts 9:9; 25:1; 28:7,12,17; Rev. 11:9).

*Tria* occurs as a neuter plural nominative adjective (Luke 13:7; I Cor. 13:13); and as a neuter plural accusative adjective (Matt. 13:33; Luke 4:25; 13:21; Acts 17:2; Gal. 1:18; Rev. 16:13,19). *Trion* occurs as a masculine plural genitive adjective (Matt. 18:16; Luke 10:36; John 21:11; II Cor. 13:1; I Tim. 5:19; Rev. 8:13); and as a feminine plural genitive adjective (Matt. 26:61; Mark 14:58; Acts 5:7; Rev. 9:18) in e.g., "The Three Taverns" (Acts 28:15). *Trisi(n)* occurs as a masculine plural dative adjective (Luke 12:52; Heb. 10:28); and a feminine plural dative adjective (Matt. 27:40; Mark 15:29; John 2:19,20).

If we consider the usage of optional letters for the masculine plural dative adjective, then in accordance with the rule found in e.g., Scrivener's Text i.e., the optional "n" is added before a vowel, we find at Luke 12:52,53, "*trisi* (three), *diameristhesetai* (shall be divided)," (in "three against two and two against *three*. The father *shall be divided* against the son" etc.). This lacks the optional "n" (nu) as the "i" (iota) of "*trisi*" is followed by the consonant "d" (delta). Likewise at Heb. 10:28 we find the words, "*trisi* (three) *martusin* (witnesses)," (in "under two or *three witnesses*"). This also lacks the optional "n" (nu) as the "i" (iota) of "*trisi*" is followed by the consonant "m" (mu). By contrast, if we consider the feminine plural dative adjective, then in harmony with the rule we find at Matt. 27:40; Mark 15:29; John 2:19,20, "*trisin* (three) *emerais* (days)." This has the optional "n" (nu) after the "i" (iota) of "*trisi*" as "*trisin* is followed by the vowel "e" (eta).

By contrast, it is clear that the Byzantine scribal tradition of e.g., W 032 and A 02 did not follow this type of later rule, much liked by a number of later neo-Byzantines, and certainly not in any way affecting English translation. E.g., at Matt. 27:57 we read, "*ematheteusen* ('was … disciple,' AV) *to* (-) *Iesou* ('Jesus',' AV)" (W 032, A 02 & Lectionary 2378[33]), not "*ematheteuse to Iesou*" (Scrivener's text & Lectionary 1968[34]). Or at Matt. 27:62 we read, "*estin* ('it is') *meta* ('after')" = "followed" (AV) (W 032 & A 02), not "*esti meta*" (Scrivener's text and Lectionaries 2378 & 1968[35]).

On the one hand, I can accept that many neo-Byzantines have seen the usage of optional letters e.g., "n" (nu") before a vowel, as putting a final "polish" or "shine" on their edition of the Received Text. But on the other hand, I do not support wilful or deliberate alterations to the text of Scripture in even the smallest particular, such as with optional letters. Nevertheless, we do not really know what the representative Byzantine text reads on these optional letters, and there is no change to the meaning of the text. Therefore, on this first matter, this is a permissible variation inside the neo-Byzantine School.

---

[33] Lectionary 2378, p. 96a.

[34] Lectionary 1968, p. 198b.

[35] Lectionary 2378, p. 86a & Lectionary 1968, p. 186b.

In looking at Scrivener's Text, the reader may wish to consider e.g., the usage of the optional "n" at the end of "*eisin* (they are)" before the vowel of "*oi* (the)" at Matt. 7:13; 13:13; 17:26; compared to the lack of the optional "n" before a consonant at Matt. 2:18; 10:30; 12:5; 15:14; 16:28; 18:20; 19:6; 22:14.   Or e.g., the usage of "*all'* (but)" before a vowel at Matt. 8:4; 9:13; 16:12,17; 17:12; 18:22; 22:30; compared to "*alla* (but)," before a consonant at Matt. 5:17; 6:13; 10:20; 11:8; 13:5; 15:1; 19:6; 20:28; 21:21; 22:32; 25:16; 27:24.   While the Majority Text (Hodges & Farstad) is not necessarily the majority Byzantine Text (Robinson & Pierpont), it usually is.   (The matter is only unclear where the texts are fairly evenly divided, in which instances because the MBT is not clearly evident, the matter must be resolved by textual analysis.) As to the unresolved issue of what is "the representative Byzantine reading" as previously observed, von Soden's work, upon which both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont are based, cannot be used for this matter.   Thus the reader may wish to consider e.g., the difference between the inclusion of the optional "n" on the end of "*eipe* (he said)" at Matt. 16:12,16,23 in Robinson & Pierpont; as opposed to its non-inclusion by Scrivener and Hodges & Farstad.   Such examples could be greatly multiplied, but these very limited examples are useful for reinforcing the basic point.

Let us now consider a second matter of divergent spellings with special reference to "*treis*" / "*tris*."   In Greek, the numbers 1 (one) to 4 (four) are declinable, but the number "three" has a more complex history than some numbers, both as to meaning and form[36].   Thus e.g., Liddell & Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon* refers to the ancient Greek words, "I am *thrice* (*tri<u>on</u>*) undone," meaning, "I am utterly undone" (Euripides' *Orestes* 434).   As part of this complexity, on the one hand, the neuter, *tria*, and it seems also possibly the masculine / feminine form *treis*, have sometimes been regarded as indeclinable[37]; but on the other hand, Liddell & Scott further refer to a number of different declined forms of *treis* that have also been used in different cases.

However for my purposes of illustrating optional letters, I shall limit discussion to *treis*, first drawing instances from non-Biblical examples found in Liddell & Scott. Omitting the "i" (iota) of "*treis*," in ancient times the nominative was sometimes written as "*tres*" (*Inscriptiones Graece*, edited by F. Hiller von Gaertringen, 1924, Vol. 1, 295:11).   So too, the accusative was sometimes written as "*tres*" (*Ibid.*, 24:16; 44:15; 188:37, 1085).   At other times, omitting the "e" (epsilon) of "*treis*," in ancient times the accusative "*tris*" sometimes functioned as a nominative ("Homer's" *Iliad*, 200, 8th-2nd century?[38]).

---

[36]   See Kittel's *Theological Dictionary of the NT* (Eerdmans, Michigan, USA, 1969-1977) at "*treis*."

[37]   Robertson, A.T., *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, Hodder & Stoughton, New York, 3rd edition, 1914, p. 282.

[38]   Though by tradition the poet Homer (*c.* 700 B.C.) wrote the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in the 8th / 7th century, this tradition is not a verifiable fact.   A problem also

And we find as an accusative the form "*tris*" (*Tabulae Heracleenses*, 1:23, in *Inscriptiones Graece, op. cit.*, 14:645, Schwyzer 62-3), at e.g., Delphi in Greece, in the 4th century B.C. (*Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, edited by W. Dittenberger, 3rd ed., Leipzig, 1915-24, 236 A 10).  The form "*tris*" which omits (or lacks, depending on which is the oldest form,) the "e" (epsilon) of "*treis*" (*Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, op. cit.*, 239), was evidently used over a considerable period of time, for "*tris*" is found in the 6th century B.C. (*Inscriptiones Graece, op. cit.*, 838,839), and also in the 4th century B.C. at Delphi in Greece, with the famous Athenian orator, Demosthenes (384-322 B.C.). It was used over a wide area, being found at Delphi in Greece, *supra*, and also at Cyrene, an ancient Greek colony in Libya, North Africa, founded *c.* 631 B.C. (*Sitzungsberichte der Pruessichen Akadamie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin, Germany, 1927, 158).  *Thus when we come across a similar array of different spelling variants in NT manuscripts for a variety of different words, it is instructive for us to know that this type of thing has a long prehistory in the Greek tongue.*  (See e.g., main commentary at Matt. 16:20a for W 032; or Matt. 17:21 for Lectionary 2378.)

In this commentary, some special reference is made in the Gospels to four ancient Byzantine text jewels, namely, W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), A 02 (*Codex Alexandrinus*, 5th century, which due to damage lacks Matt. 1:1-25:6a & John 6:50b-8:52a, and is Byzantine in the Gospels), the purple parchment Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), the purple parchment N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century); together with two Byzantine rubies from later times, Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*).

Considering these six Byzantine manuscripts in St. Matthew's Gospel, we find that at Matt. 12:40, "*treis*" (four times) as an accusative appears all four times as "*treis*" in Sigma 042.  By contrast, it appears in the form "*tris*" all four times in W 032; and once (the first time) in N 022 (and then due to damage, the manuscript lacks any reference to the three other instances of "*treis*" and recommences at Matt. 13:4).  No reading covers this verse in either of the Lectionaries.

At Matt. 15:32, "*treis*" as an accusative occurs in the form "*tris*" in W 032, N 022, and Sigma 042.  At Matt. 17:4, "*treis*" as an accusative occurs in the form "*tris*" in W 032 and N 022 (and this is part of a section lost due to damage in Sigma 042).  Finally, at Matt. 27:63 "*treis*" as an accusative appears as "*treis*" in A 02.  By contrast, it appears in the form "*tris*" in W 032 and Sigma 042 (and this is part of a section lost due to damage in N 022).  No reading covers this verse in either of the Lectionaries.

At Matt. 17:4, "*treis*" as an accusative appears as "*tris*" in W 032 and Sigma 042; and as "*treis*" in Lectionary 1968.  The reading is absent from the fragmentary N 022; and no reading covers this verse in Lectionary 2378.  At Matt. 18:20, "*treis*" as a nominative appears as "*tris*" in W 032, N 022, and Sigma 042; and as "*treis*" in

---

exists in determining exactly when the standard Greek text for these works was fixed.

Lectionaries 2378 & 1968. At Matt. 27:63, "*treis*" as an accusative appears as "*tris*" in W 032 and Sigma 042; and as "*treis*" in Lectionary 1968[39]. It is found in abbreviated form in Lectionary 2378 as "*tr*" with "*ss*" over the "*r*" and a half semi-circle line over the "*ss*"[40]. The reading is absent from the fragmentary N 022.

But it clear from the usage of "*tris*" before NT times (Liddell & Scott, *supra*), that we cannot ascribe this variant spelling of "*tris*," simply to individual scribal preferences of later scribes. This spelling was clearly part of a much wider usage by some persons, both over a number of centuries and over a wide geographical distribution in the Mediterranean world spanning from Europe (Delphi) to Africa (Libya), *supra*. I do not support wilful or deliberate alterations to the text of Scripture in even the smallest particular, such as with optional letters; although I here make the concession that since we do not know what the representative Byzantine text is, and since it makes no difference on English translation, I allow for diversity here, whether e.g., Scrivener's type of rule on optional letters, or some mix of optional letters as a neo-Byzantine "trademark" on a text. At this point once again stress, that this phenomenon of optional letters and / or spelling variants, of which I have used the changing of "*treis*" to "*tris*" as a very modest and easily understood illustrative example, has no impact English translation.

I consider this fascinating, albeit admittedly very limited sample, selected to give the reader an idea of the wider issue, is of interest and value in helping us better understand Byzantine manuscripts. That is because in more generally discussing NT Greek manuscripts, these type of minor spelling variants, or local dialect vowel changes, from time to time occur. Thus it should be recognized that these later NT Greek manuscripts are in fact operating within an earlier established normativity of such minor spelling variations within the Greek language. (See e.g., main commentary at Matt. 19:9b for W 032. A similar issue exists in the Latin, see e.g., Matt. 20:22c, second component, for old Latin q.)

## Appendix 3
### Minor variants between the NU Text and Textus Receptus
### (or another relevant text and the TR)
### not affecting, or not necessarily affecting, the English translation
### (some more notable variants in Matt. 15-20)

*UNLESS specifically stated otherwise, in Appendix 3 the MBT is regarded as correctly reflecting the TR with no good textual argument against it.*

At Matt. 15:1, the word order of the TR & MBT (e.g., W 032 with spelling

---

[39] Lectionary 1968, p. 186b.

[40] Lectionary 2378

"*grammatis*," at word 1; Sigma 042, & N 022), "*grammateis* ('scribes,' word 1) *kai* ('and,' word 2) *Pharisaioi* ('Pharisees,' word 3)," is changed in the NU Text *et al* to word order 3,2,1.    The incorrect word order (which appears to have originated with Origen,) is then followed by the ASV *et al*.    However, working from the variant it would be possible to put this back in the correct order in English for stylistic reasons.

At Matt. 15:2,3 (twice) the meaning is still "Why?" whether this is regarded as one word, "*Diati*" (Scrivener) or two words, "*Dia ti*" (NU Text).    Such are the difficulties presented when unravelling a continuous script manuscript like e.g., W 032.

At Matt. 15:7, spelling variants make no change to "[he] prophesy" (AV & ASV) for "*proepheteuse* (indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *propheteuo*)" (TR) is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022; all three with the optional "n" at end) = "*epropheteusen*" (Origen, London Sinaiticus, Rome Vaticanus, & NU Text) = "*propheteusen*" (independent Manuscript Delta, 9th century).    (So too these spelling changes are made earlier at Matt. 11:13 from the TR's "*proepheteusen*," which is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022); to the NU Text's "*epropheteusen*" of London Sinaiticus & Rome Vaticanus, to "*propheteusen*" in Delta.    But the meaning is still, "[he] prophesied," AV & ASV.)

At Matt. 15:12b, the TR's "*eipon* ('they said,' indicative active second aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *lego*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, Chrysostom), and with no good textual argument against it, is correct.    It is also found in the Alexandrian text as "*eipan* ('they said,' indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural, from the verb, *lego*)."    But the NU Text *et al* reads, "*legousin* ('they say,' indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *lego*)."    Though the Greek nuance is different, the English translation would still in both cases be, "said" (AV & ASV).

At Matt. 15:14b, the TR reads, "*pesountai* ('they shall fall,' indicative middle future, 3rd person plural verb, from *pipto*)," i.e., "shall fall" (AV).    This is MBT with no good textual argument against it.    It is also the reading of the NU Text.    In the wider text, this reads "*eis* (into) *bothunon* (the ditch) *pesountai* (shall fall)."    However, a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042), reads "*empesountai* ('they shall fall into,' indicative middle future, 3rd person plural verb, from *empipto*)."    This makes no difference to English translation since the presence of "*eis* (into)" means the reading will be "shall fall into" either from, "shall fall (*pesountai*) into (*eis*)" (MBT) or "shall fall in (*empesountai*) into (*eis*)."    But the presence of the minority Byzantine reading reminds us that while we may look with general favour on great Byzantine texts such as W 032 (in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) or Sigma 042, this does not mean they are infallible. We must always carefully apply the rules of neo-Byzantine textual analysis, as set forth before us in the *Textus Receptus* (TR).

At Matt. 15:23 the TR's Greek, "*eroton* ('they besought,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *erotao*),[41]" is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042,

---

41    Cf. Mark 7:26 (she besought) and Lk 11:37 (he besought), "*erota* (indicative

Lectionaries 2378 & twice in two different readings in 1968) and with no good textual argument against it, is correct. An alternative reading "*eroton*" (minority Byzantine E 07 & M 021) / "*erotoun*" (e.g., Rome Vaticanus, London Sinaiticus, & NU Text) ('they besought,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *erotao*),[42]" is found in Tischendorf's 8th ed., W-H, and the NU Text; although Nestle's 21st ed. follows the TR. Either way, the rendering is "besought" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

In harmony with the declined form of the TR, Liddell & Scott refer to *erotao* declined in the imperfect as "*eroton*," in Hippocrates' *Epidemiai* 7:3 (5th century B.C.); and likewise *eperotao* ('ask' / 'ask for' = *epi* / 'for' etc. + *erotao* / 'they besought') declined in the imperfect as "*eperoton*" in Thucydides' *Historicus* 7:10 (5th century B.C.). Moreover, we read in the Septuagint at Deut. 18:10,11, "There shall not be found in thee … a sorcerer employing incantation, one who has in him a divining spirit, an observer of times, questioning (*eperoton*) the dead" (LXX); in Judges 1:1, "that the children of Israel enquired (*eperoton*) of the Lord" (LXX); and in Ps. 35:11 (Ps. 34:11, LXX), "Unjust witnesses arose, and asked (*eperoton*) me of things I knew not" (LXX).

Certainly under the rules of Greek grammar as I learnt them, the TR's form is how one declines *erotao* in the imperfect[43]. On the one hand, this matter raises certain philosophical grammatical issues and questions with regard to who determines such matters? (Cf. Latin, "*fructus*" in Commentary at Matt. 3:8). But on the other hand, the TR's form is clearly the standard Greek form. This is evident from its usage by e.g., the ancient Greek medical doctor, Hippocrates (*c.* 460-377 B.C.), in memory of whom physicians take the "Hippocratic Oath;" Thucydides (*c.* 460-404), an ancient Greek historian of note, whose works include *History of the Peloponnesian War* (a 5th century B.C. struggle between Athens and Sparta); and the Greek Septuagint, a translation of the OT undertaken in inter-testamental times, according to tradition by seventy-two translators in "seventy" days (*c.* 270 B.C.), and hence the name, "Septuagint," from the Latin, "*Septuaginta* (seventy)."

In this commentary, we have already seen that a plural form of the Greek *ochlos* (multitude), may be rendered as either "multitudes (*ochlous*, masculine plural accusative

---

active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *erotao*)," declining as a thematic contraction like the TR's thematic contraction at Matt. 15:23. (And minority Byzantine reading at Luke 11:37, e.g., M 021, "*erota*," indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *erotao*, also declining as a thematic contraction.)

[42] Cf. Luke 4:38; 8:37, "*erotesan* ('they besought,' indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *erotao*)," declining as a thematic conjugation like the variant. (And minority Byzantine reading at Luke 8:37, e.g., K 017, "*erotesen*," 'it besought,' indicative active first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *erotao*, also declining as a thematic conjugation like the variant.)

[43] Whittaker's *New Testament Greek Grammar*, SCM, London, England, UK, 1969, 1975, pp. 84,85,87.

noun)" as at Matt. 8:18, or "multitude (*ochlous*, masculine plural accusative noun)" as at Matt. 14:19c. That is because "multitude" is itself a plural form, so that one can talk about either "a multitude" or "multitudes," and likewise either "a crowd" or "crowds." Here at Matt. 15:31b, the TR's "multitude (*ochlous*, plural)" (AV) is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & Chrysostom); and with no good textual argument against it, it is correct. It is also followed by Rome Vaticanus. But a minority Byzantine reading is "multitude (*ochlon*, masculine singular accusative noun, from *ochlos*)" (U 030 & Origen); and followed by London Sinaiticus. The variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al* (with footnote alternatives in all neo-Alexandrian editions other than the UBS editions). On the one hand, this makes no necessary difference to translation, since either way this may still be rendered as "multitude" (AV & TR, plural form; ASV & W-H, singular form). But on the other hand, because I think it more accurately conveys a Greek nuance, I prefer, though do not regard as essential, the plural English form "multitudes" for the plural Greek form, such as the AV has at Matt. 8:18, rather than the singular plural form, "multitude" such as the AV has at Matt. 14:19c & Matt. 15:31a. My non-essential preferences aside, there is no necessary difference in English translation between the two readings here at Matt. 15:31a. (See comments at Matt. 15:36e).

At Matt. 15:30a, the TR and MBT (e.g., P 024, E 07, & G 011) word order is "*kophous* ('dumb,' word 1) *kullous* ('maimed,' word 2)." But this is changed in the NU text to word order 2,1, following e.g., Rome Vaticanus. In fact, this may be a good example of how ellipsis occurs. Did a scribe with the words, "*kophous kullous*" in his head, get momentarily distracted by some external stimulus? Then getting confused over the "*k*" beginning and "*ous*" ending of these two words, did he first write down "*kullous* ('maimed,' word 2)," and then realizing his mistake, add back in "*kophous* ('dumb,' word 1)"? It must be frankly admitted that the wider evidence certainly indicates that good scribes were painfully hard to find in those parts of North Africa around Alexandria.

At Matt. 15:31d, the TR's Greek, "*edoxasan* ('they glorified,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *doxazo*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022), and with no good textual argument against it is correct. It is also found in the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus & the Western Text's D 05. However, Greek, "*edoxason* ('they were glorifying,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *doxazo*)," is found in e.g., Origen, and the Alexandrian text's London Sinaiticus. The two-way split in the Alexandrian text is reflected in the fact that the variant is found in the main text of Tischendorf's 8th edition, whereas the correct reading is found in the main text of W-H, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text.

Though the meaning in the Greek is certainly different (cf. commentary at Matt. 15:6b; 15:22a; 15:25), the English translation here at Matt. 15:31d is not necessarily different, and so a variation does not show up in numerous neo-Alexandrian versions. Since most neo-Alexandrian texts here favour the TR's reading, this is probably also the neo-Alexandrian versions' reading in at least most instances. However we cannot be sure of this, and possibly one or more of them agreed with Tischendorf's 8th edition. That the translation may be the same is seen in the fact that (except for old Latin d, "*glorificaverunt*" = "they glorified," indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb,

from *glorifico*,) the Latin textual tradition generally follows the variant. Thus e.g., the Vulgate reads, "*magnificabant* ('they were extolling,' or 'they were glorifying,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *magnifico*)." However, this Latin reading is rendered in the Douay-Rheims as "they glorified," which is exactly the same as the AV's rendering based on the TR.

At Matt. 15:32a the TR's Greek, "*emeras* ('days,' feminine accusative plural noun, from *emera*) *treis* ('three,' feminine accusative plural adjective, from *treis*)" (Stephanus, Elzevir, & Scrivener), is a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscule 1188, 11th / 12th century, Origen, & Chrysostom)[44], also found in the Alexandrian's London Sinaiticus. However, Greek, "*emerai* ('days,' feminine nominative plural noun, from *emera*) *treis* ('three,' feminine nominative plural adjective, from *treis*)," is the majority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; N 022, Basil the Great); and also found in the Alexandrian's Rome Vaticanus, Western Text's D 05, and the NU Text *et al*.

In Greek, "*treis* (masculine or feminine)" is used for either the nominative or accusative, *supra*. Because nouns and adjectives match, whether one regards the adjective "*treis*" here as a nominative or an accusative, depends on whether one first regards *emera* as being declined as a nominative or an accusative.

*Prima facie* one could decline *emera* at Matt. 15:32a as either an accusative (TR) or a nominative (MBT). But in Matthean Greek, while a dative form is contextually used with numerals at Matt. 27:40, "*en* (in) *trisin* ('three,' feminine plural dative adjective, from *treis*) *emerais* ('days,' feminine plural dative noun, from *emera*)," and necessary to convey the preposition, "*en*," which with a dative means, "in," i.e., "in three days" (AV); outside such requirements, St. Matthew prefers the *accusative of measure* with numerals. Hence with "days" in the accusative (*emeras*), we read at Matt. 4:2 of "days (*emeras*) forty (*tessarakonta*);" at Matt. 17:1 of "days (*emeras*) six (*ex*);" at Matt. 26:2 of "*duo* (two) days (*emeras*);" and most notably at both Matt. 12:40 and Matt. 27:63 of "*treis* (three) days (*emeras*)."

Therefore, here at Matt. 15:32a, the combination of a syntactical structure that *facilitates* the usage of an *accusative of measure*, coupled with St. Matthew's strong preference for the *accusative of measure* when numbering days, means that the presence of the variant's *parenthetical nominative*[45], appears to be incongruous. I.e., the more

---

[44] The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Majority Text Apparatus says the TR's reading is followed by between 21%-39% of all (Greek) manuscripts, and the variant is followed by between 61%-79% of all (Greek) manuscripts. Therefore the TR's reading must be a sizeable minority Byzantine reading.

[45] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 53-4 (parenthetical nominative), 201-3 (accusative of measure); Young's *Greek*, pp. 20-1 (accusative of measure); Moulton's *Grammar of NT Greek*, Vol. 3, p. 231 (working from neo-Alexandrian principles, Turner wrongly considers Matt. 15:32a is here in the nominative with a time designation;

natural expectation of the Matthean Greek nuance is that we would also expect to read here, "*emeras* ('days,' accusative) *treis* (three)" (Origen, *et al*).     Under the circumstances, the MBT reading, "*emerai* ('days,' nominative) *treis* (three)," looks suspiciously like it has been brought in from somewhere else.     Though possibly influenced in an indirect way by the presence of such terminology in Luke-Acts as, "*emerai* ('days,' nominative) *okto* (eight)" (Luke 9:28), "*ex* (six) *emerai* ('days,' nominative)" (Luke 13:14), "*hepta* (seven) *emerai* ('days,' nominative)" (Acts 21:27), or "*emerai* ('days,' nominative) *e dekaduo* (twelve)" (Acts 24:11); I think any such influence is unlikely to have exceeded beyond a very general background belief, understood even without resort to these passages, that in an appropriate context, one may decline *emera* as a nominative.

Therefore, the more immediate influence, if anywhere other than the scribe's own mind, which was quite possibly its only source, might have been the non-specifically measured "days (*emerai*)" of Matt. 9:15; 24:22.   All things considered, a likely scenario was a paper fade / loss from "*emeras* ('days,' accusative)" (TR) of the final "s" (sigma), so that it looked something like, "*emera:*", which a scribe then "reconstructed" as "*emerai* ('days,' nominative)" on general principles of Greek.   In doing so, he made a *permissible* Greek "reconstruction," but one which *in the context of Matthean Greek* clangs on the ears as non-Matthean, for which reason it was relieved from the screeching pain it had been locked into with the MBT reading, by the more natural and comfortable Matthean reading of the TR.   Therefore on this occasion, with the backing of textual analysis, St. Chrysostom, and a sizeable minority of Byzantine texts, we find *Origen at his very finest* in providing us with most ancient support for this reading.

But while our TR's reading at Matt. 15:32a divides we neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus* from both Burgonites and neo-Alexandrians alike, it must be said that this matter has absolutely no impact on English translation.   Whether from the TR's "*emeras* ('days,' accusative)" (TR) or e.g., Westcott-Hort's "*emerai* ('days,' nominative)," the rendering is still "three" in the words, "three days" (AV & ASV).

At Matt. 15:34 the TR's "*eipon* ('they said,' AV, indicative active second aorist, 3rd person plural, from the verb, *lego*)" (MBT e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; N 022), though also followed by Rome Vaticanus, becomes the NU Text's "*eipan* ('they said,' indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural, from the verb, *lego*)" (London Sinaiticus, Minuscule 33, *et al*).   But either way the Greek meaning and translation is the same, "And *they said*, Seven" etc. (AV & TR, *eipon*; ASV & W-H, *eipan*).

At Matt. 15:36b contrary to the MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; N 022) against which there is no good textual argument, the correct reading of the TR is added to in the NU Text *et al*.   Following the Alexandrian text's Rome Vaticanus & London Sinaiticus, together with the Western Text's D 05, the neo-Alexandrian texts add after "*tous* (the) *ichthuas* (fishes)," the word "*kai* (and)."   However this makes no difference to English translation, since the AV translators added "and" as part of English translation here, so

_____

nevertheless, his more general comments on the nominative of time are of interest).

that the AV reads (without "and" being in italics), "the fishes, *and* gave thanks" (AV), whereas the ASV reads, "the fishes, and (*kai*) he gave thanks" (ASV).

At Matt. 15:37 the TR and MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, & P 024) word order, is "*kai* ('and,' word 1) *eran* ('they took up,' word 2) *to* ('the,' word 3) *perisseuon* ('surplus,' word 4, spelt with only one "s" in N 022) *ton* ('of the,' word 5) *klasmaton* ('broken [meat]'),'" i.e., with "meat" (food) in italics to show it is added, and words 3 & 4 being rendered, "that was left," "and they took up of the broken meat that was left" (AV). But in the NU Text, this is changed to word order, 1,3,4,5,6,2, following the Alexandrian text's Rome Vaticanus and Western text's D 05 *et al*.

But is Matt. 15:37 a good example of how a short word can be lost? I.e., did an Alexandrian scribe, perhaps on the day after the night before, with a headache from a drunken hangover after a night out at a tavern near the local Alexandrian Bizarre, first miss so short a word as "*eran* ('they took up,' word 2)," and then, shaking his head and realizing something was wrong, then go and add word 2 back in after word 6? Certainly there were a number of irregularities occurring at Alexandria among the scribes, and if even good scribes could sometimes miss a short word like "*eran* (they took up)," how much more likely is this among bad scribes such as those of the Alexandrian School? The amazing thing is not that an Alexandrian School scribe would first miss such a word, rather, the staggering thing is that on this occasion he picked up his own error in time to "correct" it.

Following Origen *et al* who omitted "*oi* (the)," at Matt. 16:1 W-H places this definite article in square brackets, making its acceptance or denial optional. It has MBT support and is certainly correct. But whether present or absent, one would probably render it, "The Pharisees" (AV & ASV), although it is *just possible* that some neo-Alexandrian version may follow Origen here. Is this what the TEV did, or is its absence from that version due to its loose use of "dynamic equivalents"?

Likewise, at Matt. 16:17c, the "*tois* (the)" before heaven is redundant in English translation, and it makes no difference whether it is present as in the TR & MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & Lectionary 1968), or absent as in Origen. W-H places this definite article in square brackets, making its acceptance or denial optional.

At Matt. 16:11a, the TR's "*artou* ('a loaf' or 'bread,' masculine singular genitive noun, from *artos*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042) with no good textual argument against it. (Cf. commentary at Matt. 16:11b.) But following e.g., the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus, the NU Text *et al* read, "*arton* ('loaves' or 'bread,' masculine singular genitive noun, from *artos*)." Providing the translation at Matt. 16:11a is "bread" (AV & ASV), there is no necessary difference in English translation. But the ASV footnote which says here, "Gr. 'loaves'," is disturbingly incorrect, and reminds us that even where the English translation of a neo-Alexandrian text is the same as that of the neo-Byzantine TR, the underpinning Greek may still be very wrong in the neo-Alexandrian text.

At Matt. 16:14, the TR's "*eipon* ('they said,' indicative active second aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *lego*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & Lectionary 1968), with no good textual argument against it. It is also found in the Alexandrian text's London Sinaiticus. However, "*eipan* ('they said,' indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural, from the verb, *lego*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (Pi 041), referred to in Elzevir's 1624 Textual Apparatus (Gospel manuscript: w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16); also found in the Alexandrian text's Rome Vaticanus and their mixed text type "queen of Minuscules," Number 33. Found in the NU Text *et al*, the meaning is the same, "they said" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 16:17a, the TR's "*Kai* ('And,' word 1) *apokritheis* ('answering,' word 2)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & Lectionary 1968), with no good textual argument against it. But "*apokritheis* ('answering,' word 2) *de* ('And' / 'But,' word 1 substitute)," is found in the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus & London Sinaiticus, and Western Text's D 05. This variant is found in the NU Text *et al*, with the same meaning, "*And* Jesus *answered* … him" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H); and some neo-Alexandrian versions do not translate the "*de*," e.g., "Jesus *answered* him" (Moffatt Bible).

At Matt. 16:17b we have a classic example relating to the difficulties of unravelling continuous script manuscripts (which do not have spaces between words). The continuous script readings of e.g., W 032 in capital letters is "*BARIONA*" and in Lectionary 1968 in lower case letters is "*bariona*." In Scrivener's Text this becomes two words, "*Bar 'Iona*," but in the NU Text *et al* becomes one word, "*Bariona*." Either way, the English rendering "Bar-jona" (AV) or "Bar-Jonah" (ASV) or "Barjona" (Moffatt Bible) is not a matter of consequence or different Greek text. From the Aramaic "*bar*" (equating Hebrew, "*ben*,") meaning "son," "grandson," etc., the meaning of Simon's surname is "son (descendant) of Jonah."

But it would be as wrong to render it as, "Son of Jonah" (TCNT), as it would be to e.g., render the surname "McGrath," as "Son of Grace" on the basis that in Celtic "Mc" or "Mac" means "son of." That is because as a surname it retains its original basic linguistic form. Hence at Matt. 16:17b the reading should be "Simon Bar-jona" (AV), not "Simon, Son of Jonah" (TCNT), even though one could refer to this meaning in e.g., the notes of a KJV study Bible. We all accept that if someone started to claim that we should be referring to the former USA President, William McKinley (1897-1901), as "William, Son of Kinley;" the former Prime Minister of Canada, Alexander MacKenzie (1873-8), as "Alexander, Son of Kenzie;" or the former Prime Ministers of Australia, John McEwan (1967-8) and William McMahon (1971-2), as "John, Son of Ewan," and "William, Son of Mahon," respectively, that the man suggesting this would be "quirky'n'crazy." So likewise, the type of translation we find at Matt. 16:17b in the neo-Alexandrian's TCNT of "Simon, Son of Jonah," is just another example of the quirky'n'crazy kind of things we have come to expect from neo-Alexandrian versions.

At Matt. 16:19b, the TR's syncopated form, "*kleis* ('keys,' feminine plural accusative noun, from *kleis*, *kleidos*)," is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042, Lectionary 1968, &

Chrysostom); whereas a minority Byzantine reading is "*kleidas* ('keys,' feminine plural accusative noun, from *kleis*, *kleidos*)" (e.g., W 032). Both forms were known to Origen. The longer form is also found in the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus & London Sinaiticus, and is found in the NU Text *et al.* Either way, the meaning is "keys" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 16:21, the TR's "*auton* ('he,' word 1, AV) *apelthen* ('go,' word 2, AV) *eis* ('unto,' AV, word 3) *Ierosoluma* ('Jerusalem,' AV, word 4)," is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042) with no good textual argument against it. The word order is changed to 1,3,4,2 in Origen, and also the two leading Alexandrian Texts, and leading Western Text. Hence the incorrect word order is found in the NU Text *et al.* *This matter is of some interest in showing the process of ellipsis.* I.e., if this was an accidental change, then a scribe having written "*auton*," and thinking in his mind of the "a (alpha)" beginning and "n (nu) ending," may have then passed over word 2 which also has an "a (alpha)" beginning and "n (nu) ending," thus first writing words 3 and 4. Then realizing his mistake, he may have reinserted word 2 after word 4 on the basis that, "it did not make any difference to the meaning."

At Matt. 16:23 TR, "*mou* ('unto me,' word 1, singular genitive personal pronoun, from *eg<u>o</u>*) *ei* ('thou art,' word 2, indicative active present, 2nd person singular verb, from *eimi*)," i.e., "thou art … unto me," in the words, "*thou art* an offence *unto me*," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Origen, Cyril of Alexandria). In standard Greek grammar, the declensions of the personal pronoun, *eg<u>o</u>* (I, nominative singular), have an optional "e" (epsilon) in front of them in the singular: accusative, genitive, and dative. I.e., *eme* or *me* (accusative), *emou* or *mou* (genitive), and *emoi* or *moi* (dative). This makes no difference to meaning. Hence the Greek variant found in Marcellus of Ancyra (d. *c.* 374), which uses word order 2,1, and reads, "*ei* (thou art) *emou* (unto me)," makes no difference to English translation. The variant is found in the two leading Alexandrian Texts, Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus, and leading Western Text, D 05. It is also found in the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the meaning is still, "thou art … unto me" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 16:25, the TR's "*os … an* (whosoever)" is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042). Though the two leading Alexandrian Texts are wrong to add an optional epsilon, the meaning is identical as "*os … ean* (whosoever)" in the NU Text *et al.*

At Matt. 16:27, the TR's Greek, "*t<u>e</u>n* ('the,' feminine singular accusative definitive article, from *<u>e</u>*) *praxin* ('deeds,' or 'actions,' or 'works,' feminine singular accusative noun, from *praxis*)," in the words, "according to his *works* (*t<u>e</u>n praxin*)" (AV), is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042; Origen). A variant which is a minority Byzantine reading, is Greek, "*ta* ('the,' neuter plural accusative, definite article from *to*) *erga* ('works,' neuter plural accusative noun, from *ergon*)" (F 09, 9th century; Minuscule 28, 11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark; Cyril of Alexandria, & Chrysostom). The TR's reading is followed by the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus and Western Text's D 05; whereas the variant is followed by the Alexandrian Text's London Sinaiticus.

Though *praxis* is a singular noun, it can refer to the totality of one's actions, and so depending on context be rendered into English either in the plural, i.e., one's "deeds" (plural) or "works" (plural), as in Matt. 16:27 (AV); or the singular, i.e., "deed" as at Luke 23:51 (AV) (*praxei*, feminine singular dative noun). Here at Matt. 16:27, following the words, "and then he shall reward every man according to" (AV), it would be possible to render the remainder of the TR's reading as either, "his (*autou*) works (*ten praxin*)" (AV), if so, literally, "the (*ten*) works (*praxin*) of him (*autou*);" or as, "what (*ten*) he (*autou*) has done (*praxin*)" (Moffatt Bible). One may also render the variant, "and then he shall reward every man according to his (*autou*) works (*ta erga*)," if so, literally, "the (*ta*) works (*erga*) of him (*autou*)."

The NU Text *et al* follow the correct reading of the TR (for the wrong reasons). Given the general lack of neo-Alexandrian support for the variant in the neo-Alexandrian texts, it seems likely, though not definite, that the TR's reading is being followed in the ASV *et al*, *infra*. If one used the Moffatt type rendering of Matt. 16:27 (as does the RSV, NRSV, ESV, NEB, & NIV), i.e., "what (*ten*) he (*autou*) has done (*praxin*)" (Moffatt Bible); rather than the AV type rendering of Matt. 16:27 (as does the ASV, NASB, & TEV); then *providing that one was grossly incompetent*, one might in a silly and churlish kind of way, claim that there was a difference between "what (*ten*) he (*autou*) has done (*praxin*)" (Moffatt Bible) based on the TR reading, as opposed to the variant's "*ta* (the) *erga* (works)."

Now good Christian reader, at this point you may wish to reply, "Come, come good Sir, no man would e'er be this silly. Why dost thou raise this matter?" And yet good reader, *fact is sometimes stranger than fiction*. For that "darling" and "great leader" of the neo-Alexandrians, Bruce Metzger, says in Metzger's *Textual Commentary* (2nd ed., 1994, p. 34), that the TR follows the variant here. He first says he prefers, *ten* (the) *praxin* (works), "which is supported by the weight of diversified witnesses." But he then claims, some "scribes … preferred the more usual plural expression (*ta erga*), *which has been taken over by the Textus Receptus*" (emphasis mine).

Now the proposition that the TR follows the variant here is really quite silly. Certainly Scrivener did not agree with this curious claim, for his text correctly reads, "*ten praxin*;" and he thus follows such earlier texts as those of Erasmus (1516 & 1522); although the variant was known of in Elzevir's 1624 Textual Apparatus (Gospel manuscript: z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8)[46]. The bizarre claim of Metzger, appears to be premised on the outlandish proposition that the rendering of the AV can be said to follow the variant's "the (*ta*) works (*erga*)," and that one must render the reading, *praxin*, as does Moffatt *et al*, rather than the ASV *et al*. Now I leave

---

[46] Scrivener's Appendix shows all the texts he used (e.g., Erasmus, Stephanus, & Beza,) for instance, Stephanus's text, agreed with the reading he used, i.e., *praxin*. In addition to finding this it my copies of Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550); I have also personally checked the Complutensian Bible (1514) copy in the NSW State Library (1983-4 reprint, Rome), which likewise clearly reads, "*ten praxin*."

the reader to draw his own conclusions, as to just how ridiculous I think the claims of Metzger are here at Matt. 16:27.

At Matt. 16:28a, the TR's "*umin* (unto you), *eisi* (There be)," is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042; Origen, Vulgate, & e.g., old Latin a, d), with no good textual argument against it. But a minority Greek reading adds "*oti* (that / because / since)" after "*umin* (unto you)" (Chrysostom, d. 407), as do some old Latin versions (e.g., e, b, ff2). The variant is found in both major Alexandrian Texts, Rome Vaticanus & London Sinaiticus, and thus in the NU Text. But under the rule of *oti recitativum*, it is not translated because it introduces a *direct discourse*[47]. Therefore, in either instance the translation is, "Verily I say unto you, There are some" etc. (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 16:28b, the NU Text *et al* follows the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus & London Sinaiticus, and Western Text's D 05, in reading, "*t<u>o</u>n* (-) ... *est<u>oto</u>n* (standing)." This is one of three readings, (see comments on Matt. 16:28b in Appendix 2, *supra*,) but the meaning remains, "standing" (AV & TR; TCNT & W-H).

At Matt. 17:2a, the TR as found in Scrivener's Text reads, "*egeneto* ('became,' here = 'was,' indicative middle aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *ginomai*)," in the wider, "and his raiment *was* white, as the light" (AV). This is a sizeable minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032, Eusebius, & Cyril of Alexandria). Because at Matt. 17:2a, the plural subject of the sentence, "*ta* (-, neuter plural nominative definite article, from *to*) … *imatia* ('raiment,' neuter plural nominative noun, from *imation*)," is of neuter gender, the verb may be in the singular, as in the minority Byzantine reading. It was followed by both Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550).

By contrast, the MBT reading at Matt. 17:2a is "*egenonto* ('became,' here = 'was,' indicative middle aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *ginomai*)[48]" (e.g., Sigma 042 & Lectionary 1968). This reading is referred to in Elzevir's 1624 Textual Apparatus (Gospel manuscripts: w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

The "*egeneto*" (singular) of Scrivener's Text is far more common in St. Matthew's Gospel (e.g., Matt. 7:28; 8:24; 9:10; 11:1; *et al*); although in Matt. 11:20, we find the plural form when we read that, "mighty works (*dunameis*, feminine plural nominative noun, from *dunamis*) were done (*egeneto*, plural)." But a far more important

---

[47] Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Appendix, "Minor variants between the NU Text and Textus Receptus" etc., section: "Introduction," sub-section: "The conjunctions" etc.; Young's *Greek*, p. 190.

[48] The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Majority Text Apparatus says 61%-79% of all manuscripts follow this reading. Hodges & Farstad also indicate Scrivener's Text is a sizeable minority reading.

issue in this case, is that St. Matthew conforms with normative rules in generally, though not always, using singular verbs with a neuter gender plural subject (see Matt. 6:32 in 3rd Appendix, Vol. 1, Commentary). The exception to the general rule occurs where one wants to emphasize the individuality of each subject in the plural subject. I.e., if the MBT reading is correct here, one would be stressing that each item of clothing that made up Christ's raiment was individually "white as the light;" whereas if the minority Byzantine reading is correct, one would be stressing that considered corporately, all of Christ's raiment was individually "white as the light."

Given that there is no contextual factor that would indicate the propriety of such an emphasis here at Matt. 17:2a, e.g., no itemization of different parts of Christ's clothing, I am compelled to agree with the neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the 16th and 17th centuries. I.e., the representative Byzantine reading here clangs on the ears as contextually bad Greek, and to remedy this problem requires that we adopt the minority Byzantine reading. But it should be clearly understood that the matter has no impact on English translation.

Moreover, at Matt. 17:2a, the correct reading of the TR, "*egeneto*" (singular), was followed by the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus & London Sinaiticus, and leading Western Text, D 05. Hence for the wrong reasons, the correct reading entered the NU Text *et al*. Thus only the Burgonites are wrong on this, but their incorrect reading has no impact on English translation.

At Matt. 17:3a,4, such readings as "*Mo̱ses*" (Matt. 17:3a, TR & MBT) and "*Mo̱se*" (Matt. 17:4, TR & MBT), or "*Mo̱uses*" (Matt. 17:3a, NU Text) and "*Mo̱usei*" (Matt. 17:4, NU Text), all mean the same, "Moses," in the English. At Matt. 17:3a, Lectionary 1968 follows the MBT reading. But at Matt. 17:4, it reads, "*soi* ('for thee,' word 1) *mian* ('one,' word 2, here abbreviated[49]) *kai* ('and,' word 6) *mian* ('one,' word 7) *elia* ('for Elias,' word 8)." Evidently, Words 3,4,5, i.e., "*kai* ('and,' word 3) *Mo̱ses* ('Moses,' word 4) *mian* ('one,' word 5)," were lost by ellipsis, as the eye of the scribe jumped from the "*mian*" of word 2, to the "*mian*" of word 5, and he then kept writing from word 6.

I regard it of interest to note the following changed word orders. At Matt. 17:3b, the word order, "*met'* ('with,' word 1) *autou* ('him,' word 2) *sullalountes* ('talking,' word

---

[49] The Lectionary 1968 abbreviation, without a dot over the iota (j) looks something like, "μj" at the end of a line, above which are two backslashes in between this and the line above protruding out to the right of the right-hand justified section of this page, "//", in which the second backslash is curved upwards at the bottom with a hook to the right i.e., indicating an abbreviation at the end of the "μj (*mi*)" so that this is "*mian*." Given that *eis-mia-en* ('one,' masculine-feminine-neuter, adjective) declines in the singular feminine as *mia* (nominative), *mian* (accusative), *mias* (genitive), *mia* (with an iota under the alpha) (dative), the "*mi*" prefix of the Lectionary indicates this is "one," and the accusative context requires the abbreviation suffix means "*an*."

3),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968), but following the two leading Alexandrian texts and leading Western text, this goes to word order 3,2,1, in the NU Text.   At Matt. 17:4, the word order, “*mian* (‘one,’ word 1) *Hlia* (‘for Elias,’ word 2),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968), but following one of the two leading Alexandrian Texts, London Sinaiticus, and leading Western text, this is word order 2,1, in the NU Text.   At Matt. 17:5, the word order “*autou* (‘him,’ word 1) *akouete* (‘ye hear,’ word 2),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 1968), but following the two leading Alexandrian texts and leading Western text, this becomes word order 2,1, in the NU Text.   At Matt. 17:17b, the word order, “*esomai* (‘shall I be,’ word 1) *meth* (‘with,’ word 2) *um__on__* (‘you,’ word 3),” is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), but following the two leading Alexandrian texts and leading Western text, this becomes word order 2,3,1, in the NU Text.   I draw these examples to the readers attention, because in all probability *they show how a scribe can sometimes inadvertently miss a word, and then realizing his error, put it back in a little bit later. The real problem, of course, is when the scribe does not realize his error.   As with paper fades, this phenomena is a one-way track to a shorter text*, and so this phenomena should be understood.

At Matt. 17:6, the TR’s “*epeson* (‘they fell,’ indicative active second aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *pipt__o__*),” is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042 & Lectionary 1968), and certainly correct.   However, a minority Byzantine reading (W 032) is the variant, “*epesan* (‘they fell,’ indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *pipt__o__*).” This erroneous variant is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus & London Sinaiticus, and leading Western Text, D 05; and adopted in the NU Text *et al*.   There is no impact on English translation, as both means “they fell” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).   Nevertheless, as in other instances, the text of the TR ought not to have been changed.

The Greek *pipt__o__* may be declined as either a first or second aorist from *epeson*. Mounce gives both 1st aorist (*epesa*) & 2nd aorist (*epeson*) forms.   Certainly St. Matthew uses a first aorist declension elsewhere, evident in “*epese*(*n*) (indicative active first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *pipt__o__*)” at Matt 13:4 (“it fell”) 26:39 (“he fell”).   In this context, a most interesting passage is Matt. 7:25, for in it, St. Matthew uses both first and second aorist forms of *pipt__o__* in close proximity.   Here Christ says, “And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and *beat upon* (*prosepeson*, TR & MBT, e.g., Lectionary 2378[50], indicative active <u>second aorist</u>, 3rd person plural verb, from *prospipt__o__* = *pros* / upon + *pipt__o__* / fell) that house; and *it fell* (*epese*, TR &

---

[50]   Lectionary 1968, here follows a minority Byzantine reading, “*prosekopsan* (‘they beat upon,’ indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *proskopt__o__*).” The four preceding words before the “*kai* (‘and,’ word 5)” preceding either “*prosepeson*” (MBT) or “*prosekopsan*” (Lectionary 1968 *et al*) are, “*kai* (‘and,’ word 1) *epneusan* (‘blew,’ word 2) *oi* (‘the,’ word 3) *anemoi* (‘winds,’ word 4).”   But in Lectionary 1968, due to ellipsis, the eye of the scribe jumped from the “*kai*” of word 1 to the “*kai*” of word 5, thereby omitting words 2, 3, & 4.

MBT, e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968[51], indicative active <u>first aorist</u>, 3rd person singular verb, from *pipt<u>o</u>*) not: for it was founded upon a rock" (Matt. 7:25).


Yet in his section on the principal parts of NT verbs that occur more than 50 times in the NT, Mounce shows *pipt<u>o</u>* as a second aorist only.   He then says that the reason why the "t" (tau) drops out is because of the "s" (sigma); and though this implies that it would be a first aorist[52], in fact, *pipt<u>o</u>* is actually a second aorist[53].   In general, I consider Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon* (1993) to be a very good and useful work.   Nevertheless, I consider Mounce's views here that *pipt<u>o</u>* is properly regarded as a second aorist to be anachronistic and inappropriately judgmental.   The reality is that in an earlier era such diversity simply reflected different writing styles since the standard rules of Greek grammar were not established or universally accepted on this matter.   In NT times the issue of whether one considered the verb *pipt<u>o</u>* was a first or second aorist declension, was something like the diversity we know find today in "s" and "z" words of the English language such as "evangelise" or "evangelize;" and some writers might use both forms, whereas other writers may use only one form.   (Cf. my comments at Matt. 3:8; 15:23; & 20:10c.)


At Matt. 17:7 the TR's, "*proselth<u>on</u>* ('coming,' masculine singular nominative, active second aorist participle, from *proserchomai*) …*epsato* ('he touched,' indicative middle first aorist, 3rd singular verb, from *apt<u>o</u>*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & Lectionary 1968).   But a variant reading, "*pros<u>e</u>lthen* ('he came,' indicative active second aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *proserchomai*) … *apsamenos* ('touching,' masculine singular nominative, middle first aorist participle, from *apt<u>o</u>*)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus, and thus the NU Text *et al*.   But either way, the English reading is still, "And Jesus *came* (AV & TR's *proselth<u>on</u>*; ASV & W-H's *pros<u>e</u>lthen*) and *touched* (AV & TR's *epsato*; ASV & W-H's *apsamenos*) them" etc. .


At Matt. 17:9b, the TR's "*anast<u>e</u>* ('he is raised,' subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *anist<u>e</u>mi*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, in different word order, placed before not after, "from the dead;" Sigma 042, Lectionary 1968; Origen &

---

[51]   Lectionary 2378, p. 27b; Lectionary 1968, p. 41b.   In both instances these Lectionaries add the optional 'n' at the end, i.e., "*epesen*."

[52]   Where "*ps*" (psi) is one Greek letter, written as, ψ, not two letters, "p" (pi) and "s" (sigma), written as, πς; compare the first aorist *apsamenos* (ἁψάμενος), from *apt<u>o</u>* (ἅπτω) at Matt. 17:7, *infra*.   This is declined from the first aorist form, *epsa* (ηψά), and takes the first aorist participle suffix, *samenos* (ςάμενος), to become *apsamenos* (ἁψάμενος).

[53]   Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), p. 374 (both 1st & 2nd aorist forms of *pipt<u>o</u>* given), p. 542 (*pipt<u>o</u>* said to properly be a 2nd aorist).

Chrysostom).     However, unlike the Alexandrian School's London Sinaiticus, the Alexandrian School's Rome Vaticanus and Western School's D 05, both follow a variant, "*egerthe* ('he is raised,' subjunctive passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *egeiro*)."     The incorrect variant is found in the NU Text *et al*.     But either way, the rendering may still be, "be risen" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 17:14a, the TR's "*auton* ('they,' masculine plural genitive, 3rd person pronoun, from *autos*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042; Origen), with no good textual argument against it.     However, a minority Byzantine reading omits it (Minuscule 245, 1199 A.D.).     Paradoxically its loss is difficult to explain because its loss is so easy to explain by two quite different ways.     I.e., it could be either a stereotypical accidental loss from ellipsis with the *ton* endings of "*elthonton* ('[they] coming,' masculine plural genitive, active aorist participle, from *erchomai*) *auton* (they);" or a stereotypical pruning away of "unnecessary wordage," because the passage still reads the same without it. Which of these two highly plausible scenarios best accounts for its loss?

The erroneous variant is also found at Matt. 17:14a in e.g., the two leading Alexandrian texts, and hence it entered the NU Text *et al*.     Whether present or not, the reading is still, "And when they were come" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H), since if absent, the "they" may be supplied as implied from the preceding "*elthonton*," *supra*.

At Matt. 17:17, the TR's "*apokritheis* ('answering,' = 'answered,' AV, word 1) *de* ('then,' word 2) *o* ('the' = redundant in translation, word 3) *Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 4) *eipen* ('[and] said,' word 5)," i.e., "Then Jesus answered and said" (AV) is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968[54]) with no good textual argument against it.     But in a variant mentioned by W-H, Nestle's 21st ed., & Nestle-Aland 27th ed., outside the closed class of sources, in Z 035 (6th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), & 579 (mixed text, 13th century), word 2 becomes, "*tote* (then)," a fact not affecting English translation.   (The Alexandrian text's London Sinaiticus omits word 4. Was this an assimilation to Mark 9:19?   But the lack of "external" support for this omission means no neo-Alexandrian texts have adopted this reading, preferring instead to follow Rome Vaticanus which includes word 4.)

Reminding us that *neo-Alexandrians are a chip off the old Alexandrian block*, with no textual support whatsoever, at Matt. 17:17 word 5, "*eipen* ([and] said)," is gratuitously pruned away in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, NEB, REB, TEV, TCNT, and Moffatt Bible.   So too, again without any textual support, Word 2, is also freely pruned away in the new neo-Alexandrian Papists' JB and NJB; making it in this respect, far less accurate than the old Latin Papists' Douay-Rheims Version which correctly reads, "Then Jesus answered and said."   Both Words 2 & 5 are pruned away without warrant in the NRSV, NEB, REB, TEV, TCNT, NIV, and Moffatt Bible.   E.g., Moffatt, reads, "Jesus answered," etc., (Moffatt Bible).

---

[54]     Like W 032,   Lectionaries 2378 & 1968 abbreviate "*IHCOYC*   (Jesus)" to "*IC*" with a bar on top.

Reminding us of some of the difficulties of unravelling continuous script manuscripts, does Matt. 19:19 read, "*Diati;* (Why?)" (Scrivener's Text) or "*Dia ti;* (Why?) (NU Text)? Does Matt. 17:26 read, "*Apage* (Then)" (Scrivener's Text) or "*Apa ge* (Then)" (NU Text)?

At Matt. 17:20c, the TR's, "*metab**e**thi* ('Remove,' aorist active imperative, 2nd person singular verb, from *metabain**o***) *enteuthen* ('hence,' adverb)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and with no good textual argument against it, certainly correct. But a variant, "*metaba* ('Remove,' aorist active imperative, 2nd person singular verb, from *metabain**o***) *enthen* ('hence,' adverb)," is found in Origen. The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's London Sinaiticus and Rome Vaticanus, and so the NU Text *et al*.

The aorist active imperative indicates that the action to "remove," is done with a sense of urgency. The meaning of these two readings at Matt. 17:20c is the same, i.e., "Remove hence" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). Sometimes *bain**o*** is part of a larger compound word (e.g., *embain**o*** = enter [a ship], embark; from *en* / on, by, etc., + *bain**o*** / walk, Matt. 8:23; 9:1; 13:2; Mark 4:1; 8:19; Luke 5:3; 8:37). The Greek, *metabain**o*** meaning, "remove," "depart," etc., is one such instance of a compound word, from *meta* (amidst, after, etc.) and *bain**o*** (walk; *basis* = foot).

The regular declension of *bain**o***, is *b**e**thi*; but when the imperative is part of a compound word it may take the irregular declension, *-ba*. Thus on the one hand, the aorist active imperative, 2nd person singular declension, evident in the TR's reading of Matt. 17:20c, "*metab**e**thi*," is found in "Homer's" (? 8th / 7th century) *Odyssey* (8th-2nd century?[55]) 8. 492. But on the other hand, the irregular compound declension, evident in the variant's reading, "*metaba*," is found in Alexis's *Comicus* (4th century B.C.) 14[56].

Liddell & Scott state at "*enteuthen*" that this adverb is "related to" the adverb "*enthen*." The Greek "*enthen*" at Matt. 17:20c looks like it is a syncopated form of "*enteuthen*." But looks may be deceiving. Whether or not in its etymological history this is its origins, I do not know. Either way, if the change was deliberate, it *may* indicate that it was regarded as a syncopated form; although it may also indicate that the two related words were simply being used as synonyms, and so "*enthen*" may have been capriciously substituted for "*enteuthen*" by a scribe. But the change may also have been accidental if, for instance, "*enteuthen*" went over two lines, in which "*enteu*" was on the first line, and "*then*" on the second line, a paper fade of the first line to "*en:::*" may have been missed by a subsequent scribe, and so this may also be the origins of "*enthen*."

---

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

[56] Liddell & Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 302 (*bain**o***), p. 1109 (*metabain**o***).

xlvii

At Matt. 17:24a, the TR's "*Kapernaoum*" is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042), and certainly correct. However, a minority Byzantine reading, "*Kapharnaoum*" (W 032), is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts and leading Western text, and adopted by the NU Text *et al*. But either way, the proper rendering into English is, "Capernaum" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

A NKJV footnote says at Matt. 17:24a that the "NU-Text reads 'Capharnaum' (here and elsewhere)." But given that the English translation is really the same, only a farcical fool like the religiously liberal, apostate Puritan from Scotland, James Moffatt, would be silly enough to render this as something like, "Capharnahum" (Moffatt Bible at Matt. 4:13; 8:5; 11:23; 17:24a, *et al*). And I do not doubt that the religiously conservative Puritans from Scotland would agree with me in this assessment. For while my much beloved Puritan brethren from Scotland are horrified at the apostasy that is in the *Church of Scotland*, we Reformed (Evangelical) Anglicans are horrified at the apostasy that is in the *Church of England* and the *Church of Ireland*[57].

At Matt. 17:24b, the TR's "*eipon* ('they said,' indicative active second aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *lego*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and with no good textual argument against it, certainly correct. Though the original of the Alexandrian's London Sinaiticus follows the correct reading, we find that a "corrector" changed this in London Sinaiticus to the same reading as Rome Vaticanus, "*eipan* ('they said,' indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *lego*)." Like the "corrector" of London Sinaiticus, the erroneous reading was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Either way, the meaning is still, "said" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 17:24c, the TR's "*ta* (the)," before "*didrachma* (a plural noun from *didrachom*, consisting of *dis* / twice + *drachme* / drachma, i.e., 'double-drachma')," is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and correct. Though present in the Alexandrian text's Rome Vaticanus, it is omitted in the Alexandrian text's London Sinaiticus and the Western text's D 05. The neo-Alexandrian preference for the shorter text saw its omission in Nestle's 21st ed.; but its presence in Rome Vaticanus saw its inclusion in Tischendorf's 8th ed. and W-H; and thoroughly confused about what to make of it all, the NU Text just put it in square brackets. Whether or not the definite article is present, the translation is the same. If not translated literally, e.g., "the double-drachma;" it may be rendered with "money" in italics as added, by a sensible dynamic equivalent such as, "tribute *money*" (AV); or converted from the Greek, "double-drachma" coin, to the equivalent Jewish, "half-shekel" coin (ASV).

At Matt. 17:27a, the definite article, "*ten* (the)" before "*thalassan* (sea)," is MBT

---

[57] E.g., like some of the pagan religions of NT times, the C. of I. has women priests (priestesses) since 1991. Then in 2008 its General Synod called upon the southern Irish Minister for Justice, to put a law through the Republic of Ireland's parliament introducing Civil Partnerships for abusers of themselves with mankind (Gen. 18:20,21; 19:5; Rom. 1:26,27; I Cor. 6:9) ("Roots of Apostasy within the Church of Ireland," *English Churchman*, 6 & 13 June, 2008, p. 1).

(e.g., E 07, 8th century; F 09, 9th century, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; & Cyril of Alexandria, d. 444).   With no good textual argument against it, it is surely correct. However, a minority Byzantine reading omits the, "*t_en* (the)" (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042). This omission is referred to in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) (Gospel manuscripts: Parham 18).   This variant is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, and hence in the NU Text *et al*.   Either way, general context means it will not be rendered, "a sea," but rather, "the sea" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

In Matt. 18 there are some diverse word orders (Matt. 18:5,8,26b), differences of optional letters (Matt. 18:30, *all' / alla* = "but,"), and contractions (Matt. 18:33, TR's & MBT *kai eg_o* becomes NU Text's *kag_o*, both = "even … I"), not affecting meaning or translation.   Of the same type is an omission of a TR's definite article (Matt. 18:18, TR's & MBT e.g., Lectionary 2378, *t_o* / the *ouran_o* / heaven becomes NU Text's *ouran_o* / heaven, both = "heaven"). (Cf. e.g., Matt. 19:3.)

At Matt. 18:4, the TR's reading found in Scrivener's Text, following both the Greek texts of Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550), is "*tapein_ose* ('he shall humble,' subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *tapeino_o*)."   This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 2 (12th century) and Clement of Alexandria (d. *c.* 215).   By contrast, the reading "*tapein_osei* ('he shall humble,' indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *tapeino_o*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042, both using spelling, "*tapin_osei*;" Origen & Basil).   It is further referred to in 5 out of 8 manuscripts in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).   It is also found in e.g., the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus & London Sinaiticus, and Western Text's D 05[58].

The TR's subjunctive here at Matt. 18:3-6 indicates *possibility*[59].   It is used in Matt. 18:3-6 for, "*straph_ete* ('ye be converted,' <u>subjunctive</u> passive aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *streph_o*);" "*gen_esthe* ('ye become,' <u>subjunctive</u> middle aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *ginomai*);" "*eisenth_ete* ('ye shall enter,' <u>subjunctive</u> active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *eiserchomai*);" "*dex_etai* ('he shall receive,' <u>subjunctive</u> middle aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *dechomai*);" "*skandalis_e* ('he shall offend,' <u>subjunctive</u> active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *skandaliz_o*);" "*kremasth_e* ('it were hanged,' <u>subjunctive</u> passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *kremannumi*);" and "*katapontisth_e* ('he were drowned,' <u>subjunctive</u> passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *katapontiz_o*)."

---

[58]   The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green's Majority Text Apparatus says 95-100% of all (Greek) manuscripts follow the MBT reading.   Thus only about 0%-5% of all manuscripts follow the minority Byzantine reading of Scrivener's Text.

[59]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 461; Young's *Greek*, p. 137.

Thus we read in Matt. 18:3-6, Jesus "said, Verily I say unto you, Except *ye be converted* (subjunctive aorist), and *become* (subjunctive aorist) as little children, *ye shall* not *enter* (subjunctive aorist) into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever therefore *shall humble* (indicative future, MBT; subjunctive aorist, TR) himself as this little child, the same is great in the kingdom of heaven. And whoso *shall receive* (subjunctive aorist) one such child in my name receiveth me. But whoso *shall offend* (subjunctive aorist) one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone *were hanged* (subjunctive aorist) about his neck, and that *he were drowned* (subjunctive aorist) in the depth of the sea."

We find in the immediate words of the MBT, "Whosoever therefore *shall humble* (*tapeinosei* indicative active <u>future</u>) himself as this little child, the same is (*estin*, indicative active <u>present</u>, 3rd person singular verb, from *eimi*) great in the kingdom of heaven;" a statement that something a person does *in the future*, makes him "great" now *in the present*. By contrast, the minority Byzantine reading, "Whosoever therefore *shall humble* (*tapeinose*, subjunctive active <u>aorist</u>) himself as this little child, the same is (*estin*, indicative active <u>present</u>, 3rd person singular verb, from *eimi*) great in the kingdom of heaven;" is an overview snapshot of the entire action (aorist) of someone being humble. Unlike the MBT reading, this minority Byzantine reading usage of an aorist is consistent with the usage of aorists throughout this passage.

Contextually, if Christ first refers in Matt. 18:3 to those who "become (Greek, *genesthe*, <u>subjunctive</u> middle aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *ginomai*; Latin Vulgate, *efficiamini*, <u>subjunctive</u> passive present, 2nd person plural verb, from *efficio*), as little children;" then the natural corollary to this in Matt. 18:4, is surely to refer to "whosoever *therefore* (Greek, *oun*; Latin, *ergo*)" who "shall humble (Greek, <u>subjunctive</u> active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *tapeinoo*; Latin Vulgate, *humiliaverit*, <u>subjunctive</u> active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *humilio*) himself as this little child."

But in broader terms, it is clear that in this passage, the subjunctive aorist is being consistently used to contrast *different possibilities*. The contrast in the MBT of changing from the subjunctive aorists of Matt. 18:3 ("ye be converted," "become," & "ye shall … enter"), over to an indicative future in Matt. 18:4 ("shall humble," *tapeinosei*), and then back to subjunctive aorists in Matt. 18:5 ("shall receive") and Matt. 18:6 ("were hanged" & "he were drowned"), clangs on the ears as *contextually* inharmonious Greek. The contextual stylistic expectation, is that Matt. 18:4 will be consistent with the internal grammatical properties of this passage, and so likewise be a subjunctive aorist.

Thus to remedy this textual problem in the MBT here at Matt. 18:4, the composers of the Received Text such as Erasmus (1516), Stephanus (1550), *et al*, wisely and correctly adopted the minority Byzantine reading of a subjunctive aorist, *tapeinose*, attested to in ancient times by the Greek writer, Clement of Alexandria (d. *c.* 215).

The origins of the variant are speculative. Was this an accidental change? Due to a small paper space following the word, "*tapeinose* ('he shall humble,' subjunctive

aorist),” did a scribe wrongly conclude that “there must have been a paper fade,” and so add in an “i” (iota) to form, “*tapeinosei* (‘he shall humble,’ indicative future)”? Was this a deliberate change? It appears to have originated with Origen. Contrary to Articles 4 (“hell,” see Luke 16:23; Acts 2:27,31) and 8 (“from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead,” see John 5:22; 12:48; Acts 10:42; Rev. 21:8) of the *Apostles’ Creed*, Origen was a universalist who believed that after going through a form of purgatory, everyone would be saved. Did he therefore dislike the subjunctive here at Matt. 18:4 because it teaches that it is only a *possibility* that someone “shall humble himself”? To overcome this, did Origen then make this an indicative future, because he considered that in the future every person “shall humble himself”?

But for all that, at Matt. 18:4 there is no necessary difference in English translation between the TR’s, “*tapeinose* (‘he shall humble,’ subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *tapeinoo*),” and the reading of the Burgonites’ Majority Text and neo-Alexandrian’s NU Text *et al*, “*tapeinosei* (‘he shall humble,’ indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *tapeinoo*).” Though there is certainly a difference of meaning in the underpinning Greek, both may be rendered into English as, “shall humble” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 18:10, the TR’s “*en* (in) *ouranois* (‘heaven,’ masculine plural dative noun, from *ouranos*),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, N 022, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) with no good textual argument against it. Outside the closed class of sources, the correct reading is found in e.g., the Alexandrian Text’s London Sinaiticus, and the Western Text’s D 05. Hence the correct reading is found in the NU Text *et al*. But amidst a number of variants, this reads “*to* (the) *ourano* (‘heaven,’ masculine singular dative noun, from *ouranos*) in the Alexandrian’s Rome Vaticanus, and their so called, “queen of Minuscules,” Minuscule 33. Was this reading acquired from the nearby Matt. 18:18?

The English translation is the same from both readings. But the reading has caused some confusion among the neo-Alexandrians. E.g., Westcott-Hort put the reading of London Sinaiticus in their main text, but gave the reading of Rome Vaticanus in a side-note. Tischendorf’s 2nd edition (1842, Lectiones Variants, p. 6), criticizes the Greek text of Stephanus (1550) for following the TR’s reading at Matt. 18:10. But in the shake-about, turn-about, turn-around world of ever-changing neo-Alexandrian texts, Tischendorf then did a back-flip and adopted the TR’s reading in his 8th edition (1869-72).

At Matt. 18:12a, the TR’s “*apheis* (‘he leaving,’ masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *aphiemi*),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and certainly correct. However, “*aphesei* (‘he shall / will leave,’ indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *aphiemi*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscule 21, 12th century). One main Alexandrian text follows the TR (London Sinaiticus), and the other main Alexandrian text follows the variant (Rome Vaticanus). While Tischendorf’s 8th ed. follows the correct reading of his beloved London Sinaiticus; the variant of Rome Vaticanus is followed by W-H, Nestle’s 21st ed., and the NU Text. But both readings may be rendered, “doth he leave,” in the words,

"*doth he* not *leave* the ninety and nine" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 18:12c, the TR's, "*epi* ('into,' word 1) *ta* ('the,' word 2) *ore* ('mountains,' word 3) *poreutheis* ('going,' word 4)," i.e., "and (-) goeth (word 4) into (word 1) the (word 2) mountains (word 3)" (AV), is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct. But in between words 3 and 4, "*kai* (and)," is inserted in one of the leading Alexandrian texts (Rome Vaticanus) and the leading Western text (D 05). The other leading Alexandrian text (London Sinaiticus) omits words 1,2,3, changes word 4, and lacks the '*kai* (and)'. Though the TR's reading is followed in Tischendorf's 8th ed., the variant's addition is followed in W-H, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text.

Interestingly, at the point of the insertion, W 032 has a paper space of about 2 or 3 letter spaces, designed so as to help right-hand justify the page. (Even though the scribe evidently miscalculated, and then overshot the line's "ending" by a letter space or so.) Such a stylistic paper space may result either in a subsequent scribe wrongly thinking there was a paper fade, and so "reconstructing" what is "missing," in this case, "*kai* (and);" or in a subsequent scribe who believes in "stylistic improvements," opportunistically exploiting such a paper space to insert a "stylistic improvement," in this case, "*kai* (and)," and then a subsequent scribe simply copying out the altered text.

Though the addition of the "*kai* (and)" is certainly incorrect, it makes no difference to English translation, since when translating such terminology one may include "and" for reasons of English grammar. Thus whether absent (TR) or present (W-H) in the Greek, Matt. 18:12c may still be rendered the same as, "and goeth into the mountains" (AV & TR) or "and go unto the mountains" (ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 18:19b, the TR's "*duo* ('two,' word 1) *umon* ('of you,' personal genitive pronoun, 2nd person plural, from *su*, word 2) *sumphonesosin* ('they agree,' subjunctive active first aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *sumphoneo*, word 3)," is MBT (e.g., W 032 – abbreviating with a line on top where I have one underneath after the omega of word 2 to *umo* ; Lectionary 1968; Origen & Basil the Great); and certainly correct.

There is a minority Byzantine variant (*Variant 1*) not affecting English translation of word 3 as, "*sumphonesousin* ('they agree,' indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *sumphoneo*, word 3a)" (Sigma 042, N 022, & Lectionary 2378); which is further referred to in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) (Gospel manuscripts: H, Harleian. 5598, British Museum; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8); and is also found in the Alexandrian Text's London Sinaiticus.

There is also a minority Greek variant (*Variant 2*), in which "*ex* ('out' / 'of,' word A)," is placed before "*umon* (of you)" (Origen & Chrysostom). This is further referred to in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) (Gospel manuscripts: L, Codex Leicestrensis). It is also found in the Alexandrian Text's London Sinaiticus and Rome Vaticanus, but once again, does not affect English translation.

Moreover, the TR's word order 1,2,3, becomes word order 1,3,A,2 in Rome Vaticanus; and word order 1,3a,A,2 in London Sinaiticus. The NU Text *et al* follows Rome Vaticanus in reading word order 1,3,A,2, but this has no impact on English translation. Hence the reading at Matt. 18:19b remains, "two of you shall agree" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 18:24, the TR's "*prosenechthe* (indicative passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *prosphero*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; Origen & Chrysostom) and correct. It is also followed by the Alexandrian text's London Sinaiticus. But a variant, "*prosechthe* (indicative passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *prosago*)," appears to have originated with Origen (who uses both readings,) and followed in the Alexandrian text's Rome Vaticanus and Western text's D 05.

This split in the Alexandrian text's has led to confusion among neo-Alexandrians. Tischendorf's 2nd edition (1842) criticized Stephanus (1550) for following the TR's reading; but after Tischendorf "discovered" London Sinaiticus and found it also had the TR's reading here, he did an about-face, and adopted the TR's reading in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). Though the variant was followed in Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952) (Rome Vaticanus); the TR's reading was followed in the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) (London Sinaiticus).

Though the relevant Greek words may have different shades of meaning depending on context, here at Matt. 18:24, the TR's *prosphero* comes from *pros* (toward) + *phero* (bring) = *bring to*; and the variant's *prosago* comes from *pros* (toward) + *ago* (bring) = *bring to*. Therefore, both may be rendered, "was brought," i.e., "one *was brought* unto him" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 18:25, the TR's "*autou* (of him)" is twice found, firstly in, "*o* (the) *kurios* (lord) *autou* (of him)," i.e., "his lord," and secondly in, "*ten* (the) *gunaika* (wife) *autou* (of him)," i.e., "his wife;" in the reading, "*his* lord commanded him to be sold, and *his* wife, and children," etc. (AV). In both instances the TR's reading is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and with no good textual argument against it, correct.

The first "his" is omitted in old Latin g2 (10th century), and the second "his" is omitted in old Latin h (5th century). The "*autou* (his)," is omitted on both occasions in the Alexandrian text's London Sinaiticus and Rome Vaticanus. It is also omitted in the NU Text *et al*. However, as a matter of contextual translation it is added in English translation *without italics* at Matt. 18:25 in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV.

While it is only so added the second time in the NIV and TEV, both of which omit it the first time; most neo-Alexandrian translators seem to agree with the need for its contextual inclusion in English, and so follow the reading, "his lord commanded him to be sold, and his wife" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). Hence *on this occasion*

(notwithstanding the omission of the first "his" in the NIV and TEV), I have here exercised a discretion to place this reading in Appendix 3. (By contrast, cf. e.g., Matt. 15:2,22,25; 17:3; 18:15b,26a in the main commentary.) Nevertheless, the underpinning Greek is clearly different between the TR and all of these neo-Alexandrian versions.

At Matt. 18:30, the TR's "*eos ou* (till) *apodo* ('he should pay,' subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apodidomi*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968[60]) and correct. However the NU Text *et al* follow the two leading Alexandrian texts with a variant that lacks "*ou*," and so reads, "*eos* ('till,' a conjunction) *apodo* (he should pay)." Either way, the reading is still "till he should pay" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

Likewise, at Matt. 18:34 the "*eos ou* (till) *apodo* (he should pay)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct. But while the "*ou*" is found in the e.g., the Western Text's D05, it is omitted in the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus. Reflecting some uncertainty, W-H places the "*ou*" in square brackets, making it entirely optional. But either way, as per Matt. 18:30, *supra*, the reading still remains, "till he should pay." (Cf. comments at Matt. 1:25, Volume 1, last paragraph.)

The Greek, "*kai*" and "*de*" are very elastic conjunctions, meaning e.g., "and," "but," "thus" / "so;" whereas the conjunction, "*oun*," more narrowly means, e.g., "then," "whereupon," "accordingly," "so." At Matt. 18:31a, the TR's "*de* (so)" is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and with no good textual argument against it, correct. However the NU Text *et al* follow the two leading Alexandrian texts with a variant, "*oun* (so)." In both instances, the reading is still, "*So* when his" etc. (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 18:35a the TR's "*epouranios* ('heavenly,' masculine singular nominative adjective, from *epouranios*)," is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century; Lectionary 2378, 11th century; & Lectionary 1968, 1544 A.D.) and correct. But a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., K 017, 9th century), seemingly originating with Origen (d. 254), is "*ouranios* ('heavenly,' masculine singular nominative adjective, from *ouranios*)." The variant is followed by the two leading Alexandrian texts and leading Western text, and adopted in the NU Text *et al*. Either way, the rendering is still "heavenly" in the words, "my heavenly Father" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 19:4b, the TR's Greek, "*poiesas* ('making' = 'which made,' masculine nominative singular, active aorist participle, from *poieo*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968[61]; Chrysostom, Jerome, & Austin), and correct.

---

[60] In Lectionary 1968, unlike the scribe's normal "*ou*" (e.g., Matt. 18:20,34), at Matt. 18:30 the scribe wrote, "*ouu*" i.e., accidentally repeating the "*u*" (upsilon) a second time. It is nevertheless clear that his meaning is "*ou*" which I here show this Lectionary supporting.

[61] Lectionary 2378 elsewhere follows the spelling, "*poiesas*" at, for instance,

However a variant reading, "*ktisas* ('creating' = 'which created,' masculine nominative singular, active aorist participle, from *ktizo*)," is found in e.g., Origen & pseudo-Clementines. The TR's reading is followed by the Alexandrian Text's London Sinaiticus and Western Text's D 05, whereas the variant is followed by the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus. Tischendorf's 8th ed. followed London Sinaiticus and thus for the wrong reasons the TR; whereas W-H, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text followed the variant of Rome Vaticanus.

The wider sentence at Matt. 19:4b reads, "*o* ('the [one], masculine = 'he') *poiesas* (which made [them]) *ap'* (*apo* + genitive = 'from' / 'at') *arches* ('the beginning,' feminine singular <u>genitive</u> noun, from *arche*) *arsen* (male) *kai* (and) *thelu* (female) *epoiesen* ('he made,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *poieo*) *autous* (them)." Therefore, whether one follows the TR's "*poiesas* ('which made [them],' from *poieo*)" or the variant's "*ktisas* ('which created,' from *ktizo*)," there is a contextual linguistic parallelism with the following "*epoiesen* ('he made,' from *poieo*)." Hence *poieo* defines the meaning either way.

It is possible to render *poieo* as either "which made" or "which created," and likewise *ktizo* also has this flexibility. E.g., at Heb. 12:27, "*pepoiemenon* (neuter plural genitive, perfect passive participle, from *poieo*)," may be rendered as either "of things that are made" (AV) or "of created things" (NASB). Or at Eph. 2:15, "*ktise* (subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *ktizo*)," is translated "make" (AV), whereas at Eph. 2:10, "*ktisthentes* (masculine plural nominative, aorist passive participle, from *ktizo*)," it is translated as "created" (AV).

(The reader ought not to confuse this issue of "created" and "made" in the NT, with the OT issue in which those of the Gap School, both the Gen. 1:2-2:3 local earth and global earth sub-schools, distinguish between the "created" *ex nihlo* of Gen. 1:1, from the "made" of pre-existing created things in Exod. 20:11.) Hence there is no necessary difference in English translation at Matt. 19:4 to the AV's "which made," even though the main text of the ASV reads, "who made," and an ASV footnote then says, "Some ancient authorities read 'created'." An NKJV footnote accepts this distinction, and so puts "who made" (NKJV) in the main text, and then says in a footnote that the NU Text "reads 'created'" (NKJV ftn). More generally, neo-Alexandrian translations using the variant have divided in rendering this as either *made* or *created*. E.g., it is rendered "who made" in the NRSV, and "who created" in the ESV.

At Matt. 19:5a, Greek, "*eneken* ('for the sake,' preposition + genitive) *toutou* ('of this,' neuter singular <u>genitive</u>, pronoun from *outos*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; & Methodius 3rd century), and correct. But a variant, "*eneka* ('for the sake,' preposition + genitive) *toutou* ('of this,' a genitive)," is found in Origen. The variant is followed by the two leading Alexandrian texts, and hence was adopted by

---

Luke 10:25 (p. 47a) and John 2:15 (p. 4b). Yet in what is either a spelling mistake, or a local dialect's alternative spelling, the scribe here writes, "*piesas*." But because it is clear that his meaning is "*poiesas*," I here show this Lectionary supporting that reading.

the NU Text *et al.* However, *eneken* and *eneka* are simply variant forms of the same preposition, and so the meaning is identical. The combination of *eneken* / *eneka* + *toutou*, may be rendered, "For this cause" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

The term "cause" occurs in matrimonial law which historically, though alas, not since the introduction of "at pleasure" divorce" from about the 1960s and 1970s on, was generally grounded in the base of Anglican Ecclesiastical Law (including the development of divorce *a vinculo* beyond the cause of adultery, see also e.g., Cranmer's *Reformed Laws* and Justinian's Code). (Although Scottish Matrimonial Law was historically based in the Presbyterian Westminster Confession.) The term "cause" (rather than e.g., "reason") for a reason occasioning a matrimonial separation (divorce *a mensa et thoro*, Latin, "from bed and board") or divorce (divorce *a vinculo matrimonii*, Latin, "from the bond of marriage"), thus appears in the AV in harmony with Anglican Ecclesiastical Law[62].

At Matt. 19:8, the Greek spellings, "*Moses*" (MBT e.g., E 07, 8th century; K 017, 9th century; Lectionary 2378, 11th century; & Lectionary 1968, 1544 A.D.) and the minority Byzantine reading, "*Mouses*" (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022), are both rendered "Moses." The minority Byzantine reading is also found in the two major Alexandrian Texts, leading Western Text, and the NU Text.

At Matt. 19:13 the TR's "*prosenechthe* ('it were brought,' indicative passive aorist, 3rd person <u>singular</u> verb, from *prosphero*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032; Origen & Chrysostom), and with no good textual argument against it, is surely correct. However, a variant, "*prosenechthesan* ('they were brought,' indicative passive aorist, 3rd person <u>plural</u> verb, from *prosphero*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042 & Origen).

Here the subject is, "*paidia* ('little children,' <u>neuter plural nominative</u> noun, from *paidion*)." In Greek, the nominative is used for the subject, and a neuter plural subject usually, though not always, has singular verbs, as in the MBT reading. The exception to the general rule occurs where one wants to emphasize the individuality of each subject in the plural subject. Thus if in the following passage, it was clear that the individuality of each of the "little children" was in some way being stressed, then we would expect to see the minority Byzantine reading of Sigma 042. But this is not the case here at all.

Origen refers to both readings. Either accidentally, if "*prosenechthe*" came at the end of a line, as a "reconstruction" when he thought a suffix had been lost in a paper fade; or as a deliberate "stylistic improvement;" he possibly made the reading,

---

[62] See e.g., Sir William Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Vol. 1 (1765), pp. 440-1, "The … divorce, *a vinculo matrimonii*, must be for some of the canonical <u>causes</u>," e.g., "those, … arising *afterwards*, as may be the case in … corporeal imbecility … ." "Divorces *a vinculo matrimonii*, for adultery, have … been … granted." "Divorce *a mensa et thoro* is … for some supervenient <u>cause</u>, … as in the case of intolerable ill temper … in either of the parties" (my emphasis on underlined words).

"*pros<u>e</u>nechth<u>e</u>san* (they were brought)," on the basis that Jesus is said to have "laid his hands on them" (Matt. 19:15) i.e., considering that "this implied" some focus on individuals. But Origen was quite wrong to do so, since the repeated reference to the corporate "little children" (*paidia*) in Matt. 19:14; followed by the reference to the plural form, "on them (*autois*, masculine dative, 3rd person <u>plural</u> pronoun, from *autos*)," in Matt. 19:15, acts to keep a more general reference, and therefore the expected reading is that of the TR's and MBT's "*pros<u>e</u>nechth<u>e</u>* (they were brought)."

Nevertheless, the variant's erroneous reading was followed by the two major Alexandrian Texts and leading Western Text. It was then adopted by the NU Text *et al.* But it makes no difference to English translation, since in either instance the rendering at Matt. 19:13 is, "were there brought" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

With respect to the issue of ellipsis, let us now consider an instructive trilogy: (1) Matt. 19:16a (one letter); (2) Matt. 19:15 (two letters); and (3) Matt. 19:17b (three letters). See my comments at Matt. 19:23, *infra*.

(1 of 3) At Matt. 19:16a, the correct reading (TR & MBT e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042), "*proselth<u>on</u>* ('coming' = 'came,' word 1) *eipen* ('[and] he said' = '[and] said,' word 2) *aut<u>o</u>* ('unto him,' word 3)," i.e., "came and said unto him" (AV), demonstrates how ellipsis might sometimes work *on one letter*. Did a scribe's eye jump from the "n" (nu) ending of "*proselth<u>on</u>*" (word 1) to the "n" ending of "*eipen*" (word 2), thus omitting word 2? If so, upon realizing his error, did the scribe then add it back in, thus producing the word order 1,3,2 found as a minority Byzantine reading in Minuscule 3 (12th century)? Or was this "a pre-emptive" alteration by a scribe designed "to ensure" that word 2 was not so accidentally lost? Either way, the variant word order 1,3,2, is also found in the Alexandrian Text's Codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, and hence in the NU Text *et al*, but this does not affect English translation.

(2 of 3) Likewise, at Matt. 19:15, the correct reading (TR & MBT e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042), "*epitheis* ('laying on' = 'he laid … on,' word 1) *autois* ('them,' word 2) *tas* ('the,' word 3) *cheiras* ('hands,' word 4)," i.e., "he laid *his* hands on them" (AV), demonstrates how ellipsis might sometimes work *on two letters*. Did a scribe's eye jump from the "is" (iota, sigma) ending of "*epitheis*" (word 1) to the "is" ending of "*autois*" (word 2), thus omitting word 2? If so, having written words 1,3,4, did he then realize his error and add back in word 2? Is this the explanation for word order 1,3,4,2 found as a minority Greek reading in Origen (d. 254)? Or did a scribe, foreseeing such a danger, seek to prevent such a loss from ellipsis by deliberately changing the word order to 1,3,4,2? Either way, the minority Greek reading found inside the closed class of sources with Origen, is also found outside the closed class of sources in e.g., the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus, Western Text's D 05, and NU Text *et al*, with no impact on English translation.

(3 of 3) Once again at Matt. 19:17b, the correct reading (TR & MBT e.g., M 021, 9th century; U 030, 9th century; Lectionary 2378, 11th century; & Lectionary 1968, 1544 A.D.; Chrysostom & Augustine), "*eiselthein* ('enter into,' word 1) *eis* ('into,' word

2) *ten* ('the,' word 3) *zoen* ('life,' word 4)," i.e., "enter into life" (AV), demonstrates how ellipsis might sometimes work *on three letters*. Did a copyist's eye jump from the "eis" (epsilon, iota, sigma) prefix of "*eiselthein*" (word 1) to the "eis" of "*eis*" (word 2), thus omitting word 1? Upon realizing his error, did he then add it back in, thus producing word order 2,3,4,1 found as a minority Byzantine reading in K 017 (9th century) and Minuscule 248 (13th century)? Or did a scribe foreseeing such a possibility, deliberately alter this to word order 2,3,4,1? The variant is followed by the Alexandrian's two leading texts, and thus also the NU Text *et al.* But once again, this in no way affects English translation.

At Matt. 19:21a, the TR's "*ephe* ('he said' = 'said,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *phemi*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct. It is also followed by e.g., the Alexandrian text's London Sinaiticus and Western text's D 05. However, a variant, "*legei* ('he said' = 'said,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *lego*)," may be reconstructed in the Greek from the Vulgate's Latin, "*ait* ('he said' = 'said,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *aio*)." It is also found in the Alexandrian text's Rome Vaticanus. While the correct reading of London Sinaiticus was followed in Tischendorf's 8th ed., Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text; the incorrect reading of Rome Vaticanus was followed in W-H. But either way, the rendering is "said" in, "Jesus said unto him" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 19:21b, before the MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and TR's "*ptochois* ('poor' = 'the poor')," the definite article, "*tois* (the)," is gratuitously added in by the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus, but not by the Alexandrian Text's London Sinaiticus. With the two main Alexandrian texts in disagreement, the Neo-Alexandrians were in some perplexity. Thinking "the shorter reading was the better reading," for the wrong reasons, the correct reading was followed by Tischendorf's 8th edition and Nestle's 21st edition. But from the Neo-Alexandrian perspective, "Does not Rome Vaticanus have external support in the Western Text's D 05 and (mixed text type) Theta 038 (9th century)?" (and also, according to Tischendorf's 8th edition with the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic and Bohairic Versions, although these being translations it could surely be argued that their definite articles were added in as part of translation). Uncertain about what to do, the "*tois* (the)" was placed in square brackets, making its usage or non-usage entirely optional, in W-H, UBS 3rd, 3rd corrected, & 4th revised editions, and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition. But whether present or absent in the Greek, the translation into English will remain the same as, "the poor" (AV & ASV).

At Matt. 19:21c, the TR's "*ourano* ('heaven,' masculine <u>singular</u> dative noun from *ouranos*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionary 2378 which abbreviates it to "*ouno*" with a line over the "*un*") and surely correct. But the variant, "*ouranois* ('heavens,' masculine <u>plural</u> dative noun from *ouranos*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (Gamma 036, 10th century). Of notable interest, Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.) first abbreviates the "*ouran*" to "*ouno*" with a line over the "*un*," and then on the main line reads "*ois*" and in the space above this reads "*o*." This means that the scribe of Lectionary 1968 is giving both readings, and allowing the Lectionary user to select which

of the two he prefers. *This is thus an example of variant New Testament Greek readings being shown inside the Byzantine textual tradition some years before Stephanus's 1550 edition showing variants from over a dozen manuscripts!*

This variant at Matt. 19:21c is also found in the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus and Western Text's D 05, although the TR's reading is found in the Alexandrian Text's London Sinaiticus. Though the variant is found in the NU Text *et al*, because in this type of context, "heavens" is rendered into English as "heaven," the matter does not affect English translation. Hence it reads, "heaven" in both the AV (TR) and ASV (W-H).

At Matt. 19:23 the MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968[63]) and TR reads, "*duskolos* ('shall hardly,' word 1) *plousios* ('a rich man,' word 2)." Did the eye of a scribe jump from the "s" (sigma) at the end of word 1, to the "s" at the end of word 2, and then realizing his error, add word 1 back in, thus producing the work order 2,1 in Origen (d. 254)? The incorrect word order error was adopted in the two leading Alexandrian Texts and leading Western Text, and is so found in the NU Text *et al*. On the one hand, this makes no impact on English translation. But on the other hand, it should be borne in mind that this type of thing *is a one way track for word loss*. I.e., *what of the times a scribe does not realize his error and add a word back in?* (See also the trilogy on Matt. 19:16a; 19:15; and 19:17b, *supra*; and the main commentary at Matt. 20:6a.)

At Matt. 19:24a the TR's "*lego* (I say) *umin* (unto you)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and with no good textual argument against it, it is surely correct. However, after "*umin* (unto you)," a minority Byzantine reading adds "*oti* (that)" (M 021, 9th century). The TR's reading is followed by one main Alexandrian text, Rome Vaticanus, together with the main Western Text, D 05; however, the variant is followed by the other main Alexandrian text, London Sinaiticus. While Rome Vaticanus is followed by W-H (with a footnote giving the variant as an alternative), Nestle's 21st ed. (referring to the variant in a footnote), and the NU Text (with Nestle-Aland's 27th ed. referring to the variant in a footnote); by contrast, London Sinaiticus is followed by Tischendorf's 8th edition (as per usual in his very useful textual apparatus, showing the TR's reading in a footnote).

In grammar, *direct discourse* or *direct speech*, refers to where a speaker's actual words are given as a quote; e.g., "Quickly the man said, 'Get up fast Jack, you're in the army now!'" By contrast, in *indirect discourse* or *indirect speech*, the speaker's message is given, but without using the speaker's actual words as a quote; e.g., "The man spoke quickly, telling Jack to get up rapidly because he had joined the army." There is also *free indirect speech* (French, *style indirect libre*), which is a mixture of direct and indirect discourse / speech, so that the speaker's actual words are used in the indirect speech.

---

[63] As elsewhere (see Luke 18:24, p. 51a), Lectionary 2378 follows a variant spelling, "*diskolos*."

E.g., "The man spoke quickly, telling <u>Jack</u> to <u>get up fast</u> because he was <u>now</u> <u>in the</u> <u>army</u>."   But in normative English terminology, we would not say, "I say unto you, Get up fast Jack, you're in the army now!" (direct speech), or "I say unto you, That the man told Jack to get up fast because he was now in the army" (free indirect speech).

We would not say in normative English terminology, "I say unto you, It is easy for good soldiers to salute an officer properly" (direct speech); nor "I say unto you, That good soldiers easily salute an officer properly" (indirect speech).   However, this type of terminology may be found in NT Greek.   Thus among Greek grammarians the matter may be open to some debate in some circumstances when Jesus introduces his words with, "*leg<u>o</u>* (I say) *umin* (unto you)," such as occurs at e.g., Matt. 19:23,24.   Thus at Matt. 19:23, we read in the American Standard Version, "Verily I say unto you, *It is hard for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven*" (ASV).   The Greek here in both the TR and W-H has "*oti*" after "unto you" (*umin*) and before "*duskol<u>os</u>*."   The Greek, "*duskol<u>os</u>*," is an adverb, but if, as in the ASV, it is interpretatively rendered with the addition of the words, "It is" i.e., "It is hard," then we have a *direct discourse*, and so under the rule of *oti recitativum* it is not translated in the ASV.   By contrast, if the adverb "*duskol<u>os</u>*" is more literally rendered as "hardly," as in the Authorized Version, so that Jesus' words are given in the form of *indirect discourse*, then *oti recitativum* is not applicable and the translation is, "Verily I say unto you, *That (oti) a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven*" (AV).

It is notable that whereas Matt. 19:23 uses an adverb, "*duskol<u>os</u>* (hardly)," after "*leg<u>o</u>* (I say) *umin* (unto you);" by contrast, Matt. 19:24a uses a 3rd person singular verb, "*estin* ('it is,' indicative active present, <u>3rd person singular verb</u>, from *eimi*) with a comparative adjective, "*eukop<u>o</u>teron* ('easier,' neuter singular nominative, <u>comparative adjective</u>, from *eukopos / eukop<u>o</u>teros*), after the same formulae of words, "*leg<u>o</u>* (I say) *umin* (unto you)."   The presence of an adverb by itself in Matt.19:23 thus contextually contrasts with the presence of the 3rd person singular verb in Matt.19:24a, so as to indicate a different Greek nuance i.e., Matt. 19:23 is indirect speech, whereas Matt. 19:24a is direct speech.   Thus I would agree with the AV's rendering of Matt. 19:23, and so disagree with the ASV's rendering of Matt. 19:23.

But irrespective of what the reader may think about this disagreement among Greek grammarians over how to best render into English Matt. 19:23, it seems clear that Matt. 19:24a is direct speech.   Hence both the TR and variant would be rendered the same, since if the variant was followed, under the rule of *oti recitativum*, "*oti* (that)," would not translated as it introduces a *direct discourse*[64].   Thus in either instance the translation at Matt. 19:24a is that found in the AV, "Again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle" etc. .

At Matt. 19:24b, the TR's "*trup<u>e</u>matos* ('the eye,' neuter singular genitive noun, from *trup<u>e</u>ma*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968, & Origen), and (with

---

[64]   Young's *Greek*, p. 190.

no clear and obvious textual problem with it on neo-Byzantine principles,) clearly correct. *Variant 1*, "*trumalias* ('the eye,' feminine singular genitive noun, from *trumalia*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042; & Origen). *Variant 2*, "*trematos* ('the eye,' neuter singular genitive noun, from *trema*)," is also a minority Byzantine reading (K 017, 9th century; M 021, 9th century; U 030, 9th century; Origen, & Eusebius).

Origen certainly seems to have done a good deal of fiddling'n'fuddling here at Matt. 19:24b, for he not only refers to the TR's reading, but also appears to have given rise to not just one, but two variants. *Oh well, that's Origen for you!* Origen's *Variant 2* evidently appealed to the ancient Alexandrian School, for it is found in both leading Alexandrian texts, Codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. *Oh well, that's the Alexandrian School for you!* It has also appealed to some in the modern Neo-Alexandrian School, being adopted by both Westcott-Hort and Nestle's 21st edition. *Oh well, that's the Neo-Alexandrian School for you!* But on this occasion Origen was just "fiddling at the edges" in some supercilious and ridiculous way that appealed to his fancy, and the English translation remains the same. Thus the meaning remains at Matt. 19:24b, "eye" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 19:24c, the TR's "*dielthein* ('to go through' = 'to go,' active aorist infinitive, from *dierchomai* = *dia* / 'through' + *erchomai* / 'go')," which with the earlier "*dia* (through)" in the text, means, "to go (*dielthein*) through (*dia*)," is MBT (e.g., G 011, 9th century; S 028, 10th century; Lectionary 1968, 1544 A.D.; & Origen, d. 254), and with no good textual argument against it, correct. However, a variant, "*eiselthein* ('to go into' = 'to go,' active aorist infinitive, from *eiserchomai* = *eis* / 'into' + *erchomai* / 'go')," is a minority Byzantine (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionary 2378, & Origen).

Our two Sydney University Lectionaries divide over this reading. Hodges & Farstad's textual apparatus, which collates the data from the goldmine of very valuable and excellent textual information in von Soden's *Die Schriften* (1913), refers to it as a notable minority reading. Some three and a half centuries afore Hodges & Farstad (1985); Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) refers to the split, recording support for both the TR's reading (Gospel manuscripts: v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; L, Codex Leicestrensis), and variant (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8). And some 100 years before Elzevir (1624) we find that Erasmus (1516) followed the variant, whereas Erasmus (1522) and Stephanus (1550) followed the TR's reading.

On the one hand, Hodges & Farstad regard the Matt. 19:24 as a notable minority reading on the basis it is followed by their M-I group (von Soden's K-I group = Hodges & Farstad's M-I group), and also the Alexandrian's London Sinaiticus and mixed text type C 04. But on the other hand, Robinson & Pierpont make no reference to this variant, "*eiselthein*," and simply place the MBT (& TR) "*dielthein*" in their main text. Von Soden says the TR's reading is followed by the K group, other than for the variant's support in his Ki subgroup except for G 011 (Byzantine Text, 9th century, von Soden's ε

87).   But the entire Ki subgroup consists of just seven manuscripts, all Byzantine i.e., E 07 (ε 55), F 09 (ε 86), G 011 (ε 87), H 013 (ε 88), 44 (ε 239), 65 (ε 135), and 122 (δ 258). Von Soden's generally Byzantine K group contains 983 manuscripts of which 949 are Byzantine, with *c.* 914 being completely Byzantine, and *c.* 35 Byzantine only in parts. Thus these six Ki Byzantine manuscripts out of 914 manuscripts represent about 0.65% to 0.7%.   Therefore on this occasion I disagree and with Hodges & Farstad, and so I concur with Robinson & Pierpont that *this is not a notable minority reading*.

Origen's dual usage is here reflected in later Alexandrian text diversity.   The TR's reading is followed by one of the two main Alexandrian text's, Codex Vaticanus; and the variant is followed by the other one, Codex Sinaiticus.   This has split the neo-Alexandrians, so that the TR's reading is followed in the main text of the NU Text; whereas the variant is followed in the main text of Tischendorf's 8th ed., W-H, and Nestle's 21st ed. .   But either way, with the verse's earlier "*dia* (through)," the reading is still, "to go (*dielthein*, TR; *eiselthein*, W-H) through (*dia*)" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 19:28a, the TR's "*kathisesthe* ('ye shall sit,' indicative middle future, 2nd person plural verb, from *kathizo*)," is MBT (e.g., E 07, 8th century; K 017, 9th century), and surely correct.   However a minority Byzantine reading is, "*kathesesthe* ('ye shall sit,' indicative middle future, 2nd person plural verb, from *kathemai*)" (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042 read, "*kathesesthai*" = "*kathesesthe*"[65]).   The MBT reading is also found in e.g., the Western Text's D 05; whereas the minority Byzantine reading is also found in e.g., the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus & London Sinaiticus.   The correct reading is found in Tischendorf's 8th ed.; but the incorrect variant is found in W-H, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text.   Yet either way, the reading is still, "ye … shall sit" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 19:28b, after the TR's "*kathisesthe* (ye shall sit)," come the words, "*kai* (also) *umeis* ('you,' nominative, 2nd person plural personal pronoun, from *su*)," i.e., "ye also shall sit," with the "*umeis* (you)" redundant in English translation.   This is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Cyril of Alexandrian, Chrysostom, & Basil the Great) and surely correct.   However, a variant reading, "*kai* (also) *autoi* ('[your]selves,' masculine plural nominative, personal pronoun from *autos*)," i.e., "ye also shall sit," with the *autoi* ([your]selves)" redundant in English translation; is found in Origen and Ambrose.

The correct reading is also found in the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus; but the incorrect reading, probably originating from Origen's hand, is found in the Alexandrian Text's London Sinaiticus and Western Text's D 05.   The incorrect reading of London Sinaiticus is followed in Tischendorf's 8th ed. and Nestle's 21st ed., whereas Rome Vaticanus is followed by the NU Text.   While W-H place the correct reading of Rome Vaticanus in their main text, a footnote gives the incorrect reading of London Sinaiticus as an alternative.   But as both words are redundant in English translation, in either instance the reading remains, "ye also shall sit" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

---

[65]   See commentary at Matt. 10:8 (Vol.1) and Matt. 16:8b (Vol. 2).

At Matt. 19:29a, the TR's "*os* ('who,' masculine singular nominative, pronoun from *os* or with breathings, *hos*)," i.e., "that hath" (AV), is MBT (e.g., W 032) and correct. But "*ostis* ('who,' masculine singular nominative, pronoun from *ostis*)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042. This variant is also found in the two leading Alexandrian Texts and leading Western Text, and adopted in the NU Text *et al.* But this has no impact on English translation.

At Matt. 19:29d the TR's syncopated form, "*lepsetai* (indicative middle future, 3rd person singular verb, from *lambano*)" is MBT, and remains the same with the spelling variant in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian Texts and leading Western Text, "*lempsetai*" i.e., "shall receive." (Cf. Matt. 10:41, Appendix 3, Vol. 1, Matt. 1-14.)

At Matt. 20:10a, the TR's "*elthontes* (coming) *de* (But)," i.e., "But when … came" (AV), is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and certainly correct. The correct reading is found in the Alexandrian Text's London Sinaiticus (and followed in Tischendorf's 8th edition); whereas an erroneous variant, "*Kai* (And / But) *elthontes* (coming)," is found in the Alexandrian Texts' Rome Vaticanus and Western Text's D 05 (and followed in W-H, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text). While at Matt. 20:10a, "*kai*" is more likely to be rendered "And" (ASV & W-H), and "*de*" is more likely to be rendered "But" (AV & TR), both Greek words have sufficient elasticity to mean either (and other things e.g., "Now" in the ESV, or "So" in the TCNT & Moffatt). There is therefore no necessary difference in English translation between these two readings.

At Matt. 20:10b, the TR's "*pleiona* ('more,' neuter <u>plural</u> accusative, comparative adjective, masculine/feminine-neuter = *pleion-pleion*, from *polus*)," is MBT (e.g., E 07, 8th century; U 030, 9th century; Lectionary 2378, 11th century; Lectionary 1968, 1544 A.D.; & Chrysostom). But a minority Byzantine reading is "*pleion* ('more,' neuter <u>singular</u> accusative, comparative adjective *pleion*, from *polus*)" (Sigma 042 & N 022). W 032 uses an abbreviation at the end of the line, and so reads, "*plio~*". This comparative adjective can have an optional "i" (iota) i.e., *pleion* / *pleon*, and W 032 reflects the fact it could also have an optional "e" (epsilon) i.e., *pleion* / *plion*.

Was this an accidental change? Swanson claims the reading of W 032 here is "*plion*" (*pleion*)[66]. Was it due to different interpretations of the abbreviation "*plio~*" or "*pleio~*", that diversity arose between "*pleiona*" (plural) and "*pleion*" (singular)?

Was it a deliberate change? At Matt. 20:10c, the next word, "*lepsontai* ('they will receive' = 'they should have received,' AV)," is MBT (e.g., E 07, U 030, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968); whereas a minority Byzantine reading is "*lempsontai* (they

---

[66] Swanson, R., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, England, UK, 1995, St. Matthew's Gospel, p. 191.

will receive)" (W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022). The Greek "*l̲empsontai* / *l̲epsontai* (indicative middle future, 3rd person plural verb)," is from *lamban̲o*. For the future tense, the "rule" is that from the "*lab*" stem, the "a" (alpha, α) lengthens to become an "*e̲*" (eta, η), and a "m" (mu, μ) is added, with the "b" (beta, β) joining up with the "s" (sigma, σ) of the tense formative to become "ps" (psi, ψ) i.e., *l̲empsomai* (λημψομαι). However, it is clear that those following the MBT reading do not consider that the "m" (mu, μ) must be added, and hence the reading of "*l̲epsontai*" rather than "*l̲empsontai*."

This diversity touches on an interesting abstract question of Greek grammar theory, "Who determines if the 'm' (mu) should or should not be added anyway?" I.e., while it is possible to say that a particular rule of Greek (or Latin) grammar is either the common form or the more common form, (possibly qualified with respect to a given time and / or location,) who is to say that the minority grammatical form (which may or may not have been the common form in another given time and / or another location), is either "right" or "wrong" Greek (or Latin) grammar? In saying this, I do not wish to deny that movement to standard forms of spelling, or at least very similar spellings, and acceptance of a standard declension for a given word, are ultimately desirable for the purposes of communication, and avoid a good deal of confusion that may otherwise ensue[67].

It is notable that where the reading is the one letter longer with, "*pleiona* (more)," at Matt. 20:10b, the next word is usually the reading one letter shorter, "*l̲epsontai* (they will receive)," at Matt. 20:10c. This is the pattern found in the MBT & TR (e.g., E 07 & U 030). But where the reading is one letter shorter with, "*pleion* (more)," at Matt. 20:10b, the next word is usually one letter longer, "*l̲empsontai* (they will receive)," at Matt. 20:10c. This is the pattern found in the minority Byzantine reading in Sigma 042 & N 022. Outside the closed class of sources a similar general pattern emerges, with the reading "*pleiona* (more) *l̲epsontai* (they will receive)," occurring in London Sinaiticus; and the reading, "*pleion* (more) *l̲empsontai* (they will receive)," occurring in Rome Vaticanus and C 04 (and adopted in W-H, Nestle's 21st ed., & NU Text). Yet this tendency is not absolute, since we find the two longer forms in the reading of Minuscule 33, "*pleiona* (more) *l̲empsontai* (they will receive)" (adopted in Tischendorf's 8th ed.).

Therefore, following the general pattern of these readings, is it possible that scribes first "corrected" the reading "*l̲epsontai* (they will receive)," to "*l̲empsontai* (they will receive)," by "scratching" / rubbing out the final "a" of "*pleiona*" and first two letters, "*l̲e*" of "*l̲epsontai*," and then in these three letter spaces, inserting, "*l̲em*"? Was their motivation, "better Greek grammar" as they understood it, considering that on the one hand, a "m" (mu) "had" to be added to form "*l̲empsontai*" rather than "*l̲epsontai*;" but on the other hand, Greek grammar would allow either a plural "*pleiona* (more)" or a singular "*pleion* (more)"? Was this "grammatical correction" then followed by subsequent scribes? If so, is Minuscule 33 a conflation of the two? Or is Minuscule 33 an independent addition of the "m" in "*l̲empsontai*" by a copyist scribe, who retained the

---

[67] Cf. my comments in Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), both on the Greek, *eleos*, in Appendix 2, "The Definite Article," subsection b, "The Definite Article and *eleos*;" and also on the Latin, *fructus*, at Matt. 3:8 in main commentary.

"*pleiona* (more)" either because he was copying it out from a manuscript reading, "*pleiona* (more) *lepsontai* (they will receive)," or because there was enough space on a manuscript to "correct" the "*le̲psontai*," (e.g., if the "*le̲* came at the end of a line, before the "*psontai*" of the next line, the "m" might be more easily added in)?

Were these changes at Matt. 20:10b and Matt. 20:10c deliberate or accidental. Were they related to each other, or did they arise as autonomous and unconnected variants? However one resolves these questions, it will make no difference to English translation, which will remain, "that (*oti*) they should have received (*le̲psontai*, TR / *le̲mpsontai*, variant) more (*pleiona*, TR / *pleion*, variant)."

At Matt. 20:10d the TR's words, "*kai* ('and,' word 1) *elabon* ('they received,' word 2) *kai* ('also,' word 3 = 'likewise,' AV) *autoi* ('[them]selves,' word 4, masculine gender = 'man,' AV) *ana* ('each,' word 5, preposition + accusative = distributive usage, hence 'every,' AV) *de̲narion* ('a denarius,' word 6, neuter singular <u>accusative</u> noun, from *de̲narion* = 'a penny,' AV)," i.e., "and they likewise received every man a penny" (AV), are MBT (e.g., W 032, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968[68]), and with no good textual argument against it, correct. However, *Variant 1* is a minority Byzantine reading, "*kai* ('and,' word 1) *elabon* ('they received,' word 2) *kai* ('likewise,' word 3) *autoi* ('[them]selves,' word 5 = 'man') *to* ('the,' added word 4b) *ana* ('each,' word 5) *de̲narion* ('a penny,' word 6)" (Sigma 042 & N 022). This scribal addition of the definite article for "*de̲narion*" has no impact on English translation; and is followed outside the closed class of sources by e.g., C 04, L 019, Z 035, & Theta 038 (cf. commentary at Matt. 6:34 on Theta 038).

Also outside the closed class of sources are the two leading Alexandrian Texts. One of these, London Sinaiticus, reads, "*kai* ('and,' word 1) *elabon* ('they received,' word 2) *to* ('the,' added word 4b) *ana* ('each,' word 5) *de̲narion* ('a penny,' word 6) *kai* ('likewise,' word 3) *autoi* ('[them]selves,' word 5 = 'man');" and the other, Rome Vaticanus, reads, "*kai* ('and,' word 1) *elabon* ('they received,' word 2) *ana* ('each,' word 5) *de̲narion* ('a penny,' word 6) *kai* ('likewise,' word 3) *autoi* ('[them]selves,' word 5 = 'man')." Both Alexandrian texts are thus the same, except for the conflated addition of "*to* ('the,' added word 4b)" in London Sinaiticus. Does this indicate both were working from different manuscript lines, or was this a London Sinaiticus conflation (perhaps reflecting a tendency for conflationists to add here). The split between these two texts has somewhat predictably baffled the neo-Alexandrians. With similar general predictability, Tischendorf followed London Sinaiticus; and at least on this occasion, Nestles' 21s t edition followed Tischendorf. But Westcott-Hort and the NU Text's Kurt Aland & Bruce Metzger *et al* were not so sure. After all, when one is really just following these two texts, and most of the other textual references are largely "padding," what are those with no real skill of textual analysis meant to do anyway? The "final solution" for both W-H & the NU Text was pitifully the same, as setting aside the hundreds and thousands of good Byzantine texts here at Matt. 20:10d, and hamstrung by two faulty Alexandrian texts, they both put "the conundrum" of "*to*" in square brackets,

---

[68] For word 6, Lectionary 1968 here (but not at vs. 9), reads, "*deinarion*."

i.e., making its adoption or omission entirely optional.

On Manuscript Washington, a bit of a mark between the final "O" and "I" of "AYTOI" (*autoi*, word 5), joins the top of the "O" to the bottom of the "I," so that on a quick glance, it might be mistaken for as "ON". Did bumbling and stumbling Alexandrian scribes, not once, but twice, get confused with a similar type of marking, and by ellipsis jump from the "ON" ending of "ELABON" (word 2) to what they thought was the "ON ending" of "AYTON," thus removing words 2 and 3; and the suddenly realizing their mistake, add it back in later? Or did both, wishing to curiously contort the text by making a "stylistic improvement" in harmony with their own sentiments of *a greater emphasis on the money* (Exod. 20:17; I Tim. 6:10), decide to "move forwards" the "key words" of "*ana* ('each,' word 5) *denarion* ('a penny,' word 6)"?

At the end of the day, these alterations here at Matt. 20:10d in the Alexandrian, neo-Alexandrian, and other non-MBT texts, have no impact on English translation. Though the Alexandrians and neo-Alexandrians may have wanted to "run with the money," this sentiment does not really come across in the English translations, which on any of these reading will still be, "and they likewise received every man a penny" (AV).

At Matt. 20:12a, the TR's "*oti* (that)," after "*legontes* (saying)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, & Origen) and correct. But in another reading, it is omitted by Origen, and the erroneous variant is then followed by the two leading Alexandrian Texts and leading Western Text, being then found in the NU Text *et al*. However, under the rule of *oti recitativum*, the "*oti* (that)," is not translated because it introduces a *direct discourse* starting with "*Outoi* (These)"[69]. Thus either way the English translation is, "saying, These" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 20:12b, the TR's "*emin* ('unto us,' word 1) *autous* ('them,' word 2, masculine accusative, 3rd person plural pronoun, from *autos*)," i.e., "*them* equal *unto us*" (AV), is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, Lectionary 1968); and this word order is also found in the minority Byzantine variant, "*emin* ('unto us,' word 1) *eautous* ('them,' word 2a, masculine accusative, 3rd person plural pronoun, from *eautos*)" (Lectionary 2378). Though the correct word order is retained in the Alexandrian text's Rome Vaticanus; this is changed to word order 2,1 in the Alexandrian text's London Sinaiticus and Western text's D 05. Thus the neo-Alexandrians split, with the correct word order of 1,2 found in W-H & Nestle's 21st ed., and the incorrect word order of 2,1 found in Tischendorf's 8th ed. & the NU Text. But the matter has no impact on English translation.

Matt. 20:13, Matt. 20:15b, Matt. 20:32a, and Matt. 20:33, will first be considered, then discussed together. At Matt. 20:13, the TR's "*eipen* ('he answered,' word 1) *eni* ('one,' word 2) *auton* ('of them,' word 3)," is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). But following the Alexandrian Text's London Sinaiticus and Western Text's D 05, this

---

[69] Young's *Greek*, p. 190.

becomes Word order 2,3,1, in the NU Text *et al.* At Matt. 20:15b, the TR's "*poiesai* ('to do,' word 1) *o* ('what,' word 2) *thelo* ('I will,' word 3)," is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). But following the two leading Alexandrian texts and leading Western Text, this changes to word order 2,3,1 in the NU Text *et al.* At Matt. 20:32a the TR's definite article, "*o*" before "*Iesous* (Jesus)," is MBT (e.g., in both instances abbreviating the following "*Iesous*" / "ιηϲουϲ" to "ιϲ" with a bar on top, in Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). However, the "*o*" is omitted in Rome Vaticanus but not in London Sinaiticus; and so it is placed in square brackets as "optional" by W-H.

At Matt. 20:33, the TR's "*anoichthosin* ('may be opened,' word 1) *emon* ('of us' = 'our,' word 2) *oi* ('the,' word 3, redundant in translation) *ophthalmoi* ('eyes,' word 4)," i.e., "our eyes may be opened" (AV), is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 2378); and this word order is also found in a minority Byzantine reading which changes word 2, *emon* ('of us,' 1st person plural, genitive personal pronoun, from *ego-emeis*) to "*umon* ('of you,' 1st person plural, genitive personal pronoun, from *su-umeis*)" (e.g., Lectionary 1968). But following the two leading Alexandrian texts (of which London Sinaiticus also changes word 2 to "*umon*[70]*,*") and leading Western Text, this changes to word order 1,3,4,2 in the NU Text *et al.*

Matt. 20:13, Matt. 20:15b, Matt. 20:32a, and Matt. 20:33, are four instructive examples for us to consider. To some extent the square brackets in W-H at Matt. 20:32 show the confusion that can arise in neo-Alexandrian's minds when the two major Alexandrian texts are in disagreement. But given that the other neo-Alexandrian texts do not follow W-H here, it also shows how for most neo-Alexandrians, the presence of "external" support can be important, since other manuscripts generally include the "*o*" (Matt. 20:32a). Thus we see how Westcott & Hort were even more strongly influenced than certainly most later neo-Alexandrians by their idea that in the Alexandrian Text one could locate a "neutral" text," so that if their particularly "neutral" text of Codex *Vaticanus* was in agreement with their lesser "neutral" text of *Codex Sinaiticus*, they generally considered they had achieved a so called "neutral" text. For whereas Tischendorf favoured *Codex Sinaiticus*, Westcott & Hort favoured *Codex Vaticanus*. Though this basic idea of the Alexandrian Text being "neutral," minimally modified, still very largely remains with the neo-Alexandrians; most would no longer use such bellicose language as "neutral" text, and would admit some relatively small but still greater degree of error in it than would Westcott & Hort.

At Matt. 20:33, the reading "*umon* (of you)" i.e., "your eyes," would be followed by neither neo-Byzantines as a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Lectionary 1968), nor neo-Alexandrians as one of the two main Alexandrian Text's readings (London Sinaiticus). This reminds us that such an obvious error is apparent even to the neo-Alexandrians, whose abilities in textual analysis are not usually as bad as those of Westcott & Hort, but more generally, are intermediate. (Although on this occasion, not even W &H gave this as an alternative reading in their side-margin.)

---

[70] Cf. commentary at Matt. 18:14 (Variant 1).

Matt. 20:13, Matt. 20:15b, Matt. 20:32a, and Matt. 20:33b, are also instructive in relation to questions of corrupt shorter texts.   Matt. 20:13 here shows how by some probable confusion in the scribe's mind between the "*en*" of "*eipen*" and "*eni*," word 1 was first omitted, and then realizing his error, added back in by the scribe.   Or Matt. 20:15b and Matt. 20:32a here shows how for no apparent reason, a short word can be missed and drop out of the text; in the case of "*poiesai*" (Matt. 20:15b) it was then added back in when the scribe realized his error; but in the case of "*o*" (Matt. 20:32a) the lesser scribe of Rome Vaticanus did not realize his error.   And Matt. 20:33b probably shows us how word 2 was lost by an ellipsis on the "n" endings of "*anoichthosin*" and "*emon*," and then added back in by the scribe after word 4.   *What of the times when a scribe did not realize his error?   This was a one way track to a shorter text!*

At Matt. 20:15a the TR's "*e*" at the beginning of the verse is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968).   This correct reading is followed by one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus; but it is omitted in the other leading Alexandrian text, Rome Vaticanus.   As is usually the case when their two leading Alexandrian texts differ, this caused confusions and frustrations among the neo-Alexandrians.   On the one hand, the reading could claim "external support" (i.e., outside the Alexandrian Texts) from the "Caesarean" text type ("Pre-Caesarean": Family 1 & Family 13; and "Caesarean Proper": Theta 038); and it was adopted in Tischendorf's 8th ed. .   But on the other hand, neo-Alexandrians generally consider "the shorter reading is the better reading," and the omission could also claim "external support" from the Western text (D O5); and it was omitted in W-H and Nestle's 21st ed. .

Metzger and the NU Text Committee were therefore most unsure what to do; and Metzger noted that since both the previous word, "*soi* (unto thee)" (Matt. 20:14), as well as the "*e*" of Matt. 20:15a were pronounced "ee" in later Greek, scribes may have been more likely to drop out the word in transcription (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, pp. 50-1; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 41).   Hence the UBS & NU Text Committee decided to enclose the "*e*" in square brackets, i.e., making its use or non-use entirely optional.

The Greek *e* may be used to introduce either related or opposite alternatives[71]. When the alternatives are opposites, it may be easily rendered as "or;" and if context so allows, it may also be rendered "or" for a related alternative.   Here at Matt. 20:15a, it introduces a related alternative i.e., having first answered them in terms of Matt. 20:12-14, the good man then answers them in a related but different way in Matt. 20:15a.   Thus the idea is something like, "Or *to put it another way*."   This is generally regarded as too wordy for a literal word for word translation, with the consequence that it is generally becomes in such instances an untranslated Greek nuance.   Thus whether the "*e*" is or is not present, the translation at Matt. 20:15a will still be, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

---

[71]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 672.

At Matt. 20:20, the TR's "*par'* (*para* + genitive = 'from' / 'of') *autou* ('of him,' masculine singular <u>genitive</u> pronoun, from *autos*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, & St. Basil). The TR's reading is also found in the Alexandrian Text's London Sinaiticus, and adopted in Tischendorf's 8th ed. . But an erroneous variant found in the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus and Western Text's D 05, reads, "*ap'* (*apo* + genitive = 'from' / 'of') *autou* ('of him,' genitive);" and is adopted in W-H, Nestle's 21st ed., & the NU Text. Either way the rendering is, "of him" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 20:22a, the TR's "*pinein* ('to drink,' active present infinitive, from *pino*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022); but a variant reading "*piein* ('to drink,' active aorist infinitive, from *pino*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (G 011, 9th century & Lectionary 673, 12th century). The variant is referred to in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) as being in 1 of his 8 selected manuscripts (Gospel manuscript: z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8); and this erroneous variant is also found in the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus. But either way, the rendering here will still be "to drink" in Christ's question, "Are ye able *to drink* of the cup that I shall drink of?" etc. . The variant is interesting for reminding us that the type of corruptions found in the Alexandrian Text's Rome Vaticanus were known in the 16th and 17th centuries. E.g., Erasmus knew of, and thought poorly of, Codex Vaticanus.

At Matt. 20:24 the TR's "*Kai* (And)" before "*akousantes* ('having heard' = 'when … heard [it],' AV)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022). Though the reading is also followed in the two leading Alexandrian Texts, a later "corrector" of London Sinaiticus made this "*akousantes* (when … heard [it]) *de* (and)." Seemingly influenced by factors such as its usage by Origen; its "diverse" witness in what some classify as "Caesarean" Texts (Minuscules 13 & 28), a later Alexandrian "corrector" of Codex Sinaiticus, and an earlier independent text type such as Z 035 (6th century); the erroneous variant was adopted in Tischendorf's 8th edition and Nestle's 21st edition, but not in W-H or the NU Text. Though a quirky alteration to make, (not that there is ever a good reason to change the Word of God,) probably originating with Origen, that even a number of neo-Alexandrians have not wanted to adopt, if it is followed as by the neo-Alexandrians Tischendorf and Nestle, the reading still remains, "And."

At Matt. 20:27a Scrivener's "*os ean* (whosoever)" (e.g., Sigma 042 & N 022) is found in both Robinson & Pierpont's and Hodges & Farstad's von Soden based majority texts. However on this issue of optional letters one must be cautious in using von Soden, even though in this particular instance von Soden's textual apparatus shows the absence of the "*e*" as a minority reading. The alternative Byzantine reading (W 032); also found in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts, reads "*os an* (whosoever)." But the matter is of no consequence to the meaning in Greek or English.

At Matt. 20:30b,31b, we are reminded of the difficulties of unravelling continuous script manuscripts which use such abbreviations as "*dad*" (Matt. 20:30b,31b, with a line over the "*a*" in Lectionary 1968), "*Dad*" (Matt. 20:30b, with a line over the "*a*" in Lectionary 2378), and "*DaD*" (Matt. 20:31b, with a line over the "*a*" in Lectionary 2378) for "David." This is found as "*Dabid*" (Scrivener and Hodges & Farstad) and "*Dauid*"

(Robinson & Pierpont and NU Text).

At Matt. 20:33 the TR's "*anoichthosin* ('may be opened,' subjunctive passive aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *anoigo*, declined through the passive aorist form, *anoichthen*)" is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). But a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscule 1010), also found in the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian texts and leading Western text, changes this to "*anoigosin* (subjunctive passive aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *anoigo*)." Either way, the reading means the same in the Greek and remains, "may be opened" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 20:34a the TR's "*ton* ('the,' word 1, masculine plural genitive definite article, from *o*) *ophthalmon* ('eyes,' word 2, masculine plural genitive noun, from *ophthalmos*)" is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). But following the Alexandrian text's Rome Vaticanus and leading Western text, this is changed in the NU Text *et al* to "*ton* ('the,' word 1a, neuter plural genitive definite article, from *to*) *ommaton* ('eyes,' word 2a, neuter plural genitive noun, from *omma*)." Either way, the rendering is still "eyes" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

**Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E (Matt. 15-20).**
*(An asterisk \* after the rating in bold print indicates that the TR's reading is something other than the Majority Byzantine Text e.g., the Majority Byzantine Text might be fairly evenly split between two readings.)*

Matt. 15:2     {A}
Matt. 15:4a    {B}
**Matt. 15:4b   {B}\***
Matt. 15:6a    {A}
Matt. 15:6b    {B}
Matt. 15:6c    {A}
Matt. 15:6d    {A}
Matt. 15:8     {B}
Matt. 15:9     {A}
Matt. 15:12a   {A}
Matt. 15:14a   {A}
Matt. 15:15    {A}
Matt. 15:16    {B}
Matt. 15:17    {B}
Matt. 15:22a   {B}
Matt. 15:22b   {A}
Matt. 15:22c   {A}
**Matt. 15:25    {B}\***
Matt. 15:26    {B}
Matt. 15:30b   {B}
Matt. 15:31b   {B}
Matt. 15:31c   {A}
Matt. 15:33    {B}
Matt. 15:35,
& 15:36a    {A}
Matt. 15:36c   {A}
Matt. 15:36d   {A}
Matt. 15:36e   {A}
Matt. 15:38    {A}
Matt. 15:39b   {B}
Matt. 16:2,3   {B}
Matt. 16:4     {A}
Matt. 16:5     {A}
Matt. 16:8a    {B}
Matt. 16:8b    {A}
Matt. 16:11b   {A}
Matt. 16:12    {A}
Matt. 16:13    {B}
Matt. 16:19a   {A}
Matt. 16:20a   {A}
Matt. 16:20b   {A}

Matt. 16:20c {B}
Matt. 16:21 {A}
Matt. 16:26 {A}
Matt. 17:2b {B}
Matt. 17:3 {A}
Matt. 17:4 {B}
Matt. 17:8 {A}
Matt. 17:10 {B}
Matt. 17:11a {B}
Matt. 17:11b {B}
Matt. 17:11c {B}
Matt. 17:15 {A}
Matt. 17:20a {B}
Matt. 17:20b {A}
Matt. 17:21 {A}
Matt. 17:22 {A}
Matt. 17:25 {A}
Matt. 17:26 {B}
Matt. 18:2 {A}
**Matt. 18:6 {B}\***
Matt. 18:7a {A}
Matt. 18:7b {A}
Matt. 18:8 {B}
Matt. 18:11 {A}
Matt. 18:14 {A}
Matt. 18:15a {A}
Matt. 18:15b {A}
**Matt. 18:19a {B}\***
Matt. 18:21 {A}
Matt. 18:26a {B}
Matt. 18:26b {B}
Matt. 18:28a {B}
Matt. 18:29a {B}
**Matt. 18:29b {B}\***
Matt. 18:34b {B}
Matt. 18:35b {B}
Matt. 19:3a {A}
Matt. 19:3b {B}
Matt. 19:3c {A}
Matt. 19:4a {A}
**Matt. 19:5b {D}\***
Matt. 19:7 {B}
Matt. 19:9b {A}
Matt. 19:9c {A}
Matt. 19:10 {A}
Matt. 19:11 {A}

Matt. 19:14     {A}
Matt. 19:16b    {A}
Matt. 19:17a    {A}
Matt. 19:18     {A}
**Matt. 19:19    {C}\***
Matt. 19:20     {A}
Matt. 19:22     {A}
Matt. 19:25     {B}
Matt. 19:29b    {A}
Matt. 19:29c    {A}
Matt. 20:5a     {A}
Matt. 20:6a     {A}
Matt. 20:6b     {A}
Matt. 20:7      {A}
Matt. 20:15c    {A}
Matt. 20:16     {A}
Matt. 20:17a    {A}
Matt. 20:17b    {A}
Matt. 20:17c    {A}
Matt. 20:19     {A}
Matt. 20:21
Component 1  {A}
Component 2  {B}
Matt. 20:22b,
20:22c; 20:23b
**Component 1 {C}\***
Component 2  {B}
Component 3  {B}
Matt. 20:23a    {B}
Matt. 20:23c    {B}
Matt. 20:23d    {A}
Matt. 20:26a    {B}
Matt. 20:26b    {A}
Matt. 20:26c &
Matt. 20:27b
**Component 1 {B}\***
Component 2  {B}
Matt. 20:30a    {A}
Matt. 20:31a    {A}
Matt. 20:34b    {A}

**Appendix 5: DEDICATION SERMON.**   (Oral recorded form presently available at www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible .)

      **A Sermon preached for Dedication of Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20) on 5 November (Bonfire Day), 2009, at Mangrove Mountain Union Church, Mangrove Mountain (just north of Sydney, near Gosford), New South Wales, Australia.**

      In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen.   *Let us pray.*   Heavenly Father, who on this day in 1605 didst thwart a Popish plot to blow up the Protestant King and Parliament by gunpowder, graciously preserving King James and others from premature death; and didst further preserve the Protestant faith from Popery when in 1688 though didst bring William of Orange to England's shores in order to be king, we thank thee that by these acts thou didst preserve the Protestant Crown, and we thank thee that this Protestant Crown is set over us here in Australia to this very day with Queen Elizabeth the Second, Supreme Governor of the Church of England, and Defender of the Faith.   But more than this, O Lord, we thank thee that thou didst preserve thy holy Word unto us, that in the Received Text of Holy Scripture we have thy pure words, and we thank thee too, O Lord, for the King James Version in our own mother tongue.   For these, and all thy great blessings, O Lord, we thank thee, and ask thee to guide our thoughts and minds in this service today, through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost be all honour and glory, world without end.   *Amen.*

      Let me start by thanking Alex Neil, who is conducting the service today, and who is a Free Presbyterian Elder in the Hawkesbury-Nepean Congregation of western Sydney, in the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia.*   This is a non-denominational Christian service here at Mangrove Mountain Union Church, although, it is a strongly Protestant, Bible based, and Bible believing service; and no doubt my Reformed Anglican bias will at times emerge.   Although I did not come to this white wooden church in these beautiful parts of Mangrove Mountain from Sydney by this route today, I sometimes drive in my car through Mangrove Mountain via Wiseman's Ferry.   When doing so, as one comes off the car ferry, a sign pointing to the left says, "St. Albans," and another to the right on Wiseman's Ferry Road to "Gosford" is for Mangrove Mountain.   This New South Wales "St. Alban's" is named after the English St. Albans, and St. Alban is the first recorded Christian martyr in the British Isles about 303 A.D. .   He has a black letter day on 17 June in the 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer.*   Given that the Bishop of Rome first expanded his power beyond being just one of a number of other local bishops, when *later in that same century*, long after St. Alban's martyrdom, under Constantine the Great the Bishop of Rome became one of first four, and then five patriarchs, means that St. Alban reminds us that Christianity came to the British Isles *long before the Roman Church arrived there*!   He reminds us of how, over time, the Roman Church came to encroach on the Church of the British Isles; how these churches' freedom was again recovered at the time of the Reformation started under King Henry the Eighth; and how the freedom of the Protestant Churches of the British Isles was then defended against

attempts by Popery to enslave it again in, for example, 1605 and 1688.

Today's sermon may be divide into two main parts. Firstly, I want to discuss my textual commentary on the Received Text of the Authorized King James Version, which can be found on the internet at www.easy.com.au/~gmbooks/ or if you forget that address, type in three words with a space between each word on Yahoo or Google, "Gavin McGrath Books", and you'll get it at my website. And then the second matter I wish to discuss in this sermon is the fact that this second volume of Matt. 15 to 20 is being dedicated today, on the 5th of November, *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, 2009.

When it comes to Scriptural verses on the Divine *Inspiration* of Holy Scripture, I generally find that Protestants can point fairly readily to some key passages, such as II Tim. 3:16, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness;" or II Peter 1:20,21, "no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." But when it comes to the Divine *Preservation* of Holy Scripture, a number of these same Protestants start to fumble, and get blank looks on their faces. They know, and believe in the Divine *Inspiration* of Scripture; but they're not really familiar with the Biblical teaching of the Divine *Preservation* of Scripture.

Let me say that the Divine Inspiration of Scripture, and the Divine Preservation of Scripture, are the two sides of the one coin. You can't have one, without the other. There's no point in saying that you believe in the Divine Inspiration of Scripture. There's no point in saying that you believe God spake infallibly; if you must then qualify it by saying, "But we've lost the record of what he once said," or "Though God spake infallibly, we're not really sure just what he said, maybe Christ said the words of John 8:7,10, & 11; maybe the story of John 7:53 to 8:11 is true, and maybe it's not, we just don't know." You see, if we say that we believe in the Divine Inspiration of, for example, St. John's Gospel; but then we have to qualify it by saying that we don't know if the thing has been preserved, so we don't know if John 7:53 to 8:11 is or is not part of it; then our doctrine of the Divine Inspiration of Scripture is greatly devalued. I say again, the Divine Inspiration of Scripture and the Divine Preservation of Scripture are the two sides to the one coin. You can't have one, without the other. And as one who believes in both, let me add that I for one do not doubt that John 7:53 to 8:11 is indeed part of the Divinely inspired, and Divinely preserved, *Gospel According to St. John*.

So let's then consider some of the Bible verses dealing with the Divine Preservation of Holy Writ. There's no verse more important, than one which is a quotation of Isaiah 40:8, found in I Peter 1:25. Here in I Peter 1:25, the holy Apostle, St. Peter says, "But the Word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." Note carefully those words. Does it say, "the Word of the Lord endureth *for a while, but then it may get lost*"? Oh no my friends, it says, "the Word of the Lord *endureth for ever*." Does it say, "the Word of the Lord endureth *for a season and a time, but then it may become obscured for many centuries, but do not fear, for two texts from Alexandria lie hidden in dark corners, and after a thousand or so*

*years, somebody will surely find them, and then you will get the Word of God back again*"?   Oh no my friends, it says, "the Word of the Lord *endureth for ever*."

You see, the Word of God was never lost, it was always there!   And any person called and gifted by God as a teacher of the Received Text, at any time, after the original Old Testament or New Testament words were written, could compose the Received Text of the Old Testament or New Testament, such as we now find it in our King James Versions of the Bible.   Turn with me in your King James Bibles to Matthew 5:18.   Does your Bible say, "Till heaven and earth pass, *many jots and many tittles shall pass from the law, but don't worry about it, because you'll still be able to pick up the general drift of it*"?   Well my King James Bible doesn't say anything like that!   My Authorized Version says, "Till heaven and earth pass, *one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law*."   And that, my friends, is the doctrine of the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture, from the lips of our blessed Lord and Saviour.

Indeed, turn with now in the Infallible Book to Matthew 24:35.   That's the Gospel According to St. Matthew, chapter 24, and verse 35.   Here our Lord says, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."   And once again my friends, that is the doctrine of the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture.   Jesus does not say that his words may be lost, such as those of Mark 16:15 & 16, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," meaning "every" type of human "creature," that is, Jews and Gentiles, white people and coloured people, males and females, rich and poor, old and young, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.   He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

Therefore, when we pick up various neo-Alexandrian versions, which either omit Mark 16:9-20, such as Revised Standard Versions' first edition of 1946; or cast aspersions on it in a footnote, such as the Revised Standard Versions' second edition of 1971, or the Moffatt Bible which says Mark 16:9-20, "represents a couple of second century attempts to complete the gospel;" or the New American Standard Bible which puts it in square brackets, and says on its symbols page that such "brackets indicate words probably not in the original writings;" and similar kinds of things in the New Revised Standard Version of 1989, the English Standard Version of 2001, the New International Version's first edition of 1978 and second edition of 1984; and indeed in so many other new neo-Alexandrian versions based on the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus; when, I say, we pick up any of these versions that deny or cast doubts upon our Lord's words in Mark 16, we are picking up a version that fundamentally denies the teaching of Christ in Mark 13:31, "Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away."

Are we to believe Christ?   Or are we to believe these new neo-Alexandrian Versions, with neo-Alexandrian New Testament Greek texts composed by men like, for example, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, Nestle, Aland, or Metzger?   Well in the words of Joshua, found in the Old Testament Book of Joshua, chapter 24 and verse 15, "Choose you this day whom ye will serve," "but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord."

Now with respect to the New Testament Text, if we look to those texts that had general accessibility over time and through time, so that a man who in accordance with Ephesians 4:11 was called to be one of the "teachers" of the Received Text could get at them, we find that there were three broad classes of manuscripts. Firstly, there were the Byzantine Greek New Testament manuscripts, largely, though not entirely, circulating in Eastern Christendom. Then there were a second class of manuscripts, the Latin New Testament manuscripts, largely, though not entirely, circulating in Western Christendom. And then there were citations of the New Testament found in the writings of Church writers, both from ancient times and mediaeval times - especially early mediaeval times. And these three classes of manuscripts in fact form a closed class of sources for comprising the New Testament Received Text, because from these alone a suitably called and gifted teacher of the Received Text could compose the New Testament text at any time in the last 2,000 years, even though in practice, this was done more on a verse by verse basis until the Received Text was more formally composed in its entirety in the 16th and early 17th centuries. Anything else, for example, the Armenian Version, or Syriac Version, or Ethiopic Version, or Alexandrian School Greek texts, lacked this general accessibility over time and through time, and so are outside the closed class of these three sources. Hence we can't use these other manuscripts to compose the Received Text. We can look at them if we wish as a matter of interest, but we don't have to. We don't need them; and we certainly don't use them in order to compose the NT Received Text. To this, there is only one *prima facie* exception, namely the Western Greek Text, which did have accessibility. But it is a clearly corrupt and conflated text, and so it was rightly rejected by the great neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the 16th and 17th centuries, such as Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs.

And so it is that the New Testament Received Text upon which our Authorized Versions are based, comes from the Greek and Latin texts, including citations of Scripture by the church writers. Now of course, the New Testament being written in Greek, means that *in the first instance* we always give the priority to the representative or majority Byzantine Greek Text. This is found in the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. The greatest compilation we have of Byzantine manuscripts is found in the 1913 work of the German Lutheran, Hermann von Soden, who had about 40 research assistants collate the data on virtually all Codices and Minuscules over a period of about 15 years. Von Soden's work is the best we've got, and the basis for both Robinson & Pierpont's and Hodges & Farstad's majority texts. The starting point of the representative or majority Byzantine Greek Text has been compiled for us in modern times by Robinson & Pierpont's work of 2005, based on the mainly Byzantine text manuscripts in von Soden's "K" group. This "K" group comprised of about 1,000 Greek manuscripts, and is representative of the larger again Byzantine Text. This text reaches generally the same result as Hodges & Farstad's Majority Text of 1985, which is based on even more of von Soden's texts, in what are known as his "I" and "K" groups. About two-thirds of this additional "I" group are exclusively Byzantine text, and about three-quarters of them are Byzantine in parts. In all there are about *c.* 500 manuscripts in von Soden's "I" group. And von Soden got about another 1,000 manuscripts in a multiplicity of smaller groups. So if Robinson and Pierpont's text is based on about 1,000

manuscripts, of which about 900 are exclusively Byzantine text, Hodges and Farstad's text is based on about 1,500 manuscripts, of which about 1,300 are exclusively Byzantine text. Therefore more than 85% of the texts used for Hodges & Farstad's Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and more than 90% of the texts used for Robinson & Pierpont's Majority Text are Byzantine Text. But both are generally the same and the representative or majority Byzantine text constitutes our starting point.

We only move away from this representative or majority Byzantine Greek Text if there is a clear and obvious textual problem with the Greek. If this occurs, we may adopt a minority Byzantine Greek reading, or a reading from the Latin textual tradition. If from the Latin, this is known as the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*. I say "servant" maxim, because the Latin is only ever used to remedy a textual problem in the Greek, so that the focus is always on the Greek. And any such textual problem may also be remedied through reference to Greek or Latin church writers. When this is done, there is a desire to show one or more ancient church writers in the Greek or Latin, such as the Greek church fathers and doctors, St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil the Great, or the Latin church fathers and doctors, such as St. Augustine of Hippo or St. Jerome. But mediaeval writers may also be consulted, especially early medieval writers such as the Latin church doctor, St. Gregory the Great. That in broad terms is how the Received Text is composed or defended, and that in broad terms is what my textual commentaries on the Received Text and Authorized King James Version are all about.

I'll presently leave some other details of my textual commentaries, Volume 1 of which is on Matthew 1 to 14, and Volume 2 of which is on Matthew 15 to 20, to the good Christian reader to study at his leisure and pleasure. But given that this is *Bonfire Day* or *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, I would nevertheless point out that the neo-Alexandrian's present NU Text, that is to say, "N" for the first letter of *Nestle-Aland's 27th edition* of 1993, and "U" for the first letter of the *United Bible Society's 4th revised edition* of 1993, this contemporary NU Text was composed by a Committee. And while the two best known names on that Committee are those of Kurt Aland and Bruce Metzger, there was also a Roman Catholic Cardinal on it, called Cardinal Martini. Now with these thoughts in mind, I read to you an excerpt from the second volume of my textual commentary, with part of what I say at Matthew 19:20.

> The pre-Vatican II old Latin Papists followed the correct reading in the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims, which reads at Matt. 19:20, "All these have I kept from my youth" (Douay-Rheims). But the post Vatican II new neo-Alexandrian Papists removed the words, "from my youth" (Douay-Rheims) or "from my youth up" (AV), reducing reference to them to a footnote in their Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles.

> We have come to sad days indeed, when we Protestants have to admit that here at Matt. 19:20, the old Latin Papists, basing their translation solely on the Latin, were more accurate than are the new neo-Alexandrian Papists who base their translation, as they say, "on the Greek." Those who claim "Rome has changed" in that since the Vatican II Council (1962-5) "she now uses the Greek"

in her *Revised Standard Version Catholic Edition* (1965), *Jerusalem Bible* (1966), and *New Jerusalem Bible* (1985), are sadly misguided. Since the Romish *Council of Trent* (1545-1563), the fight between Papist and Protestant was always between the Protestant's Greek *Textus Receptus* which recognizes that God providentially preserved both the Byzantine Greek and Latin, but that the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, must always be subject to the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*; and the Papist's claim that only the Latin has been providentially preserved, as they unnaturally elevated the servant maxim to the place of the master maxim. *Rome has not fundamentally changed.* She still does not recognize the Received Text of the New Testament. She simply attacks it in a different way in the post Vatican II Council era to how she attacked it in the post Trent Council era until the Vatican II Council.

Rome now joins up with the religiously liberal apostate Protestants who deny God's providential protection of the *Textus Receptus*, and joins them in their neo-Alexandrian folly. The Jesuits have sometimes been called, "The Pope's secret police." Indeed, so nefarious has their web of activities been, that at times even Popish countries have closed them down. E.g., Joseph I, King of Portugal (Regnal Years: 1750-1777), was a devoted Papist; and it was during his reign that the famous *Lisbon Earthquake* of 1755 occurred. But the Jesuits were unhappy with elements of his politics and wanted him out of the way. Following the *Tavoras Conspiracy* (1758-9) in Romish Portugal, Jesuits were found by the courts to have collaborated in a plot to kill the king, Joseph I, who was wounded, but survived the attack. A leading Jesuit, Malagrida, was executed. All Jesuits were then expelled from Portugal in 1759, and the Roman Catholic Jesuit Order was suppressed by state law. Let the reader note well the Popish name of a Jesuit, "Cardinal Martini," on the NU Text Committee that composed the contemporary NU Text (1993). This Jesuit is the Pope's man! This Jesuitry is the Papal finger in the NU Text pie!!

Well I hope that readers of my commentaries will be under no delusion as to the dangers posed by both Popery and its minion of Jesuitry, as much in 1605 when they were involved in the Gunpowder Treason Plot to blow up the Protestant King and Parliament of England; as when in 1758 and 1759 they tried to kill a Popish king of Portugal who got in their way, Jacob I; as much as today, when through Cardinal Martini they have been involved in helping to produce the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition and the United Bible Society's 4th revised edition. To which I can simply reply, that we Protestants want "No Jesuitry!" and "No Popery!!"

And all of that now brings me to discuss the second matter of today's sermon, to wit, the fact that this second volume of my textual commentaries on the Received Text, is being Dedicated to God, today, the 5th of November 2009, on what is called variously, *Bonfire Day*, or *Gunpowder Treason Day*, or *Papists' Conspiracy Day*.

Now by way of introduction let me say that my first Volume on Matthew 1 to 14, was dedicated on *King Charles Martyr's Day*, the 30th of January, 2008, and a revised

Volume 1, which, God willing, I shall discuss in more detail on 30 January 2010, is scheduled to be dedicated on *King Charles Martyr's Day* 2010. This is something of a complement to the dedication of this Volume 2 on Matthew 15 to 20 on *Papists' Conspiracy Day* 2009. That's because, the significance of *Bonfire Day* on 5 November, is broadly similar to the significance of *Charles I's Day* on 30 January. We Anglicans of the holy Reformed and Protestant faith, entirely repudiate the abuse and misuse made of *Charles I's Day* by the Puseyites. The significance of the two days is basically the same. In I Peter 2:17, the holy Apostle, St. Peter, says, "Fear God. Honour the King." And in Galatians 5:20 and 21, the holy Apostle, St. Paul says, that those engaged in "seditions" and "murders" "shall not inherit the kingdom of God."

Properly understood, both *Bonfire Day* and *Charles I's Day* celebrate the fact that we Protestants believe in the absolute authority of Holy Scripture. The English revolutionary Puritans, under Oliver Cromwell and the Scotsman, Samuel Rutherford, claimed that Scriptures such as Galatians 5:20,21 could be set aside on the basis of so called "natural law" or "reason," which in Rutherford's *Lex Rex* is regarded as a higher authority than these plain words of Scripture. In a methodology that compares to the religious liberalism of modern times, Cromwell and Rutherford claimed that if a king was what they regarded as a "tyrant," then the Word of God in such Biblical passages did not apply, and could be freely set aside. On this basis, they engaged in sedition against the Crown, established a Puritan republic in the 1640s and 1650s, and murdered the King, Charles I, by beheading him on 30 January 1649. Notwithstanding his admitted blemishes, imperfections, and various errors made during his reign, to the extent that Charles I died with steadfast Christian faith, upholding such Biblical truths as I Peter 2:17 and Gal. 5:20,21, he died for Christ, and so is remembered as a Christian martyr.

The English Puritan republican revolutionaries, though having some legitimate grievances, were nevertheless opposed in their wicked deeds of sedition against the Crown, both by Anglicans in England and Ireland, and also by the vast majority of Puritans in Scotland, who were mainly Presbyterians. Thus on *Charles I's Day*, as true Protestants we uphold the authority of the Bible against these extremist Puritans, and in doing so, I hasten to add that we Reformed Anglican Protestants have the historic support of better Puritan Protestants, such as the vast majority of those from Presbyterian Scotland at the time, the Puritan Presbyterian Scottish Parliament of the time, and likewise, better Puritan Protestants down to our own day and time. E.g., the Scottish Parliament continued to recognize Charles I as King till he was beheaded by Cromwell's regime in 1649, then contrary to the unconstitutional and so illegal ordinances of Cromwell's republic, the Scottish Presbyterian Parliament proclaimed Charles II King, and supplied him with Scottish troops. For instance, his troops in the Battle of Worcester, England, against Cromwell in 1651, were mainly Scottish Puritans; after which Charles II hid in the oak tree at Boscobel, which has historically been remembered on the date of the Restoration in 1660, 29 May, *Royal Oak Day*. Indeed, it was in conjunction with strong ongoing Protestant support for the monarchy in predominantly Presbyterian Scotland, and strong ongoing Protestant support for the monarchy in predominantly Anglican England, that God brought about the Restoration in 1660.

Now the basic reason we remember *Papists' Conspiracy Day* on 5 November is exactly the same fundamental reason.   You see, the Roman Catholics also claimed that they had a so called higher authority.   One that could likewise be used to set aside the clear words of Scripture in Galatians 5:20,21, that those who engaged in "seditions" and "murders" "shall not inherit the kingdom of God;" or the words of I Peter 2:17, that we should "Honour the King."   In the case of the Papists, their alleged "higher authority" was the Pope of Rome.   For example, the Papal Bull against Queen Elizabeth the First of 1570, and I shall leave out some words to focus on the relevant ones, said "the nobles, subjects and peoples [who]… have taken an oath … to her,  we declare to be absolved for ever from such oath … and we deprive the said Elizabeth of her pretended right to the realm … .   All who disobey our command we involve in the … sentence of anathema." Little wonder then that in the 1585 *Act against Jesuits*, we read that were enacted these key words, in which I shall again leave out some words to focus on the relevant ones, "all … Jesuits …shall … depart out of this realm of England, and out of all other Her Highness's realms and dominions."   And connected with these Papal claims to absolve subjects of their loyalty to the Crown, thereafter followed the Spanish Armada of 1588.

Now this is all relevant to the Gunpowder Treason Plot of 5 November 1605, because once again we find that Papists under Guy Fawkes, with the aid of Jesuitry, sought to kill the Protestant King, James the First of the King James Bible, and the Protestant Members of Parliament, in the hope of reintroducing Popery.   Therefore the reason we remember *Papists' Conspiracy Day* on 5 November, is because we believe in an authoritative Bible, and we repudiate the claims of the Papist conspirators and their supporters, that there is a so called "higher law" promulgated by the Pope of Rome, whereby the plain teaching of Scripture in passages such as Gal. 5:20,21 and I Peter 2:17 can be set aside on the Pope's say so.

Now as a New South Wales school teacher, I have the benefit of being like the Apostle Paul who was a leather worker that sometimes made tents, in that my job is portable.   And just as St. Paul could, as a citizen of the Roman Empire move about that Empire, so likewise, because I have a patrilineal English grandmother, I can live and work in the United Kingdom on a UK ancestry visa.   And so between 2001 and 2009, I have lived and worked for a total of about 3½ years in London, with 6 months here, 12 months there, and so on.   My last trip of about 6 months, was my fifth and possibly final trip to London, and was from September 2008 to March 2009.   On this last trip, I circumaviated the globe in a westwards direction from Sydney, to Singapore, to London, to North America, and then back to Sydney.   My primary reason for going to London on this occasion was to get copies of Greek and Latin manuscripts, mainly Latin ones from libraries in England, especially the British Library in London, for the purposes of my textual commentary on the Received Text.   But I also used the opportunity to travel around the UK, especially in the school holidays.

I undertook a trip around England in December 08 and January 09.   In January I visited Ashby St. Ledgers in Northhamptonshire.   Here next to the beautifully built sandstone St. Mary's *Church of England*, I saw an old Manor House.   Its buildings were well built from stone, and behind its stone fence were some attractive well kept lawns.

*But looks can be deceptive.* I found walking up the pathway to the Manor House the path was *very slippery* and at times hazardous. *It was starting to look a bit like some nightmare inducing horror film in which some kind of sinister black robed figure had put a slippery substance on the pathways so as to run out from the shadows and catch his unweary victims when they repeatedly slipped and fell!* The Manor House was attractive to behold. *But its looks were even more deceptive again. For in the history of this Northamptonshire Manor there once lurked a dark and shadowy secret … one that might send shivers down the spine!!* For it was here at this Manor, and with great audacity indeed for it was next to a *Protestant* Church, that according to tradition, in 1605 the Gunpowder Treason Plot Conspirators who were in cahoots with some black robed Jesuits, met to hatch their Popish plot to blow up the *Protestant* King James I and *Protestant* Members of Parliament. …

Earlier on this same trip, in December I visited a much more rosy and happy site. A MUCH MORE SUNNY SITE INDEED! For in December I had gone to Brixham in Devon. This is a port city. And in port at the time was a tall ship, a replica of the Golden Hinde that circumnavigated the globe in 1577 and 1588. And against the bright, shining, and glistening seaside, with this tall ship behind it, was a statue of King William III of Orange. The inscription read in part, "William … of Orange, … King of Great Britain & Ireland landed near this spot 5th November 1688 and issued his famous declaration 'THE  LIBERTIES OF ENGLAND AND THE PROTESTANT RELIGION I WILL MAINTAIN'." …

But there's another place I visited before this Christmas and New Year trip in England. Being a good Protestant, I thought I should keep Bonfire Day down at Lewes in Sussex. Now there's a lot I could say about Lewes, but I'll let the interested listener consider some further details in the Dedicatory Preface of my second Volume on Matthew 15-20. But I would mention, that by convention, the Anglican Bishop of Lewes is always an Evangelical. And I would also note that the Bonfire Celebrations I refer to were largely connected with the Cliffe Bonfire Society, which is easily the best of the Bonfire Societies at Lewes.

I arrived in Lewes from London, on Tuesday 4 November 2008, and stayed there till Thursday 6 November. The Bonfire Day celebrations at Lewes are particularly colourful. Notably some 17 Protestants were martyred at Lewes under the Roman Catholic Queen, Bloody Mary who reigned from 1556 to 1558. The Lewes Town Hall was, during the time of Bloody Mary, the site of the Star Inn and it now has a plaque reading, "In the vault beneath this building were imprisoned ten of the seventeen Protestant martyrs who were burned at the stake within a few yards of this site 1555-1557." Their names are inscribed on the Martyrs' Memorial at Cliffe Hill which I also saw. Lewes near the south coast of east England was a front-line spiritual battleground in the defence of Protestantism against Popery under Blood Mary. *Lewes is where a number of this world's little people, who were God's big people, took their stand for the Gospel of Jesus Christ as rightly recovered by the Protestant Reformation, and died as Christian martyrs between 1555 and 1557.*

And in this context, let me say that while the memory of Protestant saints and martyrs is a lot wider than the Marian Martyrs, nevertheless, as seen by Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, memory of the Marian Martyrs is at *the heart of the Protestant memory of martyrs*.    And whilst on the one hand, the Marian martyrs have by tradition been especially remembered in a larger corporate sense through reference to Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and Hooper; on the other hand, local Marian martyrs may have a greater local significance and be remembered on a local basis throughout different parts of Protestant England, and certainly we see this with the 17 Marian martyrs of Lewes.

On the Eve of Bonfire Day, after some colourful detonations of fireworks on the street, I saw the hoisting of a number of banners.   This included one with a picture of the Lewes Martyrs' Memorial on Cliffe Hill, with the names of the 17 Marian martyrs written out on it.   Then underneath these names the words, "PROTESTANT MARTYRS OF LEWES 1555-1557."   It also included the "NO POPERY" banner being hung amidst cheers.    All throughout Bonfire Day the banner bearing the words, "NO POPERY," flutters and curls in the wind, and flies sky high.    Indeed, I walked down Cliffe High Street the next day, that is, on Bonfire Day itself, to see all these banners in the day time, especially the "PROTESTANT MARTYRS OF LEWES" banner and the "NO POPERY" banner.

On Bonfire Night itself, the centre of the town was well and truly closed down in the Lewes shut-down.    Thousands and thousands of people had poured into Lewes, chocking the pavements next to its main street, which had to be kept free for the march. Police enforced silver metal barriers erected to keep people off the road for the marchers. Then the long awaited for processions of the various Bonfire Societies began.   Dressed in their different colours, wearing one of the seven guernsey colours of each Lewes Bonfire Society, they marched.   Some were pushing *blazing barrels*.  Fireworks were sometimes let off.

Fancy dress is also a part of the Lewes parade.   Thus the colourful procession continued on this 5 November 2008 Bonfire Night, including marchers with hand-held fiery torchlights.    Then came one of the Cliffe Bonfire Society groups carrying 17 blazing crosses, one for each of the 17 Protestant Marian martyrs killed at Lewes by the Papist Queen, Bloody Mary.   They marched back and forth over Cliffe Bridge, carrying these 17 blazing crosses high in the night air.   With a birds-eye view of the action on Cliffe Bridge, I was able with no other spectators in front of me, to see one of the highlights of the night, as those carrying the 17 crosses then individually walked up to edge of Cliffe Bridge, and threw their cross into the River Ouse.   Thus Lewes remembers her 17 Marian Martyrs on Papists' Conspiracy Day.

The procession continued with, for example, a banner reading, "NO POPERY;" and a reduced size replica of the Lewes Martyrs' Memorial to the 17 Protestant Marian Martyrs killed by the Papists.   With my birds-eye view of the action on Cliffe Bridge, I was able to clearly see a matter that relates to the words of the Bonfire Ditty about "the Pope,"   "Burn him in a tub of tar. Burn him like a blazing star." Surrounded by those carrying fiery hand-held torch-lights, a lane from the road to the very top of Cliffe

Bridge, with a ceremonial type-guard each side was formed, and the blazing barrel of tar was first carried up to the edge of the bridge, and then cast over the top of the bridge into the River Ouse.

After the procession, people move off to various Bonfire site's bonfires, and so I moved off to the Cliffe Bonfire Society's site.   At this sight there were effigies of the Pope and Guy Fawkes.   I shall divide these into "Bonfire 1," "Bonfire 2," and "Bonfire 3."

The first of these, had on top of a large bonfire whose wood spiralled up into the air, both a wooden effigy of the Pope and also "a Guy," that is, Guy Fawkes.   They were seated in chairs, with their backs tied to each other, so that the Pope looked one way and Guy Fawkes looked the other way.   This cone-shaped pile of wood rose about 3 or 4 yards / meters into the air.   I shall refer to this as "Bonfire 1."

There were two further much larger than life effigies.   As one faced the main part of the bonfire site, with Bonfire 1 to one's right, these were both to the left of Bonfire 1. One effigy, hereafter called, "Bonfire 2," was "a Guy."   It showed Guy Fawkes in his stereotypically tall black hat.   He was depicted holding a barrel of gunpowder on his right-hand shoulder.   He also had about a dozen barrels of gunpowder surrounding him. These artistically recalled the words of a Bonfire Day Ditty that refers to, "Three score barrels of powder."   In this ditty the words, "make the bells ring," reminds us that up until 1859 the bells of Anglican Churches rang out throughout the day.   Anglican bell ringers would *pull the rope on the Catherine wheel*, for St. Catherine is remembered in the 1662 Anglican prayer book on 25 November, and the tradition that she was martyred on a spiked wheel gave rise to an old English tradition, that when church bells were rung by a wheel and rope mechanism, these Catherine wheel bells *might* be used as a reminder of St. Catherine, the virgin and martyr.   Hence when one sees on Bonfire Night the lighting of "a Catherine wheel," the name of this firework to some extent continues the memory of bell ringing on this day.   One further element of this Ditty that I should explain is that even when there is a Queen on the throne, one always says, "God save the King," because the reference is to King James I of the King James Bible.   The ditty is:

> "Remember, remember the fifth of November,
> The gunpowder treason and plot,
> I know of no reason why the gunpowder treason,
> Should ever be forgot.
> Guy Fawkes, Guy Fawkes, 'twas his intent,
> To blow up the King and Parlia-ment.
> Three score barrels of powder below,
> Poor old England to overthrow:
> By God's Providence he was catch'd,
> With a dark lantern and burning match.
> Holloa boys, holloa boys, make the bells ring,
> Holloa boys, holloa boys, God save the King!
> Hip hip, Hoorah!    Hip hip, Hoorah!"

Then in between Bonfire 1 with the Pope and the Guy, and Bonfire 2 with the Guy, was a large effigy of the Pope. By tradition, effigies and pictures of the Pope used as part of the Bonfire Day Celebrations are of the Pope at the time of the 1605 Papists' Conspiracy, namely, Pope Paul V, who was Pope from May 1605 to 1621. The Pope here was depicted wearing a white mitre with red trimming, and a red stole. The depiction of Pope Paul V's face was most uncomplimentary to him. He was seated up in the air on a Papal throne. I shall hereafter refer to this as "Bonfire 3." As I shall later more fully explain, on the night, this effigy was relevant to the words of the Bonfire Day Ditty:

"A penny loaf to feed the Pope,"
"A faggot of sticks to burn him.
Burn him in a tub of tar.
Burn him like a blazing star.
Burn his body from his head.
Then we'll say 'old Pope is dead.'
Hip hip, Hoorah! Hip hip, Hoorah!

The Cliffe Bonfire Society made a total of about 5,700 torches, each about 2-3 feet long or about 60-90 cm long, for Bonfire Day in 2008; and Bonfire marchers arrived at the site carrying their hand-held fiery torchlights. As part of the fireworks display, at various times beautiful shells exploded in the sky. Spectators of which I joined in as one of them, were heard to call out, "NO POPERY!!!"

Then the main action started! First Bonfire 1 was lit with a hand-held fiery torchlight. The flames generated on this large cone-shaped pile of wood rising about 3 to 4 yards / metres into the air, acted to light up the life-size effigies of the Pope and Guy Fawkes seated in chairs on top of it. Bonfire 1 was geographically closest to the spectators, and the usage of these life-size figures acted to give it more of a "real-life" feel. That is to say, on Bonfire 1, one could almost think that the Pope and Guy Fawkes really were being burnt in the faggots for their sedition against the *Protestant* Crown in 1605. It took a good 15 minutes for Bonfire 1 to burn. The flames leapt gloriously and spectacularly into the air, generating great balls of fire, and lighting up both "the Pope" and "the Guy" on top of it. In the end, Bonfire 1 came crashing down on itself into the ground as all the wood had burnt up on it, and "the Pope" and "the Guy" had been burnt to a cinder.

Two blazing crosses were now lit that is, as symbols of martyrs, and allowed to burn. Bonfire 2, a wooden effigy of Guy Fawkes with a barrel of gunpowder on top of his right shoulder, and standing amidst barrels of gunpowder, was suddenly ignited. This was done as streams of sky rockets shot out from around "the Guy" in a V shape, firing a large "V" for *"Victory" over Guy Fawkes* into the air, and igniting "the Guy."

After "the Guy" had been burnt away, another blazing cross was lit.

Suddenly Bonfire 3 exploded into action exactly the same way as Bonfire 2 had done.   Sky-rockets shot up from the effigy of the Pope in a V shape, firing a large "V" for *"Victory" over the Pope* into the air, and igniting "the Pope" as he sat on his Papal Chair.   The Pope, with his two-horned papal mitre, was now very visible amidst the flames as he started to burn.   Shells exploded in the air as the Pope burnt on his Papal Chair.   A spectacular colour display of red and yellow flames occurred as more and more sky-rockets were fired from the Papal Chair in a large "V" shape.   And then … fireworks were ignited around the neck of the Pope, as balls of fire parallel with the ground went out from both sides of the Pope's neck, and then …, with a large "Bang" and explosion …, the head of the Pope was blown off from the rest of his body.

This colourful blasting of the Pope's head from off his body, thus recalled the words, "Burn his body from his head," in the Bonfire Day Ditty:

"A penny loaf to feed the Pope, …
A faggot of sticks to burn him.
Burn him in a tub of tar,
Burn him like a blazing star.
*Burn his body from his head.*
Then we'll say 'old Pope is dead.'
Hip hip, Hoorah!   Hip hip, Hoorah!

This burning of "the Pope," in which, in effigy, a bonfire will "Burn his body from his head," is the climax of the three bonfires.   Thereafter, the nigh-sky exploded with sky-rockets and shells, in a series of spectacularly colourful displays.

*I thanked God then, as I thank him now, for the privilege of being able to attend the Bonfire Day celebrations on both the Eve of Bonfire Day and also Bonfire Night at Lewes in 2008.   These pro-Protestant and anti-Papist celebrations capture the spirit of Papists' Conspiracy Day, and while I would not condone all that I saw or heard at Lewes, nevertheless, in broad terms the Lewes Bonfire Day celebrations are a pointer in the right direction as to how Bonfire Day should be kept in its public celebratory form.*

May God give us Protestants grace that we never forget our Protestant heritage.  Let us be thankful for the fact that Jesus Christ died in our place, and for our sins on the cross, before he rose again the third day.   Let us ever be mindful that our salvation is accomplished by God's grace alone, that is to say, his unmerited favor toward us on the basis of what Christ did when he suffered for our salvation.   Let us ever remember that this gift of access to God and eternal life is accepted by faith alone.   And let us never forget that Scripture alone contains all things necessary for salvation, and is the infallible Word of God, so that we should submit unto its authority in all things, and nothing may be done that it contrary to its clear teachings.   In short, let us remember the Reformation Motto, *sola fide* which is Latin meaning "faith alone," *sola gratia* meaning "grace alone," and *sola Scriptura* meaning "Scripture alone."

The sermon will now end with four prayers, one for the dedication of this Volume

2 of my commentary; and then three Collects for *Papist's Conspiracy Day* taken from the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662, in which I shall insert "the British" as appropriate, and the words, "the Queen of Australia" before the name of Elizabeth II. After the final prayer and close of the sermon, Brother Alex will conclude the service

Let us pray.

Heavenly Father, we dedicate this Volume 2 of this neo-Byzantine textual commentary on the Received Text and Authorized Version, on Matthew 15 to 20 to thee this day, praying that it may be used to the honour and glory of thy name and in defence of the truth of the gospel recovered at the time of the Protestant Reformation, through Jesus Christ our Lord, in the power of the Holy Ghost.   Amen.

"Almighty God, who hast in all ages shewed thy power and mercy in the miraculous and gracious deliverance of thy church, and in the protection of righteous and religious kings and states professing thy holy and eternal truth, from the wicked conspiracies, and malicious practices of all the enemies thereof; we yield thee our unfeigned thanks and praise, for the wonderful and mighty deliverance of our gracious sovereign King James the First, the Queen, the Prince, and all the royal branches, with the nobility, clergy, and commons of England, then assembled in Parliament, by Popish treachery appointed as sheep to the slaughter, in a most barbarous and savage manner, beyond the example of former ages.   From this unnatural conspiracy, not our merit, but thy mercy; not our foresight, but thy providence delivered us: And therefore not unto us, O Lord, but unto thy name be ascribed all honour and glory, in all churches of the saints, from generation to generation; through Jesus Christ our Lord.   *Amen*."

"Accept also, most gracious God, of our unfeigned thanks for filling our hearts again with joy and gladness, after the time that thou hadst afflicted us, and putting a new song into our mouths, by bringing His Majesty King William [on 5 Nov. 1688], … for the deliverance of our church and *the British* nation from Popish tyranny and arbitrary power.   We adore the wisdom and justice of thy providence, which so timely interposed in our extreme danger, and disappointed all the designs of our enemies.   We beseech thee, give us such a lively and lasting sense of what thou didst then, and hast since that time done for us, that we may not grow secure and careless in our obedience, by presuming upon thy great and undeserved goodness; but that it may lead us unto repentance, and move us to be the more diligent and zealous in all duties of our religion, which thou hast in a marvellous manner preserved to us.   Let truth and justice, brotherly kindness and charity, devotion and piety, concord and unity, with all other virtues, so flourish among us, that they may be the stability of our times, and make this Church, a praise in the earth.   All which we humbly beg for the sake of our blessed Lord and Saviour.   *Amen*."

"O God, whose name is excellent in all the earth, and thy glory above the heavens; who on this day didst miraculously preserve our church and *the British* state from the secret contrivance and hellish malice of Popish conspirators; and on this day also didst begin to give us a mighty deliverance from the open tyranny and oppression of

the same cruel and blood-thirsty enemies: We bless and adore thy glorious majesty, as for the former, so for this thy late marvellous loving-kindness to our church and *the British* nation, in the preservation of our religion and liberties. And we humbly pray, that the devout sense of this thy repeated mercy may renew and increase in us a spirit of love and thankfulness to thee its only Author; a spirit of peaceable submission and obedience to *the Queen of Australia*, our gracious sovereign lady, Queen Elizabeth the Second; and a spirit of fervent zeal for our holy religion which thou hast so wonderfully rescued, and established, a blessing to us and our posterity. And this we beg for Jesus Christ his sake. *Amen*."