

Appendices to St. Matthew's Gospel

Matt. 21-25.

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

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 or MBT 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. 21-25.¹)

Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E (Matt. 21-25).

Appendix 5: Dedication Sermon for Volume 3 (2nd Thurs. in June - 9 June 2011).

Appendix 6: Corrigenda to Former Volumes 1 & 2.

Appendix 7: Queen's Message on KJV: Queen Elizabeth II Flyer.

Appendix 8: A Sermons' Bonus.

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. 21:1a, Scrivener reads "Bethphage (Bethphage)," not "Bethsphage (Bethphage)."

¹ From Vol. 3 onwards, after "Minor variants between the NU Text" and before "and Textus Receptus," I add, "or MBT," at Appendix 3; but otherwise this Appendix is the same as former volumes.

Cf. Mark 11:1 & Luke 19:29.

- Matt. 21:11, Scrivener reads “*Nazareth* (Nazareth),” not “*Nazaret* (Nazareth).”
- Matt. 21:14, Scrivener reads “*tuphloi* (the blind) *kai* (and) “*chōloi* (the lame),” not “*chōloi* (the lame) *kai* (and) *tuphloi* (the blind).”
- Matt. 21:22a, Scrivener reads “*osa an* (whatsoever),” not “*osa ean* (whatsoever).”
- Matt. 21:41, Scrivener reads “*ekdosetai* (will let out)” not “*ekdōsetai* (will let out).”
- Matt. 22:7, Scrivener reads “*akousas* (‘when ... heard,’ word 4) *de* (‘But,’ word 2) *o* (‘the,’ word 1) *basileus* (‘king,’ word 3),” i.e., word order 4,2,1,3; rather than “*o* (word 1) *de* (word 2) *basileus* (word 3) *akousas* (word 4),” i.e., word order 1,2,3,4.
- Matt. 22:9, Scrivener reads “*osous an* (as many as),” whereas the alternative reading of “*osous ean* (as many as),” is just as possible; so the text should read, “*osous [e]an* (as many as).”
- Matt. 22:37a, Scrivener reads “*Iesous* (Jesus) *eipen* (said),” rather than “*Iesous* (Jesus) *ephe* (said)” (see main commentary).
- Matt. 22:37b, Scrivener reads “*te* (‘the,’ untranslated) *kardia* (heart)” and “*te* (‘the,’ untranslated) *psuche* (soul),” rather than, “*kardia* (heart)” and “*psuche* (soul).”
- Matt. 23:3a, Scrivener reads “*osa an* (whatsoever),” not “*osa ean* (whatsoever).”
- Matt. 23:36a, Scrivener reads “*Amen* (Verily) *legō* (I say) *umin* (unto you),” rather than, “*Amen* (Verily) *legō* (I say) *umin* (unto you) *oti* (-).”
- Matt. 23:36b, Scrivener reads “*tauta* (these things) *panta* (all),” not “*panta* (all) *tauta* (these things).”
- Matt. 23:37a, Scrivener reads “*apokteinousa* (killing),” rather than, “*apoktenousa* (killing).”
- Matt. 24:17b, Scrivener reads “*ti* (anything),” rather than, “*ta* (‘the [things]’ = ‘anything’).”
- Matt. 24:20 Scrivener reads “*en* (on) *sabbato* (the sabbath day),” rather than, “*sabbato* (on the sabbath day).”
- Matt. 24:33b, Scrivener reads “*panta* (all) *tauta* (these things),” not “*tauta* (these things) *panta* (all).”
- Matt. 24:36a, Scrivener reads “*tes* (-) *oras* (hour),” not “*oras* (hour).”
- Matt. 25:3b, Scrivener reads “*lampadas* (lamps) *eauton* (their),” not “*lampadas* (lamps) *auton* (their).”
- Matt. 25:30, Scrivener reads “*ekballete* (cast ye),” not “*ekbalete* (cast ye).”
- Mark 11:1, Scrivener reads “*Bethphage* (Bethphage),” not “*Bethsphage* (Bethphage).”
- Luke 19:29, Scrivener reads “*Bethphage* (Bethphage),” not “*Bethsphage* (Bethphage).”
(See commentary on Mark 11:1 & Luke 19:29 at Matt. 21:1a).

AT MATT. 21:1a, the MBT reading is “*Bethsphage*” (e.g., W 032, N 022, & Lectionary 2378); and this is similar in having an “n” (nu) added at the end in the minority Byzantine reading, “*Bethsphagen*” (Lectionary 1968); although the reading of Lectionary 1968 once again reminds us of the difference between the clear-cut easy to read letters of the Greek alphabet in standard seminary Greek printed texts, as compared to the potential ambiguities of Greek letters in “the real world” of some of the

manuscripts². However a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042, E 07, & H 013), found in Scrivener's Text reads, "Bethphage;" and this is also found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550).

Von Soden (1913) says that inside his K group, the MBT has the support of the Kx and Kr subgroups, which in broad terms are about 68-72% of the K group; and hence Pierpont's classification of this in Green's Textual Apparatus as a "Level 1" rating i.e., "61-79% of all manuscripts" support this reading. Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) gives five out of eight clear instances of the MBT reading "Bethsphage" (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).

The Latin Vulgate reads, "Bethfage," as does old Latin ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), & g1 (8th / 9th century); and this spelling is also found in the Vulgate Codex of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). The Latin spelling, "Bethphage," is found in old Latin f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), l (7th / 8th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and from the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

² This variant form is found in neither Tischendorf nor von Soden, and to the best of my knowledge has not been previously documented; although with a similar final nu ("n"), Swanson refers to "Bithsphagein" (Minuscule 2, Byzantine text, 12th century) and "Bithsphagen" (Minuscule 579, mixed text, 13th century). In the cursive script of Lectionary 1968, one could *prima facie* read this as "Bethsphageu," "Bethsphageb," or "Bethsphagen." The final letter appears as an upside-down \cap (i.e., like "U" without the small bars on top of this letter as printed in English script). That is because in this script, the upsilon looks like a "v" and may be joined to the previous letter on the top left, but due to handwriting imperfections may be joined lower. And both the beta and nu look like the standard seminary Greek mu " μ " *without* the line curving on the bottom right as in the mu (subject to the exception referred to at the beginning of "Bethsphagen," *infra*); and while this is not always joined to the previous letter, sometimes it is, and so once again due to handwriting imperfections it could be *prima facie* either a "b" (beta) or "n" (nu). E.g., on this very same page 137a of Lectionary 1968, this letter formation is used as a beta ("b") at the beginning of this word, "Bethsphagen" in verse 1, although here the beta ("b") is joined to the following eta ("e"), so that only context tells us it is not a mu ("m") i.e., "\mu;" and this letter formation is also used for both an upsilon ("u") in the "auton (of them)" of verse 3, and as a nu ("n") in the "ten (-)" before "apenanti (over against)" of verse 2. But wider considerations of general Greek contextual style here requires that this be a nu i.e., "Bethsphagen." Thus the clear distinction we have in our standard seminary Greek printed scripts e.g., Scrivener's Text, of a lower case beta ("b") as "\beta," nu ("n") as "\nu," upsilon ("u") as "\upsilon," and mu ("m") as "\mu," is a clarity of style not necessarily found in handwritten cursive script manuscripts such as this one (which even on this page 137a further uses a multiplicity of other letter shapes for nu).

The established English word, is “Bethphage,” and (while I have not studied its etymological history into English over the centuries,) it appears to have been derived with some reference to the general Latin pronunciation of the Vulgate, “*Bethfage*,” and the spelling, “Bethphage,” found in both the Latin (old Latin, f, q, l, & c) and the Greek (e.g., E 07, G 011, S 028; Origen & Chrysostom). The significant point is that for we Anglophones, the name is “Bethphage,” and that is how we would render it if we were translating from the Latin a reading of, e.g., “*Behphage*” (old Latin aur) or “*Vethpagae*” (old Latin e), or if we were translating from the Greek a reading of e.g., St. Chrysostom’s “*Bethsphage*.” That is because such usage is established and no longer open to change.

To change it now would be as pedantically silly as someone changing the OT’s “Jehovah” to something like “Yahweh,” or “Yahveh,” or “Yehwah,” on the basis it was purportedly “more accurate.” But what ignoramus of the English language would be so silly as to suggest to Anglophones that the Anglicized form of “Jehovah” should be changed on this nonsensical basis? In the words of the holy Apostle, St. Paul, “ye suffer fools gladly;” but only because “ye yourselves are wise” (II Cor. 11:19).

Erasmus (1516 & 1522) reads in the left-hand side Greek column of the page, “*Bethphage*,” and in the right-hand side Latin column of the page, “*Betphage*,” with Erasmus’s Latin spelling being found in old Latin b (5th century), d (5th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). While in these commentaries I generally only refer to Erasmus’s Greek, in looking at the two editions of his work that I have my own copies of (Erasmus’s *Greek-Latin New Testament*, 1516 & 1522), I sometimes look at his Latin, even though I do not usually refer to it in the commentary. But on this occasion it is of some special interest to me to note that Erasmus appears to have created a *double textual trademark*, i.e., one in the Greek, “*Bethphage*,” with a history in both Greek and Latin manuscripts; and one in the Latin, “*Betphage*,” with a history in some Latin manuscripts.

Of course, Erasmus could do this type of thing precisely because he knew people from the various nations of Western Europe that would use his *Greek-Latin New Testament* had established forms for this word, e.g., in English it is “Bethphage.” The Greek form, “*Bethphage*,” thus became a popular textual “trademark,” being later found in Stephanus (1550) and finally Scrivener (1894 & 1902).

A footnote in the Majority Text Burgonites’ *New King James Version* (1979 & 1982) says at Matt. 21:1a, “M[ajority]-Text reads ‘Bethsphage’.” Of course, the NKJV’s grip on the English language, or rather, their lack thereof, is found throughout this translation. E.g., like so many of the “modern versions,” the NKJV does not follow the AV’s moderate usage of “Jehovah” in the OT, on the laughable basis that this “is not the Hebrew form.” Perhaps then they should leave the whole OT, not just YHWH Anglicized to “Jehovah,” in Hebrew! Good Christian reader, do you find this a ridiculous proposition? Then also have a look at the ridiculous way the AV’s correct “hell” in Ps.16:10 (cf. rendered by Greek *hades* in Acts 2:27), is left untranslated as Hebrew “Sheol” in the NKJV at Ps. 16:10. To be sure, good Christian reader, in comparison to the sumptuous English language “fatted calf” feast (Luke 15:23) found in the King James Version of 1611; the New King James Version of 1982 presents us with

English language “swine” “husks” (Luke 15:16). Like the other modern versions, and indeed this immoral secular age in general, *they tell their people what they CAN do, rather than what they SHOULD do.*

The masses “cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand” (Jonah 4:11), and for those of noble intellect and Christian spirituality, the Old French maxim that privilege entails responsibility surely applies, *noblesse oblige*. Now I would “not bring” “a railing accusation” “against” “the Devil,” (Jude 9), but address him respectfully as “the prince of this world” (John 12:31; 14:30), as the one who is “the god of this world” for those whose “minds” he “hath blinded” (II Cor. 4:4); saying to him with all due respect, “The Lord rebuke thee” (Jude 9), since I have no sympathy for his cause, but worship only the Trinitarian Christian God. Yet as Lucifer sits in the mind control panels of every Pope of Rome since 607 (Rev. 12:3; 13:1), and organizes matters from Rome (Rev. 18:2), he is evidently satiated with how he can so “exalt” himself (Isa. 14:13). Via his devils using his spiritual powers of suggestion to men’s minds to entice them to evil, if under God’s common grace they show some interest in repentance on broad moral issues like fornication, adultery, or lying, he seeks to channel this through established infidel or heathen religions he controls; or if they indicate some desire for Christian repentance, then he chiefly holds out to them the *Church of Rome* (although also using his daughter churches, Rev. 17:5, such as Eastern Orthodoxy). Most people are hog-tied for hell one way or the other, and so there is a sense in which the Devil “has the game sown up.”

But is this a realistic appraisal of the situation? The masses, by which I also include the intellectually intermediate who control the colleges and universities, media, courts, legislatures, etc., can be elevated or degraded; for while there is an element of choice that each of them can also exercise, to a very large extent, they simply “go with the flow.” Like others they have one real chance, and one real chance only to do the right thing, and that requires their submission to God and his infallible book the Bible. (And of course, I support a Protestant Christian State rather than a secular state, or any other kind of state; and when it is in place, and God is very openly petitioned for his help in the running of that state; it is a wonderful assistant in training the people in morals, and also isolating spiritually and intellectually gifted persons for key positions.) If people miss that one chance they have to submit to God’s will in his holy Bible, “they’re goners.” And even most of the saved ones benefit from those who are their spiritual and intellectual betters ruling over them from government. E.g., without such an assistant benefit, many of them never come to a point where they discern the dangers of a sin like miscegenation, and indeed in the time of Holy Ezra we read “the hand of the princes and rulers hath been chief in this trespass” (Ezra 9:2).

God has made them and to an even greater extent also the unsaved ones so (the latter of whom may still live moral lives via God’s common grace), *in part*, so that those he gives the opportunity to may either by his grace seek to ennoble them, or by allowing them to turn to their lusts, debase them. *Does His Majesty, the Devil, really prove anything by debasing these hapless ones, and helping to tie them up in their own lusts? Do those who pander to the lowest common denominator in moving away from teaching*

people the King's English found in the Authorized Version, really prove anything by debasing these ever willing hapless ones? Teenage high school students can learn similar English with e.g., Shakespeare, and former generations with a lower level of formal schooling than is available today were able to learn the King James Version's English. *In this, as in all matters, let us by the grace of God seek to elevate and not degrade the masses; who if left without their betters' assistance for long enough, end up living like animals; e.g., the Christian white man found the heathenized Australian Aborigines descended from Elam (Gen. 10:22) in such a shockingly degraded state of savagery and barbarism, that having fallen from the highpoint of civilization and original monotheism (Gen. 4:2,4,17; 8:20; 9:20), they were largely living like the now extinct satyr beasts whose ways they largely mimicked when they came across them upon these Adamites arrival in Australia (from India) about 30,000 years ago. (These non-Adamite creatures which were satyr beasts go back about another 10,000 years, and co-existed in ever diminishing numbers with the Adamites for about another 20,000 years.)*

Do I think the NKJV's footnote is correct to say that the Majority Text, which in practice equates the Majority Byzantine Text (where there is not a serious split in manuscripts), reads here at Matt. 21:1a, "Bethsphage"? I do not! Though they might reasonably say, "Greek reads, 'Bethsphage,' i.e., English, 'Bethphage'." As with their untranslated Hebrew word, *sheol*, which in Ps. 16:10 clearly means, "hell" (Ps. 16:10, AV; Acts 2:27,31, Greek, *hades*), the NKJV is here *lowering the standards*. For we speak English, not Greek or Hebrew.

The MBT and true TR reading for Matt. 21:1a is Greek, "Bethsphage," and the correct English rendering is that which we find in the AV, "Bethphage." *Let this Greek textual "trademark" be removed and Scrivener's Text amended accordingly, and let the AV's English rendering stand without alteration!*

Similar issues as those found at Matt. 21:1a also apply to Mark 11:1 and Luke 19:29. Von Soden says that within his K group "Bethsphage," is the reading of his Kx and Kr subgroups at Mark 11:1; and at Luke 19:29 the same appears to be the case, although he only counted 41 of the Kx manuscripts here, and they divided 31:10 for "Bethsphage" as opposed to "Bethphage." Thus "Bethsphage" is the MBT reading at Mark 11:1 (e.g., Sigma 042) and Luke 19:29 (e.g., U 030, 9th century & 127, 11th century).

But Greek, "Bethphage" is a minority Byzantine reading at Mark 11:1 (A 02) and Luke 19:29 (A 02, W 032, & N 022). This is found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522), who in the parallel Latin column of his Greek-Latin NT uses at Mark 11:1 Latin, "Bethfage" (Erasmus 1516) and "Bethphage" (Erasmus 1522), and at Luke 19:29 Latin, "Bethphage" (Erasmus 1516 & 1522). At Mark 11:1 and Luke 19:29, Erasmus's textual "trademark" is continued as Greek, "Bethphage," in Stephanus (1550) and Scrivener (1894 & 1902).

As with Matt. 21:1a, the readings of Scrivener's Text should be amended at Mark 11:1 and Luke 19:29, to the Greek, "Bethsphage." But once again, the English rendering of this as, "Bethphage," found in the AV, is correct and should not be changed. Alas, we

once again find the same claims as made at Matt. 21:1a, are made by the Majority Text Burgonites in NKJV footnotes at Mark 11:1 and Luke 19:29.

AT MATT. 21:11, Scrivener reads “*Nazareth* (Nazareth),” not “*Nazaret* (Nazareth).” See Appendix 1 of Textual Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) at Matt. 4:13 (on Matt. 2:23, 4:13; 21:11).

AT MATT. 21:14 the word order of the MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022) is Greek, “*choloī* (‘the lame,’ word 1) *kai* (‘and,’ word 2) *tuphloī* (‘the blind,’ word 3). But the word order of a variant found in Scrivener’s Text is 3,2,1, which is a minority Greek reading (Origen), also found in the Vulgate and old Latin Versions as Latin, “*caeci* (‘the blind,’ word 3) *et* (‘and,’ word 2) *claudi* (‘the lame,’ word 1, in old Latin Versions as ‘*clodi*’ = ‘the lame’).”

It is consistent with Matthean Greek to use either the word order found in the Matt. 21:14 variant, “the blind” “and the lame” (Matt. 11:5); or the word order found in the Matt. 21:14 MBT, the “lame” and the “blind” (Matt. 15:30,31). Therefore there is no good textual argument against the MBT and Scrivener’s Text should be amended.

The variant word order 3,2,1, of Scrivener’s Text is found in Erasmus, who in both the 1516 and 1522 editions has this in the Greek of his left column, and the Latin order of the Vulgate in the Latin of his right hand column. Erasmus most probably got this “textual trademark” from the Latin. It was also followed by Stephanus (1550).

But it is also important to note that it is within the discretion of a translator to alter “the lame and the blind” of Matt. 21:14 to “the blind and the lame” as found in e.g., St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, i.e., for stylistic reasons of translation since the basic meaning is still the same. Therefore while it is axiomatic that “the lame and the blind” is a valid translation of Matt. 21:14; I also consider that the AV’s word order, “the blind and the lame,” is a valid *English* translation. Hence (bearing in mind that Matthean Greek may use either word order,) the AV remains a valid rendering of the MBT Greek, although not the only valid rendering. Thus the AV need not be altered³.

AT MATT. 21:22a, Scrivener’s Text reads “*osa an* (whatsoever).” Hodges & Farstad (1985) say “*osa ean* (whatsoever),” is supported by the majority text, notwithstanding “the defection of a specific subgroup” to the reading, “*osa an* (whatsoever)”⁴. If this is a correct statement by Hodges & Farstad, then it is axiomatic that this reading is supported by the majority Byzantine text, since more than 85% of the manuscripts they use from von Soden’s I and K groups of c. 1,500 manuscripts are

³ Cf. my footnote on “word orders” in Textual Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), at Matt 13:44a, in the section on “Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.”

⁴ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 71.

Byzantine text. Yet we find that Robinson & Pierpont (2005), who use about 1,000 of von Soden's manuscripts from his K group, of which more than 90% are Byzantine Text, place "ean" in their main text, but consider that at Matt. 21:22a "the manuscripts comprising the Byzantine Textform are significantly divided" between this reading and the reading, "an"⁵.

While I generally determine the majority Byzantine text in a second-hand manner from von Soden (1913) via these two majority texts, when this type of disagreement occurs I consult von Soden in a first-hand manner. In doing so, I prefer the "Byzantine priority" methodology of Robinson & Pierpont which uses von Soden's K group which is *c.* 96.5 % Byzantine text if one includes manuscripts that are Byzantine only in specific parts, or *c.* 93% Byzantine text if one considers only the exclusively Byzantine texts. Nevertheless, the result should be the same on either this K group methodology (Robinson & Pierpont, and myself) or the I and K groups methodology (Hodges & Farstad), other than where the text is split in a major way on two or more readings. Hence the disagreement between these two von Soden based majority texts at Matt. 21:22a should not really be occurring.

Von Soden's "K" group has 983 manuscripts, of which *c.* 949 are Byzantine, i.e., *c.* 914 are exclusively Byzantine and *c.* 35 are Byzantine text in parts only. But only 156 of those in his Kx group were counted for the reading at Matt. 21:22a, of which 106 support "ean" and 50 "an". Subtracting the 513 Kx manuscripts in von Soden's K group from the 983 manuscripts, yields a total of 470 manuscripts; and then adding back in the 156 from the Kx group counted for this reading, means a total of 626 manuscripts are of relevance to us here at Matt. 21:22a from the K group. With the "an" reading supported by 50 of these, together with other K group manuscripts, this means the strength of "an" is 50 out of 626 or *c.* 8%, whereas the strength of "ean" is *c.* 92%. Of course, these figures are "rubbery" not only because von Soden's groups require an error-bar factor of *c.* 10%, but also because only *c.* 90% of the K group includes Gospel readings. But for all that, they are good enough for my generalist purposes.

Nevertheless, for the sake of those who would want an even more precise count, so that the reader may see the difference, let us consider what the difference would be if only Gospel manuscripts were considered from K group. Applying these more precise figures here at Matt. 21:22a would mean 860 Gospel manuscripts minus 513 Kx manuscripts yields a total of 347 manuscripts; and then adding back in the 156 from the Kx group counted for this reading yields 503 manuscripts. With the "an" reading supported by 53 of these, this means that 53 out of 503 Gospel manuscripts in K group or *c.* 10.5% support the "an" reading. Factoring in a 10% error bar for von Soden's generalist groups means the percentage could be as low as *c.* 9.5%. In rounded numbers this more precise figure of *c.* 9.5-10.5% for "an" compares with the less precise figure of *c.* 8%. But either way, in broad-brush terms we are looking at *c.* 90% support for the "ean" reading and *c.* 10% support for the "an" reading.

⁵ Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 47.

On these figures I would have to agree with Hodges & Farstad that the majority text clear favours the “*ean*” reading over the “*an*” reading, even though my methodology in reaching this conclusion is theoretically the same as Robinson & Pierpont’s. On this occasion, it seems to me that Robinson & Pierpont have erred badly in their calculations. (Cf. commentary at Matt. 21:28a, at “Preliminary Textual Discussion.”) I note that in Green’s Textual Apparatus (1986), Pierpont fairly said that “*ean*” had the “support” of “80-94% of all manuscripts.” So what happened in the 20 years between 1986 and 2005 to change this? None of us are perfect. We all make mistakes which if we later realize we made them, we may be baffled about how we could make such an error, and it seems that in undertaking their last revision, somehow Robinson & Pierpont (2005) just got this one wrong in their 2005 edition.

On the one hand, we find that inside of Matthean Greek, e.g., the reading “*osa an*” is both TR and MBT at Matt. 7:12, or “*os an*” meaning “whosoever” is found at Matt. 5:31. But on the other hand, e.g., “*ean*” meaning “if” is found in the TR & MBT at Matt. 4:9; 5:13; 5:23, or “*os ean*” meaning “whosoever” is found at Matt. 5:19. This type of dual usage inside of Matthean Greek of “*os an* (whosoever)” at Matt. 5:31, and “*os ean* (whosoever)” at Matt. 5:19, means that we cannot say that a majority Byzantine text reading of “*osa ean* (whatsoever)” at Matt. 21:22a, is for Matthean Greek stylistically incongruous with a reading of “*osa an*” at Matt. 7:12. This type of diversity is clearly inside the parameters of Matthean Greek. Therefore the representative Byzantine reading, “*osa ean* (whatsoever),” is the correct reading at Matt. 21:22a.

Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) shows majority support for the reading “*osa ean* (whatsoever)” (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). Yet the reading “*osa an* (whatsoever)” is found at Matt. 21:22a in Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550). The Greek “*an*” and “*ean*” may sometimes convey the same idea. E.g., there is a Hebraic / Aramaic stylistic type antithetical parallelism introduced by the Greek “*os ean*” and “*os ... an*” respectively, in which both are rendered as “whosoever” in Matt. 5:19; and likewise at Matt. 23:18 (see Matt. 23:18 at Appendix 3, *infra*,) there is such parallelism between “*os ean*” and “*os ... an*” respectively, in which once again both are rendered as “whosoever” in the AV. Thus where “*an*” and “*ean*” convey the same idea such as at Matt. 21:22a; then a textual “trademark” such as that of Erasmus in here changing the “*osa an*” to “*osa ean*,” has no impact on English (or other) translation. Nevertheless, I do not support suchlike. Let the majority Byzantine text reading, “*osa ean* (whatsoever),” stand at Matt. 21:22a! And so let the reading of Scrivener’s Text, “*osa an* (whatsoever),” (which is also the reading of the NU Text *et al* following the two leading Alexandrian Texts,) be amended accordingly here at Matt. 21:22a!

AN ASSOCIATED issue with regard to the textual analysis at Matt. 21:22a (and 23:3) is the issue of Matt. 22:9.

At Matt. 22:9 Scrivener’s Text reads, “*osous an* (as many as).” But another

reading is “*osous ean* (as many as).” Von Soden’s “K” group has 983 manuscripts, of which *c.* 949 are Byzantine, i.e., *c.* 914 are exclusively Byzantine and *c.* 35 are Byzantine text in parts only. But only 168 of those in his Kx group were counted for this reading at Matt. 22:9, of which 86 support “*an*” and 82 “*ean*”. Subtracting the 513 Kx manuscripts in von Soden’s K group from the 983 manuscripts, yields a total of 470 manuscripts; and then adding back in the 168 from the Kx group counted for this reading, means a total of 638 manuscripts are of relevance to us here at Matt. 22:9 from the K group. (For my broad-brush purposes, such approximations are valid for the Gospels since *c.* 88% of K group contains Gospel manuscripts.) The “*an*” reading supported by von Soden’s Kr group which has 211 manuscripts. This means the total strength of the “*an*” reading is 211 Kr manuscripts + 86 Kx manuscripts = 297 manuscripts out of 638 manuscripts i.e., *c.* 47% of manuscripts. Thus the “*ean*” reading has *c.* 53% support. These figures are somewhat “rubbery,” but they are good enough to give us a general guide indicating that about half the Byzantine manuscripts support each of the two readings here.

At Matt. 22:9, the reading, “*osous ean* (as many as),” is found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522); whereas “*osous an* (as many as)” is found in Stephanus (1550). Given that this matter cannot be resolved by textual analysis since both are inside the parameters of Matthean Greek, *supra*, it follows that we cannot be entirely certain as to which is the correct reading. Of course, the rendering into English is the same either way. But in view of this uncertainty, I consider Scrivener’s Text should be amended to read “[*e*]an,” so that by the usage of square brackets, the matter is left as we find it in the manuscripts i.e., an open question.

ANOTHER ASSOCIATED issue with regard to the textual analysis at Matt. 21:22a is the issue of Matt. 23:3a. At Matt. 23:3a Scrivener’s Text reads, “*osa an* (whatsoever),” a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., F 09, 9th century; S 028, 10th century; Lectionary 2378; Eusebius). But the reading “*osa ean* (whatsoever)” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings).

The reading “*osa an* (whatsoever)” is found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550). Whether or not one follows this old Erasmian “textual trademark” will not affect English translation. Nevertheless, Scrivener’s text should be changed to the correct reading of “*osa ean* (whatsoever).”

AT MATT 21:41 the MBT reading is Greek, “*ekdo_osetai* (‘he will let out’ = ‘will let out,’ AV, indicative middle future, 3rd person singular verb, from *ekdidomi*),” (e.g., W 032 & Lectionary 1968), and with no good textual argument against it, correct. It is supported by at least *c.* 90% of Byzantine text manuscripts⁶; and found in Beza (1598). *Variant 1*, “*ekdo_osei* (‘he will let out,’ indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *ekdidomi*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042 & O 023) we shall not

⁶ Von Soden mentions only 2 manuscripts following *Variant 1*, and does not itemize *Variant 2*. Therefore on the basis of his residual groups, *c.* 90% + of the K group supports the TR’s reading.

further discuss. *Variant 2*, “*ekdosete*” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 2378. It is the TR’s reading with a revowelling of the “*ai*” suffix to “*e*.” While this variant in this exact form has not, to the best of my knowledge been previously documented; Swanson refers to another variant that combines the revowelling features of both *Variants 2 & 3*, to become, “*ekdosete*” (*Variant 4*). The *Variant 4* reading is found in Minuscule 1346 (10th century, Jerusalem, Israel; von Soden’s ε 1089 in his Ika group, unclassified outside of von Soden’s system).

Variant 3, “*ekdosetai* (‘he will let out’ = ‘will let out,’ indicative middle future, 3rd person singular verb, from *ekdidomi*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscules 2, 12th century), found in Scrivener’s Text. It is first found in Erasmus (1516) and later in Stephanus (1550). *Variant 3* has the same meaning as the TR. The difference is simply in the revowelling of the TR’s reading to a local dialect using omicron (*o / o*) for omega (*ω / ω*). I have elsewhere come across this type of swapping around of omicrons and omegas. E.g., an omicron to omega swap is found at John 21:1, where the TR’s “*eauton* (‘himself,’ masculine singular accusative, 3rd person pronoun, from *eautou*)” (MBT e.g., Sydney University Lectionary 2378) is revowelled in Sydney University Lectionary 1968 to become “*eauton*” (potentially confusing as this *on* suffix is used for the genitive plural). So too the omicron of “*os ean* (whosoever)” at Matt. 10:42 is revowelled in Lectionary 1968 to an omega with “*os ean* (whosoever).” Or an omega to omicron swap is found in Lectionary 2378 at Matt. 21:33b, *infra*.

Erasmus evidently came across a manuscript, whether a Lectionary that we have now lost record of him possessing, or some other manuscript, that here revowelled the omega of “*ekdosetai* (he will let out)” to an omicron. This no doubt seemed like “a very good textual trademark” to Erasmus (1516), who was later followed by Stephanus (1550). But Beza (1598), wanting a different combination of “trademarks” so as to distinguish his text from all others, went back to the representative Byzantine reading for Matt. 21:41. Beza was quite happy to use textual “trademarks,” and so we cannot doubt that his motive for here going back to the representative Byzantine reading was his desire to formulate his own combination of “textual trademarks,” and thus quite a different reason to myself. Nevertheless, I concur with the reading of Beza (1598) here at Matt. 21:41, although it must be said that there is no impact on meaning or translation on the basis of which vowing one here uses. Let the majority Byzantine Text stand and Scrivener’s Text be amended accordingly!

FOR MATT. 22:9, see comments after Matt. 21:22a, in Appendix 1, *supra*.

AT MATT. 22:37b Scrivener’s Text uses the definite article twice, reading, “*te kardia* (‘heart,’ feminine singular dative noun, from *kardia*),” and “*te psuche* (‘soul,’ feminine singular dative noun, from *psuche*).” Hodges & Farstad (1985) consider the majority text, and since more than 85% of their manuscripts from von Soden’s I and K groups are Byzantine text, therefore the majority Byzantine text, is “seriously divided” between those readings that do and do not include the definite article in these two

instances⁷. By contrast, Robinson & Pierpont (2005) consider the majority text, and since more than 90% of their manuscripts from von Soden's K group are Byzantine text, therefore the majority Byzantine text, is not seriously divided, and that the representative Byzantine text simply supports the reading without these definite articles. Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) says the reading without these two definite articles is found at Matt. 22:37b in "80-94% of all manuscripts."

Under the circumstances, I find it necessary to directly consult the common source of von Soden (1913). In both instances, von Soden shows the definite article omitted by the entire K group (of *c.* 1,000 manuscripts) other than the Kr group and one other K group manuscript. Von Soden's Kr subgroup contains *c.* 20% or about one-fifth of the K group manuscripts, and so the readings without the definite articles has the support of *c.* 80% or four-fifths of the K group. Therefore I concur with Robinson & Pierpont's assessment that this is the majority Byzantine text reading (e.g., W 032 & Lectionary 2378), and the text is not "seriously divided" (Hodges & Farstad terminology⁸), or "significantly divided" (Robinson & Pierpont terminology⁹) in such a way as would normally require more detailed textual analysis to determine the better reading i.e., there is no clear and obvious textual problem with the MBT reading.

In broad terms, it is certainly true that St. Matthew usually has the definite article with *kardia* (e.g., Matt. 13:15 twice, 13:19; 24:48), although this is not always so (Matt. 15:8); and likewise he elsewhere uses the definite article with *psuche* (e.g., Matt. 6:25 twice; 12:18). But as seen from the Matt. 15:8 example, the usage or non-usage of such a definite article with a noun is clearly within the parameters of Matthean Greek (and indeed is more generally a wider option within NT Greek).

The origins of the variant found in Scrivener's Text are conjectural. But it looks to me as though it was probably some kind of semi-assimilation with the "*tes* ('the,' redundant in English translation, feminine singular genitive, definite article from *e*) *kardias* ('heart,' feminine singular genitive noun, from *kardia*)" and "*tes* ('the,' redundant in English translation, feminine singular genitive, definite article from *e*) *psuches* ('soul,' feminine singular genitive noun, from *psuche*)" of Mark 12:30. If so, was this an accidental semi-assimilation by a scribe who "reconstructed" them after wrongly concluding that the definite articles at Matt. 22:37b "must have been lost in a paper fade" earlier in his manuscript line? Or was this a deliberate semi-assimilation by a scribe wishing to "bring the accounts" in these two gospels, "closer together"? Or was this a deliberate semi-assimilation by a scribe who simply considered it "a stylistic improvement" to so add the definite articles here at Matt. 22:37b?

⁷ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 76.

⁸ Hodges & Farstad (1985), p. xxi.

⁹ Robinson & Pierpont (2005), p. xviii.

Of course, the issue of what such scribes might think of as “a stylistic improvement” varied considerably, e.g., outside the closed class of sources, at Mark 12:30 the Alexandrian scribe of Codex Vaticanus removed the definite articles on both occasions. Probably this was in semi-assimilation with Matt. 22:37b, which in Codex Vaticanus rightly lacks these two definite articles. These two definite articles are found in Tischendorf’s 8th ed., Nestle’s 21st ed., and NU Text, thus following a “corrector” of Codex Sinaiticus (and e.g., Minuscule 33) on the first one, and Codex Sinaiticus on the second one.

Another variant lacks the first definite article but includes the second one (Sigma 042; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). This variant is also the original reading of Codex Sinaiticus, and Westcott & Hort adopt it at Matt. 22:37b. In doing so, their darkened, disorderly, and overly simplistic minds were probably attracted to “this stylistic imbalance” as “the more difficult, and *therefore* the more probable, reading.” Of course, by such neo-Alexandrian thinking, any buffoon who tampers with the text is thought to have “the better reading” since it is “the more improbable one.” Such are the curious nooks and crannies in the dark recesses of the minds of those who prefer the readings of the “many which corrupt the word of God” (II Cor. 2:17) over the “pure words” “of the Lord” (Ps. 12:6), which God did “preserve” (Ps. 12:7) in the Received Text or *Textus Receptus*.

The correct MBT reading which twice lacks the definite articles at Matt. 22:37b, is found in the Greek NT Text of Erasmus (1516 & 1522). But the incorrect reading of Scrivener’s Text at Matt. 22:37b which includes the definite articles twice, is found in Stephanus (1550). The reading of Scrivener’s Text was clearly added sometime after Erasmus’s 1522 edition and by the time of Stephanus’s 1550 edition as a “textual trademark.” Let the representative Byzantine reading stand, and let Scrivener’s text be amended accordingly!

THE GREEK word “*oti*” means, “that.” At Matt. 23:36a, the Greek words, “*Amēn* (Verily) *legō* (I say) *umin* (unto you),” are followed in the MBT (e.g., W 032; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings) with, “*oti*.” But a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042) omits the “*oti*” and is followed by Scrivener’s Text. There is no good textual argument against the MBT reading which is thus correct.

Nevertheless, due to the rule of *oti recitativum*, “*oti* (that)” is never translated when it introduces a *direct discourse*¹⁰. Thus the rendering will be the same in both the MBT which includes the “*oti* (-)” and minority Byzantine reading of Scrivener’s text which omits the “*oti* (-).” I.e., either way, Matt. 23:36a will still read, “Verily I say unto you, (Greek *oti*, untranslated,) All these things shall come upon this generation.”

¹⁰ Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Appendix 3, section: “Introduction,” sub-section: “The conjunctions, for instance, ‘de’ (and) and ‘oti’ (that);” & Young’s *Greek*, p. 190.

The “*oti* (-)” is also absent from, e.g., the Greek NT texts of Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633). *I say, good Christian reader, this looks very much like a “textual trademark” inserted by that old Neo-Byzantine past master, Erasmus of Rotterdam; and thereafter followed by Stephanus, Beza, and Elzevir, as a mark of their respect to the great Erasmus, as well as something they could use as a “trademark” in their texts.* I too hold Erasmus in high regard. But I hold no concord with the policy of “textual trademarks.” “That’s easy for you to say,” it might be objected, “because you’re not the one producing a Greek New Testament text that you have to somehow label to prevent others from just copying it out without acknowledgement, while simultaneously making sure that no translators using it will go astray.” I reply, “You’re right, it’s far easier for me to take this stand than for those great neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries, who are my seniors and betters. Nevertheless, under God my conscience is bound to do what I believe to be right.” *Let Scrivener’s Text be amended accordingly!*

FOR MATT. 23:3a, see comments after Matt. 21:22a, in Appendix 1, *supra*.

AT MATT. 23:36b I shall discuss Matt. 23:36b; 24:2b (cf. Appendix 3, *infra*); & 24:33.

At Matt. 23:36b Scrivener’s Text reads, “*tauta* (‘these things,’ word 2) *panta* (‘all,’ word 1).” Hodges & Farstad has in the main text, “*panta* (‘all,’ word 1) *tauta* (‘these things,’ word 2),” with a footnote saying that there is “a substantial division within the Majority Text tradition” between this reading, and word order 2,1¹¹. Robinson & Pierpont likewise put word order 1,2 in their main text, and say “the manuscripts comprising the Byzantine Textform are significantly divided” between this reading and word order 2,1¹². Under the circumstances I am compelled to consult the common von Soden source of both Hodges & Farstad (von Soden’s “I” and “K” groups) and Robinson & Pierpont (von Soden’s “K” group), although as usual (though occasionally not always), I do so through a Robinson & Pierpont methodology of focusing on von Soden’s K group.

Von Soden says that in his K group, word order of 2,1 is followed by 47 out of 150 manuscripts in his Kx group; and 3 other K group manuscripts. Subtracting the 513 Kx manuscripts from the wider 860 Gospel manuscripts of K group, and then adding back in the 150 manuscripts he counted, means we are looking at a K group sample of 497 manuscripts, of which 47 Kx manuscripts and 3 others i.e., 50 manuscripts, follow the reading of Scrivener’s Text. This is *c.* 10% of manuscripts, and so clearly a minority reading, with the MBT enjoying the support of *c.* 90% of manuscripts. Given the generalist nature of von Soden’s groups, allowing a possible error bar of 10% i.e., 10% of 90% means up to *c.* 9%, we are still looking at *c.* 81-90% support for the MBT reading

¹¹ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xiv & 80.

¹² Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 53.

i.e., word order 1,2 at Matt. 23:36b.

Even though these figures are “rubbery,” they are still good enough in broad-brush terms for me to say that at Matt. 23:36b both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont, *protest too much*. The MBT reading of word order 1,2 is clearly established without any “substantial” (Hodges & Farstad) or “significant” (Robinson & Pierpont) manuscript division. In Green’s Textual Apparatus (1986), Pierpont said the MBT reading had the support of “61-79% of all manuscripts,” and on von Soden’s figures this is an understatement. Of course, Hodges & Farstad may reply that on a number of occasions they consider *c.* 20% is a “substantial” division, and *possibly* this minority reading is in this approximate range (although it may be as low as *c.* 10%). But if so, the *impression* here given by Hodges & Farstad needs to be more qualified than what it is. None of us are perfect. We all make mistakes, and in my opinion on this occasion a reader of these von Soden based majority texts would be given an inaccurate impression which greatly overstates the manuscript support for the word order 2,1 of Scrivener’s Text.

In this context let us also consider Matt. 24:2b,33. At Matt. 24:2b Scrivener’s Text reads, “*panta* (‘all,’ word 1) *tauta* (‘these things,’ word 2).” Hodges & Farstad has in the main text, “*panta* (‘all,’ word 1) *tauta* (‘these things,’ word 2),” with a footnote saying that there is “a substantial division within the Majority Text tradition” between this reading, and word order 2,1¹³. Robinson & Pierpont likewise put word order 1,2 in their main text, and say “the manuscripts comprising the Byzantine Textform are significantly divided” between this reading and word order 2,1¹⁴.

At Matt. 24:2b, von Soden made a very incomplete count of his available K group manuscripts, tallying up only 257 from the K group. However, this is still an ample sample to determine the majority Byzantine text from. The 1,2 reading at Matt. 24:2b is supported by 9 out of 12 Kx manuscripts, and the Kr group. I.e., 211 Kr Gospel manuscripts + 9 Kx manuscripts = 220. The word order 2,1 is followed by the K1 group except for 2 manuscripts. K1 has 37 Gospel Byzantine manuscripts. This means word order 1,2 has 220 manuscripts + 2 from K1 = 222 manuscripts; whereas word order 2,1 has 35 manuscripts. In total at Matt. 24:2b, word order 1,2 thus has 222 out of 257 manuscripts or *c.* 86% support; whereas word order 2,1 has 35 out of 257 manuscripts or *c.* 14% support. These “rubbery” figures are clearly good enough, and from a large enough sample, to fairly conclude that the MBT at Matt. 24:2b is word order 1,2.

With regard to Matt. 24:33b, Scrivener’s Text reads, “*panta* (‘all,’ word 2) *tauta* (‘these things,’ word 1).” Hodges & Farstad has in the main text, “*tauta* (‘these things,’ word 1) *panta* (‘all,’ word 2),” with a footnote saying that there is “a substantial division

¹³ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xiv & 80.

¹⁴ Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 53.

within the Majority Text tradition” between this reading, and word order 2,1¹⁵. Robinson & Pierpont likewise put word order 1,2 in their main text, and say “the manuscripts comprising the Byzantine Textform are significantly divided” between this reading and word order 2,1¹⁶.

At Matt. 24:33b von Soden says the reading with word order 2,1 has the support of his K1 group and 62 out of 169 counted Kx group manuscripts. I.e., 37 Byzantine Gospel manuscripts (K1) + 62 = 99 manuscripts. Subtracting from the 860 Gospel manuscripts in K group, the 513 Kx group manuscripts, and adding back in the 169 Kx manuscripts he counted, means the overall sample is 516 K group manuscripts. This means the reading with word order 2,1, is supported by 99 out of 516 manuscripts, or *c.* 19%. These “rubbery” figures are clearly good enough, and from a large enough sample, to fairly conclude that the MBT at Matt. 24:33b is word order 1,2, with *c.* 81% support (even allowing an error bar of 10% for von Soden’s generalist groups i.e., 10% of 81% = *c.* 8%, and so a support range of *c.* 73-81%).

We thus find that at two of these three places, Matt. 23:36b and Matt. 24:33b, the word order of these two words is different in Scrivener’s Text to that of the MBT; and at one of these three places, Matt. 24:2b, Scrivener’s Text is that of the MBT.

Looking more widely at St. Matthew’s Gospel, the word order, “*tauta* (these things) *panta* (all),” is found on Jesus’ lips in the TR and MBT at Matt. 4:9; 6:33; 13:34,51,56. But the order is *vice versa* with a conjunction between these two words on two other occasions. Thus at Matt. 6:32 Christ says, “*panta* (all) *gar* (for) *tauta* (these things);” and at Matt. 24:8 Christ says, “*panta* (all) *de* (‘and,’ untranslated in the AV) *tauta* (these things).” And on the lips of another, to wit, the rich young ruler, one finds at Matt. 19:20 the word order, “*panta* (all) *tauta* (these things).”

Since the word order, “*tauta* (these things) *panta* (all),” is found on Jesus’ lips in the TR and MBT at Matt. 4:9; 6:33; 13:34,51,56 this is *prima facie* a possible reading at Matt. 23:36b; 24:2b; 24:33. But since the word order, “*panta* (all) ... *tauta* (these things)” is found at Matt. 6:32; 24:8, this is also *prima facie* a possible reading at Matt. 23:36b; 24:2b; 24:33. While it is *prima facie* possible to distinguish Matt. 6:32 and 24:8 on the basis that there is a conjunction between the “*panta* (all)” and “*tauta* (these things),” this is surely an overdone “analysis” and thus too rigid a reading of the Greek. St. Matthew uses such terminology at Matt. 19:20 for the rich young ruler, and so it seems difficult to rule out the possibility that he would not be prepared to use such terminology on the lips of Christ, especially in view of Matt. 6:32 and 24:8.

Since either order of these word orders might reasonably be considered to have come from the lips of our Lord, it follows that there is no clear and obvious textual

¹⁵ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xiv & 83.

¹⁶ Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 55.

problem with either word order, and therefore, the MBT should stand at all three readings, Matt. 23:36b; 24:2b; 24:33. This being so, at Matt. 23:36b the reading should be “*panta* (all) *tauta* (these things)” (MBT, e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042), not “*tauta* (these things) *panta* (all)” (minority Byzantine reading, e.g., M 021, 9th century; S 028, 10th century, Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings; Origen; manifested in Erasmus 1516 & 1522, Stephanus 1550, & Scrivener’s Text); and so Scrivener’s Text should be changed. At Matt. 24:2b, the reading should be “*panta* (all) *tauta* (these things)” (MBT, e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042; manifested in Erasmus 1516 & 1522, Stephanus 1550, & Scrivener’s Text), not “*tauta* (these things) *panta* (all)” (minority Byzantine reading, e.g., H 013, 9th century; M 021, 9th century; X 033, 10th century; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; Lectionary 1968; & Chrysostom); and so Scrivener’s Text should be left as is. And at Matt. 24:33b, the reading should be “*tauta* (these things) *panta* (all)” (MBT, e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) not “*panta* (all) *tauta* (these things)” (minority Byzantine reading, e.g., Pi 041, 9th century; X 033, 10th century; Gamma 036, 10th century; manifested in Erasmus 1516 & 1522, Stephanus 1550, & Scrivener’s Text); and so Scrivener’s Text should be changed.

It therefore follows that at Matt. 23:36b and 24:33, Erasmus created a duo of matching “textual trademarks.” As it were, he thus here wrote: “SECRET & CONFIDENTIAL: FOR THE EYES OF NEO-BYZANTINE TEXTUAL ANALYSTS ONLY.” Such were “the secrets of the trade” for neo-Byzantines back in the 16th and 17th centuries. No doubt Erasmus “smiled widely” at this clever Erasmian doublet (Matt. 23:36b & Matt. 24:33b) which we have analyzed inside the wider context of a textual analytical triplet (Matt. 24:2b). After all, he had set a two-stepped “spring-loaded trap” to catch any second-rate copyists who might seek to reproduce his text and call it their own. On one level, we share the humour, and understand the intellectual cleverness of this past master of the Neo-Byzantine School in giving this intricate stamp to his work; as well as appreciate the reissuing of these Erasmian “textual trademarks” by, e.g., Stephanus who here followed Erasmus in both readings at Matt. 23:36b and 24:33. But as a 21st century neo-Byzantine textual analyst, this is not “a secret of the trade” that I wish to retain. I do not accept the propriety of such “textual trademarks.” Let Scrivener’s text accordingly be amended at Matt. 23:36b and 24:33. Let the MBT reading “*panta* (all) *tauta* (these things)” be used at Matt. 23:36b; and let the MBT reading, “*tauta* (these things) *panta* (all)” be used at Matt. 24:33b!

I have mentioned above that it would be *prima facie* possible to distinguish Matt. 6:32 and 24:8 on the basis that there is a conjunction between the “*panta* (all)” and “*tauta* (these things)” i.e., and thereby claim either that on Christ’s lips, but not the rich young ruler’s, the reading must be “*tauta* (these things) *panta* (all),” if there is no such conjunction. Or *worse still*, one might claim that this is a rigid rule “of Matthean Greek,” requiring that not only Matt. 24:2b and Matt. 24:33b, but also Matt. 19:20 be “harmonized” to “*tauta* (these things) *panta* (all).” However, this would be like “an overdone” and “burnt” roast-dinner which had been “cooked too long.” I.e., it would be far too rigid a reading of the Greek, created “an overly restored” text.

Given the stilted rigidity of such a *prima facie* possibility, the reader might

wonder why I would even return to so forced and unnatural a hypothetical form of pseudo-textual analysis? The reason, good Christian reader, is this. It would appear that *this is exactly what the scribe of Codex Sinaiticus did!* We find that at both Matt. 23:36b and Matt. 24:2b *Codex Sinaiticus* reads “*tauta* (these things) *panta* (all),” and more than this, at Matt. 19:20 *Codex Sinaiticus* also reads “*tauta* (these things) *panta* (all).” Therefore this Alexandrian School scribe evidently stylized the MBT readings of “*panta* (all) *tauta* (these things)” at Matt. 19:20; 23:36b; 24:2b, so as to “standardize” them on the basis of such overly rigid and thus stilted logic.

What does this tell us about this scribe of the Alexandrian School whose manuscript is one of two upon which Neo-Alexandrians pin their greatest hopes for determining the text of the NT? “*Well, ... let’s just say that when it came to textual analysis, it’s clear that the Alexandrian School scribes left a good deal to be desired.*”

Furthermore, we find that at Matt. 19:20 and 24:33 the scribe of *Codex Vaticanus* did not join the scribe of *Codex Sinaiticus* in this folly; but at Matt. 24:2b, evidently influenced by such a corruption, he adopted it here on a somewhat *ad hoc* basis, indicating he understood neither the correct textual analysis, *supra*, nor the half-way house textual analysis of *Codex Sinaiticus*, *supra*. As per normal, such splits among the two main Alexandrian texts caused painful consternation and uncertainty for the neo-Alexandrians, so that at Matt. 19:20, the erroneous reading of *Codex Sinaiticus* was followed by Tischendorf’s 8th edition and the NU Text; whereas the correct reading of *Codex Vaticanus* was followed by Westcott-Hort and Nestle’s 21st edition. At Matt. 24:33b, once again the erroneous reading of *Codex Sinaiticus* was followed by Tischendorf’s 8th edition; whereas the correct reading of *Codex Vaticanus* was followed by Westcott-Hort, Nestle’s 21st edition, and the NU Text. But at Matt. 24:2b where both *Codices Sinaiticus & Vaticanus* are wrong, they were followed by the NU Text *et al.* (Cf. Appendix 3, *infra*.)

So what does this tell us about the “textual analysts” of the neo-Alexandrian School? *Well, ... let’s just say that if it’s clear that the Alexandrian School scribes left a good deal to be desired; then the neo-Alexandrians are truly, “a chip off the old block”!*

AT MATT. 23:37a, the spelling derived from the root word, *apokteino*, in the reading of Scrivener’s Text, “*ε* (the [one]) *apokteinousa* (‘killing,’ feminine singular vocative, active present participle, from *apokteino*),” i.e., “*thou that killest*,” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042). However, the spelling derived from the root word, *apokteno*, in the MBT reading (e.g., W 032; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings) is, “*ε* (the [one]) *apoktenousa* (‘killing,’ feminine singular vocative, active present participle, from *apokteno*),” i.e., “*thou that killest*.” Greek, *apokteino*, *apokteno*, or *apoktenno* are all spelling variants of the same root Greek word¹⁷.

Hodges & Farstad put the reading, “*apoktenousa*” in their main text as their

¹⁷ Mounce’s *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), p. 91.

preferred reading, but say “there is a substantial division within the Majority Text tradition,” and thus the MBT, between this reading and that of what they call the “TR” which is “*apokteinousa*.”¹⁸ Robinson & Pierpont (2005) also put “*apoktenousa*” in their main text as their preferred reading, but say, “the manuscripts comprising the Byzantine Textform are significantly divided” between this reading and “*apokteinousa*.”¹⁹

Von Soden (1913) says that within the K group, the spelling “*apoktenousa*” is supported by his Kx and Kr groups. Of c. 860 K group Gospel manuscripts, von Soden’s Kx group contains c. 500 Gospel manuscripts; and his Kr group contains c. 175 Gospel manuscripts²⁰. $500 (Kx) + 175 (Kr) = 675$ out of 860. Therefore c. 78.5% of Gospel manuscripts support the spelling “*apoktenousa*” which is thus clearly the MBT reading (even allowing an error bar of c. 10% of 78.5% i.e., 7.85% or c. 8% for von Soden’s generalist groupings). On these figures, the MBT reading is clearly established by a safe margin.

On the one hand, here at Matt. 23:37a the 20%+ of manuscripts supporting the minority Byzantine reading may constitute what Hodges & Farstad’s call “Majority Part” (“Mpt”) and thus a “seriously divided” text²¹, or what Robinson & Pierpont put in their sidenote and call a “significantly divided” text²². But on the other hand, because these type of explanatory figures are not provided in their footnotes, a reader might wrongly think that a “seriously divided” or “significantly divided” text meant something more in the range of 50% each way. This factor highlights one of the weaknesses of both Hodges & Farstad’s and Robinson & Pierpont’s majority texts i.e., the reader not familiar with their source book of von Soden, is not really sure in any given instance what the majority text strength is. In fairness to Pierpont, in Green’s Textual Apparatus (1986) he says the MBT reading has the support of “61-79% of all manuscripts.” It is a pity that Pierpont did not note develop a similar type of Majority Text Table with details matching Robinson & Pierpont’s majority text selections, placed in an Appendix of their work; and it is a pity that Hodges & Farstad did not do so either. Certainly this is a point at which both of their majority texts might be profitably improved upon; and von Soden’s most valuable data translated into something more readily understandable to their readers.

Looking more widely at the root Greek word spelt either *apokteno* or *apokteino* in St. Matthew’s Gospel, we find that the MBT and TR reading in the first instance at Matt.

¹⁸ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xiv & 80.

¹⁹ Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 53.

²⁰ See Commentary at Matt. 21:28a, “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” “The First Matter.”

²¹ Hodges & Fartsad (1985), pp. xxi & 80.

²² Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 53.

10:28 is *apoktenō* (“which kill,” *apoktenonton*, masculine plural genitive, active present participle, from *apoktenō*) (see Textual Commentary, Volume 1, Appendix 1, at Matt. 10:28b); and in the second instance at Matt. 10:28 *apokteino* (“to kill,” *apokteinai*, active aorist infinitive, from *apokteino*). The root word is *apokteino* in MBT and TR at Matt. 14:5 (“put ... to death,” *apokteinai*, active aorist infinitive); 21:35 (“killed,” *apekteinan*, indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb), 38 (“let us kill,” *apokteinomen*, subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb²³), 39 (“slew,” *apekteinan*, indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb); 22:6 (“slew,” *apekteinan*, indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb); and 26:4 (“kill,” *apokteinosin*, subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural verb²⁴). And the root word is *apoktenō* in MBT and TR at Matt. 17:23 (“they shall kill,” *apoktenousin*, indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb), 23:34 (“ye shall kill,” *apokteneite*, indicative active future, 2nd person plural verb) and 24:9 (“shall kill,” *apoktenousin*, indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb). The root word’s exact spelling is not determinable from the declension used at Matt. 16:21 (“be killed,” *apoktanthenai*, passive aorist infinitive from *apokteino* / *apoktenō*).

In the first place it is clear that St. Matthew is prepared to use both spellings on different occasions. I shall not now address the error that denies Matthean authorship of the Greek, and claims the Greek is a later translation by an unknown hand. But I accept that St. Matthew uses various Aramaic or Hebraic stylistic forms, while maintaining that he brings them over into his Greek written Gospel. In the second place, it is instructive to note that he does so in the same verse at Matt. 10:28 as part of an Aramaic / Hebraic style antithetical poetical parallelism, thereby heightening the stylistic difference by using both spellings.

And fear not them *which kill* (*apoktenō*) the body,
But are not able *to kill* (*apokteino*) the soul.

To render this as, “And fear not them *which murder* the body, but are not able *to kill* the soul,” would constitute *an over-translation* of the nuance which is clearly *more subtle* than this. Perhaps using the archaic “murther” which is a synonym for “murder,” one might render it:

²³ *Prima facie* this could be present tense or aorist tense, which in this instance are homophones (same sound but different meanings) and homographs (same spelling but different meanings). That is because the aorist form of *apokteino* lacks the more normative sigma (“s”) which distinguishes it from a present tense (Mounce’s *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT*, 1993, pp. 22,91). But the wider Matt. 21:38 context with “*kataschomen* (‘let us seize on,’ subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *katecho*),” indicates that this too is a subjunctive active aorist.

²⁴ Per the last footnote, *prima facie* this could be present tense. But once again the wider Matt. 26:4 context of aorist 3rd person plural verbs, “*sunebouleusanto* (‘consulted,’ indicative middle aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *sumbouleuo*),” and “*kratesosi* (‘they might take,’ subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *krateo*),” shows that this is an aorist.

And fear not them *which murder* the body,
But are not able *to murder* the soul.

I hope this helps the reader better understand the poetical nuance of Matt. 10:28. For:

If you don't realise it now;
Then you'll never realize it!

Therefore it follows from this stylistic analysis, that the MBT reading at Matt. 23:37a, “ε (the [one]) *apoktenousa* (‘killing,’ from *apokteno*),” i.e., in the AV’s translation showing “thou” in italics as added, “*thou* that killest” (AV), does not present any clear and obvious textual problem. Hence it is the correct reading of the TR.

The minority Byzantine reading at Matt. 23:37a, “ε (the [one]) *apokteinousa* (‘killing,’ from *apokteino*),” looks suspiciously like it was an attempt to “standardize” Matthean spellings to the more common root form, *apokteino*; but it also looks like it was inconsistently applied in an *ad hoc* manner by this and that scribe. Thus e.g., both Matt. 10:38 and Matt. 23:37a were “standardized” from their root form of *apokteno* to the root form, *apokteino*; but others like Matt. 17:23 “fell through the cracks” of this *ad hoc* approach.

Against this backdrop, the learned Erasmus who was “forever looking for good textual trademarks,” evidently came across this one at Matt. 23:37a, and decided to “exploit his good fortune.” He thus happily adopted the reading, “*apokteinousa*,” in his editions of 1516 and 1522. Later neo-Byzantines who knew “the secrets of the trade,” smiled upon Erasmus’s doings, and in honour of him continued this “textual trademark” in the text of e.g., Stephanus (1550). Did anyone ever think that “*apokteinousa*” had much support in the manuscripts? “... Well, ... let’s just say that,” Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) showed it as a minority reading with the support of two of his eight manuscripts (Gospel manuscripts: v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; & w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16); and with the support of about ¼ or 25% of his selection, his figures were not that different to von Soden’s which puts its support at somewhere around 22%, or Green’s Textual Apparatus which puts it at between 21-39% support.

My position on the retention of “textual trademarks” is no “secret of the trade.” Let Scrivener’s Text be amended here at Matt. 23:37a, and Scrivener’s minority Byzantine reading, “*apokteinousa* (‘killing,’ from *apokteino*),” be replaced with the majority Byzantine reading, “*apoktenousa* (‘killing,’ from *apokteno*)”!

FOR MATT. 24:33b, see comments after Matt. 23:36b, in Appendix 1, *supra*.

AT MATT. 24:17b, Scrivener’s Text reads, “*ti* (‘anything,’ neuter singular accusative pronoun, from *tis*),” i.e., “anything” in the wider words, “to take anything out of his house” (AV). This is a minority Greek reading (Hippolytus, d. 235); found in the Greek texts of Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir

(1633). By contrast, the MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), reads, “*ta* (‘the [things]’ = ‘anything,’ neuter plural accusative, definite article from *to*),” i.e., once again, “anything²⁵.”

With regard to the minority Greek reading of Scrivener’s text *et al*, within Matthean Greek one finds a comparable usage of “*tis* (‘any man,’ masculine singular nominative pronoun, from *tis*),” for “any man” at Matt. 11:27; 12:19; 21:3; 22:46; & 24:23. Or even more poignantly we find the usage of “*ti* (neuter singular accusative pronoun, from *tis*),” at Matt. 5:23 (“anything” / “something” = “ought,” AV); 15:32 (“*ouk ... ti*” = “not anything” = “nothing,” AV); 20:20 (“something” = “a certain thing,” AV); and 21:3 (“anything” / “something” = “ought,” AV).

And with regard to the MBT, within Matthean Greek one finds a comparable usage of the definite article put in the singular form in, for instance, Matt. 2:23 “*to* (‘the [thing]’ = ‘which,’ neuter singular nominative, definite article from *to*),” Or even more poignantly in the same form as Matt. 22:17b in the MBT, at Matt. 8:33, “*ta* (‘the [things]’ = ‘what,’ neuter plural accusative, definite article from *to*);” twice in 16:23 with “*ta* (the [things])” in “the things that be of God,” and (‘the [things]’ = ‘those’)” in “those that be of men;” and twice in 22:21 with “*ta* (the [things which are])” in “the things which are Caesar’s,” and “*ta* (the [things that are])” in “the things that are God’s.”

Thus *prima facie* either reading could *possibly* be Matthean. But we take the representative Byzantine Greek reading as the one preserved by God over time and through time, unless there is a good textual argument against it. Here no such textual argument can be adduced as there is no clear and obvious textual problem with the MBT. Therefore the MBT must stand. The minority Greek reading appears to have been brought in as a “textual trademark” by Erasmus, and thereafter followed by Stephanus *et al*. Erasmus may well have gotten this obscure reading from Hippolytus. We recognize Erasmus’s great learning as seen in his location of this rare reading; and the fact that he hereby probably wished to honour the name of Hippolytus, a Defender of the Trinity against modalism and a Christian martyr. We too honour the name of Hippolytus. But for all that; let this “textual trademark” be removed! Let Scrivener’s Text be amended accordingly here at Matt. 24:17b to read “*ta* (‘the [things]’ = ‘anything’).”

AT MATT. 24:20 Scrivener’s Text reads “*en* (on) *sabbato* (the sabbath day).” This is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., E 07, 8th century; Minuscules 65, 11th century; 44, 12th century; & 122, 12th century)²⁶. It is found in the Greek texts of Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633). By

²⁵ The MBT has the residual support of von Soden’s K group i.e., c. 90% + of the K group, and therefore (on such a large sample we can say) c. 90% + of the MBT.

²⁶ The MBT has the residual support of von Soden’s K group other than the seven Byzantine manuscripts of his Ki group, of which I here list 4. The MBT thus has the support of c. 90%+ of von Soden’s K group and thus the MBT.

contrast, the MBT reading (e.g., W 032, 5th century; Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century; K 017, 9th century; Lectionary 2378, 11th century; Lectionary 1968, 16th century; Origen & Eusebius) is “*sabbatō* (on the sabbath day)²⁷.”

When a dative of time is used, then the dative may be rendered as “on.” E.g., St. Matthew uses a dative of time at Matt. 16:21; 17:23; 20:19, for “*te* (‘the,’ feminine singular dative, definite article from *e*) *trite* (‘third,’ feminine singular dative adjective, from *tritōs*) *emera* (‘day,’ feminine singular dative noun, from *emera*),” which could be rendered in all three instances either as, “the third day” (AV) or “on the third day” (NASB). But the *Koine* Greek of the NT was in a transition period when this dative of time was increasingly being replaced with the formulae of words, *en* + dative²⁸. E.g., we find at Matt. 12:2, “*en* (upon) *sabbatō* (‘the sabbath day,’ neuter singular dative noun, from *sabbaton*).”

This means that here at Matt. 24:20, the MBT reading, “*sabbatō* (neuter singular dative noun, from *sabbaton*),” would be rendered as “on the sabbath day;” and thus be identical in meaning with the minority Byzantine reading “*en* (on) *sabbatō* (‘the sabbath day,’ neuter singular dative noun, from *sabbaton*).”

Given that St. Matthew uses both the dative of time and also the formulae of words, *en* + dative, both are clearly within Matthean Greek, and so there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading here at Matt. 24:20. Thus it looks like as assimilationist scribe assimilated the Matt. 24:20 reading to that of Matt. 12:2, thus adding in the “*en*” before “*sabbatō*.” LET THE MBT STAND!

AT MATT. 24:36a Scrivener’s Text reads, “*tes* (‘the,’ redundant in English translation) *oras* (hour).” This is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century; Phi 043, 6th century; Minuscules 924, 12th century; & 998, 12th century; Lectionary 1968, in one of two readings, p. 70a; Basil & Chrysostom). It is manifested in the Greek texts of Erasmus (1516 & 1522²⁹) and Stephanus (1550). By contrast, the MBT reading (e.g., W 032; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; Lectionary 1968, in one of two readings, p. 149a; & Cyril of Alexandria)³⁰ lacks the definite article, and so reads simply, “*oras* (hour).” But the contextual presence of “*ekeines* (that),”

²⁷ In the abbreviation of Lectionary 1968, this is written as, “*sabba*”, and then in between this and the above line, between the double “b” (beta) is the “t” (tau) followed by “l”.

²⁸ Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, pp. 155-7; Young’s *Greek*, p. 49.

²⁹ In both instances the “*tes*” or “*της*” is abbreviated as a small sigma, “c” at the top of the right-hand cross-bar of the tau “τ”.

³⁰ The MBT has the residual support of von Soden’s K group, and so c. 90%+ of the MBT.

means it will be translated, “that ... hour” from either reading (in the wider words, “that day and hour”).

In wider Matthean Greek, though the definite article is sometimes used by St. Matthew with “*oras*” (Matt. 9:22; 15:28; 17:18); sometimes it is not (Matt. 27:45, twice). Certainly one could not say that the MBT was contrary to Matthean Greek, and therefore the MBT should stand. This Erasmian “textual trademark” was probably intended by Erasmus as a device to simultaneously honour the names of Basil and Chrysostom, and also provide himself with a “textual trademark;” and to some extent thereafter it was probably followed by e.g., Stephanus in order to both honour the name of Erasmus and also provide himself with a “textual trademark.” But the time for this “textual trademark” to go has come. Let Scrivener’s text at Matt. 24:36a be amended accordingly.

AT MATT. 25:3b Scrivener’s Text reads, “*lampadas* (lamps) *eauton* (‘of themselves’ = ‘their,’ AV feminine plural genitive, third person reflexive personal pronoun from *eautou*),” i.e., “their lamps.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), Phi 043 (6th century, Matthew & Mark), S 028 (10th century), and Minuscule 924 (12th century). It is also found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522), and followed in Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

However, the MBT reads, “*lampadas* (lamps) *auton* (‘of them,’ feminine plural genitive, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*),” i.e., “their lamps” (e.g., W 032³¹, X 033; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings).

There is no good textual argument against the MBT here which is thus correct. In the immediately surrounding verses of this passage St. Matthew uses “*auton* (‘of them’ or ‘their’)” in Matt. 25:1,2,4,7; and in Matt. 25:3 itself he uses “*eauton*” in the words, “*meth’* (with) *eauton* (them).” It looks like a scribe altered the earlier verse 3 “*auton*” of “*lampadas* (lamps) *auton* (of them),” to “*eauton*” as some kind of “internal stylistic balance” with the latter verse 3 “*eauton*” of “*meth’* (with) *eauton* (them).”

The meaning of “their lamps” is the same with either reading, and looks like the ever artful Erasmus, always looking for “a good textual trademark,” adroitly saw the value of this minority Byzantine reading. On one level, his idea “worked” since e.g., we know that the subsequent texts of Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633) are Erasmus derived texts here at Matt. 25:3b. But on another level, his idea does not work *if like myself one applies the normative rules of neo-Byzantine textual analysis as much to those readings which make no difference to the translation as to those which do*. Thus we are once again confronted with an internal neo-Byzantine textual analysts difference of opinion as to the desirability of “textual trademarks” between 16th and 17th century

³¹ Coming at the end of line in W 032, “*auton*” is written with a normative W 032 abbreviation for the final “*n*” (nu) that looks something like, “*auto~*” (cf. Matt. 25:4b, in App. 3, *infra*).

neo-Byzantine textual analysts such as Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and Elzevir; and myself as a 21st century neo-Byzantine textual analyst. My position is “on the table” and well known to all good Christian readers (and any other readers). *Let the MBT stand!* Let Scrivener’s Text be amended accordingly here at Matt. 25:3b.

AT MATT. 25:30 Scrivener’s Text reads, “*ekballete* (cast ye).” This spelling with a double “l” (lambda) is a minority Byzantine reading (F 09, 9th century; H 013, 9th century; Minuscule 2, 12th century; & Lectionary 1968, in one of two readings, p. 72b). However there is only one “l” (lambda) in the MBT spelling, “*ekbalete*” (e.g., A 02, W 032, X 033; Lectionary 2378; & Lectionary 1968, in one of two readings, p. 152a).

Was the variant an accidental alteration? Did a scribe looking at a manuscript simply use his short-term memory to remember several words at once, and then copy them down? Did he thus use the spelling of “*ekballete* (cast ye)” because that is how he usually spelt this word? Does this type of thing account for the diversity of spelling in the two readings of Sydney University’s Lectionary 1968?

Alternatively, in Manuscript London (A 02) the “A” (alpha) before the “λ” (lambda) appears in my photocopy of a facsimile to be so poorly formed as to be easily taken for another “λ” (lambda). Did a scribe using such a manuscript first write out the “EKBA”? Was he then momentarily distracted, and upon quickly looking back, did he think he saw a double “λ” (lambda) so that he wrote “λλETE”?

Was the variant a deliberate alteration? E.g., did a scribe deliberately assimilate it with the earlier double “λ” (lambda) spelling of Matt. 10:8, being unaware of the single “λ” (lambda) spelling of Matt. 22:13?

The fact that the TR and MBT (as well as Scrivener) reads at Matt. 22:13 “*ekbalete*” and at Matt. 10:8 “*ekballete*,” shows both spellings were known to, and used by, St. Matthew. Hence there is no good textual argument against either reading, and so the MBT must stand at Matt. 25:30 i.e., “*ekbalete*” rather than Scrivener’s “*ekballete*.”

The minority Byzantine reading of Scrivener’s text is found in the Greek texts of Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633). Once again this looks very much like an Erasmanian “textual trademark,” so that we know that the line of neo-Byzantine Greek New Testaments going through e.g., Stephanus, Beza, Elzevir, and ending up with Scrivener, are all getting their basis information from Erasmus. I too “doff my hat” to the learned Erasmus of Rotterdam. But I first and foremost bow down low to the throne of His Divine Majesty, the Lord Jehovah. *Let the majority Byzantine text reading here stand at Matt. 25:30, and let Scrivener’s text be amended accordingly!*

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.**

At Matt. 21:9; 21:15b; 22:42,43,45, we are presented with the difficulties that may sometimes beset us in unravelling continuous script manuscripts. The abbreviation for “ΔαΔ” (*DaD*) with a bar across the top of these letters is found at Matt. 21:9,15b; 22:42,43 in number manuscripts (e.g., Sigma 042 & Lectionary 2378), or “Δαδ” (*Dad*) with a line over the “α” at Matt. 22:45 (Lectionary 2378), or “δαδ” with a line over the “α” at Matt. 21:9,15b; 22:42,43,45 (Lectionary 1968³²).

As one who thanks God for the privilege of being able to study Sydney University Lectionaries 2378 & 1968, I do not doubt that the motive of these Lectionary scribes for such abbreviations was space i.e., the more abbreviations used, the more that could be fitted into a page of the Lectionary. As one who thanks God that we live in an age where such paper constraints no longer apply, we are nevertheless sometimes still left with uncertainties as to what the original spellings of such proper nouns was. For example, “David” may be spelt at Matt. 21:9,15b as “*Daueid*” (W 032) or “*Dauid*” (N 022).

The spelling of “David” preferred at Matt. 21:9,15b; 22:42,43,45; by Scrivener and Hodges & Farstad is, “*Dabid*,” whereas Robinson & Pierpont, Nestle’s 21st edition and the NU Text prefer “*Dauid*,” and Tischendorf and Westcott & Hort prefer “*Daueid*.” *Que sera sera*³³.

At Matt. 23:28a the “*outo* (so)” of Scrivener’s Text is followed in Hodges & Farstad’s majority text (for instance, Y 034, 9th century); whereas the same word with the optional “*s*” (sigma) is followed as “*outos* (so)” in Robinson & Pierpont’s majority text (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & Lectionary 1968), and also in the NU Text *et al* (e.g., Alexandrian Text’s Rome Vaticanus & Western Text’s D 05). This issue reminds us that

³² In Lectionary 1968, the writing is unclear at the first reading of Matt. 22:42,43,45 in positive and negative microfilm copies, and so the original was also checked (p. 69b); but it is clear in the second reading of Matt. 22:42,43,45 (pp. 146a to 146b).

³³ “What will be, will be.” From the Latin languages of Spanish and / or French. Derived from the Latin tongue of Italian, *Che sara sara*.

on the one hand, the residual support of one of these two readings from von Soden’s K group means the basic word is MBT; but on the other hand, the lack of any specific detail on the use or non-use of this optional letter in von Soden means we do not know its exact MBT spelling. But either way, the rendering will still be “so.”

Appendix 3
Minor variants between the NU Text or MBT 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. 21-25)

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. 21:1b the TR’s “*pros* (‘unto’ or ‘at,’ preposition with accusative) *to* (‘the,’ neuter singular accusative, definite article from *to*) *oros* (‘mount,’ neuter singular accusative, third declension noun, from *oros*),” is MBT (e.g., W 032; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct. However, Origen who cites this MBT reading, also refers to a variant, “*eis* (‘unto’ or ‘at,’ preposition with accusative) *to* (the) *oros* (mount).” While the MBT reading is followed by the Alexandrian text’s Codex Sinaiticus; the variant is followed by the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus, and adopted by the NU Text *et al.* But either way the rendering is still, “unto the mount” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:2a, the TR’s “*poreuthete* (‘Ye go’ = ‘Go,’ subjunctive passive aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *poreuo*³⁴),” is MBT (e.g., W 032 with altered localized dialect vowelling to *poreuthetai*³⁵; Sigma 042, N 022, & Lectionary 2378,) and correct. It is also found in Lectionary 1968, where the main text reads with the same localized vowel spelling as W 032, “*poreuthetai*,” but then above the “*a*” (alpha) of the “*ai*” (alpha, iota) suffix, is the letter “*e*” (epsilon). Thus Lectionary 1968 provides a textual apparatus giving both spellings. (Cf. W 032 at Matt. 25:9b.)

However, the reading “*poreuesthe* (‘Ye go’ = ‘Go,’ imperative middle present, 2nd person plural verb, from *poreuo*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., 1604, 13th century). This minority reading is followed by the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus, and the leading Western Text, D 05. It was adopted in the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering into English is “Go” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:2b, the TR’s “*ten* (feminine singular accusative, definite article from

³⁴ A deponent form of *poreuo* is *poreuomai*.

³⁵ See Commentary Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Matt. 16:8b, “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” “The First Matter;” and e.g., W 032 in Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), at Matt. 10:8.

e) apenanti ('over against,' or 'opposite,' preposition with the genitive) *umon* ('you,' 2nd person plural genitive personal pronoun, from singular-plural *su-umeis*)," in the wider words, "Go into the village *over against you*," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct.

However, "*ten* (-) *katnanti* ('over against,' or 'opposite,' preposition with the genitive) *umon* ('you,' genitive personal pronoun)," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., 267, 12th century). Both readings were known to Origen and Eusebius, and Origen is the probable the originator of this variant. The variant is followed in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, and leading Western Text, D 05; and was adopted in the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading at Matt. 21:2b is still, "over against you" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:3a, the TR's "*eutheos* ('straightway,' adverb)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968), and with no good textual argument against it, correct. Both the MBT reading, and a variant, "*euthus* ('straightway,' adverb)," are referred to by Origen, who is probably the originator of this variant. The scribes of the Alexandrian School were evidently attracted to Origen's shorter reading; "It's a whole one letter better," remarked these stingy scribes; and so the variant is found in both Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. From here it entered the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading is "straightway" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:3b the MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) reads "*apostellei* ('he sendeth them' = 'he will send,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *apostello*);" this is found in two old Latin Versions (d & h, "*dimittit*," indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *dimitto*); and was followed by Erasmus (1516 & 1522). By contrast, the reading of Scrivener's Text and the TR, "*apostelei* ('he will send,' indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *apostello*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (M 021 & Origen), also found in the Vulgate ("*dimittet*," indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *dimitto*), most old Latin Versions; and was followed by Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

The *future indicative* tense is commonly used for a command by St. Matthew³⁶. When the *indicative future* is used for a command, it is sometimes called "the cohortative indicative"³⁷. Here at Matt. 21:3b we find the *cohortative indicative* in the words, "And if any man say ought unto you, *ye shall say* (*ereite*, indicative active future, 2nd person plural verb, from *lego*), The Lord hath need of them" etc. . Both this fact, and the authoritative usage of "*O* (The) *Kurios* (Lord)," means that the MBT falls flat. It is like a loud drum roll for something to happen on a stage, followed by a voice declaring, "An ant is now walking across the stage." If it is not "a joke," then it is just not right.

³⁶ Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 452-3; 569-70; Young's *Greek*, p. 118.

³⁷ Young's *Greek*, p. 137.

Thus the better reading is the authoritative command, “*apostelei* (‘he will send,’ indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *apostello*.)” I.e., “And if any man say ought unto you, *ye shall say* (indicative active future, command), The Lord (authoritative title) hath need of them; and straightway *he will send* (indicative active future, command) them.” But either way, the reading at Matt. 21:3b will still be, “he will send” (AV & NKJV)³⁸.

At Matt. 21:5a the TR’s “*kai* (and)” before “*epibebekos* (sitting upon) *epi* (upon),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct. It is also found as Latin, “*et* (and),” in e.g., the *Book of Armagh* (812 A.D.). Even if the “*kai* (and)” was absent from the Greek, one would still render the key words into English as, “meek, and sitting.” The “and” is omitted in e.g., the leading Western Text (D05) and Dillmann’s Ethiopic Version (18th / 19th centuries), so that in his 2nd edition (1842), Tischendorf was emboldened to criticize Stephanus (1550) for including the “*kai* (and).”

But with the discovery of Codex Sinaiticus in Arabia, and the fusion of this with Codex Vaticanus from Papal Rome, Tischendorf became the founding father of the Neo-Alexandrian School as we basically now know it today. To Tischendorf’s undoubted consternation, it turned out that BOTH of these Alexandrian texts included the “*kai* (and).” Thus in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) we see *a switch about’n’jump about* with “*kai*” now in Tischendorf’s favour. But throughout these type of vacillations, for those who recognized the Biblical promise, “the Word of the Lord endureth forever” (I Peter 1:25), and so who upheld the *Textus Receptus*, it was a case of “Steady as she goes!”, with no such *switching about and jumping about the place*.

At Matt. 21:7a the TR’s “*epanō* (‘on,’ = preposition + genitive) *auton* (‘them,’ masculine plural genitive, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*)” i.e., “on” in the words, “and put on them their clothes” (AV), is MBT (e.g., W 032, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct. But a variant, “*ep* (‘on,’ = preposition *epi* + genitive) *auton* (them),” appears to originate with Origen, and is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus; and was predictably adopted by the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering is still, “on,” in “and put on them” etc. (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:7b the TR’s “*ta* (the) *imatia* (clothes) *auton* (of them),” i.e., “their clothes” (AV) is MBT (e.g., W 032, Lectionaries 2378 & 1968³⁹) and correct. However,

³⁸ Tischendorf’s 2nd edition (1842, *Lectiones Variants*, p. 7) criticized the text of Stephanus (1550) for following the TR; but given that this same reading is found in the two main Alexandrian Text’s, for the wrong reasons, Tischendorf later adopted it in his 8th edition (1869-72). It is thus also found at Matt. 21:3b in the NU Text *et al.*

³⁹ Lectionary 2378 here has the “τ” (tau / t) inserted above the line in the middle of the “ω” (omega / o) of “αυτων” (*auton*) which is a closed top omega that looks something like, “∞”; and Lectionary 1968 has the “τ” (tau / t) placed above the line in between the “ω” (omega / o) and “μ” (nu / n, written in this Lectionary’s cursive script as

a variant omitting Greek, “*auton* (of them),” may be reconstructed from old Latin e, b, d, ff2, & ff1. This variant is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, and leading Western Text, D 05. This omission is thus found in the NU Text *et al.* But the “*ta* (‘the,’ neuter plural accusative, definite article from *to*) *imatia* (‘clothes,’ neuter plural accusative noun, from *imation / himation*),” is considered as requiring the necessary supply of “their” in English translation. Hence it is found without italics in the ASV and NASB. Thus either way the reading is, “and put on them their clothes” (AV & TR) or, “and put on them their garments” (ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:8 the TR’s Greek “*eauton* (‘of themselves’ = ‘their,’ AV masculine plural genitive, third person reflexive personal pronoun from *eautou*),” in the words, “their garments” (AV), is MBT (e.g., N 022; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and certainly correct. However, Greek “*auton* (‘of them,’ masculine plural genitive, personal pronoun from *autos*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042). Von Soden (1913) says in his *very good textual apparatus* that the variant is followed by his Kr group. This is a subgroup within his wider K group containing *c.* 20% or about one-fifth of the *c.* 1,000 manuscripts of K group, of which more than 90% are Byzantine Text. This variant is thus regarded by Hodges & Farstad (1985) as sufficiently noteworthy to include in their *First Apparatus* i.e., showing what they regard as “a significant division within the ... manuscripts,” as opposed to their *Second Apparatus* on each page for less significant variations. Hodges & Farstad’s “Mr” group (Majority subgroup r) being a symbol that precisely equates von Soden’s “Kr” (Koine subgroup r)⁴⁰.

Outside the closed class of sources, this variant is also found in e.g., the leading Western text, D 05, L 019, and Delta 037. Only von Soden adopts this variant in his very bad main text. Either way, the translation at Matt. 21:8 is still “their” i.e., “their garments” (AV & TR) or “their clothes” (Moffatt & von Soden’s text). Under normal circumstances I would not refer to this variant, but on this occasion, in the first instance I use this reading to remind the reader that while I have *a very high regard* for von Soden’s textual apparatus, and his textual apparatus requires reference to his accompanying main text to make sense; I nevertheless have *a correspondingly very low regard* for von Soden’s main text, and that I do not normally refer to it when considering the manifestation of readings in different Greek texts.

But in the second instance, I note that the Latin of the Vulgate and old Latin Versions, “*vestimenta* (‘garments,’ neuter plural accusative noun, from *vestimentum*) *sua* (‘their,’ neuter plural accusative reflexive adjective, from *suus*),” is manifested in the Clementine. This was also rendered in the Roman Catholic’s Douay-Rheims Version as, “their garments.” The grammatical way that the Latin constructs these words here at Matt. 21:8 is thus different to the grammatical way that the Greek constructs these words, even though the rendering into English is the same either way. In this instance, the

“μ” not “ν” but without the protrusion to the right of what would be a “μ” / mu) of “*αυωμ*” (*auton*). (Cf. Matt. 25:7, *infra*.)

⁴⁰ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xiii, xv, & 69.

Latin, “their (*sua*),” has a sense more like the Greek variant, “their” or literally, “of them (*auton*),” than like the TR’s Greek, “of themselves (*eauton*).” *Yet one would be foolish to thereby conclude that the Latin was translating from the variant’s Greek rather than the TR’s Greek.* And so this reading at Matt. 21:8 also reminds us that there are times when the Latin cannot be used to distinguish between multiple Greek readings.

At Matt. 21:12a, the TR’s “*o* (‘the,’ word 1, redundant in English translation) *Iesous* (‘Jesus,’ word 2),” is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042, N 022, & Origen) and correct. But a variant omitting word 1, and reading simply, “*Iesous* (‘Jesus,’ word 2),” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032 & Origen). The variant is followed by the two leading Alexandrian Text’s Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, and from there, what originally was probably a pruning by Origen, entered the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading is still, “Jesus” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:16a and Matt. 21:27, the TR’s “*eipon* (‘they said,’ indicative active second aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *legō*),” is MBT at both Matt. 21:16a (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and Matt. 21:27 (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionary 1968), and with no good textual arguments against the reading in these two verses, they are correct. The TR is followed at Matt. 21:27 by the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus. However, a variant, “*eipan* (‘they said,’ indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural, from the verb, *legō*),” is found in the NU Text *et al* at both Matt. 21:16a (Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; & Western text’s D 05) and Matt. 21:27 (Alexandrian text’s Codex Sinaiticus & Western text’s Codex D 05). There is no difference in meaning between the first aorist (or “weak aorist”) and second aorist (or “strong aorist”), which are simply different aorist declensions. Thus either way, the rendering at Matt. 21:16a will be “said (they said)” in, “and said unto him” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H); and likewise the rendering at Matt. 21:27 will be “said (they said)” in, “And they answered Jesus, and said” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:16b, Tischendorf’s 2nd edition (1842, *Lectiones Variants*, p. 7) criticized the text of Stephanus (1550) for following the TR and MBT reading (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) which includes “*oti*” (sometimes rendered “that”) before “*Ek* (Out of).” The reading Tischendorf favoured that omitted “*oti*” is e.g., found in Methodius (d. 3rd / early 4th century); and it is also found in the leading Western Text, D 05. Later, when Tischendorf became founding father of the Neo-Alexandrian School in the form that we basically now know it, he found the two leading Alexandrian Texts split on this reading, with Codex Vaticanus following the TR and Codex Sinaiticus following the variant. He then did a switch-around turn about, and adopted the “*oti*” reading he had formerly criticized Stephanus over. We are thus reminded of a certain instability that from the outset attends the non-Byzantine modern “critical” texts. We can never be sure from one edition to the next, exactly what may change in this or that neo-Alexandrian text. Those with spiritual insight will see in this the sinful heart of man and forces of evil attacking the Received Text. But for the spiritually blinded who are brainwashed by secularism and anti-supernaturalist ideology, and in which foolishness they profess “themselves to be wise” (Rom. 1:22), this may be dismissed as “the preposterous interpretation of a religious bigot” (Matt. 13:14,15).

Yet all this huffing and puffing by Tischendorf in his 2nd edition (1842), followed by his huffing and puffing in the opposite direction in his 8th edition (1869-72), has no impact on English translation. That is because under the rule of *oti recitativum*, it is not translated because it introduces a *direct discourse*⁴¹. Therefore, in either instance the translation at Matt. 21:16b will still be, “Yea; have ye never read, (*oti*, untranslated), Out of (*Ek*) the mouths of babes” etc. .

At Matt. 21:18 the TR’s “*Proias* (‘in the morning,’ feminine singular genitive noun, from *proia*),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022; & Lectionary 2378) and correct. However, a variant, “*Proi* (‘in the morning,’ adverb, *proi*),” found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05, is adopted in the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading is still, “in the morning” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:19, the MBT reading (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) contains the adverb, “*meketi* (‘no longer’ = ‘no,’ AV).” But a variant not affecting English translation and found in Codex Vaticanus but not in Codex Sinaiticus, adds “*ou* (not)” before “*meketi* (no longer).” With such a split in the Alexandrian Texts, what were the neo-Alexandrians to do? “I know,” said Tischendorf in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), “Let’s add it in.” “I agree” said Westcott & Hort (1881) and Erwin Nestle in Nestle’s 21st edition (1952). “No way,” said Metzger, Aland, and the others on the NU Text Committee, “we want it out;” and so it is not found in the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993). What way will future neo-Alexandrians go at Matt. 21:9? We do not know, and nor do their devoted minions who sit around the world, just waiting for the next neo-Alexandrian edition to come out and tell them what the New Testament text “really is,” ... well, ... at least until the next edition after that one.

At Matt. 21:22b, the TR’s syncopated form, “*lepesthe* (‘ye will / shall receive,’ indicative middle future, 2nd person plural verb, from *lambano*)” is MBT (e.g., Lectionary 2378; and Lectionary 1968 with a local dialect revowelling of the final “*e*” to “*ai*”⁴²). Its meaning remains the same in the variant form, “*lempsthe* (‘ye will / shall receive,’ indicative middle future, 2nd person plural verb, from *lambano*),” which is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032 with a local dialect revowelling of the final “*e*” to “*ai*”⁴³; & Sigma 042). The variant form is also found in the two leading Alexandrian

⁴¹ Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Appendix 3, section: “Introduction,” sub-section: “The conjunctions, for instance, ‘de’ (and) and ‘oti’ (that);” & Young’s *Greek*, p. 190.

⁴² Here at Matt. 21:22b, cf. W 032 & D 05, *infra*. See Commentary Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20) at Matt. 16:8b, “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” “The First Matter.” Cf. N 022 on Matt. 21:13 in Commentary Vol. 3.

⁴³ Here at Matt. 21:22b, cf. Lectionary 1968, *supra* & D 05, *infra*.

texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus; and in the leading Western text, D 05 (with a local dialect revowelling of the final “e” to “ai”⁴⁴). The variant entered the NU Text *et al*; but the Matt. 21:22b rendering remains, “ye shall receive” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

I remember from studying Greek in my College days, how “*lambanō*” was always “a tricky one.” It was one of the first verbs we learnt (in present indicative active form), and for which we used special charts showing its different forms for different tenses⁴⁵. *More than three decades later lambanō is still causing me some grief here at Matt. 21:22b!* What is the issue here at Matt. 21:22b? As seen in the variant, when “*lambanō* (λαμβάνω)” is put into the future tense it declines from “*lēmpsomai* (λημψομαι),” “m” (mu / μ) is inserted after the “a” (alpha / α) (“that blasted ‘*lambanō*,’”) lengthens to “ē” (eta / η), and then the “b” (beta / β) unites with the “s” (sigma / σ)” of “*somai* (σομαι)” to form the single letter, “ps” (psi / ψ); to get “*lēmpsomai* (λημψομαι).” But as seen by the syncopated form of the TR’s reading, the insertion of the “m” (mu / μ) after the “a” (alpha / α) lengthens to “ē” (eta / η) is a grammatical nicety that need not be followed. (Cf. Matt. 10:41, Appendix 3, Vol. 1, Matt. 1-14; & Matt. 19:29d, Appendix 3, Vol. 2, Matt. 15-20.)

At Matt. 21:23a, the TR’s “*elthonti* (‘coming’ = ‘when ... was come,’ AV, masculine singular dative, active aorist participle, from *erchomai*) *autō* (‘him’ as a dative pronoun subject = ‘he’⁴⁶, AV, masculine singular dative, 3rd person personal pronoun, from *autos*),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionaries 2378⁴⁷ & 1968) and correct. However, a variant, “*elthontos* (‘coming’= ‘when ... was come,’ masculine singular genitive, active aorist participle, from *erchomai*) *autou* (‘him’ as a genitive pronoun subject = ‘he’⁴⁸, masculine singular genitive, 3rd person personal pronoun, from *autos*),” seems to have originated with Origen. Origen’s variant was adopted by the two leading Alexandrian Texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, and leading Western Text, D 05; and thereafter adopted by the NU Text *et al*. But either way, the reading is still, “when he was come” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:24b the TR’s “*kagō* (‘I also,’ a compound word from conjunction, *kai* / ‘also’ + personal pronoun, *egō* / ‘I’),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionary

⁴⁴ Here at Matt. 21:22b, cf. W 032 & Lectionary 1968, *supra*.

⁴⁵ Whittaker’s *New Testament Greek Grammar*, SCM, London, England, UK, 1969, 1975, pp. 11 (“*lambanō*” on the very first page of chapter 1) & 159 (verb chart for different tenses at “*lambanō*”).

⁴⁶ Young’s *Greek*, p. 45.

⁴⁷ Lectionary 2378 writes the “*autō* (αυτω)” with the final omega closed i.e., something like, “αυο”, and then the “τ” is placed over the omega in the middle.

⁴⁸ Young’s *Greek*, p. 38.

1968) and correct. However a variant is found in the Alexandrian Text's Codex Sinaiticus. But the TR's reading is followed in Codex Vaticanus and the NU Text *et al.* Though Codex Sinaiticus reminds us that sometimes the Alexandrian School tampered with the text, in this particular instance, either way, the reading in English is still the same.

At Matt. 21:25a, the TR's "*Ioannou* ('of John,' masculine singular genitive noun, from *Ioannes*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionary 1968) and correct. However a variant that seems to have originated with Origen, adds before this "*to* ('the [thing],' redundant in English translation, neuter singular nominative definite article, from *to*)⁴⁹." The variant was followed in the two main Alexandrian Texts, and hence was adopted in the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering is still "of John" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:25b, the TR's "*par*" (= *para*, preposition + dative, 'with') *eautois* ('themselves,' masculine plural dative, 3rd person personal pronoun, from *eaoutou*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionary 1968) and correct. However "*en* (preposition + dative, 'with') *eautois* ('themselves,' dative)," is a minority Byzantine reading (M 021 marginal reading, & Cyril of Jerusalem). In the Alexandrian School, the TR is followed by Codex Sinaiticus whereas the variant is followed by Codex Vaticanus. Codex Sinaiticus, and hence on this occasion the TR, was followed in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72); whereas the variant of Codex Vaticanus was followed (with a footnote showing the TR's reading in all but UBS,) in Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). But either way, the reading is still, "with themselves" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:25c, the reading of Scrivener's Text, "*Diati* (Why?)," or Hodges & Farstad's and Robinson & Pierpont's majority texts, "*Dia ti* (Why?)," is MBT. It is found e.g., in the continuous script of W 032 and Lectionary 1968; and the fact that in both W 032 and Lectionary 1968 the "*dia*" is at the end of one line and "*ti*" is at the start of the next, is just a quaint coincidence, i.e., one could not reasonably claim from this that these respective scribes were giving a preference for this as two words. Should this be unravelled as one word (e.g., Stephanus 1550; & Scrivener) or two words (e.g., Erasmus 1516 & 1522; W-H, & NU Text). Either way, the meaning will be, "Why?" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). (Cf. Commentary at Matt. 9:11b; 13:10; 15:2,3, twice; 19:19.)

At Matt. 21:26, the TR's "*exousi* ('they hold' = 'hold,' word 1) *ton* ('the,' word 2, redundant in English translation) *Ioannen* ('John,' word 3) *os* ('as,' word 4) *propheten* ('a

⁴⁹ Using a non-genitive article with a genitive word and meaning of "the thing," is more common in the plural form of "the things" (e.g., Matt. 16:23; 22:21) than this singular form of "the thing." Depending on context, such a definite article may also mean other things (Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 235-6).

prophet,' word 5)," is MBT (e.g., W 032⁵⁰, Sigma 042⁵¹; & Lectionary 1968⁵²) and correct. However, a variant using word order 4,5,1,2,3 is found in the two main Alexandrian texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering is still, "hold John as a prophet" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:28b, the TR's "*tekna* ('sons,' word 1) *duo* ('two,' word 2)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct. A minority Byzantine reading (Minuscule 142, 11th century) uses word order 2,1, but either way, the rendering is still, "two sons" (AV). In his 2nd edition of 1842, Tischendorf (Lectiones Variants, p. 7) criticized the text of Stephanus (1550) for following the TR's word order. After all, does not Codex Vaticanus have word order 2,1? But in 1859 he discovered Codex Sinaiticus, a manuscript that he was thereafter overly fond of. Tischendorf changed tack, and supported the TR's word order of 1,2 in his 8th edition of 1869-72. After all, does not Codex Sinaiticus have word order 1,2?

At Matt. 21:30a, the TR's, "*Kai* ('and,' word 1a) *proselthon* ('coming' = '[he] came'⁵³, word 2) *to* ('to the,' word 3)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionaries 2378⁵⁴ & 1968) and correct. However a minority Greek variant (Cyril of Alexandria) replaces word 1 with "*de* ('and,' word 1b)," and uses word order 2,1b,3. This variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; from where it entered the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading is still, "And he came to the" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:32a, the TR's "*pros* ('unto,' word 1) *umas* ('you,' word 2) *Ioannes* ('John,' word 3)," i.e., "John ... unto you" (AV) is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionary 1968⁵⁵). *Variant 1* is to the best of my knowledge a minority Byzantine

⁵⁰ W 032 has the optional "n" (nu) at end of word 1; and with word 3 coming at the end of a line, as per its normative practice, the final "N" is written as a protruding bar of about one letter space length from the second last letter of "H (e / eta) onwards.

⁵¹ Sigma 042 has the optional "n" (nu) at end of word 1.

⁵² Lectionary 1968 has the optional "n" (nu) at end of word 1.

⁵³ Masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *proserchomai*.

⁵⁴ With local dialect revowelling in Lectionary 2378 of the omegas (o / ω) of words 2 & 3 to omicrons (*o* / ο).

⁵⁵ Lectionary 1968 reads "*pros*" / "προς" as "πρ" at the end of a line, then in the space above to the right of the rho (ρ), and connected to it in running writing, is the omicron (ο), which is then joined to a figure looking something like the sideways "P" in the following box,



; although with the bottom part of this "P" looking something like the sideways "L" in the

variant not previously documented. In *Variant 1* found in Lectionary 2378, these same three words have inserted before word 3, “*Ioannes* (‘John,’ masculine singular nominative noun, from *Ioannes*),” the definite article which is redundant in English translation, “*o* (‘the,’ masculine singular nominative definite article, from *o*)”⁵⁶. Another reading (Origen), *Variant 2*, uses word order 3,1,2. *Variant 2* is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, and hence the NU Text *et al.* But irrespective of which of the three readings one follows, the translation will still be “John ... unto you” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:32b, the TR’s “*ou* (not),” in the words, “repented not afterwards” (AV) is MBT (e.g., W 032; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). However, a variant minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042) is “*oude* (not).” The TR’s reading is found in the Alexandrian Text’s *Codex Sinaiticus* and followed in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72); whereas the variant is found in *Codex Vaticanus* and followed in Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle’s 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text. But either way, the reading will still be “not” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:33b the TR’s “*exedoto* (‘he let it out,’ indicative middle second aorist: athematic, 3rd person singular verb, from *ekdidomi*),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionaries 2378⁵⁷ & 1968; & Origen) and correct. But a variant reading, “*exedeto* (‘he let it out,’ indicative middle second aorist: thematic, 3rd person singular verb, from *ekdidomi*),” is found in the Alexandrian text’s *Codex Sinaiticus*, mixed text type C 04, & mixed text type L 019.

The middle second aorist of *didomi* (*ekdidomi*, ‘give forth’ or ‘let out’ = *ek* / ‘forth’ / ‘out’ + *didomi* / ‘give’ / ‘let’) is a *mi* verb. Thematic formations have the vowel epsilon (*e*) in the 3rd person singular as at here (as well as in the 2nd person singular / plural; and the vowel omicron / “*o*” in the 1st person singular / plural, or 3rd person plural other than for the imperative). There was a Greek grammatical movement from athematic (also called unthematic) to thematic declensions dating from before the time of Homer (c. 700 B.C.)⁵⁸. The ancient Alexandrian scribe of *Codex Sinaiticus* was evidently anxious to “jump on the bandwagon” and “be trendy” by moving the TR’s

following box,



; and in which the circular part of this sideways “P” crosses over and encloses the top half of the omicron (o)

⁵⁶ Lectionary 2378 reads “*pros*” / “*προς*” as “*πρ*” at the end of a line, then in the space above between the pi (π) and rho (ρ) is the omicron (ο), followed by a backslash “\”.

⁵⁷ Revowelling the omega to omicron i.e., “*exedoto*.”

⁵⁸ Moulton’s *Grammar of NT Greek*, Vol. 2, pp. 183 & 212.

athematic declension “*exedoto*” over to the thematic declension of “*exedeto*.” Such were the fleeting fancies of one of the “many, which corrupt the word of God” (II Cor. 2:17).

The thematic declension of Codex Sinaiticus at Matt. 21:33 was adopted by Tischendorf’s 8th ed., Westcott-Hort, and the NU Text; whereas the athematic declension of the TR was adopted by Nestle’s 21st edition. But either way the rendering is still, “let it out” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H), in the wider words, “let it out to husbandmen” (AV).

At Matt. 21:43 the TR’s “*oti* (that)” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct. But it is omitted in a variant which is a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscule 28, 11th century). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian Text’s Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. But on this occasion, it was evidently deemed to be “such an obvious pruning” by the Alexandrian School, that Tischendorf did not even mention it in his textual apparatus; and it was not adopted in Tischendorf’s 8th ed., Nestle’s 21st ed., or the contemporary NU Text.

But Westcott-Hort (1881) who falsely held out the corrupted Alexandrian Text as some kind of “neutral” text, were more than a little bit edgy over this matter. “After all,” Westcott might have said to Hort, “can one safely say that two ‘neutral texts’ really aren’t ‘neutral’ when they both agree on a reading?” Perhaps Hort snorted in agreement with his fellow Puseyite. Their strain and pain was finally resolved by “the solution” of placing the “*oti*” in the main text, but giving a sidenote alternative for its absence.

Did the Westcott-Hort based ASV (or RV) follow the main text or sidenote? We do not know. We cannot know. That is because under the rule of *oti recitativum*, it is not translated because it introduces a *direct discourse*⁵⁹. Hence either way the rendering at Matt. 21:43 is, “Therefore say I unto you, [*oti*, TR & main text W-H, untranslated,] The kingdom of God” etc. (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 21:45, the TR’s words, “*kai* (‘And,’ word 1) *akousantes* (‘hearing’ = ‘when ... had heard,’ AV, word 2),” is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042) and correct. But while the Alexandrian Text’s Codex Vaticanus follows the TR, the Alexandrian Text’s Codex Sinaiticus omits word 1 and reads, “*akousantes* (‘when ... had heard,’ word 2) *de* (‘And,’ word 3).” Codex Vaticanus and thus the TR is followed with footnotes referring to the variant in W-H, Nestle’s 21st ed., and Nestle’s 27th ed., and without any footnote in UBS 4th revised ed.; though the variant of Codex Sinaiticus is followed in Tischendorf’s 8th ed. . But either way the reading will be the same.

At Matt. 21:46, the TR’s “*epeide* (‘because,’ a conjunction) *os* (‘as,’ comparative particle in the sense of ‘to be,’ = ‘for’)” is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042) and correct. But a variant that probably originated with Origen, “*epei* (‘because,’ a conjunction) *eis*

⁵⁹ Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Appendix 3, section: “Introduction,” sub-section: “The conjunctions, for instance, ‘de’ (and) and ‘oti’ (that);” & Young’s *Greek*, p. 190.

(preposition with an accusative⁶⁰, ‘as’ = ‘for’),” is followed by the two main Alexandrian Texts. The variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* But the rendering is still, “because ... for” in, “because they took him for a prophet” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 22:1, the TR’s “*autois* (‘unto them,’ word 1) *en* (‘by,’ word 2) *parabolais* (‘parables,’ word 3),” i.e., “unto them ... by parables” (AV), is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042) and correct. However, a minority Byzantine reading variant (Minuscule 60, & Origen) uses word order 2,3,1. This variant is also followed by two leading Alexandrian Texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus; and leading Western Text, D 05. Thus it entered the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering is still the same.

At Matt. 22:4, the TR’s “*etoimasa* (‘I have prepared,’ indicative active orist, 1st person singular verb, *etoimazō*),” is MBT (e.g., W 032; Lectionary 2378 with what is most probably a local dialect revowelling of the “*oi*” in the stem to “*ē*”⁶¹; & Lectionary 1968 with a local dialect revowelling of the final “*a*” to “*ai*”⁶²) and correct. However, a variant “*etoimaka* (‘I have prepared,’ indicative active perfect, 1st person singular verb, *etoimazō*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042 & S 028). The variant is also found in the two leading Alexandrian Texts, B 03 (Vaticanus) and Aleph 01 (Sinaiticus), and leading Western Text, D 05 (Bezae Cantabrigiensis); and hence in the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the English reading is still, “I have prepared” (AV & TR; TCNT & W-H).

At Matt. 22:5a the TR’s “*o* (‘one,’ masculine singular nominative, definite article) *men* (a particle⁶³) ... *de* (another),” in the wider words, “one to his farm, another to his

⁶⁰ Followed by “*propheten* (‘a prophet,’ masculine singular accusative noun, from *prophetes*).”

⁶¹ Due to obscurity in both my positive and negative photocopies of the microfilm form of Lectionary 2378 with regard to where the letters “*oi*” should be, I inspected the original at Sydney University. But I found the original to offer not much greater clarity than my copies here at p. 37a. On the one hand, it might be possible to argue that the letters here are a very thin omicron, which blotched to lose its inner circle, and whose ink also joined over to an iota, so as to look like an eta, “H.” But on the other hand, it most naturally looks like an eta, “H,” in this sense, clearly resembling the eta five lines above, written as “Hθελον (*ethelon*, ‘they wished’ = ‘they would,’ AV)” (Matt. 22:3). Therefore it seems to most naturally be some kind of local revowelling of the “*oi*” to “*ē*.” Importantly, the matter relates to the stem of the word and so irrespective of how one resolves this issue, the declension is clearly that of the MBT.

⁶² The final iota of Lectionary 1968 is here written in the longer form, and looks something like our “j” without the dot on top of it.

⁶³ Here used to correlatively distinguish this part of the series (“one to his farm”) from the sequels (“another to his merchandise,” “and the remnant”) i.e., *not* grammatically concessive. Mounce’s *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), p. 314;

merchandise” (AV) is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968⁶⁴) and correct. However, a variant, “*os* (‘one,’ masculine singular nominative pronoun⁶⁵) *men* (a particle) ... *de* (another),” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042). Whereas the TR’s reading was followed by the Alexandrian text’s Codex Sinaiticus, the variant was followed by the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus. The variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the translation is still, “one” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 22:5b the TR’s “*o* (‘one,’ masculine singular nominative, definite article) *de* (‘and,’ untranslated) *eis* (‘to,’ preposition with an accusative⁶⁶),” i.e., “another to” (AV) is MBT (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct. *Variant 1*, “*os* (‘one,’ masculine singular nominative pronoun) *de* (‘and,’ untranslated⁶⁷) *eis* (‘to,’ preposition with an accusative⁶⁸),” i.e., “another to” is a minority Byzantine reading (W 032). *Variant 2*, “*os* (‘one,’ masculine singular nominative pronoun) *de* (‘and,’ untranslated⁶⁹) *epi* (‘to,’ preposition with an accusative),” i.e., “another to” (ASV), is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042). *Variant 2* is followed by the NU Text *et al.* But the English rendering is the same from all three readings.

At Matt. 22:10a the TR’s “*pantas* (‘all,’ untranslated in AV) *osous* (‘as many as,’ masculine plural accusative pronoun, from *osos-e-ov*),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct. However a variant is found in the two leading Alexandrian Texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, and leading Western Text, D 05;

& Young’s *Greek*, p. 200 (e.g., Eph. 4:11).

⁶⁴ In Lectionary 1968 the “*men* (μεν),” is abbreviated to mu (“μ”) with nu (“ν”) written on top of this letter, something like the sideways “v” in the following box,

◁

⁶⁵ When used in the wider grammatical construct of “*os* ... *de*” such as here (see Matt. 22:5b), “*os*” = “one” and “*de*” = “another.”

⁶⁶ I.e., “*eis* (to) *ten* (‘the,’ untranslated, feminine singular accusative, definite article from *e*) *emporian* (‘merchandise,’ feminine singular accusative noun, from *emporía*).”

⁶⁷ When used in the wider grammatical construct of “*os* ... *de*” such as here (joining with Matt. 22:5a), “*os*” = “one” and “*de*” = “another.”

⁶⁸ I.e., “*eis* (to) *ten* (‘the,’ untranslated, feminine singular accusative, definite article from *e*) *emporian* (‘merchandise,’ feminine singular accusative noun, from *emporía*).”

⁶⁹ When used in the wider grammatical construct of “*os* ... *de*” such as here (joining with Matt. 22:5a), “*os*” = “one” and “*de*” = “another.”

and followed in W-H, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text; whereas the TR's reading is followed in Tischendorf's 8th ed. .

The Greek, "*osous*" is a correlative pronoun, i.e., a word expressing mutual relations⁷⁰, and it is used immediately before in verse 9 for "as many as (*osous [e]an*)" (AV). But there is also a difference with this verse 9. In the Greek, "*osous*" with "*an*" / "*ean*" makes this a more general terminology i.e., the meaning could be, "all whom" etc.

Notably this usage is common in the Septuagint, particularly in the Pentateuch. Thus e.g., at Genesis 39:3 (LXX) Brenton renders "*osa ean*" as "whatsoever" (in "whatsoever he happens to do"); and at e.g., Genesis 11:6 (LXX) Brenton renders, "*panta osa an*" as "all that" not "all whatsoever" (in "and now nothing shall fail from them of all that they may have undertaken to do").

Hence instead of the AV's "as many as," in which "*an*" / "*ean*" is left untranslated, one could make the translation "all whom" at Matt. 22:9 ("*osous [e]an*"); Acts 2:39 ("*osous an*"); and Rev. 3:19 ("*osous ean*").

But the same is so here at Matt. 22:10a since while there is no "*an*" / "*ean*" after the "*osous*;" the AV leaves the "*pantas* (all)" untranslated in order to render the "*osous*" in the form, "as many as." But one could do this with the converse emphasis of translation, i.e., one could render the TR at Matt. 22:10 like the NKJV as "all whom." This is the same as the rendering from the variant as, "*pantas* (all) *ous* (whom)." Thus there is no necessary difference in rendering between the TR and the variant here.

At Matt. 22:13a the TR's "*eipen* ('he said' = 'said,' word 1) *o* ('the,' word 2) *basileus* ('king,' word 3)," i.e., "said the king" (AV), is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct. However a variant using word order 2,3,1, is followed in the two leading Alexandrian Texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus; and hence adopted in the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the translation is the same.

At Matt. 22:13c the majority Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided between the readings, "*podas* ('feet' = 'foot,' AV) *kai* (and) *cheiras* ('hands' = 'hand,' AV)" (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionary 2378) (*Reading 1*); and "*cheiras* ('hands' = 'hand,' AV) *kai* (and) *podas* ('feet' = 'foot,' AV)" (e.g., Lectionary 1968) (*Reading 2*). Whereas Scrivener's Text follows *Reading 1*; and like the two leading Alexandrian Texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, so does the NU Text *et al.* But either way, one might reasonably render it in harmony with English language idiom as, "Bind him hand and foot" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 22:16 the TR's "*legontes* ('saying,' masculine plural nominative, active present participle, from *lego*)" is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct. But a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscule 27, 10th century),

⁷⁰ Young's *Greek*, p. 77.

reads, “*legontas*” (masculine plural accusative, active present participle, from *lego*). The variant is also found in the two leading Alexandrian Texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus. The TR’s reading is also found in leading Western Text, D 05, the neo-Alexandrian’s “queen of minuscules,” Minuscule 33, and the NU Text; whereas the variant is followed in Tischendorf’s 8th ed., W-H, and Nestle’s 21st ed. . But either way⁷¹, the reading is still, “saying” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 22:17, Tischendorf’s 2nd edition (1842, *Lectiones Variants*, p. 7) criticized the text of Stephanus (1550) for following the correct reading of the TR and MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; Lectionary 2378; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings), “*eipe* (‘tell thou’ = ‘tell,’ imperative active second aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *lego*).” The TR’s reading is followed in the two leading Alexandrian Texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, and hence the NU Text. A variant found in (the independent text type) Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) 33 (9th century), “*eipon* (imperative active first aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *lego*)⁷²,” is adopted in Tischendorf’s 8th ed., W-H, and Nestle’s 21st ed. . But either way the reading is “Tell” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 22:24 the TR’s spelling, “*Moses*” is MBT (e.g., E 07, F 09, Lectionary 1968, & Origen); but a variant, “*Mouses*,” is a minority Byzantine reading (W 032 & Sigma 042). The two leading Alexandrian Texts are split, with Codex Sinaiticus following the TR, and Codex Vaticanus following the variant. The variant is followed by the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the translation is still “Moses” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 22:25 the TR’s “*gamesas* (‘having married,’ masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, declining from first aorist stem *egamesa*, from *gameo*),” is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct. But a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042), “*gemas* (‘having married,’ masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, declining from first aorist stem *egema*, from *gameo*),” is a variant. The variant is also found in the two leading Alexandrian Texts, Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, and adopted in the NU Text *et al.* Though *gameo* has two different first aorist stem forms, their meaning is the same. Hence the reading will be the same, “when he had married” (AV & TR). Or if like the American Standard Version (1901) translators, one thinks of oneself as being committed “to eliminate obsolete, obscure and misleading terms” (ASV Preface), and one finds the AV’s “the first, when he had married” (AV & TR) to be such an instance of “obscure” and “obsolete” terminology, then one might instead render this as “the first married” (ASV &

⁷¹ Cf. the nominative / accusative participle issue at Matt. 24:15.

⁷² The Greek *eipon* is a homograph, and depending on context, can mean “thou tell” as here; or “I spake” (Matt. 16:11, indicative active second aorist, 1st person singular verb, from *lego*); or “they said” (Matt. 15:34, indicative active second aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *lego*).

W-H). But I would say that there is no necessary change in English translation here.

At Matt. 22:28 the TR's "*oun* ('Therefore,' word 1) *anastasei* ('resurrection,' word 2)," in the wider words, "Therefore in the resurrection" etc., is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042, both spelling word 2, "*anastasi*"⁷³," & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968) and correct. But a variant using word order 2,1, is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus, and leading Western Text, D 05. Hence it was adopted in the NU Text *et al.*

On the one hand, English idiom could render either reading as, "Therefore in the resurrection" (AV & TR); as recognized at Matt. 22:28 in the NIV's, "Now then, at the resurrection" (which unnecessarily uses two words for "*oun*" / "Therefore," AV). This NIV type of reading is also found from texts with word order 2,1, in the neo-Alexandrian's TEV, JB, NJB, and Moffatt's, "Now at the resurrection." But on the other hand, other neo-Alexandrian Versions (NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, TCNT, NEB, & REB), have used the English word order, 2,1, e.g., the ASV reads, "In the resurrection therefore" (ASV & W-H) etc. . But if one really wanted to, one could also get this ASV reading from the TR's word order of 1,2. The Greek is word order 1,2. As for the English word order? *Ad libitum!*⁷⁴

At Matt. 22:30a the TR's "*ekgamizontai* ('they are given in marriage,' indicative passive present, 3rd person plural verb, from *ekgamizo*, also spelt *ekgamisko*)," is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042; Lectionaries 2378⁷⁵ & 1968; Methodius, Epiphanius, & Chrysostom). *Variant 1*, "*gamiskontai* ('they are given in marriage,' indicative passive present, 3rd person plural verb, from *gamisko*, also spelt *gamizo*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (W 032). *Variant 2*, "*gamizontai* ('they are given in marriage,' indicative passive present, 3rd person plural verb, from *gamizo*, also spelt *gamisko*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscule 924, 12th century; & Athanasius & Isidore). Both the TR's reading and *Variant 2* are referred to by Origen who is its likely originator. *Variant 2* was followed by the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and from there it entered the NU Text *et al.* But as with *Variant 1*, the reading will still be the same, "are given in marriage" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H following *Variant 2*)

⁷³ Feminine singular dative noun, from *anastasis*.

⁷⁴ Latin, meaning for a person to do, "As you wish!"

⁷⁵ In Lectionary 2378 the second letter of this word (at p. 66b) is an upsilon rather than a kappa, i.e., "*eugamizontai*"? Is this a local spelling variant, or a local dialect variation for how a kappa might *sometimes* be written? Is this an copyist's error, e.g., was a copyist working from a manuscript in which the "κ" (kappa) was poorly formed so that the top half of the letter was much larger than the bottom half, so that upon initial inspection it looked like a "υ" (upsilon); and so was copied down wrongly?

At Matt. 22:30c the TR's "*en* ('in,' word 1) *ourano* ('heaven,' word 2)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968 in both instances abbreviating word 2 as, "*ouno*" with a bar over the two middle letters). But a variant adding the definite article, "*to* ('the,' redundant in English translation)" before word 2 is a minority Greek reading (Origen). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and hence in the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading is still, "in heaven" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 22:43 the TR's "*Kurion* ('Lord,' word 1) *auton* ('him,' word 2) *kalei* ('he doth call' = 'doth ... call,' AV, word 3)," i.e., "How then doth David in spirit call him Lord" (AV), is MBT (e.g., W 032, abbreviating word 1 to "*KN*" with a bar on top; Sigma 042; & Lectionary 2378, abbreviating word 1 to "*Kn*" with a bar on top; and Lectionary 1968 abbreviating word 1 to "*Kn*" with a bar on top of the first reading, twice in two different readings⁷⁶). However, a variant using word order 3,2,1, is found in Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian Text's Codex Sinaiticus and leading Western Text, D 05 and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering is still, "doth ... call him Lord" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 22:44a the TR's "*o* ('The,' word 1) *Kurios* ('Lord,' word 2)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, abbreviating word 2 to "*KC*" with a bar on top; Sigma 042; Lectionary 2378, abbreviating word 2 to "*KC*" with a bar on top; & Lectionary 1968, abbreviating word 2 to "*KC*" with a bar on top, twice in two different readings⁷⁷) and correct. But word 1 is omitted in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and hence also omitted in the NU Text *et al.*

The Trinity consists of three Persons in one Supreme Being, and because the three Persons are part of *one* Being rather than three Beings, the doctrine of the Trinity is monotheistic. For "the catholick (universal) faith is this: that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity; neither confounding (confusing) the Persons: nor dividing the Substance (Being)" (*Athanasian Creed*, *Anglican Book of Common Prayer*, 1662).

Matt. 22:44a recognizes the three Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity, for Christ says "David in Spirit" i.e., prophetically by the power of the Holy Spirit of God, said, "The Lord" i.e., God the Father, "said unto my Lord" i.e., God the Son. On the one hand, one can also argue that even if using the NU Text *et al* here at Matt. 22:44a,

⁷⁶ In Lectionary 1968 words 1 & 3 are unclear in first Lectionary reading at Matt. 22:43 in positive and negative microfilm copies, and so the original was checked at Sydney University (p. 69b); but all the words are clear in the writing of my microfilm photocopies at the second Lectionary reading (p. 146a).

⁷⁷ Word 2 unclear at first reading of Matt. 22:44a in positive and negative microfilm copies, original checked (p. 69b). The "C" of "KC" has a slight downward hook at the end, resembling something like a ' coming off the bottom of the C. At second reading the writing is clear (p. 146a).

context still requires the rendering, “The Lord,” as found in e.g., the ASV. But on the other hand, it would be possible for an anti-Trinitarian heretic to claim that the absence of the definite article “*o* (‘The,’ word 1) before “*Kurios* (‘Lord,’ word 2),” in the NU Text *et al* meant that this was not God the Father, but “a Lord” whom this heretic then identified with someone else. With the known precedent of such nonsense around us in members of the Jehovah’s Witnesses cult doing this very thing at John 1:1 for God the Son, we ought not to ignore this possibility facilitated in the NU Text *et al*.

At Matt. 22:46 the TR’s “*autō* (‘him,’ word 1) *apokrithēnai* (‘to answer,’ word 2),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Lectionary 2378⁷⁸; & Lectionary 1968, in one of two readings, p. 146b) and correct. But a variant followed by about 20% of Byzantine manuscripts⁷⁹, has word order 2,1 (e.g., Sigma 042; & Lectionary 1968, in one of two readings, p. 69b). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05; and thus the NU Text *et al*. Either way, the reading is still “to answer him” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 23:2 the TR’s spelling, “*Mōseōs*” is MBT (e.g., M 021, 9th century; Gamma 036, 9th century; Minuscule 2, 12th century; Lectionaries 2378⁸⁰ & 1968⁸¹). But a variant, “*Mōuseōs*,” is a minority Byzantine reading (W 032 & Sigma 042). The variant is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05; and thus the NU Text *et al*. But either way, the reading is still “Moses” in “Moses’ seat” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 23:6a the TR’s “*te* (and),” in the words, “and love” etc., is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Lectionary 2378), and correct. But a variant reading, “*de* (and),” is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042 & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). The

⁷⁸ The first six letters of “*apokrithēnai*” are on one line, and the remaining five letters are on the next. This last five letters of the second line look something like, “*ουουα*” in which the “*ου*” is joined. Is the “*u*” a poorly formed “*H*” (eta / *ε*) in which the bottom part was left off; or is this a local revowelling of the eta (H) to an upsilon (u)? (Original consulted.)

⁷⁹ Von Soden’s Kr group follows this variant, and this is *c.* 20% of his *c.* 1,000 K group manuscripts. This sample is clearly large enough to base MBT projections on and so Robinson & Pierpont (2005) show no alternative reading; whereas Hodges & Farstad (1985) show this variant as part of “a seriously divided” text (pp. xxi & 77).

⁸⁰ In Lectionary 2378 (p. 36b) both the epsilon (*e*) and sigma (*s*) of “*Mōseōs*” are written as a “*c*”. But the epsilon “*c*” is placed above the line between the sigma (*s*) and second omega (*ω*).

⁸¹ In Lectionary 1968 (p. 146b) both the epsilon (*e*) and sigma (*s*) of “*Mōseōs*” are written as on the pattern of a “*C*”. But to distinguish them, the sigma has a slight bar added at the end, so that it looks something like our “*G*”.

variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and hence in the NU Text *et al.* But either way the rendering is still, "and love" etc. (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 23:8a the TR's "*kathēgetes* ('Master' / 'Teacher')" is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionary 2378) and correct. However, a variant, "*didaskalos* ('Master' / 'Teacher')," is a minority Byzantine reading (U 030 & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). The TR's reading is followed by the Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus, whereas the variant is followed by the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus. But either way the English rendering is the same.

At Matt. 23:9a the TR's, "*o* ('the,' word 1) *Pater* ('Father,' word 2) *umon* ('of you,' word 3)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, abbreviating word 2 to *Per* with a bar on top; Sigma 042; and on all three Lectionary occasions abbreviating word 2 to *Per* with a bar on top Lectionary 2378, & Lectionary 1968 twice in two different readings). However, a variant using word order 3,1,2 is a minority Byzantine reading (U 030, 9th century). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and thus in the NU Text *et al.* But either way the rendering is still, "your Father" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 23:9b the TR's, "*o* ('which' or 'who' [is]) *en* (in) *tois* (-) *ouranois* (heaven⁸²)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, lacking the definite article, "*tois*" / "the;" Sigma 042 lacking the definite article, "*tois*" / "the;" Lectionary 2378, abbreviating "*ouranois*" to "*ounois*" with a bar over the "*no*;" & Lectionary 1968, abbreviating "*ouranois*" to "*ounois*" with a bar over it twice in two different readings⁸³; Basil & Cyril). However, a variant reading "*o* ('which' or 'who' [is in]) *ouranios* (heaven⁸⁴)," is a minority Greek reading (Basil & Cyril). The variant is followed by the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and adopted in the NU Text *et al.* But at Matt. 23:9b, the TR may be rendered as either, "which is in heaven" (AV) or "He who is in heaven" (NKJV); and the NU Text *et al* may be rendered as either, "who is in heaven" (ESV) or "He who is in heaven" (NASB).

Here at Matt. 23:9 the words, "your Father" (Matt. 23:9a), and "which is in heaven" (Matt. 23:9b), are part of the wider verse, "And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven." Why has this verse been so

⁸² Masculine plural dative noun, from *ouranios*.

⁸³ Microfilm photocopies unclear in both positive and negative forms for the bar at the first Lectionary 1968 reading of Matt. 23:9b (p. 65a) which looks like two bars broken in the middle; but original checked at Sydney University and this is one unbroken bar over the "*ounoi*," of "*ounois*." At the second Lectionary reading my copies are clear (p. 147a), but the bar is much shorter, being placed over only the "*un*" of "*ounois*."

⁸⁴ Masculine singular nominative adjective, from *ouranios*.

diced'n'sliced? We cannot be sure. On the one hand, Scripture condones the usage of the term, "father," for spiritual fathers as a description (I Cor. 4:15; Gal. 4:19; I Thess. 2:11; I Tim. 1:2,18; II Tim. 1:2; 2:1; Titus 1:4; Philem. 10). For example, we refer to the ancient church fathers; or in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), when Deacons who are candidates for the Order of Priests (Rom. 15:16) are presented to the Bishop for Ordination as a Minister; the Bishop is addressed as, "Reverend Father in God." But on the other hand, Scripture prohibits the usage of the term, "Father," for spiritual fathers, as a title e.g., "Reverend Father John." For example, no Anglican Protestant would call a Bishop, "Father," as a title, the way Roman Catholics call the Bishop of Rome, "Pope," e.g., "Pope Benedict XVI," meaning "Father;" and nor would we Protestants title our Ministers "Father" the way the Papists do when they call their Romish priests, "Father" followed by his name e.g., "Father O'Flanagan."

At Matt. 23:10 the TR's "*eis* ('one,' word 1) *gar* ('for,' word 2a) *umōn* ('of you' = 'your,' word 3) *estin* ('he is' = 'is,' word 4) *o* ('the,' word 5, not translated) *kathēgetes* ('Master,' word 6), *o* ('the,' word 7, not translated) *Christos* ('[even] Christ,' word 8)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, omitting word 3; Sigma 042, placing word 3 after word 4⁸⁵; Lectionary 2378, abbreviating word 8 to "XC" with a bar on top; & 1968, twice in two different readings, twice omitting the optional "n" at the end of word 4, and abbreviating word 8 to "XC" with a bar on top). However, a variant reading, "*oti* ('for,' word 2b) *kathēgetes* ('Master,' word 6) *umōn* ('of you' = 'your,' word 3) *estin* ('he is' = 'is,' word 4) *eis* ('one,' word 1) *o* ('the,' word 7) *Christos* ('Christ,' word 8)," is found in the Alexandrian Text's Codex Vaticanus, and Western Text's D 05 (with word 4 after word 1); and was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering is still the same, "for one is your Master, *even* Christ" (AV & TR); or translating word 7, "for one is your master, *even* the Christ" (ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 23:18 the TR's "*osa ean* (whosoever)" is MBT (e.g., W 032), and correct. However a variant, "*osa an* (whosoever)," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042; & Lectionary 1968). The variant is also followed in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and therefore in the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading is still "whosoever" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). (See Matt. 23:18 at Appendix 1, *supra.*)

At Matt. 23:23a, the TR's "*ton* (-) *eleon* ('mercy,' masculine singular accusative noun, from *eleos*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionary 1968; Epiphanius & Chrysostom). But a variant, "*to* (-) *eleos* ('mercy,' neuter singular accusative noun, from *eleos*)" (Chrysostom & Cyril of Alexandria); is found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and thus in the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading is still "mercy" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

⁸⁵ Did the Sigma 042 scribe first lose word 3 on an "n" ellipsis at the end of these words; then realizing his mistake add it back in? Did the scribe of W 032 make a similar mistake, made easier because of the shortness of word 3; but on this occasion being less adroit than the scribe of Sigma 042, then fail to detect his error? Did the lack of the "n" on word 4 assist scribes like those of Lectionary 1968 avoid this error?

At Matt. 23:23c the TR's Greek, "*aphienai* ('to leave undone,' active present infinitive, from *aphiemi*)" i.e., "to leave ... undone" in the wider words, "and not *to leave* the other *undone*" (AV) is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Lectionary 1968); and also found in the Latin as, "*omittere* ('to leave undone,' active present infinitive, from *omitto*)" (e.g., Vulgate & Gregory); and correct. But a variant reading Greek, "*apheinai* ('to leave undone' or 'to have left undone,' active aorist infinitive, from *aphiemi*)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus. The variant was thus adopted in Tischendorf's 8th ed., Westcott-Hort, and Nestle's 21st edition.

However, the NU Text exercising their non-Alexandrian Text pincer arm at Matt. 23:23c, were sufficiently impressed by the lack of "external support" for the variant's reading (L 019 & 892); and correspondingly impressed by the wide support of the TR's reading (e.g., Western Text's D 05, Families 1 & 13, Latin text, Byzantine text, and "Caesarean" Text's Armenian Version), to on this occasion place the TR's reading in their main text. But in doing so, the NU Text Committee said, "the Committee had difficulty in deciding which" of the two readings "to place in the text" (UBS 4th revised ed.); and so it remains possible that a future NU Text Committee will change their mind and adopt the variant. (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at e.g., Matt. 21:24a.)

On the one hand, it is possible to render the aorist variant here at Matt. 23:23c as a past tense, as occurs in the ASV, as it did in the RV afore it, i.e., "and not *to have left* the other *undone*" (ASV). This type of rendering is also found in the Papists' NJB. If so rendered, there is a clear difference between this erroneous reading and that of the correct TR's "and not *to leave* the other *undone*" (AV).

But on the other hand, it is possible to select an aorist rendering like, "without *leaving* the other *undone*." Hence at Matt. 23:23c the ESV reads, "without neglecting the others." While this is a somewhat loose translation relative to the AV, it means that one *could* understand it in the present tense (TR), although one could also say it refers to an underpinning aorist (variant). This is the type of ambiguous rendering also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, and Papists' JB. Such ambiguity makes for a less literal translation than I would endorse, but on this occasion I have exercised a discretion to place this matter in this Appendix 3 on the basis that in most of the neo-Alexandrian versions there is no *necessary* conclusion that this is not a present tense. The interested reader will find a good amount of information on the textual readings of Matt. 23:23c in the textual apparatus of the UBS 4th revised edition (1993).

At Matt. 23:28b the TR's "*mestoi* ('full,' word 1) *este* ('ye are,' word 2)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, revowelling word 2 as "*estai*"; Sigma 042; & Lectionary 1968⁸⁶).

⁸⁶ Highlighting some of the difficulties of handwritten scripts, in both words 1 & 2 Lectionary 1968 here combines a "c" shaped "e" (epsilon) with a "6" shaped "s" (sigma), so $c + 6 = "6."$ As part of its "letter economy" it further reuses the top part of the lower-half circle as part of the cross bar on the following "τ" (tau). But Lectionary

However, a variant in word order 2,1, is found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and thus the NU Text *et al.* But either way the reading is still, "ye are full" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 23:30a the TR's "*emen* ('we had been' & 'we ... have been,' indicative imperfect, 1st person plural verb, from *eimi*)" is twice MBT (e.g., W 032; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). However, *Variant 1* reading, "*emetha* ('we had been,' indicative imperfect, 1st person plural verb, from *eimi*)"⁸⁷ on the first occasion, and "*emen* (we ... have been) on the second occasion, is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042. And *Variant 2* reading, "*emetha* (indicative imperfect, 1st person plural verb, from *eimi*)" on both occasions, is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 2. *Variant 2* is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But the meaning is still, "we had been" and "we ... have been" respectively (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 23:30b the TR's "*koinonoi* ('partakers,' word 1) *auton* ('with them,' word 2)," is MBT (e.g., W 032; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). But a variant in word order 2,1, is a minority Greek reading (Chrysostom). The TR's reading is found in the Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus, and hence Tischendorf's 8th ed.; whereas the variant is found in the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus and Western text's D 05; and hence W-H, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text. But in either instance the reading is still, "partakers with them" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 23:35a, the TR's "*ekchunomenon* ('being shed' = 'shed,' AV)," is MBT (e.g., K 017, 9th century; Gamma 036, 10th century; Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings⁸⁸). However, a spelling variant with a double "n", "*ekchunnomenon*" is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042⁸⁹). While the TR's reading is found in the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus; the variant is found in the Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus and Western text's D 05, and hence the NU Text *et al.*

1968 does not usually use this "*est*" abbreviation.

⁸⁷ Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT*, p. 23.

⁸⁸ Unlike the second reading (p. 218b), the first reading of Lectionary 1968 (p. 148b) comes at the end of a line. Hence instead of the final letter, "n" (nu), the scribe places a curvy shape that looks like a dingle, "~", over the second last letter, i.e., the "o" (omicron) of this word.

⁸⁹ Von Soden says the K group follows the TR here, and lists only 2 K group manuscripts that follow the variant, Codex G 011 (9th century, Byzantine Text), Minuscule 661 (11th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system). Thus *c.* 90%+ of the K group follows the TR's reading, and because this is a reasonable sample, *c.* 90%+ of the MBT. But we do not know from von Soden's generalist group figures, where in the range of up to *c.* 10% the variant falls.

Showing the hazards of handwritten manuscripts, W 032 here has the second and third letters of “EKXYNNOMEN” written in such a way that the “K” and “X” look very similar and could be confused with each other. This type of thing constitutes the probable origins of the reading in the Western text’s D 05, as “EXXYNNOMEN,” which I thus take to be a scribal blunder for “EKXYNNOMEN.” Hence I show D 05 following the variant, *supra*. Irrespective of which spelling one follows, the reading at Matt. 23:35a is still, “shed” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 23:37b the TR’s “*episunagei* (‘gathereth,’ word 1) *ornis* (‘a hen,’ word 2),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings, *infra*). However, a variant in word order 2,1 is a minority Greek reading (Clement of Rome). The variant is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way the meaning is still, “a hen gathereth” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

Unlike in its first occurrence of Matt. 23:37b (p. 149a), in its second occurrence (p. 219a), Lectionary 1968 spells word 1 “*episunagei* (‘she gathereth,’ indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *episunagō*), with an optional “*n*” on the end of it i.e., “*episunagein*.” In the standard seminary Greek one learns at a tertiary College, there is never an optional “*n*” after the “*ei*” suffix of such a 3rd person singular verb (although there may be one at the end of an indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, ending with “*ousi*” or “*ousin*”). Thus before my 21st birthday in January 1981, when I was learning Greek back in my College days of the late 1970s and early 1980s, if I saw an “*ein*” suffix I would have thought it was an active present infinitive i.e., “to gather”⁹⁰. However, the study of manuscripts such as Lectionary 1968 acts to remind us that “in the real world” scribes of this or that local Greek dialect did not necessarily employ *standard seminary Greek*! (Cf. my comments on standard seminary Greek at Matt. 22:39.)

At Matt. 23:37c, in the wider words, “as a hen gathereth her chickens” (AV), the TR’s “*eautēs* (‘her,’ feminine singular genitive, 3rd person reflexive pronoun, from *eautou-es-ou*),” is MBT (e.g., U 030, X 033; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings; Basil & Chrysostom) and correct. However, *Variant 1* which is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042) reads, “*autēs* (‘her,’ feminine singular genitive, 3rd person personal pronoun, from *autos-e-o*).” *Variant 1* is also found in the Alexandrian text’s Codex Sinaiticus and Western text’s D 05; whereas in *Variant 2* no word appears here at all in the original reading of the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus. Hence *Variant 1* was adopted in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), and NU Text (1993). But the Westcott-Hort desire to uphold their “neutral” text of Codex Vaticanus, meant the variant was put in square brackets as optional so one could follow *Variant 1* (Codex Sinaiticus) or *Variant 2* (Codex Vaticanus). The Westcott-Hort “solution” was also followed in Nestle’s 21st edition (1952).

⁹⁰ Whittaker’s *New Testament Greek Grammar*, *op. cit.*, pp. 11 (present indicative active of *luō*) & 48 (infinitive of *luō*).

Variant 1, was certainly followed in the ASV and NASB. While the non-usage of italics means we cannot be entirely certain about a number of other neo-Alexandrians, e.g., those who translated the RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, and TEV, the fact that none of them have a footnote referring to this omission means that they appear to have followed *Variant 1*. Therefore, on this basis I have exercised a discretion and placed this matter in this Appendix 3. Thus the reading of the TR and *Variant 1* is the same as, “her” (AV & TR; ASV & option in W-H selected by ASV translators).

At Matt. 24:1 the TR’s “*eporeuto* (‘departed’ or ‘went out,’ word 1) *apo* (‘from,’ word 2) *tou* (‘the,’ word 3) *ierou* (‘temple,’ word 4),” is MBT (e.g., W 032). However, a variant in word order 2,3,4,1 is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus (word 2 = “*ek*” / “from”) & Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading is still “departed from the temple” (AV & TR) or “went out from the temple” (ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 24:2b the TR’s “*panta* (‘all,’ word 1) *tauta* (‘these things,’ word 2)” is MBT (e.g., W 032 & Sigma 042), and correct. But a variant, “*tauta* (‘these things,’ word 2) *panta* (‘all,’ word 1)” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). The variant is also followed in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and so adopted in the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading is still “all these things” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). (Cf. Appendix 1, at Matt. 23:36b, *supra*.)

At Matt. 24:2c, in the “not” of “that shall not be thrown down,” Scrivener’s Text reads “*ou me* (not).” This is a minority Byzantine reading (Codices Phi 043, 6th century; G 011, 9th century; G 012, 9th century; K 017, 9th century; U 030, 9th century; Y 034, 9th century; & Pi 041, 9th century; & Minuscules 23, 11th century; 880, 11th century; 1207, 11th century; 1188, 11th / 12th century; 119, 12th century; 120, 12th century; 217, 12th century; 270, 12th century; 280, 12th century; 924, 12th century; 1010, 12th century; 1085, 12th century; 1200, 12th century; 1375, 12th century; 2127, Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles, 12th century; 248, 13th century; 945, Byzantine outside of Acts & General Epistles, 13th century; 477, 13th century; 482, 13th century; 1441, 13th century; 1604, 13th century; 2093, 13th century; 232, 14th century; 578, 14th century; 70, 15th century; 287, 15th century; 288, 15th century; 745, 16th century). By contrast, the MBT reads, “*ou* (not)” (e.g., W 032; Sigma 042; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968)⁹¹. Either way, the rendering may be “not.”

In the Greek, the negative particle, *me*, may sometimes function as a conjunction, and the emphatic conjunction, “*me*” in “*ou me*” acts to intensify its sense. Thus the

⁹¹ Von Soden lists only one K group manuscript in support of the minority Byzantine reading, G 011 (von Soden’s ε 87 in his Ki group). This means the MBT reading has the support of at least c. 90% of the Byzantine texts. (Von Soden also lists a number of Byzantine manuscripts that support the TR’s reading from his I group.)

nuance in the Greek of the minority Byzantine reading of Scrivener's Text might *prima facie* be rendered, "certainly not (*ou me*)" as opposed to simply, "not (*ou*)"⁹². However, let the reader imagine a volume control in which "0" is silence, and "5" is a "very loud." If "*ou*" is "not" at volume level 1 or 2, then "*ou me*" indicates a higher volume level. But context determines if this is e.g., volume level 3, in which instance one might still render it as "not;" or volume level 4 or 5, in which instance one might render it, "certainly not."

The issue of whether or not this nuance of "*ou me* (not)" is contextually strong enough here at Matt. 24:2 to so render it, "certainly not," rather than simply as "not," is one of those things that translators may therefore debate back and forth. Thus e.g., Scrivener evidently considered that "*ou me*" was rendered as simply "not" here in the AV at Matt. 24:2.

St. Matthew may use the negative adverb *ou* (or *ouk* before a vowel, or *ouch* before a vowel and rough breathing) by itself (e.g., Matt. 1:25, *ouk* / "not"; 5:14, *ou dunatai* / "cannot"; 5:27, *ou* / "not"), or he may use it with *me* either with "added volume" in the English translation (e.g., "*ou me*" at Matt. 5:18, "in no wise;" 5:20, "in no case;" & 24:21, "nor ever"); or no "added volume" in the English translation (e.g., Matt. 16:22, "not;" 24:34, "not;" 24:35, "not;" & 26:29, "not").

In this context before considering Matt. 24:2c, the Hebraic / Aramaic poetical style of Matthean Greek at Matt. 13:14 is of specific interest. Here Jesus quoting from Isaiah says, "By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not (*ou me*) understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not (*ou me*) perceive." Here we find an expected and natural stylistic balance in the double usage of "*ou me* (not)" in this couplet.

By contrast, when we come to the MBT of Matt. 24:2c (in which the AV's English is close enough to the Greek to make the basic point,) we read, "There shall not (*ou me*) be left here one stone upon another, that shall not (*ou*) be thrown down." This means one goes from a stronger "*ou me* (not)" to a weaker "*ou* (not);" while simultaneously the intensity of the sentence is going in the very opposite direction and increasing. Therefore the MBT reading of "*ou* (not)" in which the intensity of the sentence is increasing, while the intensity of the "*ou* (not)" is going in the opposite direction and decreasing, clangs on the ears as bad Greek in general, and bad Matthean Greek in particular. To remedy this clear and obvious textual problem with the MBT we must therefore adopt the minority Byzantine reading of "*ou me* (not)," found e.g., in the purple parchment, *Codex Beratinus* (Phi 043, 6th century, St. Matthew's & St. Mark's Gospels; Tirana, Albania). Therefore Scrivener's Text is correct at Matt. 24:2c.

The minority Byzantine reading of Scrivener's text is manifested in the Greek texts of Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

⁹² Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 673.

The MBT reading is found in 6 out of 8 possible manuscripts in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; L, Codex Leicestrensis; H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8); whereas the minority reading followed by Elzevir (1633) was found in only one of these manuscripts (Gospel manuscript w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16). The MBT is also followed by the majority texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). The MBT reading is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and so adopted in the NU Text *et al.*

Thus both Burgonites and Neo-Alexandrians here unite to oppose the TR's reading. What does this tell us about the textual analytical skills of both Majority Text Burgonites and Neo-Alexandrians? But either way, the reading at Matt. 24:2c is still, "not" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 24:3 the TR's "*tes* (the)" before "*sunteleias* (of ... end)" in the wider words, "of the (*tes*) end of the world," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). However the "*tes* (the)" is omitted in a variant found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way the contextual meaning is still, "of the end" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 24:9 the TR's "*ton* ('of the,' word 1, redundant in English translation) *ethnon* ('of nations,' word 2)," in the wider words, "of all nations" (AV), is MBT (e.g., W 032; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings⁹³; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings), and correctly found in Scrivener's Text. However, word 1 is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading (Omega 045, 9th century). In Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) he shows six of his eight gospel manuscripts following the TR's MBT reading which includes word 1, "*ton* ('of the') (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); and says in one manuscript it appears twice (Gospel manuscript: z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8). He thus indicates that he is aware that his omission of word 1 in Elzevir's Text (1633) is a minority reading.

Among the neo-Byzantine texts, only Elzevir's Text (1633) makes this omission of "*ton* ('of the,' word 1, redundant in English translation)," and it does not affect English translation. It looks very much like an "Elzevir textual trademark," which together with other such minority readings that do not affect translation, when added together act to

⁹³ At the first reading of Lectionary 2378 (p. 38a) this is written as the normative "τωv" in which the omega is closed at the top, something like "∞". But at the second reading (p. 65a), the "ωv" comes at the start of a new line in the second column of the page, and the "τ" is placed above the omega (once again with a closed top omega).

show that this is an “Elzevir” text. Thus were the 16th and 17th century “secrets of the trade” among the Neo-Byzantines who composed NT texts. Hence either way, the reading at Matt. 24:9 will still be, “of nations” in the wider words, “of all nations.”

At Matt. 24:15 the TR’s “*estos* (‘standing’ = ‘stand,’ masculine singular nominative, active perfect participle, from *‘istemi / histemi*),” is MBT (e.g., E 07, 8th century; M 021, 9th century; S 028, 10th century; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; Hippolytus, d. 235; & Eusebius, d. 339). However, a variant, “*estos* (‘standing’ = ‘stand,’ neuter singular nominative / accusative, active perfect participle, from *‘istemi / histemi*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (W 032 & Sigma 042). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and thus the NU Text *et al.* But either way⁹⁴, the reading is still “stand” (AV & TR) or “standing” (Geneva Bible of 1560 & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 24:16 the TR’s “*epi* (‘into’ or ‘unto,’ preposition + accusative) *ta* (‘the,’ neuter plural accusative, definite article from *to*) *ore* (‘mountains,’ neuter plural accusative noun, from *oros*),” is MBT (e.g., W 032; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). However, a variant, “*eis* (‘into’ or ‘unto,’ preposition + accusative) *ta* (‘the,’ accusative) *ore* (‘mountains,’ accusative),” is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042). The TR’s reading is followed by the Alexandrian text’s Codex Sinaiticus, whereas the variant is followed by the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus. This split in the Alexandrian texts split the neo-Alexandrians, with Codex Sinaiticus predictably followed by Tischendorf’s 8th ed., and Codex Vaticanus just as predictably followed by W-H. W-H’s lead was also followed by Nestle’s 21st ed. and the NU Text. “After all, does not Codex Vaticanus have the ‘external support’ of the Western Text’s D 05?” But either way, the reading is still, “into the mountains” (AV & TR) or “unto the mountains” (ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 24:17a the TR’s “*katabaineto* (‘let him ... come down’ or ‘let him ... go down,’ imperative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *katabaino*),” in the wider words, “let him which is on the housetop not come down to take anything” etc., is MBT (e.g., W 032; Lectionary 2378 with variant spelling “*katabbaineto*”⁹⁵; & Lectionary 1968). However, a variant, “*katabato* (‘let him ... come down’ or ‘let him ... go down,’ imperative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *katabaino*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042). The variant is followed in the Alexandrian text’s Codex Sinaiticus and Western text’s D 05, and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the

⁹⁴ Cf. the nominative / accusative participle issue at Matt. 22:16.

⁹⁵ In Lectionary 2378 (p. 65b) in the first column at the end of one line is “κατ” with a squiggle something like “~” attached to the top cross-bar of the tau (τ) representing alpha (α) at the end of a line, and above this “~” is the first beta (which in this Lectionary looks something like an English “u” or Greek mu without the left line of “μ”), and on the next line the rest of this word, ending in the letters “εω” in which the omega is something like “∞”. The tau which comes before the omega is then placed directly in the middle of the omega in between this letter and the line above it.

meaning is still, “let him ... come down (AV & TR) or “let him ... go down” (ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 24:30 the TR’s “*en* (‘in,’ word 1) *to* (‘the,’ word 2, masculine singular dative, definite article from *o*; redundant in English translation) *ourano* (‘heaven,’ word 3),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). However, word 2 is omitted in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading is still, “in heaven” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 24:31b the TR’s “*ap* (‘from,’ word 1) *akron* (‘[the] extremities’ = ‘one end,’ AV, word 2, neuter plural genitive noun, from *akron*) *ouranon* (‘of the heavens’ = ‘of heaven,’ AV, word 3) *eos* (‘to,’ word 4) *akron* (‘[the] extremities,’ word 5) *auton* (‘of them,’ word 6) (words 5 + 6 = ‘the other,’ AV),” is MBT (e.g., W 032⁹⁶, Sigma 042; & Lectionary 2378, abbreviating word 3 to “*ounon*” with a bar on top; and Lectionary 1968, omitting the final “*n*” of word 2, & abbreviating word 3 to “*ounon*” with a bar on top). But a variant adding, “*ton* (the)” before word 5 is a minority Greek reading (Theodoret of Cyrus, d. 460).

A split between the two main Alexandrian caused a split among the neo-Alexandrians. The TR’s reading is followed by the Alexandrian text’s Codex Sinaiticus and Western text’s D 05 (word 1 of D 05 retaining omicron before the vowel of the following word i.e., as “*apo*”); and is also found in Tischendorf’s 8th ed. . By contrast, the variant is followed in the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus. To “resolve” this problem, the “*ton* (the)” before word 5 was placed in square brackets as entirely optional by Westcott-Hort, Nestle’s 21st ed., and the contemporary NU Text. But the matter has no impact on English translation, and either way it may be rendered, “from one end of heaven to the other” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

The issue of optional letters is not generally covered. Manuscript data from von Soden does not generally allow us to make a safe calculation on this incidental matter. (This is why I do not object to some combination of them being used as “textual trademarks” in this or that Greek text.) But as elsewhere, we are reminded of them constantly. E.g., at Matt. 24:33a, “*outo* (so),” in Scrivener and Hodges & Farstad, is “*outos* (so)” in Robinson and Pierpont and the NU Text.

At Matt. 24:34 the TR’s “*lego* (I say) *umin* (unto you),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice

⁹⁶ The “A” comes at the end of one line, and with the “KPΩN” (*kron*) of the next line there is a “_” before the “K” and going to just under the “K” i.e., acting as a hyphen to show “*akron*” is one word. This is unusual, though not unknown elsewhere in W 032, which is a continuous script manuscript that generally lacks such hyphens for words going over two lines.

in two different readings⁹⁷). However, a minority Byzantine reading adds “*oti* (that)” after the “*umin* (unto you)” (F 010, 9th century). The TR’s reading is followed by the Alexandrian text’s Codex Sinaiticus, and hence Tischendorf’s 8th ed.; whereas the variant is followed by the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus and Western text’s D 05, and hence Westcott-Hort, Nestle’s 21st ed., and the NU Text. However, under the rule of *oti recitativum*, “*oti* (that)” is not translated when it introduces *direct discourse*⁹⁸. Hence either way the rendering is still, “Verily I say unto you, (Variant adds in Greek “*oti*,” untranslated,) This generation” etc. (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 24:35 the TR’s “*pareleusontai* (‘they shall pass away,’ indicative middle future, 3rd person plural verb, *parerchomai*),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings⁹⁹; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings¹⁰⁰) and correct. However, a variant, “*pareleusetai* (‘it shall pass away,’ indicative middle future, 3rd person singular verb, *parerchomai*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (Y 034, 9th century; & Origen). The variant is followed by the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus and Western text’s D 05. Bearing in mind that “a bit of fiddling and fudging” was always an irreducible element of the Alexandrian School’s *modus operandi*, the originally blank line of the Alexandrian text’s Codex Sinaiticus was later “written in” by a “corrector” Alexandrian School scribe with the words of the variant. Thus the variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* But either way the rendering is still “shall pass away” in the words, “Heaven and earth shall pass away” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). Let us thank God for the Divine Preservation promise in the remainder of this verse, “but my words shall not pass away”!

At Matt. 24:38a the TR’s “*osper* (as),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; Lectionary 2378; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings¹⁰¹). However, a

⁹⁷ At second reading (p. 144b), at end of first line “*lego* (I say)” is written with a dingle shape at end i.e., as, “λΕΓΩ~”.

⁹⁸ Young’s *Greek*, p. 190.

⁹⁹ In the second reading of Lectionary 2378 (p. 66a, columns 1-2), this is spelt as “*pareleusontai*.” But in the first Lectionary reading (p. 38b, column 2), there a localized revowelling of the suffix from “*ai*” to “*e*” i.e., “*pareleusonte*” (cf. e.g., N 022 at Matt. 21:13).

¹⁰⁰ In the first Lectionary reading of Lectionary 1968 (p. 70a) this is spelt as “*pareleusontai*.” But in the second Lectionary reading (p. 144b), this becomes “*pareleuson*.”

¹⁰¹ In Lectionary 1968’s first reading (p. 70a) this is written as “ωσπερ” (in which “c” can be either a sigma / “s” or an epsilon / “e”, and is here used for both). In the second reading (p. 149a), the “ωσπ” is followed by an amalgam letter something like a “G” (for the epsilon) which is above the line, but with an extended right-hand bar from this “G” in the “)” shape abbreviating the “ρ” so as to remove the top circular part of it,

variant which quite possibly originated with Origen, reads “*os* (as).” The variant is followed by the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading is still “as” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 24:38c the TR’s “*ekgamizontes* (‘giving in marriage,’ masculine plural nominative, active present participle, from *ekgamizo* = *ek* / ‘off from’ + *gamizo*, also spelt, *gamisko*, / ‘giving in marriage’),” is MBT (e.g., W 032 with the alternative spelling, “*ekgamiskontes*”¹⁰²; and Sigma 042 with the alternative spelling, “*eggamiskontes*”¹⁰³; Lectionary 2378; & Lectionary 1968, with the TR’s spelling at the first reading, p. 70a, and with a local revowelling of the last “*e*” to “*a*” i.e., “*ekgamizontas*” at the second reading, p. 149b¹⁰⁴; & Chrysostom). However, a variant, “*gamizontes* (‘giving in marriage,’ masculine plural nominative, active present participle, from *gamizo*, also spelt, *gamisko*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscula 1355, 12th century; & Chrysostom). The variant is found in both the Alexandrian text’s Codex Sinaiticus and Western text’s D 05 with the spelling, “*gamizontes*” from *gamizo*; and in the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus with the alternative spelling of, “*gamiskontes*” from *gamisko*. With the spelling of Codex Sinaiticus and D 05, the variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* But however the TR or variant are spelt, the reading will still be, “giving in marriage” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 24:41 the TR’s “*muloni* (‘mill,’ masculine singular dative noun, from *mulon*),” is MBT (e.g., H 013, 9th century; Lectionary 2378, with revowelled spelling, “*miloni*,” Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings; & Chrysostom) and correct. But a variant, “*mulō* (‘mill,’ masculine singular dative noun, from *mulos*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (W 032; Sigma 042; & Origen). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way the rendering will still be, “the mill” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 24:43 the TR’s “*diorugenai* (‘to be broken up’ or ‘to be broken through’ or ‘to be broken into,’ passive second aorist infinitive, from *diorusso*),” is MBT (e.g., W

reaching down to below the line to where a “p” would normally end. Is this abbreviation that of the local hand of this Lectionary scribe only, or was it more widely used? I do not have sufficient knowledge of different scripts to know the answer to this.

¹⁰² As this goes over two lines in W 032, the abbreviation “-” is used instead of the “n” over the top of the “o” and then protrudes one letter space to the right. Thus the “*ekgamisko-*” comes at the end of one line, with “*tes*” in the next line.

¹⁰³ Cf. Geoffrey Horrocks’ *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*, Longman, London, UK, & New York, USA, 1997, p. 63, for a “k” (kappa) to “g” (gamma) exchange with “*prosenekken* (he brought)” for “*prosenegken*” (3rd century B.C., Egyptian Greek).

¹⁰⁴ Cf. *Ibid.*, for “*e*” (epsilon) and “*a*” (alpha) exchanges in Coptic Greek.

032, Sigma 042; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings, revowelled suffix at first reading to “*diorugene*” p. 38b, but TR’s spelling at second and third readings, pp. 67a & 100b; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings; Origen & Chrysostom). The TR’s reading is followed by the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus. However, a variant, “*dioruchthenai* (‘to be broken up’ or ‘to be broken through’ or ‘to be broken into,’ passive first aorist infinitive, from *diorusso*),” is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codex Sinaiticus and Western text’s D 05. The variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the meaning is still the same, e.g., “to be broken up” (AV & TR), or “to be broken through” (ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 24:44 the TR’s “*ora* (‘an hour,’ word 1) *ou* (‘not,’ word 2) *dokeite* (‘as ye think,’ word 3),” i.e., “an hour (*ora*) as ye think (*dokeite*) not (*ou*)” (AV), is MBT (e.g., W 032, revowelling word 3 to “*dokeitai*”; Sigma 042; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings, revowelling word 3 to “*dokeitai*” in the third reading¹⁰⁵; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings, revowelling word 3 to “*dokeitai*” in the second reading¹⁰⁶; & Chrysostom). However, a variant using word order 2,3,1, is found in Athanasius of Alexandria. The variant is followed in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading will still be the same.

At Matt. 24:45a the TR’s “*therapeias* (‘household,’ feminine singular genitive noun, from *therapeia*),” is MBT (e.g., Gamma 036, 9th century; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings¹⁰⁷; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings).

¹⁰⁵ In Lectionary 2378’s first reading (p. 38b) this is written as, “ΔΟΚΕΙΤΕ.” At the second reading (p. 67a) this is written as “ΔΟΚ” followed by an abbreviation for “εἰ” that looks something like a “q” and “d” combined to share the same “o” in the middle i.e., “c” (epsilon) + “l” (iota) (not to be confused with another abbreviation used in this Lectionary for “εἰ,” that looks something like a “6” with a “)” curving down from the right hand curve of the “6” i.e., where “6” = epsilon and the downward curving bar = the iota something like a “j” without the dot on top); followed by a “τ”; followed by an epsilon which looks something like the sideways “6” in the following box,



; (although this is only one of a number of different letter scripts used for epsilon in this Lectionary). In the third reading (p. 100b) this is written as “δοκειτα.” Such are some of the variations of script and spellings inside this *one* lectionary.

¹⁰⁶ The spelling of word 3 in Lectionary 1968’s first (p. 70b) and third (p. 237a) readings is that of the TR; but the suffix “e” becomes “ai” (with the same meaning) at the second reading (p. 149b).

¹⁰⁷ At the first reading (p. 67a), Lectionary 2378 writes this as, “*therapei*” in the main line, with something like “÷c” above the line; whereas at the second reading (p.

Variant 1, “*oiketias* (‘household,’ feminine singular genitive noun, from *oiketeia*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & Y 034, 9th century¹⁰⁸). *Variant 1*, with the alternative spelling, “*oiketeias* (‘household,’ feminine singular genitive noun, from *oiketeia*, derived from *oiketēs*, derived from *oikeō*, derived from *oikos*),” is also found in the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus; and derived from the same root word of “*oikos* (house [-hold]),” *Variant 2*, “*oikias* (‘household,’ feminine singular genitive noun, from *oikia*, derived from *oikos*),” is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codex Sinaiticus. *Variant 1* spelt, “*oiketeias*,” was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering is still, “household” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 24:45b the TR’s “*didonai* (‘to give,’ present active infinitive, from *didōmi*),” is MBT (e.g., W 032; Lectionary 2378, in one of two readings, p. 110b; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). But a variant, “*dounai* (‘to give,’ aorist active infinitive, from *didōmi*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042; Lectionary 2378, in one of two readings, p. 67a¹⁰⁹). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering is still, “to give” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 24:46 the TR’s “*poiounta* (‘doing,’ word 1) *outos* (‘so,’ word 2),” is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionary 2378, in one of two readings, p. 101a; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). However, a variant using word order 2,1 is a minority Byzantine reading (Lectionary 2378, in one of two readings, p. 67a). The variant is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05; and thus the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering remains, “so doing” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 25:1c the TR’s “*auton* (‘of them’ = ‘their,’ feminine plural genitive, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*),” of “their lamps” (AV) is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). The TR’s reading is followed by the Alexandrian text’s Codex Sinaiticus, and hence Tischendorf’s 8th ed. . However, a variant, “*eauton* (‘of themselves’ = ‘their,’ feminine plural genitive, third person reflexive personal pronoun from *eautou*),” is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus, and Western text’s D 05, and hence Westcott-Hort, Nestle’s 21st ed., and the NU Text. But either way, the reading will still be, “their lamps” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

100b) this is written on the one line in full. Amidst other writing style differences, the form at p. 67a ends with a “c” sigma, whereas the form at p. 100b ends with a “σ” sigma.

¹⁰⁸ Though the variant has some wider Byzantine text support, the MBT has the support of von Soden’s K group, and so *c.* 90%+ of the Byzantine texts.

¹⁰⁹ Though the variant has some wider Byzantine text support, the MBT has the support of von Soden’s K group, and so *c.* 90%+ of the Byzantine texts.

At Matt. 25:1b the TR's "*apantesin* ('meet,' feminine singular accusative noun, from *apantesis*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). However, a variant, "*upantesin* ('meet,' feminine singular accusative noun, from '*upantesis* / *hypantesis*'¹¹⁰)," is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042). The variant is followed by the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering is still, "meet" in "meet the bridegroom" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 25:2a the TR's "*esan* ('they were' = 'were,' word 1) *ex* ('of,' word 2) *auton* ('of them' = 'them,' word 3)," in the wider words, "And five of them were wise" (AV) is MBT (e.g., W 032, M 021; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). But a variant in word order 2,3,1 is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading is still, "of them were" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). For the wider context, see commentary at Matt. 25:2b.

At Matt. 25:4b the TR's Greek "*auton* ('of them' = 'their,' feminine plural genitive, personal pronoun from *autos*)," in the words, "their lamps" (AV), is MBT (e.g., W 032¹¹¹, Sigma 042, Gamma 041; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings¹¹²) and correct. But Greek "*eauton* ('of themselves' = 'their,' AV feminine plural genitive, third person reflexive personal pronoun from *eautou*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscles 655, 11th / 12th century; & 21, 12th century). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering is still, "their" in "their lamps" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 25:7 the TR's "*auton* ('of them' = 'their,' feminine plural genitive, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*)," of "their lamps" (AV) is MBT (e.g., W 032, 5th century; X 033, 10th century; Lectionary 2378, 11th century, twice in two different

¹¹⁰ This is simply two different ways to transliterate into English the Greek root word, *ὑπάντησις* (standard seminary Greek) / *YPIANTHCIC* (letters of unical manuscripts).

¹¹¹ Coming at the end of a line in W 032, "*auton*" is written with a normative W 032 abbreviation for the final "*n*" (nu) that looks something like, "*auto~*" (cf. Matt. 25:3b, in App. 1, *supra*).

¹¹² Coming at the end of a line and indeed the end of the page in Lectionary 1968, the "*auton* (*αυτων*)" at the second reading (p. 150a) is written in two letter spaces as "*αυ*" above which in the middle of these two letters is the "τ," above which is a large "*~*" shape, above which is a smaller "*^*" shape.

readings¹¹³; & Lectionary 1968, 1544 A.D., twice in two different readings). However, a variant, “*eauton* (‘of themselves’ = ‘their,’ feminine plural genitive, third person reflexive personal pronoun from *eautou*),” is a minority Byzantine reading found in A 02 (5th century)¹¹⁴ and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus, and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading will still be, “their lamps” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 25:8 the TR’s “*eipon* (‘they said’ = ‘said,’ indicative active second aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *legō*),” is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, K 017; *Lectionary* 2378, twice in two different readings¹¹⁵; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). The TR’s reading is followed in the Alexandrian text’s Codex Sinaiticus; whereas a variant, “*eipan* (‘they said’ = ‘said,’ indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural, from the verb, *legō*),” is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus. It is possible to either decline *legō* from a second aorist of *eipon* or a first aorist of *eipa*¹¹⁶. The variant is found in the NU Text *et al.* But either way the meaning is still “said,” in the wider words, “And the foolish said unto the wise” etc. (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 25:9a the TR’s “*ouk* (not)” is MBT¹¹⁷ (e.g., Codex A 02; Minuscule 2;

¹¹³ At the first reading (p. 40a, column 1), *Lectionary* 2378 has this written as simply “*αυτων*” (*auton*) with a closed top omega that looks something like, “∞”; but at the second reading (p. 67b, column 2), it has the “τ” (tau / t) inserted above the line in the middle of the “∞” (closed top omega / *o*) of “*αυων*” (*auton*), with the “αυ” at the end of one line, and the “ων” at the start of the next. (Cf. Matt. 21:7b, *supra*.)

¹¹⁴ In A 02 this comes at the end of a line in the first column of a two column page (p. 26a), and an abbreviation looking something like “~” replaces the final “n” (nu).

¹¹⁵ At *Lectionary* 2378’s first reading (p. 40a, column 1), between the “*ei*” and “*pon*” of “*eipon*” there is a paper space evident in my microfilm photocopies. I checked the original at Sydney University and this is a hole that goes right through the vellum. It is a pear shape, *c.* 1 cm or *c.* 3/8" long, in the middle *c.* 6mm or 1/4" in width, although smaller that this at the two ends, starting at the top end like breakable top stem of a pear, and at the bottom end being a width of *c.* 3mm or *c.* 1/8". It is clear that the scribe of *Lectionary* 2378 wrote around this hole, for vellum was not cheap, and more broadly, this was still a good vellum page, as attested to by its very good condition after *c.* 1,000 years.

¹¹⁶ Mounce’s *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), pp. 21 & 299.

¹¹⁷ Robinson & Pierpont (2005) have this as the MBT reading without comment (von Soden’s K group); whereas Hodges & Farstad (1985) show it as the majority reading (von Soden’s I & K groups), but say the majority text is here “seriously divided” with the reading, “*ou me* (not)” (pp. xxi & 85). Von Soden (1913) says that inside his K group, the MBT has the support of the Kx and Kr subgroups, which in broad terms are about 68-72% of the K group; and so this reading is clearly MBT. (This reading is one

Lectionaries 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings), and correct. However, a variant “*ou me* (not)” is a minority Byzantine reading (Codices W 032 & Sigma 042). The TR’s reading is found in the Alexandrian Text’s Codex Sinaiticus; whereas the variant is found in the Alexandrian Text’s Codex Vaticanus, Western Text’s D 05, and NU Text *et al.*

The Greek “*ou* (not)” is used with “*me* (not)” i.e., “*ou* (not) *me* (not),” as an emphasis something like the English terminology of, “No! No! No!,” and is sometimes rendered, “by no means.” The Greek nuance of the variant is therefore a stronger or more solemn, “not,” than the Greek nuance of the TR’s reading here at Matt. 25:7. Perhaps an English reader who understands the Greek, *might* raise his voice in a slightly louder “not” if following the variant than he would if following the TR’s reading; but either way, the rendering into English will still be the same, i.e., “not” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H) in the wider words, “lest there be not enough for us and you” (AV).

At Matt. 25:16b the TR’s “*eirgasato* (indicative middle first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *ergazomai*),” is MBT (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, K 017; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings¹¹⁸; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings¹¹⁹) and correct. But a variant, “*ergasato* (indicative middle first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *ergazomai*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032). The aorist form of *ergazomai* can be declined either from *eirgasamen* as in the TR, or

of many not itemized by Pierpont in Green’s Majority Text Textual Apparatus of 1986.)

¹¹⁸ At Lectionary 2378’s first reading (p. 39a, column 1), this is written (with a backward slopping alpha or “a” that looks something like a “d” but at an angle something like \) something like, “εἰρΓd” followed by an alpha that looks like an α + υ combined (a common form of alpha in this Lectionary) i.e., “αυ”, and in the middle of this alpha above the line a “τ.” But, where is the omicron? Is it simply omitted as part of this abbreviation? Or is it being changed to an omega, which in this Lectionary generally looks something like “ω” (i.e., a closed top form of “ω”), in which the general shape of the alpha as something like “αυ” is doubling up as first an alpha, and then an omega? If the latter, might this then lead to an apparent “letter loss” if a subsequent scribe was copying this out without such abbreviations? By contrast, at its second reading (p. 68a, column 1), Lectionary 2378 simply reads “*eirga* (εἰρΓd)” on one line, and “*sato* (σdτo)” on the next. At this second reading the second alpha looks like the first alpha i.e., something like a backward slopping “d” (rather than the “αυ” of the first reading), and it clearly ends with an omicron. There is thus clearly some level of internal diversity of hand style used between these two readings (a phenomenon also found in other instances of two readings in this Lectionary). (Original of Lectionary 2378 checked at Sydney University and no omicron fade apparent for this word at either readings 1 or 2.)

¹¹⁹ At Lectionary 1968’s first reading (p. 71b), this is written as, “εἰρΓασατο”. But at the second reading (p. 151a), this is written with a large omicron as “εἰρΓασαΟ”, in which a smaller “τ” is then placed on top of the omicron.

from *ergasamen* as in the variant¹²⁰. (Cf. commentary at Matt. 14:19c, “Principal Textual Discussion,” at “Type 1.”) The variant’s form is also found at Matt. 25:16b in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering remains, “traded” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 25:18a the TR’s “*en* (‘in,’ word 1) *te* (‘the,’ word 2, feminine singular dative, definite article from *e*) *ge* (‘earth,’ word 3, feminine singular dative noun, from *ge*),” is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, M 021; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). *Variant 1* is, “*ten* (‘[in] the,’ word 2, feminine singular accusative, definite article from *e*) *gen* (‘earth,’ word 3, feminine singular accusative noun, from *ge*)” (the mixed text type, C 04, & independent text 700). *Variant 2*, “*gen* (‘[in the] earth,’ word 3, feminine singular accusative noun, from *ge*),” is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and thus the NU Text *et al.* It is common for an accusative to be used for the object of a verb (here “digged¹²¹”), and hence it receives and limits the verb’s action¹²². Thus the meaning of *Variants 1 & 2* will still be “digged in the earth.” Therefore whether following the TR or *Variant 2*, the reading will still be “digged in the earth” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 25:18b the TR’s “*apekrupse* (‘he hid away’ = ‘he hid’ = ‘hid,’ AV, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apokrupto* = *apo* / “off” i.e., *apo* = “away” + *krupto* / ‘hid’),” is MBT (with or without an optional “*n*” on the end,) (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, U 030; & Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings without the optional “*n*” on the end; & Lectionary 1968, in the first reading at p. 71b with the optional “*n*” on the end, and at the second reading at p. 151a without the optional “*n*” on the end), and correct. However, a variant, “*ekrupsen* (‘he hid’ = ‘hid,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *krupto*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (A 02). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering remains, “hid,” in the words, “and hid his lord’s money” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 25:19a the TR’s “*chronon* (‘a time,’ word 1) *polun* (‘long,’ word 2),” is MBT (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, Pi 041; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings¹²³; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). However a variant in word order

¹²⁰ Mounce’s *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), pp. 21 & 214.

¹²¹ Greek, “*oruxen* (‘he digged’ = ‘digged,’ AV, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *orusso*).

¹²² Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, p. 179; Young’s *Greek*, p. 16.

¹²³ At both Lectionary 2378’s first (p. 39a, column 1) and second (p. 68a, column 2) readings, word 2 is spelt “*pollun*.”

2,1, is a minority Byzantine reading (G 011). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering is still, "a long time" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 25:19b the TR's "*sunairei* ('he settles,' word 1) *met'* ('with,' word 2) *auton* ('them,' word 3) *logon* ('account,' word 4)," i.e., "reckoneth with them" (AV) is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032¹²⁴, Gamma 041; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). However, a variant in word order 1,4,2,3, is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042 & Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings¹²⁵). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05¹²⁶; and hence the NU Text *et al.* Because the meaning of words 1 & 4 are joined as "he settles account" or "reckoneth" (AV), the variant looks like a scribal "stylistic improvement" to put these two words in a consecutive order "for greater ease of understanding." But either way, the rendering is still the same.

At Matt. 25:22a the TR's "*de*" in the wider, "*de kai* (also)," in the words, "He also that" etc. (AV & TR), is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, X 033; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). However a typical Alexandrian pruning of the text is found in the omission of the "*de*" in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus. This is adopted in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952); although the weakness of this reading's "external support" beyond these two Alexandrian texts,

¹²⁴ In W 032 word 1 is spelt, "*sunerei*."

¹²⁵ Due to what looked like it *might be* a "correction" on the photocopy of the microfilm copy, I checked the original of Lectionary 2378 at Sydney University. At its first reading (p. 39a, column 1), word 1's is made with the spelling of the MBT's "*sunairei*" by a "corrector" scribe. Under a magnifying glass, it seems the word originally had a large epsilon (stylistically like the large epsilon of the "*erchetai*" / 'he cometh' = 'cometh,' AV, two lines above in this same verse,) i.e., something like "συνἔρει"; and the epsilon was then written over with an "*ai*" (alpha, iota), fitting something like "αι" into the former space of the large "ἔ". At the second reading (p. 68a, column 2), the main text reads, "*sunerei*", but between the lines and above the "*e*" is "*ai*" i.e., this is a textual apparatus giving both spellings. On the one hand, the fact that the alpha shape with the iota is slightly different to normal, and this is in lighter ink, suggests the possibility that this textual apparatus may also have been created by a "corrector" scribe; but on the other hand, the internal diversity of any given handwriting, coupled with the fact that this is only two letters, means that it remains possible that this textual apparatus is part of the original work. Hence one would need to scientifically check the two inks used to resolve this matter.

¹²⁶ In D 05 word 1 is spelt, "*sunerei*."

evidently led the NU Text to place the “*de*” in square brackets as entirely optional in the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993). Depending on context, the Greek “*de kai*” (or “*kai de*”) can e.g., mean either, “But also,” or simply “too” / “also”¹²⁷. However, since the context here indicates the “*de kai*” (TR) means “also;” and the same would be true if the reading were simply “*de* (also)” (Variant); it follows that either way it may be translated the same.

At Matt. 25:27a the TR’s “*oun* (‘therefore,’ word 1) *se* (‘thou,’ word 2),” is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, K 017; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). But a variant in word order 2,1, is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and thus the NU Text *et al.* But either way the rendering is still “thou oughtest therefore” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 25:27b the TR’s “*to* (‘the,’ neuter singular accusative, definite article from *to*) *argurion* (neuter singular accusative, noun from *argurion*) *mou* (of me),” i.e., “my money,” is MBT (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, M 021; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). However, a variant, “*ta* (neuter plural accusative, definite article from *to*) *arguria* (neuter plural accusative, noun from *argurion*) *mou* (of me),” i.e., “my money,” is a minority Byzantine reading (W 032). The variant is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and thus the NU Text *et al.* But either way the rendering is still “my money” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 25:29 the TR’s “*apo* (‘from,’ word 1) *de* (‘but,’ word 2) *tou* (‘the [one],’ word 3, masculine singular genitive, definite article, from *o*, i.e., ‘him’ = ‘him that hath,’ AV) is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, Gamma 036; Lectionary 2378, definitely in one of two readings, and *probably* twice in two different readings, *infra*; Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings; Cyril of Jerusalem & Chrysostom).

One of the two Lectionary readings of Lectionary 2378 is unclear here at word 2. Coming at the end of a line (p. 68b, column 1), after word 1 is a sign that looks something like a question mark “?” at a right to left backwards sloping angle (with no dot on the end of the question mark,) above which are markings something like “‘*’”. I have checked the original at Sydney University and it shows no signs of a paper fade, nor yields any further information than what is evident in my photocopies of a microfilm form. On the one hand, this is not a common end of line abbreviation for “*de*” in this Lectionary, which when coming at the end of a line is usually written out in full as “Δε” (e.g., “And” at Mark 15:44, Lectionary 2378 p. 86a, column 1; or “And” at John 18:2, Lectionary 2378 p. 79b, column 2) or less commonly as “δε” (e.g., “but” at John 17:25,

¹²⁷ Cf. e.g., Mounce’s *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), p. 132; & Newman, B.M., *A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament*, United Bible Societies, Stuttgart, West Germany [part of modern Germany], 1971 (in “Dictionary” editions of UBS *Greek NT* 3rd Corrected edition of 1983), p. 39.

Lectionary 2378, p. 79b, column 1). But on the other hand, three factors indicate to me that this is *probably* a symbol for “*de*.” Firstly, it must be an abbreviation for something. Secondly, there is no known variant that I can locate either omitting the “*de*,” or changing it to something else that this abbreviation might mean. And thirdly, the general shape of the “?” (without the dot underneath it) looks *something like* the loop than *sometimes* joins a “δ” to a following letter in this Lectionary (e.g., “*de*” untranslated in AV at Matt. 25:26, Lectionary p. 68b, column 1). Nevertheless, I say “probably,” since it remains possible that this is an abbreviation for “*kai*,” and if so, this would be the first recorded instance of this variant. But in the absence of any such known variant of “*kai*,” I would say that on the presently available data, on the balance of probabilities, this is an abbreviation for “*de*.”

A variant omitting word 1, is found in word order, 3,2. It is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But whether translated from the TR’s “*apo* (‘from,’ word 1) *de* (‘but,’ word 2) *tou* (‘the [one],’ genitive, word 3, i.e., ‘him’ = ‘him that hath,’ AV),” or the variant’s “*tou* (‘from the [one],’ genitive, word 3, i.e., ‘from him,’ = ‘from him that hath,’ ASV) *de* (‘but,’ word 2);” either way, the TR’s and variant’s reading will still be, “but from him that hath” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

In Koine Greek (sometimes called Hellenistic Greek), the genitive’s meanings of either “of” or “from” are generally distinctive, so that the meaning of “from” came to be increasingly expressed by either *apo* + genitive or *ek* + genitive¹²⁸. Therefore if the variant’s omission was deliberate, and certainly it looks like a typical Alexandrian scribe’s pruning of the text; then the variant’s omission of *apo* is an unlikely reading since it represents a grammatically retrograde trend, and seemingly expresses a quirky scribe’s ill-thought through concept of what was “redundant” and so might be pruned away. Given that this omission is found in both main Alexandrian texts, what does this tell us about the grammatical standard of Greek knowledge held by these two Alexandrian School scribes? What does it tell us about the lack of due care and consideration they both exercised in their scribal duties? If you knew a second-hand car salesman to possess similar character traits exhibiting a lack of due care and consideration for motor vehicles, would you buy a second-hand car from him?

At Matt. 25:32a Robinson & Pierpont (2005) show the TR’s “*sunachthesetai* (shall be gathered),” as MBT with no alternative given; whereas, Hodges & Farstad (1985) put “*sunachthesetai* (shall be gathered),” in their main text, but say that the text is “seriously divided” between this and the reading “*sunachthesontai* (shall be gathered)¹²⁹.” Von Soden (1913) says “*sunachthesetai*,” has the support of his K group,

¹²⁸ Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, pp. 77,107-109. For Wallace’s terminology of “ablative genitive” (8 case system) see five-case as opposed to eight-case systems (Young’s *Greek*, pp. 9 & 23).

¹²⁹ Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 87.

other than his Kr subgroup and three other K group manuscripts that all follow “*sunachthesetai*.” Von Soden’s Kr group has 211 manuscripts. This means the total strength of the “*sunachthesetai*” reading is 211 Kr manuscripts + 3 other K group manuscripts = 214 out of a total of 983 K group manuscripts, i.e., in approximate terms (since the vast majority of K group has gospel manuscripts), about one-fifth of the Byzantine manuscripts follow “*sunachthesetai*.” Thus the TR’s “*sunachthesetai*” is clearly MBT.

Therefore, at Matt. 25:32a the TR’s “*sunachthesetai* (shall be gathered),” is MBT and supported by about four-fifths of Byzantine manuscripts (e.g., A 02, W 032, S 028; Eusebius & Basil the Great). However, a variant reading, “*sunachthesontai* (shall be gathered),” is a minority Byzantine reading followed by about one-fifth of Byzantine manuscripts (e.g., Sigma 042, G 011; K 017; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings, in the first reading in a wider section rewritten by a “corrector” scribe¹³⁰; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings; Eusebius & Theodoret of Cyrus).

In the TR’s reading, because the subject, “*ethne* (‘nations,’ neuter plural nominative noun, from *ethnos*),” is of neuter gender, the TR’s verb is singular i.e., “*sunachthesetai* (‘shall be gathered,’ indicative passive future, 3rd person singular verb, from *sunago*) ... *ta* (‘the,’ neuter plural nominative, definite article from *to*) *ethne* (‘nations,’ neuter plural nominative noun, from *ethnos*).” By contrast, the variant reads, “*sunachthesontai* (‘shall be gathered,’ indicative passive future, 3rd person plural verb, from *sunago*) ... *ta* (‘the,’ neuter plural nominative, definite article from *to*) *ethne* (‘nations,’ neuter plural nominative noun, from *ethnos*).” In Greek, a neuter plural subject usually, though not always, has singular verbs. The exception to the general rule

¹³⁰ At Lectionary 2378’s first reading (p. 55a, column 2) from “*doxes* (of glory)” (Matt. 25:31) to “*autous* (them),” has been rewritten. The text is the same as the TR other than for this variant, which is also found in the Lectionary’s second reading (p. 68b, column 2). The first reading is written over a scratched out section of the vellum removing a former reading, but in much smaller writing, with a finer nib, and in lighter ink, indicating that the original scribe inadvertently left out part of this verse, although which part, is unclear. The work of this later “corrector” scribe is evidently not that of the original scribe because e.g., the letter xi (pronounced “zye”) transliterated as “x”, in the corrector’s hand looks much more like, but not the same as, the standard seminary Greek “ξ” in this Lectionary’s Matt. 25:31 first reading of “δοξHC (*doxes*, ‘of ... glory’);” whereas the Lectionary 2378 scribe’s xi looks more like either our capital English “E” (although it has a slight protrusion at the top like the standard seminary Greek ξ) in e.g., the earlier Matt. 25:31 “ΔΟΕΗ (*doxe*, ‘glory’),” or more like a larger form of the standard seminary Greek epsilon “ε” (although it has a slight protrusion at the top like the standard seminary Greek ξ) in e.g., the latter Matt. 25:33 “ΔΕΕΙΟΟV (*dexion*, ‘right hand’).” Thus in this Lectionary’s second reading (p. 68b. column 2) this is written in the scribe’s normative hand of a larger looking epsilon “ε” with a slight protrusion at the top like the standard seminary Greek “ξ”, at Matt. 25:31 as, “ΔΟΕHC (*doxes*, ‘of ... glory’).” Original checked at Sydney University. Cf. Matt. 25:32b.

occurs where one wants to emphasize the individuality of each subject in the plural subject¹³¹. Hence the reading of the variant might be taken to mean that this act of judgement is stressing the individual element of each person's judgment. But context gives this in the TR's reading, and no such alteration to the text of Scripture is warranted.

The erroneous variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, at Matt. 25:32a the rendering remains, "shall be gathered," in the words, "and before him shall be gathered all the nations" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 25:32b the TR's "*aphoriei* ('he shall separate,' indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *aphorizo*)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, K 017; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings, in the first reading in a wider section rewritten by a "corrector" scribe¹³²; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). However, a variant reading, "*aphorisei* ('he shall separate,' indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *aphorizo*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (W 032). It is possible to decline *aphorizo* from two different future forms, either from *aphorizō* as in the TR's reading, or from *aphoriso* as in the variant's reading¹³³. Thus the difference between the TR and variant here at Matt. 25:32b is the difference of a Greek spelling variant, something like the difference in English between the spelling variants "program" and "programme."

The TR's reading is followed by the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus, whereas the variant is followed by the Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus; although on this occasion the variant was uniformly adopted by the NU Text *et al.* But a Greek spelling variant has no impact on English translation or meaning, and so either way, at Matt. 25:32b the rendering is still, "he shall separate," in the words, "and he shall separate them one from another" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 25:36 the TR's "*elthete* ('ye came,' indicative active second aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *erchomai*)," is MBT (e.g., K 017; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings¹³⁴; Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings; Clement of Rome, Origen, Basil the Great, & Chrysostom). But a variant reading "*elthate* ('ye came,' indicative active first aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *erchomai*)," is a minority

¹³¹ See my footnote comments at Matt. 6:28, in Appendix 3 of Textual Commentaries Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14).

¹³² See previous footnote on Lectionary 2378 at Matt. 25:32a, *supra*.

¹³³ Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), pp. 21 & 109.

¹³⁴ At Lectionary 2378's second reading (p. 69a, column 1), this is written as "ηλθετε". But at its first reading (p. 55b, column 1), this is written in a script common to various parts of this Lectionary as something like "ηλθGτσ", in which the top cross-bar of the "τ" comes across as part of the top of the final letter.

Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, & Chrysostom). The Greek *erchomai* can be declined as a second aorist from *elthon* as in the TR's reading, or as a first aorist from *eltha* as in the variant's reading¹³⁵. But these are simply different aorist declensions resulting from different aorist stem forms. The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the reading will still be "ye came," in the wider words, "I was in prison, and ye came unto me" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 25:39 the TR's "*asthene* ('sick,' masculine singular accusative adjective, from *asthenes*)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, Gamma 036; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). However, a variant "*asthenounta* ('ailing' = 'sick,' masculine singular accusative, active present participle, from *astheneo*, derived from *asthenes*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscule 237, 10th century; & Minuscule 259, 11th century). The TR's reading is found in the Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus; whereas the variant is found in the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus, and Western text's D 05. The variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* But either way the rendering is still "sick" in the wider words, "when saw we thee sick ... and came unto thee?" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 25:41 the TR's "*oi* ([ye] the [ones]' = 'ye,' AV, masculine plural vocative, definite article from *o*) *katerameno* ('having been cursed' = 'cursed,' AV, masculine plural vocative, perfect passive participle, from *katarao*)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, Pi 041; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). But a variant omitting the "*oi*" is found in Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444). The TR's reading is found in the Western text's D 05; whereas the variant is found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus. The variant is adopted in Tischendorf's 8th ed., Westcott-Hort, and Nestle's 21st ed.; although with "external support" in e.g., Origen and D 05, the NU Text Committee decided to put the "*oi*" in square brackets as entirely optional. But either way, it may still be rendered, "ye cursed," in the wider words, "Depart from me, ye cursed" etc. (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). Alternatively, it is also possible to read the vocative (addressing them) "*oi*" suffix as a nominative, and thus Moffatt reads, "Begone from me, accursed ones (*katerameno*, 'having been cursed' = 'accursed,' masculine plural nominative, perfect passive participle, from *katarao*)" etc. . Seeking "to ride" this ambiguity, the TCNT reads, "Go from my presence, accursed" etc. .

¹³⁵ Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), pp. 21 & 216.

Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E (Matt. 21-25).

*(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. 21:4 {A}
 Matt. 21:5b {A}
 Matt. 21:6 {A}
Matt. 21:7c {B}*
 Matt. 21:9 {A}
 Matt. 21:11a {A}
 Matt. 21:12b {A}
 Matt. 21:13 {A}
 Matt. 21:15a {A}
 Matt. 21:23b {A}
 Matt. 21:24a {A}
Matt. 21:28a {B}*
 Matt. 21:28c {A}
 Matt. 21:29,30c,31b
Component 1:
 Matt. 21:29 {A}
Component 2:
 Matt. 21:30c {A}
Component 3:
 Matt. 21:31b {A}
Matt. 21:30b {B}*
 Matt. 21:31a {A}
Matt. 21:33 {A}*
 Matt. 21:38 {B}
 Matt. 21:44 {A}
 Matt. 22:7 {B}
 Matt. 22:10b {A}
 Matt. 22:13b {B}
 Matt. 22:20 {B}
Matt. 22:23 {A}*
 Matt. 22:27 {A}
 Matt. 22:30b {A}
 Matt. 22:32 {B}
 Matt. 22:35a {A}
 Matt. 22:35b {A}
 Matt. 22:37a {A}
 Matt. 22:38 {A}
 Matt. 22:39
Component 1: {A}
Component 2: {B}
 Matt. 22:40 {A}

Matt. 22:44b {A}
 Matt. 23:3b {B}
 Matt. 23:3c {A}
 Matt. 23:4a {A}
 Matt. 23:4b {A}
 Matt. 23:4c {A}
 Matt. 23:5a {B}
 Matt. 23:5b {A}
 Matt. 23:7 {B}
 Matt. 23:8b {B}
 Matt. 23:13,14
Component 1: {A}
Component 2: {B}^{*}
 Matt. 23:17 {A}
 Matt. 23:19 {A}
Matt. 23:21 {B}^{*}
 Matt. 23:23b {A}
Matt. 23:25 {B}^{*}
 Matt. 23:26 {A}
 Matt. 23:32 {A}
 Matt. 23:34 {A}
 Matt. 23:35b {A}
 Matt. 23:38 {A}
 Matt. 24:2a {B}
 Matt. 24:6 {B}
 Matt. 24:7 {A}
 Matt. 24:18 {B}
Matt. 24:27 {B}^{*}
 Matt. 24:28 {A}
 Matt. 24:31 {B}
 Matt. 24:36b {A}
 Matt. 24:36c {B}
 Matt. 24:37 {A}
 Matt. 24:38b {A}
 Matt. 24:39 {A}
 Matt. 24:40 {A}
 Matt. 24:42 {A}
 Matt. 24:48a {A}
 Matt. 24:48b {A}
 Matt. 24:49a {B}
 Matt. 24:49b {B}
 Matt. 25:1c {A}
 Matt. 25:2b {A}
 Matt. 25:3a {A}
 Matt. 25:4a {A}
 Matt. 25:6a {A}

Matt. 25:6b {A}
Matt. 25:9b {B}
Matt. 25:13 {B}
Matt. 25:16a {A}
Matt. 25:16c {B}
Matt. 25:16d {A}
Matt. 25:17a {A}
Matt. 25:17b {A}
Matt. 25:20 {A}
Matt. 25:21 {A}
Matt. 25:22b {A}
Matt. 25:22c {A}
Matt. 25:31 {B}
Matt. 25:44 {B}*

Appendix 5: DEDICATION SERMON. A Sermon preached for Dedication of Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25) on Thursday 9 June (Royal Oak Day), 2011, at Mangrove Mountain Union Church, Mangrove Mountain (just north of Sydney, near Gosford), New South Wales, Australia. (Oral recorded form presently available at www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible.)

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. *Let us pray.* “O Almighty God, who art a strong tower of defence unto thy servants against the face of their enemies; we yield thee praise and thanksgiving for the wonderful deliverance ... from THE GREAT REBELLION” of the 1640s and 1650s Puritan revolutionary republic, “and all the miseries and oppression consequent thereupon, under which they had so long groaned.” “O Lord God of our salvation, who hast been exceedingly gracious ... by thy miraculous providence, ... restoring ... King Charles the Second,” in 1660 “notwithstanding all the power and malice of his enemies, we are here now before thee, with all due thankfulness, ... to offer unto thee our sacrifice of praise ... for Jesus Christ, his sake, our only Lord and Saviour. Amen¹³⁶.”

Let me start by thanking Alex Neil, who is conducting today’s service, and who’s a Free Presbyterian Elder in the *Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia*; and it was great to sing the song, “God Save the Queen,” at the start of today’s service. The figs of oak you see on lapels and other oak inside the church today are the English Oak, in Latin, *Quercus robur*, meaning, “hard oak.” In this 360th anniversary year we are reminded of God’s protection of Charles II as he hid in the oak tree from revolutionary republicans seeking to murder him in 1651. We thank God for the miraculous manner of the King’s happy Restoration in 1660, in which without the effusion of blood, the Interregnum’s tyranny and unhappy confusions were ended; and we thank God for the legal Protestantism of the Restoration throne, and *Princes of blessed memory since the Reformation* upholding that Protestantism found in the Anglican *39 Articles* and *Book of Common Prayer*. Under Interregnum rules, Oliver Cromwell selected as his successor, his eldest son, Richard or Dick Cromwell. Under God, the republic’s tyranny ended when following Oliver Cromwell’s death, his son, Dick Cromwell, took over. Known as “Idle Dick,” even by *low* republican standards this idle character was an exceptionally poor leader, and the whole ugly, gory, mess of the Puritan republic came [*clap hands] **crashing *down *around “*Idle *Dick’s” *ears*; and the cry went up from Royalist Puritans in Scotland, and Royalist Anglicans in England, “We want the King Back!,” and in came Charles II, known as, “The Merry Monarch.” [pause]

And before proceeding I would draw your attention to “Flyer 2” on my textual commentaries website; which quotes from the Queen’s Christmas message of 2010, in which Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, by the grace of God, *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith*; Queen of the United Kingdom; Queen of Australia, and elsewhere, quotes from, and upholds the King James Bible. The Queen

¹³⁶ Abbreviated from Collects in the Office of Restoration of the Royal Family (29 May), found in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer (as revised 1664) till 1859.

says it is [quote] “a masterpiece of English prose and the most vivid translation of the Scriptures, the glorious language of this Bible has survived the turbulence of history” [unquote], and she refers to the fact that 2011 is the 400th anniversary year. [pause]

Now I’ve remembered Royal Oak Day more than usual in 2011; and you can see some relevant photographs on my textual commentaries website at <http://www.easy.com.au/~gmbooks/> [2015 update: <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>] or on Yahoo or Google type in “Gavin McGrath Books”. You’ll see there it’s remembered as a secondary focus of *King Charles I’s Day* on 30 January, and as *Royal Oak Day* by some on Saturday 28 May when, as happened this year, the 29th of May falls on a Sunday; by some on 29 May irrespective of what day of the week it is; and by others at the London Royal Oak Day Parade or Oak Apple Day Parade, on either the first or second Thursday in June; for example, in 2009 it was the first Thursday in June, and in both 2010 and 2011 it’s been the second Thursday in June, and so today on the second Thursday in June, the 9th of June 2011, we’re remembering Royal Oak Day and dedicating the third volume of my textual commentaries on the Received Text and Authorized Version on Matthew 21 to 25.

Royal Oak Day’s known by a multiplicity of names, e.g., Oak Apple Day, Charles II’s Day, Restoration Day, or The King’s Restoration Day. Last year was the 350th anniversary of the Restoration; and I have here a coin [hold up coin] a special five pound coin which I got in 2010, minted in the UK in 2010 which reads [quote], “Restoration of the Monarchy 1660” [unquote]. The Royal Mint’s folder that this coin came in says, [quote] “Charles II hid in an oak tree to escape capture following his defeat at the Battle of Worcester The coin therefore includes a number of references to it, with oak leaves ... as well as oak apple flowers. The latter refer to Oak Apple Day, ... celebrating the King’s return to London¹³⁷.”

For the purposes of this Dedication, I’ve selected the London Oak Apple Day Parade Thursday date in June for a number reasons; one reason is that after Charles II’s ship had safely reached the white cliffs of Dover in 1660, the people came out to throw flowers in front of him as he proceeded homeward to the place known in the Latin tongue as Londinium, and in the English tongue as London. Another reason in this 400th anniversary year of the King James Bible, which I shall return to later, relates to one of its translators, Daniel Featley; and another reason relates to the fact that these London celebrations have continued to enjoy royal patronage following the removal of Royal Oak Day from the 1662 prayer book calendar in 1859. 29 May is both Charles II’s birthday and the date of his Restoration, and after it ceased to be a state day from 1859, it was decided by the *Royal Chelsea Hospital* to continue their London *Oak Apple Day Parade* celebrations as part of their *Founder’s Day* since Charles II founded the institution in 1681 and 1682. But they then decided to exploit the fact that they weren’t any longer required to observe it on 29 May; by holding it on the first or second Thursday in June to,

¹³⁷ “The Royal Mint. The 2010 UK Restoration of the Monarchy ... £5 Brilliant Uncirculated Coin” (Folder brochure holding coin), Limited Edition Presentation: 50,000, The Royal Mint, Llantrisant, Pontyclun, CF72 8YT, United Kingdom, 2009.

[quote] “regularise a more permanent date and not change the day every year” [unquote]. The June date’s also part of a wider trend to transfer the celebration of monarch’s birthdays to June, in order to standardize such matters. For example, in both England and here in eastern Australia, we remember the birthday of Queen Elizabeth II in June, even though she was born in April; so this year in eastern Australia Queen’s Birthday is on Monday 13 June 2011.

Now today I’m wearing the black-striped red tie and cufflinks of the Royal Chelsea Hospital; and in my lapel is the customary oak leaves worn at Royal Oak Day celebrations. That’s because the London Oak Apple Day celebrations are held at the Royal Chelsea Hospital. It was founded by King Charles II, and that word, “hospital” formerly had a broader meaning, and in this context meant a “charitable institution to house and maintain ... needy” retired soldiers. So the Royal Chelsea Hospital is what we would more commonly call today an Old Soldiers’ Home, or a Retirement Village for ex-servicemen. And as the name, “*Royal Chelsea*” indicates, Royal Chelsea Hospital enjoys *royal* patronage, and has done so since King Charles II’s Royal Warrant of 1681 to build it. Thus e.g., the statue of Charles II in the Royal Chelsea Hospital’s Figure Court, was regilded by Queen Elizabeth II in 2002 for her Golden Jubilee. And you can see a picture of that statue on my textual commentary web page.

Today, the London Oak Apple Day Parade is being Reviewed by Prince Charles’ younger son, Prince Harry, who was born in 1984. And though various members of the royal family were sometimes Reviewing Officer before 1977, since this time there’s a general, though not absolute tradition, that a royal family member will review the London Oak Apple Day Parade. For example, the contemporary heir apparent, Prince Charles, was Reviewing Officer in 1977, 1983, 1992, 1999, and 2005. Now our allegiance to the Crown derives from our greater allegiance to God, and we recognize that just like Biblical monarchs such as King David and King Solomon made mistakes for which they can be justly criticized, so too, for example, the monarchs whose names I am about to recite as Reviewing Officers of the London Oak Apple Day Parade, were not perfect. But I now put my right-hand over my heart and name, King Edward VII who reigned from 1901 to 1910, was Reviewing Officer in 1909; King George V who reigned from 1910 to 1936, was Reviewing Officer in 1912; King George VI who reigned from 1936 to 1952, was Reviewing Officer in 1942; and Queen Elizabeth II who has reigned since 1952, was Reviewing Officer in 1962, 1975, 1982, and 2006. And I now remove my right-hand from over my heart. [pause]

Now I’ll be making some reference in this sermon to places named after the Royal Oak. But before I do so, I would point out that the memory of the royal oak is usually found in such places *exclusively* in their name. Beyond that, they’re usually no different to anywhere else. A Hotel or Restaurant bearing the name, “Royal Oak,” may be good, bad, or indifferent, with respect to its food, drink, or clientele. The seventh ship of the Royal Navy named HMS Royal Oak saw action in World War One; and was the first British battleship sunk in World War Two, when peacefully anchored at Scarpa Flow in Scotland, she was torpedoed by a Nazi German submarine in October 1939. But a ship bearing the name, “HMS Royal Oak,” is no different to any other ship of the royal navy.

Now at the heart of the celebration of the royal oak, we're remembering the absolute authority of the infallible Bible. Beyond the weekly Sunday of Acts 20:7 and I Corinthians 16:2; Romans 14:5 & 6 teaches there's a liberty to keep certain days, if we so wish, such as Royal Oak Day; and we're told by St. Paul in the previous chapter, Romans 13, verse 7, to "render" "to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour." And we're specifically told in Matthew 22:21 by Christ himself, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Sadly, like so many things in the Bible, nowadays this teaching is under attack. For instance, here in Australia the republicans sought and obtained a Constitutional Convention which was held in Canberra in 1998. On the Royalist side, the Right Honourable Reg Withers said, [quote] "We have heard a lot today about the 1975 double dissolution What we are having here is a re-run of the English Parliament of the 1640s," [unquote] which he went on to say [quote] "eventually fell under a dictator, ... Cromwell" [unquote]. On the republican side, the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Beazley, brandished in his hand an artifact from the time of the English and Irish republic, saying, [quote] "I have here Cromwell's shilling" [unquote]. A Puritan, the Baptist Minister, Tim Costello, who later from 1999 to 2002 was the President of the *Baptist Union of Australia*, was a delegate for a group called, "Real Republic." Costello said with regard to the English and Irish Puritan supported republic of Cromwell, [quote] "like many of you, I have stood near the spot where Charles I was tried in the Great Hall of Westminster" [unquote], and he also described himself [quote] "as a real republican" [unquote]. And Professor Craven, another avowed republican, seeking to capture the spirit of Cromwell's regicidal republic, said in an unmistakable reference to the beheading of King Charles I's in 1649 [quote] "We are, in a sense, metaphorically *cutting off the head of the Queen*. Someone else did that before – Oliver Cromwell. Was not Oliver Cromwell's Commonwealth a republic? ... I think we should remember that¹³⁸" [unquote]. Well if Professor Craven's language of republicans seeking to metaphorically decapitate Queen Elizabeth II analogously to the decapitation of King Charles I, isn't reviling the Queen of Australia contrary to Exodus 22:28 and Royalist Australian Anglicans who since 1978 have revived *King Charles I's Day*, then, What is? And of course we're told in I Corinthians 6:9 & 10, that such

¹³⁸ *Constitutional Convention*, 2nd – 13th February 1998, Transcripts of Proceedings, Old Parliament House, Canberra. Official Hansards, 3 Feb. 1998, p. 165 (Reg Withers) (<http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard/conv/hancon.htm>); *Ibid.*, Thurs. 12 Feb. 1998, p. 859 (Mr. Beazley). Mr. Beazley was also critical of the Australian "bicentenary" "speech" of the heir apparent, "Prince Charles," given "at Sydney Cove 10 years" earlier in 1988. His criticism was related to the fact that the Prince was a member of the "royal family" (*Ibid.*, Mon. 2 Feb. 1998, p. 8); *Ibid.*, Tues. 3 Feb. 1998, p. 183 (emphasis mine) (Tim Costello); *Ibid.*, Thurs. 12 Feb. 1998, p. 841 (Professor Craven). Other references to the King and Cromwell may be found at *Ibid.*, Thurs. 5 Feb. 1998, p. 354 (Alf Garland on Charles I's trial, regicide, and the Restoration); *Ibid.*, Fri. 6 Feb. 1998, p. 405 (Mr. Lavarch on Cromwell); and *Ibid.*, Wed. 11 Feb. 1998, p. 718 (Professor David Flint on Cromwell).

“revilers” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” [pause] The then Prime Minister of Australia, John Howard, who when he left office after 11¾ years in 2007 was Australia’s second longest serving Prime Minister, spoke at the 1998 Constitutional Convention for the monarchy. And in the subsequent referendum, the royalists joyously defeated the republicans in all States of Australia. We thank God for this royalist victory. [pause]

Now when you hear myself later in this sermon, or anyone else either verbally or in an artwork, referring to when Charles II was in the royal oak, if we go beyond the fact that he was protected by God as he hid in the oak tree at Boscobel in 1651, and as Roundheads were looking for him, it started to rain, and one of them walked under the oak tree but didn’t realize he was there; and because Jesuits had palmed themselves off as Puritans and joined Cromwell’s army, one could never be sure if a Roundhead was a Papist or a Puritan; then your imbibing of the story-teller’s *artistic license*; which is a bit like, but not the same as, the Irish tradition of metaphorically kissing the Blarney Stone.

Now the Bible very clearly states in I Peter 2:17, “Fear God. Honour the king.” Galatians 5:20 & 21 says that those involved in “seditions” and “murders,” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God;” and then Romans 13:2 says that those who “resisteth the power” “shall receive to themselves damnation;” which is why so many of those involved in the Puritan Revolutionary Republic of the 1640s and 1650s, and so many of those involved in the secular republic of the American Revolution of the 1770s, were or became, either Deists or vaguely defined Theists. In the words of Romans 13:2 they did “receive to themselves damnation.” While a number of North American Anglican Churches now have some sad apostasy in them; back then the Anglican Church in North America was Biblically sound. And while on the one hand, the USA is a longstanding military ally of Australia, and there are many good and godly Protestants in the USA; on the other hand, it has to be candidly said that at the time of the American Revolution, some very bad things happened to good Royalist Evangelical Anglicans who believed in the Biblical teaching of “Honour the king.” Some were killed, and others were chased out of town, for the secularist Deists or vaguely defined Theists of the American Revolution, made sure that anyone who believed in a Protestant Christian State was first killed, or driven out of town, before they granted their unBiblical “religious liberty” which gave a legal equality to, e.g., Jews, witches, and Popish idolaters, contrary to, Leviticus 18, Psalm 2:10-12, Isaiah 49:23, & Romans 1. And they later used immigration to increase the non-white and non-Protestant groups. Hence when I visited North America in March 2009, one of the sites I saw was Holy Trinity Anglican Church, Wall Street, New York, near the world famous Wall Street Stock Exchange which I also saw. During the time of the American Revolution, a former Pennsylvanian school teacher who was then the Rector of Holy Trinity, the Reverend Charles Inglis, prayed for King George III while an American Revolutionary, George Washington, was in the congregation. Washington later became the United States of America’s first President. That an Anglican clergyman would *dare* follow the *Biblical* injunction of I Tim. 2:1,2, that “prayers” “be made” “for kings,” outraged the American Revolutionaries and in 1783 Charles Inglis was effectively driven out of town in an evacuation of loyalists and royalists, and went to England.

Now *King Charles I's Day* has a primary focus on Charles I, and a secondary focus on the interregnum and Restoration. And Charles Inglis preached a *King Charles Martyr's Day Sermon* at New York in 1780. Preached on I Peter 2:17, "Fear God. Honour the King," joining together some relevant excerpts, Inglis refers to [quote], "the rebellion, whose guilt was consummated by the shedding of the royal blood - by the martyrdom of King Charles I, which we commemorate this day;" "and" "the present rebellion" "which ... desolates and disgraces America, bears the strongest resemblance to the former rebellion;" "and" "the leaders of the rebellion ... have leagued with the Popish ... enemies of our nation, ... religion and liberties ... Let us 'Honour the King' ... and support the cause of truth, ... real liberty, and the Protestant religion ... " [unquote]¹³⁹. We Biblical Protestants stand by our people, whether politically we win, lose, or draw. And when in 1787 George III created the Diocese of Nova Scotia in Canada, he made Charles Inglis its bishop; and Bishop Inglis is remembered in Canada on an Anglican Calendar with a black letter day on 12 August. As for George III, he won in Australia and Canada, and lost in America, so it's a case of "ya' win some, and ya' loose some."

In Acts 5:29 we're told "to obey God rather than man;" so we disregard laws asking us to, for example, murder people, Exodus 1:17; worship idols, Revelation 13:14-18; or not proclaim the gospel, Acts 16:16-40; though otherwise we are "subject unto the higher powers," Romans 13:1. But historically either directly, or indirectly, the claims of Samuel Rutherford and Oliver Cromwell, have been used to set aside Biblical laws prohibiting sedition and murder, to overthrow a so called "tyrant." Firstly, the claim that King Charles I was a "tyrant," leading to sedition against the Crown and murder of the king in 1649. Secondly, the connected sedition against the Crown under King Charles II, leading to his attempted murder in 1651. Thirdly, the 1770s claim of the American Revolutionaries that King George III was a "tyrant." Fourthly, the 1798 Rebellion in Ireland, which though modeled on the 1776 American Revolution, unlike these first three acts of sedition, this one against King George III lacked the support of the legislators; although under Rutherford's *Lex Rex* principles, only the legislature can take the action of sedition. But of course, when like Rutherford, one announces a philosophy of sedition and murder, one can never know if something like the 1776 American Revolution might not inspire something like the 1798 Irish Rebellion and later 1804 rebellion at Vinegar Hill in Sydney, New South Wales, in which those latter two rebellions lacked any support from legislatures. And I have here in my hand now this sword; [*hold up sword, swing in air*] it's the sword of one of my matrilineal four-time great grandfathers, Captain John Brabyn of the New South Wales Corps. At one stage he served in what later became the office of Governor in Tasmania, and he held the second pew from the front on the far

¹³⁹ "The Duty of Honouring the King, ... in a sermon, preached at St. George's and St. Paul's Chapels, New York, on Sunday, January 30, 1780; being the Anniversary of the Martyrdom of King CHARLES I. By Charles Inglis, D.D. Rector of Trinity Church, New York. New York, Printed by Hugh Gaine, at the BIBLE and CROWN, in HANOVER SQUARE, MDCCLXXX [1780]," on "I PETER, II. 17. *Fear God. Honour the King*" "To the inhabitants of the City of New York, in the Communion of the Church of England;" in "The Duty of Honouring the King, by Charles Inglis, D.D.," "Project Canterbury" (<http://anglicanhistory.org/charles/inglis.html>).

south side of St. Matthew's Windsor; and was an Evangelical Anglican who helped sow the Evangelical seeds in the Diocese of Sydney. He helped put down this fifth rebellion at Vinegar Hill in Sydney in 1804, in which the rebels sought to mimic the 1798 events of Vinegar Hill in Ireland, in which Papists massacred Protestants [*put down sword*].

In broad, though not exact terms, it's possible to construct a Protestant hagiology from the time of the Reformation to the Caroline eras, and from the time of William of Orange on. But other than on Protestant unity against Papists in the 1641 Irish Massacre, there's a major hagiological divide among Protestants on the Caroline eras. To get the overview, I'll first mention, and then put aside some of the intricacies and complexities which qualify the big picture; such as the fact that Caroline royalists are to some extent critical of both Charles I and Charles II; or the fact that some Protestants derived from English or Irish Puritan Churches, may by God's grace come to the point where they repudiate Oliver Cromwell's Puritan republic; or the fact that Puseyites and semi-Puseyites who sadly arose from the 19th century on, and who generally lack a Protestant spirit, are pro-Archbishop Laud, whereas we Low Church Evangelical Anglicans, are anti-Archbishop Laud; or the fact that the majority royalist Scottish Presbyterian group, supported the *Solemn League and Covenant* into the 1650s, but after the republic had come to Scotland, and having considered all the confessors and martyrs that had been made out of their fellow Anglican Protestants under its provisions in England and Ireland, after the Caroline Restoration they supported an Act of Rescission against it, for in the words of Isaiah 1:15, God will "not hear" the "prayers," of those whose "hands are full of" innocent "blood." So in broad-brush terms, either you're a Caroline royalist, and so usually an Anglican or a Presbyterian Puritan of the majority derived Church of Scotland group; or you're a pro-Cromwell republican Puritan from an English or Irish derived Puritan Church; or you're a Puritan who by the grace of God has repudiated the earlier pro-Cromwell position of their church group. That's the big general picture. [pause]

Historically Anglicans consider that if the church has found a practice to be useful and good, then it may be adopted, providing in the words of Article 34 of the 39 Articles, [quote] "that nothing be ordained against God's Word" [unquote]. By contrast, Puritans looked for a specific instruction to do something, hence Presbyterian Westminster Confession 21:1 says, [quote] "God ... may not be worshipped ... any way not prescribed in the holy Scripture" [unquote]; although Westminster Confession 1:6 makes an unclear qualification to that. Historically Puritans criticized Anglicans for their usage of natural law or reason to which Anglicans replied that "we do 'nothing' which is 'against God's Word'." It was therefore a most notable turn-about when Samuel Rutherford claimed that one could use natural law or reason to actually go *against God's Word*, with such passages as Romans 13:1-9 and I Peter 2:17 being set aside for the so called higher law of natural law or reason with regard to a so called tyrant king, such as Charles I, to which some North American Puritans have added George III. And I have to ask, if English and Irish Puritans with regard to Charles I, or certain North American Puritans with regard to George III, so glorifying Samuel Rutherford and Oliver Cromwell that they set aside the authority of God's law on the basis of a so called 'higher law of nature' meaning 'reason,' if that isn't religious liberalism, then what, I ask, is? And it's notable that the secular state, first set up in what became the United States of America, and then tragically

adopted in the United Kingdom and throughout what was then the British Empire of the nineteenth century such as here in Australia, did in fact spawn a religiously liberal group inside the Christian Church who had the brains to see and develop that connection.

Hence one of the controversial aspects of Samuel Rutherford and Oliver Cromwell, is that they are glorified by some largely different groups. For example, at one end of the gradient, are a group of Puritan derived Protestants who see themselves as in general religiously conservative, and who say the setting aside of Biblical law on the basis of “reason,” with Rutherford’s basic principle that if a Divine Law allows a “tyranny” then in an act of self-defence one may set it aside; only applies as a “one-off” in application to allowing sedition and murder in a political revolution against a so called “tyrant” king such as Charles I or George III. But in varying degrees others say, “*What’s good for the goose is good for the gander.*” “And if one can apply the principle of ‘reason’ overruling Divine Law to set aside Romans 13 and so on, for a ‘tyrant king,’ then one can do likewise to set aside a whole raft of Biblical laws.” Now Rutherford himself didn’t develop his principles beyond the issue of sedition against a so called “tyrant” king; but Galatians 6:7 warns us, “whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap,” and having sown Rutherford’s principle in the soil of a political revolution, others may reap it in setting aside, for example, laws against abortion or sodomy. Thus some would see the 1969 events of Stonewall Inn at New York, USA, when about 200 homosexual men fought against Police enforcing anti-sodomy laws, as simply a continuation of the fight for “freedom” based on so called “reason” over Divine Law, that is found in the wars against the so called “tyrant” kings of Charles I and George III. For instance, *The Rutherford Institute* founded in Virginia, USA, in 1982 in honour of Samuel Rutherford, published a number of editorials on its web-site in favour of the 2003 US Supreme Court case decision in *Lawrence verses Texas*, in which the US Supreme Court struck down the anti-sodomy laws in Texas¹⁴⁰. Now the more conservative followers of Rutherford would say that because Rutherford himself was morally conservative on issues like abortion and sodomy, that his jurisprudence can’t be used this way; and so they continue to sow the seed of Rutherford, speaking favourably of him in their pulpits, and *shutting their eyes* to the connected harvest of religious liberalism. *For there are none so blind, as those who WILL NOT see.* Thus those at the more liberal end say Rutherford enunciated a *principle* of “reason” overruling Divine law, and it’s a “tyranny” against homosexuals to have anti-sodomy laws. If one can set aside the words “seditions” and “murders” in Galatians 5:20 & 21 for political revolution, then it’s merely the exercise of a discretion to likewise set aside “murders” in Galatians 5:21 for abortion, or the words “effeminate,” and “abusers of themselves with mankind” in I Corinthians 6:9.

But the issue of “freedom” and “tyranny” may have relativistic perceptions. E.g., what the English Puritan revolutionaries called “freedom,” the Anglicans called “tyranny.” Or for many, though not all, heterosexual men, working in a military context with homosexuals destroys their fraternity of trust and is perceived as tyranny. Or what

those promoting abortion might call the “tyranny” against women wanting an abortion; millions of little unborn boys and girls would experience as the child abuse tyranny of the abortion slaughter. And so if these type of relativistic perceptions of “freedom” and “tyranny” are understood, then this whole argument collapses in on itself. After the Restoration of 1660, the hangman publicly burnt Samuel Rutherford’s *Lex Rex*. And I say, “Rah, Rah, Rah,” for that Restoration hangman, because if you want real freedom, then look to it in God’s law, which is why in James 2:11 & 12, St. James calls the Ten Commandments, “the law of liberty.” And I say, “Rah, Rah, Rah,” for that “law of liberty.” The 9th commandment in the “law of liberty,” “Thou shalt not bear false witness,” was set aside by Rutherford who lied when he said Anglicans kneeling to take Communion committed intrinsic idolatry. And Rutherford lied when he said God’s law in Romans 13 and so on could be set aside to allow sedition and murder with the so called *great brain of man overruling* the Word of God. He was a big, big, liar! And his lies led to bloodshed and murder, in violation of the 6th commandment, “Thou shalt not kill.” And in this he resembled his “father the Devil,” whom we’re told in John 8:44 is both “a liar” and “a murderer.” And Rev. 21:8 further tells us that “all liars” and “murderers,” “shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.” [pause]

But today, of all the possible rebellions that I could consider, both spiritual and temporal, I very largely just want to consider the issue of the rebellion of the 1640s and 1650s civil war and interregnum, as largely led by Oliver Cromwell, and philosophically guided by Samuel Rutherford’s book *Lex Rex*; two men, who like some of those involved in the later American Revolution, and like Christ’s accusers in Luke 23:2, claimed that Christ’s teaching meant [quote] “forbidding to give tribute to Caesar” [unquote]; two men who in the words of Romans 13:2, did “receive to themselves damnation;” two men who like Barabbas in Luke 23:19 & 25 supported “sedition” and “murder;” two men whose actions are referred to in the words of Galatians 5:20 & 21, that those who engage in “seditions” and “murders,” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” [pause]

It’s significant that the focus of this day is *not on Charles II in general*, but the Restoration that gave us, e.g., William III of Orange or the present Queen of Australia, Elizabeth II. While II Samuel 12 and Mark 6:18 teach us to condemn unchastity in a ruler; II Sam. 12, and Genesis 6:2,3 with Deuteronomy 34:7 teach God will judge a ruler for unchastity; and Numbers 12 and Neh. 13:26 teach us that even if a ruler engages in unchastity, his God ordained authority to rule is still to be accepted AND RESPECTED. I Kings 8:46 says, “there is no man that sinneth not;” and I Kings 11 tells of how King Solomon entered mixed marriages; and so too Charles II married a Portuguese Roman Catholic wife, Catherine of Braganza; and as in I Kings 11:4, we find that to some extent his wife “turned away his heart” from religious purity. So we support the Williamite Act of Settlement which further protected the Protestant throne by prohibiting any future monarch from so marrying a Roman Catholic. But for all that, our focus on Royal Oak Day is on the big thing, namely, the Restoration of a legally Protestant monarch and royal family. A monarch who as Supreme Governor of the Anglican Church was required to give his allegiance to the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 and 39 Articles. And if, like the later Popish Duke, James II, he didn’t, then by his actions he would *de jure* abdicate the legally Protestant throne, and the Parliament could lawfully declare his *de facto*

abdication, and recognize the next Protestant in line as the lawful successor, such as occurred in 1688 and 1689 with the coming of William of Orange. So it's the big thing of the Restoration of a legally Protestant throne that we remember on *Royal Oak Day*.

The Caroline reign of Charles II includes a number of positive accomplishments. For example, in 1679 he gave his Royal Assent to the *Habeas Corpus Act*; ensuring people were protected from arbitrary detention that lacked proper legal authority. Cranmer's prayer book was hated by the Papists, and taken away under Bloody Mary because of its *Protestantism*, and then restored as a *symbol of Protestantism* under Elizabeth I in 1559; and Cranmer's prayer book was also hated by the Puritans, and taken away under Interregnum Ordinances because of its *Anglicanism*, and then restored as a *symbol of Anglican Protestantism* under Charles II in 1662. The Puritans were opposed to the 1662 prayer book because, for example, it has on 14 September the black letter day of "Holy Cross Day," and it requires that at Baptism a Minister make *the sign of the cross* on the forehead, and Puritans claimed crosses were idols. For example, in 2008 I visited England's Banbury Cross which was rebuilt for the marriage of Queen Victoria's eldest daughter, being destroyed over 200 years earlier by Puritans. Opposite it is a statue of a woman sitting as a lady, side-saddle on a horse, with the Nursery Rhyme, "Ride a cock horse to Banbury Cross, To see a fine lady upon a white horse; With bells on her fingers and bells on her toes; She shall have music wherever she goes."

There's a hagiological divide within Protestantism on the Caroline eras. My hagiology for the era is that of a traditional Low Church Evangelical Anglican who believes in the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* and 39 Articles in their true Reformed Protestant sense and spirit e.g., the Biblical teaching against sedition and murder in the six *Homilies Against Rebellion* of Article 35. The 1662 English and 1666 Irish Acts of Uniformity's prayer book "Prefaces" uphold [quote] "the Reformation" [unquote], refer to the [quote] "unhappy confusions" [unquote] of the Interregnum, Charles II's [quote] "happy Restoration" [unquote]; and made the King James Version of 1611 the Authorized Version, whose 400th anniversary we are remembering this year in 2011. The last three surviving King James Version translators, Andrew Bing, John Boyce, and Daniel Featley, were three Royalist Anglicans who all died in the 1640s and 1650s when Anglicans were persecuted by the English Puritan regime. You can read more on them in the Preface of my third volume. Andrew Bing, a former sub-dean of York Cathedral and Archdeacon of Norwich Cathedral, died in 1652 under the "unhappy confusions" and "tyranny" of the *Solemn League and Covenant*, and was under Interregnum Ordinances prohibited the rite of an Anglican burial. John Boyce was a Prebendary at Ely, and under the *Solemn League and Covenant*, later declared an illegal oath, the first day on which the Puritan regime closed Ely Cathedral to Anglican services was Sunday 14 January 1644; and perhaps it was the stress of this coming event that broke his heart. For on that very Sunday, he did lay down and die, and the angels of God came and carried the soul of this Anglican King James Bible translator home to his heavenly rest, where the Puritan Revolutionaries could no longer molest him.

Puritan revolutionaries burnt down the barns and stables of Daniel Featley, breaking open his Anglican church, smashing its windows, pulling down the baptismal

font where infants were baptized with *the sign of the cross* made on their foreheads which thing the Puritans opposed; and then putting to the torch the Communion rails in his church for the Puritans did not believe in kneeling to receive Communion. For example, the Final Rubric of the Communion Service in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662, refers to extremist Puritans such as Samuel Rutherford in [quote] “malice and obstinacy” [unquote], who have [quote] “misconstrued and depraved” [unquote] the Anglican practice of kneeling to receive Communion which [quote] “may not be adored;” “for that were idolatry, to be abhorred” [unquote]. *My, my my, but the Puritans kept-a-comin’*. After refusing to give his assent to the *Solemn League and Covenant*, and defending Anglicanism at the Westminster Assembly, withdrawing from it when King Charles told him to, Daniel Featley was imprisoned on the basis that he was in close contact with both His Grace, Archbishop James Ussher of Ireland and His Majesty King Charles I. After 18 months of jail he was extremely ill, and the pallor of death hung over him. The weak and sickly Daniel Featley was let out on bail and lived at *Chelsea College* in London; but he died shortly later in 1645 aged 63. His final residence of *Chelsea College* had been a Theological School founded in 1610 by James I of the King James Bible, and to which King Charles I had appointed Daniel Featley as Provost; but it was closed during the civil war era and used to imprison royalists in. On its site now stands *College Court* at Royal Chelsea Hospital, a retirement home for old soldiers which keeps *Oak Apple Day*. A picture of *College Court* is on my website. I have stood in *College Court*, and in walking there one is walking where a King James Bible translator and confessor walked, Daniel Featley who was persecuted by republican Puritans for his Royalist Anglicanism. Today the London *Oak Apple Day Parade* is being held at the Royal Chelsea, and in this 400th anniversary year of the King James Bible, I honour, and I salute the memory of this holy confessor, Daniel Featley. [pause]

And I now return to the issue of the 1660s Acts of Uniformity which also raise the issue of ejection. The name of “Covenanter” was used in the 1637 to 1640 fight for religious freedom from Anglicanism by Presbyterians in Scotland, which Charles I ultimately agreed to. But having first gotten this religious freedom, the *Solemn League & Covenant* of 1643 then changed the name of “Covenanter” to mean one who was opposed to the religious freedom of Anglicans, and sought to impose Puritanism on an unwilling Anglican England. The Puritan’s *Solemn League & Covenant* calling for the removal of religious freedom for Anglican Protestants, and associated abolition of Anglican Protestant Christianity, was adopted under English Interregnum Ordinances in 1643, even though some of its associated roll-on provisions, such as making the Anglican prayer book [quote] “illegal” [unquote] in 1645, took a bit longer before being made the subject of further Interregnum Ordinances. Under the Puritan republic, the *Greater Ejection* from 1643 saw about 7,000 to 10,000 Anglican clergymen, school teachers, and others ejected by the revolutionary Puritan regime. This was between five to ten times more Anglicans being ejected in the *Greater Ejection* than the 800 to 2,000 Puritans later ejected under the *Lesser Ejection* of the 1660s. For example, all Anglican Bishops were ejected under Interregnum Ordinances abolishing episcopal church government, for instance, His Grace James Ussher, the Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland was so ejected. English and Irish Puritan propaganda tends to focus on the *Lesser Ejection* of Puritans from Anglican Churches in the 1660s without any reference to the *Greater*

Ejection of 5 to 10 times this number of Anglicans who were ejected before this time from 1643 onwards. English and Irish Puritan propaganda does not state that those Puritans whose churches were closed down till 1689, were in many instances seeking under the illegal *Solemn League and Covenant* to close down all Anglican Churches, and were basically “sore” because the Anglicans in England and Ireland, had done to the Puritans, what the Puritans wanted to do to them. English and Irish Puritan propaganda does not mention that at the heart of the Test Acts against English and Irish Puritans was the fact that large numbers of them just weren’t prepared to take seriously Scriptures such as Matthew 22:21, “Render” “unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s;” I Peter 2:17, “Fear God. Honour the king;” and Romans 13:9, “Thou shalt not kill.” They just weren’t prepared to take seriously the fact that a king of England had been murdered by political revolutionaries in 1649, and these same political revolutionaries had then sought to kill a second king in 1651. They wanted some kind of immunity from Biblical Law when it came to their Puritan republican revolutionary heroes. English and Irish Puritan propaganda does not mention that the Anglicans’ denial of religious liberty to Puritans in England and Ireland before 1689, and their continued subordination to the Test Acts after the religious toleration of 1689, was linked to the fact that in general the Puritans glorified men like Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford, and that since under their ideology one could engage in seditions and murders against the Crown, it followed that if, for instance, such English and Irish Puritans were allowed into the Parliament, then they might, as occurred in North America in the 1770s, once again claim that a particular king was a [quote] “tyrant” [unquote], and contrary to Galatians 5:20 & 21 and I Peter 2:17, then engage in “seditions” and “murders” against the Crown.

And so English and Irish Puritan propaganda tends to present Restoration Anglicans as just wanting to persecute English and Irish Puritans for no good reason. And likewise these Puritan accounts tend to focus exclusively on the Anglicans from the 1660s to 1689 denying religious freedom to English and Irish Puritans, while not mentioning that under their republic, Anglicanism and the Anglican prayer book was made [quote] “illegal” [unquote]. They don’t mention that for Anglicans, the prayer book was a Protestant symbol reintroducing Protestantism in 1559 after the Popish Queen, Bloody Mary, had tried to reintroduce Roman Catholicism.

Now on the one hand, I’m a 1662 prayer book man; but on the other hand, I don’t want to deny that under the 1662 English and 1666 Irish Acts of Uniformity, there were also some good men who were Puritans ejected in the 1660s; and while I support ejecting them from Anglican Churches, I regret that the type of later religious tolerance to English and Irish Puritan Protestants under the 1689 Toleration Act could not have come earlier back in the 1660s, which is what I would have preferred, because I think that the Test Acts and legally endorsed incest laws found in Archbishop Matthew Parker’s Table, and also endorsed in the Presbyterian’s Westminster Confession, would have been enough, in a paternalistic manner, to save these Puritans from themselves. While the Presbyterian Puritans agreed with Anglicans on incest; the other Puritans regarded certain forms of incest as either morally ambiguous or freely permissible. And so, in a spirit of Christian paternalism, it was necessary to save that group from their proclivities towards incest of the type and kind that Henry VIII had broken with Rome over; and also to save both

groups of Puritans from their Oliver Cromwell and Samuel Rutherford connected glorification of seditions and murders against the Crown, and desires to close down Anglicanism. I think it right that under the Test Acts the English and Irish Puritans were protected from themselves with respect to sedition, murder, and incest, much as some of them resisted such a discipline; though the more moderate ones who were prepared to occasionally take Anglican Communion could and did hold government offices.

In Scotland, after the Restoration of 1660 the *Episcopal Church of Scotland* had a modified form of episcopacy and with a small number of modifications, basically Presbyterian services. The basic idea was that Puritans divided amongst themselves on the issue of church government, and so this would extend that issue one further, to a Puritan Scottish Church with Anglican type Episcopal Church government. But in the end, it was pulled apart by the Jacobite Episcopal wing, so the Williamite Presbyterian wing understandably withdrew from it. From that time on, Anglicans in England and Ireland worked with the Established Presbyterian *Church of Scotland* as fellow Protestants, established from 1690 under William III and Mary II; and not the *Episcopal Church of Scotland*. The *Solemn League and Covenant*, calling for [quote] the “extirpation of” “Prelacy” [unquote] in Scotland, England and Ireland, and seeking to impose Puritanism on England and Ireland was as unreasonable as trying to impose Anglicanism on Scotland. The *Solemn League and Covenant* was declared an illegal oath in the 1662 English and 1666 Irish *Acts of Uniformity*, and Scripture teaches that such unlawful oaths are not binding in I Samuel 25:14-35, Psalm 24:4, and Acts 23:11-14. Nevertheless, Charles II sinned in signing this oath, and for this sin God’s judgment is seen in his defeat at Worcester, although God’s mercy is seen in his protection at the royal oak. Charles II repented of this Psalm 25:7 *sin of his youth*, and God blessed him with the Restoration; and there’s an important lesson in that for us, taught in Isaiah 1:15 and Proverbs 28:9, namely, we must repent of our sins if we want God’s fuller blessing.

The *Solemn League and Covenant* was also invalidated under the 1661 Scottish Rescissory Act, wisely upheld in the Williamite Settlement with regard to Scotland. But after 1689 Jacobites were still hoping that, for example, after he claimed to be the “Duke of York,” and then claimed the throne in 1788, the Jacobite Pretender, Cardinal Enrico might turn up on the streets of London and seek to galvanize English Protestants into Jacobite sedition by saying, “*I’ma Cardinal Enrico from Frascati in Italia; ... I’ma Duca Di York.*” But somehow *Cardinal Enrico* just didn’t sound like a Briton, and when he died in 1807, another of the Jacobites brightest hopes faded into oblivion. [pause]

The secular state wickedly and horribly allowed the Biblical Protestantism of the *Church of England* to very largely go to rack’n’ruin with Puseyites, semi-Puseyites, and religious liberals; but before the regrettable 19th century rise of the secular state, the post 1689 Anglican-Scottish Presbyterian alliance became fundamental to the Protestant Christian State in Britain and the British Empire; with the Anglican Church Established in England and Ireland, and the Presbyterian Church Established in Scotland. And in this context I should also mention that decades before the 1689 Act of Toleration, back in the 1660s, Lutheran Protestants, though a very small group in England, had religious tolerance, for instance, Pastor Gerhard Martens, was appointed Minister of the London

Lutheran congregation in 1668. And there were some international elements of fellow Protestant fraternity with Lutherans on the Continent, so that support for the Protestant Christian State in the British Isles against sedition, was a threefold Protestant alliance between Anglicans, Lutherans, and Scottish Presbyterians. But the Lutheran element, though real, was relatively minor, being more that of *moral* support than tangible assistance, for example, Lutherans were happy to meet the Test Acts requirements and take Anglican Communion to hold government offices, long before more moderate Puritans did so after 1689; in contrast to the Papists who were never prepared to do so. And so under God, in this threefold Protestant alliance of Anglicans, Lutherans, and Scottish Presbyterians, the primary strength of it was most assuredly a twofold Protestant alliance between Anglicans in England and Ireland and Presbyterians in Scotland. In the words of King Solomon found in Ecclesiastes 4:12, “if one prevail against him, two shall withstand; and a threefold cord is not quickly broken.”

But lest my endorsement of this threefold Anglican-Lutheran-Scottish Presbyterian Protestant alliance be misconstrued, let me also say that its desire, and my desire, is to bring to a Biblical repentance those in other religious traditions who might be taught to glorify sedition against the Crown. The State Days on 5 November *Papists’ Conspiracy Day*, 30 January *King Charles Martyr’s Day*, and 29 May *Royal Oak Day*, reminded people that under the Protestant Crown, also remembered on *Accession Day* of a reigning monarch, the Protestant Christian State took seriously the Biblical teaching against “seditions” and “murders,” requiring we “Honour the King;” and that Anglicans in England and Ireland and Presbyterians in Scotland, would *unite* to defend these Biblical truths against Papists who like Guy Fawkes claimed *the Pope* can dissolve bonds of allegiance to the Crown, *Jacobite* Episcopalians in Scotland, and *Oliver Cromwell* and *Samuel Rutherford* glorifying Puritans in England and Ireland together with a small minority of ratbags in Scotland. For *the bedrock* of that Protestant Christian State was the Matthew 22:21 *Christ* of the Infallible Bible. And something of this old Anglican-Presbyterian Protestant alliance is back in place today in this service dedicating my Textual Commentaries Volume 3, in a service conducted by a Presbyterian in a church derived from the *Free Church of Scotland* and in turn the *Church of Scotland*, Alex Neil; and a sermon preached by myself, an Anglican, with both of us being Royalist Australian Protestant Christians. God blessed that Protestant alliance in the past, and we pray he blesses our faithfulness to these Biblical truths today; as like them we thank him for his protection of Charles II at the royal oak in 1651, and the Restoration in 1660. [pause]

One of the issues we’ll now touch on is, Whether or not Charles II made a death-bed conversion to Popery? The first view is that he did. If so, his early death may be God’s judgment on him for signing the unlawful 1670 *Treaty of Dover* commitment to do so. And if so, I’d agree with what Willoughby Mynors says in his *Royal Oak Day Sermon* preached around 1717, said as a possibility with regard to Charles II, and as a certainty with regard to James II, namely, “There is a drop of the royal martyr’s blood in it.” That’s because due to the Puritan’s revolutionary republic, the boy-king Charles II and his brother, James II, were driven from England into Popish France where crafty and devious Jesuits were able to mind-molest the tender young minds of these fatherless boys, whose Protestant father, Charles I, had been murdered by the revolutionaries; and so the

Puritan revolutionaries are partly responsible for any possible conversion of Charles II to Popery, and for the definite conversion of his brother James II to Popery, because *There's a drop of the royal martyr's blood of these two orphan boys' father in it.*¹⁴¹ Thus any such conversions remind us of the dangers posed to Protestantism of Papists seeking converts.

Now a shining day-star appeared high in the sky around high-noon when Charles II was born on 29 May 1630. In Numbers 24:15-17, we read the prophet Balaam prophesied “a Star” would arise, fulfilled at Christ’s nativity. Though Balaam *later* went into apostasy, that didn’t invalidate his earlier work; or Jehoshaphat’s in II Chronicles 20. So if Charles II did convert to Roman Catholicism upon his death-bed, this doesn’t invalidate the fact that *before his apostasy* God used him to re-establish the legally Protestant monarchy. On this view one finds something similar in the old *Church of Ireland’s* Irish Massacre Day on 23 October which referred favourably to the Irish Presbyterian Owen O’Connolly due to his assistance to the Crown in 1641, even though he *later* fell into *deep religious apostasy* in connection with the Puritan republic.

The second view is that the whole story about Charles II’s deathbed conversion to Popery was a cock’n’bull story, put out by the propaganda machine of the Popish Duke, James II, in cahoots with the Popish priest, [quote] “Father” [unquote] Huddleston, in order to try and promote Popery throughout the realm. In other words, just after the Anglican Protestant Bishops left the room of the dying Charles II, having received every intimation and indication from him that he was a good and faithful Protestant; then in orchestrated cahoots with James II, Huddleston, who is known to have silently, like a spider, crept up into Charles II’s room secretly by a back-flight of stairs, then Popishshshshly ssssslithered like a ssssssnake to the king’s bed-ssssside; and either waited till Charles II was bleary eyed, *non compos mentis*, and not knowing what was going on; or waited till he had actually died; and then yelled out something like, “He joined up with the Roman Church a split second before he died ... so he can’t confirm or deny it to anybody else, because dead men tell no tales.” And then in a premeditated, rehearsed, and orchestrated response, the Popish Duke, James II jumped in and blurted out something like, “Yea, Yea, that’s right.” And then the Popish propaganda machine put the story out, but it’s a snow-job, to be taken *cum grano salis*, that is, being interpreted from the Latin, “with a grain of salt,” *cum grano salis*. [pause]

Well, as to which of these two possibilities is correct, I leave you to consider. And I would remind you that it was unlawful with regard to the legally Anglican Protestant throne for Charles II to sign any agreement to become either a Puritan as he did when he signed the *Solemn League & Covenant*, or a Papist which he did when he signed the *Treaty of Dover*; even though there is no clear evidence that he ever took these *unlawful* commitments seriously. Rather, knowing that an *unlawful agreement* for a

¹⁴¹ Re: “orphan boys” i.e., while these boys were left fatherless by the death of Charles I; they were thereby left spiritual orphans (in human terms,) since their mother was a Roman Catholic.

legally Anglican Protestant king to become either a Puritan or a Papist could not hold up at law, he simply signed these documents to enhance his political power. Nevertheless, it was still wrong for him to sign these unlawful documents; and just as we see God's judgment on him at the Battle of Worcester for signing the unlawful *Solemn League & Covenant*; so likewise, in his relatively early death at age 54 we may see the judgment of God upon him for his having signed this unlawful provision in the *Treaty of Dover*.

But whether or not Charles II did convert to Popery, either way, it's clear that under Charles II, God kept the throne safe for Protestantism up till the time of his death-bed. And either way, Royal Oak Day was instituted in the early 1660s, it's not a saint's day for the general life of Charles II, but rather, is focused on Charles II's preservation during the interregnum, and Restoration of both himself and the Royal Family in 1660. So the celebration of this day is for the big thing, the Restoration of the Protestant monarchy; and so Oak Apple Day should not be misconstrued to mean any necessary endorsement of, anything either Charles II, or any other later monarch did or did not do. Thus it's like *Accession Day* which likewise remembers the big thing of a constitutional Protestant monarch who is *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*, without necessarily endorsing anything that particular monarch has done. We may, within reasonable bounds as royalists, be critical of some of the later actions of Charles II or other monarchs; and still celebrate *Royal Oak Day* or *Accession Day* because we accept the big thing, namely, the Restoration of a constitutionally Protestant monarchy.

And so that now brings me back to the Battle of Worcester in 1651, and the story of the royal oak. In December 2008 I arrived at Worcester from Gloucester on the night of Wednesday 24 December, Christmas Eve; and I stayed there till Saturday the 27th, the red-letter day of St. John the Evangelist. And you can see some photos I took at Worcester, known for its Caroline faithfulness as "the faithful city," on my web-site. Now in the old days the high towers of Anglican churches weren't "just a pretty picture" for townsfolk to look at. They were fortified, and could be used as lookout posts in time of fire or war; and they could be defended along their stairway in the same way one would defend the stairway of a castle's high tower. If you have a look at St. Anne's Church at Top Ryde in Sydney, where I started school in 1964 at the Pre-School in the Church Hall, then you'll see this type of old Anglican church design of a high tower. And you'll see the same thing at St. Philip's Church Hill, near the Harbour Bridge. Now in 2008 I inspected Worcester Cathedral and Powich Church. And as Charles II knew the secrets of Anglican Churches, the high towers of these two churches were used by the Royalist Forces as the lookout posts over the Worcester Battlefield. Hence one of the photos you'll see on my website shows the bullets marks made by the Roundheads on the high tower of St. Peter's Church Powich. And you'll also see there a picture of the Battlefield that I took on Christmas Day.

The Scottish Presbyterian Kirk or Church was split into a majority royalist group called "Resolutioners;" and a small minority republican group under the spell of the vile Samuel Rutherford, called "Protestors," a name related to Rutherford's 1652 treatise whose short title is, "A Protest Against ... the Resolutioners." Both the majority royalist anti-Rutherford Resolutioner Kirk, and the minority republican "Protestor" Kirk of

Samuel Rutherford, were closed down by the Congregationalist identifying republicans after they held rival General Assemblies in 1653; although the Puritan revolutionaries then gave their favours to Rutherford. And English and Irish revolutionary republican Puritan propaganda has always sought to put a strong focus on Samuel Rutherford, both because of the importance of his *Lex Rex* in their sedition against the Crown, and also because it allows them for their propagandist purposes to depict him as a representative of Scottish Presbyterianism which supported Cromwell, while simultaneously concealing the fact that he was the leader of a small minority “Protestor” Kirk repudiated by the majority royalist “Resolutioner” Scottish Presbyterian Kirk. Hence they use Samuel Rutherford as a “Trojan horse” figure, first putting the emphasis on his writings other than *Lex Rex*, and then, if they wantta’ rev people up for a political revolution, they then tap in on this pro-Samuel Rutherford sentiment, as they bring *Lex Rex* more to the fore.

And so to understand this basic fact, is to understand why Charles II’s army at Worcester was basically made up of what after the split would be the majority Resolutioner Scottish Puritan Presbyterian Protestants whose Parliament had recognized Charles I as king, and upon his death, had declared Charles II king. Now following the Battle of Worcester in 1651, in which the Scottish *Puritan* army of King Charles II was defeated by the revolutionary republican *Puritan* army of Oliver Cromwell; Charles II escaped, and went into hiding at Boscobel. But after Cromwell and his cohorts murdered King Charles I in 1649, they had blood on their hands, *of a strange and curious type, for it was a blood that would not wash off!* God has said in Romans 13 verses 1 and 2 that “every soul” is to “be subject unto the higher powers,” “and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.” But the words of St. Paul in Romans 13 verses 7 and 9 had been set aside by Cromwell and his cohorts, “Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour;” and “Thou shalt not kill.” And so in the words of Roman 13:2 they did “receive to themselves damnation.” For they had on their hands a Shakespearian Macbeth type of *blood that would not wash off*.

And when word was brought to the republican revolutionaries in England of the proclamation of King Charles II as King of the three kingdoms, England, Ireland, and Scotland, by the Scottish Parliament in 1649; the coronation of King Charles II at Scone in Scotland in 1650; and the supplying of troops to King Charles II by the Scottish Presbyterian Parliament; Cromwell and his regicidal cohorts had been thrown into a brain crazed fury. In their bloodlust to kill a second king, after the Battle of Worcester Cromwell ordered that a drag-net of death be constructed and sent forth, and that it criss-cross England, to find Charles II and find him at all costs; that they might do unto him, even as they had done unto his father, Charles I. And so with the 1649 blood of Charles I still dripping from his finger tips, Oliver Cromwell sought by his 1651 dragnet of death, if such a thing were at all possible, to mingle with the blood he already had on his hands from Charles I’s murder, also the blood of Charles II. Thus the bloodthirsty murderous megalomaniac, Oliver Cromwell, who had refused to follow constitutional law requiring that statutes be made by the Parliament with the King’s Royal Assent; by his actions, in effect the bloodthirsty murderous megalomaniac *monster from within* Oliver Cromwell cried out for Charles II, “I want, I want!, I want!! ... Give me, Give me! Give me!! ...

More royal blood! More royal blood!! MORE ROYAL B-L-O-O-D!!!” [pause]

And as under Oliver Cromwell’s bloodthirsty orders, the brain-busting blood-lust of the Roundheads, ran and ran and ran from one end of England to the other, that if such a thing were possible, they might find and kill the king; their pounding Roundhead feet came even unto the place known as Boscobel. Now unknown to them, this was the place where His Divine Majesty, the Lord Jehovah, King of the Cosmos, had secreted and hid, King Charles II. And he who in Genesis 19:11 struck with blindness the wicked abusers and defilers of themselves with mankind in the city of Sodom; this same God decreed that as Charles II hid in the royal oak at Boscobel, and the Roundheads ran puffing’n’panting near that oak tree, panting for his blood, that they too would be blinded to the presence of the one they sought. For they looked, but could not find, Charles II.

Now we know from Canon du Moulin’s book, “Vindication of Protestants,” that Jesuits entered England, palmed themselves off as Puritans, joined the Roundhead’s army, and helped to incite sedition amongst the English and Irish Puritans. And as King Charles II looked down at the Roundheads from the oak tree; with their anti-Royalist trigger happy hands brandishing their muskets, rain started falling, and a lone Roundhead started to walk towards that oak tree. Was he an English Puritan, or was he a Jesuit Papist? Was he a Puritan, or was he a Papist? A Papist. A Puritan. (twice) A Papist. (thrice) A Puritan. (thrice) A Papist. (twice) A Puritan. A Papist. (twice) A Puritan. A Papist. What was he? ... We just don’t know. But whoever he was, whatever he was; he was out to kill the king. And this Roundhead now came to stand under the very oak tree in which Charles II hid. And as the stench of his sweat oozed out from his body, King Charles II looked down at him from the oak tree; with the Roundhead’s trigger happy hand brandishing his musket. And the stench of the Roundhead’s sweat ooooozed out of his dirty, stinking, reeking, body, and up the nostrils of Charles II. It was a bad smell! It was a big stink!! ... Phew, what a stench! ... Pew, what a pong!!! ... [pause]

Now the Roundhead was thinking in his head, “Where’s King Charles the Second?” The question was, “Would he look up into the oak tree?” The Roundhead sniggerly looked at his right-side, but couldn’t see Charles II. The question was, “Would he look up into the oak tree?” The Roundhead smiling slyly looked at his left-side, but he couldn’t see Charles II. The question was, “Would he look up into the oak tree?” With squinted eyes, the Roundhead smirkingly looked at his front-side, but couldn’t see Charles II. The question was, “Would he look up into the oak tree?” With his shoulders drooping down, the Roundhead gaily looked at his back-side, ... but he couldn’t see Charles II. ... The question was, “Would he look up into the oak tree?” With his shoulders hunched up, the Roundhead frustratingly looked down at the ground, thinking in his head, “Where’s King Charles the Second?” The question was, “Would he look up into the oak tree?” The Roundhead then started to lift up his head, but stopped as he looked straight ahead. The question was, “Would he look up into the oak tree?” And then as this Roundhead loitered around the royal oak tree at Boscobel, ... suddenly ..., without warning, this dirty, sweaty, stinker, ... darted off with the other Roundhead soldiers in another direction, hoping to locate King Charles II *in some other place*. [pause]

Today, on *Royal Oak Day*, we remember that following the Battle of Worcester in 1651, in which King Charles II's Scottish Presbyterian army was defeated; Charles II hid in the Royal Oak at Boscobel where *God* protected him, thereafter being gloriously restored in 1660; and so likewise, God has protected his Divinely Inspired and Infallible Book; for we are taught the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture in such passages as I Peter 1:25, "The Word of the Lord endureth for ever." And so we repudiate the claims of neo-Alexandrians such as those on the NU Text Committee, spelt "NU," which is an acronym in which the "N" stands for the "Nestle-Aland" text and the "U" stands for the "United Bible Societies" text. Rather, we uphold the neo-Byzantine New Testament Received Text. And just as Charles II couldn't be sure if the Roundhead standing under the oak tree was a Jesuit Papist or an apostate Protestant Puritan; we can't be sure if the attack on God's Word will come from a Papist, like the NU Text Committee Member of the present 1993 NU Text, the Jesuit, Cardinal Carlo Martini; or from an apostate Protestant like the NU Text Committee Members of the present 1993 NU Text, Bruce Metzger and Kurt Aland – both of whom are now deceased. And just as it was by the power of God, without the effusion of any blood, that Charles II and the Royal Family were Restored in 1660; so it is by the power of God, that the Received Text of Holy Scripture endures, and is the right royal text of His Divine Majesty, King Christ, repeatedly restored for us after many attacks upon it.

And starting in this Volume 3, from Matthew 25:6b onwards, and till the end of St. John's Gospel, a special Greek treat will be citations from *Codex Alexandrinus*, a manuscript which comes to us through the hands of two holy martyrs of the Protestant Christian faith, Cyril Lucar who was martyred in 1638 for seeking to Protestantize Greek Orthodoxy, and King Charles I who was martyred in 1649. This complements my usage of *Codex Freerianus* in both St. Matthew's Gospel and St. Luke 8 to 24; because between these two Codices, we have most of the four Gospels in two fifth century Byzantine Greek texts. And a special Latin treat is an enhanced usage of the 9th century *Book of Armagh*, from the 1913 edition of the *Church of Ireland's* Dean of Raphoe, John Gwynn. The Bishop's Castle of Raphoe was attacked by Papists in the *Irish Massacre* of 1641 because it was a symbol of *Protestantism*; it was then stormed by *republican Puritans* in 1650 because it was a symbol of *Royalist Anglicanism*; and it was then attacked by anti-Williamite Jacobite Papists in 1689 because it was a symbol of *Protestantism*. "Remember the Bishop's Castle of Raphoe, Both Papist and Puritan dealt it a blow; Anglican Protestants held on hand and toe, Remember the Bishop's Castle of Raphoe."

Back in the civil war, the Royal Cavaliers fighting the Roundhead republicans who denied the teaching of Holy Scripture in I Peter 2:17, "Honour the king;" were fighting against both apostate Protestants and Papists, as Jesuit Papists, palming themselves off as Puritans joined the Roundhead's army. And we modern day Cavaliers are still fighting against apostate Protestants and Papists. We're fighting apostate Protestants such as those on the NU Text Committee in Kurt Aland and Bruce Metzger who deny the teaching of I Peter 1:25, "the Word of the Lord endureth forever;" and we're fighting against Papists such as the NU Text Committee's Jesuit member, the Popish Cardinal, Carlo Martini. There's a civil war a-raging, but in the words of the

holy Apostle, St. Paul in Ephesians 6:12, we're not fighting "against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." There's a civil war a-raging as neo-Alexandrian textual critics seek to depose King Christ and his right royal Received Text, as they deny Divine Preservation ... But I say, I say, I say, Here cometh King Christ's Cavaliers! I say, I say, I say, Here come the Cavaliers! Praise God! Alleluia! Glory, glory! Alleluia! Amen! [pause]

So let me say that the benefits of this Cavalier's work of mine on the Received Text and King James Bible are not just for *one* Protestant group, for example, they're not for just Low Church Evangelical Anglicans who use the 1662 prayer book; but by the grace of God, they're for all religiously conservative Evangelicals or Protestants who bow down low at the throne of grace, and accept the Biblical teaching of the Divine Preservation of Scripture found in I Peter 1:25; who accept the teaching of Ephesians 4:4 and 5:29 to 32 that there is what the *Nicene Creed* calls, "*one* Catholick" or universal "Church;" and who accept the teaching of Ephesians 4:11 that God calls "teachers" to that one catholic church; and that a neo-Byzantine textual analyst is one such teacher, albeit, a fairly rare and unusual type of such a teacher, since by the grace of God, I am the first neo-Byzantine textual analyst in over 300 years. For the Lord provides for what the *Apostles' Creed* calls "the holy Catholick Church," as it suits best his godly and gracious wisdom. And so I pray God it may benefit, for example, religiously conservative Evangelical Lutherans, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Baptists. *And glory be to God Most High! Amen and Amen!*

The sermon will now end with two prayers, one for the dedication of this Volume 3 of my textual commentary on Matthew 21 to 25; and the other extracted parts from two Collects for *Royal Oak Day* taken from the Anglican Caroline *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662, to which I shall add the title, "the Queen of Australia." The service will be concluded, and will include the singing of Psalm 126 from the Presbyterian Caroline Psalter of 1650.

Let us pray. "Almighty God, fountain of all goodness, be pleased to take and use this textual commentary Volume 3 and all other textual commentaries in this series to the honour and glory of thy holy name. Thou hast caused all Holy Scripture to be Inspired and Preserved, and in thy catholic Church dost give "the manifestation of the Spirit" "to every man to profit withal;" and so for the common good of the universal church, thy "one body" of which "Christ" is "the head" thou dost give different kinds of "teachers," of which neo-Byzantine textual analysts such as myself are one type, though not the only type, of such "teachers." Look then, O Lord, with favour upon this textual commentary Volume 3 upholding the Received Text and Authorized King James Version of the Bible of 1611 in this four hundredth anniversary year of 2011, forgiving me for any blemishes or imperfections which due to the frailty of my fallen human nature may be found therein; and blessing it to thy glory for the general good that is in it. And this we pray in the power of the Holy Ghost, and through the blood of the Lamb, who is the only mediator between God and man, Christ Jesus our Lord.

“Almighty God, who hast in all ages shewed forth thy power and mercy in the miraculous and gracious deliverances of thy Church, and in the protection of righteous and religious kings and states, professing thy holy and eternal truth, from the malicious conspiracies and wicked practices of all their enemies; we yield unto thee our unfeigned thanks and praise, as for thy many other great and publick mercies, so especially for that single and wonderful deliverance by thy wise and good Providence ..., vouchsafed to our then most gracious Sovereign King Charles the Second, and all the Royal family, ... from the unnatural rebellion, usurpation, and tyranny of ungodly and cruel men, and from the sad confusions and ruin thereupon ensuing. ... Strengthen the hands of our gracious Sovereign Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of Australia, and ... cut of all such workers of iniquity, as turn religion into rebellion, ... that they may never again prevail against us, nor triumph in the ruin of the monarchy and thy Church among us ... through Jesus Christ our only Saviour and Redeemer Amen.

[I Cor. 11:3; 12:7,12,28; Eph. 4:11; 5:23]

Appendix 6: Corrigenda to Former Volumes 1 & 2

The need for a Corrigenda Appendix should remind the good Christian reader of my claim that, “I am as infallible as the Pope.” That is a perfectly proper and humble statement of my frailty and capacity to err, for we Protestants entirely repudiate the absurd Romish claims of so called, “Papal infallibility.” When I learn of errors or omissions, or ambiguities requiring rewording, of which I myself am sometimes baffled as to how I made them, I correct them in due course in a corrigenda. E.g., I know both Bondi Beach and Manly Beach in Sydney, and while thinking in the back of my head about the beach at Manly when discussing something else at Manly, I thrice referred to “Bondi” rather than “Manly” in Vol. 1 (at pp. cxxxii-cxxxiii), *infra*. I can do no better than correct such errors when I learn of them, for “I am,” I say, “as infallible as the Pope,” and that, to be sure, makes me *anything but infallible*.

Corrigenda to Volume 3 (Matt. 20-25). The following corrigenda changes are integrated into present internet copies of Volume 3, but will need to be made to some earlier printed copies in this textual commentary series. Pagination and footnote numbering corresponds with printed library copies (not internet copy). Abbreviation for a change, “>” means “goes to”; and “+” means add.

Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14).

At Preface p. iv, remove “*Dedication” at top of page, second line; “***Common Abbreviations.**” > “* **More common Abbreviations.**”; after “2) *The Diatessaron*” on contents page, + fullstop “.”; and under Dedication, “c) i)” > “c) i) Charles the First’s Day (30 Jan), Charles the Second’s Day (or Royal Oak Day) (29 May), & Papists’ Conspiracy Day (5 Nov).” In the space above “Appendices. Introduction;” add, “**TEXTUAL COMMENTARY Matt. 1-14.**”

At Preface p. v, line 1, > “***Displaying Some Byzantine Text Diamonds.**”

At Preface p. xi, “*The Articles of the Creed.*” > “***The Articles of the Creed.**”; “*Transliterations of Greek letters into English letters.*” > “* **Transliterations of Greek letters into English letters.**”; & transliterations, “Eta” > “Eta Η η = Η / Ε ε” and “Upsilon” > “Upsilon Υ υ = Υ u / y”.

At Preface p. xiv, “Prefatory” > “prefatory”.

At Preface p. xviii, para 1, add a space after “...” and before “conceded”; and at para 2 after “this calamity ..” add an extra dot i.e., “this calamity ...”.

At Preface p. xx, “*Rating the TR’s textual variants A to E.*” > “***Rating the TR’s textual variants A to E.**”

At Preface p. xxviii, para 3, at end of sentence “featured in one of their promotional brochure-flyers”, add a footnote saying:

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

At Preface p. lvii, “*b) The Received Text (Latin, Textus Receptus).*” > “****b) The Received Text (Latin, Textus Receptus).***”

At Preface p. lix, between paras 3 & 4, remove the headings, “a) The “AV only history; 2) The Diatessaron.”

At Preface p. lxxxvi, para 2, sentence 4 starting with the words, “If it is an independent Greek line,” now reads, “If it is an independent Greek line, then this Minuscule’s added marginal reading constitutes the notable preservation of an independent line of Greek manuscripts; the existence of which is e.g., reflected in a similar Latin manuscript of the ancient church writer Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century) whose writings are preserved in Greek and / or Latin works.”

At Preface p. civ, after “in public by a man” add (which is clearly an incorrect theory anyway, as seen in this very Hebraic vocalization of “YeHoWaH” or “YeHoVaH” used by the Jews in the Hebrew Masoretic Text at e.g., Exod. 6:3 and Isa. 11:2, although I note that the vocalization is different in the *Codex Leningrad Text of Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*); and after “into the Anglicized form, Jehovah” before the fullstop add “in harmony with the vowel vocalization in the Hebrew Masoretic Text.”

At Preface p. cv, para 5, after “(to some extent, on analogy with “testament” in I Cor. 3)”, fullstop “.” > question mark “?”.

At Preface p. cxii, ftn 208, after “[Oct. 5, 2009],” at very end of footnote add a closing quotation mark, ”.

Add in an apostrophe “’” after “James” so > “St. James’ Palace”, at Preface pp. cxxiii, para 2; cclv, para 3; ccciii, para 5; & ccciv, para 3.

At Preface p. cxxvii, para 6, between “any real and essential presence” and “of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” and in “...”.

At Preface p. clxiii, para 2, after “Headmaster” and before “with”, add, “, Mr.

Frank McKenzie.”.

At Preface p. clxxxvii, para 3, “simply dichotomy” > “simple dichotomy”.

At Preface p. cxciv, both para 4 and para 5, between “any real and essential presence” and “of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” and in “...”.

At Preface p. ccii, para 2, between “any real and essential presence” and “of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” and in “there being”.

At Preface p. ccviii, both para 1 and para 4, between “any real and essential presence” and “of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” and in “...”.

At Preface p. ccxvii, last footnote, starting “Puritan sabbatarianism was notoriously extreme”, “chapter 8:11” > “chapter 7:11”.

At Preface p. ccx, last footnote on page, at “Churchill, W., *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples*, Cassell & Co..,” remove one “.” so “Co..” > “Co.”.

At Preface p. ccxxx, para 3, 3rd last line, “many not be adored” > “may not be adored”.

At Preface pp. cxxxii-cxxxiii, “Bondi” > “Manly” (thrice); and after what now reads, “that when Jensen had been a Curate many years before at St. Matthew’s Manly,” add before the comma, “(1970-1973)”

At Preface p. cclvii, para 4, line 3, “Anglicans” > “Episcopalians”; line 4, “Anglican-Presbyterian” > “Episcopal-Presbyterian”, & “Anglican wing” > “Episcopal wing”; 3rd footnote, “Anglican-Presbyterian” > “Episcopal-Presbyterian”.

At Preface p. cclxii, para 3, “Edward Herbt (1853-1648)” > “Edward Herbt (1583-1648)”.

At Preface p. cclxix, para 4, line 7, remove “(Anglicans)”; para 5, 3rd last line, after “it” and before “also”, add “is”.

At Preface p. cclxx, para 3, 2nd line, “*Lesse Ejection*” > “*Lesser Ejection*” ; and line para 3, line 11, “*God ha brought*” > “*God had brought*”.

At Preface p. cclxxi, para 6, after “near St. Mary-le-Bow with its plaque to Richard Johnson” + “at St. Mary Aldermary’s”.

At Preface p. cclxxiv, para 4, line 8, “*and Anglicans second*” > “*and Anglicans supporters of episcopal church government second per Article 34 of the 39 Articles*”; “Anglican-Presbyterian” > “Episcopal-Presbyterian”; line 9 “Anglican wing” > “Episcopal wing”.

At Preface p. cclxxv, para 1, after “English Protestants.”, and before “The *Act of Settlement* (1701) and associated *Act of Union* (1707) ensures a Protestant monarch”; add, “This oath was then modified in 1910, and as first taken by George V in 1910 it now reads simply, ‘I ..., do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I am a faithful Protestant, and that I will, according to the true intent of the enactments to secure the Protestant Succession to the Throne of my realm, uphold and maintain such enactments to the best of my power.’” Para 5, fourth last line from “However, the Restoration” to end of para 5, > “However, the Restoration had seen an unprecedented level of co-operation between the Anglican Crown and Presbyterians in Scotland which had the united Episcopal-Presbyterian Church of 1660-1688/9. Upholding the Scottish Rescissory Act of 1661 (which among other things declared the *Solemn League and Covenant* invalid,) and having an Established Scottish Puritan Church from 1690 with religious tolerance to other Protestants was thus the final solution to the problem.”

At Preface p. cclxxvi, para 4, line 2, “Anglicans” > “Episcopalians”.

At Preface p. cclxxxiii, para 4, “their see” > “there see”.

At Preface p. cclxxxviii, para 4, line 5, “Anglican-Presbyterian” > “Episcopal-Presbyterian”; line 6, “Anglican wing” > “Episcopal wing”; para 5, line 1, “their fellow Anglicans” > “Episcopalians”; line 8, “Anglicans” > “Episcopalians”; lines 9 & 10, “other Anglicans moved to close” > “Anglicans supported Scottish Presbyterians closing”; para 6, line 1, “about Anglicans” > “about Episcopalians”; line 2, “Anglicans” > “Episcopalians in church government”; line 4, “most of their fellow Anglicans” > “Episcopalians”; para 7, line 1, “Scottish Anglicans” > “Scottish Episcopalians”; at p. cclxxxix, para 1, line 2, “Scottish Anglicans” > “Scottish Episcopalians”; para 2, lines 3 & 5 both times “Jacobite Anglicans” > “Jacobite Episcopalians”; para 3, line 4, “Anglicans moved to close” > “Anglicans supported closing”; para 4, line 7, “their own fellow Anglicans” > “Episcopalians”; line 8, “*and Anglicans second!*” > “*and supporters of episcopal church government second!*”; para 8, line 1, omit “while”; line 2, “he nevertheless” > “and he”.

At Preface p. cccii, 2nd ft. starting “Unlike the Puseyites,” line 6, after “prominent” add “figures”.

At Preface p. ccciii, last para “IHSOUS (*Iesous / Ihsous*).” > “IHSOYS (*Iesous / Ihsous*).”

At p. 2, para 3, line 1, change fullstop “.” to comma “,” so “before a name. we cannot” > “before a name, we cannot”.

At p. 13 (Matt. 1:11), para 2, after “the Syriac Harclean Version (616) in an asterisk marked out text” add “(indicating it is not the representative reading of the Harclean Version)”.

At p. 16 (Matt. 1:18), para 1, remove the word “Greek” and add after “Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century)” the words, “whose writings are preserved in Greek and / or Latin works”.

Remove all reference to O 023 (Codex Sinopensis) at pp. 52-3 (Matt. 4:10), 126 (Matt. 7:2, para 3), 129 (Matt. 7:4, para 1), 171 (Matt. 8:25a, para 4), 190 (Matt. 9:5b, para 2); 224 (Matt. 10:8, para 5), 269 (Matt. 12:6, para 1).

At p. 30 (Matt. 1:25), para 4, “*eos*” > “*eos*” (thrice).

At p. 126 (Matt. 7:2) para 3 & p. 383 (Matt. 14:25b) para 6, “Colberinus” > “Colbertinus”.

At p. 209 (Matt. 9:27b), 3rd last para, last sentence > “It is also followed by the early mediaeval church writer Pseudo-Athanasius (6th century) whose writings are preserved in Greek and / or Latin works; and the early mediaeval church Greek writer John of Damascus (d. before 754).”

At Appendices p. xvi, last para, “Matt. 8:4b” > “Matt. 8:4c” (twice).

At Appendices p. xxxii, para 2, last line “17:3” > “15:23; & 20:10c”.

At Appendices p. liii, para 1, with heading, “Appendix 5: Sermon preached” etc., add “(Oral recorded form presently available at www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible.)”

At Appendices p. liv, 2nd last para, line three, before “murders” add start of a quotation mark, “.

Notice on Pseudo-Chrysostom. Pseudo-Chrysostom’s *Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum*, contains a series of Latin homilies on St. Matthew’s Gospel by an unknown Arian and Pelagian heretic. Some dispute exists as to whether he wrote in Greek or Latin, although there is no doubt that his surviving work is in Latin. My citation of him is generally from Tischendorf’s 8th edition, and I have not looked at his surviving Latin work first hand. I am now standardizing all references to him as, “the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Chrysostom in a Latin work (6th century).” Therefore this terminology is now used in Volume 1 at: p. 31 (Matt. 2:11), para 6; p. 96 (Matt. 6:1a), para 2; p. 108 (Matt. 6:13), para 5; p. 111 (Matt. 6:15), para 4; and at Preface p. lxxxix, para 5, line 7, remove the word, “Greek”.

Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20).

At Preface p. iv, in the space above “*Appendices to St. Matthew’s Gospel Matt. 15-20.*” add, “**TEXTUAL COMMENTARY Matt. 15-20.**”

At Preface p. xi, last para, “Prefatory” > “prefatory”.

At Preface p. iv, “28” > “20,” so “*Appendices to St. Matthew’s Gospel Matt. 15-28*” > “*Appendices to St. Matthew’s Gospel Matt. 15-20*”.

At Preface p. ix, transliterations, “Alpha” > “Alpha A α = A a”; “Eta” > “Eta H η = H / E e” and “Upsilon” > “Upsilon Y υ = Y u / y”.

At Preface p. xiv, para 5, add a space after “...” and before “conceded.”

At Preface p. xv, para 1, after “this calamity ..” add an extra dot i.e., “this calamity ...”.

At Preface p. ccxxiv, para 5, “a picture of King Charles II” > “a Caroline picture”.

At p. 24 (Matt. 15:6d), para 1, line 4, after “It” add “is”.

At p. 77 (Matt. 15:31b), para 1, line 2, “Is it” > “It is”.

At p. 197 (Matt. 17:20b), last para, 3rd last line, “Colberinus” > “Colbertinus”.

At p. 227 (Matt. 17:26), para 2, 5th line, remove “, O 023 (6th century)”.

At p. 479 (Matt. 20:34b), last para, last line, “Here” > “Hear”.

At Appendices p. xxxviii, paras 5 & 6 should read (retaining the same footnote 60 in para 5 after “1968”):

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) 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.)

At Appendices p. l, “Appendix 5” of “Matt. 15-28” > “Appendix 4” of “Matt. 15-20”.

At Appendices p. li, heading for “Appendix 6” > “Appendix 5”; and remove the

note just before this Appendix which says: “**Note to Internet Users:** (Relevant for about 3 to 4 months from November 2009.) I made some corrigenda changes to Volume 1 on the internet version of Volume 1, and said I intended to publish a Corrigenda in Volume 2 for these. But having now subsequently decided to produce a revised Volume 1, which is scheduled for Dedication on 30 January 2010, and should be up on the internet within a month or two of this date, under these changed circumstances, I have now decided to omit reference to this Corrigenda here, and simply incorporate the corrigenda changes into the revised Vol. 1.”

I am now standardizing all references to Pseudo-Chrysostom, *supra*, as, “the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Chrysostom in a Latin work (6th century).” Therefore this terminology is therefore now used in Volume 2 at: p. 394 (Matt. 20:7), para 1; & p. 437 (Matt. 20:22b,c,23b, at Matt. 20:23b), para 3.

**Appendix 7:
Queen's Message on KJV: Queen Elizabeth II Flyer.**

KING JAMES BIBLE 400th anniversary 1611-2011

In the Queen's Christmas Message of Saturday 25 December 2010, televised on the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC), Her Majesty, the Queen, spoke on a most important matter. The following excerpts are taken from the Queen's Christmas Message given at the Chapel Royal of Hampton Court Palace in London by Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, by the grace of God, *Supreme Governor of the Church of England, Defender of the Faith*; Queen of the United Kingdom; Queen of Australia, and elsewhere.

The Queen said: "Over 400 years ago King James the Sixth of Scotland inherited the throne of England at a time when the Christian Church was deeply divided. Here at Hampton Court in 1604 he convened a Conference of churchmen of all shades of opinion to discuss the future of Christianity in this country. The king agreed to commission a new translation of the Bible that was acceptable to all parties. This was to become the King James or Authorized Bible which next year will be exactly four centuries old. Acknowledged as a masterpiece of English prose and the most vivid translation of the Scriptures, the glorious language of this Bible has survived the turbulence of history, and given many of us the most widely recognized and beautiful descriptions of the birth of Jesus Christ which we celebrate today." Then after a succession of pictures on the TV screen first showing the title page of the "The Holy Bible;" then the Dedicatory Preface page of this Bible "To ... James, by the grace of God, King ..., Defender of the Faith," etc.; then the first page of the third Gospel in the Authorized Version reading, "The Gospel according to S. Luke;" three successive students from St. Mary & St. Pancras *Church of England* Primary School, London, read, "And so it was, that, while they were there, the days were accomplished that she should be delivered" (Luke 2:6). "And she brought forth her firstborn son, and wrapped him in swaddling clothes, and laid him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn. And there were in the same country, shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flock by night" (Luke 2:7,8). "And, lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them: and they were sore afraid ... And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of ... heavenly host praising God, and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men" (Luke 2:9,13,14). The Queen later said, "The King James Bible was a major co-operative endeavor that required the efforts of dozens of the day's leading scholars. The whole enterprise was guided by an interest in reaching agreement for the wider benefit of the Christian Church and to bring harmony to the Kingdoms of England and Scotland." Then quoting from Saint Matthew 7:12, the Queen said: "From the Scriptures in the Bible which bears" "King James" "name," "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

This notice prepared by Gavin McGrath, author of Textual Commentaries on the King James Bible and Received Text (<http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com> or on Yahoo or Google type in "Gavin McGrath Books"). Please feel free to copy & distribute this flyer.

Citations of this may also be found in McGrath, G.B. (myself), "Queen's Christmas Message," *English Churchman*, (EC 7810), 14 & 21 Jan. 2011, p. 2.

Appendix 8: A Sermons' Bonus.

A number of sermons preached by Gavin at Mangrove Mountain Union Church are presently available as oral recordings at: www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible. This Appendix is a "Sermon Bonus" providing the interested reader with a written transcript that he may wish to refer to in addition to these oral recordings.

Four Prayer Meeting Apologetic Sermons in July 2010

"If the Bible says it, you can believe it: OT prophecies on cities and nations – Part 1 of 4 Biblical Apologetics sermons."

Mangrove Mtn Union Church: Thursday 1 July, 2010: 1) Tyre; 2) Sidon; 3) Samaria; & 4) Egypt¹⁴².

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. *Let us pray.* "Blessed Lord, who hast caused all holy Scriptures to be written for our learning; grant that we may in such wise hear them, read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest them, that by patience, and comfort of thy holy Word, we may embrace, and ever hold fast the blessed hope of everlasting life, which thou hast given us in our Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen."¹⁴³

Good brethren, today we start four midweek prayer meetings, held on this and the following four Thursdays of July 2010. That's today and then Thursdays the 8th, 15th, and 22nd of July. Now when I flew by AIR CANADA from London in England to Boston in the USA in March 2009, I had a short airport stop in which I walked around the airport at Montreal in Quebec, a Province of Canada. I didn't leave the airport for the 1 to 2 hours that I was on the ground in Canada, although I did take a panoramic photograph of part of Montreal from a large window at the airport. And I note that today, the 1st of July is "Canada Day." So let me take the opportunity for wishing any brethren listening to this sermon who have Canadian connections, a Happy Canada Day. [pause]

¹⁴² See e.g., McDowell, J., *Evidence That Demands A Verdict*, A Campus Crusade for Christ Book, Here's Life Publishers, 1972, San Bernardino, California, USA, Revised Edition, 1979, pp. 274-280 (Tyre, Ezek. 26:3,4,7,8,12,14,21), 280-281 (Sidon, Ezek. 28:22,23), 281-283 (Samaria, Hosea 13:16 & Micah 1:6), 293-296 (Egypt, Ezekiel 30:13); & Ramm, B., *Protestant Christian Evidences*, Moody Press, Chicago, USA, 1953, reprint 1978, pp. 101 (Tyre & Sidon, Joel 3:6-8); 105 (Samaria, Micah 1:6). Both McDowell's and Ramm's books contain errors in various parts, and beyond these books I here cite, both have been involved in promoting various errors e.g., the ecumenical compromise. Nevertheless, I think we should give credit where credit is due, and the pages I refer to in these works, as well as some other portions of these two books, contain some valuable information.

¹⁴³ Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) Collect (for 2nd Sunday in Advent).

These four Biblical apologetics sermons will be divided into a trilogy over the first three mid-week Thursday prayer meetings of three addresses on the topic of Old Testament prophecy; followed by a fourth and final address on Biblical Archaeology on the last Thursday, all here at Mangrove Mountain Union Church. There's one other thing that I should explain before we start, and that's the usage I'll be making of the word, "apologetics." Now when we use the word, "apology," we normally mean by it an acknowledgement and expression of regret for something we've done wrong. None of us are perfect, we all make mistakes, and so we all have to sometimes make such an apology. But when we use the word "apology" in this *theological* context of what's called, "Biblical Apologetics," it means something quite different. It comes from the Greek word, *apologia*, meaning a "defence." For example, when St. Paul says in Acts 22:1, "Men, brethren, and fathers, hear ye my DEFENCE which I make now unto you;" that word, rendered in our Authorized Versions as "defence," is this Greek word, *apologia*¹⁴⁴. And so when one offers a *defence* of Biblical Christianity, we refer to this as "Biblical Apologetics."

In traditional Reformed Evangelical Anglicanism, the *Athanasian Creed*, upheld in Article 8 of the 39 Articles, is a foundational threshing instrument to divide the wheat from the chaff, first in harmony with Mark 16:16 and Revelation 21:8, to condemn the errors of all unbelievers, whether heathens such as Buddhists and Hindus; or infidels, such as Mohammedans and Jews; and secondly in harmony with Galatians 5:20 and 21 and II Peter 2:1, to condemn the Trinitarian heresies of, for example, the Eastern Orthodox who deny the double procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *and the Son*, taught in John 15:26 and Acts 2:33; or the monophysitist heresies of the Oriental Orthodox who deny the full humanity of Christ; or the religiously liberal heresies of those who deny such things as the reality of hell or the Second Advent. While Articles 38 and 39 of the Anglican 39 Articles address certain errors of some Protestant spin-off groups; having by the *Athanasian Creed*, thus very largely reduced the field to a bi-polar Protestant-Roman Catholic paradigm, there is then a sudden-death one on one grand-slam final contest between Protestants and Papists, with much of the 39 Articles then addressing issues relevant to the defence of Protestantism against Roman Catholicism. [pause] Whether Anglican Protestant or other Protestant, such as Lutheran, Presbyterian, or Baptist, we *Sons of the Reformation* stand shoulder-to-shoulder with each other in defending the Biblical Christianity of *Protestantism* against all comers; against heathens such as, for example, the idolaters of Buddhism and Hinduism; against infidels who recognize monotheism, but make no claim to being Christians, and who deny the Trinity, such as those in Sikhism, Mohammedanism, or Judaism. And we defend the Biblical Christianity of Protestantism against all those who profess to be Christians, but who deny the Bible's absolute infallibility and authority, such as the religious liberals; and all non-Protestants, for example, Roman Catholics; or Eastern Orthodox, such as Greek Orthodox and Russian Orthodox; or Oriental Orthodox, such as the monophysitist Armenian Orthodox and Coptic Orthodox; or the Jehovah's Witnesses; or the Mormons; and others. That's because only those of religiously conservative Protestant Christianity can

¹⁴⁴ Acts 22:1 reads, "*apologias* (*απολογία*, feminine singular genitive noun, from *apologia* / *απολογία*)."

realistically be said to believe in the absolute infallibility and authority of the Bible. Only Protestant Christians truly recognize the ultimate sole authority of Scripture, the *sola Scriptura*, or Scripture alone, of the Reformation.

We read in I Peter 3:15, that's the first book of Peter [pause], chapter 3 [pause], and verse 15 [pause], "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear." Today is the first of a trilogy of midweek prayer meeting sermons that I'm giving on the Old Testament prophecies dealing with cities and nations. The basic theme I'll be putting before you, both in this trilogy on OT prophecy, and also the final sermon on Biblical Archaeology, is this, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it's accurate; it's reliable; it's true.* I'll be going through three or four groups of prophecies about cities or nations in each of these first three sermons on Old Testament prophecies, that is, a total of ten groups of prophecies about cities or nations prophesied about in the Old Testament. In today's sermon, we'll be looking at: Tyre, Sidon, Samaria, and Egypt.

Now we have some familiarity with these four places from the New Testament. For example, we read in Luke 9:51-56 of some bad "Samaritans," who we're told in Luke 9:53, "*did not receive*" Christ. And then we're told in the next chapter, in Luke 10:25-37 of the Good Samaritan. And the question from this comparison is will we choose to be like the bad Samaritans of Luke 9 who "*did not receive*" Christ, or by the grace of God, shall we be like the Good Samaritan of Luke 10? And we find this similar issue of choice with regard to Egypt, because we read in Hebrews 11:24-26, "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt." So the New Testament tells us that Moses made a choice to serve God and be justified by faith, rather than live in a world of sin in Egypt. Now turn with me also, if you will, to Matthew 11:21, that's the Gospel according to St. Matthew [pause], chapter 11 [pause], and verse 21 [pause], for here our Lord says, "Woe unto thee Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida! For if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes."

And so from the New Testament we're familiar with Tyre, Sidon, Samaria, and Egypt. But it's to the Old Testament that we now turn to consider some AMAZING Bible prophecies, which can only lead us, by the grace of God to recognize that, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it's accurate; it's reliable; it's true.*

The first Old Testament prophecy that we'll consider today, comes from the prophet, Holy Ezekiel. Turn with me then in your King James Bibles, to the Old Testament Book of Ezekiel 26:3, that's the Book of Ezekiel [pause], chapter 26 [pause], starting at verse 3 [pause]. In the early part of the 6th century B.C., the Old Testament prophet, Ezekiel, says, "Therefore thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I am against thee, O Tyrus, and will cause many nations to come up against thee, as the sea causeth his waves to come up. And they shall destroy the walls of Tyrus, and break down her towers: I will also scrape her dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock. It shall be a place for

the spreading of nets in the midst of the sea: for I have spoken it, saith the Lord God: and it shall become a spoil to the nations.” In verse 7 we read that “God” “will bring” the “king of Babylon,” Nebuchadnezzar, to accomplish this “with horses, and with chariots, and with horsemen, and companies, and much people.” And from verse 7, going to verse 12, “And they shall make a spoil of thy riches, and make a prey of thy merchandise: and they shall break down thy walls, and destroy thy pleasant houses: and they shall lay thy stones and thy timber and thy dust in the midst of the water. And I will cause the noise of thy songs to cease; and the sound of thy harps shall be no more heard. And I will make thee like the top of a rock: thou shalt be a place to spread nets upon; thou shalt be built no more: for I the Lord have spoken it, saith the Lord God.”

Jesus said in John 13:19, “Now I tell you before it come, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am he.” You see, prophecies are given, in part, that when we see the fulfilment of them, we may have the Divine Inspiration of Scripture confirmed to our hearts and minds. For Jesus also said in John 10:35, “The Scripture cannot be broken.” You see, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it's accurate; it's reliable; it's true.*

In the first place, I would draw your attention to the specificity of this prophecy in Ezekiel 26. This is not some vague, woolly statement, such as, “In the future a bad man will arise, ... and do much harm” [pause]. Oh no, my friends, this prophecy of Ezekiel 26 is very specific indeed. Let's consider some of this specificity.

Firstly, we're told in Ezekiel 26:3, that specifically this is a prophecy about “Tyrus” or ancient Tyre. And let me say, that Tyre was no ordinary city as cities go, but rather, a commercial centre of the Mediterranean world, for we read in Ezekiel 27:3, “Tyrus, O thou that art situate at the entry of the sea, which art a merchant of the people for many isles.” Secondly, in Ezekiel 26:7, we're told that it is the “king of Babylon,” Nebuchadnezzar, who will do this. And indeed, from 585 to around 573 or 572 B.C., Nebuchadnezzar the Second undertook a 13 year siege of Tyre. And this fulfilled the words of Ezekiel 26:7,8, & 9 which says of Nebuchadnezzar, “he shall make a fort against thee, and cast a mount against thee, and lift up the buckler against thee. And he shall set engines of war against thy walls, and with his axes he shall break down thy towers.”

And so, there was a remarkable fulfilment of this element of the prophecy under Nebuchadnezzar, the “king of Babylon.” And yet, good friends, the prophecy does not end there, for we read in Ezekiel 26:3, a third point of specificity, namely, that God would “cause many nations,” not just one nation, but “many nations to come up against” “Tyrus.” And so there were still some unfulfilled elements of this prophecy after this initial destruction of mainland Tyre by King Nebuchadnezzar. Indeed, during this siege by Nebuchadnezzar, the inhabitants of Tyre withdrew by ship to an island that is about 1 kilometre or about ½ a mile off the coast.

Can you hear the people of God saying back there around 572 B.C. and later, “What an amazing fulfilment of Bible prophecy it is, that King Nebuchadnezzar, in

accordance with these words of Ezekiel, has come ‘with horses, and with chariots, and with horsemen, and companies, and much people,’ and has ‘set engines of war against Tyre, and broke through the city ‘walls’.” [pause]

But as surely as night follows day, can you also hear the Bible critics saying, “Yea, yea, but Ezekiel said God would ‘destroy the walls of Tyrus, and break down her towers’. But they’re still standing on the island city state in the new city of Tyre.” And then can you hear the people of God saying around 570 B.C. and later, the prophet Ezekiel said ‘many nations’ will ‘come up against’ ‘Tyrus,’ and so this is just the first element of the prophecy’s fulfilment. God fulfilled the first part, and we believe he’ll fulfil the second part too!”

And indeed, good brethren, that’s exactly what, in time, did occur. But before looking at that, I ask you to first look carefully at the specificity of Ezekiel 26:12, that’s Ezekiel, chapter 26, and verse 12, in the latter part of the verse, “and they shall lay thy stones and thy timber and thy dust in the midst of the water.” Now that’s a very specific prophecy. Well the great Babylonian Empire was in time succeeded by the Medo-Persian Empire. And in time, the Medo-Persian Empire was succeeded by the Grecian Empire. Now the Grecian Empire came into world empire prominence under a man from Greek Macedonia, Alexander the Great, the son of Philip the Macedonian king. Alexander the Great defeated the Medo-Persian Empire under Darius III in the famous Battle of Issus in 333 B.C. . As Alexander’s armies moved south towards Egypt, they gave orders for all Phoenician cities to open their gates to them. But the people of Tyrus or Tyre refused. Alexander then laid siege to the old city of Tyre on the mainland that had formerly been destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar but then rebuilt.

But the new city of Tyre on the island off the coast, held out. Those of Tyre evidently felt secure, because though Alexander the Great had a powerful army, he had no navy. And therefore he was unable to sail over to the remaining island city-state of Tyre. But what Alexander did then, was he took all the debris from the old city of Tyre on the mainland, and used it to slowly but surely, build a causeway across to the island containing the new city of Tyre. Do you see, good brethren, how the building of this causeway perfectly fulfilled the words of Ezekiel 26:12, “and they shall lay thy stones and thy timber and thy dust in the midst of the water.” That’s amazing prophetic accuracy, isn’t it?

And as Alexander the Great built this causeway from the “stones” and “timber” and “dust” of mainland Tyre, he also managed to get some naval support brought in, so that by the time of the final battle, he did have some naval power. By the following year of 332 B.C., the leader of the Grecian Empire, Alexander the Great, charged over the causeway and reduced Tyre to rubble. He killed 10,000 inhabitants of Tyre, and sent another 30,000 into slavery. In the words of Ezekiel 26:3 & 4, “Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I am against thee O Tyrus, and will cause many nations to come against thee, ... and they shall destroy the walls of Tyrus, and break down her towers.” And so another element of this amazing prophecy was fulfilled. You see, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it’s accurate; it’s reliable; it’s true.*

Can you hear the people of God saying back there around 332 B.C. and later, “What an amazing fulfilment of Bible prophecy it is, that Alexander the Great, in accordance with these words of Ezekiel, has come to ‘destroy the walls of Tyrus, and break down her towers;’” and did “lay thy stones and thy timber and thy dust in the midst of the water” with the causeway he built [pause]

But as surely as night follows day, can you also hear the Bible critics saying, “Yea, yea, but Ezekiel said it would be ‘like the top of a rock,’ and ‘a place for the spreading of nets,’ and that hasn’t happened.” And then can you hear the people of God saying around 330 B.C., and later, “The prophet Ezekiel said ‘many nations’ will ‘come up against’ ‘Tyrus,’ and so just like the first element of the prophecy was fulfilled with Nebuchadnezzar of the Babylonian Empire; and the second element was fulfilled with Alexander the Great of the Grecian Empire; so likewise, we believe God will fulfil the third part of this prophecy too!”

Following Alexander the Great, Tyrus survived, but was no longer as powerful or prosperous. About 20 years later, the rebuilt Tyre was again broken down and destroyed this time by one of Alexander the Great’s old generals, Antigonus “the one-eyed,” also known as “Antigonus the Cyclops.” And so there was a further fulfilment of Ezekiel 26:3 & 4, that God would “cause many nations to come up against” “Tyrus,” and they would “destroy” and “break down” that city state.

And then some 970 years later, came the sword of Islam. Like locusts, the Mohammedans spread their false and spurious teachings based on Mohammed’s *Koran* across the Middle East. From 638 A.D. to 1124 A.D., Tyre was occupied by the Mohammedans Arabs. And over time, once again it came to prosper. Then in the 12th and 13th centuries it became a Christian Crusader fort. Now these Christians were admittedly in sad apostasy and unorthodox. But that’s not the issue we’re looking at today. In the same way that in the 20th century, Western countries like Australia and the United States of America took a stand against the spread of the guns of Communism by combating it in Korea and Vietnam; and even though they militarily withdrew from Vietnam this still sent a signal that the West would increasingly fight against Communist military aggression; so likewise, the Christian Crusaders took a stand against the spread of the sword of Islam by combating it in the Middle East, and even though they militarily withdrew from certain areas this still sent a signal that the West would increasingly fight against Mohammedan military aggression.

Now in this context, the aggressive Mohammedan armies didn’t distinguish between orthodox and unorthodox Christians, they were just against *all and any* who professed and called themselves “Christians.” But of course, God does make such a distinction, and he was not prepared to give the guarantee of victory to the Crusaders on Tyre because of their many sins. And yet simultaneously, the Mohammedans were not against the Crusaders for their departures from Christianity, but rather for those truths of Christianity that they held to, such as the Trinity. And so in this paradox, we find that in 1291 A.D., Tyre which had been held by the Crusaders, was captured by the violent and

vicious sword of Islam. Thus there had been Christians in Tyre, albeit unorthodox Christians, and it seems the Mohammedans wanted to erase all trace and memory of them *and any* form of Christianity, whether orthodox or unorthodox. The population of Tyre was massacred, dispersed, and sent into slavery; and Tyre never again became an important or notable city.

Thus the words of Ezekiel 26:3,4, that God would send “many nations” against “Tyrus,” that they would “destroy the walls of Tyrus, and break down her towers,” that the “dust” would be “scrape[d]” from her, and she would be made “like the top of a rock,” came to be fulfilled. And as for those amazing words of Ezekiel 26:5, “it shall be a place for the spreading of nets in the midst of the sea,” and verse 14, “thou shalt be a place to spread nets upon,” we find that this describes well the situation of Tyre to this very day. For it is a port city in Lebanon known as Sur, in which small fishing vessels now anchor, and the fishermen spread their nets.

But there’s one more element of this prophecy on Tyre that I want to look at. In Ezekiel 26:19 & 21 we read, “Thus saith the Lord God; when I shall make thee a desolate city, like the cities that are not inhabited; when I shall bring up the deep upon thee, and great waters shall cover thee;” verse 21, “I will make thee a terror, and thou shalt be no more: though thou be sought for, yet shalt thou never been found again, saith the Lord God.” Now can you hear the Bible critics saying, “Oh that’s a Bible blunder, first the Bible says in Ezekiel 26:14 that Tyre will be a place where fisherman “spread” their “nets” out to catch fish; and then it says in Ezekiel 26:19 & 21 that this same Tyre will “not” be “inhabited” because God will “bring up the deep,” meaning water from rivers or oceans, that he “shall bring up the deep” upon Tyre, that “great waters shall cover” Tyre, and “though thou be sought for, yet shalt thou never be found.” Can you hear the Bible critics saying, “How can two such contradictory things possibly be correct?”

Well let me say that in the first place, we cannot doubt that this prophecy considers that in some sense Tyre will be reinhabited, because we’re told in Ezekiel 26:14 that Tyre would become a fishing port, as indeed it has. So what then does Ezekiel 26:19 & 21 mean? Well I’ll tell you something very interesting indeed. The archaeologists have dug down deep into Tyre, and they’ve gone all the way down to the Grecian period of Tyre. But try as they may, they can’t make it down to the Phoenician period of Tyre. Why? Because the old parts of the city have *sunk below the water level*, and when they dig down, they just get mud and have to stop. So the old part of Phoenician Tyre is under the water level, in fulfilment of the words of Ezekiel 26:19, “I shall bring up the deep upon thee, and great waters shall cover thee;” and so is remarkably fulfilled the further words of verse 21, “though thou shalt be sought for, yet shalt thou never be found.” Ask any archaeologist who’s worked in Tyre, and tried to find the ancient part of Phoenician Tyre, and he’ll tell you, “though” we have “sought for” the old “city” of Tyre, “yet” has she “never” been “found,” for she is covered by “great waters,” and “the deep” has been brought up “upon” her.”

And might I add at this point, that these words of Ezekiel 26:21, “though thou be sought for, yet shalt thou never be found;” are thus also a prophecy of the rise of Biblical

Archaeologists in historically modern times. For it is those engaging in Biblical Archaeology who would be seeking to dig down and find the old city of Tyre in the first place. And so one more amazing element of this prophecy of Ezekiel 26, is the fact that the modern science of Biblical archaeology, whose rise can be broadly dated to the 19th century, even though some elements of it can be dated as early as ancient times; the more developed form of Biblical archaeology as we now know it, basically originated in the 19th century. And so it is that one element of Ezekiel 26:21 has only been fulfilled in historically modern times, with the rise of Biblical archaeologists whose seeking of Phoenician Tyre fulfils the words of Scripture, “though thou be sought for, yet shalt thou never be found.” And of course, in the fourth mid-week prayer meeting here at Mangrove Mountain Union Church on Thursday July 22, 2010, we’ll be looking in more detail at some matters from the science of Biblical Archaeology.

And so it is, that through reference to Ezekiel 26, you can see my friends, there are no errors in the Bible, there are only the errors of men’s fallible interpretations. And while foolish men spiritually blinded and superficially looking at Ezekiel 26, may claim that there’s a so called “Bible blunder” and “contradiction” between the statements of Ezekiel 26:14, that God would make Tyre a fishing port; and the statements of Ezekiel 26:19 & 21, that the old “city” of Tyre would “not be inhabited” because God would “cover” it with “great waters,” so that “though” it “be sought for, yet” it “shalt” “never be found;” though I say, such Bible critics may claim there is a contradiction in Ezekiel 26, yet for those with spiritual eyes to see, upon more careful examination we find that what the Bible says is absolutely accurate, and indeed an outstanding example of Biblical detail in prophetically foretelling what would happen to Tyre.

You see, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it’s accurate; it’s reliable; it’s true.* The prophecy of Tyre’s destruction was not one of an instantaneous act, but one in which God said in Ezekiel 26:3, that he would bring “many nations” “against” it. And indeed, he brought the Babylonians, the Grecians, and finally the Arabs. And all this took place over a period of nearly 2,000 years. And the prophecy of Tyre’s final state was also multifaceted, on the one hand, in Ezekiel 26:19 & 21, it was to be “desolate,” “not inhabited,” covered with “great waters,” so that “though thou be sought for, yet shalt thou never be found,” and indeed this is what has happened to the old city of Phoenician Tyre, which has gone below the water level, and so the archaeologists can’t get at it. But on the other hand, in Ezekiel 26:14, Tyre was to become a “place to spread nets upon,” that is to say, a fishing port in which fisherman spread their nets to catch fish; and of course, that’s also exactly what has happened to Tyre, which as the modern city of Sur in Lebanon, is indeed a fishing port. And so these remarkable Biblical prophecies about Tyre, remind us that in the words of Christ in John 10:35, “The Scripture cannot be broken.” Be sure of this, good brethren, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it’s accurate; it’s reliable; it’s true.* [pause]

And that now brings us to Tyre’s sister-city of Sidon. Turn with me, if you will, in your Authorized Versions, to Ezekiel 28:20 to 23, that’s the Old Testament prophet, Ezekiel, chapter 28, and verses 20 to 23. Ezekiel here says, “Again the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, set thy face against Zidon [Sidon], and prophesy

against it, and say, Thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I am against thee, O Zidon [Sidon]; and I will be glorified in the midst of thee; and they shall know that I am the Lord, when I shall have executed judgment in her, and shall be sanctified in her. For I will send into her pestilence, and blood into her streets: and the wounded shall be judged in the midst of her by the sword upon her on every side: and they shall know that I am the Lord.”

Once again, this is not some vague, woolly statement, such as, “a city somewhere in the known world, ... will one day experience some problems” [pause]. Oh no, this very specific to Sidon. This is a prophecy of a military judgement, a “pestilence” in which there is “blood” in the “streets,” and “the wounded” shall fall by “the sword.” And this remarkable prophecy has most assuredly been fulfilled.

We’ve already mentioned Alexander the Great, and it was his military forces that came and captured Sidon. But even before this time, we find a fulfilment. For the later conqueror of Sidon, Alexander the Great, was born in 356 B.C., and when he was still a boy of about 5 years of age, in 351 B.C., the people of Sidon rebelled against the Persian king who controlled Sidon. Ultimately, the king of Sidon, in order to save his life, allowed the city to go back to the King of Persia. The people of Sidon knew that the vengeance of the Medo-Persian king against them would be very great; and so about 40,000 residents of Sidon, barricaded themselves inside their houses, and then set fire to those houses, thereby murdering themselves. And thus came the Ezekiel 28:23 prophesied “pestilence” of “blood” in the “streets.” And then in time, the Ezekiel 28:23 prophesy of “the sword” coming to Sidon was fulfilled when Alexander the Great, took the city of Sidon in 333 B.C., and then moved down to the city of Tyre for the battle and siege of Tyre in 333 to 332 B.C. .

Indeed, the destruction of the twin cities of Tyre and Sidon is mentioned together in Joel 3:4-8. For if you turn with me now to the Old Testament Minor Prophet of Joel, chapter 3, we read there, beginning at verse 4, “Yea, and what have ye to do with me, O Tyre and Zidon [Sidon], and all the coasts of Palestine? Will ye render me a recompense: And if ye recompense me, swiftly and speedily will I return your recompense upon your own head.” Verse 6, “The children also of Judah and the children of Jerusalem have ye sold unto the Grecians,” verse 7, “Behold, I will raise them out of the place whither ye have sold them, and will return your recompense upon your own head.” Now here in verses 4, 6, and 7, we’re specifically told by Joel in the ninth century B.C., that God would destroy both “Tyre, and Zidon, and all the coasts of Palestine” by “*the Grecians.*” And so it is specifically to the “Grecians” that Joel here points to for a double military assault on Tyre and Sidon, followed by a triple military assault on the wider area in “the coasts of Palestine.” And so that of course, refers to Alexander the Great, the leader of the Grecian or Greek Empire, who decimated Tyre, Sidon, and Phoenicia on “the coasts of Palestine,” with for example, some 13,000 inhabitants of Tyre sold into captivity. *Note good brethren the specificity of Joel here, saying in Joel 3:6 that it would be the “Grecians” who would so destroy these cities of Tyre, Sidon, and the Palestinian coast; and of course when Joel said this, it was some FIVE HUNDRED YEARS before the rise of the Greek Empire under Alexander the Great.*

And so once again we find that, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it's accurate; it's reliable; it's true.* The prophecy of Sidon was first fulfilled with the "pestilence" of "blood" in the "streets" as 40,000 Sidonians died in 351 B.C.; and then the prophecy of Sidon in Ezekiel 28:23 concerning "the sword" coming to Sidon was fulfilled less than 20 years later with the military campaign of Alexander the Great in 333 B.C. . And so once again, we are reminded of the words of Christ in the Gospel of St. John, chapter 10, and verse 35, "The Scripture cannot be broken." [pause]

And this now brings us to the third Old Testament prophesy that we're considering today, namely that of Samaria. Turn with me in your Authorized King James Versions of the Bible to the Book of Hosea. In our Bibles, this is the first of the Old Testament Minor Prophets, following the four Old Testament Major Prophets of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. The Old Testament prophet, Hosea, wrote in the mid to latter part of the 8th century B.C., and he says in the first part of Hosea 13:16, that's the first part of Hosea, chapter 13, and verse 16, "Samaria shall become desolate; for she hath rebelled against her God: they shall fall by the sword."

And now turn with me to Micah 1:6. That's another of the Old Testament Minor Prophets, and he also wrote around the middle to latter part of the 8th century B.C., that's the prophet Micah, chapter 1, and verse 6. And here we read these words, "Therefore I will make Samaria as an heap of the field, and as plantings of a vineyard: and I will pour down the stones thereof into the valley, and I will discover the foundations thereof."

Don't forget the words of Jesus in John 13:19, "Now I tell you before it come, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am he." These prophecies are likewise written aforetime, that when they come to pass, we may believe in the Divine Inspiration of Scripture.

Samaria was part of the northern kingdom of ancient Israel, who turned away from God committing, we are told in Micah 1:7, such sins as idolatry. The Assyrian king, Sargon II, referred to in Isaiah 20, reigned in about the last 20 years of the 8th century B.C.; and he came and captured Samaria in a siege initiated by the earlier Assyrian king, Shalmaneser V. Samaria thus fell by the sword in the early 720s B.C. .

Samaria was conquered a second time by the Grecian, Alexander the Great, in 331 B.C., and then a third time by the Jewish high priest, John Hyrcanus I in 120 B.C. .

With all these three conquests, we see fulfilled the prediction of Hosea 13:16, that Samaria would "fall by the sword." Concerning the words of Micah 1:6, "I will make Samara as an heap of the field, and as planting of a vineyard," it should be understood that Samaria was on a hill. Now we find that in fulfilment of this prophecy, the whole hill of Samaria consists of a fertile soil, which is now cultivated on the top, with the "plantings of" many olive and fig trees in this "vineyard," which is now all part of a huge garden.

Concerning the further words of Micah 1:6, "and I will pour down the stones

thereof into the valley,” we find that the building stones of Samaria were quite literally rolled down or poured down the hill of Samaria, and today, at the foot of the hill of Samaria, in the valley, lie the foundation stones of Samaria.

And this also acts to further fulfil the words of Micah 1:6, “and I will discover the foundations thereof.” The foundations as seen in some of its foundation stones are now laid bare, they are now “discovered.”

What amazing fulfilments of the Biblical prophecies of Hosea 13:16 and Micah 1:6 we thus find fulfilled in Samaria. You see, good brethren, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it's accurate; it's reliable; it's true.* [pause]

And that brings us to the fourth and last group of Old Testament prophecies that we're looking at today, namely those of Egypt. So turn with me now in your Authorized Versions of the Bible to the Book of Ezekiel, chapter 29 and verses 9, 14 and 15; that's Ezekiel 29, verse 9, “And the land of Egypt shall be desolate and waste: and they shall know that I am the Lord; because he hath said, The river is mine, and I have made it.” Verse 14, “And I will bring again the captivity of Egypt and will cause them to return into the land of Pathros, into the land of their habitation: and they shall be there a base kingdom. It shall be the basest of ... kingdoms; neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations: for I will diminish them, that they shall no more rule over the nations.” And now turn in the next chapter of Ezekiel, to chapter 30 and verse 13, and before I read this verse I should mention that the Biblical “Noph” refers to the great Egyptian city of Memphis. Ezekiel 30:13 says, “Thus saith the Lord God: I will also destroy the idols, and I will cause the images to cease out of Noph: and there shall be more a prince of the land of Egypt: and I will put a fear in the land of Egypt.” And now if you turn back in your Bibles, from Ezekiel back through Jeremiah to Isaiah, then we come to the Book of Isaiah, chapter 19, verses 1 and 5 to 7; that's Isaiah 19:1 and 5-7, “The burden of Egypt, Behold, the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt; and the idols of Egypt shall be moved at his presence, and the heart of Egypt shall melt in the midst of it.” Verse 5, “And the waters shall fail from the sea, and the river shall be wasted and dried up. And they shall turn the rivers far away; and the brooks of defence shall be emptied and dried up: the reeds and flags shall wither. The paper reeds by the brooks, by the mouth of the brooks, and everything sown by the brooks shall wither, be driven away, and be no more.” And in the Minor Prophets, Joel also says in Joel 3:19, “Egypt shall be a desolation.”

Now in both Isaiah 19:1, & 5-7; and Ezekiel 29:9 and 30:13; this is a picture of Egypt, in which its “idols” have been removed, and some kind of drought destroys it, so that it's no longer a great and powerful nation. Now when Egypt was annexed by the Roman Empire in 30 B.C., it thereafter became known as [quote] “the bread basket” [unquote] of the Roman Empire. Egypt was lush with grasses and wildlife. And it was full of idols. But if you look at Egypt today, as a consequence of desertification, in the words of Isaiah 19:5-7 “the waters ... fail,” “the brooks of defence” are “emptied and dried up: the reeds and [the] flags shall wither. The paper reeds by the brooks, by the mouth of the brooks, and everything sown by the brooks shall wither,” are “driven away”

and in their former lush abundance, are “no more.” And the idols are also gone, as a consequence of Mohammedanism in Egypt.

Just think of, Isaiah back in the 8th century B.C., and Ezekiel back in the 6th century B.C., when Egypt was full of idols and so fertile that it would later become the bread-basket of the Roman Empire, both of these prophets said that “the idols” in “Egypt” would go; as they did with the rise of Mohammedanism in Egypt; and that it would cease to be a powerful nation as it would no longer be lush; and that’s exactly what’s happened. You see, good brethren, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it’s accurate; it’s reliable; it’s true.* [pause]

But that’s not all. Anyone who knows anything about Egyptian history, knows how important the royal dynasties of the Pharaoh’s were. But in Ezekiel 30:13, we read, “there shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt.” Now when this was written in the 6th century B.C., the proposition that Egypt, *the land of the Pharaohs*, would cease to have a royal household of Pharaohs, would have been something that the Bible critics would have laughed at loudly. “Oh!” “Absolutely inconceivable!,” “ha, ha, ha;” they would no doubt have said. But in the words of John 10:35, “The Scripture cannot be broken;” and indeed, the last Pharaoh of Egypt was Nectanabo II of the 30th Dynasty, who reigned from 360 to 343 B.C., until the Medo-Persian Empire’s king, Artaxerxes III, swept down into Egypt. And thus ended the great dynastic line of Pharaohs. In the words of Ezekiel 30:13, “there shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt.”

And not only that, but Egypt, a great and powerful nation, was to be brought low, for Ezekiel 29:15 says, “they shall be there a base kingdom. It shall be the basest of the kingdoms; neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations: for I will diminish them, that they shall no more rule over the nations.” And that has also been fulfilled, since Egypt has long since ceased to be a world super-power.

Now just think of it. Egypt a great and powerful nation. A superpower, with a long dynastic line of Pharaohs. Fertile and lush. Full of idols. And God says in Joel 3:19, “Egypt shall be a desolation.” God says through Isaiah in the 8th century B.C., and Ezekiel in the 6th century B.C., that the idols would go from Egypt, as they did under Mohammedanism; and that the great dynastic line of Pharaohs would cease, and “there shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt,” as occurred following the last Pharaoh from 343 B.C.; that Egypt would cease to be a world super-power and become one of “the basest of the kingdoms,” one which would no longer “exalt itself” “above” and “rule over the nations,” which thing also happened; and that due to drought, fulfilled in desertification, Egypt would no longer be a lush land. *What amazing specificity! What staggering claims to make about Egypt at the time they were made! And what amazing fulfilments of Biblical prophecy these prophecies on Egypt are!*

To be sure, good brethren, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it’s accurate; it’s reliable, it’s true.* This Book, the Bible, comes from a God who cannot lie; the God who in the words of Isaiah 46:9 & 10 says, “Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me. Declaring the end from

the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.” [pause]

Having now considered the amazingly accurate fulfilments of Bible prophecies with regard to Tyre, Sidon, Samaria, and Egypt, I now wish to return to a verse we referred to at the beginning of this sermon, Matthew 11:21, and add to it verse 22, that’s the Gospel according to St. Matthew [pause], chapter 11 [pause], and verses 21 and 22 [pause]. Here our Lord says, “Woe unto thee Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida! For if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment than for you.”

You see, good brethren, the same God who prophesied in this Infallible Book the destruction of such prosperous cities as Tyre and Sidon, has likewise prophesied of the Day of Final Judgement, with the Second Coming of Christ. And even as men foolishly and stupidly mocked the Bible prophets with their prophecies of the judgment and destruction of flourishing cities such as Tyre and Sidon, so likewise today they foolishly and stupidly mock the Bible prophets with their prophecies of the Final Judgement and destruction of this world at the Second Coming of our Blessed Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. *But If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it’s accurate; it’s reliable; it’s true.* The Lord will return. He will raise the dead and he will judge all peoples.

And only those who have been brought under conviction of their sins and repented of them, exercising saving faith in Jesus Christ, who died in our place, and on our behalf, for our sins, and who rose again the third day; only such persons will pass through the judgement. Our sins, as isolated through the Ten Commandments of Exodus chapter 20, include for example, the denial of the Lord’s place as the only God, for he says in the First Commandment, “Thou shalt have no other gods before me.” But alas, people deny the true and living God, in many ways, not the least, by denying the absolute authority of this Book [**hold up Bible**], the Holy Bible. And then there’s the Second Commandment, “Thou shalt not make, bow down to, nor serve,” “any graven image”. Different men have different idols. For some they are literal idols, such as the heathen idols of Buddhism or Hinduism; or those of some apostate form of Christianity, such as in Popery the statues of Mary that the Roman Catholics venerate. For others they are idols of lust, such as money or materialism, Matthew 6:24; or gluttony with the “god” of the “belly,” Philippians 3:19; or some other lust which is the focus, and therefore the god of their life, Colossians 3:5, for example, drunkenness, Galatians 5:21, or fornication, Galatians 5:19, or “love” of “the world,” I John 2:15 for example, what I shall generically call, “Big Beat Popular Music,” that is, rock’n’roll, pop, metal or heavy metal, R & B, Rap or Hip Hop, and Punk, and their associated so called, “rock idols” and other Big Beat Popular music “idols.”

But whatever the sins are that stand between a man and God, he must, by the grace of God, turn and repent of them, accepting Jesus Christ as his only Saviour and Lord, or else he will perish in the pits of hell. We read in Ephesians 2:8,9, that’s the Book of Ephesians [pause], chapter 2 [pause], verses 8 and 9 [pause], “For by grace are

ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God not of works, lest any man should boast.” “Grace” is the unmerited favour of God. He offers us eternal life on the basis of what Christ accomplished at Calvary. For we read in the words that John the Baptist said about Christ in John 1:29, that’s the Gospel according to St. John [pause], chapter 1 [pause], and verse 29 [pause], referring to Christ, “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.”

And we further read in John 5:28,29, that’s the words of Jesus in the Gospel according to St. John [pause], chapter 5 [pause], and verses 28 and 29 [pause], starting in the middle of verse 28, “For the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice,” that is, Christ’s voice, “And shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.” So Christ here foretells of two resurrections. One “the resurrection of life;” the other, “the resurrection of damnation.”

And this prophecy of the Final Judgement is as sure as the prophecy of judgment on the ancient cities and nations we have considered today. And so it is that I return again to the words of Christ in Matthew 11:21 & 22, that’s the Gospel according to St. Matthew, chapter 11, and verses 21 and 22, where our Lord says, “Woe unto thee Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida! For if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment than for you.” [pause]

Let us pray.

“O Lord, our heavenly Father, high and mighty, King of Kings, Lord of Lords, we repent of our sins, such as any lack of faith we have had in thee or thy holy Word; we repent of any idolatry, or any other sins found in the Ten Commandments. We thank thee that thou hast given us this Holy Book, the Bible; and thou hast given us prophecies such as these prophecies of Tyre, Sidon, Samaria, and Egypt, written before the things in them came to pass, so that when they came to pass, we might believe in thee as the God who inspired this holy book, the Bible. We thank thee that in this Book, thou hast also told us why it be that men should rebel against thee, for ‘sin lieth at the door,’ and over our ‘wicked’ ‘hearts’ it doth rule yet more and more. We acknowledge before thee that though our sins be as scarlet, yet thou canst make them to be as white as snow; and though they be red like crimson, yet thou canst make them to be as wool. Like Moses who esteemed ‘the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt,’ we choose, by thy grace, to be made righteousness ‘by faith’ on the basis of Christ’s atoning death at Calvary. Though for our sins we be worthy of thy judgement and destruction in the pits of hell, even as thou didst judge Tyre and Sidon, Samaria, and Egypt; yet we seek thy mercy for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom thou didst send into the world for our redemption, that by his blood he should be a propitiation for our sins when thou didst lay upon him the sins of the world, and he did suffer, and bleed, and die for us. And so for his merit, and not ours, we ask that thou dost forgive us all our sins, renewing us by the power of the Holy Ghost, giving us by thy grace new hearts, and taking from us any

stony hearts that we may have. Save us, O Lord, by the blood of the Lamb, for in Christ do we trust, and in Christ alone; for he is our only Saviour, he is our only redeemer, he is our only mediator, so that by the faith alone that thou dost give us, we accept the gift of eternal life that by grace alone thou dost give us, and this we do through thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.”

Sermon audio: www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible

Title: Biblical Apologetics 1/4: OT prophecies on cities and nations.

Bible Texts: Ezekiel 26:3; Matthew 11:21.

Brief Overview: This is the first of four addresses delivered in July 2010 on the topic of Biblical Apologetics. The first three sermons deal with Old Testament prophecies remarkably fulfilled, and the fourth sermon deals with Biblical Archaeology. In this first sermon, Gavin deals with some amazing Old Testament prophecies on 1) Tyre, 2) Sidon, 3) Samaria, & 4) Egypt. For example, Which sin found in the Ten Commandments of Exodus 20, did the prophet Ezekiel isolate as a major sin of Egypt? Why did Egypt which in ancient times was so lush that it was known as “the bread basket” of the Roman Empire, then experience the Bible prophesied judgement of God leading to its desertification? The theme of this address is, “If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it’s accurate; it’s reliable; it’s true.” The sermon ends with a prayer of repentance and belief in the Biblical Christ of religiously conservative Protestant Christianity.

Keywords: Apologetics Archaeology Bible Prophecy King James Version

Four Prayer Meeting Apologetic Sermons in July 2010

“If the Bible says it, you can believe it: OT prophecies on cities and nations – Part 2 of 4 Biblical Apologetics sermons.”

Mangrove Mtn Union Church: Thursday 8 July, 2010: 1) Babylon; 2) the Philistines; & 3) Ninevah¹⁴⁵.

¹⁴⁵ See e.g., McDowell, J., *Evidence That Demands A Verdict*, A Campus Crusade for Christ Book, Here’s Life Publishers, 1972, San Bernardino, California, USA, Revised Edition, 1979, pp. 302-9 (Babylon, Isa. 13:19-22; 14:23; Jer. 51:26,43); pp. 283-287 (Gaza & Ashkelon, Jer. 47:5; Amos 1:8; Zeph. 2:4,6,7); & Ramm, B., *Protestant Christian Evidences*, Moody Press, Chicago, USA, 1953, reprint 1978, 102 (Amos 1:6-8, Gaza) & 107-108 (Ninevah, Nahum 1:8,10; 2:6; 3:3,11). Both McDowell’s and Ramm’s books contain errors in various parts, and beyond these books I here cite, both have been involved in promoting various errors e.g., the ecumenical compromise. Nevertheless, I think we should give credit where credit is due, and the pages I refer to in these works, as well as some other portions of these two books, contain some valuable information.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. *Let us pray.* “O God the Father of heaven: have mercy upon us miserable sinners. O God the Son, Redeemer of the world: have mercy upon us miserable sinners. O God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son: have mercy upon us miserable sinners. O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three Persons and one God: have mercy upon us miserable sinners. From all blindness of heart, Good Lord, deliver us. From all hardness of heart, and contempt of thy Word and commandment, Good Lord, deliver us. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen*¹⁴⁶.”

Welcome to all listening to this address. Now this is the second of four Biblical apologetics sermons in midweek prayer meeting addresses held on consecutive Thursdays this month. There’s a trilogy on Old Testament prophecy, with a fourth and final sermon on Biblical Archaeology. Today we’ll be considering three groups of prophecies, the first on Babylon, the second on the Philistines, and the third on Ninevah.

So the first city we’ll be looking at today is Babylon. And what a magnificent city it was! When I visited the Pergamon Museum in Berlin, Germany, in April 2004, I saw there the Ishtar Gate that the museum had brought over from ancient Babylon. It had a background blue brick, and then in gold different animals, some real, some mythical. For example, on one section of this ancient Babylonian wall, I saw a number of golden lions one after the other. That was of some particular interest, because in the Book of Daniel, chapter 2, Daniel describes a prophetic statue in which Babylon is depicted as with “head of gold,” and in Daniel 7:4, he then describes Babylon in another prophecy as being “like a lion.” And so perhaps this Babylonian wall that comes to us from Biblical archaeology helps us to better understand some of this Biblical imagery.

And so because of its great magnificence, Babylon is described in Dan. 2:38 as a city [quote] “of gold” [unquote]. And other prophets used that same imagery of Babylon. Turn with me in your King James Versions to the Book of Jeremiah, known in the New Testament as Jeremy; that’s Jeremiah or Jeremy 51:7. And here we read at Jeremiah 51:7, “Babylon hath been a *golden* cup in the Lord’s hand.” Note there this usage of “golden.” And turn back from Jeremiah in your Authorized Versions, to one prophet earlier, to the Book of Isaiah, known in the New Testament as Esaias; that’s Isaiah or Esaias 14:4. And Isaiah 14:4 says, “take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and say, How hath the oppressor ceased! The *golden* city ceased!” So the Old Testaments prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Daniel, all refer to Babylon as being “golden” or made of “gold.” Why? Because gold is a most precious and valuable stone, and Babylon was a very wealthy, prosperous, and powerful city. Indeed, it was at the head of an Empire, the Great Neo-Babylonian Empire which came onto the scene in the Middle East in the late 7th century B.C. .

To put it in modern terminology, Babylon was that world’s super-power. Or to put it in more traditional terms, Babylon was at the head of a great world empire. The vast Babylonian Empire stretched from the Persian Gulf, up north inside and outside the

¹⁴⁶ Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), Litany & Collect selections.

region of the great Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, in the area sometimes called, Mesopotamia - which is the place where the two rivers flow, up into Carchemish and the area of south-east Turkey, and then down south onto the coastal regions of the Mediterranean Sea, going through the region of Syria, with its capital of Damascus, going further down south through Israel, Ammon, Jordan, Gaza, and into Edom on the Horn of Africa [correction, not 'Horn of Africa' but 'Arabian Peninsula']. So it was big. Real big, and real powerful!

And so if somebody said something like, "God will destroy this great Babylon," they'd have been regarded by most people as pretty silly. It'd be sought of like saying today, that God was going to destroy the super power of the United States of America, and turn it into a dunghill. Most people just wouldn't take it seriously, because ancient Babylon was like the modern United States of America, it was the world's super power, and as far as most people in it were concerned, it was invincible.

Well guess what guys, the destruction of this great "golden city," this great Babylon, is just exactly what the Bible prophets said was gonna' happen. Turn with me if you will in your King James Bibles to Isaiah chapter 13 and verses 19 and 20; that Isaiah 13, starting at verse 19, "And Babylon, the glory of the kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation: neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall the shepherds make their fold there." Well that's a pretty specific prophecy. In Genesis 18 & 19 we read that God destroyed the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah because their inhabitants were what I Timothy 1:10 calls, "them that defile themselves with mankind," in reference to the defilement of Leviticus chapter 18 and verses 22 and 24. They were what I Corinthians 6:9 calls "abusers of themselves with mankind," in reference to the sexual abuse referred to in Romans chapter 1 and verses 26 and 27. And then we here read in Isaiah 13:19 that "Babylon" will be overthrown, and "shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah."

Furthermore, if you turn with me to the next book of the Bible, the Book of Jeremiah, chapter 51, that's Jeremiah 51 and verse 37, "And Babylon shall become heaps, a dwelling place for dragons, astonishment, and an hissing, without an inhabitant." Now with regard to the first part of this prophecy in verse 37, we will not today be spending much time on the Biblical teaching about "dragons" which is obscured and taken out of Scripture in the modern translations, but which is correctly recognized in various passages in our much more accurate Authorized Versions of 1611. But it will suffice for our purposes today, to simply note that sometimes the Bible uses the term "dragon" to allow both a temporal and spiritual application. For example, in Psalm 91:13, to "trample" "the dragon" "under" one's "feet," refers to both a temporal application if accidentally treading on snakes for which we find a relevant type of example in Acts 28:3-6, where St. Paul picked up "a bundle of sticks" and there was "a viper" in the woodpile; and it also has a spiritual application to overcoming the Devil, for which we find a relevant type of example in Romans 16:20, where St. Paul says, "And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet."

And so here in Jeremiah 51:37, the words “a dwelling place for dragons,” means on the temporal application, that certain animals will be living there; and bearing in mind that in Revelation 12 the Devil is called a “dragon,” on the spiritual application the words of Jeremiah 51:37, “a dwelling place for dragons,” means it will be a haunt of devils. And since we’re told in the New Testament in Revelation 18:2 that “Babylon” “is become the habitation of devils;” and in Revelation 17:5 & 9 that “Babylon” refers to the seven hills of Rome; this further means that while ancient Babylon became for a limited period of time the haunt of “dragons” in the sense of devils, that this is a prophetic type pointing forward to the fact that Rome was to become the spiritual Babylon which in the words of Revelation 18:2 “is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit.” And so for our purposes here today, the significant thing is that “dragons” here in Jeremiah 51:37 refers to a non-human presence of both animals and devils, in contrast with the second part of the prophecy in Jeremiah 51:37, which says it shall be “without an inhabitant,” meaning without a *human* inhabitant. And this point of Jeremiah 51:37, that Babylon is to be without human inhabitant, is the same thing that’s said in Isa. 13:19 & 20 where we read, “Babylon” “shall never be inhabited.”

Now these prophecies, given by Isaiah in the 8th century B.C., and Jeremiah in the 7th to 6th centuries B.C., have been remarkably fulfilled. Concerning the words of Isaiah 13:19, that “Babylon, the glory of the kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees’ excellency, shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah;” it is notable that Babylon was so thoroughly overthrown, that until the 19th century, our knowledge of it was based exclusively on the Bible and a small number of ancient writers. It was only after the discovery of ancient Babylonian monuments, and the decipherment of the cuneiform script, that further knowledge about Babylon came to light.

And in a more immediate fulfillment of these words of Isaiah 13:19, in 539 B.C. Babylon fell to the Medo-Persian Emperor, Cyrus; and it was further plundered in the later 4th century B.C. by the Grecian Emperor, Alexander the Great. Then under Alexander the Great’s successors, the area of Babylon quickly became a desert region. And so were fulfilled the words of Isaiah 13:19, that “Babylon” “shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah.”

But we further read in Jeremiah 51:37 that it shall be “without an inhabitant;” and likewise in Isaiah 13:20, that “It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation: neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall the shepherds make their fold there.”

Well the fact that it was to be “without an inhabitant,” has already been referred to by virtue of the fact that until the 19th century, nobody knew anything about it except from the Bible and a few ancient sources. It was an unknown and uninhabited place. Even now, some 45 miles or 70 kilometers south of modern Bagdad in Iraq, the inner part of the old city of Babylon lies desolate in sand-swept ruins, dolled up a bit for the tourists, and frequented only by those connected with archeology or tourism. And so it is, that in fulfillment of Isaiah 13:20, “the Arabian” does not “pitch tent there; neither” do

“the shepherds make their fold” in this desolate place.

You see, good brethren, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it's accurate; it's reliable; it's true.* God says in Isaiah 46:9 & 10, “Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me. Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.” God said these things of the once great Babylon, the capital city of the ancient and splendid Babylonian Empire, and they all came to fulfilment. You see, *the Bible is not an ordinary book. The Bible is God's Divinely Inspired and Divinely Preserved Book. So if the Bible says it, you can believe it; it's accurate; it's reliable; it's true.* [pause]

And that brings us now to the second groups of prophecies that we're looking at today, those on the Philistines. And of the two books I've found particularly valuable and containing some very useful information, but with which one must exercise some care and caution, since they both contain some errors, namely, Josh McDowell's *Evidence That Demands a Verdict*, and Bernard Ramm's, *Protestant Christian Evidences*; of these two books I would have to say that Bernard Ramm is a lot better on the real meaning of the Philistine prophecies than is Josh McDowell. So we must use these type of sources cautiously and critically, because only the Bible is infallible.

Now before considering these prophecies about the Philistines; I perhaps should mention that the Philistines came from a place called “Caphtor” which possibly was the Island of “Crete.” Turn with me in your King James Bibles to the Old Testament prophet of Ezekiel, chapter 25 and verse 16. That's Ezekiel, 25, verse 16. And here from a prophecy in the 6th century B.C., we read, “Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will stretch out mine hand upon the Philistines, and I will cut off the Cherethims and destroy the remnant of the sea coast.” And I should explain here that “the Cherethims” also known as the “Cherethites,” are a group that we're told in I Samuel 30:14 lived in the south of Israel, broadly speaking somewhere on the coast in the general area that's to the west of the Dead Sea.

The Philistines established a pentapolis, from the Greek word “pente” meaning “five,” and “polis” meaning “city,” this pentapolis meaning “five cities,” consisted of the major cities of Ashkelon, Gaza, Ashdod, Ekron, and Gath. Hence in our focus on the Philistines, in part we'll be considering some of the main Philistine cities of this pentapolis, like Gaza and Ashkelon. And so the prophecies that we consider on the destruction of Gaza and Ashkelon, are contextually referring to the destruction of the Philistines in these cities.

If you turn in your Authorized Versions to the Book of Jeremiah chapter 47 and verse 5, that's Jeremiah 47:5, we read here in the AV with respect to two of the cities of the Philistine pentapolis, the words of Jeremiah spoken in the 6th century B.C., “Baldness is come upon Gaza; Ashkelon is cut off with the remnant of their valley: how long wilt thou cut thyself?”

And if you turn now from Jeremiah in the Major Prophets, from Jeremiah who is one of the four Major Prophets, to the end part of the Old Testament containing the Twelve Minor Prophets, then over in the Minor Prophets if you turn to the Book of Amos, that's the Book of Amos after Joel and before Obadiah, the Book of Amos, chapter 1, and verses 6-8. The Book of Amos was written in the mid 8th century B.C. . And we read here with respect to four of the cities of the Philistine pentapolis, and indeed with respect to all of the Philistines, in Amos 1:6-8, "Thus saith the Lord: For three transgression of Gaza, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof: because they carried captive the whole captivity, to deliver them up to Edom: but I will send a fire on the wall of Gaza, which shall devour the palaces thereof: and I will cut off the inhabitant from Ashdod, and him that holdeth the sceptre from Ashkelon, and I will turn mine hand against Ekron: and the remnant of the Philistines shall perish, saith the Lord God." - And of course, that statement that "the remnant of the Philistines shall perish" is inclusive of *all* the Philistines.

Now keep turning in the Minor Prophets over to the Book of Zephaniah written in the late 7th century B.C. . That's the Book of Zephaniah which comes after the Book of Habakkuk, and before the Book of Haggai. That's the Old Testament Minor Prophet of Zephaniah, chapter 2, and reading verses 4 to 7. That's Zephaniah 2:4-7, "For Gaza shall be forsaken, and Ashkelon desolation: they shall drive out Ashdod at the noon day, and Ekron shall be rooted up. Woe unto the inhabitants of the sea coast, the nation of the Cherethites! The word of the Lord is against you; O Canaan, *the land of the Philistines*, I will destroy even thee, that there shall be *no inhabitant*. And the sea coast shall be dwellings and cottages for shepherds, and folds for flocks. And the coast shall be for the remnant of the house of Judah; they shall feed thereupon: in the houses of Ashkelon shall they lie down in the evening: for the Lord their God shall visit them, and turn away their captivity."

Now turn in your Bibles to the Historical Books of the Old Testament, that's Joshua, Judges, Ruth, I Samuel, II Samuel, I Kings, II Kings, I Chronicles, II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. And these Historical Books come after the Pentateuch of Genesis to Deuteronomy and before the Poetical Books of Job to the Song of Solomon. So that inside the Historical Books of the Old Testament, if you turn to the Second Book of Kings, that's II Kings, which comes after I Kings, and before I Chronicles; the Second Book of Kings, chapter 18 and verses 1 and 8. That's II Kings 18:1 & 8, and here we read of Hezekiah who reigned in the latter part of the 8th century and earlier part of the 7th century B.C., and so some time after the prophecy of Amos 1:6-8; we read in II Kings 18:1 & 8, "Now it came to pass in the third year of Hoshea son of Elah king of Israel, that Hezekiah the son of Ahaz king of Judah began to reign;" and verse 8, "He smote the Philistines, even unto Gaza, and the borders thereof, from the tower to the watchmen to the fenced city."

And so we here see in II Kings 18:8, the beginning of the fulfillment of these prophecies. Now this fulfillment of II Kings 18:8 came in time before the prophecies of Jeremiah 47:5 and Zephaniah 2:4-7 that we've look at; but it came in time after the prophecy of Amos 1:6-8 that we looked at; and so therefore we here find in this historical

book of the Old Testament, what in fact is the beginning of the fulfillment of the Biblical prophecies, that God would destroy the Philistines. For Hezekiah we here read in II Kings 18:8, “smote the Philistines, even unto Gaza, and the borders thereof.”

For in completion of this earlier prophecy of Amos 1:6-8, and also the later prophecies of Jeremiah 47:5 and Zephaniah 2:4-7, further destruction was wrought against the Philistines. The late 8th century B.C. Assyrian king of Ninevah, Sennacherib, referred to in, for example, II Kings 18:13, also came against the Philistines. So too did the Egyptian king, Psammetichus I who stormed Philistia in 655 B.C.; and his son, the late 7th and early 6th century B.C. Egyptian king, Pharaoh-Necho II, who is referred to in, for example, II Kings chapter 23, he also had his troops in this region until they were forced to withdraw by Nebuchadnezzar. And then the late 7th and early 6th century king of the Babylonians, Nebuchadnezzar who is mentioned in, for example, Daniel 1:1, he came into Philistia; and the 4th century B.C. leader of the Grecian Empire, Alexander the Great, whose rise to world prominence had been prophesied in the 6th century B.C. by the Old Testament Major Prophet, Daniel in the Book of Daniel chapter 8 verses 8 and 21. And after these attacks on the Philistines by the Jewish king Hezekiah, the Assyrian king Sennacherib, the Egyptian king Psammetichus I, the Egyptian king Pharaoh-Necho II, and the Grecian king Alexander the Great; there were some further attacks by the Jewish Hasmoneans in the 2nd century B.C., in fulfillment of the words of Zephaniah 2:7, “the remnant of the house of Judah,” “shall feed thereupon in the houses of Ashkelon,” and “shall” “lie down in the evening: for the Lord their God shall visit them and turn away their captivity.”

And so in accordance with Biblical prophecy, the Philistines’ strong cities were destroyed, and their inhabitants slain, by the Jews under Hezekiah, by the Assyrians, by the Babylonians, by the Egyptians, by the Grecians, and finally by the Jewish Maccabean Hasmoneans in the 2nd century B.C., who finally reduced the Philistines and dwelt in their lands.

And note also the words of prophecy in Jeremiah 47:5, that “baldness is come upon Gaza.” Note the particularity of these words. For this statement, that “baldness is come upon Gaza” is of some special interest. For to this day, old Gaza lies buried under sand dunes. It should not be confused with modern Gaza or new Gaza which is 3 kilometres or 2 miles further from the shore. Since old Gaza is covered with sand-hills rather than grass, it is truly accurate to say that in the words of Jeremiah 47:5, that “baldness is come upon Gaza.”

And I also draw your further attention to the words of Ezekiel 25:16, “Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will stretch out mine hand upon the Philistines, and I will cut off the Cherethims and destroy the remnant of the sea coast.” And Amos 1:8, “I will cut off the inhabitant from Ashdod, and him that holdeth the sceptre from Ashkelon, and I will turn mine hand against Ekron: and the remnant of the Philistines shall perish, saith the Lord God.” And of course this race of Philistines, who are thought by some to have originated in Crete, this entire race of Philistines has disappeared from the face of the earth. There are no Philistines left today. In fact, one of the reasons why their origins

are disputed, is that no-one even knows what language they spoke, because no Philistine documents have survived. Think of it when these prophecies were spoken and written by the Bible prophets, the Philistines were a powerful people who had built up the Philistine Pentapolis. But God in the Bible said in Ezekiel 25:16 that he would “destroy the” Philistine “remnant of the sea coast;” and of this race he said in Amos 1:8, “the remnant of the Philistines shall perish, saith the Lord God.” And so thoroughly have these prophecies been fulfilled, that no-body even knows what language the Philistines spoke. Which is why some people think they came from Crete, but others don’t.

THESE PROPHECIES ABOUT THE DESTRUCTION OF THE PHILISTINES HAVE BEEN MOST ACCURATELY FULFILLED. Although at the time they were written the Philistines were a strong and dangerous foe of the Israelites; in accordance with Ezekiel’s and Amos’s prophecies, they were “cut off” and “the remnant of the Philistines” did “perish.” THIS DESTRUCTION IS SO COMPLETE, THAT THERE’S NOT ONLY NO *PHILISTINE* “INHABITANT” IN CANAAN, THERE’S NO PHILISTINE ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD¹⁴⁷. The Philistines are an extinct race and a dead culture. Truly, both they and their pentapolis have been destroyed!

And so once again we find, that *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it’s accurate; it’s reliable; it’s true.* Once again, we find that’s the message that comes through loud and clear from these wonderfully fulfilled Bible prophecies about the Philistines. [pause]

And this now brings us to the third group of prophecies we’re looking at today, namely, those of ancient Nineveh.

Before we do that, let me say that I thank God for having made some five trips to London, and having lived there for a total of about 3½ years in various periods of about 6 or 12 months each, during which I’ve worked as a school teacher in London. My first trip to London was for 12 months from April 2001 to 2002. I was living at Croydon which is in the south of London or what’s sometimes called, Greater London, and it took me 1 to 2 weeks to set up my lodgings there at West Croydon. But finally, on a weekend in the merry month of May, which by the old tradition starts with merriment on the 1st of May with May Day, and ends with merriment on 29 May with Royal Oak Day or Charles II’s Day, the king known as “the merry monarch;” in I say this, the “very merry month of May” when the warmer weather comes to England, I finally, by the grace of God, got into the heart of inner London to have a look-see at some places of interest to me.

And walking around the streets of inner London in the merry month of May, among other things I saw the big marble entrance gate to Hyde Park and in some parts of that park a monument to World War One “Cavalry” that included a section on “Australia;” and I also saw Buckingham Palace, which is the residence of the monarch, Queen Elizabeth the Second, Queen of the United Kingdom, Queen of Australia,

¹⁴⁷ George Davis, *Bible Prophecies Fulfilled Today*, (1931), p. 46; in McDowell, Vol. 1, p. 284.

Supreme Governor of the Church of England, and at the time there were some beautiful red flowers blossoming in front of Buckingham Palace. I kept walking, and I came to the outside of Westminster Abbey, and Westminster Parliament with the famous Tower of Big Ben clock and connected Westminster Hall; from where I crossed over the beautiful Thames River on the Westminster Bridge in order to look back at the Westminster Parliament and also to look down river at the nearby London Eye Ferris wheel.

It was a very exciting time for me, and I still remember the great excitement I felt when, for example, I first saw Westminster Abbey and the Tower of Big Ben. I then returned over Westminster Bridge which by tradition is painted green because in the olden days that's how Members of the lower house, the House of Commons, got to Westminster Parliament, and green is the colour used in the Commons; in distinction to red which is the colour used in the House of Lords, and the next bridge along, Lambeth Bridge, is traditionally painted red because in the olden days that's how Members of the upper house, the House of Lords got to Westminster Parliament, for example, the *Church of England's* Archbishop of Canterbury by virtue of office is a Member of the Lords, and he could come across on the red bridge from his residence in the nearby Lambeth Palace.

Now as I came back over Westminster Bridge, I came to a small church in the grounds of Westminster Abbey, known as St. Margaret's Church. This beautiful looking Anglican Church building was consecrated in the 16th century under King Henry the Eighth, the king who broke with Rome in the early stages of the English and Irish Reformation; and this same church of St. Margaret's, since 1614 in the time of King James of the King James Bible, has been the church of the House of Commons. Inside St. Margaret's I saw a marble stone with the epitaph of a man who had died in 1894. Part of this epitaph read, [quote] "I pray you remember Henry Austen Layard ... Discoverer of Nineveh" [unquote]. And later in this sermon I shall return to the words of this epitaph, "I pray you remember Henry Austen Layard ... Discoverer of Nineveh."

Turn with me, if you will, in your Authorized King James Versions of the Bible, to the Old Testament Book of Nahum, that's Nahum in the Minor Prophets - which are the twelve prophets with short or minor length books at the end of the Old Testament. Nahum chapter 1 and verse 1, "The burden of Nineveh." You see, this whole Book of Nahum is a prophecy about Nineveh's destruction, but like the other prophecies we're looking at in this series of mid-week prayer meetings, I'm just selecting some of the relevant prophecies. But if you want to pursue it in further detail, then you'll find a lot more in the Bible than I'm covering, not just on Nineveh, but on some of these other places also.

Now come down to verse 8, of chapter 1 in Nahum, "But with an overrunning flood he will make an utter end of the place thereof." So this is a prediction that Nineveh would be destroyed by a flood of waters. Some Bible critics have said that this can't be right, because the Tigris and Khosr rivers are too far away from Nineveh to ever be flooded by it. But importantly, we know that the season of heavy rainfall in Nineveh is usually in March, with the rivers of the area attaining their greatest height in April or

May. And in describing the excavations at Nineveh, George Percy Badger, cited in Josh McDowell's 1979 book, *Evidence That Demands a Verdict*, records that a flood [quote] "stratum of pebble and sand ... has been found a few feet below the surface" [unquote]. And that fact certainly proves that this region could be flooded, whether or not that stratum was from this or another inundation of water.

And let me just say, good brethren, that only the Bible is without error. So when we read another book, we need to be able to pick out the good parts, and benefit from them, while simultaneously being able to reject the bad parts that are unorthodox or wrong. We need to be able to sift the gold from the dross. In this context, I say that Josh McDowell's 1979 revised 1972 book, *Evidence That Demands a Verdict*, together with his 1975 sequel, *More Evidence That Demands a Verdict*, and Bernard Ramm's 1953 book, *Protestant Christian Evidences*, of which I have a 1978 reprint by Moody Press in Chicago, USA; are books that have been in my library for about 30 years. Both men's books contains some errors, for example, I wouldn't agree with McDowell's prophetic views on the modern state of Israel because I would say that the Christian Church is Israel now, for instance, Galatians 3:29 says, "if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise;" and the prophetic fulfillment in the Christian Church in connection with the Second Advent is found in, for instance, Revelation 21:2, where St. John the Divine sees "the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband."

Moreover, both McDowell and Ramm are writers who hold some unorthodox opinions. For example, contrary to Galatians 1:8 & 9 and 3:11 both Josh McDowell and Bernard Ramm have been sullied by the ecumenical compromise with Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox¹⁴⁸, both of whom are apostate Christian Churches. Both Roman

¹⁴⁸ E.g., in Josh McDowell & Don Stewart's *Handbook of Today's Religions* (Campus Crusade for Christ, USA, 1983, Thomas Nelson Publishers, Nashville, Tennessee, USA), we read the claim, "While there is some doctrinal disagreement within the three branches of Christendom – Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox and Protestant – there is a general agreement among them as to the essentials of the faith" (p. 26, emphasis mine). This is contextually said in a chapter entitled "The Beliefs of Orthodox Christianity" (pp. 26-40), so that Roman Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, and Protestants, are all regarded as representing "orthodox Christianity." Ramm's *Protestant Christian Evidences*, 1953, Moody Press, Chicago, USA, 1978, e.g., pp. 31 (endorses the "Evangelist Billy Graham," b. 1918), 225 (lacks requisite qualification in referring to, "the major traditions of Christian theology – Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Protestant, ... Calvinistic, and Arminian"), 238 (lacks requisite qualification in saying, "some of our keenest thinkers in ethics were outright Christians, as ... [Roman Catholic, Thomas] Aquinas ..."); 234 (reference to "the unusually powerful influence of the Bible on such great personalities as ... ["Saint" Francis] Xavier ...," a 16th century founding / early member of the Popish Jesuits, who exhibited Satanic miracles as part of his promotion of Popery, II Thess. 2:9); & 8,21,35,73,78,166 (usage of the term "Catholic" for "Roman Catholic" means he helps bolster the false claims of Romanism that the Pope is head of the *universal* or *catholic* church of e.g., the Nicene Creed). In later works,

Catholics and Eastern Orthodox deny the Galatians 1:7 and 3:11 “gospel” of “grace,” which says, “The just shall live by faith,” and so in the words of Galatians 1:8, both are “accursed.” And both Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox endorse idolatry with Mary and “Saints” in the form of Roman Catholic statues or Eastern Orthodox icons which they idolatrously venerate. And they further commit a species of witchcraft, for the Bible prohibits any attempt to communicate with the dead in Deuteronomy 18:10 & 11, and we’re told in I Samuel 28 of how the Witch of Endor sought to communicate with the dead Saul. And so it is, that also contrary to I Timothy 2:5, Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox engage in the invocation of saints, purportedly praying to “Saints” in conjunction with their idolatrous statues or icons of “Saints.” Hence in the words of Galatians 5:20 & 21, with others who commit “idolatry” and “witchcraft,” they “shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” [pause] And to the questions: Why is it that neither Roman Catholics nor Eastern Orthodox believe in the *sola fide* or “faith alone,” *sola gratia* or “grace alone,” and *solo Christo* or “Christ alone” of the Reformation? And, Why is it that contrary to Romans 4:2 & 20 which says, “if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God,” for he “was strong in faith, giving glory to God;” and Isaiah 42:8, “I am the Lord: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images;” why, contrary to such Scriptures, do the Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox deny what the Reformation called in the Latin tongue, *Soli Deo Gloria*, or in the English tongue, “Glory to God alone”? The answer is that neither Roman Catholics nor Eastern Orthodox submit to the *sola Scriptura* or “Scripture alone” of the Reformation. [pause]

It’s also the case that after his book, *Protestant Christian Evidences*, Bernard Ramm wrote a number of subsequent books whose standard went from bad to worse; so that this earlier 1953 book is the only one that’s generally okay, notwithstanding some problems with it. So the good Christian reader should exercise care and caution with both Josh McDowell and Bernard Ramm and these books I’ve mentioned. But for all that, in broad general overview I’ve found these three books to contain some very useful Biblical apologetics material. And certainly both authors are spot on and correct, when they see that the destruction of Nineveh was clearly prophesied in the Bible before the event, and then fulfilled in accordance with Bible prophecy.

Now we know that Nineveh was destroyed in 612 B.C. . The father of Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, namely, Nabopolassar, the king of the Chaldeans, made a military alliance with Cyaxares, the king of the Medes, in which they agreed to divide up Assyria. And so as part of this alliance Nineveh was attacked and conquered in 612 B.C.

But there’s another feature of this prophecy of Nahum that I want you to note, and note well. In Nahum 1:14 we read, “now the Lord hath given a commandment concerning thee,” and a bit later in the verse, “out of the house of thy gods will I cut off the graven image and the molten image: I will make thy grave; for thou art vile.” And so we’re here told that because of Nineveh’s *sin of idolatry*, in which contrary to the Second

Ramm developed suchlike further.

Commandment of Exodus chapter 20, men did make, bow down to, and serve, graven images; comparable in type to the modern statues of Buddha used by the heathen Buddhists who bow down to, and offer such things as flowers and incense to the Buddha idol; or the statues of the Shiva idol used by the heathen Hindus; because of this sin of idolatry, God said of Nineveh, “*I will make thy grave; for thou art vile.*” What does, “make thy grave” mean? Well turn to Nahum 3:11, and we there read of Nineveh, “thou shalt be hid.” Now the only natural construction to place on these two verses of Nahum 1:14 and 3:11, is that Nineveh was to be buried as in a “grave” and thus “hid” from view.

And that of course, is exactly what happened. Nineveh lay hid for centuries and centuries, under mounds and mounds of earth. *God had dug its grave!* Indeed, it was so well hid, that no-one knew just exactly where it was. And a good proof of that, is the epitaph that we read earlier from St. Margaret’s Church, “I pray you remember Henry Austen Layard ... Discoverer of Nineveh.” Now while some work on the site of Nineveh dating from the 1820s had preceded Layard’s work there, some of the bigger and more impressive discoveries were made by Layard. Among his archaeological discoveries, between 1845 and 1851 Layard dug down and excavated the Palace of Sennacherib, and took back to England cuneiform tablets from the great library of Ashurbanipal. Sennacherib, whose temple Layard discovered, had made Nineveh a truly magnificent city in about 700 B.C., and then later in the 7th century B.C., Ashurbanipal constructed a new palace and a great royal library. Layard discovered both of them. But it *all* had to be dug up, because Nineveh was so well hid, down in the ground, in a grave, in fulfillment of Nahum 1:14 and 3:11.

But there’s another prophecy about Nineveh that I want to look at now. Turn with me in your Authorized Versions of 1611, to the Old Testament prophet Zephaniah. That’s one of the Twelve Minor Prophets, Zephaniah, chapter 2, reading from verse 13 down to verse 15. And referring to God, we read, “And he will stretch out his hand against the north, and destroy Assyria: and will make Nineveh desolation, and dry like a wilderness. And flocks shall lie down in the midst of her, all the beasts of the nations: both the cormorant and the bittern shall lodge in the upper lintels of it: their voice shall sing in the windows; desolation shall be in the thresholds: for he shall uncover the cedar work. This is the rejoicing city that dwelt carelessly, that said in her heart, I am, and there is none beside me: how is she become desolation, a place for beasts to lie down in! Every one that passeth by her shall hiss, and wag his hand.”

We’re here told that the great city of Nineveh, the capital of Assyria, would sink down so low, that it would become the kind of place where, in the words of Zephaniah 2:14, “flocks shall lie down in the midst of her.” And that, my friends, is exactly what has happened. Nineveh today is a place where shepherds lead flocks of sheep, all over the mounds of Nineveh. It’s dotted here, there, and everywhere, by shepherds with their flocks of sheep. And so the words of this prophecy in Zephaniah chapter 2 are remarkably fulfilled in Nineveh to this very day. [pause]

Note then, good brethren, the particularity of Scripture with respect to the ends of the three places we have considered today. Firstly, of Babylon, it was said in Jeremiah

51:37 that it would be “without an inhabitant;” and in Isaiah 13:20, that “It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation: neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall the shepherds make their fold there.” And that is exactly what happened. It became an uninhabited place, one in which in fulfillment of Isaiah 13:20, “the Arabian” does not “pitch tent there; neither” do “the shepherds make their fold” in this desolate place. Secondly, of the Philistines it was said in Zephaniah 2:7, and Ezekiel 25:16; and Amos 1:8; that the Philistines were to have their lands inhabited by the Jewish Maccabean Hasmoneans in the 2nd century B.C.; and to disappear as a race with sand dune “baldness” coming upon old “Gaza;” which again is precisely what happened. Thirdly, of Nineveh, it was said in Nahum 1:14 and 3:11, that Nineveh would be buried as in a “grave” and “hid” from view, which again is what happened, so that Nineveh’s remains had to be excavated by Layard and others as they lay hid, deep in the earth, buried under piles and piles of soil. And it was further said of Nineveh in Zephaniah 2:14, that “flocks shall lie down in the midst of her.” And once again, that is exactly what has happened, since to this day, Nineveh is a place where shepherds lead their sheep, and lay down their flocks.

Three Divine Judgments on three places, all prophesied before the event in the Bible, and all perfectly fulfilled; with three different outcomes foretold, all perfectly fulfilled. Babylon to be “without an inhabitant,” and it is! ... The Philistines to have their lands inhabited by the Jewish Maccabean Hasmoneans in the 2nd century B.C, and they were; and the Philistines to disappear as a race with sand dune “baldness” coming upon old “Gaza,” and that’s what’s happened! Nineveh to be buried as in a “grave” and “hid” from view, and it was; ... and Nineveh to be a place where “flocks shall lie down in the midst,” and it is! Three specific outcomes prophesied to follow the prophesied destruction of three places; all perfectly fulfilled. How would someone know that? How could anybody predict that kind of specificity? You see, the Bible is not an ordinary Book. It’s the Book of Books. It’s God Book. It’s infallible from the first verse of Genesis to the last verse of Revelation. It’s without any error of any kind. It’s the Divinely inspired and Divinely preserved Word of God. *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it’s accurate; it’s reliable; it’s true.* For in the words of Christ himself, spoken in John 10:35, “The Scripture cannot be broken.” No “ifs,” no “buts,” no “maybes.” “The Scripture cannot be broken;” it’s as simple and straightforward, as that! “The Scripture cannot be broken”! [pause]

We earlier read in Isaiah 13:19, “And Babylon” “shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah.” And Jesus referred in Mark 6:11 and 12 to “Sodom and Gomorrah” and “the day of judgment,” and St. Mark tells us the reason for this was to teach “that men should repent.” The word “repent” means to change direction, to do a U-turn in your life, by turning away from sin, by accepting Jesus Christ as your Lord and Saviour, and doing what God says in the Bible. Now as I’ve also mentioned, Nineveh was the Assyrian capital; but I should also mention that some hundreds of years afore the time of these prophecies in Nahum and Zephaniah, the Old Testament prophet Jonah had gone to Nineveh, and they repented under his preaching. But then they later turned against God, and did that which is evil. And that’s the time of these prophecies that we’re looking at today from the Old Testament Books of Nahum and Zephaniah.

And so we find a contrast between Nineveh in Jonah's earlier time, and Nineveh in Nahum and Zephaniah's later time. Thus our Lord says in Matthew 12:41, that's the first Book of the New Testament, the Gospel According to St. Matthew, chapter 12, and verse 41, "The men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas; and, behold, a greater than Jonas is here." "Jonas" of course, is the New Testament form of the Old Testament name of "Jonah." And so Christ here refers to how Nineveh had earlier repented under the preaching of Jonas. You see, people must make a choice, to either repent or to not repent. They choose to be either like the earlier Nineveh under the preaching of Jonah, and repent; or like the later Nineveh under the preaching of Nahum and Zephaniah, and to not repent. But let me just say with respect to those who choose not to repent, that we see in the remains of Nineveh to this very day, how God may *fearfully recompense* in this world those places that he marks out for his judgment and wrath. And if this be what happened to Nineveh, that it be dug down deep like a grave in the ground, to be dug up only in historically modern times; and to this day, it be a place where "flocks" "lie down in the midst of her," if, I say, this be the worldly Divine Judgment on Nineveh's refusal to repent, then "What?" I ask, must be their misery in the pits of hell to this very day? You see, it's a fearful thing to fall into the hands of an angry God. It's a fearful thing, to turn away from the living God, and to not repent of your sins. It's a fearful thing to spurn the blood of Christ's atonement, and then to go down into hell, to burn, and burn, and burn! [pause]

In Nahum 3:1 we read that the murderous and "bloody city" of Nineveh, was "full of lies and robbery;" and in Nahum 1:14, that it was full of idols. With regard to the Ten Commandments of Exodus chapter 20, Nineveh thus violated the first commandment, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;" the second commandment, "Thou shalt not make, bow down to, nor serve," "any graven image;" the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," the eighth commandment, "Thou shalt not steal," and the ninth commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness." And no doubt it violated other commandments of God as well. But then we read in Nahum 1:15, "Behold upon the mountains the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace!"

You see, the gospel of God's grace is just as much an Old Testament teaching, as it is a New Testament teaching. The covenant of grace is an everlasting covenant. It's a covenant inside a covenant, and so it was administered differently in Old Testament times compared with how its been administered since New Testament times, because it's now a covenant inside the new covenant in the blood of Jesus Christ. But the fundamental covenant of grace is the same, one, eternal, covenant. The real solution to the sin problem is that covenant of grace, in which by God's grace, that is, his unmerited favour, he offers reconciliation with himself and salvation on the basis of what Christ has done on Calvary's cross; to those who repenting of their sins, accept by faith the Lordship of the Son of God, as David did in Psalm 110, verse 1, and who accept this gift of eternal life. In the Old Testament, it was a case of looking forward to Calvary through animal sacrifices symbolically pointing forward to this; whereas in the New Testament, it's a case of looking back to Calvary as remembered by, for example, the symbols of the

Lord's Supper. Although the sacrament of Communion also has a forward pointing element in it to the Second Advent, as I Cor. 11:26 tells us that by it we "do shew the Lord's death till he come" at the Second Coming. But though the administration of it is thus different, in both the Old and New Testament it's the same basic "glad tidings" or good news of Nahum 1:15. And the judgment that fell on Nineveh, is a type of the judgment that will fall on all ungodly persons who do not accept the good news or glad tidings of peace, found in the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The Old Testament prophet, Jeremiah, says in Jeremiah 13:23, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." You see, in God's holy sight, your sins, your violations of the Ten Commandments found in Exodus chapter 20, such as taking God's name in vain; or not keeping Sunday sacred; or sexual lust and impurity; or other lust such as gluttony or drunkenness; or your idols of lust such as various sporting idols, or over-focusing on some sports and making it the focus of your spare time and energy, and thus making it an idol; or your telling of lies; or your violations of any of the other commandments you'll there find in Exodus chapter 20, or sins mentioned elsewhere in Scripture; your violation of these commandments, that is, your sins, says God in Jeremiah 13:23, are as black as the skin on a Negro's back. Perhaps your sin is one of those mentioned in Revelation 21:8, the sin of unbelief. For there we read, "But the" "unbelieving" "shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone."

And if unbelief is your sin, then it's a violation of the First Commandment in the Holy Decalogue, "I am the Lord thy God," "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." For in the words of Hebrews 11:6, "But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must first believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." Is your sin then this violation of the very First of the Ten Commandments? God says of your sins in Jeremiah 13:23, *They're as black as the dots, of the leopard's dark spots; They're as black as the skin, of a negro's dark kin. ... So your sins are very black! Black!! Black!!! ... Put in blunt terms, what happened to places like Babylon and Nineveh, will ultimately happen to every man, women, and child, who does not accept Christ as their only Lord and only Saviour from sin. We must repent of sin, and by faith alone, not trusting in any works that we can perform, turn to Christ in saving faith, Christ the substitutionary sacrifice for sins, that is, the one who died in our place and for our sins at Calvary's cross, before he rose again three days later on Easter Sunday. And if we do so, in the words of the Old Testament prophet, Isaiah, in Isaiah 1:18, "though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool."* [pause]

Let us pray. To thee, O Lord, heavenly Father, belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against thee, neither have we obeyed the voice of thee, the Lord our God, to walk in thy laws which thou hast set before us. O Lord, the only-begotten Son, Jesu Christ; O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer. Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us. We

thank thee Lord, heavenly Father, that through thy only Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, thou art pleased to hear us. We thank thee by thy Holy Spirit, proceeding from thee, O Father, and also from thy Son, that thou didst inspire and preserve thy holy Word as set forth in Holy Scripture. We thank thee, that 'the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by' thy 'Holy Ghost.' O Lord, if there be any who are coming under the sound of this message, who hearing the evidences presented here today for the truthfulness of thy Holy Word, yet still retaineth a hard and unbelieving heart, we pray thee, that if it by thy will, thou dost convict them of the truth of thy holy and infallible Word as found in the Holy Bible. And if it be thy will, that they may believe and 'be saved,' for we know 'that' he that 'beleiveth not' in thy 'gospel,' 'shall be damned.' 'From hardness of heart, and contempt of thy Word and Commandment, Good Lord, deliver us.' O Lord Jesus Christ, 'by thine agony and bloody sweat; by thy cross and passion; by thy precious death and burial; by thy glorious resurrection and ascension; and by the coming of the Holy Ghost, Good Lord, deliver us.' 'O holy, blessed, glorious Trinity, three Persons and one God: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.' 'That is may please thee to give us true repentance; to forgive us all our sins, negligences, and ignorances; and to endue us with the grace of thy Holy Spirit to amend our lives according to thy holy Word; We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.' Hear us, we pray, through our only mediator and advocate, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Sermon audio: www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible

Title: Biblical Apologetics 2/4: OT prophecies on cities and nations.

Bible Texts: Nahum 1:14; Matthew 12:41.

Brief Overview: This is the second of four addresses delivered in July 2010 on the topic of Biblical Apologetics. The first three sermons deal with Old Testament prophecies remarkably fulfilled, and the fourth sermon deals with Biblical Archaeology. In this second sermon, Gavin deals with amazing some Old Testament prophecies on 1) Babylon, 2) the Philistines, & 3) Ninevah. For example, unlike modern translations which obscure the meaning of Scripture, the Authorized King James Version of 1611 says plainly in Jeremiah 51:37, "Babylon shall become ... a dwelling place for dragons." Gavin explains the secret in the sands of Babylon as to what is meant by the words that it was to "become ... a dwelling place for dragons." Or what is meant by the words of prophesy in Nahum 1:14 & 3:11 that Ninevah would be buried as in a "grave" and "hid" from view? Why does St. Margaret's Church next to Westminster Abbey in London, which under King James I of the King James Bible became from 1614 onwards the church of Members of Parliament in the House of Commons, have a marble stone bearing the epitaph, "I pray you remember Henry Austen Layard ... Discoverer of Nineveh"? The theme of this address is, "If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it's accurate; it's reliable; it's true." The sermon ends with a prayer of repentance and belief in the Biblical Christ of religiously conservative Protestant Christianity.

Keywords: Apologetics Archaeology Bible Prophecy King James Version

Four Prayer Meeting Apologetic Sermons in July 2010

“If the Bible says it, you can believe it: OT prophecies on cities and nations – Part 3 of 4 Biblical Apologetics sermons.”

Mangrove Mtn Union Church: Thursday 15 July, 2010: 1) Petra & Edom; 2) Moab & Ammon; 3) Ishmael and the Arabs¹⁴⁹.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. *Let us pray.* “Almighty and everlasting God, who hastest nothing that thou hast made, and dost forgive the sins of all them that are penitent; create and make in us new and contrite hearts, that we worthily lamenting our sins, and acknowledging our wretchedness, may obtain of thee, the God of all mercy, perfect remission and forgiveness; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen¹⁵⁰.”

Welcome to all listening to this address. This is the third of four midweek prayer meeting addresses on Biblical apologetics; and today we end a trilogy on Old Testament prophecies before going next week to a final address on Biblical Archaeology. And the sermon today on Bible prophecies is on firstly Petra and Edom; secondly, Moab and Ammon; and thirdly on Ishmael and the Arabs. [pause]

Well, who were the Edomites? The Jewish race came down through Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Jacob’s brother was Esau. Esau was older than Jacob, but God had prophetically said in Genesis 25:23 “the elder shall serve the younger.” And Bible prophecy was fulfilled and once again proven true, for in Genesis 25:30-34 we’re told that Esau sold his birthright to Jacob for some “red pottage,” and thus his name was changed to “Edom” which means “Red.” So he was called, “Edom” or “Red,” because

¹⁴⁹ See e.g., McDowell, J., *Evidence That Demands A Verdict*, A Campus Crusade for Christ Book, Here’s Life Publishers, 1972, San Bernardino, California, USA, Revised Edition, 1979, pp. 287-293 (Petra-Edom, Isa. 34:6,7,10,13,14,15; Jer. 49:17,18; Ezek. 25:13,14; 35:5-7); 286-7 (Moab & Ammon, Ezek. 25:3,4; Jer. 48:47; 49:6); 296-302 (Ninevah, Nahum 1:8,10; 2:6; 3:10,13,19); & Ramm, B., *Protestant Christian Evidences*, Moody Press, Chicago, USA, 1953, reprint 1978, pp. 103-105 (Obadiah 17-21, Edom); pp. 102-3 (Amos 1:13-15, Ammonites; Amos 2:1-3, Moab). Both McDowell’s and Ramm’s books contain errors in various parts, and beyond these books I here cite, both have been involved in promoting various errors e.g., the ecumenical compromise. Nevertheless, I think we should give credit where credit is due, and the pages I refer to in these works, as well as some other portions of these two books, contain some valuable information. Gen. 16:12 & 25:18, Brown’s *Study Bible* of 1778, also known as *The Self-Interpreting Bible*, with notes by the Reverend John Brown of Haddington, Scotland (1722-1787), Revised Edition with the appended notes of the Rev. Dr. Henry Cooke (1788-1868) and Rev. Dr. Josiah Porter (1823-1889), Gresham, London & Glasgow, [19th century edition, printing year undated, late 19th century or early 20th century].

¹⁵⁰ Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662), Collect for Ash Wednesday.

of this “red pottage” and he sold his birthright for it in Genesis 25:30. And that’s where these Edomites came from.

Turn with me then, if you will, in your Authorized King James Versions of 1611, to the Old Testament prophet of Jeremiah. That’s one of the four Old Testament Major Prophets, Jeremiah, chapter 49, and beginning at verse 16. Writing in the sixth century B.C., in Jeremiah 49:16-18 we read, “Thy terribleness hath deceived thee, and the pride of thine heart, O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, that holdest the height of the hill: though thou shouldest make thy nest as high as the eagle, I will bring thee down from thence, saith the Lord. Also Edom shall be a desolation: every one that goeth by it shall be astonished, and shall hiss at all the plagues thereof. As in the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah and the neighbour cities thereof, saith the Lord, no man shall abide there, neither shall a son of man dwell in it.”

Note that description of Jeremiah 49:16, “O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, that holdest the height of the hill: though thou shouldest make thy nest as high as the eagle.” We find a similar description in the Book of Obadiah. Obadiah is one of the Twelve Old Testament Minor Prophets. They’re called the Minor Prophets because their books are shorter in length than the books of the four Major Prophets: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. For instance, this Book of Obadiah which comes after the Book of Amos and before the Book of Jonah, this Book of Obadiah has only *one* chapter. And so that’s why we don’t say “Obadiah 1:3” or “Obadiah 1:4,” we just say Obadiah followed by the verse. Now if you look at Obadiah 3 and 4, we there read, “The pride of thine heart hath deceived thee, thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, whose habitation is high: that saith in his heart, who shall bring me down to the ground? Though thou exalt thyself as the eagle, and though thou set thy nest among the stars, thence will I bring thee down saith the Lord.” And verse 10, and “For thy violence against thy brother Jacob shame shall cover thee, and thou shalt be cut off for ever.”

Now the first thing we note from the prophecies of Jeremiah and Obadiah, is that Edom was up in rock fortresses such as Petra, which is in modern Jordan. And these were high. Hence both Jeremiah and Obadiah refer to “thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock,” and whose “nest” is high like that of “the eagle.” But Obadiah also says that it’s so high that it’s “among the stars,” which was not true of Edom. Edom was high, but not that high. And when we read these type of statements in a prophecy, that go beyond the facts of what we’re immediately looking at, it means that there’s a further layer of meaning to it. We read in Isaiah 14:12 & 13, that “Lucifer,” said “I will exalt my throne above the stars of God;” and in Isaiah 14:15, “Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit.” And so when we read here in Obadiah 4 that Edom’s “nest” is “among the stars,” the point that’s being made is that in the first place God will cast down Edom; but in the second place, this is a prophetic type of the fact that God will also cast down Lucifer, or the Devil, casting him down into the pits of hell. Now today, we won’t be looking in any detail at this greater element of casting down the Devil into hell, but just be aware that this is an element of this Obadiah 3 prophecy, which in fact goes beyond Edom, and which uses the destruction of Edom as a prophetic type of this greater fulfilment against Satan.

Now Edom was destroyed in a succession of waves. Thus in the 6th century B.C. the Nabateans expelled Edom from their rock fortresses and took over the city of Petra. And while the beautiful carvings of the tombs, temples, and houses of Petra actually belongs to this latter era of the Nabataeans; with the beauty of this red-rose city made of rock in mind, one better understands the words of Obadiah 1,3, & 4: “Thus saith the Lord God concerning Edom ..., The pride of thine heart hath deceived thee, thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, whose habitation is high, that saith in his heart, Who shall bring me down to the ground? Though thou exalt thyself as the eagle, and though thou set thy nest among the stars, thence will I bring thee down, saith the Lord.”

But there’s another element of this prophecy I want you to look at in Obadiah 17 and 18. That’s Obadiah starting at verse 17, “But upon Mount Zion shall be deliverance, and there shall be holiness: and the house of Jacob shall possess their possessions. And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau for stubble, and they shall kindle in them, and devour them: and there shall not be any remaining of the house of Esau; for the Lord hath spoken it.”

Obadiah here states that the Edomites or “house of Esau” would perish; and “upon Mount Zion shall be deliverance, and there shall be holiness; and the house of Jacob shall possess their possessions.” The “house of Jacob” means the Jews, who though carried away captive, did return to Jerusalem and “possess their possessions.” And then verse 18 says, “the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of Joseph a flame, and the house of Esau for stubble, and they shall kindle in them, and devour them: and there shall not be any remaining of the house of Esau.” This is what happened when the Jews conquered Edom under Judas Maccabees in the 2nd century B.C. . And we read of that in, for example, the *uninspired* Apocrypha Book of I Maccabees, chapter 5 and verse 3, which says, “Then Judas fought against the children of Esau in Idumea at Arab-attine, because they besieged Israel: and he gave them a great overthrow, and abated their courage, and took their spoil.” And in the inter-testamental period, they were also attacked by John Hyrcanus who ruled the Jewish nation from about 134 to 104 B.C.; and also Simon of Gerasa; thus perfectly fulfilling this prophecy of Obadiah that the Jews too would conquer them.

In Josh McDowell’s 1979 book, *Evidence that Demands a Verdict*, he says that around the time of Christ’s birth, Petra was prosperous, and he adds citing the ancient Greek historian, Strabo, who lived from about 64 B.C. to about 23 A.D., [quote] “George Davis explains, ‘Petra was also a city of great prosperity. Strabo tells that it was the terminus of one of the great commercial routes of Asia. It was the market of the Arabians for the spice and frankincense’” [unquote]. But finally, the Nabateans were cleaned up by the Romans, when in 106 A.D., the Romans fought their way into Petra, which became part of the Roman province of Arabia. And as a fruit of Roman victory, a gate was later dedicated there to the Roman Emperor Trajan, who reigned from 97 to 98 A.D. . Thereafter the Edomites disappear as a separate people from history. [pause]

BUT the rock fortress of Petra lived on. Following an earthquake in 551 A.D. significant habitation ceased, although a small group seems to have remained there. Petra was thus already in decline at the time of the 7th century A.D. Mohammedan invasion under the brutal sword of Islam. We also know that much later in the 12th century A.D. the Mohammedans fighting Christian Crusaders built a castle there called Sel. Otherwise, the site was occupied only by wandering tribesmen. And that's the condition that it was in when it was rediscovered by the Swiss explorer, John Burckhardt in 1812.

FOR EDOM HAD BEEN SO THOROUGHLY DESTROYED IN ACCORDANCE WITH BIBLICAL PROPHECY, such as Obadiah 19, "thou shalt be cut off forever," and Jeremiah 49:18, "As in the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah and the neighbour cities thereof, saith the Lord, no man shall abide there, neither shall a son of man dwell in it;" Edom, I say, had been so thoroughly destroyed, that the Bible critics disputed its existence and claimed that the whole thing must have been legendary. They wrote it off as a so called, "Bible blunder," by people trying to just make up Bible prophecies. 'How?,' they asked, 'Could such a people as strong as the Edomites were said to have been in the Bible, possibly have vanished without a trace?' But Burckhardt's discovery of this fabulous Lost City of Petra silenced the Bible critics not just in terms of Biblical archaeology, but also in terms of showing the wonderful reliability of Biblical prophecy with regard to Edom.

THUS WITH AMAZING CLARITY, HISTORY WAS HERE FORETOLD IN BIBLE PROPHECY. The Bible prophets Jeremiah and Obadiah both said of Edom, "thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock," whose "nest" is high like that of "the eagle;" that it would be brought down to destruction. In Obadiah 17 and 18, specific reference was made to the Jews part in this, which was strikingly fulfilled. And in harmony with the words of Obadiah 19, "thou shalt be cut off for ever;" and the words of Jeremiah 49:18, "As in the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah and the neighbour cities thereof, saith the Lord, no man shall abide there, neither shall a son of man dwell in it;" in fulfilment of these prophecies, Petra and Edom were so thoroughly lost, the Bible critics scoffed at the idea of their very existence; until that is, with embarrassed red-faces, they were made to take a back-seat position, after the work of Biblical archaeology by John Burckhardt who rediscovered it in 1812.

And those red-faced Bible critics turned out not to be the only red things, because Petra turned out to have a lot very beautiful red rock, such as the red-stone of what is called, "The Treasury of Pharaoh;" so named, not because Pharaoh really had anything to do with it, but because of a local fable that the stone urn at the top of this edifice contains [quote] "Pharaoh's treasures" [unquote].

The Bible spoke of Petra and Edom and their demise. And the Bible was right and the Bible critics were wrong. You see, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it's accurate; it's reliable; it's true.* That's the message that comes through loud and clear from these amazing Biblical prophecies about Petra and Edom. [pause]

Now the second set of Old Testament prophecies we're considering today are on Moab and Ammon. Turn with me if you will to the Old Testament Book of Amos chapters 1 and 2. That's the Book of Amos, chapter 1, verses 13 to 15, and following immediately on from them chapter 2, verses 1 to 3. And so starting at Amos 1, verse 13, we read: "Thus saith the Lord: For three transgressions of the children of Ammon, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof: because they have ripped the women with child of Gilead, that they might enlarge their border: but I will kindle a fire in the wall of Rabbah, and it shall devour the palaces thereof, with shouting in the day of battle, with a tempest in the day of the whirlwind: and their king shall go into captivity, he and his princes together, saith the Lord. Thus saith the Lord: for three transgressions of Moab, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof because he burned the bones of the king of Edom into lime: but I will send a fire upon Moab, and it shall devour the palaces of Kerioth: and Moab shall die with tumult, with shouting, and with the sound of the trumpet: and I will cut off the judge from the midst thereof, and will slay all the princes thereof with him, saith the Lord."

Now we here see that in the 8th century B.C., with regard to Moab the prophet Amos isolated the sin of cremation in the words, "burned the bones of the king of Edom into lime." The Bible is opposed to cremation. Qualified exceptions to this include where there's contagion, such as occurs with the Black Plague, when for sanitary reasons the body may be burned, but not the bones, Amos 6:10. Or death by incineration, for example, some Christian martyrs, I Corinthians 13:3. Or on a battlefield, if the practice of an enemy is to desecrate the human remains of bodies, the bodies may be burned, but not the bones, Psalm 27:2 & 3; I Samuel 31:11-13; and II Samuel 2:5. Or Divine Judgment such as the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah in Genesis 18 and 19; and from this example also burning certain criminals as capital punishment. Or the non-burial of certain evildoers on the basis of Jeremiah 25:33, for example, the regicide, Oliver Cromwell, who was guilty of sedition against the Crown; murder of one king, Charles I in 1649; and the attempted murder of a second king, Charles II in 1651. In harmony with I Peter 2:17, "Fear God. Honour the king;" and the Bible's teaching on "damnation" in Romans 13:2, "seditions" and "murders" in Galatians 5:20 & 21, and "murderers" in Revelation 21:8; after the Restoration in 1660, the 350th anniversary of which we are celebrating this year in 2010, Oliver Cromwell's body was exhumed in 1661, and other than his skull, his body was hung in chains at Tyburn in London's Hyde Park; and his skull was placed on a public gazing pole at London's Westminster Hall, next to Westminster Parliament, where it remained on public display for the further 24 year reign of King Charles II. So evildoers like Oliver Cromwell may on the basis of Jeremiah 25:33, be left to rot away, unburied, as a symbol of the fact that they have *no part* in the resurrection of life. But for all that, the basic Biblical rule is still burial, not cremation. And because Moab committed the sin of cremation, and in the words of Amos 2:1, "burned the bones of the king of Edom into lime," God said he would judge them.

With regard to Rabbah, the Ammonite's capital city, its ruins have been discovered and examined. And with regard to Moab, it's known that Nebuchadnezzar conquered it in the 6th century B.C., and its area was then taken over by others. We cannot doubt that

these judgments fell upon both Ammon and Moab at the hands of the Babylonians in the 6th century B.C. .

But the Bible makes an interesting qualification with regard to Moab and Ammon, one that puts it in stark contrast to the prophecy we earlier considered about Petra and Edom in Obadiah 19 and Jeremiah 49:18. Turn with me to the prophet Jeremiah chapters 48 and 49. That's the Book of Jeremiah, chapter 48, and verse 47, where we read, "yet I will bring again the captivity of Moab in the latter days, saith the Lord. Thus far is the judgment of Moab." And in the next chapter, that's Jeremiah chapter 49 and verse 6, we read, "And afterward I will again bring the captivity of the children of Ammon, saith the Lord."

And so we here have predictions, that some of those from the captivity of judgment, will be brought back to their lands of Moab and Ammon. This, as I say, is in stark contrast to the prophecy of Edom where we read a little later in Jeremiah 49:18 of Edom, "no man shall abide there." And following the judgments upon Moab and Ammon, with Moab and Ammon conquered by Babylon in the earlier part of the 6th century B.C., both of these places then came to be re-inhabited. Thus Moab and Ammon were re-inhabited under Cyrus the Great in the latter part of the 6th century B.C. .

Today, Ammon is the capital of Trans-Jordan, and a flourishing city, having experienced a phenomenal growth since the earlier part of the 20th century. And while the peoples now inhabiting the regions of Moab and Ammon are not necessarily descended from the ancient Moabites and Ammonites, the fact that these regions are still inhabited, testifies to an amazing difference between the prophecies of Moab and Ammon as compared to Petra and Edom. God said Petra and Edom wouldn't be inhabited following their judgment, and they weren't; but God said Moab and Ammon would be re-inhabited following their judgments, and they were. You see, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it's accurate; it's reliable; it's true.* [pause]

And that now brings me to the third group of prophecies that we'll be considering today, those on Ishmael and the Arabs. And in due course we'll note a very interesting contrast and comparison between the prophecies that we've just looked at on Petra and Edom, Moab and Ammon, and those that we will look at on the Ishmaelite race. But firstly, let's be clear on just who the Arabs are.

The Bible refers in Jeremiah 25:20 to the "mingled people," and the Hebrew word used there for "mingled" is *ereb*. It's derived from the Hebrew word, '*arab* meaning to intermix, in other words, the Arabs are a mixed race people. And that's also true of the modern Arab race, as it was of the different ancient group of Arabians. Though they are predominantly Mediterranean Caucasoids, they are a very admixed group. Up near Turkey, some of them show Caucasian admixture, and Mongoloid admixture. More south, some of them show signs of Negro-Caucasoid admixture. Some of them have the curly hair derived from the negro woolly hair, and exhibit the wider noses of the negroes, and darker skins than the Semites. In particular, many of the modern Egyptians are Negro-Mediterranean admixed. But traces of the original Mediterranean races from

Ham and Shem mentioned in Genesis 10, are still visible amongst the Arabs, with those in West Asia still sometimes showing the Semitic hooked nose; and those in North Africa from the region of Libya, still sometimes exhibiting the lighter coloured skin of the Genesis 10:6 and I Chronicles 1:8, Putites.

By contrast, without commenting on the claim of various Copts in the Coptic Orthodox Church that they're descended from the [quote] "Pharaonic race" [unquote], I certainly would accept that a number of them appear to be racially a lot closer to the Mizraim race of Genesis 10:13, such as we find it described in ancient times, than would be the average modern Arab Egyptian, and certainly their religious affiliation has to some extent preserved them from racially mixed marriages with Islamic Arabs. To say the Copts are predominantly of the ancient golden-brown Egyptian Mizarim race is one thing, but to say, as many of them do, that they're specifically of a "Pharaonic race" is another thing again. But to generally look at, they're certainly not Arabs.

Now against that backdrop, we read in Genesis 12:5 & 7 that Abraham was to sire the Jewish race through his wife Sarah. But lacking in faith, in Genesis 16 Abraham fathered a child through his wife's handmaiden, the Egyptian Hagar. This was a violation of the word of God in Genesis 9:26, "Blessed be the Lord God of *Shem*; and Canaan shall be his servant;" because we're told in Genesis 10:6 that the "Mizraim" or Egyptians are Hamitic, not Semitic. And so this Hamite-Semite half-breed, Ishmael, could not fulfill the racially Semitic prophetic words of Genesis 9:26. What Abraham had done displeased the Lord, and God said that the child born, Ishmael, would not be the child of promise; but in Genesis 17:15-21 that Isaac via his wife Sarah would be the child of promise. Hence if you turn in your Authorized Versions to Genesis 16:12, that's Genesis chapter 16, and verse 12, we read of the Hamite-Semite half-breed, Ishmael, "And he will be a wild man; and his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him: and he shall dwell in the presence of his brethren"

And in Genesis 25:18, we read that the Ishmaelites dwelt on the Horn of Africa [correction, not 'Horn of Africa' but 'Arabian Peninsula'] between their Hamitic brethren in Egypt and their Semitic brethren. Now overall the Authorized Version is the best available English translation, but it's not word perfect. The AV says of Ishmael, "He *died* in the presence of his brethren," but the Hebrew word, *naphal*, here rendered, "died," means "to fall," and so it might be better rendered as he "fell" in the sense of "he settled" in the presence of his brethren¹⁵¹. Hence I think the better rendering of this verse is the one found in the Geneva Bible of 1560 which says, [quote] "dwelt in the presence of all his brethren" [unquote]; and a footnote in that 1560 edition says the Ishmaelites, [quote] "dwelt among the Arabians, and were separate from the blessed seed." [unquote] And of course, we know from Genesis 16:12 that the part-breed Ishmaelites settled there in hostility to both these Hamitic and Semitic racial brethren. So if Genesis 25:18 applying the words of Genesis 16:12 says "they" the Ishmaelites,

¹⁵¹ Hebrew, *naphal*, active perfect, masculine 3rd person singular kal verb, from *naphal*.

“they dwelt” “in the presence of all his brethren,” this means that the words spoken of Ishmael in Genesis 16:12 are contextually being applied to the Ishmaelite race. The Hebrew word in Genesis 25:18 for “they dwelt” is a Hebrew verb, “*shakan*,” that’s in the third person plural meaning “they dwelt,” and so it correctly reads in our AV’s, “they dwelt,” meaning all the Ishmaelites¹⁵². A race of whom it is thus said, that it would be a “wild” race, and in the Hebrew, that word “wild” means a “wild ass,” with its “hand” “against every man, and every man’s hand against” it. But the accursed blood of Ishmael was largely, though not entirely, locked up on the Horn of Africa [correction, not ‘on the Horn of Africa’ but ‘in Arabia’] from about 2,000 B.C. onwards, right through till after New Testament times. The Ishmaelites which as a racial group have on average an abnormally high level of violence, were thus largely, though not entirely, contained on the Horn of Africa [correction, not ‘Horn of Africa’ but ‘Arabian Peninsula’], and their influence relatively limited. They were contained.

But then something happened. After about two and a half thousand years, this racial time-bomb went *Bang! Bang!* in a *big, big, way*. Mohammed came onto the scene, and in his *Koran* he changed the Bible’s ambivalence towards Ishmael. He removed reference to the Hamite-Semite mixed race features of Ishmael constituting disobedience to God’s command against racially mixed marriages in Genesis 6, and also disobedience to God’s command in Genesis 9:25 with regard to the Semitic racial prophecy, he removed reference to the racial curse on Ishmael, and he presented Ishmael in a much more favorable way. For example, in the *Koran*’s Sura 14:41, Mohammed gives the half-caste Ishmael a racial equality with the Jewish race from Isaac; as reading from Rodwell’s 1909 translation, Mohammed depicts Abraham as saying, [quote] “Praise be to God *who hath given me* in my old age, *Ishmael* and Isaac! *My Lord is the hearer of prayer.*” [unquote]

That of course is very different to the Biblical account, which makes it clear that Ishmael was not God’s answer to “prayer,” and was not the child “God hath given.” For example in Romans 9:7 we read, “Neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but in Isaac shall thy seed by called;” and in comparing this to the issue of Jacob and Esau, we further read in Romans 9:13, “Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.” And so Ishmael is here compared to Esau. Ishmael was the hated half-caste, and in Galatians 4:30 we read of both Hagar the Horrible and Ishmael the hated half-breed, “Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman.” Yet contrary to such Biblical teachings, we find not only in the Sura from the *Koran* that I have mentioned, but also more generally, in Mohammed’s *Koran*, Ishmael is only ever presented in a favorable way. For example, the *Koran*’s Sura 19:55 says, [quote] “Commemorate Ishmael” [unquote] and Sura 38:48 says, [quote] “remember Ishmael” [unquote]. And of course, for the Mohammedans, the geographical centre of their religion is Mecca, in the mixed races region that the Ishmaelites came from. For example, the *Koran*’s Sura 2:119 says in part, [quote] “remember when we appointed the Holy House ... and we commanded Abraham and

¹⁵² Hebrew, *way-yis-ke-nu* (*wa* = “And” + *yis-ke-nu* = “they dwelt”); Hebrew *yis-ke-nu*, active imperfect, masculine 3rd person plural kal verb, from *shakan*.

Ishmael, ‘Purify my house for those who shall go in procession round it’” [unquote]. Now this “house” is known as “The Caaba,” and is a shrine near the Great Mosque in Mecca, on the Horn of Africa [correction, not ‘on the Horn of Africa’ but ‘in Arabia’].

The practical consequence of all this glorification of Ishmael, was that with the spread of Islam, Ishmael or as they say, “Ismael,” came to be regarded as a positive figure and Middle East Muslims were happy, even desirous, of marrying into Ishmaelite races as they conquered more and more areas in the Middle East and inter-married with one another to form the modern Arab race, which I thus consider can be fairly described as an Ishmaelite race. And so it was that the accursed blood of Ishmael has been spread around from its original base on the Horn of Africa [correction, not ‘on the Horn of Africa’ but ‘in Arabia’] in order to make the modern Arab race, and with it the racial curse of Genesis 16:12, making it “wild,” with its “hand” “against every man, and every man’s hand against” it.

Now from 1962 Dr. Ed Ulrich was a Member of the Board of Trustees at Bob Jones University, known as BJU, in the United States of America, having been appointed under Bob Jones Sr., and Brother Ed Ulrich, an independent Reformed Baptist Protestant, died only 6 to 7 months ago in December 2009 aged 88; although for about the last decade of his life he was in ever increasing degrees, *non compos mentis* due to Alzheimer’s disease. But in his better days we were in contact with each other; and for those interested you’ll find that an Obituary comment, written and signed by myself has for some months been placed after the notification of his death on a web-site of the Anchorage Camp in North Carolina, USA, at <http://blog.anchoragecamp.org/>, then click on “Ministry Report,” then click on “Comment¹⁵³.” Under Bob Jones Sr. who died in 1968 and Bob Jones Jr. who died in 1997, BJU had a policy, based on its understanding of the Bible, that rightly prohibited inter-racial dating and racially mixed marriages among its students; in accordance with, for example, Genesis 6 & 10; Ezra 9 & 10; Daniel 2:43; or Matthew 24:37-39. This opposition to mixed marriages was at the heart of the 1970s and 1980s BJU court case. Now most interestingly, Dr. Ed Ulrich says in the 1981 “Joint Appendix” for Bob Jones University and Goldsboro Christian Schools in the *Bob Jones University case*, that with regard to [quote] “Genesis 16,” “There,

¹⁵³ The “Anchorage Camp” page here says, “JUNE 3, 1921 - DECEMBER 29, 2009. Dr. Ed Ulrich, founder and longtime director of The Anchorage Camp, passed away peacefully Tuesday morning, Dec. 29 after a lengthy illness. He was a faithful servant of Christ and his Gospel.” Following this is my comment, under “Gavin McGrath April 3rd, 2010.” “From Sydney, Australia, I knew Brother Ed in Lake Waccamaw, USA, over some years, through both written correspondence to each other and numerous phone calls. I remember him as [a] man strongly committed to the authority of the Bible. I have missed not being able to hold a conversation with Brother Ed for about 10 years now; and his passing is a matter of sorrow. I look forward to meeting him in heaven, for he was a man washed clean by the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ. Gavin McGrath. April 2010.” (This Internet site checked for my Obituary Comment in May, June, & July, & last checked before sermon on 15 July 2010.)

Abraham, a Semite, took a Hamitic handmaiden and caused her to conceive. She bore a son, Ismael, who was, as a result of the interracial union, a wild man and whose descendants to this day are embroiled in warfare and unrest ... ¹⁵⁴.” [unquote]

THUS THE AMAZING ACCURACY OF THIS PROPHECY IS SEEN in the fact that the Ishmaelites have been a “wild” race whose “hand” has been “against every man, and every man’s hand against” it. Historically after the Ishmaelite blood was released from its captivity largely, though not exclusively, on the Horn of Africa [correction, not ‘on the Horn of Africa’ but ‘in Arabia’] from the 7th century A.D. by intermarriage with Muslims who went on to form the modern Arab race; the Mohammedan Arabs warred throughout the Middle East and Central Asia, attacked southern Europe and for a long time were in Spain. They also captured Asia Minor to form Turkey by defeating its Christian inhabitants with the Fall of Constantinople in 1453, now known as Istanbul. To this day, the Arabs exhibit an abnormally high level of violence and are involved in many ongoing wars either with themselves or with others.

To give you just some selected examples of this from the last half century or so: in November 1966, in South Arabia or Yemen, a DC-3 aircraft was blown up in mid-air by a luggage bomb with 28 people killed. In May 1968, a USA Presidential candidate, Senator Robert Kennedy was murdered by an Arab Jordanian in Los Angeles, California, and there were further Arab terrorist attacks demanding the killer’s release. At the 1972 Munich Olympic Games in Germany, 11 Israeli athletes were killed as a result of the action of 8 Arab terrorists. In October 1973, letter bombs were sent to England, and 2 Arabs were arrested and expelled from Holland. In June 1973, a coalition of Arab states attacked Israel in the Yom Kippur War during the Mohammedan infidel religious days of Ramadam. In December 1973 Arab terrorists attacked a Pan American 707 plane in Rome, Italy, in a hijack demanding the release of two Arab terrorists, and 33 people were killed. In January 1975 Arab terrorists attacked Orly airport in Paris, France, taking 10 hostages. In February 1986 a plane coming from Rome had a bomb in it made of plastic explosives go off at about 15,000 feet or 4.6 kilometres in the air as it headed for Athens in Greece; and responsibility was claimed by the Ezsedine Kassam Unit of the Arab Revolutionary Cells. From 1980 to 1990 there was the Iran-Iraq War, which saw the reintroduction into warfare of gas attacks and gas masks. In August 1991, a 100 kilogram or 220 pound car bomb was detonated in Lebanon destroying the American University. In May 1996 the Arab Mohammedan group, Hamas, fired on a bus load of students at the Bet El settlement on the West Bank. In September 2001 an Arab suicide bomber killed 3 Israelis in Nahariya. In August 2003, a suicide car bombing occurred killing 17 people and wounding another 122 at Riyadh in Saudi Arabia. In May 2004 the Head of the Iraqi Governing Council was assassinated by a suicide bomber, and responsibility was claimed by the “Arab Resistance Movement.” And 2004 also saw the Madrid train bombings in which 191 people were killed and 1800 wounded in a series of coordinated train bomb attacks, in which the suspects came from the Mohammedan Arab world in Morocco, Algeria, and Syria; so that in 2007 al-Qaeda said it was [quote]

¹⁵⁴ Ulrich, E., “Joint Appendix” for Bob Jones University and Goldsboro Christian Schools, Inc., 1981 in 76 L. Ed. 2d, BJU case (US Sup. Ct.) pp. 43-44.

“proud” [unquote] of the 2004 Madrid train bombings. If the Arabs aren’t fighting with themselves, they’re fighting with somebody else. ... They just wanta’ fight E-V-E-R-Y-B-O-D-Y-eee. [pause]

And when I went on my fourth trip to London from October 2005 to April 2006, people were still talking about the London train tube bombings and attempting bombings by Muslims. For example, four Mohammedans unsuccessfully sought to detonate bombs on the London tube system on 21 July 2005. The ring-leader was Ibrahim Muktar who was born in Eritrea near the Horn of Africa [correction, not ‘near the Horn of Africa’ but ‘near Arabia’]; and his cohorts included, for example, Ramzi Mohammed from Somali also near the Horn of Africa [correction, not ‘near the Horn of Africa’ but ‘near Arabia’]. Now the objection is advanced by “politically correct,” ignorant and unlearned persons, that such violence has no racial basis because violent Mohammedans are not always Arabs, or Arab admixed. For example, the Bali Bombings of 2005 in Indonesia which either killed or injured about two dozen tourists from Australia, and which either killed or injured about another seven dozen Indonesians; were perpetrated by Mohammedans of the Mongoloid race, such as Jemaah Islamiah of Malaysia; Azahari Husin; and Nourdin Mohammed Top. Or in the United States of America, a Negro Mohammedan, Hasan Akbar threw a grenade into USA military tents in 2003 in Kuwait; and was convicted in 2005 of both premeditated murder and attempted murder; or in 2009, another Negro Mohammedan, Abdul Hakim Mujadid Muhammed, murdered two USA soldiers outside an Arkansas recruiting centre. Now the straight black haired, brown eyed, and brown skinned Mongoloids with medium prognathism of the Bali Bombing; or the tight woolly curled black haired, brown eyed, and black skinned Negroids with strong prognathism and everted lips of the USA military killings, racially were *not* Arabs.

But in the first place, I would point out that the Mohammedan Arabs are the primary instigators and perpetrators of a violent ideology suited to the proclivities of their abnormally violent race, but with which they can infect persons of other races at an ideological Islamic level. Thus on the one hand, the presence of Muslims from any racial group will increase the likelihood of violence because the religion of Islam produces an intellectual so called “justification” in its follower’s minds for the so called “jihad.” For example, the *Koran’s* Sura 47:4-9, says in part, [quote] “When ye encounter the infidels, strike off their heads till ye have made a great slaughter among them, and of the rest make fast the fetters.” “And whoso fight[eth] for the cause of God, their works will not suffer to miscarry; he will vouchsafe them guidance, and dispose their hearts aright; and he will bring them into the Paradise But as for infidels, let them perish” [unquote]. Or Sura 8:66 & 67 says in part, [quote] “Stir up the faithful to fight. Twenty of you who stand firm shall vanquish two hundred. And if there be a hundred of you they shall vanquish a thousand of the infidels,” “if there be a thousand of you, they shall vanquish two thousand by God’s permission; for God is with those who are resolute to endure” [unquote]. Or Sura 4:72,76, & 79 says in part, [quote] “O ye who believe! Make use of precautions, and advance in detachments, or, advance in a body;” “Let those then fight on the path of God.” “Small the fruition of this world; but the next life is the true good ...!” [unquote]. Now these military tactics from the Koran in which Mohammedans engage in “jihad” against those 10 times stronger than themselves, help to

explain why Islamic terrorists keep going when hopelessly outnumbered. Therefore, I certainly accept the proposition that the religion of Islam produces an intellectual so called “justification” in its follower’s minds for the so called “jihad.” But on the other hand, if one looks to the general instigators, in various ways it’s the Arabs; even if in a given instance this is an indirect instigation produced simply by the example effect of its history of spreading Mohammedanism throughout the Middle East by the sword of Islam. And of course, that Arab example is ever before the Mohammedans’ eyes both with the *Koran* and the wider history of Mohammedanism. For example, they think about Mecca on the Horn of Africa [correction, not ‘on the Horn of Africa’ but ‘in Arabia’], whose violent capture by the sword of Islam is gleefully referred to in the *Koran*’s Sura 47:14.

Mohammedanism is very largely an Arab created, Arab focused, and Arab glorifying religion. And if you understand that the glorification of the wild race of Ishmael is at its heart, you begin to understand why even non-Arabs who get entangled in Islam, can by example effect, start to pick up on the violent proclivities of the Arabs. Indeed, Scripture warns of suchlike in Proverbs 22:24 & 25, “Make no friendship with an angry man; and with a furious man thou shalt not go. Lest thou learn his ways, and get a snare to thy soul.” Whether by such a general example through the Arab history of Islam and its geographical location in the heart of the Arab world at Mecca, as found in both the Koran and wider Mohammedan history; and present in the minds of both Arab and non-Arab Mohammedans when they *face Mecca to pray* or read the Koran *in Arabic*; or whether by the additional influence of specific Arabs, we find that the heart-beat of Islamic violence stems from Arab Mohammedans. For example, we know that the American Negroid Mohammedan who threw grenades into USA military tents in Kuwait in 2003 had formerly attended a Saudi *Arabian* owned Bilal Islamic centre in Los Angeles, California; and we also know that the American Negroid Mohammedan who shot two soldiers at the Arkansas recruiting centre in 2009 had earlier been in Yemen on the Horn of Africa [correction, not ‘on the Horn of Africa’ but ‘in Arabia’]. Specifically, on 16 February 2010, in their article entitled, “A Muslim Son, A Murder Trail, & many Questions,” the *New York Times* reported that Hakim Mohammed had travelled to Yemen on the Horn of Africa [correction, not ‘on the Horn of Africa’ but ‘in Arabia’] to study Arabic, and that while there he had married a woman from Yemen. So either way, whether Arabs engage in acts of violence, or whether they incite others into them, we find that the heart-beat of Islamic violence stems from the Arabs. Arabs are the instigators of the Mohammedan violence, either indirectly by their historic example of violence endorsed in the Koran, by the location of Mecca towards which they pray, or by the reading of the Koran in Arabic; or directly by Arab incitement. Arabs are thus the primary source of direct violence, and also through one or both of these two means, the instigators and inciters of further Mohammedan violence by non-Arabs such as the Mongoloid Mohammedans of the Bali Bombing of 2005, or the Negroid Mohammedans of the USA 5th columnist military killings in 2003 and 2009.

And in further answer to the objection advanced that the violence is not a racial trait of Ishmaelite Arabs because there are peaceful Arabs and violent non-Arabs; I would in the second place further say that such racial traits are a group average, and so to say that on average the Arabs are abnormally violent, is not to say that every individual Arab

is abnormally violent, nor is to say that there are not persons of other races who exhibit abnormal violence, and who if Mohammedan, may be more strongly attracted to the Arab Mohammedan ethos of violence. Those who understand racial traits, understand that we're talking about a group average; and in this context, I thus maintain that the Arabs are abnormally violent. Silly persons who deny that on average the Arab race is abnormally violent, either by pointing to some peaceable Arab or some violent non-Arab, are as foolish and stupid as those who try to deny that on average men are physically stronger than women, by pointing to some physically strong woman and some physically weak man. It's the depiction of foolish anti-racist or anti-sexist propagandists, who are blinded by their ideology, and whose bigoted brains think that if one doesn't like the message, then one just kills the messengers. Theirs is not the depiction of reality.

Indeed, following my 5th trip to London from September 2008 to March 2009, on return to Australia with a visitation to North America in March 2009, I got a train out from the USA capital city of Washington D.C., that took me over the beautiful Potomac River, at which point I entered Arlington in the State of Virginia, and there inspected the Pentagon which is a USA military headquarters. The name of this building comes from the Greek word, "*pente*" meaning five, and Greek word, "*gonia*" meaning "a corner" or "an angle," because the Pentagon has five sides. I there saw "The Pentagon Memorial" to the September 11 2001 attacks by Mohammedan terrorists, which killed about 200 people, and about a further 300 in New York, as well as others in Pennsylvania; and I also saw there in Virginia the Pentagon memorial park to the September 11, 2001 victims. I later went to New York, New York, where I saw a lot of rebuilding activity going on at the old site of the Twin Towers. A sign on the scaffold read, "The National September 11 Memorial & Museum," which is evidently one of the things being constructed there on the corner of Liberty and Church Streets; and I also saw opposite this at the Fire Station a memorial to some fireman killed in the September 11 2001 terrorist attack when a hijacked plane was flown into the old Twin Towers there.

These attacks on the Pentagon in Virginia, USA, the Twin Towers in the Manhattan area of New York City, New York, USA, and also Pennsylvania, USA, were strongly connected with *Arab* Mohammedans. For example, the American Federal Bureau of Intelligence, the FBI, has identified one of those involved as, "Sar-eed al G,HAM,die," an Arab from Bahah in Saudi Arabia who died in the attack; and another Arab seeking by his actions to *lead* people into the way of jihad in *Mohammad's* Koran was identified by the FBI as, "Waleed Mohammed al-Shehri," from Asir in Saudi Arabia who also died in the attack. Now these two Arabs died in different attacks, with Saeed al-Ghamdi from Bahah dying in the September 11 Pennsylvania attack, and "Waleed Mohammed al-Shehri" from Asir, dying in the September 11 New York attack. You see, the "wild" race of Ishmaelites found in the modern "wild ass" Arab race, has its "hand" "against every man, and every man's hand against" it. In this warped, wicked, and degenerate Western society, among those whose soul and mind sickening bigotry and prejudice entails a willful shutting of the eyes to racial traits, it's not "politically correct" to refer to the accursed blood of Ishmael; or the Bible's prohibition on racially mixed marriages in, for example, Ezra 9 & 10, or the miscegenationist events preceding the Second Advent in Daniel 2:43 & 44 or Matthew 24:37-39. But among those of a higher

order intellectual perceptiveness and moral stamina prepared to stand up against such narrow-minded intellectually intermediate brain-washers, the reality of racial traits cannot be reasonably denied, and certainly in the case of the Ishmaelites it is also Biblically correct to do so. For with respect to this prophecy of Genesis 16:12 and 25:18 in the words of Acts 5:29, “we ought to obey God rather than men;” and in the words of Acts 20:27, “I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.”

Brown’s *Study Bible* of 1778, also called *The Self-Interpreting Bible*, with notes by the Reverend Mr. John Brown of Haddington in Scotland, a Presbyterian Minister, is one of the great Protestant Study Bibles of yesteryear. Reverend Brown had some schooling in Latin, but beyond that was self-taught in the Biblical languages of Hebrew, Latin, and Greek; and Brown’s *Study Bible* was an influential Protestant work throughout the 19th century. My copy of it was handed down to me through a succession of family members and their friends, and is a 19th century edition of the Authorized Version with some added notes by Dr. Henry Cooke of Ireland who died in 1868, and Dr. Josiah Porter who died in 1889. But their comments always follow an earlier section marked out as the commentary of Reverend Brown who died in 1787. And at the section on Genesis 16:10-12, Reverend Brown says in part, [quote] “Here it is foretold that Ishmael *and his seed* should be wild ... like wild ass; mischievous to all around them, and extremely numerous. For almost four thousand years the fulfillment has been amazingly remarkable All along they have been a nuisance and plague to the nations around them In the seventh century of the Christian era, these Ishmaelites, under Mahomet, their famed imposter, and his successors, furiously extended their empire, and their new and false religion, through a great portion of Asia and Africa, and even some countries of Europe” [unquote] Well this Protestant Christian Minister was able to say in 1778 that, [quote] “Here it is foretold that Ishmael *and his seed* should be wild ... like wild ass ... the fulfillment hath been amazingly remarkable” [unquote]. And we Protestant Christians today, living more than 230 years later, can still surely say of Genesis 16:12 and 25:18, in the words of Reverend Brown, [quote] “Here it is foretold that Ishmael *and his seed* should be wild ... like wild ass ... the fulfillment hath been amazingly remarkable¹⁵⁵.” [unquote] You see, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it’s accurate; it’s reliable; it’s true.* That’s the message that comes through loud and clear from this amazing Biblical prophecy on the Ishmaelites. [pause]

Now let’s consider the three groups of prophecies that we’ve looked at today in a broad overview of how God predicted three quite different outcomes in Old Testament Bible prophecies. Who could predict three such different outcomes? In Obadiah 19 and Jeremiah 49:18, Edom to be completely destroyed; and it was. In Jeremiah 48:47 and 49:6 Moab and Ammon to be destroyed and then reinhabited; and that’s exactly what’s happened so that today they’re flourishing cities. And in Genesis 16:12 and 25:18, from the hated half-breed, Ishmael, who came from the mixed racial union between the Hamite, Hagar the Horrible, and the Semite, Abraham; the Ishmaelites to be a “wild”

¹⁵⁵ I here gave this quote as, “hath been” (twice), but I should have give it as, “has been” (twice).

mixed race whose “hand” was to be “against every man, and every man’s hand against” it; as indeed it has been since the accursed blood of Ishmael was released largely, though not entirely after this time, from the Horn of Africa [correction, not ‘Horn of Africa’ but ‘Arabian Peninsula’], as under Mohammedanism it worked its way through into the modern mixed race Ishmaelite Arabs, which race has ever since plagued the Middle East, Europe, and elsewhere, with what on average, an overall group average, is an abnormally high level of violence. Three different outcomes from three different types of prophecies, all perfectly fulfilled. In the words of Christ spoken in John 10:35, “The Scripture cannot be broken.” You see, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it’s accurate; it’s reliable; it’s true.* [pause]

Let us pray. Lord of heaven and earth, we stand in awe of thy holy Word. Thy “words” “are pure words, as silver tried in a furnace,” “purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O Lord, thou wilt preserve them from” those of “this generation” who would seek to deny or destroy them. Thou, O Lord, art the One that dost declare “the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.” Thou, O Lord, art “God, and there is none else,” “there is none like” unto thee. We thank thee, O Lord, for these prophecies that tell us of thy sovereignty, and that thou dost “rule,” “and none can stay” thy “hand, or say unto” thee, “What doest thou?” We thank thee by these prophecies thou dost show unto us the absolute reliability, dependability, and unerring infallibility of thy Book, the Holy Bible. Give us grace, O Lord, that we may “study to shew” ourselves “approved” of thee, being workmen “that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the Word of truth.” Heavenly Father, repenting of our sins, such as any disbelief in thy Word, the Bible, we ask that thou dost cover us with the atoning blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, who died in our place and for our sins on Calvary’s cross, rising again on the third day. We ask all these things through him who is thy only begotten Son, our Lord and Saviour, our only mediator and advocate, Jesus Christ. Amen¹⁵⁶.

Sermon audio: www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible

Title: Biblical Apologetics 3/4: OT prophecies on cities and nations.

Bible Texts: Genesis 16:12; John 10:35.

Brief Overview: This is the third of four addresses delivered in July 2010 on the topic of Biblical Apologetics. The first three sermons deal with Old Testament prophecies remarkably fulfilled, and the fourth sermon deals with Biblical Archaeology. In this third sermon, Gavin deals with some amazing Old Testament prophecies on 1) Petra & Edom, 2) Moab & Ammon, & 3) Ishmael and the Arabs. His treatment of Ishmael and the Arabs includes through connection to the Arab focused and Arab glorifying religion of Mohammedanism, reference to the historically recent events of the Bali Bombing of 2005 in Indonesia which killed or injured about two dozen tourists from Australia; the 2004 Madrid train bombings in Spain by al-Qaeda in which 191 people were killed and

¹⁵⁶ Pss. 4:4; 12:7; Isa. 46:9,10; Dan. 4:26; 4:35; II Tim. 2:15.

1800 wounded in a series of coordinated train bombings; the 2005 London train tube bombings and attempted bombings by Mohammedans in the UK; and the September 11, 2001 Mohammedan Arab attacks on the USA in Washington D.C., Pennsylvania, and New York. The theme of this address is, “If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it’s accurate; it’s reliable; it’s true.” The sermon ends with a prayer affirming belief in the Bible and the Biblical Christ of religiously conservative Protestant Christianity.

Keywords: Apologetics Archaeology Bible Prophecy King James Version

Four Prayer Meeting Apologetic Sermons in July 2010

“If the Bible says it, you can believe it: Biblical Archaeology – Part 4 of 4 Biblical Apologetics sermons.”

Mangrove Mtn Union Church: Thursday 22 July, 2010: Biblical Archaeology.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. *Let us pray.* O Lord our heavenly Father, high and mighty, King of Kings, Lord of lords, the only ruler of princes, who dost from thy throne behold all the dwellers upon earth: most heartily we thank thee that the doctrine of thy law, the Holy Bible, is perfect, converting the soul, that its testimony is sure, making wise the simple. We pray thee, O Lord, let the words of my mouth, and the meditations of our hearts, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, our strength, and our redeemer; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen¹⁵⁷.

Welcome to all listening to this address. This is the fourth and final in a series of four midweek prayer meeting sermons, the first three dealt with Biblical prophecy; but today’s topic is Biblical Archaeology. In considering Biblical Archaeology, we’re considering a very large topic indeed, and I’ll only be able to scratch the surface of a number of issues. A precursor to modern Biblical Archaeology occurred in ancient times, when Jews and Christians sought to identify certain sites from the Bible. For example, in ancient times, the Jews identified a site at Borsippa, known as Birs Nimrud, which was a suburb of Greater Babylon in modern day Iraq, as the site of the Tower of Babel in Genesis 11. We know from the Nebuchadnezzar Borsippa inscription from this site, that this is a ziggurat that men started to build, but which was incomplete and left abandoned for a very long time, and then much later King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon who reigned from 605 to 562 B.C., built it up into a later tower; and it was excavated in modern times by the German archaeologist, Robert Koldewey in 1902. Or in ancient times, Christians identified certain sites, such as, for example, the Pool of Siloam in Jerusalem. And so these type of ancient identifications by Christians and Jews were a forerunner to the modern science of Biblical Archaeology which dates from the 19th century.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) Collect, Matins & Evensong, & Ps. 12:7,14.

And there's been some amazing finds! For example, in 1850, Sir Austen Henry Layard dug into three mounds at Babylon. Later with Layard's discoveries being more widely discussed, in 1879 the British Museum in London asked Layard's old assistant from 1853 to return and look the sites over again. And upon doing so, he found the Cyrus Cylinder; and its discovery was then announced to the public by Sir Henry Rawlinson in 1879. The Cyrus Cylinder refers to the same decree as II Chronicles 36:23 and Ezra 1:2-4, for the post Captivity Jews to return to Jerusalem.

Now it should be understood that the benefits of Biblical Archaeology to us, are multi-faceted. Sometimes Biblical Archaeology simply helps us better understand something found in the Bible that's not necessarily in any kind of dispute. For example, just recently the remains of a first century A.D. synagogue have been discovered at Magdala, where Mary Magdalene came from; and as I discuss in Volume 2 of my textual commentaries on Matthew 15 to 20 at my website, we're also told in Matthew 15:39 that Jesus "came into the coasts of Magdala." Or when we think of Egypt, we may think of: The three big Pyramids of Giza, which are one of the Seven Wonders of the ancient World. The biggest is Cheops' Pyramid, and to its south there's the famous Sphinx. Or the famous obelisks of Egypt. For example, when I was in Rome in August 2001, I saw at St. John's Lateran in Papal Rome, a large Egyptian obelisk from the time of Ramasees, 1000s of years ago; and in London on a number of occasions I've seen on the banks of the Thames not far from the London Eye and Westminster Parliament, an obelisk called, "Cleopatra's Needle," which is 1000s of years old from the time of Thutmoses III, with inscriptions later added by Ramasees the Great.

The value of these type of things to Biblical Archaeology is that because they were there in Bible times, they give us a better background picture to certain Biblical events. For example, when the Children of Israel were in Egypt, these three Pyramids of Giza and the Sphinx were there, and so they'd have known about them. Or when the Bible prophecies we considered about Egypt were made, these great obelisks were there in Egypt; and like the Pyramids, they would also have been known in New Testament times. So they help us build up a picture of the world during Bible times, and in this sense, are a valuable part of Biblical Archaeology.

Furthermore, the Egyptians embalmed the dead, and we have a number of wrapped mummies showing this technique, and coffins that the mummy was then placed in. For example, at the British Museum in London, in January 2006 I there saw the coffin of Pharaoh Intef of the 17th Dynasty, who died 1000s of years ago. And I also saw there in May 2001 the wrapped mummy of Cleopatra, the daughter of Candace, from the early 2nd century A.D. . And the archaeologists have also found a wall painting on a tomb at Rekhmire which portrays Egyptian embalming. By contrast, the Jews usually buried their dead shortly after death. However, we're told in Genesis chapter 50 and verse 2, "And Joseph commanded his servants the physicians to embalm his father: and the physicians embalmed Israel;" and then we're told in verses 5 and 6 that this was done in order to transport the body back to Canaan for burial. And likewise in Genesis 50:26 we read, "So Joseph died, being an hundred and ten years old: and they embalmed him, and he was put in a coffin in Egypt." And so this knowledge we now have about embalming

from Egypt helps us better understand what the Bible means when it says that both Israel, also known as Jacob, and his son, Joseph, were embalmed in Egypt. And we also have the famous Meneptah stele from Egypt that refers to [quote] “Israel.”

And there’s lots of other examples of how Biblical Archaeology helps us better understand something found in the Bible. For example, I’ve made three trips to Rome, and Rome can be divided three ways into Papal Rome, Italian Rome, and Ancient or Imperial Rome. And on one of those trips to Rome in August 2001, I went to the old central part of Imperial Rome. As I walked around the Roman Colosseum, I thought of the Christians who had been martyred for their faith there; and I was interested to see that some seats had Roman numerals on them, so people could go to numbered seats to watch the Christians dying for their faith.

Then when I went up some stairs to a certain part of the Colosseum, I got a very good overview of the Arch of Constantine erected in 312 A.D. . But not far from there, I saw another Arch, the Arch of Titus, which is just outside a place I also went to and saw, called The Roman Forum. Now what was truly fascinating about this Arch of Titus, erected in 81 A.D. by the Roman Emperor, Titus, who ruled from 79 to 81 A.D., is that in celebration of the Romans Destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., there was included in this arch a stone engraving, known in archaeology as a relief, which depicted the Romans carrying off the seven-branched candlestick that they’d taken from the temple. And so that means that Biblical Archaeology has here given us a very accurate picture of the seven-branched candlestick mentioned in the Bible, for example, in Exodus 25:37; and also an extra-Biblical historical record of the Destruction of Jerusalem, prophesied by Jesus about 30 years before in Matthew 24 as a prophetic type of the Final Judgment that will fall at the Second Advent of Christ.

And sometimes Biblical Archaeology helps us better understand some elements of a particular Bible passage. For example, I thank God that I’ve been able to travel to a number of places, and one of the places I thank him for visiting is Israel, which I went to in February 2002. And in Jerusalem, I went outside the city walls down to the part called “The City of David.” Just 4 years earlier in 1998 a cistern had been uncovered which is regarded as the probable area of the King’s Palace and Courtyard, and so on the basis of Jeremiah 38:5,6, & 13, which talks about how under “Zedekiah the king” “Jeremiah” was drawn out of a “dungeon” with “cords” of rope, it’s thought that this might be “Jeremiah’s Well.” Of course, no-one can be totally sure of that, but on the available evidence it’s certainly possible. We live in an age when some foolish people criticize the great Protestant institution of Sunday Schools, but I thank God that as a boy I benefited from Evangelical Anglican Sunday Schools. And I remember at one of them, when my father was at Kapooka army camp in Wagga Wagga, in south-eastern New South Wales, training men for the Vietnam war; and I was about 6 and my brother, Peter, was about 8, my brother made a Lego model of Jeremiah’s Well that was featured for some weeks at the Kapooka *Church of England* Army Chapel as an example of what was happening in the local Sunday School.

But not far from what has been tentatively called, “Jeremiah’s Well,” I went down

into Hezekiah's Tunnel. In II Kings chapter 20 and verse 20 we read, "Hezekiah ... made a pool, and a conduit and brought water into the city;" and in II Chronicles 32:30 we further read, "Hezekiah ... stopped the upper watercourse of Gihon, and brought it straight down to the west side of the City of David." Now as fruit of Biblical Archaeology, it's possible to go and see, Hezekiah's Tunnel. I'd seen a video of someone going through Hezekiah's Tunnel, and because it showed them going in one end and then out the other end quite quickly, I thought that it would take less than 5 minutes. I had to use a torch because it was pitch black, and before I got there I didn't know that the water level in it varies considerably; so I had to take my socks'n'shoes off, hang my shoes around my neck, and roll up my trousers. The water went up to about one foot or 30 centimetres above my knees, so my trousers got soaked through where I'd rolled them up to; but it was a slow walk because I kept feeling in front with one foot, to make sure that I didn't suddenly plunge into even deeper water. I was the only one there, and it was quite nerve racking at times because I'd heard in my hotel of a recent attack by a group of Mohammedan Arab bandits on a tourist in the Muslim Quarter of Jerusalem; and I kept thinking that in all this blackness and isolation it would be possible for one of these violent blasted Arabs to come at me in an attack. I kept going and going, and kept wondering when this seemingly never-ending tunnel would come to an end! It's actually about 600 yards or about half a kilometre long. It took me about *twenty-five minutes* in this water, going slowly because I kept checking the ground in front of me with one foot, until finally, and I say the words "Thank God" reverently, "Thank God!", I finally saw the light at the end of the tunnel, which was a great relief to me; and I came out at the Pool of Siloam.

When I got there, I saw a white Caucasian Jew, who was therefore obviously an Ashkenazi Jew, who are a group of converts or proselytes to Judaism from some centuries after New Testament times. Racially, their Ashkenazi ancestors are not Semitic from Noah's son, Shem, but come down through Noah's son Japheth, via Japheth's son, Ashkenaz mentioned in Genesis 10:3, hence they're called Ashkenazi Jews; as opposed to the Sephardic Jews who are of the Semitic race descended from Noah's son Shem, and the Semites Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Now the matter is complicated by the fact that there have been some inter-marriages between these Ashkenazi and Sephardic Jews, and so you sometimes get a Jew who belongs to one of these two communities, but he's mixed race; stereotypically the ones that are predominantly white Caucasian from their Ashkenazi ancestry, but say with a hooked Jewish nose from their Semitic Sephardic ancestry.

But for all that, in broad terms, when one talks about the European Jews, many of whom have now gone to Israel, they are one of these two groups, whether Ashkenazi Jews or Sephardic Jews. And sometimes there's a bit of racial friction between these two groups, and of course in Acts 2:10 we read of "Jews and proselytes." Well in terms of that Biblical distinction, the Sephardic Jews are what Acts 2:10 calls "Jews;" and the Ashkenazi Jews are what Acts 2:10 calls "proselytes." And other groups like the black Ethiopian Jews who are Hamitic and come down from Noah's son Ham via "Cush," mentioned in Genesis 10:7, would also be classified under this Acts 2:10 distinction as "proselytes." So when we read in Romans 9 to 11 of a great conversion of Jews just

before the Lord's return, because they're contextually identified as members of the Jewish *race*; it's basically to the Sephardic Jews and some Semitic Jews that historically stayed in the Middle East, that we look too, to have this prophecy fulfilled in. So because that prophecy of Romans 9 to 11 is racial, it's not going to be fulfilled in proselyte groups to Judaism, like the white Ashkenazi Jews who come down from Noah's son, Japheth, or the black Ethiopian Jews who come down from Noah's son, Ham. It'll be fulfilled in the light brown Semitic Jews who come down from Noah's son Shem, and thereafter from the Semites Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

Well this distinction between the Ashkenazim and the Sephardim aside, I was very interested to meet, and talk with, this Ashkenazi Jew at the Pool of Siloam. He kindly took a photograph of me there at the Pool of Siloam; and I also took a photo of him washing various items because he was at the Pool of Siloam as part of certain Jewish purification ceremonies. Now in Jesus' day this Pool of Siloam was also used for Jewish purification ceremonies because it was from here that they used to take water for the rites connected with the Jews' *Feast of Tabernacles* mentioned in John 7.

But something else emerged from all this, that helped me to better understand another Biblical Story. You see, the Pool of Siloam is mentioned in St. John's Gospel in the Story of John 9:1-7. Turn with if you will in your Authorized Versions to the Gospel of St. John, chapter 9, and beginning at verse 4. This is the story of the man "born blind" whom Jesus gave sight to. Now in this story Jesus uses this miracle as an object lesson, because he says in John 9:4-7, "I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work, as long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world. When he had thus spoken, he spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay, and said unto him, Go, wash in the Pool of Siloam, (which is by interpretation, Sent.) He went his way therefore, and washed, and came seeing." So the point is that Jesus gave physical sight to a physically blind man, as an object lesson and proof of the fact that he gives spiritual sight and light to the spiritually blind through the gospel. Now in John 8:59 it says Jesus had just gone "out of the temple," and in John 9:1 that "as Jesus passed by, he saw" this "blind" "man." And so it's sometimes asked, 'Why did Jesus send the blind man to the Pool of Siloam which was so far away from the temple area?' Why not just send him to somewhere closer to wash?

WELL I TELL YA' WHAT! This is a good example of how Biblical Archaeology helps us to better understand the Bible. Because having gone through Hezekiah's tunnel, which is all black and dark, so I had to use a torch to see, and then coming out of the end at the Pool of Siloam, I can now see an added level of significance to the imagery of this story. That's because when one goes through Hezekiah's Tunnel, the Pool of Siloam is a most welcome exit point because as I discovered, it's quite literally, "the light at the end of the tunnel." And so likewise for this blind man, the Pool of Siloam was literally "the light at the end of the tunnel;" and so for us also, who have saving faith in Jesus Christ as the only begotten Son of God, sent by God the Father into the world to save sinners, for us Christ is the spiritual "light at the end of the tunnel." In the words of John 1:9, Christ is "the true light." And so we read in John 3:16 & 36, "For

God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth on him.”

And the other element that emerged from my visitation to Hezekiah’s Tunnel and the Pool of Siloam in Jerusalem, is when I got wet legs going through this tunnel and coming out at the Pool of Siloam, there was this Ashkenazi Jew I mentioned, there at the Pool of Siloam who was doing ceremonial washings of items; and so I spoke to him about this. And so in John 9, Jesus asked the blind man to wash here at the Pool of Siloam also as a symbol of the fact that we need to be washed with the spiritual waters of regeneration. In the words of John 3:5, “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God;” and this is not literal water for in the words of Titus 3:4-7, “after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.”

So I thank God for the experience of going through Hezekiah’s Tunnel, and coming out at the Pool of Siloam; because this fruit of Biblical Archaeology has now helped me better understand this passage in the Bible from St. John’s Gospel. And I hope that it also now helps you better understand this Gospel Story in John chapter 9 about the washing of regeneration by the Holy Ghost, and the light of Christ as Saviour of the world, to those who look to him with saving faith. For “these” things found in St. John’s Gospel, in the words of John 20:31, “are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.”

And there was something else from Biblical Archeology that I saw in Jerusalem that helps us to better understand the Bible. And that’s the Wailing Wall of the Jewish Temple from Christ’s time. Now my father, who’s a retired army officer, is a soldier from the Second World War of 1939 to 1945. He’s now 89 years old; and in the latter part of World War Two he was a Signalman fighting in the Pacific theatre of war with the 21st Infantry Brigade of the Australian 7th Division against the Japanese on the Kokoda Trail in Papua and New Guinea and also in parts of what is now Indonesia. But in the earlier part of World War Two he was a Signalman fighting with the 7th Division, against the Vichy French in the Syrian Campaign. The Vichy French were French who after Hitler defeated France, went over to fight for the Nazi Germans. After the Allies defeated the Vichy French, they had some leave in which they could look around certain places in the Middle East. Now King George VI reigned from 1936 to 1952, and Father tells me that the when he was in the Middle East, the coloureds there, who of course were Arabs, used to call all the white Australian soldiers, “Mr. George,” because the King’s name was George. So if one walked down a Bizarre, one might see some Arabs holding up some useless, worthless, trinkets, and calling out something like, “Mr. George! Mr. George! You come look my shop!” [pause]

Now I spoke to Father about some of the relevant matters before preparing this sermon in order to refresh my memory on certain particulars, and for example, in Syria, Father visited Aleppo in the north, which is an old capital city of the Biblical Amorites; and Damascus in the south. And of course, in Acts chapter 9 we read that it was when he was on the road to Damascus that the Jew, Saul, got converted and became the Christian, Paul, the Apostle. Now Father has some early 1940s black'n'white photographs taken in 1941 or 1942 of what was then called Palestine, but since 1948's been called Israel, as well as visiting Lebanon and Syria; together with some stories. For example, he visited the traditional site of Christ's nativity in Bethlehem; as indeed did I some six decades later. But one of the stories that Father tells is about his visitation to the Wailing Wall. Now if you go to my website, at <http://www.easy.com.au/~gmbooks/> [2015 update: <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>] or on Google or Yahoo type in as three separate words, "Gavin McGrath Books", then you'll see a blue'n'yellow home page, the top left of which says, "Gavin McGrath Books" "Religiously conservative Protestant Christian works in the holy Reformed faith," and the top right of which has a picture of myself standing at this site, with the caption, "The Gentile Christian, Gavin McGrath, at the Jewish Wailing Wall of Herod's Temple, Jerusalem, Israel, in 2002."

Now the old city of Jerusalem is segregated into four parts, the Jewish Quarter, the Armenian Quarter, the Christian Quarter, and the Mohammedan Quarter. The Wailing Wall is in the Jewish Quarter. And this amazing stone Wailing Wall which formed the foundations of Herod's Temple, helps us better understand a number things from the Bible. For example, we read in Luke 3:46 that in his boyhood, Jesus was "in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions." And so these foundation stones of this same Herod's temple would have been there at that time, and known to people of that era. Furthermore, in his Olivet Discourse in Matthew 24, speaking about 40 years before the Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in 70 A.D., Christ prophetically foretold this Destruction of Jerusalem, and taught that it would be a prophetic type of the much greater judgment that would occur at his Second Advent. And he also refers to some things that will occur between these two events, for example, he warns in Matthew 24:24 of a succession of "false Christs, and false prophets."

Now turn with me in your King James Bibles to Matthew chapter 24 and verse 2; that's Matthew 24:2. "And Jesus said unto them, See ye not all these things? Verily I say unto you, There shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." Well on the one hand, we cannot doubt that in 70 A.D., the Jewish Temple was destroyed, and pulled down, stone upon stone. But on the other hand, we cannot doubt that the words, "There shall not be left one stone upon another," have not been completely fulfilled, because we still have "one stone upon another" in this Jewish Wailing Wall. So what that tells us is that this prophecy is not going to be completely fulfilled till the Second Advent, at which time, even these stones of the Wailing Wall will all be demolished.

You see, this same Christ says in John 13:19, "Now I tell you before it come, that, when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am he." In Matthew 24 Christ taught that

the future Destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., was to be a prophetic type of the Final Judgment at his Second Coming. And just as his words were dramatically fulfilled 40 years after the Olivet Discourse of Matthew 24 with the Destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., so likewise we can be sure that his greater words will also be fulfilled concerning the Second Advent and the Day of Final Judgment, in which he will judge the quick and the dead. In the words of Article 8 of the *Apostles' Creed*, Christ [quote] “shall come to judge the quick and the dead” [unquote]; and in the words of Article 12 of the *Apostles' Creed*, I believe in [quote] “the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting” [unquote].

And I should mention that the *Apostles' Creed* is named after, not written by, the apostles; the *Athanasian Creed* is named after, not written by, Athanasius - a great defender of the Trinity; and the *Nicene Creed* is named after, and partly written by, the *Council of Nicea*. And in the words of Article 7 of the Anglican Protestant 39 Articles, “The three Creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius’s Creed, and ... the Apostles’ Creed, ... may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.” So I believe the three creeds, because they’re Biblical. The *Nicene Creed* gives more detail on the Incarnation and Trinity than does the *Apostles' Creed*; in turn, the *Athanasian Creed* gives more detail on the Incarnation and Trinity than does the *Nicene Creed*; and both the *Nicene* and *Athanasian Creeds* more succinctly link the incarnation to Christ’s suffering for our salvation, than does the *Apostles' Creed*. The *Athanasian Creed* is a bright shining light whose illumination dispels the darkness from the bewildering array of the world’s heathen and infidel religions; together with most heretical Christian religions, like, for example, the Eastern Orthodox who deny the double procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father *and the Son*. The *Athanasian Creed*’s light very largely reduces the field of world religions to a bi-polar Protestant-Roman Catholic paradigm, in which we religiously conservative Protestants then go on to shine the greater gospel light into the remaining dark regions of Popery. And among other non-Anglican Protestants; for example, Presbyterians also have the Apostles’ Creed in their Shorter Catechism; and Lutherans refer in Article 12 of the Lutheran *Formulae of Concord* to the three creeds as the [quote] “three approved symbols” [unquote] of the faith.

Now in Matthew 24 we also read that certain things will occur in between these two events of Christ’s Second Advent as typed by the Destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. . For example, Matthew 24:6 & 7 says there’ll be “wars,” “famines,” “pestilences,” and “earthquakes.” And in considering the Bible’s teaching of God’s judgment, one should distinguish between *God’s general warnings of future judgment*, and *God’s specific judgments*. For example, here in Matthew 24, the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. is a *specific judgment* that types the *specific judgment* of the Second Advent. But these words at Matthew 24:6 & 7 about how between these two events there’ll be “wars,” “famines,” “pestilences,” and “earthquakes,” are *general warnings of future judgment*. In other words, God either directs or permits such things to be a part of man’s world, as a *warning and reminder* of God’s future Day of Final Judgment.

And so when foolish and shallow persons claim there’s no answer to a question like, “How could a good God either direct or permit masses of human beings to be killed

in various ‘wars,’ ‘famines,’ ‘pestilences,’ and ‘earthquakes?’;” the answer from Matthew 24 is that he wants people to remember that there will be a Day of Final Judgment. And the same message is found in Luke 13:1-5 with regard to the Tower of Siloam, whose falling killed 18 people reminds us, in the words of Jesus, “except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.” God wants people to remember the Biblical teaching of the *Nicene Creed* which says [quote], “he shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead: whose kingdom shall have no end. ... And I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen” [unquote]. Sad to say, some people, dim of spiritual hearing and dull of spiritual mind, refuse to take a hint. They wantta’ add insult to injury against God by saying foolish and stupid things like, “God cannot be good and sovereign if he directs or allows such suffering.” The reality is that when they learn of various “wars,” “famines,” “pestilences,” and “earthquakes;” they should get down on their knees and thank God for this reminder that they need to start thinking about the great Day of Final Judgment, and repent of their sins as itemized in the Ten Commandments of Exodus chapter 20. They need to seek what the *Nicene Creed* calls [quote], “the remission of sins” [unquote], procured through [quote], “one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, ... who for us men and *for our salvation* came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and *was crucified also for us* under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried, and the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father” [unquote]. That’s the Christ that I believe in, and that’s the Christ that you should believe in too! And so we here find that there’s a very powerful and practical message for us in Matthew 24, and also in the Biblically based teachings of the *Apostles’* and *Nicene Creeds*. [pause]

Now I’ve never been to Lebanon or Syria, but Father’s photo album includes some 1941 or 1942 photos from both places. For example, a photo of a Church then still under construction to commemorate the Cedars of Lebanon; a specific photograph of what the tourist people told him was, [quote] “the largest cedar in Lebanon” [unquote], and also a more general photograph of some of the famous Cedars of Lebanon themselves. These are referred to in the Bible in, for example, Psalm 92:12 where we read, “The righteous shall flourish like the palm tree: he shall grow like a cedar in Lebanon;” or Psalm 104:16, “The trees of the Lord are full of sap; the cedars of Lebanon, which he hath planted.”

But amidst his early 1940s black’n’white photos from the Middle East, Father’s photos include a place he visited in Lebanon called Baalbek. And he’s got a photo of the six remaining pillars in the Temple of Jupiter at Baalbek. The very name, “Baalbek” refers to a centre of heathen worship of “Baal” in the Valley of “Beca,” and this piece of Biblical Archeology reminds us of Baal worship referred to in both the Old and New Testaments. For example, in Romans 11:3,4 we read, “Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal.” [pause] And these remains of the pagan temple of Jupiter at Baalbek, also give us some further information on the cult of this wicked idolatry, for the pagan god “Jupiter” is referred to three times in the New

Testament Book of Acts, in chapter 14 verses 12 and 13; and Acts chapter 19 verse 35. And this horrible sin of idolatry is prohibited in the first and second of the Ten Commandments in Exodus chapter 20, in their summary form, the first commandment, “I am the Lord thy God,” “Thou shalt have no other gods before me,” and the second commandment, “Thou shalt not make,” “bow down” “to,” “nor serve,” “any graven image.”

Now one of the places that my father saw in the early 1940s and I then saw about 60 years later, was the Mount of Olives, and the traditional site where Jesus is said to have ascended into heaven. I visited what’s called variously the “Dome of the Ascension” or “the Church of the Ascension” on top of the Mount of Olives. It was opened up for me by a nearby shop keeper, from whom I also bought some souvenir memorabilia from Jerusalem. In Acts chapter 1 verses 9, 11, and 12, we read that Jesus “was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight,” after which, the “men of Galilee” “returned” to the main part of “Jerusalem from the Mount called Olivet.” Now on the one hand, we can say that this Church of the Ascension is on the *traditional* site that Jesus is said to have ascended up into heaven from. But on the other hand, we cannot thereby prove that Jesus really did ascend into heaven. It’s only by faith in what God has told us in the Bible that we believe in the Ascension, and subsequent mediatorial work of Christ at God the Father’s right hand. In the words of Articles 6 and 7 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, Christ [quote], “ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty” [unquote]. Like any Christian, I believe that by faith. It’s something that Biblical Archaeology can neither prove nor disprove. But it can to some extent illuminate the Biblical story, first by pointing out to us where the Mount of Olives is, and secondly by pointing out to us what is regarded as the traditional site of the Ascension.

And the same thing is true of the atoning death and resurrection of Christ. Romans 5:6 says, “Christ died for the ungodly.” Romans 4:5 to 8 says, “But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.” And Romans 10:6 and 9 says, “the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise,” “that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.”

And so we read in Articles 1,2,4, and 11, of the *Apostles’ Creed*, [quote] “I believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who ... suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, he descended into hell; the third day he rose again from the dead. I believe in ... the forgiveness of sins” [unquote]. Or in the *Nicene Creed* we read in part, [quote] “I believe in ... one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God,” “who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried, and the third day he rose again according to the Scriptures, and

... I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins” [unquote]. And of course, for we Protestants, that means the spiritual baptism of regeneration that we read of in Titus 3:4 to 6, “the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour.” That spiritual baptism is what Ephesians 4:5 calls the “one baptism.” It’s not talking about the mode of administering the symbol of water baptism; it’s not referring to the sacrament of baptism; it’s talking about this spiritual baptism of regeneration, also referred to in Matthew 3:11, when St. John Baptist says of Christ, “he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire;” and on the lips of our Lord in John 3:5-7, “Verily, verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again.” So that’s the “baptism for the remission of sins” referred to in the *Nicene Creed*; and also referred to in Mark 1:8 and 16:16.

So we Christians believe in things like the virgin birth of Christ, or his resurrection, by faith. We believe them because we believe the Bible. We can, like both my father and I did, visit the Church of the Holy Nativity in Bethlehem and see the traditional site of Christ’s birth, or the Church of the Ascension on the Mount of Olives; but it’s only by faith that a man can truly say the words of Articles 3 and 5 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, Christ [quote], “was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary ...; The third day he rose again from the dead” [unquote].

But even though Biblical Archaeology can neither prove nor disprove things like Christ’s resurrection, it may help illuminate some elements of them for we believers. For example, we read in Matthew 28:2, that at the time of Christ’s resurrection, “the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it.” Now this raises the question of what this stone looked like. Well if you look at something like the early 16th century artwork of Al Tdorfer in Vienna, Austria, entitled, “The Resurrection of Christ,” you’d have to conclude that this was a stone pushed freely across the sepulchre’s door; and one would also have to draw a similar conclusion about a stone or boulder being just freely pushed across in front of the sepulchre door from the 19th century artwork depiction of Christ’s resurrection by Carl Bloch; or the 15th century oil on canvas painting of Bellini in Venice Italy, also entitled “The Resurrection of Christ.” And so that’s one view of Matthew 27:60.

But there’s also a second view related to some discoveries of Biblical Archaeology. When I visited Nazareth on my trip to Israel in February 2002, among other things I saw, at the Roman Catholic Sisters of Nazareth Convent, some 1st century A.D. ruins which included a tomb. In front of the tomb was a coin-shaped stone, in a groove, that was rolled back to put someone in the tomb, and then rolled closed in the groove to seal the tomb. And I saw a similar thing in Jerusalem, when I looked at Herod’s Family Tomb. Though the design was a bit different to the one I saw at Nazareth, like it, Herod’s Tomb had a coin-shaped stone in a groove, that was rolled down to close the tomb, and rolled back to open the tomb. And so from these type of

tombs, brought to light by Biblical Archaeology, some people consider that when Matthew 28:2 says that at Christ's resurrection, "the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it;" that the stone he rolled back would have been similar. That is, a coin-shaped stone, in a groove, rolled back'n'forth to open or close the tomb.

But whichever of the two views you think is the better one, about what the stone in front of Christ's grave looked like, it's still only by faith that we can say the words about Christ in Article 5 of the *Apostles' Creed*, [quote], "the third day he rose again from the dead" [unquote].

But there are also some instances where Biblical Archaeology has been very useful for refuting the claims of Bible critics¹⁵⁸. For example, in Isaiah chapter 20 and verse 1, we read that Sargon the Second is called "the king of Assyria." Before Biblical Archaeology, this was the only such reference and there was no mention made of him in any ancient literature. This led Bible critics to claim that the Bible was in error, and no such person ever existed. But in 1843, Paul Emil Botta discovered the ruins of Sargon II's Palace at Khorsabad in Iraq, and so silenced these Bible critics. Indeed, I've seen in the British Museum a stone relief of Sargon II. [pause]

Then there was the issue of the Biblical Hittites. For example, Genesis 10:15 and Genesis 23, refer to the Children of Heth; and the Hittites are presented as a powerful people in II Kings 7:6. Or Deuteronomy 7:1 addresses the Children of Israel and says, "When the Lord thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee, the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites, seven nations greater and mightier than thou." And so the Hittites are put at the top of the list of what are called, "seven nations greater and mightier than thou." So they must have been a pretty powerful people. But up till the 19th century, there was no record of them outside of the Bible. And so the Bible critics said, "Aha, they never existed;" and so wrote off the Bible's claims about these powerful Hittites as "a Bible blunder." But then came the Biblical Archaeological work of men like Archibald Henry Sayce and others;

¹⁵⁸ See e.g., for *some* of this information, Josh McDowell's *More Evidence that demands a verdict*, Campus crusade for Christ, USA, 1975, pp. 21 & 310 (Sargon II), 309-311 *et al* (Hittites), 21-22 (Belshazzar), 317 (Cyrus Cylinder); *Evidence That Demands A Verdict*, A Campus Crusade for Christ Book, Here's Life Publishers, 1972, San Bernardino, California, USA, Revised Edition, 1979, p. 68 (Ebla); pp. 70-73 (Ramsay & Acts), & Ramsay's *St. Paul the Traveler*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1935, pp. 7-8 & *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1915, pp. 150-2 (Sergius Paullus / Paulus); F.F. Bruce in Henry, C.F.H. *Revelation & the Bible*, Tyndale Press, London, 1958, 1959 British Ed., p. 325 (politarchs in Acts 17:6,8). "House of David," Davies. P., "In Search of 'Ancient Israel'," Sheffield England, JSOT Press, 1992 (Bible critic) vs. "House of David" Stelle in Auraham Biran's discoveries, *Biblical Archaeological Review*, 1994, pp. 26-39 & *Biblical Dan*, Exploration Society, Jerusalem, Israel, 1994, pp. 274-8.

and it turned out that the Hittites did indeed exist. Genesis 10 tells us they came from a Hamitic root, although we know many of them spoke Semitic, and some of them spoke Japhetic or Aryan. And so together with other data, that means they were mixed race, something like the modern Arabs. But the evidence for these mixed race Hittites is irrefutable, and it shows that they were indeed a very powerful and widespread people, in such places as Boghazkale in Turkey, known to the Hittites as “Hattusas,” or Hamath in Syria at which were found the Hamath Stones with Hittite hieroglyphs. For example, the British Museum has some Hittite stone artefacts from Carchemish in Syria. And so once again, the Bible critics were shown to be wrong, and they had to whimper away into a corner. [pause]

But then, the Bible critics came back for more. They discovered that the reference to “Belshazar” in Daniel 5 and other parts of the Old Testament Book of Daniel stood alone, with no references in any other ancient Middle East sources. “Ah,” they said, “We’ve got ya over a barrel this time, because we say Belshazar never existed, and the Book of Daniel wasn’t written in the 6th century B.C., rather, it’s a forgery from the 2nd century B.C.,” and they smiled widely. The Bible believing Christians responded to this as they had to other claims about the Hittites, saying that they believed it because the Bible said it, and they would believe it whether or not there was any evidence for it from archaeology. But then in 1854 the Nabonidus Cylinder turned up at Ur of the Chaldees; and this refers to Belshazzar as the son of Nabonidus, and shows that there was a co-regency between them. And the Nabonidus Cylinder is now in the British Museum where I’ve seen it. Thus what the Bible says about Belshazzar in the Book of Daniel is shown in the archaeological evidence to be correct. Hence the Bible critics, frustrated and fuming, scurried off. [pause]

But then another one of them got a so called “bright idea.” He noted that in Genesis 1, Genesis 1:2 says, “And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep.” Now the word used to describe this pre-Adamite flood that transpired in the time-gap between the first two verses of Genesis, and which is rendered in our King James Bibles as “the deep,” is the Hebrew word, “*tehom*.” But Bible critics claimed that this was a late word, and that this proved that Moses hadn’t written Genesis 1 back in the 1400s B.C., but that it was a much later forgery by some faceless and anonymous person. But then came the archaeological work of Matthiae at Ebla in Syria in the 1960s and 1970s. Many tablets were unearthed, including one that showed that the word, “*tehom*,” was used at Ebla some 800 years before Moses’ time. And so the Bible critics once again darted off looking for cover. [pause]

Then came Philip Davies, who in his 1992 book, “In search of Ancient Israel,” claimed that Bible history before the Babylonian Captivity of the 6th century B.C. was fictional. This Bible critic claimed the whole “House of David” was just a made up story. But then came the work of Professor Abraham Biran at Biblical Dan, published in the journal, *Biblical Archaeological Review* in March & April 1994, in which a stone stele referring to the [quote] “House of David” [unquote] and the [quote] “king of Israel” [unquote], was found, dating from around the 9th century B.C. . And so Davies earlier claim that the “House of David” was a fiction created sometime after the 6th century B.C.

was shown on the archaeological evidence to be false; and another Bible critic “bit the dust.” [pause]

And then there was the work of Sir William Ramsay who died in 1939. In his Book, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, he tells of how he was educated in the religiously liberal “Tubingen theory” that considered the New Testament Book of Acts was written in the 2nd century A.D. . But having entered his investigation on the historicity of Acts with such views, he found the evidence for the accuracy of Acts was so great, that he renounced his religiously liberal views, and became a religiously conservative Christian. For example, in his 1915 book *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*, he refers to both an inscription dating from the first century A.D. referring to the Proconsul “Sergius Paullus” found at Pisidian Antioch in 1912; and a stone which refers to the fact that he had a great-grandson *of the same name* who was consul around 150 to 168 A.D. . And so when the Bible says in Acts 13:7 that “Sergius Paulus” was a “deputy of the country,” it’s referring to this 1st century A.D. one, not his great-grandson of the same name in the 2nd century. [pause]

And in Carl Henry’s book, *Revelation & the Bible*, F.F. Bruce refers to how the Greek word in Acts 17:6 & 8, “*politarches*” meaning “the rulers of the city” in Acts 17:6 & 8¹⁵⁹, was not found in any non-Biblical classical literature, but only in the Bible. But it then turned up on nineteen inscriptions from the 2nd and 3rd centuries showing it was an established title of magistrates in ancient Macedonian cities. [pause]

You see, *If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it’s accurate; it’s reliable; it’s true!* And so time and time again the Bible critics have been routed and shown to be wrong through reference to Biblical Archaeology. Now don’t misunderstand me, I’m not saying that Biblical Archaeology can always do this. Only a limited number of things are preserved, and only a limited number of things are ever found by the archaeologists. And so the Bible critics can always keep going till they find something that Biblical Archeology hasn’t got anything on. But the point is that we can show from these type of discoveries and also the Biblical prophecies that we’ve considered, that the Bible is a trustworthy and reliable book, and should be believed also in those areas where we don’t have specific evidence from Biblical Archaeology. And so it turns out that when we consider all the evidence from Biblical prophecy and Biblical Archaeology that we’ve looked at over the last four weeks, that there is a problem. But the problem’s not with the Bible. The problem’s with those who don’t believe the Bible. And this same book tells us the reason for that in Jeremiah 18:9, where we read, “The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.”

If the Queen of Australia, Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth the Second, were to stand at the door of your residence and knock, would you be so foolish and rude as to not answer the door? And yet we read in Revelation 3:20 & 21 that the King of the Universe, His Divine Majesty, the Lord Christ, King of heaven and king of earth, stands at the door of your heart and mind, and knocks. “Behold,” the Lord of heaven and earth

¹⁵⁹ Greek, “*politarchas* (masculine plural accusative noun, from *politarches*).”

says, “I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.” Christ knocks. [5 loud knocks on pulpit] Dost thou turn a king away? [pause]

Let us pray. Almighty and everlasting God, heavenly Father we thank thee that thou didst so love the world, that thou didst send thine only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, “that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” We acknowledge before thee that we are sinners, that we have a wicked heart. We turn from our sins as found in the Ten Commandments; we turn from any idolatrous focuses we have on things other than thee, O Lord; we turn from any unbelief we have in thee, O Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three Persons and one God; we turn from any unbelief in the gospel of Jesus Christ in which thou dost save men by thy unmerited favour, that is, thy grace alone, accepted by faith alone; we turn from any unbelief in the absolute infallibility and authority of thy error free holy word, the Holy Bible; we turn from any idolatry of materialism; we turn from any Devilish spirituality such as the reading of horoscopes or participation in Halloween; we turn from any heathen idols such as those of Buddhism or Hinduism; we turn from any idols of some forms of apostate Christianity such as statues or icons of Mary and other “saints”; we turn from any attempt to communicate with the dead, whether in the form of Devilish séances, or some apostate form of Christianity that invokes saints in prayer; we turn from any apostate Christian idolatrous adoration of the consecrated Communion elements; we turn from any blasphemies, foul language, or irreverent talk; we turn from any failure to sanctify Sunday as the Lord’s Day; we turn from any failure to honour our parents, including maintenance of the graves of any deceased parents; we turn from any ungodly hates or murders, such as other than as an act of self-defence where it is necessary to save the mother’s life, any abortions; we turn from any unchastity such as fornication, adultery, or sodomy; we turn from any morally prohibited unions and so turn from any inter-racial dating such as that between whites and coloureds, and we turn from any inter-religious dating with non-Protestants; we turn from any racially mixed marriage such as that between white and coloured persons; and we turn from entering any religiously mixed marriage with non-Protestants; we turn from any adulterous remarriage following an unBiblical divorce not procured on Biblically sound grounds such as the weighty causes of adultery, desertion, or cruelty; we turn from any theft such as robbing thee, O Lord, of the glory due to thy holy name; we turn from any lying or dishonesty; we turn from any covetousness or lust, such as envy, gluttony, drunkenness, pornography; we turn from any lust of sex role perversion wherein the patriarchal structures of family, church ministry, or society in general are undermined; we turn from worldly lusts, including any fearfulness or cowardice in not confessing the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully fighting under his banner against sin, the world, and the Devil. We turn, O Lord, from these and any other sins. We turn, O Lord, to the Christ who stands at the door, and knocks. Repenting of our sins, we acknowledge Christ as thy only Son, heavenly Father, and confess Christ as our only Lord and Saviour who died in our place and for our sins on Calvary’s cross, being “delivered for our offences, and” “raised again” on the third day “for our justification.” We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord, through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ, thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

(John 3:16; Exod. 20; Rev. 3:20,21; Rom. 4:25; Litany; Collect Trinity 12.)

Sermon audio: www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible

Title: Biblical Apologetics 4/4: Biblical Archaeology.

Bible Texts: Matthew 24:2; Titus 3:5.

Brief Overview: This is the fourth of four addresses delivered in July 2010 on the topic of Biblical Apologetics. The first three sermons deal with Old Testament prophecies remarkably fulfilled, and the fourth sermon deals with Biblical Archaeology. In this fourth sermon, Gavin refers to his father's visitation to various Middle East sites in 1941 or 1942 while on leave as an Australian soldier during World War Two; and also of his own trip, some 60 years later to Israel in 2002, at which time he visited some of the same sites that his father had, such as the Church of the Holy Nativity in Bethlehem, or the Dome of the Ascension on the Mount of Olives in Jerusalem. Gavin deals with a number of interesting, informative, and exciting matters from Biblical Archaeology including: the Great Pyramids of Giza, the Cyrus Cylinder; the Nabonidus Cylinder; the depiction of the seven-branched candlestick from the Destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. at Titus's Arch in Rome; and in Jerusalem, Hezekiah's Tunnel, the Pool of Siloam, and the Wailing Wall of Herod's Temple, a picture of which is referred to at Gavin's website of <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>. The theme of this address is, "If the Bible says it, you can believe it; it's accurate; it's reliable; it's true." The sermon ends with a prayer of repentance and belief in the Biblical Christ of religiously conservative Protestant Christianity.

Keywords: Apologetics Archaeology Bible Prophecy King James Version

SERMON 2 SERIES: (Thurs. 3 February 2011) Sermon 2:1

An Exegetical Trilogy on I & II Thessalonians.

Sermon 1: I Thess. 1: "Flee from idolatry" (I Cor. 10:14). Subtitle: "Repent!" (I Thess. 1:9)

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. *Let us pray.* "O Lord, we beseech thee, mercifully hear our prayer, and spare all those who confess their sins unto thee; that they, whose consciences by sin are accused, by thy merciful pardon may be absolved; through Christ our Lord. Amen¹⁶⁰."

Welcome to all listening to this address. Today, Thursday the 3rd of February, 2011, we remember a national motif saint of Christianity in Australia, because today is *Richard Johnson's Day*, and so we thank God that more than 220 years ago, on 3 February 1788, the Reformed, Evangelical, Anglican Protestant clergyman, the Reverend Richard Johnson, arriving in Australia with the First Fleet, conducted the First Christian

¹⁶⁰ From "A Commination," Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662).

Service in Australia, in which he used the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662, and the Authorized King James Version of 1611 whose 400th anniversary is this year of 2011.

Before proceeding I draw your attention to “Flyer 2” on my textual commentaries website; and give notice that Her Majesty, the Queen, has recently spoken on a most important matter, and I ask that you respectively listen to the following excerpts from the Queen’s Christmas Message of last year, 25 December 2010, given by Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, by the grace of God, *Supreme Governor of the Church of England and Defender of the Faith*; Queen of the United Kingdom; Queen of Australia, and elsewhere, in which she quotes from Saint Matthew 7:12. [Quote] “Over 400 years ago King James the Sixth of Scotland inherited the throne of England at a time when the Christian Church was deeply divided. Here at Hampton Court in 1604 he convened a Conference of churchmen of all shades of opinion to discuss the future of Christianity in this country. The king agreed to commission a new translation of the Bible that was acceptable to all parties. This was to become the King James or Authorized Bible which next year will be exactly four centuries old. Acknowledged as a masterpiece of English prose and the most vivid translation of the Scriptures, the glorious language of this Bible has survived the turbulence of history, and given many of us the most widely recognized and beautiful descriptions of the birth of Jesus Christ we celebrate today.” ... “The King James Bible was a major co-operative endeavor that required the efforts of dozens of the day’s leading scholars. The whole enterprise was guided by an interest in reaching agreement for the wider benefit of the Christian Church and to bring harmony to the Kingdoms of England and Scotland.” “From the Scriptures in the Bible which bears” “King James” “name,” ““Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.”” [unquote]. [pause]

Now this is the first of a trilogy of sermons in the Thursday mid-week prayer meetings from *The First and Second Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians*. The first is principally on the issue of idolatry; the second on the Antichrist of II Thessalonians 2; and the third on the “Word” of God in II Thessalonians 3:14. So let’s now turn to II Thessalonians chapter 1. Now I’ve entitled this sermon, “Flee from idolatry,” and these words are taken from I Corinthians 10:14. But I’ve subtitled it, “Repent!” That’s because we read in II Thessalonians 1:8 of “the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ;” and the need to “repent” comes from the context of I Thessalonians 1:9 where we read, of “how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God.” We also read of “grace” in II Thessalonians 1:12, “the grace of our God and the Lord Jesus Christ.” And “faith” in II Thessalonians 1:3,4, & 11, “your faith groweth exceedingly,” verse 4, “your patience and faith in all your persecutions,” and verse 11, “the work of faith;” and “faith” in these verses includes both the faith in justification by faith, and also the believer’s ongoing faith in sanctification. We read of “sanctification” in I Thessalonians 4:3, but examples of this in Christian “charity” and prayer are found in II Thessalonians 1:3 & 11. We read of “judgment” in II Thessalonians 1:5, “of the righteous judgment of God.” And thus when we think of the subtitle of today’s sermon, “Repent!” we should think of “The Gospel” of: Repentance, “Grace,” “Faith,” “Sanctification,” & “Judgment.” And while all of those things are important, most of the

sermon will be taken up with “repentance” in turning from idolatry.

Turn with me then if you will to I Thessalonians 1. It’d be possible to preach a lot of sermons from this chapter, for example, from verses 1,3,5,9, & 10, one about the Trinity; or from verse 3, one about “faith,” “hope,” and “love;” or from verse 4 one about “election;” or from verse 5, one about the “assurance” of the believer, and the “Holy Ghost” “power” of the “gospel;” or from verse 7 one about the “ensamples” or examples of the saints, for instance, in the Great Protestant Missionary movement men like Samuel Marsden in New Zealand, William Carey in China, Henry Martyn in India and Persia, Adoniram Judson in Burma, Allen Gardiner in South America, Robert Moffat in Africa, or John Williams, the Missionary Martyr of Polynesia; or from verse 8 one about saving “faith to God-ward;” or from verses 9 & 10 one about the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ, or one about his literal return at the Second Advent. And all of them would be good sermon topics. But from the rich treasures of I Thessalonians chapter 1, I’ll be preaching today from verse 9, where we read that the Thessalonians “turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God.” The Greek word for “repent” is *metanoeo*, but our English word, “repent,” comes from the Latin word, “*paeniteo*;” and it means to change course, to change direction, or do a U-turn. So when we read that the Thessalonians “turned to God from idols,” that means that they repented of their idolatry, and instead worshipped God. God hates idolatry! It’s forbidden in the Ten Commandments, and God says in Isaiah 42:8, “I am the Lord: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images.”

Now we live in an ungodly age where some church people use various unBiblical devices and strategies to get people to go to church on Sunday, as though the mere act of Sunday observance somehow made a person a Christian. When I speak to unsaved people, when they want to know if I’m a genuine Christian, they frequently say things like, “So do you go to Church *every* Sunday?” And that type of view has come into various pulpits and churches. Now don’t misunderstand me. It’s true that we should sanctify Sunday in accordance with the fourth commandment of Exodus 20, and the New Testament teaching that Christ rose on “the first of the week,” Sunday. In the Greek the word, “*sabbaton*” has a double meaning of both “week” and “sabbaths,” so the words of the Gospel accounts that Christ rose on “the first of the week,” simultaneously mean, “the first of the sabbaths,” thus making Easter Sunday the first of subsequent Christian Sunday Sabbaths. But the sad truth is that churches are filled with Sunday observers who have never heard the gospel of Christ. They don’t know or understand that they are sinners, whose violations of God’s holy laws, as found most especially in the Ten Commandments, isolates them from God; that God the Father sent God the Son into the world, to die in our place and for our sins on Calvary’s cross, that he rose again the third day, ascended to the Father’s right hand where he intercedes for us, and is coming again to judge the quick and the dead. They don’t understand that they must repent of their sins, and turn to Christ in saving faith, accepting Christ as their only Saviour and Lord.

Sad to say, the message of Jesus in Mark 1:15, “Repent ye, and believe the gospel,” is frequently no longer preached. And yet we read in Mark 6:12, that when Jesus sent “out” his disciples, that they “preached that men should *repent*.” You see,

there's a fundamental need for repentance, and while the repentance of an unsaved person to the Gospel is a repentance from death to life, and so different to the need for continuing repentance throughout the Christian's life, which a Christian does not in order to be saved, but rather, because he is saved; so that we repudiate the Romish teaching that people fall in and out of salvation depending on whether or not they have any unconfessed sins; while I say the need for continuing repentance from sin in the Christian's life is not done in order to be saved, but because one is saved, it is nevertheless an ongoing reality because in the words of II Chronicles 6:36, "there is no man which sinneth not." Hence St. John the Baptist pointed to Christ, saying in John 1:29, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." That's sacrificial language, in which the Messiah was typed by the animal sacrifices of the Old Testament. For example, Isaiah 53:4 says of Christ, "surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows;" and Isaiah 53:5-7 says, "he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes are we healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter." And so it was, that pointing to the one that Isaiah calls "a lamb to the slaughter," that John the Baptist said, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." And so in I John 1:8 & 9, and I John 2:1 & 2, St. John says, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." "And if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."

But that's not all St. John says. For he continues in the next two verses, saying in I John 2:3 & 4, "And hereby we do know that we know him, If we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." And one of the commandments St. John isolates is that of idolatry, saying in I John 5:21, "Keep yourselves from idols." And likewise St. Paul says in Galatians 5:20 & 21, that those who engage in "idolatry" "shall not inherit the kingdom of God." So this is the same type of thing that we read of in I Thessalonians 1:9, where St. Paul says that the Thessalonians "turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God." And of course, that precept is found in the Ten Commandments.

In the summary forms of *The Ten Commandments*, the First Commandment is, "I am the Lord thy God," "Thou shalt have no other gods before me;" the Second Commandment is, "Thou shalt not make," "bow down to," "nor serve," "any graven image;" and the Tenth Commandment is, "Thou shalt not covet." In Colossians 3:5, we read of "covetousness, which is idolatry." You see, whatever your principal focus in life is, that's your god. And if your principal focus is on worldly lusts, then you'll have idols of worldly lusts. Hence there are many idols of this type in our world. [pause]

There are the Big Beat Popular music idols that is, rock'n'roll, pop, metal or heavy metal, R & B meaning "Rhythm & Blues," Rap or Hip Hop, and Punk, and their associated so called, "rock idols" and other Big Beat Popular music "idols." Now for

me, Big Beat Popular music is a most unpleasant topic, because I really hate this ungodly music culture, its unholy lyrics, and its wicked images. It's such a big and pervasive form of worldly lust, it would be possible to speak in much greater detail on it than I am today, and still only cover some of the larger sickly elements of this vile and horrible music. But for our purposes today, suffice to say that the whole Big Beat Popular music culture is based on working up fleshly lusts, worldly lusts, and turning people's focus away from God and the Bible, and onto ungodly lusts. It's an example of "covetousness, which is idolatry;" and hence the Logie-award winning TV programme that's been on Channel 10 since 2003, in which various potential Big Beat popular music singers audition in, is entitled, [quote] "Australian idol" [unquote]. And its short title is simply, [quote] "Idol" [unquote]¹⁶¹. So ya' don't have to be Einstein to work out that Big Beat Popular music is an idolatrous lust, in violation of the 1st, 2nd, and 10th commandments of the Holy Decalogue in Exodus chapter 20. [pause]

Then there are sport idols where sport crazy persons in a sport crazy world waste their life consuming their spare time and energy in a massive over-focus on sport, thereby making it their idol, or at least, one of their idols; thinking, for example, that if a guy can kick a ball well, or get that goal on the sport's field, then he's some kind of "hero." What a debased form of a "hero" such a person is, relative to the heroes of Christian faith that we find in the Bible or church history. Then there are TV and matinee idols, as people watch and idolize all kinds of garbage on the Television and in the movie theatres. There's the god of materialism, as men fail to heed Jesus' words of Matthew 6:24, "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Or there's the god of gluttony, in the words of Philippians 3:19, referring to those "whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly."

Or we're told in Colossians 2:8 & 9, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ. For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." You see, sometimes a "philosophy" can take the place of Christ, as some unBiblical "philosophy" becomes the focus or god of one's life. Thus, for example, in II Corinthians 1:12, there's a comparison and contrast made between being [quote] "godly" [unquote], as opposed to having [quote] "fleshly wisdom" [unquote]. And there are various examples of this, such as the philosophy of Karl Marx which leads men into atheistic Communism; or the political philosophy of secularism, which denies the

¹⁶¹ "Australian Idol," *Wikipedia* (25 July 2010), (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Australian_Idol), quoting "A Network Ten spokesman" referring to this Television programme by its short title, "Idol;" citing, D. Devlyn with G. Mitchell & C. Vickery on 4 Aug. 2009; "Sandilands dumped as judge on Australian Idol," *The Herald Sun* (Newspaper) at <http://www.news.com.au/heraldsun/story/0,21985,25877881-2902,00.html>; "Channel Ten Announce Their 2010 Programming – Australian Idol is Still on It," by Reality Raver, "Reality Ravings, Australia's ... TV Blog" (<http://www.realityravings.com/2009/10/29/channel-ten-announce-their-2010-programming-australian-idol-is-still-on-it/>).

Biblical teaching of a specifically Christian State found in such Establishment Principle passages as Psalm 2:10 to 12 and Isaiah 49:23; or the philosophy of French Revolution derived so called “human rights” on race, gender, or human sexuality, which in fact from the Biblical perspective are “human wrongs;” or the “science falsely so called” of Charles Darwin, which leads men into the highly erroneous theory of evolution. The Bible teaches creation, not evolution¹⁶². [pause]

And in this hedonistic culture, the god of drunkenness holds an enormous influence, especially due to the social pressure in numerous work-places to conform to the weekly Friday ritual of going with one’s work-mates to a pub, and getting drunk. Sometimes, but not always, this might be connected with social networking to help get a job promotion; or it might be just connected with social pressure to “join in” with others. For example, in a Sydney workplace I was in some years ago, they would sometimes sing or chant during the day the repetitive lyrics of a song, “More beer, more beer.” And this was sometimes sung or chanted during the week in anticipation of the weekly Friday ritual of drunkenness. I wasn’t interested in their weekly Friday binge of drunkenness, and so I don’t know if these words were the whole song, or just the refrain. But I think that such an idolatrous lust focus on drunkenness, reminds us that when people turn from worshipping the true and living God of the Bible, as found only in religiously conservative Protestant Christianity, then after turning from God, they do not end up worshiping nothing, rather, they end up *worshipping absolutely anything*, and every lust idol the Devil throws at them. And let me say that this lust idol of drunkenness, is a false focus in people’s lives, and so a false god. It’s a counterfeit, for we’re told in Ephesians 5:18, “be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit.” [pause]

Now I’m not an alcohol prohibitionist. I consider the Bible allows Christians to be either moderate drinkers or to abstain from alcohol, but not to be drunkards. Alcohol content is regulated by glass size, for example, a port glass is relatively small, but contains the same alcohol level as a glass of red wine in a red wine glass. Since they’re the two alcoholic drinks I prefer, I use them as examples; but the same is true for others as well; although beer has become more difficult because of different strengths. By “moderate,” for a man, I mean no more than two to three glasses consumed slowly over 2 or 3 hours; and for a woman, no more than two glasses consumed slowly over 2 or 3 hours. So, for example, I might have a few ports after dinner; or I might have a glass of red wine with my meal, followed by two ports. But that would be it for the day.

I should also mention that it’s best to drink alcohol with, or after a meal, not on an empty stomach. I’m opposed to drinking before or while on duty, Leviticus 10:9. So I don’t think one should drink at lunch-time on working days, but on weekends or a day off, if one wanted to have a glass of wine with one’s lunch, then that’d be okay; and while I might do that occasionally, as a general rule I’m a night-time moderate drinker.

¹⁶² I here said “evolution” (twice) but I should have said, “macroevolution” (twice).

Now unlike myself, some consider the best way to overcome the drunkenness problem is by alcohol prohibitionism. While I would not agree with that *per se*, I would accept that there are some individuals or racial groups, for which that's the best way to go, since they either seem to be unable to control their alcohol intake in a moderate manner; or they have some aversion to it. For example, among the Mongoloid races, with the black and straight head hair, medium prognathism, brown eyes and brown skin, being Gentiles who come down from Shem; the East Asians generally have an alcohol dehydrogenase, known as "the alcohol-aversion gene" ADH1B, which means they quickly get flushed, uncomfortable, or nauseated, from even a small amount of alcohol; and the gene's also found among a number of Ashkenazi Jews¹⁶³. Red Indian Mongoloids from the Americas don't have that gene, but they get drunk quite easily, e.g., on 19 February 1999 the United States Bureau of Statistics revealed that, for instance, in 1996 alcohol-related offences among Red Indians was more than double what it was for others in the United States of America, and you'll find that in, [quote] "American Indians are violent crime victims at double the rate of general population" [unquote]¹⁶⁴. So I'd accept that alcohol prohibition is a good thing for most Mongoloids; although I note that while it's not a drink that appeals to me, Japanese Mongoloids have culturally tried to overcome any alcohol-aversion by a very quick gulp of the high alcohol content rice wine.

And here in Australia, inside the human primary race, the Aboriginals are not part of the Mongoloid secondary race, but part of the Australoid secondary race. The Australoids have five tertiary races, one of which is the Australian Aborigines, with wavy and black head hair, moderate to abundant male facial and body hair, narrow heads, broad noses, strong prognathism, brown eyes, medium stature, dark brown to black skin, large teeth, long legs, and heavy eyebrow ridges. Now the Aborigines generally have better vision than other races, and their racial brain has an excellent visual recognition of, and memory for, shapes, and the combination of these racial traits makes them excellent trackers; so that full-blooded Aborigines have historically been used as trackers by the Police. And another of the five Australoid tertiary races are the Dravidians of, for example, southern India and Ceylon or Sri Lanka, with wavy to woolly and black head hair, moderate to medium male facial and body hair, broad noses, medium prognathism, brown eyes, medium stature, and dark brown skin. Now they're the "cinnamon"

¹⁶³ Quintanilla, M.E., Tampier, L., Sapag, A., Gerdtzen, Z., & Israel, Y., "Sex differences, alcohol dehydrogenase, acetaldehyde burst, and aversion to ethanol in the rat: a systems perspective," *University of Chile*, Santiago Chile & Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, March 2007, (Correspondence contact: Yedy Israel, University of Chile, Olivos 1007, Independencia, Santiago, RM, 8380492 Chile; or Email: yisrael@uchile.cl) (<http://ajpendo.psychology.org/content/293/2/E531.full>); & Norton, A., "Mindfood," Fri. 21 Jan. 2011, *Weekly Newsletters* (<http://www.mindfood.com/at-alcohol-aversion-gene-asian-groups-addiction.seo>).

¹⁶⁴ Cited in "Drunk driving in the United States," *Wikipedia* (Jan. 2011) (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Drunk_driving_in_the_United_States).

“merchants” of Revelation 18:11-13. And we know from work on the Proto-Elamo-Dravidian language that Dravidians, and therefore other Australoids like the Australian Aborigines, come down from Shem’s son, Elam in Genesis 10:22. But the Aborigines also have an alcohol problem. For example in June 2007, the then Prime Minister of Australia, John Howard, announced a government take-over of all Aboriginal settlements in the Northern Territory, wisely introducing a blanket ban on alcohol in all of them, since among other things, drunkenness was resulting in child abuse¹⁶⁵. And in many Aboriginal Communities, the elders have requested this themselves. For example, in August 2010, three Aboriginal Communities at Halls Creek in Western Australia, asked the Western Australian State Government to use Police to enforce a ban on alcohol, which was done; and there are another ten such Aboriginal Communities in Western Australia¹⁶⁶. So I support all that. But I’m not an Aboriginal or Mongoloid descendant from Noah’s son Shem. I’m a white Caucasian descendant from Noah’s son Japheth; with, for example, slight prognathism meaning jaw protrusion, abundant male facial and body hair, a narrow nose, we Aryans have different coloured hair and eyes, my hair’s dark brown, and my eyes are a two-tone green and gold; and so it’s okay for the white guys like me to be moderate drinkers; unless, of course, a white guy is a weaker brother, in which case he too might choose to drink no alcohol. And let me say that “weak” in this context does not necessarily mean “weak” in all areas, it just means that for whatever reason they’re not well suited to the moderate consumption of alcohol; after all, one could hardly say a figure like St. John the Baptist was “weak” in an overall sense.

And yet some have gone so far as to make alcohol prohibitionism an article of their religious faith. For example, among infidels, Mohammedans prohibit alcohol because Mohammed’s or Mahomet’s *Koran* in Sura 2:216, claims the consumption of [quote] “wine ... is great sin” [unquote]¹⁶⁷. So too, among Protestant Christians, Puritans have often, though not in all instances, been alcohol prohibitionists.

But unlike many Puritan derived Protestants, and unlike the Mohammedans, the traditional Anglican Protestant and Lutheran Protestant position on alcohol is that the Bible prohibits drunkenness, but condones moderate drinking. For example, drunkenness is condemned in Matt. 24:48-51 and Galatians 5:21. But moderate drinking is condoned in Deuteronomy 14:26 and Psalm 104:15. Hence when in I Corinthians 11:21 abuses of the Lord’s Supper are condemned in which participants are getting “drunken,” St. Paul does not say, “start using grape-juice at Communion,” but rather says in the next verse, “What? Have ye not houses to eat and drink in?” And so he says they

¹⁶⁵ Laga, B., “Australia bans alcohol on Aboriginal land,” [London] *Times Online*, 21/6/2007 (<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/artcile1966996.ece>).

¹⁶⁶ O’Brien, A., “Aboriginal communities ask government for drink bans,” *The Australian*, 5 Aug. 2011 (<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/aboriginal-communities-ask-government-for-drink-bans/story-e6frg6nf-1225901336628>).

¹⁶⁷ *The Koran*, translated by J.M. Rodwell, 1909, J.M. Dent & Sons, London, England; reprint: Everyman’s Library, London, UK, 1974, p. 361.

can consume alcohol in their homes; although we cannot doubt that this is the moderate usage of alcohol he's endorsing, for he earlier says in I Corinthians 6:9 & 10 that "drunkards" "shall not inherit the kingdom of God."

Thus, for example, in the Lutheran's Concordia Publishing House of the USA editions of Martin Luther's works, in Volume 7 Luther says at page 351, [quote] "If we were more frugal and saved only what we spend annually on the immoderate drinking of beer and wine, there would be far ampler resources, both private and public" [unquote]. And so Luther here condemns drunkenness. But then in Volume 23, at page 129, he condones the moderate consumption of [quote], "bread and beer into your mouth" [unquote]. And in Volume 50 at pages 286 to 287, he wrote a letter [quote] "on the day of the Conversion of St. Paul" [unquote], which you'll find from the Calendar in the 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* is 25 January. In this letter, addressed to his wife, Katie, whom he describes as [quote] "a brewer" [unquote]; in the year of his death, 1546, referring to "Torgau" of Saxony in eastern Germany and "the Rhine" River of western Germany; Luther says, [quote] "we take good beer from Torgau and good wine from the Rhine, with which we refresh and comfort ourselves" [unquote]¹⁶⁸.

But in contrast to Lutheran and Anglican Protestants, while Puritan derived Protestants are historically divided over the issue, there's always been a strong alcohol prohibitionist group among them. For example, in the United States of America, between 1919 and 1931, Puritan derived Protestants were largely responsible for laws prohibiting the manufacture or sale of alcohol in America. We Anglican and Lutheran Protestants would see that as an attempt to spy out our Christian freedoms, and a direct violation of the command in Colossians 2:16, "Let no man ... judge you in meat, or in drink;" of which we read further detail in Colossians 2:20 to 23, with such "ordinances" as "Touch not; taste not; handle not; which all are to perish with the using:" "after the commandments and doctrines of men". "Which things have" but "a shew of wisdom," and in fact fail in "the satisfying of the flesh." Indeed, the alcohol prohibitionist era in America quite frankly reminds me of the type of nonsense that happened under Oliver Cromwell's Puritan republic, which, for example, set aside the specific command of Romans 14:5 & 6, and the spirit of Colossians 2:16, "Let no man ... judge you ... in respect of an holyday," by seeking to prohibit holy days such as Christmas. [pause]

Nevertheless, in harmony with the general teaching of Romans 14 and I Corinthians 8, and the specific teaching of Romans 14:17 & 21, it's wrong to drink alcohol, or eat food offered to idols, when one's in the presence of Christian brethren that find it offensive, or are hurt by it. For example, rice wine made in Japan that has heathen rituals performed over it during the production process. And it's notable that in the holy gospels we read that John the Baptist was subject to the Nazarite vow of Numbers 6, because we read in Luke 1:15, "he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and drink

¹⁶⁸ *Luther's Works*, Concordia Publishing House, USA, Vol. 7, (Lectures on Genesis 38-44, Editor, J. Pelikan, 1965, Saint Louis, Missouri,) p. 351; Vol. 23, (Sermons on John 6-8, Editor, J. Pelikan, Saint Louis, Missouri,) p. 129; Vol. 50, (Letters III, Editor H.T. Lehmann, Fortress Press, Philadelphia,) pp. 286-7.

neither wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb." But by contrast, Christ did drink wine or strong drink, for we further read in Luke 7:33-35, "For John the Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine; and ye say, He hath a devil. The Son of man is coming eating and drinking; and ye say, Behold a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners! But wisdom is justified of all her children." Now those words of Luke 7:25, "wisdom is justified of all her children;" are a statement from the lips of our Lord himself, that on this issue, the Christian church has within its pale, two quite different types of people. It has on one wing, a group of alcohol prohibitionists who do not wish to touch alcohol in any form; and on the other wing, a group of moderate drinkers. The "wisdom" of the church requires both wings in order to fly; and so there should be tolerance between us. But in public gatherings where Christians are socializing, if certain weak brethren are present, then pursuant to Romans 14:21, we should not have any alcohol present.

Now at Matthew 3:2 St. John the Baptist preaches, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" and likewise, at Matthew 4:17, our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, preaches "Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Repentance from sin is an important element of the gospel. Those who claim that in an evangelistic context one can, [quote] "Accept Christ" [unquote], without repentance of sin, are preaching a false gospel. And while Christ isolates a number of sins, for example, using the Ten Commandments to isolate sin in Matthew 19:16-23; in his Olivet Discourse of Matthew 24, Christ specifically isolates the sins of gluttony and drunkenness, saying in Matthew 24:37-39, "But as the days of Noe were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they were *eating and drinking*, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be."

Now Genesis 6, in the connected context of the Genesis 4 & 5 genealogies, tells us of the mixed marriages between Cain's race and Seth's race, and God's general solution to inter-racial marriages in the racial segregation of national groupings via Noah's three sons in Genesis 9 & 10; and God's solution to the Genesis 6 "violence" is found in the Genesis 9:6 teaching that makes murder a capital crime; but Genesis 6 doesn't specifically tell us about this gluttony and drunkenness. The terminology of "eating and drinking" in Matthew 24:38, is like that of Matthew 11:19, "The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber;" and hence the contextual appropriateness of Jesus' elucidation in Matthew 24:48 & 49 to the "evil servant" that begins "to eat and drink with the drunken." And so Christ here tells us that in the events that precede the Second Advent, in addition to the issue of racially mixed marriages also prophesied of in Daniel 2:43 & 44; that gluttony and drunkenness are going to be *very serious problems*, and that those who engage in these sins will be caught by surprise when Christ returns to judge the living and the dead; and asks, "Who" now is my "faithful and wise servant, whom" I shall set over my "household"¹⁶⁹? [pause] And so gluttony and drunkenness, wherein men worship gods of lust such as the god of the belly, Philippians 3:19; and the god of drunkenness, are forms of idolatry that in the

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Matthew 24:45.

words of I Thessalonians 1:9, people need to have “turned to God from.”

And if ya’ wondering what ya meant to do with ya’ spare time once you get rid of all these idols, like the sports’ idols, the Big Beat Popular music idols, or the god of drunkenness, then your sanctification can start by reading the Bible and getting a better knowledge of it, and church history. You can start in prayer, asking God to guide you to do his directive will. In referring to sanctification or holiness of living, II Thessalonians 1:11 gives us the example of prayer, for we there read, “Wherefore also we pray always.” And it also gives the example of “charity” in II Thessalonians 1:3. Christian “charity” takes many forms, but one form is voluntary service in something God wants you to do.

And if in prayer and life, you put yourself under God’s directive will, not just for 5 to 10 seconds, or 5 to 10 days, or 5 to 10 months, but stay under it for 5 to 10 years and more, you’ll find God has a job for you. It might be, for example, that you’re meant to be the organizing person, or one of the persons who is organized by someone else, that God wants to use to hold a weekly prayer-meeting in a retirement home near you. Or it may be, for example, that you’re meant to be the organizing person, or one of the persons who is organized by someone else, that God wants to use for a weekend church ministry to teenagers in a detention centre, where in a group of others, you weekly take ‘em some cakes’n’biscuits’n’fizzy drink, talk to ‘em over a couple of hours on a Saturday or Sunday afternoon, and somewhere in there, as the Lord leads, introduce Biblical things to them. It might be that God has some other job for you.

It may be you’re meant to be a Sunday School teacher. Or maybe, instead of being one of those who criticizes the great Protestant institution of Sunday Schools, you’re meant to be the organizing person who gets one or more mini-buses going around the area to bring all the kids to the local Protestant Sunday School who want to come. And if ya’ start doin’ that, you want keep long with all this business about how it’s best for just parents to bring their kids to Church, because among other things you’ll find out that there’s a number of parents who hardly ever come to church themselves, but who’ll let their kids go on the Sunday School bus, or let them go if driven in a car by a parent taking their kids of about the same age to the Sunday School. Maybe you’re the person who was meant to drive that boy or girl who was a school friend of your kids to Sunday School, and maybe it’s now too late because that boy or girl’s grown up, and because nobody offered to drive that person to Sunday School, their life’s a spiritual and moral wreck.

Now I just don’t know what your God given job of Christian charity’s meant to be. Maybe you’re meant to be one of the friendly persons who talks to people after a church service that no-one else wants to talk with. Or maybe you’re meant to do something else again. I don’t know. But I do know, that with so many saved people, living like Lot in Sodom, under God’s permissive will; rather than like Abraham after he started to do the right thing, living under God’s directive will; *there’s a whole lot of jobs, that ONLY a whole lot of people, in a whole lot of Protestant Churches CAN DO, and that a whole lot of jobs, just haven’t gotten done for a whole lot of time. It seems that while a whole lot of Christians have been spending their time watching various sporting*

activities, for example, a relay-race on the sport's field; there's been a number of their fellow Christians holding out the relay-baton of some ministry that they've been involved in, and finding no-one who's prepared to grasp and take over that relay-baton, and they've taken their relay baton with them down into their grave. [pause] It's been an awfully long time, it's been far, far, TOO LONG a time, Western-world wide, since a whole lot of jobs have been done by any Protestant Christian in the service of God! And God's still waiting for saved persons in their religiously conservative Protestant Churches, who are justified by his grace, to put themselves under his directive will, and stop wasting all their time on all this garbage that they live for!! [pause]

For some time now, both spiritually and morally, the Western World has been on the decline; and it seems that too many Western Protestant Christians are just too busy with worldly things, to really mind. In the words of the holy Apostle, St. Peter, found in I Peter 4:17, "the time is come that judgement must begin at the house of God." In a selection of the words from Horatius Bonar's great hymn of 1846, "I heard the voice of Jesus say, 'Behold, I freely give, The living water; thirsty one, stoop down and drink, and live.'" "I looked to Jesus, and I found in him my star my sun; and in that light of life I'll walk, till travelling days are done." [pause]

Well may we pray, "God, sanctify us saved ones in holiness of living, till our travelling days are done;" because nothing will ever sanctify in true holiness of living, the world, and the lusts thereof, that so many people are consumed by. We're told in Philippians 3:5, that before his conversion to Christianity, that Paul was a Jewish "Pharisee;" and in Luke 16:14 we're told "the Pharisees ... were covetous." Notably then, St. Paul who tells us in Colossians 3:5 of "covetousness, which is idolatry;" in Romans 7:7, citing the Tenth Commandment of the Holy Decalogue says, "I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." And we all know what job God gave him, when he got under God's directive will. This man of the Jewish race became the Apostle to those of the Gentile race. For which we Gentile Christians are deeply indebted to God, and deeply thankful to the holy Apostle, St. Paul. And if you're under God's directive will, I wonder who should be thankful for you? I don't say they necessarily will be thankful. I say they *should* be thankful. *I say, I say, I say, if you're under God's directive will, I wonder who should be thankful for you?* [pause]

Now when Satan had Devil-possessed a serpent and spoke through it in the Garden of Eden to Eve, he said in Genesis 3:5, "ye shall be as *elohim.*" Depending on context, the Hebrew word, *elohim*, can mean "God" singular, or "gods" plural. But here in Genesis 3:5, before the *elohim*, the Hebrew *hayah* is declined as a second person plural verb, "ye shall be." And that plural context of referring to both Adam and Eve is also found in the immediate context either side of verse 5. And so Lucifer is saying both Adam and Eve will be as *elohim*. Now it doesn't take much mathematical brilliance to realize, that if Adam thinks of himself as a god, and Eve thinks of herself as a god, then there would be two gods. And so the most natural way to render the *elohim* here in Genesis 3:5 is the way it is in our King James Bibles as, "ye shall be as gods," not "ye shall be as God."

Understandably then, Genesis 3:5 is rendered, “ye shall be as gods” in both the Greek Septuagint where “gods” is in the plural as Greek, *Theoi*, and the Latin Vulgate where “gods” is in the plural as Latin, *dij* – spelt “d” double “i.” And so the Greek Septuagint, Latin Vulgate, and Authorized Version translators, all could tell from context that the meaning of *elohim* in Genesis 3:5 is best rendered “gods,” in the wider words to Adam and Eve, “ye shall be as gods.” However, this verse is mistranslated in the “new” versions, such as the New King James Version or New American Standard Bible, as “God” singular. So what does that tell us about the superficiality and shallowness of these modern translators; who are incapable of working through a contextual chain of logic to realize that *elohim* here is best translated as “gods”? [pause]

Now we thank God that the correct meaning of the Hebrew in Genesis 3:5, as found historically in both the Greek Septuagint and Latin Vulgate, is found for us in our Authorized Versions, which read, “ye shall be as gods.” And this verse is very significant because it means that the attack on original monotheism, and thus the beginning of polytheism, comes from Lucifer’s temptation in the Garden of Eden. Now there are different spin-offs from this temptation to violate the First Commandment, “Thou shalt have no other gods before me.” One spin-off is the deification of man with ancestor worship, such as one finds, for example, in the heathen Chinese religion of Confucianism, in which the spirits of dead ancestors are worshipped in the belief that by appeasing them they will not cause trouble for the living¹⁷⁰. Another spin-off is polytheism and idolatry such as one finds, for example, in the heathen Indian religion of Hinduism. But without considering all its many, many, spin-offs, it’s notable that Genesis 3:5 teaches that the attack on original monotheism, and beginning of polytheism, comes from Lucifer’s words of temptation in Genesis 3:5, “ye shall be as gods.”

That’s significant because it means that when one looks at all the people in different religious cultures who are trapped by all kinds of false ethnic religions, it’s important to remember that these false ethnic religions came about because at some point in time their ancestors got off track, and stopped worshipping the true God. If you go back in any human being’s genealogy, eventually you’ll come to Noah who we’re told in Genesis 8:20, “builted an altar unto the Lord;” and then you’ll come to Adam and Eve and original monotheism. So when Christian missionaries bring people out of the religious darkness of their ethnic religions into the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ, they’re in fact acting to reconnect them with the religious beliefs of their earlier ancestors who worshipped the true God. It’s important to remember that, because the spiritually blinded of this world sometimes say that these people should be left to their pre-existing non-Christian ethnic religion. But that religious culture is an imposition, brought about by religious apostasy, and the true worship of God found in the earlier religious culture that all peoples come from is the original monotheism and pure worship of God by Adam and Eve in Eden.

¹⁷⁰ Josh McDowell & Don Stewart’s *Handbook of Today’s Religions* (Campus Crusade for Christ, USA, 1983, Thomas Nelson Publishers, Nashville, Tennessee, USA), pp. 329-330 & 337.

And so let us consider some of the gods of heathenism. There are numerous heathen religions, for instance, while some Australian Aborigines have become Christians, repenting of their sins and turning in saving faith to Christ, a large number of them have sadly remained in their heathen religion of animism, with all its Devilish deceptions, and violations of the First Commandment in the Holy Decalogue, “I am the Lord thy God,” “Thou shalt have no other gods before me.” Other smaller heathen religions include, for instance, Jainism, Confucianism, Taoism, Shintoism, and Zoroastrianism; together with the heathen religions of the occult, for instance, astrology, fortunetelling, white and black magic, Ouija boards, Satanism, Spiritism, and witchcraft¹⁷¹. But the two biggest and most significant heathen religions in the world today are Buddhism and Hinduism. Buddhism began in India about 500 B.C. as a break-away group from Hinduism¹⁷², and so they’re related religions. Both have idolatry at their heart, in the case of Buddhism the statue idol of Buddha, and in the case of Hinduism various idols such as the Shiva statue. And these idols of Buddhism and Hinduism are a further violation of the Ten Commandments of Exodus 20, specifically being a violation of the Second Commandment, “Thou shalt not make,” “bow down” “to,” “nor serve,” “any graven image.”

There’s also the Japanese religion of Shintoism. However, in Japan Shintoism and Buddhism co-exist for most people in a dualistic syncretism. Put simply, most Japanese belong to both religions. Shintoism is a national religion of Japan and essentially confined to Japan and persons of Japanese descent. It has various heathen deities, for example, the heathen sun goddess, Amaterasu¹⁷³. On my third trip to London from August 2003 to April 2004, on the way over I shortly visited Osaka in Japan on just one night, and on the way home to Sydney, I visited Tokyo in Japan, where I spent four days. My guide around Tokyo was an old friend of mine who I was in Sydney University Regiment with. He’s a white Caucasian Australian living there in Tokyo who teaches English language. And I should mention that my Father who recently celebrated his 90th birthday, thus becoming a nonagenarian, is a little bit older than my mother who’s still an octogenarian. And one of Father’s twelve medals is the *Australian Service Medal* 1945-75 with clasps South-West Pacific & Korea, because following the anti-Communist Korean War of 1950 to 1953, in 1956 he was part of what was called “Korea Force” and stationed at a British Commonwealth Signals Base at Kure in Japan; and we’ve heard about the Korean situation recently with the flare up three months ago in November 2010 when North Korean Communists shelled South Koreans on the Island of Yeonpyeong.

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*, Part II, The Occult (pp. 149-272), & Part III, Heathen & Infidel Religions (pp. 283-405). On the one hand, their condemnation of evil is far too weak e.g., they do not care that the term “magic” is used generally in a popular usage to desensitize people to its dangers (p. 203); or they are unprepared to condemn outright some literature using Devilish imagery, or participation in Halloween (Appendix 1, pp. 273-4). But on the other hand, this book contains much useful information.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, pp. 304-324 (Buddhism) at p. 304.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. 349-355 (Shintoism).

Now after Father's plane landed at Tokyo in 1956, he had gotten from Tokyo to Kure in the south by train; and when he was on leave he visited the relatively close Hiroshima where the Allies dropped the first of two atomic bombs that ended World War Two. And one of Father's Hiroshima photos is an old black'n'white postcard, autographed by "K. Kikkawa" which he used to sell as a [quote] "Bomb Souvenir" [unquote], and on his shop sign called himself [quote] "Atomic Bomb Victim No. 1" [unquote]. He had spent six years at Hiroshima Red Cross Hospital suffering from burns to over half his body; and this autographed postcard in Father's album shows him sitting on the ground revealing his naked back which was badly mutilated from the 1945 atomic bomb blast. But I thank God for these two atomic bomb drops that *speedily* ended World War Two and saved *many, many*, Allied lives.

Well in 2004 my Tokyo guide and I went around looking at some of the *heathen* idols in Tokyo, such as the Meiji Jingu Garden Shrine of Shintoism which is in an area of 83,000 square metres, and which involves the Devilish teaching of ancestor worship; and also the Shiba & Shinmei Gate going to the Shiba-Daljunga heathen Shinto shrine. We also saw the Sensoji Buddhist Temple, notable for its large lantern at the entrance on the pagoda, and some very ugly statues of heathen gods on display in its recesses; as well as the Sengakuji Buddhist Temple famous in Japan because here are the cremated remains of the 47 Samari who fought against the Shogun in the south, and then committed mass suicide. And the debilitating influence of heathen Buddhism is thus clearly seen in the fact that these acts of self-murder are regarded by Japanese heathens as giving these 47 Samari some kind of [quote] "honour" [unquote]. And we saw there a number of Japanese offering incense to [quote] "the spirit" [unquote] of the dead, in an enclosure containing the cremated remains of the 47 Samari. And amidst all this, my friend told me that most Japanese get married at a Shinto shrine; but have their funeral service at a Buddhist temple. So most Japanese are involved in a syncretism, in which they belong to two idolatrous heathen religions, Shintoism and Buddhism.

Now I saw some other interesting things in Tokyo, including, for instance, the top of Mount Fuji from Tokyo Tower; the Rainbow Bridge from Tokyo Bay, where the USS Missouri anchored at the end of World War Two, and the Japanese Emperor signed the surrender. Or the outside Palace walls and various Imperial Palace gates, such as the Sakoradom Gate where the Emperor or King lives, and some Palace buildings that can be seen from the outside of the Palace Walls. We also saw the Sumo wrestling stadium at Ryogoau; and at the Edo Museum, for example, an unexploded World War Two bomb dropped on Tokyo by an Allied American B29 Bomber in 1944; some costumes and stage settings for Kabuki plays; and a 19th century Japanese sword. Indeed, I then saw a lot more swords of samaris and others when we went to the Japanese Sword Museum.

It was great to see some sites connected with the Emperor or king of Japan; but I wanted to know what the King of Kings, King Christ, had been doing in Japan. It was great to see some things relevant to World War Two; but I wanted to know about what I Timothy 1:18 calls the "good warfare" of the Gospel. It was fantastic to have my photo taken standing next to a big Japanese sumo wrestler; but I wanted to know what those who in the words of Ephesians 6:12, "wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against

principalities, against powers, and the rulers of the darkness of this world,” what they had had been doing in Japan. It was good to see the top of Mount Fugi from Tokyo Tower; but I wanted to know about those who were heading for what Isaiah 11:9 calls the “holy mountain.” I was very interested to see the swords at the Edo Museum and Japanese Sword Museum; but I wanted to know about what Ephesians 6:17 calls “the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God,” and how that sword had been unsheathed for spiritual battle in Japan. In short, I wanted to know about the Christian Missionary work among these heathen idolaters; and the proclamation in the Land of the Rising Sun of the Christ who in Malachi 4:2 is called, “the Sun of righteousness.”

As one of the many manifestations of the Great Protestant Missionary Movement, that dates from the late 18th and early 19th centuries, Protestant Christian Missionary work to Japan dates from the mid 19th century. In 1859 representatives of three Protestant churches and seven Protestant missionaries arrived from America. An American Baptist, Jonathon Cable, arrived in Japan in 1860 when Christianity was still an illegal religion. He was later joined by Nathan Brown and in 1876 the first Protestant Church, which was a Baptist Church, was built in Tokyo. In 1884 the Baptists then established a theological school in Tokyo, which expanded to become the Kanto Gakuin University in 1949. This model of using educational institutions as a means of Christian missionary work has been more widely followed in Tokyo. Protestant missionary work from the 19th century on included that of Anglicans, Presbyterians, Dutch Reformed, and Baptists; and an example of this is seen in education linked with missionary work at St. Paul’s Rikkyo University, founded in Tokyo in 1874. I inspected this university, seeing there a bust of Bishop Tucker who died in 1959, and a stained glass window bearing a Christian Cross as part of the university crest on a Chapel window. I further visited St. Paul’s International Lutheran Church, in Tokyo; and Tokyo Baptist Church. Now I don’t know how faithful to the tenets of religiously conservative Protestant Christianity these particular Protestant universities and churches in Tokyo presently are, but I hope they are faithful to the great truths of the Reformation, and their presence there and history bespeaks of some level of missionary work.

In 1880, the first Protestant translated New Testament in Japanese was published, and this was followed in 1888 with the publication of the first Protestant translated Old Testament in Japanese. The Sword of the Lord - the Word of God, had been unsheathed in Japan, and by 1908 there were about 1,000 Protestant Missionaries in Japan. According to some statistics I saw, when I was Japan there were between 600,000 to 700,000 Protestants, and about 7,000 Protestant Churches. Now these statistics don’t give me any specific data on who are being designated as [quote] “Protestants” [unquote]; and I don’t know the quality of the Christian profession of these 600,000 to 700,000 Protestants in 7,000 Churches. For instance, it might include unorthodox groups like religious liberals. But even on these very unclear statistics, in the wider Japanese population of about 125 million, 600,000 to 700,000 professed Protestants are clearly less than 1% of the population. And so whether or not we discounted these numbers as possibly including unorthodox groups like Puseyites; it’s still clear we’re looking at Protestant figures of something less than 1% of the Japanese population.

So on the one hand, relative to the larger Japanese population, Christian evangelism by Protestants has not reaped a large percentage of souls in Japan. But on the other hand, it has reaped a harvest of many souls, and in the words of Acts 13:48, “as many as were ordained to eternal life believed.” So we thank God for those precious souls which have been saved by the Gospel of Jesus Christ in Japan. We thank God that amidst the false religious paths planted by the Devil in the heathen religions of Shintoism and Buddhism; that God has enabled some Japanese *Children of Adam* who are also *Children of Shem*, to find their way home through the Gospel of Jesus Christ as found in religiously conservative Protestant Christianity; and thus ultimately to the place where their honourable ancestors are in heaven, such as Abel, Enoch, Noah, and the great Patriarch of Asia, Noah’s son, Shem. We thank God that by his grace, some Japanese have in the words of I Thessalonians 1:9, “turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God.” In the words of Zechariah 3:2, they are *brands plucked out of the fire*; or in the words of Romans 11:5, they are part of “a remnant according to the election of grace.” And when we thus consider the Great Protestant Missionary Movement, that dating from the late 18th and early 19th centuries reached even unto such places as the Far East with Japan and the Chinaman, and did spiritual battle there with both pagans and Papists, we are reminded that as Evangelicals or Protestants we also repudiate and reject the idolatry in apostate forms of Christianity, such as statues of saints which are venerated and are prayed to in Roman Catholicism, or icons of saints which are venerated and prayed to in Eastern Orthodoxy and Oriental Orthodoxy. And in such apostate forms of Christianity, including Puseyite Anglicanism, we cannot doubt that it is Mary that is the most venerated, worshipped, and prayed to saint; which form of idolatry of Mary is known as, “Mariolatry.” And of course, there’s also the idolatrous adoration of the consecrated Communion elements.

And as religiously conservative Protestants we are also reminded of the remedy of such idolatry found in the Gospel of Jesus Christ, recovered at the time of the Reformation ignited under Martin Luther. And this brings me back to where we started at the beginning of this sermon, entitled, “Flee from idolatry,” and subtitled, “Repent!” in the context of “The Gospel” of: Repentance, “Grace,” “Faith,” “Sanctification,” and “Judgment.” For though the emphasis of this address has been on the need for repentance such as found in repentance from idolatry; this is not repentance from dead works to dead to dead works, from one form of idolatry and works’ righteousness such as found in heathenism, to another form of idolatry and works’ righteousness such as found in Roman Catholicism. Rather, this must be a true and Biblical repentance.

As a consequence of original sin, man is far gone from original righteousness, for David says in Psalm 51:5, “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me;” and then in Psalm 53:3, “there is none that doeth good, no, not one.” And so that means that every human being, from the time of his conception, is sinful. That’s because Romans 5:12 teaches that Adam’s primal sin is imputed to every human being; and as all die and Romans 6:23 teaches that “the wages of sin is death,” it follows that to this original sin there attaches an original guilt. If unborn children or babies lacked this original sin, then they would have no original guilt, and they would be unable to die since in the realm of human beings, “the wages of sin is death.” But in fact, since the fall of

man in Adam, all human beings are conceived “in sin,” and “shapen in iniquity,” even from their mother’s womb. But we thank God that the matter does not end there. “For” Jesus said in John 3:16, “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” And because in the words of Romans 5:6, “Christ died for the ungodly,” we further read in Romans 5:20 and 21, “where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.” “Grace” is the unmerited favour of God. And so we read in Romans 4:2 to 5, “if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God. For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.”

And so having repented of our sins as found chiefly, though not exclusively, in the Ten Commandments of Exodus 20, we accept by *faith alone*, the offer of salvation given by God’s *grace alone*, procured by *Christ alone* when he hung on the cross and died for our sins, before rising the third day, and we *give glory to God alone* for it. And as religiously conservative Evangelical or Protestant Christians, our authority for this teaching is *Scripture alone*. For the Scriptures are both Divinely Inspired, II Timothy 3:16; and Divinely Preserved in the Received Text or *Textus Receptus*, I Peter 1:25. And having been justified by faith alone, we are then sanctified in holiness of living, of which two examples from II Thessalonians 1:3 & 11 are prayer and Christian charity; but of which there are many more examples in Holy Scripture. [pause]

Let us pray. Heavenly Father, we thank thee for the assurance we have as believers found in the words of Christ our Lord in John 5:24, “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation: but is passed from death unto life.” O Lord, repenting of our sins, such as any idolatry we may have in our life, we hear Christ’s “word,” and we believe on him that thou didst send, even Christ our Lord. We thank thee for thy words of assurance given to us in John 20:31, that “these” things in the Bible have been “written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.” “Almighty God, Father of all mercies, we thine unworthy servants do give thee most humble and hearty thanks for all thy goodness and loving-kindness to us and to all men; particularly to those who desire now in silent prayer to offer up their praises and thanksgivings for thy late mercies vouchsafed unto them. ... [pause c. 10 seconds] ... We bless thee for our creation, preservation, and all the blessings of this life; but above all for thine inestimable love in the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ, for the means of grace, and for the hope of glory. And we beseech thee, give us that due sense of all thy mercies, that our hearts may be unfeignedly thankful, and that we shew forth thy praise, not only with our lips, but in our lives; by giving up ourselves to thy service, and by walking before thee in holiness and righteousness all our days; through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with thee and the

Holy Ghost be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen¹⁷⁴.”

Sermon audio: www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible

Title: Exposition of Thessalonians 1/3: “Flee from idolatry.”

Short title: Repent!

Bible Texts: 1 Corinthians 10:14; 1 Thessalonians 1:9.

Brief Overview: This is the first of a trilogy of Thursday mid-week prayer meeting sermons delivered in February 2011 on selected parts of I & II Thessalonians; and includes notice of Queen Elizabeth II’s message of support for the King James Bible on the occasion of its 400th anniversary of 1611 to 2011. The first sermon is largely focused on repentance from idolatry (I Thess. 1:9). The title of this first sermon, “Flee from idolatry,” comes from I Cor. 10:14. It is subtitled, “Repent!,” & Gavin explains this should be understood in the context of “The Gospel” (II Thess. 1:8) of: Repentance (I Thess. 1:9), “Grace” (II Thess. 1:12), “Faith” (II Thess. 1:3,4,11), “Sanctification” (I Thess. 4:3, e.g., II Thess. 1:3,11), & “Judgement” (II Thess. 1:5). And while Gavin says all of those things are important, he says most of the sermon will be on “repentance” in turning from idolatry. Thus in this sermon, Gavin is primarily concerned with, and focused on, the issue “that men should repent” (Mark 6:12) with respect to the sin of idolatry (I Thess. 1:9). He lists various idols including lust idols (Col. 3:5) such as: Big Beat Popular Music; TV & matinee idols; sport idols; materialism, vain philosophy idols such as atheistic Communism, secularism, and Darwinian macroevolution; the gods of drunkenness & gluttony; together with heathen religions in the context of his 2004 trip to Japan and some of the Christian Missionary work there; and he also refers to some of the idols of apostate Christianity in e.g., Roman Catholicism & Eastern Orthodoxy. The sermon ends with a prayer of repentance from any idolatry, and belief in the Biblical Christ of religiously conservative Protestant Christianity.

Keywords: Repentance; idolatry; grace; faith; sanctification; judgement; Protestant; Evangelical; prayer; charity.

SERMON 2 SERIES: (Thurs. 10 February 2011) Sermon 2:2

An Exegetical Trilogy on I & II Thessalonians.

Sermon 2: II Thess. 2:1-12. “Roman Catholic Pope is Antichrist.”

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. *Let us pray.* “Lord of all power and might, who art the author and giver of all good things: graft in our hearts the love of thy name, increase in us true religion, nourish us with all goodness, and of thy great mercy keep us in the same; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

¹⁷⁴ “A General Thanksgiving,” (to which are added the words understood in an Anglican context, “in silent prayer,”) Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662).

Amen¹⁷⁵.”

Welcome to all listening to this address. This is the second in a trilogy of addresses from *The First and Second Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians*. This week’s sermon on II Thessalonians 2:1-12 is self-explanatory in the sermon title which is, [quote] “The Roman Catholic Pope is the Antichrist” [unquote], a teaching found in the major Confessions of the Protestant Reformation. And for any who are interested in more detail, I would point you to my book *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist*, a second edition of which was dedicated three to four months ago on the Eve of All Saints’ Day, 2010, in memory of the Reformation started when Martin Luther nailed his 95 Theses to the Door of Wittenberg Church on the Eve of All Saints’ Day, 1517; and you can get that at my website, <http://www.easy.com.au/~gmbooks/> [2015 update: <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>] or on Google or Yahoo type in as three separate words, “Gavin McGrath Books”, and then click on “The Roman Pope is the Antichrist.” That Book has a Foreword by the Reverend Mr. Samuel McKay, who was Secretary of the *Protestant Truth Society* from 1996 to 2004. Brother Sam is an independent Reformed Baptist Protestant; and he left the *Protestant Truth Society* in Fleet Street, London, to be the Minister of a London Baptist Church.

In March 2009 I was in North America, and one of the places I saw was Boston, USA, and from there, I got out to Salem, where I saw some places connected with the famous Salem witchcraft trials, for example, the house of one of the judges of the witch trials, Mr. Justice Corwin; reminding us that Galatians 5:19 & 20 says that those in “witchcraft” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” And near this house I then saw the *Tabernacle Congregational Church* whose present 1924 building is a replica of its earlier 1777 one; and from this church in 1812, Adoniram Judson was commissioned as one of the American missionaries in the *Great Protestant Missionary Movement* that started in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, and is still going; and at the time of Adoniram Judson’s commissioning, the Minister of this church was the Reverend Dr. Samuel Worcester who produced a Psalter and Hymnal printed in Boston in 1815, called, “*Christian Psalmody in four parts.*” Now Hymn 181 has six verses, and I’ll read verses 1,2 & 4. And as a microcosm symbol here in earth, of the macrocosm power of God, I now raise my right arm parallel to the ground, and say, [quote] “[vs. 1] Arm of the Lord, awake, awake! Put on thy strength – the nations shake! And let the world adoring, see, Triumphs of mercy wrought by thee. [vs. 2] Say to the heathen from thy throne, ‘I am Jehovah – God alone!’ Thy voice their idols shall confound, And cast their altars to the ground. [vs. 4] Arm of the Lord, thy power extend, Let Mahomet’s imposture end; Break superstition’s Papal chain, And the proud scoffers rage restrain” [unquote]; and I now lower my right arm. You see, with regard to “idolatry” and “heresies” such as one finds in the Church of Rome, which in the words of Galatians 1:6 preaches “another gospel” than that of Galatians 3:11, “The just shall live by faith,” Galatians 5:21 says that such persons “shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” And in Revelation 21:8 we’re told “idolaters” and “unbelievers” “shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone;” and “idolaters” covers both pagan and Papal “idolaters,” and “unbelievers”

¹⁷⁵ Collect for 7th Trinity Sunday, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662).

covers all heathens and infidels such as Mohammedans. And so when Adoniram Judson went out to Burma, he went from a church that understood this, he went from a church whose Minister published a Psalter and Hymnal with the words, “Say to the heathen from thy throne, ‘I am Jehovah – God alone!’, Thy voice their idols shall confound. And cast their altars to the ground. Arm of the Lord, thy power extend, Let Mahomet’s imposture end; Break superstition’s Papal chain, And the proud scoffers rage restrain.” [pause]

And today, it is with respect to the topic found in the words of that hymn, “Break superstition’s Papal chain,” that I especially wish to address in this sermon. To the objection sometimes raised by certain persons, that Protestant historicists who believe the Pope is the Antichrist should desist from proclaiming the Word of God because their Roman Catholic friends dislike it; I would in the first instance remind you of the words of the fourth to third centuries B.C. Athenian Greek poet, Menander, whose words appear to have been quoted in I Corinthians 15:33, “evil communications corrupt good manners;” and “communications” here means “associations,” and “manners” act to reflect one’s character, in other words, “bad company corrupts good character.” In this context I refer to Martyn Lloyd-Jones, an independent Evangelical Congregationalist Protestant Minister of London who died in 1981. I remember on one of my five trips to London between 2001 and 2009, I was walking the streets of inner London with a fellow Evangelical friend, and he pointed to a church and said to me that it was Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ old church. And when I was on a London train, the train stopped at a station *en route* to where we were going, and my with fellow Evangelical friend pointed out to me that we were at Haringay Station, which is the place where Billy Graham held his 1954 Crusade. That was all relevant because we both knew, and talked about the fact, that Martyn Lloyd-Jones was so unhappy with the association of professed Evangelicals with Roman Catholics and other non-Evangelicals in the Billy Graham Campaigns, that he refused to appear on the same platform with the apostate Billy Graham in his 1954 Haringay Crusade in London. And when I was a student at Moore Theological College in Sydney, back in the mid, early to mid 1990s, another fellow Evangelical student drew my attention to the fact that in his book, *What is an Evangelical?*, published by Banner of Truth Trust in 1992, Martyn Lloyd-Jones says at pages 22 to 24, [quote] “We must not become subject to a false, vague, nebulous, ecumenical type of thinking.” “I believe that one of the most potent factors in this respect has been the Billy Graham campaigns” [unquote]; and he further says how such friendships with, for instance, Roman Catholics, has had the effect of [quote] “shaking people’s convictions as to what” “it means to be Evangelical” [unquote]. And so the big point is that if one’s friends are leading one away from the Bible, then they’re not the type of friends one should be keeping; in the words of James 4:4, “friendship of the world is enmity with God.”

Secondly, we don’t walk away from Biblical truth because it upsets those who are unrepentant. Were we to adopt such a view, we would not, for example, preach against idolatry forbidden in the Ten Commandments because Hindu or Buddhist idolaters may get upset. Nor would we preach the Matthew 19:9 Christian teaching of the seventh commandment against adultery in the form of polygamy, because Mohammedans may get upset. Nor would we preach Christ who as the prophesied Old Testament Messiah died for our sins and rose again the third day, because those in Judaism may get upset; for

example, in Matthew 23:38, Christ said of this apostate Judaism that had rejected the Messiah, “Behold, your house is left unto you desolate.” Nor would we preach, “Thou shalt not kill,” another of the Ten Commandments, because other than as an act of self-defence to save a mother’s life, abortion is murder, and those supporting abortion may get upset. And so on, and so forth. And thirdly, those Papists who say they’re upset by it, won’t be dead very long before they say the very opposite, and as they burn in hell they say, “Those Protestant historicists told us *the truth*. I wish I’d listened to them more. Oh! I wish I’d listened to them more.” [pause]

And so the argument about not upsetting unrepentant Roman Catholics by proclaiming Biblical historicist truth, is crafted, calculated, and designed, to be the thin edge of a wedge in introducing categories of thought into people’s minds to get them thinking in an unBiblical manner; and ultimately this then leads them into the quick-sand of the ecumenical compromise with apostate Christian religions such as Roman Catholicism, Eastern Orthodoxy, and Oriental Orthodoxy; religious liberalism, and the inter-faith compromise with non-Christian religions such as Mohammedanism, Buddhism, and Hinduism. And so it gets people on what Jesus calls in Matthew 7:13 the “broad” “way, that leadeth to destruction.” You see, under the spiritually debilitating effects on society of secularism in which all religions are largely regarded as the same, and under the spiritually debilitating effects on many Protestant Churches of the ecumenical movement, there’s been a lot of fiddling and faddling and pussy-footing about with the Roman Papacy. But today’s the day that *the sword of Lord* which is the Word of God, is being unsheathed; and there’s gonna’ be a sword-fight, a duel, between the Biblical truths of religiously conservative Protestant Christianity, and the apostate Christianity of Roman Catholicism. And I ask you to judge the contest fairly, because we’re dealing with the matters of eternity, we’re not playing games. In considering the New Testament’s Antichrist teaching, we’ll be focusing today on four broad Biblical areas, and a lesser fifth area. Firstly, what the Apostle John says in his First and Second Epistles; secondly, what our Lord says in his Olivet Discourse of Matthew 24; and thirdly and fourthly, what the Apostle Paul says in II Thessalonians 2 and I Timothy 4; and fifthly, to a much lesser extent some parts of Daniel and Revelation.

St. John uses the terminology of “antichrist” in I John 2:18 & 22; 4:3; and II John 7. The Greek word, “*antichristos*,” is a compound word made up of two lesser words, the Greek “*anti*” which means “in the place of” or “instead of,” and the word “*christos*” which means “Christ.” And so the simple definition of the Antichrist is that he is one who puts himself “in the place of” or “instead of” “Christ.” But St. John also gives us some further important information, so that we can identify the Antichrist. He says in I John 2:18, “as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists,” and then in verse 22, “Who is a liar but he that denieth Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son.” So St. John here refers to a series of “antichrists” plural, whom he says act as prophetic types for what in his day was the coming “Antichrist” singular, and in this context he isolates some kind of Trinitarian heresy, in which the incarnation and thus the humanity of Christ is somehow denied since in the words of I John 2:22, “he ... denieth that Jesus is the Christ.” And we find more detail about what this means at I John 4:1-3, “Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try

the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.”

Furthermore, the words of I John 4:1-3 show that this is an enemy from within the Church, that is, one who professes to be a Christian. This is also clear from the fact that in the prophetic types of the antichrists of his day, St. John isolates certain heretics *inside the church*, saying in II John 7, “For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist.” Furthermore, it is clear from the title of “Antichrist” in I John 2:18, that his significance will be to *the entire church*, and so he will claim some kind of universal jurisdiction. And so we have four clear identifiers given to us in I and II John. Firstly, from I and II John, we know that the Antichrist will work inside the Church, professing himself to be some kind of Christian. Secondly, we know from the meaning of the Greek word “*antichristos*” in I and II John, that he will put himself “in the place of” or “instead of,” “Christ.” Thirdly, his coming is clearly of importance to the entire church, and so it is clearly indicated in I and II John that he will claim some kind of universal jurisdiction in the church. And fourthly, we know from I and II John that at the heart of his *modus operandi* will be a central Trinitarian heresy that in some way denies the humanity of Jesus Christ.

Now historically there are many “antichrists” who meet this first descriptor of working inside the Church. For example, the first century gnostics of St. John’s day who denied Christ’s humanity because they considered human flesh was intrinsically evil; and so they claimed Christ could not have had a real human body or be fully human. St. John refers to these when he says in I John 2:18, “even now are there many antichrists.” But while there have been “many antichrists” who meet this first descriptor of a heretical enemy working from inside the Church; when we come to the second and third descriptors, namely, the fuller meaning of the word, “Antichrist,” coming from the Greek word “*antichristos*,” referring to one who will put himself “in the place of” or “instead of,” “Christ;” and his necessary claim to a universal jurisdiction in the church; we find that there is only one serious candidate. ... And that is the Pope of Rome, whose central claim to power and authority with a universal jurisdiction is that he is, [quote] “the Vicar of Christ” [unquote]. His Latin title of office, is “*Vicarius Christi*” translated as the “Vicar of Christ.” The Latin word “*vicarius*” means a “substitute” or a “deputy”; and the Latin word, “*Christi*” means, “of Christ.” And so the Latin title, “*Vicarius Christi*,” meaning the “substitute” or “deputy” “of Christ” here on earth, perfectly correlates in meaning with the Greek word, “*Antichristos*,” meaning one who puts himself “in the place of” or “instead of,” “Christ.” Thus the Latin, “*Vicarius Christi*,” is a good translation of the Greek, “*Antichristos*.”

And the third descriptor is also clearly met in the Pope of Rome who claims a “universal” jurisdiction in the entire Church of Christ. If a church leader were merely to maintain that he was the “head of the church” on earth [quote] “as far as the law of Christ

allows” [unquote] in a specified local area like “England and Ireland,” which is what King Henry VIII did, putting aside the issue that we prefer the later title of “Supreme Governor” rather than “Supreme Head,” what Henry VIII did would not meet the requirement that the Antichrist is of significance to the entire church. By contrast, the Pope of Rome claims a universal jurisdiction and makes an unqualified claim to headship of the universal church on earth as “Vicar of Christ,” which headship Ephesians 5:23 & 32 says belongs to Christ. For example, the Roman *Catholic Encyclopedia* of 1911 and 1913, which has a Roman Catholic *Imprimatur* by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York, USA, Cardinal John Furley, says in Volume 15, that [quote] “Vicar of Christ” [unquote] is [quote] “a title of the Pope implying his supreme and universal primacy” [unquote] and is [quote] “expressive of his supreme headship of the Church on earth” [unquote]. And the Vatican II Council *Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents* say in the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, section 22, that [quote] “the Roman Pontiff, by reason of his office as Vicar of Christ,” “has full, supreme and universal power over the whole church, a power which he can always exercise unhindered” [unquote]¹⁷⁶.

In 533 A.D., the Byzantine or Eastern Roman Emperor, Justinian, referred in his Code to the Bishop of Rome as [quote] “the head of all the churches” [unquote]. However, this statement was made in a letter of Justinian’s that was attached to *Justinian’s Code*, and so it had no legally binding force. It was only a letter, not a decree. It simply meant that the Emperor Justinian used a royal prerogative to give the Bishop of Rome a titular primacy over his main rival, the Bishop of Constantinople; but it gave the Bishop of Rome no governing jurisdiction over the Bishop of Constantinople; and because it rested on a royal prerogative, it expired when Justinian died in 565 A.D. . Thus from 565 onwards the situation reverted back to what it had been before 533, in which the Bishop of Rome was no longer a titular primate over the East.

But in 607, the Bishop of Rome, Boniface III, obtained a decree from the Eastern Emperor, Phocas, making him [quote] “universal bishop” [unquote]. Now before this time the term, “Pope,” had been used of various Diocesan Bishops; but given that the Bishop of Rome now claimed he was the “universal Bishop” of the “universal” Diocese of the “universal” church in the whole world, the term “Pope” generally came to refer to just him as Diocesan Bishop of the world. And so this is the starting point of the Roman Papacy as we know it; and from 607 its claim to a “universal” jurisdiction in the church must be taken very seriously. Thus far from the Papacy starting, as the Roman Catholics claim, with the Apostle Peter, in fact, the Roman Papacy is an early mediaeval institution dating from 607, and the claims of, for example, the Vatican II Council of the Pope’s [quote] “supreme and universal power over the whole church” [unquote]; are thus a modern times continuation of the claims made in this old decree from 607.

And so we find that the third descriptor of the Antichrist in I and II John, namely, a claim to a “universal” jurisdiction in the entire Church of Christ that makes the Antichrist of importance to the entire Church, is found in the Bishopric of Rome in

¹⁷⁶ *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, 22, *Vatican Council II Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, p. 375.

miniature and prophetic type from 533 to 565 A.D. when he had a titular primacy over the Bishop of Constantinople; but then in its fuller and more enduring form from 607 A.D. when the Roman Papacy as we basically now know it was formed, after Boniface III got a decree from Phocas declaring him “universal bishop.” And so Boniface III in 607 was the first Pope, in the sense that we now generally use that word, “Pope.” Before 607 there were Bishops of Rome; and between 533 and 565 there were Pope-like Bishops of Rome; but from 607 A.D. there were Popes of Rome.

And we now come to the fourth descriptor mentioned by the Apostle John in I and II John, namely, that at the heart of his *modus operandi* the Antichrist will have a central Trinitarian heresy that in some way denies the humanity of Jesus Christ. At first blush, some people would deny that this descriptor fits the Roman Pope, since in theory he holds to an orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. But more careful scrutiny shows that this is quite false. Concerning I John 2:22, that “antichrist” “denieth that Jesus is the Christ,” Popery denies the Biblical Christ by, for example, denying Galatians 3:13, “Christ hath redeemed us,” in its unBiblical claim that Mary is “co-redeemer” or “co-redemptrix,” who purportedly suffered for the world’s sins as she stood by the cross. Popery denies the Biblical Christ by denying the I Timothy 2:5 teaching that Christ is the “one mediator between God and men,” by claiming Mary is “co-mediator” or “co-mediatrix,” together with numerous saint mediators. Popery denies the Biblical Christ by denying the work of our great high priest, Jesus Christ, in its claim that one must go to a Popish priest for auricular confession. Popery denies the Biblical Christ by denying the completeness of Christ’s atonement, both in terms of their claims that one must add to it some good works to be saved, and so denying justification by faith; and also in the blasphemous so called “sacrifice of the Mass,” in which it is blasphemously claimed that Christ is once again “offered for the living and the dead.” Popery denies the Biblical Christ by denying that Christ is the Rock on which the Church is built, claiming that it’s St. Peter and his so called successors in the Popes, whereas St. Paul says in I Corinthians 3:11, “other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.” And so by putting in the place of the Biblical Christ, a weak and anemic trimmed down Christ, we find that in the words of I John 2:22, “antichrist” “denieth that Jesus is the Christ.”

Moreover, the Final Rubric of the Communion Service in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662, says in part, [quote] “Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the administration of the Lord’s Supper, that the communicants should receive the same kneeling ... for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgement of the benefits of Christ ..., and ... avoiding ... disorder ..., lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; it is hereby declared, That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any corporeal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances and therefore may not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians); and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one” [unquote].

This rubric rejects Roman Catholic transubstantiation; and following the bad experience of having Archbishop Laud, its 1662 form modified an earlier form from the 1552 prayer book rejecting [quote] “any real and essential presence there being of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” [unquote], that is transubstantiation, to the 1662 form rejecting [quote] “any corporeal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood” [unquote], that is, either the Romanists’ transubstantiation or the Laudians’ consubstantiation. But I would particularly draw your attention to the words, contextually directed at both transubstantiation following Romanists and consubstantiation following Laudians, [quote] “For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances and therefore may not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) *and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one*” [unquote]. The first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer, wrote on this issue in his 1550 work, *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood*; and he decided to condemn this heresy in the 1552 Anglican prayer book, as preserved in the 1662 prayer book, on the advice of John Knox of Scotland. Scriptures teaches Christ’s body is in heaven for Christ says in Matthew 26:11, “Ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always,” and in John 16:28, “I leave the world, and go to the Father.” Or St. Peter says in Acts 3:21, “heaven must receive” Christ “until the times of restitution;” and likewise St. Paul in I Corinthians 11:26 says of the Holy Communion, “For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord’s death till he come;” note those words, “till he come.”

You see, as touching upon his Divinity, Jesus is omnipresent and so with us here on earth. Hence in Matthew 18:20 Jesus says, “where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.” But as touching upon his humanity, Christ’s body can only be at one place at one time, and that place is presently in heaven. Thus Roman Catholic transubstantiation, in which it is claimed that Christ’s body is here on earth in the Roman Mass, is a Trinitarian Christological heresy that denies the humanity of Christ. In the words of Cranmer’s 1662 prayer book rubric [quote], “For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances and therefore may not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one” [unquote]. And in the words of St. John in I John 4:3, “every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist.”

And so we find that the Roman Catholic Pope meets the four descriptors of Antichrist isolated by the Apostle John in I and II John, firstly, he works from inside the Church, professing himself to be some kind of Christian; secondly, the Greek word, “*Antichristos*,” meaning one who puts himself “in the place of” or “instead of,” “Christ,” is found in the Latin title of Papal Office as “*Vicarius Christi*” meaning the “vicar” or “substitute” or “deputy” “of Christ” here on earth; thirdly, since 607 A.D. the Pope makes a serious claim to having a “universal” jurisdiction in the church and Antichrist is of significance to the entire Christian Church; and fourthly, at the heart of the Pope’s *modus operandi* is a central Trinitarian heresy that denies the humanity of Jesus Christ in

the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation, found in the centrality of the Roman Mass to Roman Catholic Church services. The combination of these four descriptors fits the Pope, and nobody else. And so on the basis of I and II John we must conclude that the Pope of Rome is the Antichrist. [pause]

Now there are three other important Antichrist passages that we are especially considering today, Matthew 24; II Thessalonians 2; and I Timothy 4. And there are sometimes parallels between what these passages say. For example, Matthew 24:28 says, “wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered.” The eagle is sometimes used to symbolize an angel, Ezekiel 1:10. So Jesus is saying that you’ll know when he has bodily returned because his body will be surrounded by angels. He says the same thing in Matthew 25:31, “the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him.” So Jesus here gives us a test, that if anyone claims the body of Christ is somewhere, if it’s not surrounded by the visible presence of angels, the claim is false. And so one, though not the only application of this test, means Matthew 24:28 teaches us that the transubstantiation heresy of Antichrist which denies his humanity, is a hoax because there’s no visible presence of angels at the Roman Mass.

But I would also draw your attention to a difference of emphasis sometimes found in these passages, for example, Matthew 24 and II Thessalonians 2. In II Thessalonians 2:3, we read of a singular Antichrist, called, “that man of sin.” “Man” here is the Greek word, “*anthropos*,” from which we get our English word, “anthropology,” meaning “the study of man.” And so this shows that Antichrist is not some devil, or some alien, or some philosophy, but a “man,” an “*anthropos*.” But as I say, here in II Thessalonians 2:3 “man” is in the singular. And so is the rest of this passage, for example in II Thessalonians 2:4 we read that Antichrist, “as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God”; and that’s all in the singular.

By contrast, when we go to Matthew 24, we read in verse 5, “For many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many.” Then in verses 21 & 22, Christ refers to “those days” of the great 1260 day-year prophecy in the Books of Daniel and Revelation, that on the day-year principle of Numbers 14:34 and Ezekiel 4:6, spans on inclusive reckoning from 607 to 1866, terminating with the Daniel 7:26 “judgement” on the Papal States between 1860 and 1870, in which 1866 is especially highlighted both because of political events relating to the fall of the Papal States in 1866, and because of the martyrdom of Protestants by Papists at Barletta in Italy in 1866 which is a type of the Papal persecution and martyrdom of Protestants that will occur just before the Second Advent that we’re told about in Revelation 13 when “the mark of the beast” is given out. That element’s still future, the giving out of “the mark of the beast” only occurs just before Christ’s return. But the earlier parts of Revelation 13 have already been fulfilled, for example, the words of Revelation 13:3, that the Pope’s “deadly wound was healed,” transpired when he got temporal power back with the Vatican City State in 1929. But Christ also says in Matt. 24:22, “those days shall be shortened,” as they were in parts of Western Europe by the Reformation in the 16th century hundreds of years before 1866; and also “shortened” in some Popish parts of Western Europe by the rise of the secular state from the late 18th and 19th centuries; although in the Papal States of

Italy this power continued through to 1866; and continued in reduced measure for several years till 1870. But in discussing all these things, Christ again says in verses 23 & 24, “Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs;” and so that once again, this is in the plural.

Now the Pope is a “false Christ,” by virtue of his claim to be a Vice-Christ, as “Vicar of Christ;” and likewise the Pope “as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God,” by virtue of his claim to be a Vice-God, as “vicar of God” in the form of “Vicar of Christ.” But Matthew 24:5 & 24 puts it in the plural, “false Christs,” whereas II Thessalonians 2:3 & 4, puts it in the singular, “that man of sin,” who “as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.” And so the only way to reasonably reconcile these two passages of Scripture on the Antichrist is to conclude that the Antichrist is an Office that contains a succession of men. Put in blunt terms, the Office of the Roman Papacy established in 607 A.D., is the Office of the Antichrist. Jesus does not say in Matthew 24:5, “a few shall come,” but “*many* shall come,” and since the first Pope, Boniface III in 607, the incumbent Benedict XVI is the 199th Pope; and so with about 200 Popes since 607, “many” have “come in” Christ’s “name, saying, I am Christ” as a *Vice-Christ* or *Vicar of Christ* with “universal” jurisdiction. [pause]

Well having considered our Lord’s words in the Olivet Discourse in Matthew 24 and those of the Apostle John in his First and Second Epistles, let us now look in some greater detail at the words of the Apostle Paul in II Thessalonians chapter 2 and I Timothy chapter 4. And whereas I Timothy 4:1 refers to “seducing spirits,” and Matt. 24:24 says Antichrist “shall shew great signs and wonders;” II Thessalonians 2:9 says, his “coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders.” And of course we see this in the Devilish miracles of Popery, for example, the stigmata phenomenon found in Francis of Assisi, Founder of the Franciscan monks.

Or the miracles of one of the founding members of the Jesuits, Francis Xavier, a slimy’n’grimy figure, some of whose miracles were fraudulent, and some of which were real miracles by the power of devils. He got heathens to swap their old heathen idols, for the new idols of Romanism. Hence when working in Goa, India in the early 1540s, he mingled his miracles with a bit of Popish salesmanship, so that instead of worshipping the heathen Hindu goddess Shiva [“salesman” voice], ‘have a look at our bigger, brighter, better, idol ooof [of] ... Mary!’ ... And then, as it were with the roll of a drum, the pagan idol of the goddess Shiva, becomes, “Heeeey presto,” the Popish idol o-o-o-o-f ‘Mary, Queen of Heaven,’ da,da! ... And so, aided by the temporal power of the Portuguese, and the spiritual power of devils, Hindu Indians became Papists. ... Such are the follies of Popery’s deceptions and Satanic miracles. But since both religions are under the control of the Devil, it was a case of “keeping it all in the same spiritual family” of idolatry and works’ righteousness. [pause]

II Thessalonians 2:3 says “that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first,” and verse 3 then says, that “he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.” Then verses 6-8 say, “And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he

who now letteth will let, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed.” Now the old English word “let” or “letteth” means *to hinder or obstruct*. So St. Paul says that there was something operating in the Roman Empire of his day that was *withholding or restraining* the Antichrist from appearing, and when that thing would be taken out of the way, only then would the Antichrist arise.

So II Thessalonians 2:3 means that there has to be some kind of religious apostasy, also referred to in I Timothy 4:1, followed by the rise of the Antichrist “in the temple of God.” Now through reference to passages such as Ephesians 2:21 and II Peter 2:6, we know that “the temple of God” refers to the Christian Church. And thus, for example, the church fathers and doctors, St. John Chrysostom who died in 407 and St. Jerome who died in 420, both say that “the temple of God” in which the Antichrist sits, is the church of God. But more than this, the Archbishop of Constantinople, St. Chrysostom, further says in his Homily on II Thessalonians 2:6-9, [quote] “One may ... naturally inquire, what is *that which withholdeth ...* ? ... he says this of the Roman Empire *Only he who now hindereth will hinder, until he be taken out of the way*; that is, when the Roman Empire is taken out of the way, then he shall come For as long as the fear of this empire lasts, no one will readily exalt himself, but when that is dissolved, he will ... ¹⁷⁷.” [unquote]. Now I think St. John Chrysostom, and the others he refers to, who before the Fall of the Roman Empire, predicted that this would be a necessary precursor to the rise of Antichrist, are correct. After all, II Thessalonians 2:4 says that Antichrist “opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God;” and if he is to be that powerful, he must seek some level of tolerance from the temporal power, and there’s no way that the old Roman Empire would ever give that to the Pope.

So the focus here is on Rome. And that’s also consistent with, for example, Revelation 17:9, where we read of the central location of Antichrist’s church organization, “And here is the mind which hath wisdom, The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth.” This can refer to none other than Rome, the City of Seven Hills. Now in the year 395 the Imperial Roman Empire split into the Eastern Roman Empire under Constantinople and the Western Roman Empire under Rome. And so this means that from 395, the focus on Rome of the Antichrist prophecies, more narrowly focuses us on Western Europe under Rome, even though there’s a larger world-wide significance to them. Thus with the fall of Rome in 476, this Western Roman Empire in time, came to be continued as a spiritual empire of Roman Catholicism under the Bishop of Rome. But the Bishop of Rome’s rise to Pope was still gradual. He was gradually, in the words of II Thessalonians 2:8, “revealed,” first in a prophetic type from 533 to 565 when under the Eastern Roman Empire’s Emperor, Justinian, he was given in a letter attached to Justinian’s Code, the status of a titular universal primacy over the east. But this lay in the royal prerogative of Justinian rather than in a legal enactment, and so it expired at Justinian’s death in 565. Then in 607 the Bishop of Rome, Boniface III, got a decree from the Eastern Roman Empire’s Emperor,

¹⁷⁷ *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom ... on the Epistles of S. Paul the Apostle to the Philippians, Colossians, and Thessalonians*, new edition, revised by H. Walford, J. Parker & Rivingtons, Oxford, 1879, Homily 4, II Thess. 2:6-9, pp. 491-492.

Phocas, giving him a governing primacy over the East, and thus with his claims to a “universal” jurisdiction clearly established, the Roman Papacy as we know it, and so the Office of Antichrist was formed.

So between 565 and 607, the Bishop of Rome was in no sense the Antichrist, either in the prophetic form of 533 to 565, or the fuller form from 607. Thus between 565 and 607, the Bishop of Rome reverted back to his pre-533 status. And indeed during this period, a pious Bishop of Rome, Gregory the Great, held that bishopric from 590 to 604. St. Gregory is one of the four traditional Church doctors of the Western Church, together with St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine.

And it’s notable that, for example, Martin Luther, John Calvin, and Thomas Cranmer, all thought highly of Gregory the Great, and all considered that from 607 the Bishop of Rome became the Office of Antichrist. And if you want the relevant quotations for that, you’ll find them in the Preface of every volume of my textual commentaries, in the section entitled, “Scripture Citations of Bishop Gregory the Great,” at my website of <http://www.easy.com.au/~gmbooks/> [2015 update: <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>] or on Google or Yahoo type in as three separate words, “Gavin McGrath Books”. For example, Luther who regarded the Office of Pope as the Office of Antichrist, refers to [quote] “when there were still bishops in Rome, before the Pope.” “The Papacy did not exist before Emperor Phocas and Boniface III, and the church in the whole world knew nothing of it. St. Gregory, pious ... bishop of the Roman church, condemned it and would not tolerate it at all” [unquote]. Or Calvin describes Gregory as [quote] “a pious man” [unquote]; and further says, [quote] “the title of ‘Universal Bishop’ arose ... in the time of Gregory Gregory ... strongly insisted that the appellation is profane; nay, blasphemous; nay, the forerunner of Antichrist.” “[T]hese ... defenders of the Roman See ... defend the title of ‘Universal Bishop’ while they see it so often anathematised by Gregory.” “If effect is to be given to his testimony, then they, by making their Pontiff ‘universal,’ declare him to be Antichrist” [unquote]. And Cranmer also refers favourably to what [quote] “St. Gregory writeth” [unquote]; and further says, [quote] “as for the Pope, I refuse him, as Christ’s enemy and Antichrist, with all his false doctrine” [unquote].

And this type of thinking is also manifested in the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 and the 39 Articles. Thus on the Calendar of the 1662 prayer book, Gregory is given a black-letter day on 12 March. And the Homilies of Article 35 in the Anglican *39 Articles* refer to, and endorse St. Gregory’s teaching on the Antichrist. Book 2, Homily 16, Part 2 of Article 35 in the Anglican 39 Articles says, [quote] “As for pride, St. Gregory saith ‘it is the root of all mischief.’ ... First, as touching that” “the Popes” “will be termed *Universal Bishops* and *Head ... of all Christian Churches* through the world, we have the judgment of Gregory expressly against them; who writing to Mauritius the Emperor, condemneth John Bishop of Constantinople in that behalf, calling him ... the forerunner of Antichrist” [unquote]. And this same Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles teaches that all the Popes of Rome since 607 have held the Office of Antichrist. For example, Book 1, Homily 5, says, [quote] “King Henry the Eighth,” “put away” “superstitious pharisaical sects by *Antichrist* invented and set up” [unquote], and

then specifies as examples of this, [quote] “Papistical superstitions,” “Councils of Rome,” [unquote] and [quote] “laws of Rome” [unquote]. Or speaking plainly in Book 1, Homily 10, the Article says, [quote] “the bishop of Rome” “ought” “to be called Antichrist” [unquote]. Or referring to Matt. 24:5 & 24, Book 2, Homily 16, says, [quote] “‘Many shall come in my name,’ saith Christ,” “all the Popes” “are worthily accounted among the number of” “‘false Christs’” [unquote]. Or Book 2, Homily 21, refers to [quote] “Christ, whose vicar,” “the Bishop of Rome” “pretendeth to be” [unquote], and in referring to Revelation 13 & 17, says [quote] “the bishop of Rome” [unquote] is in fact [quote] “the Babylonical beast of Rome” [unquote].

And so we here find in these Anglican Protestant confessions of faith, the same teaching as that of the three great doctors of the Reformation, Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer, namely, that St. Gregory the Great was a pious Bishop of Rome, who stated when the Bishop of Constantinople sought to become [quote] “universal bishop” [unquote], that no human being here on earth is “universal bishop,” and since only the Antichrist will be such a “universal bishop,” it follows that the Bishop of Constantinople was thus a “forerunner of Antichrist.” Hence when some three years after Gregory’s death, the Bishop of Rome, Boniface III, became the first Pope by getting a decree from the Emperor Phocas making him “universal bishop,” on St. Gregory’s teachings, the Popes of Rome came to hold the Office of Antichrist.

Now after the rise of the Office of Roman Papacy and Office of Antichrist in 607, the Pope came to his fullest power when in 756 the first Papal state was established in Western Europe. This meant the Pope now had both a spiritual and temporal jurisdiction, and he held that temporal jurisdiction in the Papal States till 1860 to 1870. He then regained something of that temporal power with the Vatican City State in 1929.

Now some date the rise of the Roman Papacy to 606 on an Anglican Annunciation Day Calendar that starts the year on 25 March, and others use the year 607 on a 1 January New Year’s Day Calendar. And so we date the rise of the Roman Papacy to 606 or 607 because from here we have the two necessary elements of both claiming to be a vice-God or vice-Christ as “vicar of Christ;” and also a serious claim and capacity to gain some kind of “universal” jurisdiction in the church. Hence the issue of jurisdiction is very important to Antichrist, and thus the significance of Article 37 of the *Church of England’s* 39 Articles which says, [quote], “The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England” [unquote]. The words, “no jurisdiction” means he has no temporal jurisdiction in England, and that he has no spiritual jurisdiction in the Anglican Church. Hence the propriety of the words in the Dedicatory Preface to the King James Version of 1611, whose 400th anniversary we are celebrating this year of 2011, which says that King James [quote] “zeal ... and ... writing in defence of the truth, ... hath given such a blow unto that man of sin, as will not be healed” [unquote]. And this includes the basic idea that because King Henry VIII, under him, England broke with Rome, the absence of a Papal jurisdiction in both the temporal realm of England and spiritual realm of the Anglican Church, “hath given such a blow unto that man of sin, as will not be healed” because jurisdictional power is necessary for “that man of sin” of II Thessalonians 2:3 to operate as he desires.

Now in considering some examples of what St. Paul calls in II Thessalonians 2:3, “that man of sin,” and in II Thessalonians 2:7 his “iniquity,” I shall make some reference to I Timothy 4, and the Ten Commandments of Exodus 20. Concerning I Timothy 4, we read in verse 1, “that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils.” And two further specific matters are then isolated, verse 3, “forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats.”

Concerning “seducing spirits,” I would draw your attention to the words of Galatians 3:1 and 4:9, where we read, “O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, and crucified among you?” “But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage.” Those words, “who hath bewitched you?” show the same type of concern as I Timothy 4:1’s “seducing spirits;” and it’s clear in the Book of Galatians that such “seducing spirits” were presenting a false gospel of justification by works. Hence we read in Galatians 3:11, “But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, *The just shall live by faith.*” And in protecting this gospel of justification by faith, we read in Galatians 1:8, “Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.” And of course, any such “angel” would in fact be a *fallen* angel, a devil, it would be a “seducing spirit.” Now we cannot doubt that the Church of Rome preaches a false gospel of righteousness by a combination of faith and works. In Galatians 5:20 & 21 we’re told that those in “heresies” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God,” and we cannot doubt that the Roman Catholic teaching of works’ righteousness is an example of such a heresy. It’s an example of what II Thessalonians 2:7 calls “the mystery of iniquity” “already” at “work” in New Testament times. And hence when warning people of Papal Rome, in Revelation 14:6, St. John the Divine sees an “angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth,” because as the Reformation has proven, that “everlasting gospel” of justification by faith is the death-knell of Popery. And so like those entangled in justification by works at Galatia, the warnings of I Timothy 4:1 that the apostasy of II Thessalonians 2 will have “seducing spirits,” has in its prophetic fulfillment in Romanism, included this same type of devilish bewitching of people into the “bondage” of works’ righteousness, contrary to what Galatians 1:6 calls the “gospel” of “*grace*,” that is, justification by faith *alone*.

I Timothy 4:2 says the apostasy includes “commanding to abstain from meats.” Now while Protestant Christians sometimes fast in sorrow for their sins in harmony with, for example, Mark 2:20 and I Corinthians 7:5; or as part of being an exorcist per Matthew 17:21 and Mark 9:29; such Protestants don’t regard this fasting as works’ righteousness. But the Roman Catholic Church engages in “commanding to abstain from meats” as part of its teachings of works’ righteousness. For example, the Vatican II Council imposed [quote] “penance during the Lenton Season” [unquote]. In particular, *The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* section 109 required [quote] “the paschal fast must be kept” “on Good Friday” [unquote] and it also said preferably on the following “Saturday” before Easter. As I say, this Romish element of “penance” which in Roman Catholic theology

is linked to works' righteousness, means that it's very different to a *voluntary* fast by, for instance, some Anglicans, with respect to sorrow for their sins. Unlike, for example, Anglican days of fasting or abstinence in the 1662 prayer book; this type of Popish thing commanding fasting as [quote] "penance during the Lenton Season" [unquote] is connected with works' righteousness, and thus the "seducing spirits" of I Timothy 4:1 links in with the "commanding to abstain from meats" in I Timothy 4:3.

And I Timothy 4:3 says the apostasy will include "forbidding to marry." And the Roman Catholic Church fulfils this by requiring that its religious orders, including its priests and bishops, be celibate. That's contrary to I Corinthians 7, which teaches that God calls some men to celibacy, but others not; and Jesus taught in Matthew 19:9 that Christians can divorce and remarry. And without now going into the detail of the New Testament teaching on remarriage after divorce, it's clear, for example, from Matthew 19:9 that remarriage can occur for a divorce on the grounds of adultery. But the Roman Catholic Church teaches marital indissolubility; and so even if someone gets a Biblical divorce for adultery, they will not remarry them, and so this is another way the Church of Rome engages in "forbidding to marry." I Timothy 4:2 also refers to those "speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron." Now while I don't know how many sodomite child-molester Popish priests there are, the evidence for this slim'n'grime is really *O-O-O-OZING* out of the Roman Catholic Church, left, right, and centre, with for example, a series of bankrupted USA Romish Dioceses from litigants suing them; so there seems to be a sense in which *they feel at home* in the Roman Church. There are now many instances where upon discovery of such a Romish priest, the Romish Bishop seems to have said in a somewhat namby-pamby, lay-back, manner something like [slower lethargic voice], "Tut, tut. Slap your wrists, you naughty boy; and by the way, here's a new church with *altar-boys* for you to go to, where *nobody knows* you're a homosexual child-molester!" [pause] And a similar sickly picture of homosexual child-molesters *feeling at home in the Roman Church* emerges with those in professedly celibate Romish religious orders working at Popish *orphanages*. It seems that whether it's the more common pedophile homosexual in Romish religious orders, or the less common pedophile heterosexual in Romish religious orders, that if it's somebody in one of the so called "celibate" Popish religious orders, then the Roman Church just doesn't take this matter of child sexual assault seriously enough. For example, to date, I know of no such Popish priest or monk who's ever been excommunicated. As young children scre-e-e-am in agony from the physical pain of sexual assault by a Popish priest or monk; and scre-e-e-am for years later from the ongoing psychological pain; the Roman Church's response is very inadequate, and looks more like public relations damage control, than a serious attempt to root out pedophile priests and monks [pause].

And then with regard to the Ten Commandments of Exodus 20, we see still more examples of what II Thessalonians 2:7 calls the "iniquity" of what II Thessalonians 2:3 calls "that man of sin." For example, the Second Commandment, "Thou shalt not make, bow down to, nor serve," "any graven image;" is set aside in many, many, Roman Catholic idols. Indeed, in terms of stand-up comic strip humour, you know, the type of thing where a guy is hosing his car and forgets the window is open, then opens his car door and a pool of water comes out; well in terms of that kind of slap-stick humour, if

you open the door of a Roman Catholic Church, 100s of idols would fall out the door on top of you. [pause]

There's idols galore! There's idols of saints, especially Mary, and others. And of course, there's the adoration of the Roman Mass. The Anglican 1662 prayer book describes as [quote], "idolatry" [unquote], any [quote] "adoration ... unto the sacramental bread or wine, ... or any corporal presence ... for the natural body and blood of ... Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one" [unquote]. And the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession*, Congregational *Savoy Declaration*, and *Baptist Confession*, all say [quote] "transubstantiation" "is the cause" "of gross idolatries" [unquote]. Or the Dutch Reform *Heidelberg Catechism* says the [quote] "Mass is" "a denial of the one sacrifice and suffering of Jesus Christ and a condemnable idolatry" [unquote]. And concerning the Third Commandment which prohibits blasphemy, Article 31 of the Anglican 39 Articles further calls the Roman Mass, [quote] "blasphemous" [unquote]. [pause]

And the Pope has also set aside the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," with the murder of many Protestants, such as we read about in Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*. In 1995 the Pope canonized the 16th and 17th century mass murderer of Protestants, Sarkander of Moravia; and in 1998 he beatified the convicted Nazi war criminal, Cardinal Stepinatz, who collaborated with the Nazi Ustashi that killed Lutheran Protestants from Slatina in Croatia in 1941, and from the Srem in Serbia in 1941 and 1942 under the Croatian Inquisition. And last month in January 2011, the Vatican announced that it intends to beatify Pope John-Paul II in May this year; and it was then announced in Warsaw Poland, that a gruesome and superstitious vial of blood was extracted from the veins of John-Paul II shortly before his death, and that this repulsive and sickly vial of blood would be used as a ghastly relic of him in a Popish Polish Church once he's been beatified. The voice of the blood of those 1941 and 1942 Lutheran Protestant Christian martyrs of the Croatian Inquisition, together with other persons murdered under the Croatian Inquisition, crieth from the ground against Pope John-Paul II and his 1998 beatification of Cardinal Stepinatz; and against Pope Benedict XVI and his coming beatification of Pope John-Paul II presently scheduled for May 2011 [pause].

And I note that the Devil's religiously liberal stooges and puppets, who love to open their big mouths and attack Protestant historicists who denounce the Pope as the Antichrist, are very shut-face when it comes to condemning Pope John-Paul II for his 1995 beatification of the Protestant mass murderer, Sarkander the butcher of Moravia; or Pope Benedict XVI's coming beatification of this same John-Paul II. That's because they've lost the Biblical focus on the Antichrist, they've disarmed, and so they're not watching out for the Antichrist's sin. Indeed, the religious liberals love sin. They love to present themselves as the "lovey dovey" ones. They love the sin of sex role perversion, commonly called feminism, so much so that quite apart from the ideology of feminism's other debilitating and dangerous effects, they won't come out and condemn the secular state with its abortion slaughter of tens of millions of unborn babies. Despite the pictures of hearts that these "lovey dovey" ones like to metaphorically depict themselves in; every abortion stops another human heart from beating. And they love

“that man of sin” the Pope so much, they won’t come out and condemn Pope John-Paul II’s beatification in 1995 of this mass murderer of Protestants, Sarkander the butcher of Moravia; but instead, smile in acquiesce to the coming beatification of the culprit, John-Paul II Unlike the Dedicatory Preface of the King James Bible which uses the words of II Thessalonians 2 to condemn the Pope as [quote] “that man of sin” [unquote], these religious liberals, these so called “lovey dovey” ones, whose real love is sin, they don’t wantta’ talk about, they just wantta’ keep quiet about, any of *that man of sin’s* sin.

There’s a long history of Papists killing Protestants. From 1814 to 1820 the Papists took out Continental Calvinists at Nimes and elsewhere in southern France, chanting, “We will wash our hands in Protestant blood, and make black puddings from Calvin’s children’s blood;” ... ooh, how the devils behind Popery hate those Western European Continental Protestants of the holy Reformed faith! [pause] In 1866 the Papists took out Baptists at Barletta in Italy; ... ooh, how the devils behind Popery hate those Baptist Protestants! [pause] In 1902 the Papists targeted the leader of the *Protestant Truth Society*, who was a Low Church *Evangelical* Anglican clergyman, John Kensit, and took him out at Liverpool in England; ... ooh, how the devils behind Popery hate those Low Church *Evangelical* Anglican Protestants! [pause] In 1941 to 1942 the Papists took out *Evangelical* Lutherans in Croatia and Serbia under the Croatian Inquisition of the Nazi Ustashi; ... ooh, how the devils behind Popery hate those *Evangelical* Lutheran Protestants! [pause] From 1948 to 1962 the Papists took out over 100 Protestants in Columbia, South America. ... ooh, how the devils behind Popery hate those South American Protestants! [pause]¹⁷⁸ And with the *Irish Republican Army* and associated spin-off groups of anti-Protestant, Irish Roman Catholic terrorists, the Papists have taken out more Protestants again in Northern Ireland, for example, in 1976 at King’s Mill in Armagh, the IRA stopped a bus, and not wanting to kill any Roman Catholics, told the Papist bus driver “to” “run up the road;” and then 10 Protestants were ordered out of the bus and shot dead; with an 11th Protestant, escaping, but being maimed for life. 9 of the 10 Protestants killed were buried at nearby Bessbrook, 6 were Presbyterians and 3 were Anglicans ... ooh, how the devils behind Popery hate those William of Orange supporting, royalist and loyalist, *Protestants* of Northern Ireland! [pause]. And then there was the Omagh Bombing of 1998, whose 10 Protestant victims included Esther Gibson, a 36 year old Sunday School teacher in the *Free Presbyterian Church of Ulster*; ... ooh, how the devils behind Popery hate that great Protestant institution of the Sunday School, in which children are taught about the Bible [pause]. The point is clear my friends. Papal Rome takes out Protestants wherever and whenever it can. And we’re told in Revelation 13 it’ll do so again just before the Second Advent, when “the mark of the beast” is given out. For in the words of Revelation 17:6, “I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus;” ... ooh, how the devils behind Popery hate *all* those religiously conservative *Protestant* Christians. [pause]

¹⁷⁸ Boettner, L., *Roman Catholicism*, Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, 1962, pp. 437-42 (South America 1948-1962).

Now recognition that the Pope is the Antichrist is known as the Historical School, or Historicist prophetic school. It predates the Reformation, being found before this time among, for instance, the Waldensians. But when the Protestant Historicist School started to really bite after the Reformation, the Pope turned to his trusted crafty Jesuits, to come up with something to try and stop the Protestants exposing the Pope of Rome for whom he really was. Two Jesuits went away and turned their devious dark minds to think about the matter; applying to it all the tricky arts and crafts of Jesuitry. They both came back to the Pope with elaborate ruses; which they thought could act as decoys to attract people away from Historicism. One of the devious Jesuits came up with preterism, ‘I know,’ said Alcazar, ‘We’ll tell ’em *it’s all in the past, so you don’t have to worry about it ... NOW.*’ And the other crafty Jesuit came up with futurism, ‘I know,’ said Ribera, ‘We’ll tell ’em *it’s all in the future, so you don’t have to worry about it ... NOW.*’ And the Antichrist Pope of Rome smiled, ... ‘PER-R-R-R-FECT!’ [pause]

But we’re told in II Thessalonians 2:3 that the Pope is “the son of perdition.” The same terminology is used of Judas Iscariot in John 17:12, and we’re told in John 13:26 & 27 that “Satan entered into” “Judas Iscariot.” So the term, “the son of perdition,” refers to devil-possession by Lucifer himself. And so just like in Isaiah 14, Isaiah could look the king of Babylon in the eye and address “Lucifer” himself, or just like in Ezekiel 28, Ezekiel could look the king of Tyre in the eye and address Satan himself, so likewise, one can look the Pope in the eye and address the Devil himself. But I would urge you not to attempt to do that unless very specifically guided under God’s directive will to do so; for outside of Christ, on earth, is not the Devil’s equal; and if you are ever so directly called by God to do so, remember that II Corinthians 4:4 says Lucifer is “the god of this world;” and Jude 9 teaches that we must address the “god of this world,” the Devil, in a respectful manner, not bringing “a railing accusation” against him, but most respectfully saying, for example, “The Lord rebuke thee.” But look, if God doesn’t very clearly direct you to so address the Devil in a one-on-one, eye-ball to eye-ball talk with the Pope of Rome, then whatever ya’ do, please steer clear of ever attempting such a direct dialogue with the Devil. You’ll be grabbing a tiger by the tail, and if you haven’t gone in there under God’s directive will, don’t presume on God’s mercy to help and protect you. As to the question of how the Devil gains such access to each new Pope, John 14:7-13 teaches that the Holy Ghost is Christ’s universal vicar or representative on earth; and so when since 607 every Bishop of Rome claims to be “the Vicar of Christ” *with a universal jurisdiction*, he commits the unpardonable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. Thus he can, and is, then devil-possessed by Lucifer. Hence no exorcism could ever work with the Pope. Unlike God, the Devil’s not omnipresent, so he usually works through his legions of devils. And we’re told in Revelation 17:9 and 18:2 that he runs everything from Rome. [pause]

You see, working through his legions of devils, Satan is behind every false religion and ideology in the world. And if he can send someone to hell via atheism, or agnosticism, or Buddhism, or Hinduism, or Mohammedanism, or Judaism, then he will. In working with the secular state, his devils will whisper in a woman’s ears that she “should have an abortion.” But if she looks like she wants ta’ repent and turn to Christianity’s saving gospel, then the same Devil’s there with a number of decoys such as

Eastern Orthodoxy or various cults such as the Mormons or Jehovah's Witnesses. But his *Number 1* decoy always has been since 607, and still is, Roman Catholicism. It's the Devil's masterpiece of deception. It's so important to him, that per Revelation 12:3 & 13:1 & 2, he doesn't generally leave control of its Papal head to a delegated lesser devil, but himself, personally devil-possesses every Pope of Rome since 607 A.D.; although per Revelation 16:13 & 14, he may temporarily leave the Pope in the hands of some lesser devils if he's gotta' go somewhere. And so the same devils that formerly whispered in that women's ear to have an abortion, now whisper in that woman's ear if she wants to repent, that she should become a Papist, "because," they say, "the Pope has always said he opposes abortion." And so she is through a false gospel of works' righteousness, blasphemy, and idolatry, then hog-tied for hell. Few ever see through this type of deception which has other similar spins. Take for instance "Jane Roe" who was the woman in the 1973 USA Supreme Court case of *Roe versus Wade* which directly opened up the abortion slaughter in America, and indirectly helped open it up Western World wide. When she finally came to repent, she fairly quickly became a Papist. And so the Devil hog-tied her for hell both ways. Few, I say, ever see through the Devil's masterpiece of the Roman Catholic Church, whose Pope is personally devil-possessed by Lucifer himself. In the Garden of Eden, Satan devil-possessed a beautiful serpent; and now he possesses the gorgeously appalled Pope of Rome. It seems it's a case of "nothing but the best" for Lucifer. And when he sits in the control-panels of the Pope's head, he makes sure that when the Pope appears in public with others, the Pope's in bright white, and the others are in darker colours, for he likes to have the white aura of light surrounding his Papal puppet, as both a mimic of Christ's splendidly shining white aura and also that of the dazzlingly bright "Lucifer" whose name means "light-bearer." It's a case of "nothing but the best" for Lucifer. [pause]

Well may one say: [Softer-slower-higher-longer voice] *Oh, of course, subtle trickery of the Devil, who came to our first parents in the Garden of Eden after devil-possessing a beautiful snake, and then speaking through that serpent, deceived them. Oh similar subtle trickery of the Devil, who now comes to us through Antichrist who presents himself as the "Vicar of Christ," in the splendor and beauty of great ritual and pomp, and seated on the seven hills of Rome. Oh, of course, art and craft of the Devil, who pretends to believe that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh," but who then denies the humanity of Christ in the transubstantiation heresy of the idolatrous and blasphemous Roman Mass! Oh art and craft of the Devil, who while claiming the Roman Catholic Church believes in the Ten Commandments of Exodus chapter 20, thereby sets aside the Second and Third Commandments against idolatry and blasphemy. Oh art and craft of the Devil, who while claiming the Roman Church believes in Christ as man's mediator, further sets aside the Second Commandment by Mariolatry and invocation of the saints. Oh art and craft of the Devil, we should have known that the Antichrist scenarios of the preterists evacuate the prophecies of their potency! Oh art and craft of the Devil, we should have known that the Antichrist scenarios of the Futurists were so silly that they were an insult to the intelligence of the Devil! Oh art and craft of the Devil, we should have known that Antichrist would not, for example, come in some spaceship as an obviously evil being; or come as any other obviously evil and wicked monster, for then would nobody have believed in him! Oh, of course, art and craft of the Devil, we should*

have realized that in Devil-possessing every Pope of Rome since the establishment of the Office of Antichrist in 607 A.D., we have a deception WORTHY of the one who likewise tricked our first parents in the Garden of Eden by Devil-possessing the serpent. Oh art and craft of the Devil. [longer pause]

Wake up! Good Christian, where Luther's *Smalcald Articles* upheld in the Lutheran *Formulae of Concord*, *woke up*, saying the [quote] "Pope ... is the true Antichrist ..., who hath raised himself over and set himself against Christ This is called precisely, 'setting oneself over God and against God,' as St. Paul saith" [unquote]. *Wake up!* where Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles*, *woke up*, for example, referring to Matthew 24, [quote] "'Many shall come in my name,' saith Christ," "all the Popes" "are worthily accounted among the number of" "false Christs" [unquote]; referring to Revelation 13 & 17, the Pope is [quote] "the Babylonical beast of Rome" [unquote]; or [quote] "the bishop of Rome" "ought" "to be called Antichrist" [unquote]. *Wake up!* where the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession*, *woke up*, saying, [quote] "There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ: nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that Antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ and all that is called God" [unquote]. *Wake up!* where the Congregationalist's *Savoy Declaration*, *woke up*, saying, [quote] "There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ; nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof; but is that Antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ, and all that is called God, whom the Lord shall destroy with the brightness of his coming" [unquote]. *Wake up!* where the *Baptist* or *London Confession*, also known in America as *The Philadelphia Confession*, *woke up*, saying, [quote] "The Lord Jesus Christ is the head of the church, neither can the Pope of Rome, in any sense, be head thereof, but is no other than Antichrist, that man of sin and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ, and all that is called God; whom the Lord shall destroy with the brightness of his coming" [unquote]. *Wake up!* Good Christian, *Wake up!* [pause]

Let us pray. "O God the Father ..., God the Son ..., [and] God the Holy Ghost ..., O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three Persons and one God ..., From all sedition and privy conspiracy, from the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, from all false doctrine and heresy, from hardness of heart, and contempt of thy Word and Commandment, Good Lord, deliver us¹⁷⁹." Heavenly Father, we are taught in thy holy Word that we may "come boldly" into thy presence "unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need;" through "Jesus the mediator of the new covenant." We recognize no co-mediators, whether the Romanists' Mary, or Saints, or Popish priests in confessionals, or Popes who claim the keys to heaven. For we are taught in thy holy Word that "there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." We thank thee Lord that major Protestant confessions: Lutheran, Anglican, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, and Baptist; all teach that the Roman Catholic Pope is the Antichrist, and we seek thy forgiveness for the fact that this precious truth has been lost among so many Protestants. We pray that

¹⁷⁹ Selections from the Litany, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1552).

this amazing truth may again be impressed upon the hearts and minds of Protestant Christians, that they may be protected from the wiles of Satan, and the Papal Antichrist whom he devil-possesses. We pray for Papists deluded by the Antichrist; we pray for Protestants deluded by preterism and futurism. Lord have mercy. Christ have mercy. Lord have mercy. Hear us, merciful God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

[I Tim. 2:5; Hebrews 4:16 and 12:24.]

Sermon audio: www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible

Title: Exposition of Thessalonians 2/3: "Roman Catholic Pope is Antichrist."

Bible Texts: 2 Thess. 2:3; 1 John 2:18

Brief Overview: In this sermon Gavin unmasks the Antichrist as the Pope of Rome since 607 A.D. . . . While making some reference to a 5th area of the Books of Daniel & Revelation, he focuses on 4 broad NT areas: 1) the Apostle John in I John 2:18,22; 4:3; & II John 7; 2) Christ in Matthew 24:5,22-24; and the Apostle Paul in 3) II Thess. 2:1-12 and 4) I Timothy 4:1-5. He deals with both the false gospel of works' righteousness in Romanism (Gal. 1:6-9; 3:1,11); and e.g., its violation of the 2nd Commandment (Exod. 20:4-6), in this context quoting from e.g., the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662, "no adoration ... ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine, ... for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians; and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one." He also cites Luther's *Smalcald Articles* upheld in the Lutheran *Formulae of Concord*, the "Pope ... is the true Antichrist;" & the Homilies of Article 35 of the Anglican *39 Articles*, referring to Matt. 24, "'Many shall come in my name,' saith Christ," "all the Popes" "are worthily accounted among the number of" "'false Christs';" referring to Rev. 13 & 17, the Pope is "the Babylonical beast of Rome;" or "the bishop of Rome" "ought" "to be called Antichrist;" and the Presbyterian *Westminster Confession*, Congregational *Savoy Declaration*, and *Baptist Confession*, which all say, "the Pope of Rome ... is ... Antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition." Gavin refers the listener seeking further detail to his book, *The Roman Pope is the Antichrist*, at <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>.

Keywords: Roman Catholicism; Pope; Antichrist; abortion; Protestant martyrs; Sarkander; Stepinac Stepinatz.

SERMON 2 SERIES: (Thurs. 17 February 2011) Sermon 2:3 An Exegetical Trilogy on I & II Thessalonians. Sermon 2:3 II Thess. 3:14. "The Doctrine of Scripture - The 'Word' of II Thess. 3:14 & Ps. 119:140 'is very pure'."

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. Let us pray. "O merciful God, who hast made all men, and hatest nothing that thou hast made, nor wouldest the death of a sinner, but rather that he should be converted and live; have mercy upon all Jews, Turkish and other followers of Mahomet's religion, Infidels, and

hereticks, and take from them all ignorance, hardness of heart, and contempt of thy Word; and so fetch them home, blessed Lord, to thy flock, that they may be saved among the remnant of the true Israelites, and be made one fold under one shepherd, Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. Amen¹⁸⁰.”

Welcome to all listening to this address. In our final of this trilogy of sermons in these special two hour prayer-meetings on parts of I and II Thessalonians our text is from II Thessalonians 3:14, which reads, “And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed.” This reference to the “Word” teaches the authority of Scripture. And we read in Psalm 119 verse 140, “Thy word is very pure: therefore thy servant loveth it.” This year of 2011 is the 400th anniversary of the King James Version of 1611, and we’re reminded that the text that it is based on, the Received Text, is both Divinely Inspired and Divinely Preserved. It’s “pure” and it’s authoritative. Without the Word of God we could never be saved, because the Word is a means of grace, and hence we read in I Peter 1:23, that we are “born again ... by the Word of God.” And there’s also edification by the Word, hence Jesus prays in John 17:17, “Sanctify them through thy truth: thy Word is truth.”

The classic Bible verse for the Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture is II Timothy 3:16, “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.” And the classic Bible verse for the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture is I Peter 1:25, “the Word of the Lord endureth forever.” And Psalm 119:140 covers both when it says, “Thy word is very pure.” The Divine Inspiration of Holy Scripture and the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture are the two sides of the one coin. It’s pointless to say that God spake infallibly at the point of Divine Inspiration, if we must then add that ever since we’ve been scratching our heads and wondering just exactly what it was that he said, because the Divine revelation was not Divinely Preserved for us. [pause]

Now there are three broad points I wish to make about the authority of Scripture as taught in II Thessalonians 3:14. Firstly, while we find the “pure” “word” of God in the Received Text or *Textus Receptus* of the Old and New Testaments, translated for us in our Authorized King James Versions of 1611; that does not mean that the Authorized Version is word perfect, because only the underpinning Old and New Testament Received Texts are word perfect. But the King James Bible is *by far* the best available English translation we have, and the one people *should* be generally using. Secondly, while the Received Text is, in the words of Psalm 119:140, the “very pure” “word;” nevertheless, there are many other corruptions of Scripture that have been made. And thirdly, that there are sometimes *errors of interpretation* than men place on the Bible.

An example of the first point that the AV is not word perfect is found in Hosea 6:7. This reads in the AV, “they like men have transgressed the covenant.” The Hebrew word here rendered “men” is “*adam*” from which we get our word, “Adam,”

¹⁸⁰ Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) Collect (Good Friday) changing “Turks” to “Turkish and other followers of Mahomet’s religion.”

and I'd say that it'd be better rendered, "they like Adam have transgressed the covenant." But you see, the better understanding of covenant theology inside of Protestantism, was a development that started in the later 16th century, but did not culminate till the much later 17th century, long after the 1611 translators of the King James Bible looked at this passage of Hosea 6:7. Now their rendering of Hosea 6:7 as "men" is certainly one possible translation, but I'd say the better rendering is as "Adam." For with a more developed understanding of both the covenant of works that Adam originally had in Eden, and the everlasting covenant of grace under which all men who have ever been saved, are saved, there was a better Protestant development of Federalism over Augustinianism with respect to original sin, and a better understanding in which was stated the threefold doctrine of imputation of sin, namely, the imputation of Adam's sin to his descendants of the Adamic or human race; the imputation of the sins of his people to Christ their redeemer when in the words of the *Nicene Creed* "he suffered" and "was crucified" "for our salvation;" and the imputation of Christ's righteousness to his people. And in this enhanced understanding of covenant theology, it becomes clear that Hosea 6:7 is best understood as a reference to the covenant of works, which Adam was capable of keeping but which fallen men are not capable of keeping, and so rendered as "they like Adam have transgressed the covenant."

Though Adam before the fall had original righteousness, and so was capable of keeping that covenant of works, man after the fall is, due to his sinful nature, incapable of keeping such a covenant of works. But whereas we're told in Romans 5:12-14 that from the time of Adam to the time of Moses, men died and went to hell on the basis of Adam's primal sin; we're also told that this covenant of works was reissued as a covenant inside the Sinai covenant, so that in the words of Romans 5:20, "the law entered, that the offence might abound." Of that Sinai covenant of works found in any attempt to earn salvation by perfectly keeping the Ten Commandments, Hosea 6:7 tells us the men of Hosea's day transgressed, which of course, any fallen man who tries to keep it, must likewise do. For we're told in Galatians 3 that it was a "schoolmaster" or school teacher designed to *teach* us that we couldn't keep God's law perfectly, and so we should cry out for mercy under the alternative covenant of grace, which simultaneously existed in Old Testament times under, for example, the Abrahamic Covenant of Galatians 3:16-19, which covenant of grace is now found for us Christians inside the New Testament covenant. These two covenants are alternatives. If you want to in the words of Matthew 19:16, "do" some good works to "have eternal life," then the answer of Matthew 19:18 & 19 is that one should perfectly keep the Ten Commandments. But there's a problem with that which the rich young ruler of Matt. 19:13-22 failed to recognize, as indeed did more generally the Jews of New Testament times, namely, that for we sinful fallen men the thing is an impossible goal. For in the words of Leviticus 18:5, cited in Galatians 3:12, "the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them." You see, in both Old and New Testament times, attempts to keep the covenant of works perfectly, and so merit salvation, is God's way of teaching us that our only hope is to cry out for mercy under the alternative covenant of grace. For Galatians 4:24-26 says the Sinai covenant "gendereth to bondage," whereas the covenant of grace makes us "free," through the justification by faith of Galatians 3:11. So as one who upholds such Reformed covenant theology, I'd say Hosea 6:7 is best rendered as "they

like Adam have transgressed the covenant.” So as I say, the AV isn’t word perfect, but it’s by far the best available English translation, and the one we should generally be using.

Now concerning the second point, there are many corruptions of the Received Text of Scripture, for both the Old and New Testaments. For example, in New Testament times there was the Samaritan Pentateuch which greatly corrupted the first five Books of the Bible: Genesis Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, with about 6,000 variants. And beyond that, the Samaritans, who in racial terms are Semites who are Assyrian-Israelite admixed, don’t accept any of the other 34 Old Testament books of Joshua to Malachi. For example, one of the corruptions in the Samaritan Pentateuch is that references to Jerusalem are changed to Mt. Gerizem; and they claim the temple should be at Mt. Gerizem, rather than Jerusalem, because they don’t accept the words of II Chronicles 3:1, “Then Solomon began to build the house of the Lord *at Jerusalem* in Mount Moriah.” And so when the Samaritan woman, referring to Mt. Gerizem, said to Jesus in John 4:20, “Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship,” she was referring to this corrupt Samaritan Pentateuch. And Jesus replies in John 4:22, “Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship: for salvation is of the Jews.” And so Jesus here upheld the Old Testament Received Text over the Samaritan’s corrupt text.

And the same is also true of the Greek Septuagint translation of the Old Testament. It’s of a very uneven standard. Where it’s an accurate translation of the Hebrew and Aramaic Old Testament, it’s sometimes quoted in the New Testament. But where it’s a bad translation of the Hebrew and Aramaic Old Testament, it’s not quoted, and another Greek translation is provided. You see, textual corruption of Scripture is nothing new. Which is why, for example, the neo-Alexandrian claims that simply because their New Testament Alexandrian texts of Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus are from the fourth century they are more accurate, is such silliness. And yet we have today an attack on the Neo-Byzantine Received Text of the New Testament by two groups in particular; the Neo-Alexandrian School who make critical New Testament texts based around their highly faulty manuscripts, essentially basing their neo-Alexandrian texts on two corrupt codices, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus; and also the Majority Text Burgonite School. The neo-Alexandrians omit such Scriptures as, for example, Matthew 17:21; Matthew 18:11; Matthew 23:14; Mark 16:9-20; and John 7:53 to 8:11. And likewise, the Majority Text Burgonites, found in, for instance, the New King James Version, likewise adopt many textual corruptions, for example, the omission of such Scriptures as the words, “and with fire” in Matthew 3:11, or “by them of old time” at Matthew 5:27. And we find that both neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites sometimes unite in a pincer attack against the neo-Byzantine Received Text, with, for example, both of them omitting such Scriptures as, much of Acts 9:5 & 6, or I John 5:7 and part of verse 8. By contrast, the words of the neo-Byzantine School’s *Textus Receptus* or Received Text are, in the words of Psalm 119:140, “very pure.” And if you want to look more into that matter then I refer you to my textual commentaries on the Received Text, which you can find at my website, at <http://www.easy.com.au/~gmbooks/> [2015 update: <http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com>] or on Google or Yahoo type in as

three separate words, “Gavin McGrath Books,” and then click on “Commentary on the Received Text.” [pause]

Both the Alexandrian Text’s Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus are attached to copies of the Old Testament Septuagint, and these Septuagints are corrupt in many places, just like the New Testament sections of these codices are corrupt. Coming from the fourth century A.D., these Old Testament Septuagints in Codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus are both much older in time than copies we have of most of the Old Testament Hebrew and Aramaic Text; yet no-one claims that because of their greater age, in general their Old Testament sections are more reliable than the much later Hebrew and Aramaic copies for most of the Old Testament that we have. And yet, paradoxically, such a claim is made for their equally corrupt New Testament sections. Jesus lived in a culture where people were aware of corruptions to the Old Testament in both the Samaritan Pentateuch and Greek Septuagint, and yet he said of the Old Testament in Matthew 5:18, “Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law.” That’s the doctrine of the Divine Preservation of Scripture in a cultural context in which corruptions of Scripture were rife. And likewise, we’re told of a similar situation in New Testament times, where in II Corinthians 2:17, St. Paul refers to “*many* which corrupt the word of God;” but in I Peter 1:25, St. Peter says, “the Word of the Lord endureth forever.” Once again, that’s the doctrine of the Divine Preservation of Scripture in a cultural context in which corruptions of Scripture were rife. For in the words of Psalm 119:140, “Thy word is very pure.” And so we read in II Thessalonians 3:14, “if any man obey not our word by this epistle,” “have no company with him.”

Indeed, it’s sometimes said the first form critic to attack God’s Word was the Devil, because after he devil-possessed a snake in the Garden of Eden, he spoke through that serpent to the mother of the human race, Eve, first questioning God’s word by saying in Genesis 3:1, “Hath God said?” He thus first cast doubt on the Word of God, thereby seeking to cast aspersions upon its Divine Inspiration and Divine Preservation, and to try and corrupt its transmission, before then telling Eve it was okay to go ahead and eat the forbidden fruit from the specified apple tree. Eve then led her husband astray, and so when the great patriarch of the human race, Adam, ate the apple that Eve had given him, mankind fell into sin. And so we’re here taught that the reason why the Devil or anyone else corrupts the Word of God, is in order to lead men astray into sin. [pause]

Last week I referred to a Christian Missionary Hymn, with the words, “Arm of the Lord, thy power extend, Let Mahomet’s imposture end; Break superstition’s Papal chain, And the proud scoffers rage restrain.” And today, it is with respect to the topic found in the words of that hymn, “Let Mahomet’s imposture end,” that I especially wish to elucidate upon. “Mahomet” – M-A-H-O-M-E-T is simply another form of “Mohammad;” hence in Article 35 of the Anglican 39 Articles, we read in Book 2, Homily 2 of [quote] “Mahomet’s false religion” [unquote] or in Book 2, Homily 7, of [quote] “the devilish religion of wicked Mahomet” [unquote]. And since he was a false prophet, an impostor, well may we say or sing, “Arm of the Lord, thy power extend, Let Mahomet’s imposture end”! Mohammed’s Koran corrupts the Bible in many, many, places; far more than we have time to look at today. For example, the Mohammedans’

claim on their traditional understanding of the Koran, that Ishmael, not Isaac was offered by Abraham. Back in the 1980s I purchased the 1974 paperback reprint by J.M. Dent & Sons of London of the 1909 edition of Rodwell's 1876 translation of *The Koran*, which has some helpful footnotes explaining certain things, and an Introduction by Margoliouth. Now reading from that translation, Sura 37:99-101 says, "'O Lord give me a son, of the righteous'," to which the reply is, "We announced to him a youth of *meekness*, and when he became a *full-grown youth*, his father said to him, 'My son, I have seen in a dream that I should sacrifice thee'." Now the Mohammedans say that the Koran refers to two sons, one son who in Sura 37:98 is called "righteous," and they apply that to Isaac as Sura 37:112 says, "we announced Isaac to him – a righteous prophet;" and a second son who in Sura 37:99 is called "a youth of meekness," and they apply that to Ishmael because Sura 21:85 calls Ishmael "steadfast in patience." And because Abraham here addresses this "youth of meekness," Mohammedans say the sacrifice of Abraham refers to Ishmael, not Isaac. And that conclusion is also consistent with the more general way the Koran glorifies Ishmael in a most unBiblical and most incorrect manner. The Mohammedans also consider that because Abraham had asked in Sura 37:98, "'O Lord give me a son, of the righteous'," fulfilled in Sura 37:112 with "Isaac;" that Isaac was too young to then be described in Sura 37:100 as the [quote] "full-grown youth" [unquote] that Abraham was to sacrifice, and so once again they say the Koran here teaches that Abraham was to sacrifice Ishmael, not Isaac.

Furthermore, Genesis 22:2 says the place of this sacrifice was "Moriah," and the Mohammedans then relocate this either to a place called "Mina" in Syria, or to a place called, "Marwah" in Mecca on the Horn of Africa [correction, not 'Horn of Africa' but 'Arabian Peninsula']. And this type of thing reminds me of the corruptions in the Samaritan Pentateuch and religion that we read about in John 4:20, where they made Mt. Gerizem the place of their temple, rather than Jerusalem. And likewise, the Muslims false religious views on Ishmael gives rise to the Islamic [quote] "*Festival of Sacrifice*," in which they annually sacrifice domestic animals such as sheep, goats, cows, or camels, to remember this sacrifice of Abraham which God then stopped from happening by providing an animal sacrifice, in the words of Sura 37:107, "we ransomed his son with a costly victim."

Now all this Mohammedan teaching is very different to what the Christian Bible says. This union between the Hamite, Hagar, and the Semite, Abraham, violated the teaching of Genesis 6 and 10 against racially mixed marriages, and also the promise of Genesis 9:26, giving the blessing racially to "Shem." We read of the Hamite, Hagar the Horrible, and the hated half-caste Ishmael in Genesis 21:10, "Cast out this bondwoman and her son," that we're further told "shall not be heir ... with Isaac." Ishmael was not the child of prophetic promise. Then we read in Genesis 22:2, "Take now thy son, thine only son Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the land of Moriah; and offer him there for a burnt offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of." Verse 8, "Abraham said, My son, God will provide himself a lamb;" verse 13, "Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up." And in II Chronicles 3:1 we read, "Then Solomon began to build the house of the Lord at Jerusalem in mount Moriah;" and so Judaism considers on what is called, "the temple mount," that the sacrifice of Abraham occurred

on what is now the temple site in Jerusalem.

Now it's significant that this sacrifice of Abraham, in which Isaac was offered, is a prophetic type of the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ at Calvary. Hence Hebrews 11:17-19 says, "By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son, of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called: accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure." You see the sacrifice of Abraham was a type of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, hence the propriety of the words of Genesis 22:8, "God will provide himself a lamb," pointing to the one that John 1:29 calls, "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." And the fact that Isaac lived, is we're told in Hebrew 11:19, "a figure" of the resurrection. And so the sacrifice of Isaac types the sacrificial death and resurrection of Christ.

You see, a half-breed Hamite-Semite like Ishmael could not prophetically type the sacrifice of the Semitic Christ, who we're told in Luke 3:36 "was the son of Sem" or "Shem." Now providing the level of intake is fairly small, one race can assimilate another race over a number of generations. That's not a particularly desirable thing for any race to do, but it's a possible thing. And so we read in Deuteronomy 23 that over ten generations of bastardy, one might occasionally make such an assimilation. And of course a good example of that is the Moabitess, Ruth. Matthew 1 is Joseph's genealogy, and Luke 3 is Christ's genealogy via Mary; but "Boaz" and "Salmon" in Luke 3:32 parallel Salmon and his wife Rahab, and Boaz and his wife Ruth, in Matthew 1:5. If you look at Matthew 1:5, between Rahab at the beginning period of the judges, and Jesse at the time of the monarchy, there's only one generation, Ruth. That means that Rahab and Ruth span about 400 years. And that means that many generations of bastardy are omitted for both, making the point, that pursuant to Deuteronomy 23, their blood-lines had to be genetically washed out over a period of about 400 years of bastardy.

Now of course, just like the New Testament repealed the Old Testament laws of polygamy and reverted back to the monogamy of antediluvian times; so likewise, the New Testament repeals these type of small-scale racial assimilation laws, and reverts back to the absolute prohibition on racially mixed marriages in antediluvian times, in passages such as Matthew 24:37-39 or Acts 15:20. So in harmony with Article 7 of the Anglican 39 Articles, I would say that "civil precepts" such as Deuteronomy 23:2-8 no longer "ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth;" however, I would also say that they provide a valuable broad structure to help guide the minds of godly lawmakers in working out how to deal with such undesirable instances of small scale racial assimilation. And in that sense one sees their godly imprint on historic anti-miscegenation statutes. So in harmony with the New Testament prohibitions of, for example, Matthew 24:37-39 and Acts 15:20, and echoing the type of thing we find in Ezra 9 & 10; after Luke 17:26 & 27, Christ refers in Luke 18:29 to those "that hath left" "wife" "for the kingdom of God's sake." For instance, the Acts 15 *Council of Jerusalem* held that when Jewish and Gentile Christians come together in a fellowship meal, such as that mentioned in Galatians 2:11 & 12, where we read that "Peter" "did eat with the Gentiles;" then Acts 15:20 & 29 says those Gentiles are to keep Jewish food rules,

although these are not normally binding on Gentile Christians as seen by Mark 7:19, Colossians 2:16, and I Timothy 4:4 & 5; although Colossians 2:16 is a two-edged sword which also allows Jewish Christians to voluntarily keep these type of things as part of their cultural heritage. And I should mention that the only time I've ever eaten Jewish *kosher* food was at a restaurant at Tiberius on the Sea of Galilee in Israel in February 2002. It was quite stringy, and to my Gentile palate, not something that I've ever wanted to return to and eat again in the subsequent 9 years. And so while on the one hand, this Jewish-Gentile fellowship meal rule clearly facilitated some level of contact between the two groups; on the other hand, I think the Gentile palate's aversion to this Jewish food would be such as to ensure that the number of such fellowship meals would be kept *fairly low*. [pause] But Acts 15:20 & 29 also says to abstain from "fornication," and since there's only one type of fornication that can occur when Jewish and Gentile Christians are together, but cannot occur when they're apart, it follows that this is a ban on inter-racial and inter-cultural dating or mixed marriages between the two groups.

Hence after first showing there's a time and place for fellowship between different groups such as Jewish and Gentile Christians, and then wanting to make the point that there's also a time and place for segregation of different groups such as Jewish and Gentile Christians, in the segregationist context of Jewish Christians bidding farewell to the Gentile Christian Trophimus, the decree is also cited in Acts 21:25, with Jewish Christians going over the segregation line at the Gate Beautiful of the Temple, for an act of segregated Jewish Christian worship. Now we know from Biblical archaeology, that in 1871 a warning inscription in the Greek tongue was dug up around the temple that said any Gentile going beyond the temple barricade, would be executed. And a second such inscription was later found in 1935. The one found in 1871 by Clermont-Ganneau is now in the Istanbul Archaeological Museum in Turkey¹⁸¹, and the one discovered in 1931 by Illiffe is now in the Jerusalem Rockefeller Museum in Israel. They both date from NT times of the first century A.D., and they're made of stone, being about 34 centremetres or 13 inches long, about 23 centremetres or 9 inches high, and about 15 centremetres or 6 inches thick. The 1871 discovered Greek inscription is written over seven lines, whereas the 1935 discovered inscription is written over 6 lines.

The Greek inscription forbids upon pain of death a [quote] "*allogene*" [unquote] from entering the area, and the same root Greek word is translated "stranger" at Luke 17:18; it's a compound word made up of two Greek words, "*allos*" meaning "other," and "*genos*" which gives rise to the Greek word, "*genea*" meaning a "generation," and via the German word spelt, "G-E-N," the Greek "*genea*" gives us our word, "gene"¹⁸², and so "*genos*" means "race," or in the context of Genesis 10 type race-based national identity, through racial "families," meaning "nation." For example, the Matthew 15:22 "woman of Canaan," is referred to in Mark 7:26 as "a Greek" meaning "a Gentile," and possibly also meaning a Greek speaking Gentile, who was "a Syrophenician by nation," and

¹⁸¹ Turkish, "Arckeoloji Muzesi" (some render this, "Archeology Museum"). In 3 buildings inside the first court of the Topkapi Palace, Gulhane Park, Istanbul.

¹⁸² Coined by Wilhelm Ludvig Johannsen (1857-1927), a Danish geneticist.

“nation” there is *genos* meaning “race” or “nation,” one which came down from Noah’s son Ham via Canaan; or in II Corinthians 11:22 St. Paul describes himself as of the “Hebrews” and “the seed of Abraham,” now “Hebrews” come down from Noah’s son Shem via “Eber,” and more particularly St. Paul says he is of “the seed” or race “of Abraham,” and then in verse 26 he refers to his “own countrymen,” and “countrymen” there is once again this Greek word *genos* meaning “nation” or “race.” And so this temple inscription forbidding entry to those of another “*genos*,” means that even though the Jewish race included a small amount of assimilation, in broad-brush terms this was a segregation line against those of “*the other race*,” meaning “Gentiles.”

So it was a capital offence for a Gentile to go over that segregation line; and the enemies of St. Paul and Christianity claimed that Christians didn’t believe in racial segregation, and that St. Paul had really taken a Gentile over that segregation line. So if you were to read the charge sheet under which St. Paul was executed by the Romans, the charge would be that he took a Gentile over the segregation line at the Gate Beautiful of the Temple in Jerusalem. The manufacturing of evidence claimed he was some kind of “civil rights desegregationist” engaging in acts of civil disobedience in which he was seeking the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, such as segregation; and this manufacturing of evidence would then have entailed false witnesses who claimed he so took a Gentile named “Trochimus” over the segregation line. It might also have possibly included allegations that because St. Paul had taught the racial universality of the Christian gospel to both Jew and Gentile, that he was in fact trying to say that in more general terms different racial groups should never be segregated. But whatever was said in that court case, it was a false charge, though we know from II Timothy 4:6-8 that he was ultimately executed on this false charge. And some people who have internalized worldly, secular, so called “human rights” values, and wish to anachronistically find these in Scripture, still claim that Christianity is such a desegregationist religion, and still falsely claim that this is what St. Paul and the New Testament teach. And so St. Paul died a Christian martyr’s death that men might know that the allegation that Christianity is opposed to racial segregation is absolutely false. Such persons like to cite the first part of Acts 17:26 which says that “of” which is Greek, “*ek*,” meaning “from,” “one blood,” namely Adam’s blood, “all nations of men” come; but they don’t like to cite the second part of that verse, which makes it clear that the Biblical “nations” or races are no longer of one bloodline, for God “determined” “the bounds of their habitation,” and if you look at such passages as Genesis 10 & 11, or Deuteronomy 32:8, or the Book of Nature, it’s clear that God set such “bounds of” “habitation” in order to segregate different racial “families.” And so while there are some contexts where inter-racial contact may and should occur, if in general terms different groups are not segregated, then it’s a statement of rebellion against God such as that of Nimrod with “the beginning of his kingdom” at “Babel.” And that’s why, for example, James 1:1 makes it clear that in the first instance this epistle was addressed to segregated Jewish Christian Churches, which from the Greek of James 2:2 we know were called “synagogues,” even though in the second instance that Epistle is for all Christians, both Jewish and Gentile. And of course the same is also true for the Epistle to the Hebrews, whose title words, “to the Hebrews,” are part of the Divinely inspired and preserved book, and this is clearly a racial term, indicating that once again, they were meeting in racially segregated congregations;

though once again, this Epistle is thereafter intended for all Christians, whether they are by race Hebrews, or by race Gentiles. [pause]

So from all this, the bigger point I wish to make is that Jesus was racially Semitic and Jewish, because any small-scale assimilation permissible in Jewish times, before the New Testament reintroduced the earlier antediluvian absolute ban on inter-racial marriages, any such small-scale assimilation from Jewish times had been washed out over these bastardy generations of Deuteronomy 23. God told Abraham to sire a race, the Jewish race, and that's the Semitic race that the Messiah came from. He's the "seed" of Genesis 3:15 which is referring to the primary race, that is the Adamic race also known as the human race. But this is then more narrowly defined into racial subdivisions of the human primary race in the prophecy of the Semitic race in Genesis 9:26. Now inside the human race, there are five second level or secondary races, such as, for example, Negroids who come down from Ham's son Cush in Genesis 10:6; and Caucasoids. And these five secondary races, such as the Capoids of southern Africa who come down from Ham, these five secondary races further internally subdivide into a third level of race or tertiary race; so that the Caucasoid secondary race, divides into the white Caucasian tertiary race that comes down from Noah's son Japheth, and also the Mediterranean Caucasoid tertiary race that comes down from Noah's sons Shem and Ham. So in turn, this Mediterranean Caucasoid tertiary race from Shem and Ham, subdivides into a fourth level of race or quaternary race, and one of those quaternary races is the Semitic race from Shem. There are also some other races than come down from Shem that we call "Shemitic races," namely, the Mongoloid secondary race and the Australoid secondary race; but in English when we say "Semitic race," we mean this quaternary race which is light brown in colour, frequently with hooked noses, and speaking the Semitic languages; inside the larger Mediterranean Caucasoid tertiary race, which has wavy and black hair, narrow heads; medium noses; brown eyes; light brown skin and medium stature; which in turn is inside the Caucasoid secondary race which has wavy hair; abundant male facial and body hair; slight prognathism or jaw protrusion; which in turn is inside the human primary race which is Adam's race, made in the image of God. However, this Semitic race seed of Genesis 9:26, is then in turn, even more narrowly defined again as the Jewish race "seed" of Genesis 12:7 and 15:18. This Jewish ethnic race, comes down from Shem's son Arphaxad, and then Arphaxad's son Eber, from which we get the word "Hebrew" in Genesis 10:22 & 24; and then ultimately through Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. And so if you understand that Biblically the Jewish Semitic race, that the typology of atonement must fit with Abraham's sacrifice to racially type the Messiah, requires that Abraham offered the son of promise, the full-blooded Hebrew Semite Isaac; then it's not possible for the son of the sacrifice typology to be the son of miscegenationist fleshly lust, the Hamite-Semite half-caste, Ishmael.

And indeed in further corruption of the Bible, we find in Mahomet's or Mohammed's *Koran* that there is a complete denial of Christ's sacrificial death and resurrection. You see, the Koran's Sura 5:50 says "Jesus" was one of "the prophets;" Sura 3:48 says that Jesus died; and Sura 23:52 says Jesus went to heaven. But that's as far as it goes. There's nothing of the atoning death and resurrection of Christ in the Koran. Indeed, Christ's atoning death is specifically denied in Sura 4:156 which says,

[quote] “And for their saying, ‘Verily we have slain the Messiah, Jesus the son of Mary, an Apostle of God.’ Yet they slew him not, and they crucified him not” [unquote]. And without going into all the intricate details of the matter, some Mohammedans claim that a substitute, sinful, fallen, human being, died in Christ’s place; and other Mohammedans say he hung on the cross but never died, which is like the religiously liberal, “Swoon Theory,” in which they say he just fainted, and was then revived after they took him off the cross. But whichever of these two ridiculous views a particular Muslim may claim, the salient point is that on the basis of Sura 4:156 the Mohammedans deny that Christ *died on the cross*. And so the perversion in the Koran, which denies that Abraham was to sacrifice Isaac, and that God provided in his place a lamb, first denies the type or figure of Christ’s atoning death and resurrection, and then goes on to deny the greater reality of Christ’s actual atoning death and resurrection. [pause]

Moreover, Jesus says in John 10:17, “I lay down my life, that I might take it again;” and in this is one of the proofs that in the words of Christ in John 10:30, “I and my Father are one.” And so Christ’s death and resurrection should also lead us to proclaim of Christ words those of Thomas in John 20:28, “My Lord and my God;” for in the words of John 1:1, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” But once again, we find that the Koran denies the Deity of Christ, and denies the Holy Trinity in Suras 2:110; 4:169, 5:77, and 112:3.

And so we see how one sin leads to another, one corruption of the Word of God, namely, the denial that Abraham was to sacrifice Isaac, with the Koran’s claim that the sacrifice was of Ishmael; in turn becomes another corruption of God’s Word with the claim that Jesus was simply a “prophet” and that he did not die for our sins and rise again the third day; and in turn this becomes another corruption of God’s Word by denying the Deity of the Son of God, and the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Such are the corruptions of God’s holy Word in Mohammed’s Koran. And indeed there’s a whole stack of other corruptions of God’s Word in Mahomet’s Koran; so that once again, the Koran which produced the modern mixed race Arabs, reminds me of the mixed race Samaritans’ Pentateuch and religion, since like it, it corrupts Biblical stories, corrupts Biblical theology, and leaves out a lot of what the Bible says. By contrast, Psalm 119:140 tells us of the Bible, “Thy Word is very pure: therefore thy servant loveth it.” We can love the Bible because its “Word is “pure;” but we have no such sentiment for the Koran, because it is most corrupt and impure. God undertook to Divinely Inspire and Divinely Preserve the Bible, and only the Bible. The Bible has no rivals, whether the false and spurious teachings of the Koran, or any other false and spurious teachings. Only of the Bible may be said the words of Psalm 119:140, “Thy Word is very pure: therefore thy servant loveth it.” And so we read in II Thessalonians 3:14, “if any man obey not our word by this epistle,” “have no company with him.” [pause]

And then there’s the Mormon Church. And if you want to research this cult further, then have a look at Anthony Hoekema’s 1963 book, *The Four Major Cults*. For example, the Mormons deny the Trinity by endorsing the Arian heresy’s claim that the Son of God was created, contrary to, for example, Micah 5:2, which says Christ is “from everlasting;” and the Mormons also deny the monotheism of the Trinity by teaching

polytheism in which they claim that upon their death, good Mormons become further gods in an expanding pantheon of gods. Of suchlike the Bible says in Galatians 5:20 & 21, that those in “heresies” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” And furthermore, the Mormon prophet, Joseph Smith, modified the King James Version, and produced what the Mormons call variously, the [quote] “Inspired Revision of the Authorized Version” [unquote], the [quote] “Inspired Version” [unquote], or the [quote] “Joseph Smith Translation” [unquote]. Now among other things, one entire Book of the Bible, “The Song of Solomon,” is taken out. And Joseph Smith says in his version, [quote], “The Songs of Solomon are not inspired writings” [unquote].

Now there’s a lot in the Song of Solomon, and much of it goes beyond King Solomon and his bride, and is a prophetic type of Christ and the Church. For example, Song of Solomon 6:13 says Solomon’s bride is a Shulamite, which is another form of Shalem or Salem, which is the shorter form of Jeru-SALEM. So she’d have been a light-brown Semite from Jerusalem. But in Song of Solomon 1:6, she says, “look not upon me, because I am black, because the sun hath looked upon me: my mother’s children were angry with me; they made me the keeper of the vineyards.” And so she says that she has a sun-tan that makes her “black,” because “the sun” “looked upon her” after her siblings made her work outdoors in “the vineyards.” Now we can accept that a light-brown Semite from Jerusalem might go darker brown from a sun-tan, but there’s no way that she would go “black.” And so these words mean that Solomon’s bride types Christ’s church, which is black due to original sin. Indeed, Jeremiah 13:23 describes sin in terms of being as black as the skin on a Negro’s back.

And likewise it could never be truly said of the Semitic light brown skinned Solomon in Song of Solomon 5:10, “My beloved is white;” nor could it be said of Solomon’s bride in Song of Solomon 6:9, that she was [quote] “undefiled” [unquote]. But it can be said of Christ in his resurrection body, in Revelation 1:14, that “his head and hairs were white like wool, as white as snow;” or of the church in Ephesians 5:27, that Christ shall “present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.” Hence in Song of Solomon 6:10 the woman is no longer described as “black;” but quite the opposite, she is said to be “fair as the moon, clear as the sun,” and this imagery is applied to the Jewish church in Revelation 12:1, where she is called “a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet,” and she then becomes the Christian Church in, for example, Revelation 12 verses 14,16, & 17.

But of course the imagery in a passage like Revelation 12:17 or Ephesians 5, is of what Article 10 of the *Apostles’ Creed* calls “the holy catholic church;” that is, the universal church of Christ, as opposed to smaller divisions such as racial, regional, or local churches. And so the Ephesians 5 imagery has to be monogamous because if there was no “universal” or “catholic church,” then Christ would be depicted as polygamously married to many churches. However, the whole thrust of Ephesians 5 is teaching that the monogamous relationship of Christ to his Church, is like the monogamous relationship of a man to his wife in the Christian era, or like Adam and Eve in Genesis 3. And so in harmony with such passages as Matthew 19:9, where Jesus does not say, “whosoever

shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, *engageth in lawful polygamy*,” but rather, our Lord says, such a man “*commiteth adultery*,” the New Testament teaches monogamy. You see, the New Testament repeals Old Testament polygamous laws, such as those found in Exodus 21:10 and Deuteronomy 21:15-17, and upholds instead, Christian monogamy.

But Joseph Smith’s teachings included a Judaizing element that sought to promote polygamy. Like Mohammed who says in his Koran at Sura 4:3, that Muslim men may “marry ... two, or three, or four” wives; Joseph Smith says in *Doctrine & Covenants* section 132, verses 61 & 62, that Mormon men may marry a “second” wife, or indeed “ten” wives. And so Joseph Smith was understandably anxious to get rid of the Old Testament book of the Song of Solomon, because its typology points to the monogamous relationship of Christ and the Church, which Ephesians 5 teaches us is a model for monogamous marriage in the Christian era. [pause]

And so the second point I have made is that we find that the text of Scripture, preserved for us in what Psalm 119:140 calls the “very pure” “word;” has sometimes been corrupted in texts like the Samaritan’s Pentateuch, or the Mohammedan’s *Koran*, or Joseph Smith’s Mormon translation, or the Burgonites’ Majority Text, or the Neo-Alexandrians’ New Testament texts such as Westcott & Hort or the 1993 NU Text of Nestle-Aland and the United Bible Societies.

And this now brings me to the third point I wish to make with regard to the words of II Thessalonians 3:14, “if any man obey not our word by this epistle,” “have no company with him.” And that third point is this. That though there are no errors in the Bible, there are sometimes *errors of interpretation* that men place on the Bible.

There are far more errors of interpretation than we can possibly look at today, but let me refer to just seven of the many more that have come my way over the years. The first error of interpretation I’ll deal with is one that *some* of the Darwinian evolutionists come up with. Now I know some of my fellow old earth creationists believe in the Day-Age School; but as one who follows the creationist Gap School of, for example, the Protestant theologian, Pye Smith of London, who died in 1851, in which I’d locate Eden in an area now under the Persian Gulf’s waters, I’d say that Genesis 1 is referring to six literal 24 hour days on the basis of the general natural sense of the passage, the repeated terminology of “the evening and the morning,” and Exodus 20:8-11. While we may have some different views on Genesis 1, the most important thing is that we believe in creation not evolution, and the absolute authority of the Bible in Genesis 1 and elsewhere¹⁸³.

Now the Darwinists are attacking the Book of Genesis; and some of those opposed to the Biblical teaching of creation say that if God created Adam and Eve inside

¹⁸³ I here said “evolutionists” and “evolution” respectively, but I should have said, “macroevolutionists” and “macroevolution” respectively.

a 24 hour day in Genesis 1; then since they only had two sons' Cain and Abel, and then in place of Abel, a third son, Seth, it wouldn't be possible for all the other human beings that have ever existed to have come from just three males, Cain, Abel, and Seth. I most recently heard this three months ago in November 2010 when a Teaching Assistant from one of my classes claimed [quote], "Simple stories are made for simple people ... Adam and Eve had only sons" [unquote]. And on this basis she then further claimed that they therefore could not have been the progenitors of the human race, and that men evolved from [quote] "apes" [unquote]. She thought she was very smart. But as I said to that woman, we're told in Genesis 5:4, that "Adam ... begat sons and daughters." And while we know from the story of the Ammonites and Moabites' origins in Genesis 19 that parent-child incest was always prohibited; when men had better genes, close relationships between brothers and sisters, and uncles and nieces were permitted. So the claim that Adam and Eve *only* had three sons is *an error of interpretation*.

The second error of interpretation that I'll deal with has to do with abortion. Around the mid 1990s a woman who at the time would have been about 30, spoke to me after she had been chatting with another woman she knew. She told me of how these two women had purportedly worked out from the Bible that it was okay to have an abortion or take a morning after, the night before, abortion pill. She turned to "The Law of Jealousies" in Numbers 5, which was an Old Testament Test of adultery, no longer applicable for we Christians, although like fornication, adultery remains a sin. Numbers 5 verse 18 refers to an accused woman coming before a Jewish priest, who in the Old Testament supernatural power of the Lord, gives her "bitter water that causeth the curse." And this curse in verse 21 is said to "make thy thigh to rot, and thy belly to swell." And in verse 27 we read, "And when he hath made her to drink the water, then it shall come to pass, that if she be defiled, and have done trespass against her husband, that the water that causeth the curse shall enter into her, and become bitter, and *her belly* shall swell, and her thigh shall rot: and the woman shall be a curse among her people."

Now the key words were those of Numbers 5:21, which says in the Authorized Version, "*her belly* shall swell." But this woman I spoke to back in the 1990s, quoted to me from the highly unreliable *New International Version*, in which Numbers 5:21 says in a footnote reading, [quote] "causes you to have *a miscarrying womb* and barrenness" [unquote]. And the NIV has similar footnote readings at verses 22 and 27. And on the basis of these three *New International Version* footnote readings about [quote] "*a miscarrying womb*" [unquote], this woman and her friend considered that they had a Biblical basis for supporting a morning after, the night before, abortion pill; or any other abortion to get rid of an unwanted child.

Now I spoke to this woman on a couple of occasions about this matter. And during these discussions this woman described me in her terminology, as a [quote] "Rah, Rah," "conservative" [unquote]. Well, let me just say that in this woman's terminology, I am a "Rah, Rah," "conservative;" Thankyou very much, I make no apology for that. [pause] But let me also say that this woman's reading from the *New International Version* is *an error of interpretation*. It rests on an error of translation by the highly unreliable NIV. In the words of Numbers 5:21 which says, "the Lord doth make thy

thigh to rot, and thy belly to swell,” the word here translated “to swell,” is the Hebrew *tsabeh*, which is derived from Hebrew *tsabah*. And the Hebrew Lexicon of Brown, Driver, and Briggs, says these words refer to something “swelling” or “swollen,” or that will “swell” or “swell up.” So this Hebrew word refers to a swelling, and does not refer to a miscarriage. The Hebrew words for a miscarriage, rendered in Exodus 21:22 as “her fruit depart from her,” are very different to the Hebrew words for a “swollen” belly here in Numbers 5 verses 21,22, & 27.

And in fairness to this woman, it must be said that she came to a point in these discussions with me, where she admitted to me that she had gotten the wrong interpretation of this passage, and that I had clarified its actual meaning to her. I thank God that he convicted her of this truth, because I have no power to convict anyone of any truth. All I can ever do is present the truth as found in the Bible. Only God can convict. And let me also say in passing, that this is yet another reason why people should not be using the highly unreliable *New International Version*. The best English translation, based on the most accurate text, and the one I recommend, is the Authorized King James Version of 1611, which is by far, the best available English translation.

But it seems that these two woman are not the only ones who have tried to misuse this passage in Numbers 5; because in my wider reading, I find that the Ryrie Study Bible for the *New American Standard Bible* of 1995, claims at Number 5 that [quote] “Verse 27 may indicate a miscarriage” “*waste away* literally means ‘fall’ see Job 3:16, where a similar Hebrew word refers to untimely birth” [unquote]. Now as in a number of other places, Charles Ryrie really has gotten the bull by the horns with these comments of his. You see, while it’s true that Job 3:16 refers to “an untimely birth,” and this is the Hebrew word, *nephel* meaning ‘fallen,’ and this word is derived from *naphal* which is found in Numbers 5:27, where it means *to fall*; it is translated in our Authorized Versions as “rot” in the words “her belly shall swell, and *her thigh* shall rot.” And so *naphal* here contextually does not refer to *the falling* of a miscarrying foetus as Ryrie would have us believe, but rather, refers to the falling of the woman’s *thigh*; and so the meaning is clearly, as correctly stated in the Authorized Version, that “*her thigh* shall rot.” And so, once again, it’s *an error of interpretation*, this time by Ryrie, to try and claim that Numbers 5 refers, or may refer, to an abortion.

And might I further say that with regard to these errors of interpretation on Number 5, that we’re taught in passages such as Matthew 4:6 & 6, that in the words of Article 20 of the Anglican 39 Articles, [quote] “it is not lawful to .. so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another” [unquote]. And we also know on general principles that abortion, other than as an act of self-defence to save the mother’s life, is prohibited in God’s Word. For example, we read in Psalm 139:13, “Thou hast covered me in my mother’s womb,” verses 14 & 15, “and that my soul knoweth right well. My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret.” And without going into the greater details of this passage, we’re here taught that God creates and places a soul in the unborn child. And so under the Mosaical law of the Jews, the unborn child was legally protected in Exodus 21:22 from manslaughter, that is, accidental killing; and so also protected from deliberate killing in abortion under the words God thundered from

Mount Sinai, when he said in Exodus 20:13, [slowly & extended] “Thou shalt not kill.” [pause] And so we also read in Revelation 21:8, that “murderers” “shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.” [pause]

We live in a day’n’age when this sixth commandment of the Holy Decalogue is set aside in the shocking and horrible abortion slaughter. But amidst this mass murder of unborn children, it’s important that we resist *any* attempts to justify this wickedness and vice, such as any *errors of interpretation* with regard to Numbers 5. [pause]

Now a third error of interpretation that I wish to deal with today has to do with sodomy, condemned in such Biblical passages as Genesis 18 & 19; Leviticus 18; or Romans 1. Historically, the Anglican Diocese of Sydney, is predominantly, though not exclusively, Evangelical, about 90% or more is Evangelical; and back in the 1980s for some years the issue of sodomy kept being brought before the Sydney Synod, in which in opposition to a small non-Evangelical minority who disagreed, the Synod correctly and repeatedly upheld the Biblical teaching that homosexuality is wrong and morally prohibited in the Bible. Thus no Christian should ever engage in this vice of sodomy.

But in the associated row and debate, the pro-sodomy group referred to a 1980 book by John Boswell entitled, “Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality.” Now this book contains some useful information amidst a large number of errors, and Boswell falsely seeks to depict the Bible and Christianity as pro-sodomy. There are far more errors in this book than I will be dealing with today. But let me just isolate one of the many errors in Boswell’s book. Now I shall twice substitute the word “sodomites” for the words he uses when referring to people who practice this vice, when he says at page 238, [quote] “Increased familiarity with and tolerance of sodomites and their feelings by persons who were not themselves sodomites is nowhere more poignantly illustrated than in the use of the theme of David and Jonathan” [unquote]. Now without going into the intricacies of this matter, the basic idea that Boswell is promoting, is that a sodomite relationship is being referred to in II Samuel 1:26, when David says, “I am distressed for thee, my brother, Jonathan: very pleasant hast thou been unto me: thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women.”

Now any type of pro-homosexual interpretation that is *foisted* upon II Samuel 1:26 is a *nonsense* interpretation! The claim of somebody like Boswell is *absolute balderdash!* *There’s not a word of truth in it!* The Bible is anti-homosexual, make no mistake about that! In the Bible, it’s a big, big, “No! No!” For example, in referring to the type of defilement found in Leviticus 18:22, 24 & 27, “Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination;” “Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things;” “these abominations;” we read in I Timothy 1:9 & 10, that “the law” of God is made to convict such persons as “them that *defile* themselves with mankind.” Or in referring to the type of sexual *abuse* referred to in Romans 1:27, where we read, “the men, leaving the natural *use* of the woman, burned in their lust one toward the other; men with men;” with reference, I say, to this type of sexual *abuse*, we read in I Corinthians 6:9, that “*abusers* of themselves with mankind,” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” And indeed, during the time that we read of II Samuel 1:26 when David was king, the

penalties of Leviticus 20 were in place, and so sodomy was actually a capital crime, for we read in Leviticus 20:13, “If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them.” [pause]

You see, if one was to put these words of II Samuel 1:26 about David and Jonathon into the typical Australian vernacular, one would say, “They were great mates!” [pause] Yes, “They were great mates,” but they certainly weren’t sodomites! And so it’s *an error of interpretation* to claim that II Samuel 1:26 teaches that sodomy is morally permissible. Most assuredly, it is not. [pause]

And that now brings me to a fourth error of interpretation that has come my way over the years. This one came to me fairly recently in the last few years. I was sitting at the microfilm copier at Fisher Library in Sydney University, slowly photocopying out, page by page, microfilms of two Byzantine Text Greek Lectionaries, one from the 11th century known as Lectionary 2378, and the other from the 16th century known as Lectionary 1968. These Lectionaries, whose originals are also at Sydney University, and which I have to also sometimes consult because the microfilm photocopies are not always good enough; these two Byzantine Text Lectionaries are a very big bonus for my textual commentaries on the Received Text. Indeed, by the grace of God, I’m the first person to undertake any serious work in itemizing the readings of these two Greek Lectionaries. [pause]

Well, as I was working there in the Library at Sydney University, an extended relative of mine who sometimes visits my mother who is a keen genealogist, happened to see and speak to me. This relative is a religious sceptic who likes to attack the Bible. Now I took some time out from my busy schedule, and I challenged him with the Gospel of Jesus Christ. But he responded negatively, and claimed that one couldn’t believe in the Bible, because it had errors in it. Now when I questioned him further on this, he could come up with only one such purported error, although he claimed there were many more. Now the one purported error that he came up with, was this.

He said that in Galatians 3:17 the time between Abraham and the giving of the covenant at Mount Sinai is said to be 430 years. However, from the time of Abraham to the time that the Israelites went into Egypt was over 200 years, and then Exodus 12:40 says the Israelites were in Egypt for 430 years, so that from the time of Abraham to the giving of the law on Mount Sinai was over 630 years; and this time he then claimed, contradicted the 430 years of Galatians 3:17.

But once again, this is *an error of interpretation*. You see in Galatians 3:16 we first read, “Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seed, as of many; but as of one. And to thy seed which is Christ.” Now St. Paul clearly does believe that the promise was made to “seed” plural, because he says twelve verses on in Galatians 3:29, “And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” And so the point of the singular and plural in Galatians 3:16 is that a word is used that can mean the plural, or can mean the singular, and by this, God

indicates that the plural community of Abraham's "seed," belongs to, and is represented by, a singular "seed," which is Christ. So when St. Paul says in Galatians 3:16, "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made," he's including in that all and any confirmations of the Abrahamic covenant that contained within it the covenant of grace, made to Abraham's descendants.

We read of such a confirmation to Isaac in Genesis 26:24; of such a confirmation to Jacob in Genesis 28:13 & 14; and 46:2-4 just before he went down to Egypt; and God again confirmed it to Joseph through Jacob in Genesis 48:4,11, & 19. And so when we read in Galatians 3:17 "that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ" was 430 years before "the law" given on Mount Sinai, what that means is that *from the last time* that God confirmed the Abrahamic covenant, before the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, was 430 years. So it's not talking about the time from Abraham to the law on Mount Sinai, it's talking about the time *from the last confirmation* of the Abrahamic covenant till the law on Mount Sinai. And so the claim that Galatians 3:17 is meant to be the time between Abraham and the law on Mount Sinai, is *an error of interpretation*. And yet so deeply absorbed in this error of interpretation is my relative, that he's even put it up on the internet, and uses it to try and spread scepticism about the Bible. But the error is not in the Bible, it's in his erroneous interpretation of Galatians 3:17. [pause]

Now a fifth error of interpretation that came to me was from a member of the Christian Science Church, which together with, for example, the Jehovah's Witnesses, is one of the four religious groups dealt with in Anthony Hoekema's 1963 book, *The Four Major Cults*. Some decades ago, a woman who was a member of the Christian Science cult, said to me that when one has a "thought," that this is what the Bible means by an "angel." She claimed an "angel" was just a "thought" we get; or if a man brings such a "thought" or "message" to us; then that human being is an "angel."

Now this claim is *an error of interpretation*. In fact, angels are supernatural beings, made in the image of God, of an angelic race, and not of the Adamic race. For example, we read in Genesis 3:22 to 24, of how when God sent man out of the Garden of Eden, he had angels or "cherubims" guarding the gate to the Garden of Eden. Now there were only two human beings in existence back then, Adam and Eve, so these "cherubims" were clearly not human beings, they were clearly not Adamites. And that passage is also important for refuting the claims of religious liberals who say the idea of "angels" was a so called 'later theological development.' In fact, the reality of angels was clearly present at the start of man's history, and the start of God's Divine revelation.

Indeed, angels are referred to in the Bible even earlier, for Genesis 3 says a serpent tempted Eve, who then tempted Adam into eating the forbidden fruit; identified in the Song of Solomon 8:5 as an apple. For since the Solomon of II Samuel 12:24 would have been born in a Palace, not "under" an "apple tree," Song of Solomon 8:5 refers to Christ who was born "under the apple tree," but since Christ was born in a stable, this must be a metaphoric "apple tree," meaning into a world of sin; and since "apple" here means "sin" this shows that the forbidden fruit was on one particular apple tree, though not all apple trees in the Garden of Eden. And that fact is also preserved for us in the

Latin tongue, which at the point of Divine Preservation is together with the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, one of the four Biblical languages; and we find that the Latin noun, [spell], “M-A-L-U-M,” is both “*mālum*” meaning “apple,” and “*malum*” meaning “evil.”

And we know that it was actually Satan who devil-possessed that serpent in the Garden of Eden, for which reason Revelation 12:9 refers to “that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan.” And various other passages of Scripture such as Daniel 10:13, Hebrews 1:5 & 6, or Jude 9, make the same point about the existence of angels as a distinctive spirit race. Actually this attempt by members of the Christian Science cult, or for that matter various religious liberals, to deny the reality of angels is nothing new; for we’re told in Acts 23:8 that “the Sadducees” of New Testament times also claimed that “there is no” such thing as an “angel.” Therefore this claim by members of the Christian Science Church that “angels” are just “thoughts” people have, or a human being who brings a message, is in fact *an error of interpretation*. [pause]

And the final two *errors of interpretation* that I shall consider, both come to us from the Jehovah’s Witnesses cult, namely, the denial of *both* the Trinity and justification by faith. These are two examples of what St. Peter in II Peter 2:1 calls, “damnable heresies;” and two examples also of what St. Paul refers to when he says in Galatians 5:20 & 21, that those in “heresies” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” The Jehovah’s Witnesses deny the Trinity, and in denying the Deity of Christ, they claim that John 1:1, which reads, “the Word was God,” should be retranslated as “a god,” and then they say that it really means that “Jesus” was “simply wonderful.” I once heard a Jehovah’s Witnesses say that when his wife bought something at the shops, she might say, [use high voice] “Oh, it’s simply divine,” meaning, “simply wonderful,” and he claimed that this was the meaning of John 1:1, that Jesus was “simply wonderful.” That’s contextually a very false meaning of John 1:1, which like other Biblical passages such as Philippians 2:6 and I Timothy 3:16, clearly uphold the Deity of Christ and the Holy Trinity.

Likewise, members of the Jehovah’s Witnesses cult claim that the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith, found in such passages as Romans 1:17 and Ephesians 2:8,9 is “wrong” on the basis of their reading of James 2:24 which says, “Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.” However this is a gross decontextualization of James 2:24, since in the context, St. James is concerned with how a person justifies himself *in human eyes* before the church. For example, he says in James 3:1, “My brethren, be not many masters,” meaning church “teachers.” He’s thus concerned with the quality of church teachers. And then in James 4:1, he asks how inside the church, “come wars and fightings among you?” So when St. James talks about being justified by faith and works in James 2:24, he’s talking about how a man is *justified before other men in the church*. But that’s a very different issue to how one is justified before God for the purposes of salvation, which is what St. Paul is talking about in passages such as Romans 1:17 and Galatians 3:11, when he says, “The just shall live by faith;” or in Galatians 2:16, “by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified;” or in Ephesians 2:8 & 9, “For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast.” You see, in Romans 4:2, St.

Paul does not say, that Abraham was not justified by works, *per se*, but rather, he says “Abraham” was not “justified by works” “*before God.*” And so it is an *error of interpretation* to claim that the justification by faith *before God* in Romans 4:2 for the purposes of salvation, is the same thing as the justification by faith and works *before other men in the church* in James 2:24 for the purposes of maintaining church discipline.

Now I’ve come across these types of *errors of interpretation* by the Jehovah’s Witnesses over quite a long period of time. As the son of an army officer, I enjoyed a highly mobile lifestyle and went to nine different schools, before proceeding onto tertiary studies at college and university. One of those nine schools was Belconnen High School in the Australian Capital Territory. And in Canberra in 1975 when I was 15 years old in Year 10 or Fourth Form, I used to sometimes ride a bike to school and sometimes get the school bus. But when I got the school bus back to where I was living in the suburb of Flynn, when I got off the bus, I would sometimes talk to a fellow school-boy called Dominic. Now Dominic had formerly been at a Roman Catholic School, but he’d left that school and come to Belconnen High because he’d left the Roman Catholic Church to become a Jehovah’s Witness. And while Dominic and I used to debate a number of issues, I think the issue that we debated the most, was the doctrine of the Trinity in general, and the Deity of Christ in particular. And over the years I’ve debated a number of Jehovah’s Witnesses, seeking *when they come to me* to sow a seed in the presentation of gospel truth to them. For example, I’ve lived for about 3½ years in London, over 5 trips between 2001 and 2009, working there in my profession as a school teacher. And on a number of occasions Jehovah’s Witnesses have approached me in London, for example, on a bus when I was coming home from a school I was working at. And I’ve pulled *the sword of the Lord* out of its sheath in my top left-hand pocket, and done spiritual battle with them, arguing among other things, for the Deity of Christ and the Trinity, as well as justification by faith alone. And I’ve done the same thing in Sydney when they’ve come to my home. [pause]

And so I return now to our verse of Scripture in II Thessalonians 3:14, which reads, “And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed.” This verse clearly teaches the authority of Scripture, both with respect to its Divine Inspiration and Divine Preservation. The three qualifications I have made are firstly, while we have the “pure” “word” of God in the Received Text translated for us in the Authorized Version; that does not mean the AV is word perfect, because only the underpinning Old and New Testament Received Texts are word perfect. But the King James Bible of 1611 is *by far* the best available English translation we have, and so the one people *should* be generally using. Secondly, while the Received Text is “pure” there are many other corruptions of Scripture that have been made, for example, the Mohammedan’s Koran corrupts the Word by claiming that Abraham’s sacrifice was of Ishmael, not Isaac; the neo-Alexandrian texts and versions corrupt the Word by denying, or casting aspersions on, for example, Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53 to 8:11; or the Burgonite Majority Texts such as endorsed by the *New King James Version* of 1982, deny such passages as Acts 9:5 & 6 and I John 5:7 & 8. And thirdly, there are *errors of interpretation* that men place on the Bible, such as the Jehovah’s Witnesses denial of the Holy Trinity, or denial of the glorious Protestant

gospel of justification by faith *alone*. But there are no errors in the Bible itself. In the words of Psalm 119 verse 140, “Thy word is very pure: therefore thy servant loveth it.” [pause]

Let us pray. O “Lord,” “longsuffering, and of great mercy, forgiving iniquity and transgression, and by no means clearing the guilty;” we pray for those who might oppose this message because they know what change would be required in their own lives if they accepted it. We thank thee in this year of 2011, in this 400th anniversary year of the King James Bible of 1611, that we have the pure word of God preserved for us in the Received Texts of that Bible, and we thank thee that in the Authorized King James Version we have such an accurate translation that we may use. Heavenly Father, we love thy Word, the Bible, and thank thee for both its Divine Inspiration and Divine Preservation, asking thee to bless it to our hearts, that we may better know thy ways, and both live and proclaim thy directive will in our lives here on earth. And this we pray in the power of thy Holy Ghost, and through the atoning blood of our Lord Jesus Christ by which we are saved. Amen.

Sermon audio: www.sermonaudio.com/kingjamesbible

Title: Exposition of Thessalonians 3/3: “The Doctrine of Scripture - The ‘Word’ of II Thess. 3:14 & Ps. 119:140 ‘is very pure’.”

Bible Texts: Ps. 119:137; II Thess. 3:14

Source: Mangrove Mountain Union Church

Brief Overview: In this final of a trilogy of sermons, Gavin considers the “word” of II Thess. 3:14. The sermon includes reference to the amazing Biblical archaeological discovery of two stone warning inscriptions from the Jerusalem Temple, relevant to the events of Acts 21 leading to the Apostle Paul’s martyrdom (II Tim. 4:6-8). In this 400th anniversary year of King James Bible (1611-2011), Gavin considers the Divine Inspiration and Divine Preservation of Scripture. His 3 broad points are: 1) While we find the “pure” “Word” of God (Ps 119:137) in the Received Texts of the King James Bible, that does not mean that the Authorized Version is word perfect because only the underpinning Old and New Testament Received Texts are word perfect. But the AV is the best available English translation and so the one we should be generally using. 2) While the words of the Received text are “very pure” (Ps. 119:140), nevertheless, there are many corruptions of Scripture that have been made. E.g., the corruptions of Mohammad’s (or Mahomet’s) Koran which claims Abraham offered Ishmael not Isaac; the corruptions of Joseph Smith’s Mormon version which takes out an entire Book of the Bible; the corruptions of the neo-Alexandrians who following the Alexandrian Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus take out such passages as Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11; or the corruptions of the Burgonites’ Majority Text which takes out such passages as Acts 9:5,6 & I John 5:7,8. 3) While the Bible itself is without error of any type, men sometimes bring to it errors of interpretation e.g., those sometimes brought to it by

Darwinists, or people promoting sodomy or abortion, or members of the Christian Science and Jehovah's Witnesses cults.

Keywords: Received Text; King James Version; archaeology; Islam; Mormon; Jehovah's Witnesses