Appendices to St. Matthew's Gospel

Matt. 26-28.

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

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

*Appendix 3: Minor variants between the NU Text 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. 26-28.*

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

Appendix 5: Dedication Sermon for Volume 4 (Mon. 6 Feb 2012).

Appendix 6: Corrigenda to Former Volumes.

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. 5:23   Scrivener reads "*kakei* (and there)," not "*kai* (and) *ekei* (there)"
(see discussion at Matt. 28:10).
Matt. 26:4, Scrivener reads "*krates̲o̲si* ('they might take,' word 2)
dol̲o̲ ('by subtilty,' word 1)," not "*dol̲o̲* ('by subtilty,' word 1)
krates̲o̲si ('they might take,' word 2)."
Matt. 26:11, Scrivener reads "*pantote* ('always,' word 4) *gar* ('for,' word 3)
tous ('the,' word 1) *pt̲o̲chous* ('poor,' word 2)," not
"*tous* ('the,' word 1) *pt̲o̲chous* ('poor,' word 2)
gar ('for,' word 3) *pantote* ('always,' word 4)."
Matt. 26:33a, Scrivener reads "*Ei kai* (Though)" not, "*Ei* (Though)."

Matt. 26:39a, Scrivener reads "*proelthon* ([he] went)" not, "*proselthon* ([he] went)."
Matt. 26:52, Scrivener reads "*apolountai* ('they shall perish' = 'shall perish')," not
    "*apothanountai* ('they shall perish' = 'shall perish')."
Matt. 26:59b, Scrivener reads "*auton* ('him,' word 2) *thanatososin*
    ('put to death,' word 1)," not "*thanatososin* ('put to death,' word 1)
    auton ('him,' word 2)."
Matt. 26:71b, Scrivener reads "*tois* ('unto the [ones]' = 'unto them')," not
    "*autois* (unto them)."
Matt. 26:74, Scrivener reads "*katanathematizein* (to curse)," not
    "*katathematizein* (to curse)."
Matt. 27:33a, Scrivener reads "'*os* (that)" not "'*o* (that)."
Matt. 27:35, Scrivener reads "*upo* (by)" not "*dia* (by)."
Matt. 27:44b, Scrivener reads "*auto* ('him' = 'his,' in AV type translation)," not
    "*auton* ('him' = 'his,' in AV).
Matt. 27:46b, Scrivener reads "*lama* (lama)," not "*lima*" (which in English
    translation transliteration may be e.g., 'lima' or 'lama')" in the
    main text with a footnote / sidenote saying "or '*leima*'" (which in
    English translation transliteration may be e.g., 'lima' or the
    AV's 'lama')."
Matt. 27:45
& 46a,   Scrivener reads "*ennates* (ninth)" & "*ennaten* (ninth)," not
    "*enates* (ninth)" & "*enaten* (ninth)" respectively.
Matt. 28:9b   Scrivener reads "*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," not "*Iesous* (Jesus)."
Matt. 28:10   Scrivener reads "*kakei* (and there)," not "*kai* (and) *ekei* (there)."

Mark 15:34c, Scrivener reads "*lamma*," not "*lima*" (which in English
    translation transliteration may be e.g., 'lima' or the AV's 'lama')"
    (see Matt. 27:46b in main commentary).

        AT MATT. 26:4 the MBT (Majority Byzantine Text) reads, "*dolo* ('by subtilty,' word 1) *kratesosi* ('they might take,' word 2)," in the wider words, "And consulted that <u>they might take</u> Jesus <u>by subtilty</u>, and kill *him*" (AV, showing italics for added word) (e.g., A 02 with an optional "n" on the end of word 2, W 032 with an optional "n" on the end of word 2, Sigma 042 with an optional "n" on the end of word 2, Minuscule 28; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968).   But Scrivener's text reads, "*kratesosi* ('they might take,' word 2) *dolo* ('by subtilty,' word 1)" (which word order 2,1, Tischendorf's 8th ed. says is found in some non-specified Minuscules); and this reading is earlier found in Erasmus (1516 with an optional "n" on the end of word 2, & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

        There is no good textual argument against the MBT which thus must stand here at Matt. 26:4.   Let this Erasmian "textual trademark" found in Scrivener's Text be

removed, and the MBT stand![1]

AT MATT. 26:11 Hodges & Farstad's majority text considers the text here is "seriously divided," and Robinson & Pierpont's majority text regards it as "significantly divided[2]." Von Soden says that the reading, "*tous* ('the,' word 1) *ptochous* ('poor,' word 2) *gar* ('for,' word 3) *pantote* ('always,' word 4)," i.e., "For … the poor always" in the wider words, "For ye have the poor always with you" (AV & TR), is supported by his Kx group, and this is the reading manifested in the main text of Hodges & Farstad.

Kx has 513 manuscripts so this means 513 out of 983 K group manuscripts i.e., 52% support the wood order 1,2,3,4; and this "border-line" calculation probably explains why Robinson & Pierpont's do not put this reading in their main text, but relegate it to a footnote. However, a finer division within von Soden's data is possible in this instance, so that on a more accurate count of just Gospel manuscripts, 513 out of 860 Gospel K group manuscripts i.e., 59.88% or *c.* 60% of manuscripts support this reading. With the support of about three-fifths of Byzantine manuscripts in K group, and thus on any reasonable projections, three-fifths of the greater number of Byzantine manuscripts overall, the TR's reading is clearly MBT. Thus relative to Robinson & Pierpont (2005), Hodges & Farstad (1985) here have the more accurate Majority Text, and given that more than 85% of the manuscripts Hodges & Farstad use from von Soden's I and K groups of *c.* 1,500 manuscripts are Byzantine text, means this is also the MBT.

Therefore, at Matt. 26:11, the word order 1,2,3,4, is supported by the MBT (e.g., E 07, F 09, H 013; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings; Amphiliochius, d. after 394; & Chrysostom, d. 407). It is manifested in the majority text of Hodges & Farstad (1985). However, a variant found in Scrivener's Text (and the main text of Robinson & Pierpont), uses word order 4,3,1,2 (e.g., A 02[3], W 032, Sigma 042; & Chrysostom). The variant is manifested in Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550).

The MBT & TR word order at Matt. 26:11 is also the MBT & TR word order at John 12:8; whereas the variant's word order at Matt. 26:11 is the MBT & TR word order at Mark 14:7. While it is possible to render Mark 14:7 as, "For ye have the poor with you always" (AV), and John 12:8 as, "For the poor always ye have with you" (AV); it is also possible to render both the same, and so I support the MBT here as the true TR and regard that the AV's rendering of Matt. 26:11 is perfectly valid as, "For ye have the poor

---

[1] The MBT reading is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al*.

[2] Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 89; Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 59.

[3] Though my copy of A 02 is difficult to read here, it clearly follows this word order, and Swanson (1995) also agrees that this is A 02's reading here.

with you always." Let the MBT stand & Scrivener's Text be amended accordingly!

AT MATT. 26:33a the MBT reads, "*o* (-) *Petros* (Peter) *eipen* (said) *aut*o (unto him), *Ei* (Though) *pantes* (all [men])" etc. (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, U 030; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; & Origen). But a variant found in Scrivener's Text (1894 & 1902), adds after "*Ei* (Though)" and before "*pantes* (all [men])," the conjunction, "*kai*" i.e., "*Ei kai* (Though) *pantes* (all [men])" etc. . This is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032, F 09, Y 034; & Origen) found in between *c.* 20-25% of the Byzantine text manuscripts[4]. Both readings were known to Origen who is the probable originator of the variant.

Given that under Wallace's fourfold classification system for *Semantic Categories of Conditional Sentences*[5], in the words of Matt. 26:33a, "*Ei* (Though) *pantes* (all [men]) *skandalisth*e*sontai* ('shall be offended,' <u>indicative</u> passive future, 3rd person plural verb, from *skandaliz*o)," are an example of Wallace's first category of *ei* + <u>indicative mood</u> of any tense; one might *prima facie* classify this grammatical structure as a *first class conditional sentence*. I.e., one in which there is a *protasis* ("if") and *apodosis* ("then"), forming an "if" this, "then" that, grammatical structure i.e., "if (*ei*)" is the condition (*protasis*) in, "If (*ei*) all shall be offended in thee" (ASV), upon which depends the main term (*apodosis*) of "I will never be offended" (ASV).

As previously discussed in Textual Commentaries Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), "If" can have a synonymous meaning with "when," as to opposed to "if" being used in a *conditional sense* (see comments at Matt. 7:9 at Matt. 7:10). But "if" might also be used in a concession clause, *infra*, and if so, more commonly a term like "Even if" would be used as a synonym for "though" or "although" (cf. "*kan*" = *kai* / "even" + *ean* / "if" = "Though" in Matt. 26:35). E.g., at I Cor. 9:2, "<u>If</u> (*ei*) I be not an apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you" (AV), might be rendered as, "<u>Though</u> (*ei*) I be not an apostle unto others," or as in the NIV, "<u>Even though</u> (*ei*)" etc. . Or at II Cor. 13:4, "For <u>though</u> (*ei*) he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God" (AV). Or, "yea, <u>though</u> (*ei*) we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more" (II Cor. 5:16).

Therefore, it might be *prima facie* possible to argue that the "If (*ei*)" of Matt. 26:33a in the *Revised Version* (RV) and *American Standard Version* (ASV), is being used like the "<u>If</u> (*ei*)" of I Cor. 9:2 in the AV i.e., as a synonym for "Though." But I think this

---

[4] This variant has the support of von Soden's Kr subgroup and one manuscript from his Ki subgroup i.e., between *c.* 20% or one-fifth of the *c.* 1,000 K group manuscripts overall, and *c.* 22.5-25% or one-quarter of the K group's *c.* 860 Gospel manuscripts. Thus on any reasonable broad-brush statistical projections from this more than adequate sample, between about one-fifth to one-quarter of the overall Byzantine text manuscripts. On the Kr subgroup, see Textual Commentary in e.g., Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) at Matt. 5:31a & 12:29; in Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), at Matt. 20:15c; & in Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25) at Matt. 26:33b.

[5] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 689-694.

possibility can be safely ruled out when we remember Frederick Scrivener (1813-1891) who produced Scrivener's Text (1894 & 1902), was one of the Revised Version (1881) reviser-translators.   He also produced *Scrivener's Annotated Greek New Testament* (1881) which refers to this as a difference between what Scrivener regards as the AV's text (*ei kai*), and that which Westcott-Hort used in the RV (*ei*)[6].   Thus the RV and ASV translators thought of themselves as going from a text reading "Though ('*ei kai*,' Scrivener's Text)" to a Westcott-Hort text reading "If (*ei*)."   Therefore they evidently made this change in their rendering to reflect what they perceived, albeit wrongly, as a textual change from "*ei kai*" to "*ei*," with the consequence that the most natural reconstruction of their actions is that they were using "If" for Greek "*ei*" at Matt. 26:33a (RV & ASV) in a conditional sense, as they saw it, albeit wrongly, in contradistinction to the AV's "Though" which they thought of as based on Greek, "*ei kai*."

Therefore, the type of English rendering one here finds at Matt. 26:33a in the *Revised Version* (1881-5) and *American Standard Version* (1901) would give it a different nuance to that of "Though" (AV), which on the RV and ASV type thinking one would have to then argue was based on "*Ei kai* (Though)."   But Wallace notes that just because such a condition may not, in practice, correlate with the reality of what happens, this does not, as some grammarians have claimed, and which *the RV and ASV translators appear to have here rested upon*, mean that nothing can be said about the reality of the supposition.   Rather, Wallace first argues, "the force of the indicative mood … lends itself to the motion of *presentation* of reality[7]," and then shows the presence of this force in such a *first class conditional sentence* (although as seen by Luke 11:8, *infra*, I would say that there are some other constructs where such a force for the indicative does not necessarily so exist).   And so if Matt. 26:33a really is an RV and ASV type of conditional sentence, then the *protasis* ("if") here at Matt. 26:33a must, in all contextual probability, be taken seriously as the *presentation* of a perceived reality, whether or not it actually eventuated.

But does such context warrant any serious suggestion that on the RV and ASV type of rendering, that only "If (*ei*) all shall be offended in thee, I will never be offended" (RV & ASV) (emphasis mine) is the actual meaning?   Context surely does not support this type of RV and ASV rendering, since by definition St. Peter is here absolutely denying any possibility of a presentation of reality in Jesus words, "all ye shall be offended because of me this night" (Matt. 26:31), in any such RV and ASV statement, "If all shall be offended in thee."   For how in the presentation of reality can "all" "be offended," when simultaneously Peter says, "I will never be offended"?   Is he not part of the original "all"?   For this type of RV & ASV grammatical construct and usage of "*ei*" as a *protasis* meaning "if" to be viable at Matt. 26:33a, St. Peter would not say, "If all (*pantes*, masculine plural nominative adjective, from *pas-pasa-pan*)," etc., but rather, "If others (*alloi*, masculine plural nominative adjective, from *allos-e-o*) shall be offended in

---

6   Scrivener, F.J.A., *Scrivener's Annotated Greek New Testament*, 1881, Reprint: Dean Burgon Society Press, Collingswood, New Jersey, USA, 1999, p. 74.

7   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 691-694.

thee, I will never be offended" (using the other parts of the RV & ASV translation). And so we find the RV's and ASV's translation to be unsatisfactory.

Having ruled out the RV & ASV type of rendering of "*ei*" at Matt. 26:33a, leads us then to ask, How might the "*ei*" be better rendered than in the RV & ASV? Young refers to the usage of "*ei*" (e.g., I Cor. 9:2) or "*ei kai*" (e.g., II Cor. 7:8; 11:6) in the construct of a *concession* clause which may be rendered as "although" or "though"[8]. E.g., we read in Luke 11:7,8 Jesus' words about a man who says, "Trouble me not: the door is now shut, and my children are with me in bed; I cannot rise and give thee." To which Jesus comments, "I say unto you, Though (*ei kai*) he will not rise and give (indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *didomi*) him, because he is his friend, yet because of his importunity he will rise and give him as many as he needeth." There is clearly no sense in which the presence of the indicative in "and give him" here has the *presentation of reality* found in the *first class conditional sentence*, *supra*, since immediately after our Lord says, "Though (*ei kai*) he will not rise and give him," then in the following factual presentation of reality, "he will rise and give him as many as he needeth." We thus see from Luke 11:7,8 that the *concession conjunction* of "*ei*" or "*ei kai*" + indicative mood, meaning "though" or "although," does not require the *presentation of reality*, but may represent the presentation of what is regarded as non-reality.

Therefore, the proper meaning of "*ei*" at Matt. 26:33a must be "though," i.e., "Peter answered and said unto him, Though (*ei*) all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended." It thus has the same *concession conjunction* meaning as "*ei kai*" in the *concession* clause of Mark 14:29, "But Peter said unto him, Although (*Kai ei*) all shall be offended, yet will not I." I.e., Peter here no more thinks the statement "Though (*ei*) all men shall be offended" (Matt. 26:33) or "Although (*Kai ei*) all shall be offended" (Mark 14:29) is a *presentation of reality*, than Jesus does in Luke 11:7 when he says, "Though (*ei kai*) he will not rise and give him" etc. .

That the "*ei*" of Matt. 26:33a should be rendered as "Though" or "Although" has in fact been correctly recognized by subsequent revisers of the erroneous RV and ASV rendering, in the NASB, RSV, ESV, and NRSV, which like the RV and ASV all follow neo-Alexandrian texts which read, "*ei*" not "*ei kai*[9]." E.g., the translators of the *English Standard Version* here renders Peter's words at Matt. 26:33a as, "Though they all fall away because of you, I will never fall away" (ESV).

On the one hand, if I considered that the RV's and ASV's type of meaning of Matt. 26:33a were the only type of meaning of "*ei*," (or the contextually most probable meaning of "*ei*,") then I would have to conclude that there was a clear and obvious problem in the MBT reading of "*ei*," requiring that that the minority Byzantine reading of

---

[8]   Young's *Greek*, p. 185.

[9]   The MBT reading "*ei*" is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al*.

"*ei kai*" be adopted. But on the other hand, since it is clear that "*ei*" can be used as a *concession conjunction* in a *concession clause* to mean "Though" or "Although" (I Cor. 9:2; II Cor. 13:4), the same as "*ei kai*" can (II Cor. 7:8; 11:6); it follows that the issue of the MBT's "*ei*" at Matt. 26:33a is not *a textual issue* but *a translation issue*.

This is then unusually significant, since it means that when *c.* 20-25% of Byzantine scribes followed the variant, which looks like a semi-assimilation with the "*Kai ei*" of Mark 14:29, while some of them would have just been copying out a manuscript with this reading, *at least some of them* were *quite possibly* doing something more than what occurs in a normative assimilation. The same is true of the fact that "*ei kai*" is found in Matt. 26:33a in e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1565 & 1598), and Elzevir (1624 & 1633)[10]. In specific terms, probably like *at least some of* the Byzantine scribes, when e.g., Erasmus created this "textual trademark" of "*ei kai*" at Matt. 26:33a, he was giving a synonym for the "*ei*" which thereby acted to inhibit a translator from falling into the error of the RV and ASV translators, *supra*, who no sooner than the "*kai*" was taken out in Westcott-Hort's text, immediately rushed headlong into this mistake, badly "breaking their necks" in the process.

This puts the "textual trademark" of the learnèd Erasmus here at Matt. 26:33a, as followed by e.g., Stephanus, Beza, and Elzevir, in a different category to normal. It means that this "textual trademark" was also "a protection device" so that unweary translators such as those of the RV and ASV would not "break their necks" on it. It is certainly notable that none of the great neo-Byzantine translations made the same mistake that the RV and ASV translators did, for Matt. 26:33a is rendered as "though" in Tyndale (1526 & 1534), Cranmer (1539), the Geneva Bible (1557 & 1560), and the King James Bible (1611). It might also be remarked that the Latin, "*etsi*" of the Vulgate and old Latin Versions h, f, aur, 1, g1, & ff1, is rendered as "though" by Wycliffe (1380) and "Although" in the Douay-Rheims (NT, 1582), so that *the sense* of the Greek is found in these Latin based translation; not that these Latin translations help one determine if the underpinning Greek of the Latin "*etsi*" is Greek "*ei*" or "*ei kai*." Tischendorf makes the staggering claim in his 8th edition (1869-72), that the reading of the Vulgate and old Latin h, f, g1, & ff1 should be understood to follow that of the variant's "*ei kai*" rather than that of the TR's "*ei*," indicating that in certain ways he has slipped'n'tripped in at the same spot that the RV and ASV translators did.

On the one hand, the type of thing here done by Erasmus, Stephanus, *et al*, appeals to my spirit of Christian paternalism (e.g., I Cor. 4:15; I Tim. 1:2), since it acts to safeguard the unweary against the type of "if (*ei*)" rendering found in the RV and ASV. But on the other hand, I too am a son of my heavenly Father (e.g., Matt. 23:9; Gal. 4:4,5),

---

[10] Stephanus (1550), Beza (1565), and Elzevir (1624) from Stephanus's 1550 Greek text in Scrivener's *Novum Testamentum Textus Stephanici* (1877); and Beza (1598) and Elzevir (1633) from Scholz's *The Student's Analytical Greek Testament* (1894) (see Textual Commentaries, Vol. 2, Matt. 15-20, Preface, "*Elzevir's 1624 Textual Apparatus").

and I am therefore unable to condone any wilful change to the text Holy Scripture. Rather, I think discussion of something like the interesting and fascinating meaning of the Greek "*ei*" here at Matt. 26:33a is best left to a commentary such as this one; and I also note that "the children" of the RV and ASV, namely, the NASB and RSV, and "the grandchildren" of the RV and ASV, namely the ESV, and NRSV, all made the suitable correction to the English text, so that in time this earlier error was detected and remedied.

Therefore, while I admit a stronger appeal than normal to me in this "textual trademark" of Erasmus, Stephanus, *et al*; nevertheless, I am compelled to still decline from condoning it. My position is unequivocal. Let the MBT reading of "*ei* (Though)" stand at Matt. 26:33a, and accordingly let Scrivener's reading of "*ei kai* (Though)" be altered!

AT MATT. 26:39a Scrivener's text reads "*proelthon* ('going' = '[he] went,' masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *proerchomai* = *pro* / 'in front of' + *erchomai* / 'going')." This is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042, F 09, M 021, & Pi 041) found in between *c.* 20-25% of the Byzantine text manuscripts[11]. However, "*proselthon* ('going' = '[he] went,' masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *proserchomai* = *pros* / 'forward to' + *erchomai* / 'going')," is supported by the MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, K 017; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968).

There is no good textual argument against the MBT, and indeed *proserchomai* is a fairly common form in St. Matthew's Gospel as "*proselthon*" (Matt. 4:3; 8:19; 18:21; 19:16; 21:28,30; 25:20,22,24; 26:49; 27:58; 28:2,18), or "*proselthon* (indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb)" (e.g., at Matt. 4:11, "they came" = "came," AV; Matt. 9:28; 13:36; 14:15; 15:30; 17:24; 18:1; 19:3; 21:14,23; 22:23; 24:1; 26:17). (Cf. Mark 14:35.)

The minority Byzantine reading "*proelthon*" is found in Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1565 & 1598), and Elzevir (1624 & 1633). Methinks I here see a well used Erasmian "textual trademark," traceable to that neo-Byzantine past-master, Erasmus of Rotterdam. But as a 21st century neo-Byzantine textual analyst, on this issue I dissent from those who as a package deal, are my learnèd betters as neo-Byzantine textual analysts, to wit, the great neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries. I do not support the usage of such "textual trademarks" which do not change the meaning and rendering for a translator, used in various combinations to identify this or that text; unless that is, we do not know what the MBT actually is, e.g., the spellings of certain proper nouns such as "David" or "Moses." Therefore here at Matt. 26:39a, let the text of Scrivener be amended accordingly!

---

[11] Von Soden says the MBT has the residual support of his K group other than Kr and one other K group manuscript. I.e., between *c.* 20% or one-fifth of the *c.* 1,000 K group manuscripts overall, and *c.* 22.5-25% or one-quarter of the K group's *c.* 860 Gospel manuscripts; and thus on any reasonable broad-brush statistical projections *c.* 20-25% of the MBT. On the Kr subgroup, see footnote on Matt. 26:33a, *supra*.

In doing so, I note that this will then become a point of disagreement at Matt. 26:39a with Westcott-Hort, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text, which all follow the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus in reading "*proelthon*." By contrast, Tischendorf's 8th ed. follows the Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus with (from the neo-Alexandrian paradigm,) "external support" from e.g., the Western text's D 05, which on this occasion both follow the correct reading of "*proselthon*."

AT MATT. 26:52 Scrivener's text reads Greek, "*apolountai* ('they shall die,' or 'they shall perish' = 'shall perish,' indicative middle future, 3rd person plural verb, from *apollumi*)." This is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, E 07; Minuscule 28; & Origen). It is manifested in Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550). However the MBT is Greek, "*apothanountai* ('they shall die,' or 'they shall perish' = 'shall perish,' indicative middle future, 3rd person plural verb, from *apothensko*)" (e.g., W 032, K 017, M 021; Minuscule 2; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; Basil & Chrysostom)[12].

Inside of Matthean Greek we find both the Greek *apollumi* of the minority Byzantine reading at Matt. 26:52 at e.g., Matt. 2:13 & 10:28 ("to destroy[13]"); 9:17 ("perish[14]"); 10:42 ("lose") & 16:25 ("will lose[15]"); 10:6 & 15:24 ("lost[16]"); 10:39, 16:25 ("shall lose") & 21:41 ("he will … destroy[17]"); and also the Greek *apothensko* of the MBT at Matt. 8:32 ("perished[18]"); 9:24 ("is … dead") & 22:27 ("died[19]"); 22:24 2 ("die[20]"). Since either reading at Matt. 26:52 could be Matthean, it follows that there is no good textual argument against the MBT which thus must stand. Both readings have the same meaning, and so this looks like an old Erasmian textual "trademark." Therefore let the MBT stand and Scrivener's Text be amended accordingly! (Cf. Matt. 26:52 at Appendix 3, *infra*.)

---

[12]   Von Soden says the MBT is supported by his K group other than one manuscript i.e., it therefore has the support of *c.* 90% plus of the MBT.

[13]   Greek "*apolesai* (infinitive active aorist)."

[14]   Greek "*apolountai* (indicative middle future, 3rd person plural verb)."

[15]   Greek "*apolese* (subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb)."

[16]   Greek "*apololota* (neuter plural accusative, active perfect participle)."

[17]   Greek "*apolesei* (indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb)."

[18]   Greek "*apethanon* (indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb)."

[19]   Greek "*apethane* (indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb)."

[20]   Greek "*apothane* (subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural verb)."

What about the fact that here at Matt. 26:52 the *New King James Version* reads "perish" (KJV) on the basis of Scrivener's type of textual reading, and then says in a footnote that the "M[ajority]-Text reads 'die'" (NKJV ftn)? … "Well let's just say, … we're here reminded that the NKJV translators' grip on both the Greek and the English leaves a good deal to be desired."

AT MATT. 26:59b the MBT reads, "*thanat<u>o</u>sosin* ('put to death,' word 1) *auton* ('him,' word 2)" (e.g., Sigma 042 with the optional "n" on the end of word 1; M 021; & Lectionary 1968, with the optional "n" on the end of word 1, in one of two readings, p. 164b; Origen & Eusebius).   It is manifested in the majority texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005); and also found in Green's Textual Apparatus (1986).   However, Scrivener's text uses the *Variant 1* word order 2,1; which is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., N 022, 6th century; & 090, 6th century, from the same manuscript as 064 & 074; & Cyril of Alexandria)[21].   *Variant 1* is manifested in the Greek NT texts of Erasmus (1516 & 1522 in both instances with the optional "n" on the end of word 1), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

At Matt. 26:59b, "him" is *auton* from *autos*[22].   On the one hand, the grammatical construction of *autos* + verb, such as here found in the variant is not unknown in Matthean Greek (e.g., Matt. 12:14; 14:5); but on the other hand, the grammatical construction of verb + *autos*, such as here found in the TR's reading is much more common in Matthean Greek (e.g., Matt. 3:15; 5:15; 4:5,8,14; 10:21; 26:15,48; 27:64). Certainly there is no good textual argument against the MBT reading here at Matt. 26:59b which must thus stand. The time has come for this Erasmian "textual trademark" to be removed from Scrivener's Text.   Let the MBT stand![23]

AT MATT. 26:71b Scrivener's text reads Greek, "*tois* ('unto the [ones]' = 'unto them,' masculine plural dative, definite article, from *o* / *'o* / *ho*) *ekei* ('there' = 'that were

---

[21]   A further minority Byzantine reading replaces the TR's "*thanat<u>o</u>sosin* ('put to death,' word 1, <u>subjunctive</u> active <u>aorist</u>, 3rd person plural verb, from *thanato<u>o</u>*)" i.e., "put him to death" (AV & TR), with "*thanat<u>o</u>sousin* ('they shall cause to put to death' = 'cause … to put to death,' word 1b <u>indicative</u> active <u>future</u>, 3rd person plural verb, from *thanato<u>o</u>*)," i.e., to "cause him to be put to death" (*Variant 2*), in word order 1,2 (A 02, with the optional "n" on the end of word 1b; W 032, with the optional "n" on the end of word 1b; & Lectionary 2378, in one of two readings, p. 81a; & Lectionary 1968, with the optional "n" on the end of word 1b, in one of two readings, p. 176b), or in word order 2,1 (Lectionary 2378, in one of two readings, p. 74a).

[22]   Masculine accusative, 3rd person singular, personal pronoun from *autos-<u>e</u>-o*.

[23]   *Variant 1* 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 at Matt. 26:59b will still be "put him to death" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

there,' an adverb)." This is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032, G 011, & S 028). It is manifested in Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633). However, the MBT, is "*autois* ('unto them,' masculine dative, 3rd person plural, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*) *ekei* ('there' = 'that were there,' an adverb)" (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, E 07; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & 1968, twice in two different readings)[24].

The reading now found in Scrivener's Text was a known minority reading. Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) shows five of his selected eight Gospel manuscripts in favour of the MBT (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; L, Codex Leicestrensis; H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8), one lacking anything here (P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18), and no manuscripts in favour of the "*tois*" reading. This shows Elzevir knew it to be a fairly poorly attested to reading, even though he followed it in his 1633 text, *supra*.

There is no good textual argument against the MBT here at Matt. 26:71b. The origins of this variant are speculative. In the first reading of Lectionary 2378 (p. 74b, column 1), the "*au*" is at the end of one line, and the "*tois*" at the start of the next. Did a paper fade of such an "*au*" accidentally give rise to the "*tois*" reading? Or did a scribe, seeking to save space in an era when parchment was more expensive, choose to become a prunist scribe for "economic" reasons? If so, might the pruned down texts such as we generally find with the two main Alexandrian texts (both of which here follow the variant, "*tois*"), be better described as "the cheap texts" or "the miser's text," since those motivated by such "economic" concerns did not believe in "giving one's best to God"?

Methinks we here see at Matt. 26:71b an old Erasmian textual "trademark." In fairness to Erasmus, he "proved his point," since the presence of this reading in such later texts as those of Stephanus, Beza, and Elzevir, *supra*, showed just how much they owed to the learnèd Erasmus, who must stand as the single most important neo-Byzantine textual analyst of all time. My skills in textual analysis pale into insignificance compared to his; and like the great neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries, I humbly pay my respects to the name of this neo-Byzantine past master, Erasmus of Rotterdam. Nevertheless, I maintain that the ideological basis of so called textual "trademarks," which do not affect the way something is translated, but the combination of which act as a sort of "copyright" proof, are fundamentally wrong in principle. Therefore at Matt. 26:71b let the MBT stand and Scrivener's Text be amended accordingly!

---

[24] Von Soden says the MBT is supported by his K group other than four manuscripts, one of which, E 07, he says follows Scrivener's reading as the result of a "corrector" scribe changing it; so overall the K group other than 3 itemized manuscripts here follows the MBT. Therefore (on any reasonable statistical projections based on this more than adequate sample of *c.* 1,000 manuscripts,) this reading has the support of *c.* 90% + of the MBT.

AT MATT. 26:74, in the wider words spoken of Peter, "Then began he to curse and to swear" etc. (AV), Scrivener's text reads Greek, "*katanathematizein* ('to curse' active present infinitive, from *katanathematizo* = *kata* – which makes intensive the connected *anathematizo* / 'curse')."   This is a minority Byzantine reading (Phi 043, 6th century). It is manifested in Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).   However, the MBT, is "*katathematizein* ('to curse,' active present infinitive, from *katathematizo* = *kata* + *athematizo* which is a syncopated form of *anathematizo*[25])" (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, X 033; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & 1968, twice in two different readings)[26].

There is no good textual argument against the MBT here at Matt. 26:74.   The skilful Erasmus, "always looking around for a good textual trademark" that "would keep the meaning the same" but stamp a Greek text as Erasmian, was no doubt well pleased when his diligent labours were rewarded with the discovery of this very obscure minority Byzantine reading, which he then proudly proceeded to put into his NT Greek text.   But my position on such "textual trademarks" is no secret.   Let the MBT stand at Matt. 26:74 and let Scrivener's Text be amended accordingly![27]

AT MATT. 27:33a the MBT reads, "*o* (or *ho*, 'which' or 'that,' word 1a, neuter singular nominative, pronoun from '*os* / *hos*)," in the wider words, "that (*o*) is to say, a place of a skull," or "that is to say, The place of a skull," or "that is to say, The place of the skull" (e.g., W 032, N 022, E 07 & G 011; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings; ; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings[28]).   It is manifested in Erasmus (1516).   However, Scrivener's text reads, "*os* (or *hos*, 'which' or 'that,' word 1b, masculine singular nominative, pronoun from '*os* / *hos*)."   This is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, & Pi 041).   It is manifested in Erasmus (1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) shows the MBT reading for 5 of his 8 Gospel manuscripts (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) (and "*o*" used twice in a 6th Gospel manuscript, z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8), so he was clearly aware that the

---

[25]   See Liddell & Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 891 (*katathematizo*).

[26]   Von Soden says the MBT has the residual support of his K group i.e., this reading has the support of *c.* 90% + of the MBT.

[27]   Following the two main Alexandrian texts and leading Western Text, for the wrong reasons, the right reading of the MBT is also here found at Matt. 26:74 in the NU Text *et al*.

[28]   For the state of Lectionary 1968 at its third reading (p. 196b), see commentary at Matt. 27:33b in Appendix 3, *infra*.

"*os*" was not strongly supported in the manuscripts. There is no good textual argument against the MBT here at Matt. 27:33a. Erasmus, who was always looking for a good "textual trademark," somehow managed to turn this one up sometime between his 1516 edition which reads, "*o*," and his 1522 edition which reads, "*os*." This Erasmian "textual trademark," was thereafter "stamped" on a series of neo-Byzantine texts culminating in Scrivener's Text (1894 & 1902), as so stands as a tribute to the learnèd Erasmus. But I look to other ways to honour, and thank God for, the work of the learnèd Erasmus. Let the MBT stand! Let Scrivener's Text be here amended at Matt. 27:33a!

AT MATT. 27:44b the MBT reads, "*auton* ('him' = 'his,' in AV type translation, masculine singular <u>accusative</u>, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*)," in "*to* ([in] the) …*auto* (same [way]) ... "*oneidizon* ('they reviled' = 'cast in … teeth,' AV) *auton* (him)," in the wider words, "reviled him [in] the same [way]" or "cast the same in his teeth" (AV) (e.g., A 02, W 032[29], Sigma 042, Gamma 036; Lectionary 2378, in one of two readings, p. 88a, column 1; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings). It is manifested in Erasmus (1516 & 1522). However, Scrivener's text reads, "*auto* ('him' = 'his,' in AV type translation, masculine singular <u>dative</u>, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*)," in "*to* ([in] the) … *auto* (same [way]) ... "*oneidizon* ('they reviled' = 'cast in … teeth,' AV) *auto* (him)," in the wider words, "reviled him [in] the same [way]" or "cast the same in his teeth" (AV). This is a minority Byzantine reading (Phi 043, 6th century; & Lectionary 2378, in one of two readings, p. 84a, column 2[30]). It is manifested in Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

Matt. 27:44b has an indicative active imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, "*oneidizon* ('they reviled' = 'cast in … teeth,' AV, from *oneidizo*)" followed by the MBT's "*auton* (him)" or the variant of Scrivener's Text "*auto* (him)." One can find similar grammatical constructions for both readings in Matthean Greek. For instance, at Matt. 8:31 an indicative active imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, "*parekaloun* ('they besought' = 'besought,' AV, from *parakaleo*)" followed by "*auton* (him);" or at Matt. 9:2 an indicative active imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, "*prospheron* ('they brought,' from *prosphero*)" followed by "*auto* (him)." Both the MBT and variant are inside the parameters of Matthean Greek. But since there is no good textual argument against the

---

[29] Coming at the end of a line, the final "*n*" of "*auton*" is abbreviated with a bar something like "‾".

[30] Original checked at Sydney University due to a seeming partial paper fade and some markings on my photocopies of microfilm forms of Lectionary 2378. The original shows that this is clearly written as "αυτ∞". The final letter is a closed omega ("∞", which when written in standard seminary Greek is "ω",) in which the right half is faded but still legible. It is thus instructive to note, that if the fade were complete, it could be taken as an omicron, "o", giving rise to the question, "On how many occasions when we think there has been a revowelling of an omega to an omicron due to factors of a local dialect, might this in fact be an accidental alteration where a closed omega has faded on one side?"

MBT reading, it must therefore stand.

It seems that somewhere between Erasmus's 1522 edition and Stephanus's 1550 edition, either Erasmus or Stephanus (or someone else) came up with this "textual trademark"[31]. This "bright idea" appealed to Stephanus, and thereafter other neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries. But my position on such "textual trademarks" as that of Stephanus's is unequivocal. Let the MBT stand and Scrivener's Text amended accordingly![32]

AT MATT. 27:45,46a, Scrivener's reads with double "n" (double nu) spellings "*ennates* ('ninth,' feminine singular genitive adjective, from *ennatos*)" (Matt. 27:45) and "*ennaten* ('ninth,' feminine singular accusative adjective, from *ennatos*)" (Matt. 27:46a). These double "n" spellings are minority Byzantine readings (G 011; & Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings). They are manifested in Erasmus (1522[33]) and Stephanus (1550).

By contrast, the readings with single "n" (nu) spellings are "*enates* ('ninth,' feminine singular genitive adjective, from *enatos*)" (Matt. 27:45) and "*enaten* ('ninth,' feminine singular accusative adjective, from *enatos*)" (Matt. 27:46a). These single "n" (nu) spellings are MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042; Minuscule 2; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings). They are manifested in Erasmus (1516)

There is no good textual argument against the MBT single "n" (nu) spellings which thus must stand at Matt. 27:45,46a. (Cf. in Volume 2, Matt. 15-20, Appendix 1, Matt. 18:12b,13 & Matt. 20:5b).

The first time ever exciting documentation of the double "n" spelling in Lectionary 2378[34], now increases the number of those rare instances that we know about of this spelling in the Greek manuscripts; and it also acts to "fly a kite" I sometimes like to "fly," namely, whether or not Erasmus (and other neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries), might have used a *relatively small number* of Byzantine Greek Lectionaries in

---

[31] I do not have a sufficiently comprehensive set of neo-Byzantine texts to specifically isolate where this "textual trademark" originated, e.g., I do not know what the reading here was of Colinaeus (1534); but for my immediate purposes here at Matt. 27:44b it does not matter.

[32] At Matt. 27:44b, the MBT reading "*auton* (him)" is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al*.

[33] In Erasmus (1522), at Matt. 27:45 this is written as an abbreviation with a small sigma "*s*" on top of the final tau ("*t*") and no eta ("*e*").

[34] Lectionary 2378, p. 84a column 2, p. 88a columns 1-2, & p. 95b column 1.

their private libraries?[35]   But wherever he got this double "n" spelling from, this looks like an old Erasmian "textual trademark" that Erasmus, always eager to find suchlike, managed to locate sometime between his 1516 and 1522 editions.   But my position on such "textual trademarks" remains and is no "secret of the trade."   Let the MBT stand and Scrivener's text amended accordingly![36]

AT MATT. 28:9b the MBT reads, "*Iesous* ('Jesus,' in standard seminary Greek letters, 'Ιησους)" (e.g., A 02 abbreviated as "IC" i.e., the first & last letters of "IHCOYC" with a bar on top, K 017, M 021; Lectionary 2378 abbreviated as "ισ" with a bar on top i.e., the first & last letters of "ιнσους", & Lectionary 1968 abbreviated as "ιc" with a bar on top i.e., the first & last letters of "ιhcovc"; & Chrysostom), in the wider words, "behold, Jesus met them" etc. .   It is manifested in Erasmus (1516 & 1522).

However, Scrivener's text reads, "*o* ('the,' redundant in English translation) *Iesous* (Jesus)."   This is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032 abbreviated as "OIC" with a bar on top of "IC," Sigma 042, & Y 034).   It is manifested in Stephanus (1550).

St. Matthew generally uses the definite article "*o* (-)" with "*Iesous* (Jesus)" (e.g., Matt. 21:1,6,12); but sometimes does not (Matt. 20:30, 21:11; 27:37).   Thus the presence of the definite article here at Matt. 28:9b looks like a scribal standardization influenced by Matthean Greek in general, and perhaps some immediate nearby references to "*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)" in particular (Matt. 28:10,16,18).

It would appear that sometime between Erasmus's 1522 edition and Stephanus's 1550 edition, "a bright spark" discovered this minority Byzantine reading which was adopted by Stephanus as "a brilliant textual trade mark."   But my position on such "textual trademarks" is no secret.   Let the MBT stand and Scrivener's Text amended accordingly![37]

THE DISCUSSION at Matt. 28:10 will include reference to both Scrivener's Text at Matt. 5:23 and Matt. 28:10.

In Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), Appendix 1, I say:

My own views on these matters are stated in the discussion at *Primary & Secondary Rules of Neo-Byzantine Textual Analysis*, *supra*.   But conscious of the fact that this area of secondary rules on readings has no impact on English

---

[35]   Cf. my comments at Matt. 27:35b.

[36]   The single "n" spelling is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al*.

[37]   The Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus here have the correct reading, and hence for the wrong reasons, the correct reading is found in the NU Text *et al*.

xvi

translation and is a matter of neo-Byzantine scholastic differences, I leave some
of these matters where English translation is not affected for the reader to think
through for himself, *infra* … .

And then in Appendix 3, I say:

>   At Matt. 5:23, Scrivener reads, "and there" (*kakei*).   Von Soden says "and
> there" (*kai ekei*) is followed by all but one manuscript in the K group (although
> given the generalist nature of his groups, this means the one itemized manuscript
> is representative of anything from just one K group manuscript up to *c.* 10% of K
> group); and this is the reading found in both R & P and H & F; who thereby here
> follow in the earlier footsteps of B & M.

However, I rarely follow this practice of leaving such things, "for the reader to
think through for himself" in the Appendices, and only potentially do so where the matter
does not affect basic Greek meaning or English translation, such as with optional letters
(which may from time to time be discussed or referred to at various places in these
commentaries,) or the matters discussed in Appendix 2.   That is because while on the
one hand it may act to intellectually challenge the reader with textual analytical skills; on
the other hand, the skills of a neo-Byzantine textual analyst are not common, and so the
reader might be perplexed by such matters.   I.e., a reader who may follow the logic when
he sees it, may not be able to arrive at such a conclusion himself unaided.   My Christian
calling and duty is to help those who seek assistance in better understanding the TR, and
so I generally provide explanations, only rarely not doing so where the matter has no
impact on fundamental Greek meaning or English translation[38].   But in connection with
the fact that the issues at Matt. 5:23 are relevant to the Matt. 28:10 discussion, I have now
decided to "declare my hand" on the matter in both of these readings.

At Matt. 28:10 the main text of both Hodges & Farstad's majority text (1985) and
Robinson & Pierpont's majority text (2005) has "*kai* (and) *ekei* (there)," but Hodges &
Farstad consider the text here is "seriously divided," and Robinson & Pierpont regards it
as "significantly divided" with Scrivener's reading of "*kakei* ('and there,' a compound
word = conjunction *kai* / "and" + adverb *ekei* / "there")[39]."   The reading, "*kai* (and) *ekei*
(there)," in the wider words, "<u>and there</u> shall they see me" (AV), is said by von Soden to
have the support of his Kx and Kr groups.   In broad terms these two groups are *c.* 68-
72% of the K group, and so (even factoring in a error bar of up to *c.* 10%) on any
reasonable extrapolations based on von Soden's K group of *c.* 1,000 manuscripts, this
means the MBT is supported by at least about three-fifths to two-thirds of the Byzantine
text manuscripts.

---

[38]   See e.g., Matt. 1:23; 2:7; 13:3; 21:9; cf. Matt. 19:5b & 19:5c.

[39]   Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 102; Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp.
xviii & 68.

Thus at Matt. 28:10 the reading "*kai* (and) *ekei* (there)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032 written with the "KAI" as an abbreviation something like "K₃EKEI", K 017; & Minuscule 2). However, the reading of Scrivener's Text, "*kakei* (and there)," is a strong minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042, M 021, S 028; Minuscule 28; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). It is manifested in Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550).

At Matt. 5:23 the reading "*kai* (and) *ekei* (there)," is MBT (e.g., K 017, M 021, U 030; Minuscules 2 & 28; Apostolic Constitutions & Cyril of Alexandria). It is manifested in Erasmus (1516 & 1522). However, Scrivener's Text reads, "*kakei* (and there)" (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Minuscule 655 11th / 12th century; & Origen). It is manifested in Stephanus (1550).

In Matthean Greek we find the compound word form "*kakei* (and there)" at Matt. 10:11 and we also find it in Johannean Greek at John 11:54. We find the individual word form "*kai* (and) *ekei* (there)" in the MBT of Matt. 5:23 & 28:10; and we find this form also in the Lucan Greek of Luke 15:13 and Johannean Greek of John 2:12; 3:22; & 6:3. But there is no good textual argument against the MBT at Matt. 5:23 & 28:10. Therefore it looks as though the minority Byzantine readings found in Scrivener's Text of "*kakei* (and there)" at Matt. 5:23 & 28:10 were adopted as "textual trademarks," in the case of Matt. 5:23 by Stephanus (1550), and in the case of Matt. 28:10 by Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550). But my position on such "textual trademarks" in unequivocal. Let the MBT stand at Matt. 5:23 & 28:10, and Scrivener's Text amended accordingly![40]

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.**

We have considered in former volumes a number of abbreviations in which Scrivener's text is one possible reading, though not the only possible reading. E.g., the

---

[40] At Matt. 5:23 "*kakei* (and there)" is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al*. At Matt. 28:10 "*kakei* (and there)" is found in the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus, and hence Westcott-Hort, Nestle's 21st ed., & the NU Text; and "*kai* (and) *ekei* (there)" is found in the Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus, and hence Tischendorf's 8th ed. .

abbreviation "ΔΑΔ" (*DAD*) with a bar across the top of these letters for the proper noun we translate into English as "David" (e.g., Matt. 21:9, Lectionary 2378); which may be written as, for instance, "ΔΑΥΕΙΔ" (*DAYEID*) (e.g., Matt. 21:9, W 032), or "Δαυειδ" (*Daueid*) (e.g., Matt. 21:9, Westcott-Hort), or "Δαυιδ" (*Dauid*) (e.g., Matt. 21:9, Robinson & Pierpont), or "Δαβιδ" (e.g., Matt. 21:9, Scrivener, and Hodges & Farstad). While no such relevant instances of this occur in Matt. 26-28 for proper nouns, the issue remains for various optional letters not usually discussed.   For instance, at Matt. 26:54 Scrivener and Hodges & Farstad have "ουτω" (*outo* / 'thus'), whereas Robinson & Pierpont have "ουτως" (*outos* / 'thus').

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. 26-28)

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. 26:7a the TR's "*alabastron* ('an alabaster box,' word 1) *murou* ('of ointment,' word 2) *echousa* ('having,' word 3)," 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).   But a variant in word order 3,1,2, 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 will still be that of the AV & TR, "having an alabaster box of … ointment."   Alas, the beautiful simplicity of language and assonance of the AV's "alabaster box" was jettisoned for the linguistically jarring "alabaster jar" of the NRSV, NIV, and TEV.   Give me the literary beauty of the Authorized Version's "alabaster box," its simple elegance is sweet sounding music to my ears!

At Matt. 26:7b the TR's "*ten* ('the,' feminine singular <u>accusative</u>, definite article from *e*) *kephalen* ('head,' feminine singular <u>accusative</u> noun, from *kephale*) *autou* (of him)," is MBT (e.g., A 02[41], W 032, Sigma 042, K 017; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings) and correct[42].   However, a variant, "*tes* ('the,' feminine singular <u>genitive</u>, definite article from *e*)

---

[41]   Though on my photocopy of a Facsimile of A 02, the ending of the noun is unclear due to the difficulty of reading the text, the preceding definite article is clearly "*ten*" and so this is the correct declension given in A 02.   Both Nestle-Aland (1993) and Swanson (1995) also agree that this is A 02's reading here.

[42]   The MBT is here supported by *c*. 90%+ of von Soden's K group, and thus on any reasonable statistical projections, *c*. 90%+ of the MBT.

kephales ('head,' feminine singular <u>genitive</u> noun, from *kephale*) *autou* (of him)," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., M 021 and Gamma 036). 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 "his head" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:9a the TR's "*edunato* ('it might have been,' indicative passive imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *dunamai* or *dynamai*)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, Gamma 036; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings[43]; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). However, a variant, "*edunato* ('it might have been,' indicative passive imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *dunamai*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (W 032). In Greek, *dunamai* is a passive deponent, and the imperfect may sometimes be declined from *edunamen*, as the variant is[44]; or declined from <u>edunamen</u>, as the TR's reading is[45]. But either way the meaning is the same. The variant is followed by the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and thus the NU Text *et al*. But either way, the rendering is still "might have been" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:9c Hodges & Farstad's majority text considers the text here is "seriously divided," and Robinson & Pierpont's majority text regards it as "significantly divided[46]." The TR's "*ptochois* ('to the poor,' masculine plural dative adjective, from *ptochos*)" is supported by between *c.* 67% and 75% of the MBT (e.g., F 09, M 021; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; Lectionary 1968, in one of two readings, p. 160a; Basil the Great, d. 379; & Amphiliochius, d. after 394). However, a minority Byzantine reading adds the definite article, "*tois* ('to the,' masculine plural dative, definite article from '*o / ho*[47])" (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042; & Lectionary 1968, in one of two readings, p. 155b). This is a minority Byzantine reading found in between *c.* 25% and 33% of the Byzantine text manuscripts[48]. Thought I do not regard

---

[43] After verse 8, "To what purpose is this waste?," is added at the first reading (p. 70a, column 1), but not at the second reading (p. 71a, column 2), the words, "*tou* (of the) *murou* (ointment) *gegomen* ('we have produced,' indicative active perfect, 1st person plural verb, from *ginomai*, revowelling the '*amen*' suffix to '<u>omen</u>')."

[44] Whittaker's *New Testament Greek Grammar*, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

[45] Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), pp. 21 & 153.

[46] Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 89; Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 59.

[47] On the usage of the article with an adjective, see Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 231 & 233; Young's *Greek*, pp. 60-61. Cf. Matt. 26:45b, *infra*.

[48] This variant has the support von Soden's K1 and Kr groups, together with two manuscripts from his Ki group. The combination of von Soden K1 and Kr groups means

the MBT to be under any serious textual threat from this minority reading, either way, the rendering will still be "to the poor" (AV & TR).

At Matt. 26:10 the TR's "*eirgasato* ('she hath wrought,' indicative middle aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *ergazomai*)," is MBT (e.g., A 02[49], Sigma 042, E 07; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings[50]; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). However, a variant reading, "*ergasato* ('she hath wrought,' indicative middle aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *ergazomai*),' is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032). The Greek *ergazomai* has two first aorist forms that it may be declined from (given as middle indicative), *eirgasamen* as in the TR's declension, or *ergasamen* as in the variant's declension, but either way, the meaning is the same[51]. 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 "she hath wrought" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:15 Hodges & Farstad's majority text put "*kago* ('and I')" in their main text (e.g., A 02, K 017, Y 034; Lectionary 1968, in the first of two readings, p. 146b), but say the text is "seriously divided" with "*kai* (and) *ego* (I)[52]" (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, G 011; & Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings[53]); and Robinson

---

a reading has the support of between *c.* 25% and 33%, or between about one-quarter and one-third of the Byzantine manuscripts (see textual commentary at Matt. 26:33b, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The Third Matter").

[49] Though on my photocopy of a Facsimile of A 02, the text is unclear and difficult to read, it is clear that there is an "ε" (epsilon) followed by a fade "I" (iota) and then a "P" (rho) at the start of this word, which thus follows the TR. Both Tischendorf (1869-72) and Swanson (1995) also agree that this is A 02's reading here.

[50] In a style found elsewhere in Lectionary 2378 (e.g., 2nd reading of Matt. 24:44, p. 67a, for *dokeite* / "as ye think"), though not always used, unlike the "*ei*" (epsilon, iota) at the first reading of Matt. 26:10 (p. 70a, column 1) which is more like a standard seminary Greek "ει" (although unlike standard seminary Greek the epsilon is larger and its middle bar joins the iota); the "*ei*" at the second reading of Matt. 26:10 (p. 71b, column 1) looks something like a "d" and "q" combined to share the same "o" in the middle, with a forward slopping "d" shape. This form in fact is "c" (used for epsilon, sometimes, though not always in this Lectionary) + "I" (iota).

[51] Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), pp. 21 & 214.

[52] Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 89.

[53] At the second reading (p. 71b, column 1), this is simply written as "καιεϝ∞". But at the first reading (p. 70a, column 2), a common Lectionary 2378 abbreviation for the "και" is used which looks something like a "G" with a protrusion to the bottom left so it looks something like ى (cf. Matt. 20:4 in Vol. 2, App. 1), so that it is written as "ىεϝ∞".

& Pierpont's majority text also puts "*kago* ('and I')" in their main text, and say the text is "significantly divided" "*kai* (and) *ego* (I)[54]." Notably, in Lectionary 1968 the second reading (p. 160b) looks something like:

αι'ϲ'

καιω

I.e., the main text reads, "καιω (*kago*)," but above the line in a textual apparatus, are the letters "αιϲ" (in which the iota goes below the line). Thus the first "αι" above the line may join the "κ" of the main line to form "και" (= *kai*) and the following "ϲ" (epsilon, "*e*") above the line may join the "ιω" of the main line to form "ϲιω" (= *ego*). Thus the same preference division of both Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005), is found more than 500 years earlier in the textual apparatus of the second reading of Lectionary 1968 (1544), even though its first reading (p. 146b) is "*kago* ('and I')."

Consulting Hodges & Farstad's and Robinson's & Pierpont's common source book of von Soden (1913), we learn that inside the K group, the TR's reading is supported by Kx and 2 other K manuscripts. Kx has 513 manuscripts so this means 513 out of 983 K group manuscripts i.e., 52% support the TR; or on a more accurate count of just Gospel manuscripts, 513 out of 860 Gospel K group manuscripts i.e., 59.88% or *c.* 60% of manuscripts support the TR's reading. If I could be confident that this reading had the support of about three-fifths of the Byzantine manuscripts in K group, and thus on any reasonable statistical projections, three-fifths of the greater number of Byzantine manuscripts overall, then I would conclude that the TR's reading is clearly MBT. However, when dealing with von Soden's generalist groups one must allow for an error bar of *c.* 10% i.e., 10% of *c.* 60% means the support could be as low as *c.* 54%. This means that at Matt. 26:15 the Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided between the two readings, and so textual analysis is required to resolve the matter.

St. Matthew may use "*ego* (I)" with "*de* (but)" (Matt. 5:22,28,34,39,44). And in St. Matthew's Gospel, "*kai* (even) *ego* (I)" may be used with the sense of "even …I" (Matt. 18:33, MBT & TR); but where the sense of "*kai* (and) *ego* (I)" is "and … I," then between the "*kai*" and "*ego*" there is a conjunction such as "*gar* (for)" (Matt. 8:9, "*kai*" a redundant conjunction in English translation) or "*ei* (if)" (Matt. 12:27), or a participle such as "*elthon* (at … coming)" (Matt. 25:27), or a verb such as "*idou* (lo)" (Matt. 28:15). The failure to appreciate this nuance led Origen, followed by Alexandrian scribes (Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus), Western Greek scribes (D 05), and neo-Alexandrians (NU Text *et al*) to change "*kai ego*" at Matt. 18:33 (MBT & TR) to "*kago*;" although it must be said in fairness to them that they were correct in perceiving Matt. 18:33 was different, and *almost right* in their erroneous solution.

St. Matthew uses "*kago* ('and I')" in a more general, "and … I" sense (Matt. 2:8; 11:28; 16:18) or "I … also" sense" (Matt. 10:32,33; 21:24, twice, first time "I also," AV, second time "I also" = "I in like wise," AV). Therefore here at Matt. 26:15 this form of

---

[54] Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 60.

"*kago* ('and I')" is the more natural and expected one for Matthean Greek.   The failure to appreciate this nuance led about half the scribes in the Byzantine School (e.g., M 021 & U 030), one of the two main Alexandrian texts (Codex Sinaiticus), the Western Text (D 05) and some neo-Alexandrians (Tischendorf's 8th ed.) to change "*kago*" at Matt. 26:15 to "*kai ego*;" although it must be said in fairness to them that this is *a subtle nuance* of Matthean Greek.   Largely for the wrong reasons that it was in one of the two main Alexandrian texts (Codex Vaticanus), the correct reading of "*kago*" at Matt. 26:15 was followed by other neo-Alexandrians (Westcott-Hort, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text). But either way, the rendering at Matt. 26:15 will still be, "and I."

At Matt. 26:17b the TR's "*etoimasomen* ('we prepare,' <u>subjunctive</u> active <u>aorist</u>, 1st person plural verb, from *'etoimazo / hetoimazo*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, Gamma 036, Pi 041; Chrysostom, d. 407; Lectionary 1968; & Theophilus of Alexandria, d. 412), found in Scrivener's text and manifested in Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550)   However, "*etoimasomen* ('we prepare,' <u>indicative</u> active <u>present</u>, 1st person plural verb, from *'etoimazo / hetoimazo*)," is MBT (e.g., K 017, U 030; Lectionary 2378; & Origen, d. 254).

In what Hodges & Farstad's call "Majority Part" ("Mpt") or a "seriously divided" text[55], and what Robinson & Pierpont call a "significantly divided" text[56], both of these majority texts have "*etoimasomen*" in their main text, with "*etoimasomen*" given as an alternative in a footnote (Hodges & Farstad) or sidenote (Robinson & Pierpont).   Since in the *c.* 1,500 manuscripts of von Soden's "I" and "K" groups used by Hodges & Farstad, more than 85% are Byzantine text; and since in the *c.* 1,000 manuscripts of von Soden's "K" group used by Robinson & Pierpont, more than 90% are Byzantine Text, we cannot doubt that both of these majority texts give us the majority Byzantine Text (other than where the text is fairly evenly split, in which instance textual analysis would be required anyway).   Thus in Green's Textual Apparatus (1986), the Majority Text Burgonite, William Pierpont (d. 2003), joint compiler of Robinson & Pierpont (2005), says "61-79% of all manuscripts support the change" to the MBT reading.   Going to the common source for these two majority texts, von Soden (1913) says that inside his K group, the MBT has the support of his Kx and Kr subgroups, which in broad-brush terms are about 68-72% of the K group.   Hence even factoring in a error bar of up to *c.* 10% of this figure for von Soden's generalist groups, i.e., *c.* 90% + of the these figures, on any reasonable extrapolations based on the more than adequate sample of von Soden's K group, the MBT has the support of at least about three-fifths to two-thirds of the Byzantine text manuscripts, and *possibly* more.

Let us consider the wider question put by the disciples in Matt. 26:17.   "*Pou* (Where) *theleis* ('wilt thou,' indicative active present, 2nd person singular verb, from *thelo*) etoimasomen* (MBT) / *etoimasomen* (TR) ([that] we prepare) *soi* (for thee) *phagein*

---

[55]   Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 89.

[56]   Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 60.

('to eat,' active aorist infinitive, from *esthio*) *to* (the) *pascha* (passover);" i.e., "Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?" (AV).   Here the "*theleis* (wilt thou)" is in the indicative mood as a *potential indicative* in its relatively common form[57], i.e., a verb of wish / desire / obligation in "*theleis*" followed by an infinitive in "*phagein*."

If we were to here follow the MBT <u>indicative</u> active present reading, "*etoimasomen* (we prepare)," as a verb of obligation it carries the same connotation of a *potential indicative* i.e., making this *a potential action*.   By contrast, the minority Byzantine <u>subjunctive</u> active aorist reading, "*etoimasomen* (we prepare)," has a similar connotation in some ways, *but an additional connotation of probability* is gained by using a *subjunctive* since the subjunctive carries with it the idea of possibility, desire, or supposition, as opposed to fact, in which the action is *uncertain but probable*[58].

The weaker connotation of the indicative active which *lacks the additional connotation of probability* for "*theleis*" is not a problem, since there are clearly different potentials as to where the passover might be kept.   But though the nuance difference between these two possibilities here is admittedly subtle, this same weaker connotation of the indicative active which *lacks the additional connotation of probability* for "*etoimasomen* (we prepare)," presents a clear and obvious textual problem given the very clear and emphatic earlier statement of "Jesus" "unto his disciples, Ye know that after two days <u>is</u> (*ginetai*, 'it is become') the feast of the passover" (Matt. 26:1,2).   (And I note in passing a similar issue exists with *etoimasomen* being preferred over *etoimasomen* at Mark 14:12 on the basis of Mark 14:1; and also at Luke 22:9 on the basis of Luke 22,1,7,8, which is even stronger here on the basis of Luke 22:8).   Therefore it is not contextually possible that the actual action of the disciples, "[that] we prepare" for this event was only in the realm of *potential* as in the *potential indicative* of "*etoimasomen*" (MBT), but rather, it clearly had *a stronger connotation of probability* as in the subjunctive of "*etoimasomen*" (TR).

Since "the screaming out" textual problem of the MBT's "*etoimasomen*" at Matt. 22:17b, is remedied by the soothing balm of the minority Byzantine reading's "*etoimasomen*," we cannot doubt that this is the correct reading here at Matt. 22:17b (and also at Mark 14:12 and Luke 22:9, *supra*).   On the one hand, there is an important, albeit subtle, difference of meaning between these two Greek readings.   But on the other hand, this subtlety is too much to convey in the English, which either way would here at Matt. 22:17b be rendered "[that] we prepare" in the wider words, "Where wilt thou that we prepare for thee to eat the passover?" (AV).

The subtleties of these two readings would most likely have been lost on the buffoons of the Alexandrian School, or the clowns of the Western Greek School who appear to have been scribes "not good enough" to be Western Latin scribes, and who

---

[57]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 451-2.

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

were thus "relegated" to being Western Greek scribes in a Western Church that rightly valued the Latin, but wrongly devalued the Greek. This allowed badly misguided elements inside the Western Latin Church who had forsaken the Byzantine Greek text, to hold up a Western Greek text in one hand, and a Latin text in the other hand, and within this two text paradigm, to say with some justification, "The Latin is more accurate than the Greek." It inexorably follows from this, that the presence of the incorrect reading of "*etoimasomen* ('we prepare,' <u>indicative</u> active <u>present</u>)" in the Western text's D 05 would doubtless have raised no eyebrows among the scribes of the Western Greek School; and the fact that the correct reading of "*etoimas<u>o</u>men* ('we prepare,' <u>subjunctive</u> active <u>aorist</u>)" is found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus (and hence the NU Text *et al*), would simply reflect the fact that they were here preserving a correct manuscript line with regard to this particular reading, which they saw no need to change.

The presence of the incorrect reading, not once, not twice, but thrice (Matt. 26:17b; Mark 14:12; & Luke 22:9), strongly suggests that there was a deliberate alteration of the text from "*etoimas<u>o</u>men* ('we prepare,' <u>subjunctive</u> active <u>aorist</u>)" to *etoimasomen* ('we prepare,' <u>indicative</u> active <u>present</u>)," although it is possible that one of these three alterations, to wit, that at Mark 14:12, came about from a later assimilationist scribe seeking a "standard" reading with Matt. 26:17b and Luke 22:9. At both Matt. 26:17b and Luke 22:9, the variant appears to have originated with Origen. *"Did I hear you say that Origen had his sticky fingers in this pie? … Say no more!"*

At Matt. 26:23, the TR's "*en* ('in,' word 1) *t<u>o</u>* ('the,' word 2) *trubli<u>o</u>* ('dish,' word 3) *t<u>e</u>n* ('the,' word 4) *cheira* ('hand,' word 5)," i.e., "He that dippeth *his* <u>hand</u> with me <u>in the dish</u>" etc. (AV, showing italics for added word), is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, M 021; & Lectionaries 2378[59] & 1968). However, a variant in word order 4,5,1,2,3 is a minority Byzantine reading (A 02). 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, "hand … in the dish" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:26a the TR's "*ton* ('the,' word 1, redundant in English translation) *arton* ('bread,' word 2)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, U 030; & Lectionary 2378). However, a variant omitting word 1 is a minority Byzantine reading (G 011 & Lectionary 1968). 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*. But either way, the rendering will still be "bread," in the wider words of the Last Supper, "Jesus took <u>bread</u>" etc. (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:26c the TR's "*edidou* ('he gave' = 'gave [it],' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *did<u>o</u>mi*) *tois* (to the) *math<u>e</u>tais* (disciples), *kai* (and)," is MBT (e.g., A 02[60], W 032, Sigma 042[61], K 017; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968).

---

[59] Word 2 is written as a closed omega "∞" with a "τ" on top of it in the middle.

[60] Though this section is difficult to read in my photocopy of a photolithic facsimile, under a magnifying glass this is certainly the reading.

Variant 1 found in the Alexandrian Text's Codex Sinaiticus is, "*edidou* ('gave [it],' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *didomi*) *tois* (to the) *mathetais* ('disciples, [and]')."   *Variant 2* found in the Alexandrian Text's Codex Vaticanus and Western Text's D0 5 is, "*dous* ('giving' = 'gave [it],' masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *didomi*) *tois* (to the) *mathetais* ('disciples, [and]')."   *Variant 2* was adopted by the NU Text *et al.*   But adding "and" as part of English translation (ASV), either way, the rendering is still "gave *it* to the disciples, and" (AV & TR; NASB & Nestle's 26th ed.), or "he gave to the disciples, and" (ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:28a the TR's "*to* ('the [blood],' word 1, redundant in English translation) *tes* ('of the,' word 2)," i.e., "of the" in the wider words, "For this is my blood <u>of the</u> new testament" (AV & TR), is MBT (e.g., A 02[62], W 032, Sigma 042, U 030; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; & Chrysostom, d. 407).   However, a variant omitting word 1 is found in Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).   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*.   But either way, the rendering will still be "of the" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:28c the single "n" in the TR's "*ekchunomenon* ('being shed' = 'is shed,' neuter singular nominative, present passive participle, from *ekcheo*)," in the wider words of Christ at the institution of the Lord's Supper, "For this is my blood of the new testament, which <u>is shed</u> for many for the remission of sins" (AV & TR), is MBT (e.g., W 032, V 032, Gamma 036; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968).   However, a spelling variant with a double "n," "*ekchunnomenon* ('being shed' = 'is shed,' neuter singular nominative, present passive participle, from *ekcheo*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (A 02, Sigma 042, & Pi 041).   The spelling 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 will be the same.

At Matt. 26:29a the TR's "*oti*" is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, M 021; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968).   However, a variant omitting the "*oti*" is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., 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 under the rule of *oti recitativum*, "*oti* (that)" is never translated when it introduces a *direct discourse*[63].

---

[61]   Though Sigma 042 here adds "*autou* (of him)," after "*tois* (to the) *mathetais* (disciples)," i.e., "to his disciples," this is a separate issue to the one being considered here, and is one of the many minor variants (also found in U 030) not discussed in these textual commentaries.

[62]   Though on my photocopy of a Facsimile of A 02, the omicron ("o") is clear, the tau ("t") is not visible though a space the size of one letter space is.   Tischendorf (1869-72), Nestle-Aland (1993), and Swanson (1995), all consider this is A 02's reading here, and so on this occasion I will assume that they had clearer copies of A 02 than I do.

[63]   Commentary Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Appendix 3, section: "Introduction," sub-

Thus either way the rendering will still be, "But I say unto you [*oti* in TR], I" etc. (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:29b Hodges & Farstad's majority text considers the text here is "seriously divided," although Robinson & Pierpont's majority text makes no comparable claim and in its main text simply reads "*gennematos* (fruit)[64]," in the wider words, "this <u>fruit</u> of the vine" etc. (AV).   Von Soden says that the reading using the double "n" spelling for, "*gennematos* ('fruit,' neuter singular genitive noun, from *gennema*)," is supported by his Kx group and 2 out of 14 readings looked at in his Kr group; whereas the remaining 12 out of 14 readings looked at in Kr, together with some other K group manuscripts, all follow the single "n" spelling for "*genematos* ('fruit,' neuter singular genitive noun, from *genema*)."   The fact that the TR's double "n" spelling for, "*gennematos* (fruit)" has the support of von Soden's Kx group, is sufficient for us to say that *c.* 60% of manuscripts support this reading[65].   Since about three-fifths of Byzantine manuscripts in K group, and thus on any reasonable projections, three-fifths of the greater number of Byzantine manuscripts overall, support this reading, it follows that the TR's reading is clearly MBT.

Thus the TR's reading at Matt. 26:29b using the double "n" spelling for, "*gennematos* ('fruit,' from *gennema*)" is MBT (e.g., G 011; K 017; S 028; & Lectionaries 2378[66] & 1968).   However, a variant using the single "n" spelling for "*genematos* ('fruit,' from *genema*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02[67], W 032, & Sigma

---

section: "The conjunctions, for instance, 'de' (and) and 'oti' (that);" & Young's *Greek*, p. 190.

[64]   Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 90; Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 60.

[65]   For the relevant Kx group calculation, see Matt. 26:11 in Appendix 1, *supra*.

[66]   In my microfilm photocopy of Lectionary 2378, this looks something like, "ΓΕΝ Ημα τος" (p. 72b, column 2; in standard seminary Greek this would be written as, "γεν ήματος").   The paper space after the nu and before the eta looks like a paper fade of a nu.   Therefore I checked the original at Sydney University, and found this was the case, with the original written with two different forms of the letter nu, the first something like in standard seminary Greek as "ν", the second, something like a standard seminary Greek mu "μ" but without the right-hand bar of the "μ" i.e., something like, "ΓΕΝμΗματος".   This prods the obvious question, Did a manuscript with such a nu at the end of a line, likewise lose the first nu through a paper fade, thus giving rise to the variant?

[67]   My photocopy of a Facsimile of A 02 clearly reads at the end of one line, "ΓΕΝΗΜΑ (= *genema*)," though the next line containing the remaining "ΤΟΣ (= *tos*)" is not clear to me.   But Tischendorf (1869-72) and Swanson (1995) both consider this is A 02's reading here, and so on this occasion I will assume that they had clearer copies of A 02 than I do.

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 rendering will still be "fruit" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:31 the TR's "*diaskorpisthesetai* ('shall be scattered abroad,' indicative passive future, 3rd person <u>singular</u> verb, from *diaskorpizo*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, U 030, & Pi 041).   The subject is, "*ta* ('the,' <u>neuter</u> <u>plural</u> nominative, definite article from *to*) *probata* ('sheep,' <u>neuter</u> <u>plural</u> nominative noun, from *probaton*);" and since the <u>plural subject</u> of the sentence is of <u>neuter</u> gender, the TR's verb is singular. However, a variant, "*diaskorpisthesontai* ('shall be scattered abroad,' indicative passive future, 3rd person <u>plural</u> verb, from *diaskorpizo*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, G 011; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968).   The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and thus the NU Text *et al.*   But either way the rendering will still be, "shall be scattered abroad," in the wider words, "and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:35a the TR's, "*ou me* (not) … *aparnesomai* ('will I deny,' <u>indicative</u> middle <u>future</u>, 1st person singular verb, from *aparneomai* - given as a middle indicative) is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02 & V 031; & Lectionary 1968).   The TR's reading is found in Scrivener's Text (1894 & 1902), being earlier manifested in e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550).   The MBT is, "*ou me* (not) … *aparnesomai* ('will I deny,' <u>subjunctive</u> middle <u>aorist</u>, 1st person singular verb, from *aparneomai* - given as a middle indicative)" (e.g., W 032[68], Sigma 042, H 013; & Lectionary 2378).

Von Soden says that in his limited count of the Kx group, this is fairly evenly divided between the two readings in which 85 out of 173 Kx manuscripts follow the MBT, and 88 out of 173 Kx manuscripts follow the TR.   An additional 3 K group manuscripts follow the TR, and the rest (i.e., *c.* 90% + of them,) follow the MBT.   Of 513 Kx manuscripts inside the K group of 983 manuscripts, there are 513 Kx Gospel manuscripts out of 860 K group Gospel manuscripts.   860 – 513 = 347 Gospel manuscripts, + 173 Kx manuscripts here counted = 520 K group manuscripts in the K group counted for this reading.   The TR's reading has the support of 85 Kx + 3 other K group manuscripts = 88, and 88 out of 520 = *c.* 17%.   Since von Soden's generalist groups means a reading has the support of at *c.* 90% +, the TR's reading could be *c.* 10% less, i.e., 10% of 17% = 1.7% = *c.* 2%, so the range of these manuscripts is *c.* 15-17%. The MBT's reading has the support of 430 out of 520 = *c.* 83%.   Since von Soden's generalist groups means a reading has the support of at *c.* 90% +, the MBT range is up to *c.* 10% less, i.e., 10% of 83% = 8.3% = *c.* 8%; so the MBT range is *c.* 75-83%.   As to where between *c.* 15-25% support the TR's reading falls is anybody's guess; suffice to say for our purposes the TR is at *c.* 20% +/- *c.* 5%.   In Green's Textual Apparatus,

---

[68]   Revowelling the "*ai*" suffix to "*e*."   Cf. e.g., Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14) App. 3 at Matt. 8:4b; & Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25), App. 1 at Matt. 21:41, *Variant 2*.

Pierpont says "61-79% of all manuscripts support the change" to the MBT reading, and so his figures are within this range on my calculations, though Pierpont potentially understates the MBT's support.

The subjunctive mood conveys possibility, desire, or supposition, but does not always simply mean "might" or "may." I.e., one would *not* here render the subjunctive of the variant at Matt. 25:35a as, "I may not deny." That is because the *subjunctive of emphatic negation* is formed from "*ou me* (not)" + a subjunctive aorist, and emphatically denies that a certain thing will transpire. Thus it might be rendered here as, "will I not deny" or "will I never deny." The same nuance *with respect to the negation element* may also be gained from "*ou me* (not)" + an indicative future[69].

Does this mean that these two readings are therefore synonyms? *Absolutely not!* The difference in nuance is that "*ou* (not)" + an indicative = the denial of <u>a certainty</u>; whereas "*ou me* (not)" + a subjunctive = the denial of <u>a potentiality</u>. It is not that the negative element of the denial is weaker in these two grammatical constructs, rather, it is that the affirmation being negated is weaker or less sure in the subjunctive[70]. E.g., at Matt. 24:35 the affirmation that Christ's word "shall pass away," is a weaker type of affirmation in the strong negation of Jesus' words, "my words shall not (*ou me*) pass away (*parelthosi*, <u>subjunctive</u> active <u>aorist</u>, 3rd person plural verb, from *parerchomai*);" than is the stronger type of affirmation in Matt. 4:4 given by "the tempter" (Matt. 4:3) that "man shall live by bread alone," in the strong negation of Christ's words, "Man shall not (*ouk*) live (*zesetai*, 'shall live,' <u>indicative</u> middle <u>future</u>, 3rd person singular verb, from *zao*) by bread alone."

But here at Matt. 26:35a, the affirmation first given by Christ in Matt. 26:34 is, "That this night, before the cock crow, <u>thou shalt deny</u> (*aparnese*, <u>indicative</u> middle future, 2nd person singular verb, from *aparneomai*) me thrice." Given that generally the indicative is the mood used to state a certainty or reality[71], the following denial of Matt. 26:35a contextually falls flat if it is in the subjunctive, and contextually requires that it be in the indicative. It is possible that a scribe confused this with the element of contingency in Matt. 26:35a, "Though I <u>should</u> (*dee* 'it is necessary,' <u>subjunctive</u> active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *dei*) die with thee," a fact which fails to recognize that while Peter allows for the fact he might die, he also allows for the fact he might live, and either way, says "yet will I not deny thee."

For the subjunctive to have contextual propriety here at Matt. 25:35a, we would first have to read, "That this night, before the cock crow, <u>thou mightest deny</u> (*aparnese*, <u>subjunctive</u> middle aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *aparneomai*) me thrice."

---

69   Young's *Greek*, pp. 137-9.

70   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 468-469.

71   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 448; Young's *Greek*, p. 136.

Presumably this is how those who took the reading of Matt. 26:35a "*aparnesomai* ('will I deny,' subjunctive middle aorist, 1st person singular verb)," understood the homograph "*aparnese*" at Matt. 26:34. But for the homograph "*aparnese*" of Matt. 26:34 to be such a subjunctive, then in the wider context of this passage, the words of Matt. 26:31, "all ye shall be offended (*skandalisthesesthe*, indicative passive future, 2nd person plural verb, from *skandalizo*) because of me;" would have to read, "all ye might be offended (*skandalisthete*, subjunctive passive aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *skandalizo*) because of me." Therefore, the MBT reading in the subjunctive contains a clear and obvious textual problem that is resolved by the minority Byzantine reading in the indicative. Hence of the two possibilities, we cannot doubt that the grammatical syntax of Matt. 26:31,34,35a points us to the TR's reading in the indicative of "*aparnesomai* ('will I deny,' indicative middle future, 1st person singular verb)."

On the one hand, to the extent that at Matt. 26:35a the preferred reading in the main text of both Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005) is the subjunctive reading of the MBT, it must be said that these majority text compilers have missed an important contextual nuance in the Greek as a result of the application of their Burgonite majority text school rules[72]. But on the other hand, the English translation would be the same from both readings here at Matt. 26:35a, since if a subjunctive, it would be part of a *subjunctive of emphatic negation*, and thus rendered into English the same as the correct reading of the indicative future i.e., "will I not deny," in the wider words of Peter, "Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee."

At Matt. 26:35b the TR reads, "*Omoios* (Likewise) *kai* (also)" (e.g., S 028, 10th century; Minuscule 280, 12th century; Latin Vulgate & Origen in a Latin translation). The TR's reading found in Scrivener's Text (1894 & 1902) is manifested in e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633)[73]. However, the MBT reads, "*Omoios* (likewise) *de* ('And' / 'Then,' either translated or regarded as redundant in English translation,) *kai* (also)" (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, G 011; & Lectionary 1968). The MBT reading is also found in Scholz's 19th century critical text (later reproduced in *The Student's Analytical Greek Testament*, 1894); and the main texts of Hodges & Farstad's Burgonite majority text (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont's Burgonite majority text (2005).

As previously discussed, in Matthean Greek "*de*" is a stronger stylistic break than "*kai*" (see commentary at Vol. 3, Matt. 22:7; 22: 39; 23:23b). In the wider words of Matt. 26:35, "Peter said unto him, Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee. Likewise (*omoios*) also (*kai*) said all the disciples." Far from there being a clear change

---

[72]   The Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05, both have the correct reading of the indicative here at Matt. 26:35a; and hence so does the NU Text *et al*.

[73]   The TR's reading is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al*.

in focus warranting such a stronger stylistic breaker, the words, "Likewise (*omoiōs*) also (*kai*) said all the disciples," already have a strong enough stylistic breaker with the combination of "*omoiōs* (Likewise)" with "*kai* (also)," and so flow on naturally with this weaker stylistic break from, "Peter said unto him, Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee." Therefore the MBT here poses a clear and obvious textual, requiring resolution by adopting the minority Byzantine reading that lacks the "*de*"[74.] (The MBT looks like some kind of conflation with the "*de*" of Mark 14:31, which is contextually a synonym for the "*omoiōs*" of Matt. 26:35b, and so at Mark 14:31 means "Likewise.")

On the one hand, if I were translating the MBT, I would want to reflect this stronger stylistic break and so I would render it differently to the AV as, "<u>And</u> (*de*)" or "<u>Then</u> (*de*) likewise (*omoiōs*) also (*kai*) said all the disciples." But on the other hand, the only Burgonite translation we have into English, namely the NKJV, takes the view that this "*de* (And / Then)" is redundant in English translation and so both Greek readings have the same English reading as the AV.

The Burgonite Majority Text translators of the NKJV here render the passage in the same way as the AV in their Matt. 26:35b translation, "And (*kai*) so (*omoiōs*) said all the disciples" (NKJV); and this is one of the instances in which the NKJV translators did not consider a footnote was necessary to show a different reading in the Majority Text. While the NKJV translators are most inconsistent on this issue of when to show such a Majority Text footnote and when not to, to the extent that they did not do so here at Matt. 26:35b, they evidently do not find the MBT's added "*de*" of Hodges & Farstad's Majority Text as warranting a necessary difference in English translation. While even when judged from within their own paradigm they are not entirely competent in making such decisions, (e.g., no such NKJV Majority Text footnote appears at Matt. 26:38 referring to the MBT reading, "Jesus,") nevertheless, on this occasion, given that "*de*" is not always translated, I will with qualification "let them have their way" here. Hence on this occasion I have exercised a discretion and placed this matter in this Appendix, rather than discussing it more comprehensively in the main part of this commentary. However, if a future edition of the NKJV should take a different view, or another future Burgonite version should appear that takes a different view to the NKJV, then I may revisit this matter and give some greater elucidation on it.

At Matt. 26:35c the TR's "*eipon* ('they said' = 'said,' indicative active <u>second</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *legō*)," in the wider words, "Likewise also <u>said</u> all the disciples" is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032[75], Sigma 042, & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). The

---

[74] Another minority Byzantine reading with "*de*" instead of "*kai*" appears in Lectionary 2378. But taking into account the contextual way Matthean Greek uses "*de*" and "*kai*," while the stylistic combination of "*omoiōs* (Likewise)" with "*kai* (also)" is a strong enough contextual break, the combination of "*omoiōs* (Likewise)" with "*de*" would here be excessive. Hence the more natural contextual construction of the Latin, "*et*" in the Vulgate *et al* is from "*kai*" rather than "*de*," *supra*.

[75] At the end of a line with a bar symbol (something like "‾") for the final "n."

TR's reading is found in e.g., the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus; and hence Tischendorf's 8th ed. .   However, a variant, "*eipan* ('they said,' indicative active <u>first</u> aorist, 3rd person plural, from the verb, *leg<u>o</u>*)," is found in e.g., the neo-Alexandrians' "queen of minuscules," Minuscule 33 & mixed text type Codex Theta 038; and hence Westcott-Hort, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text.   But either way, the rendering will still be "said" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:36a the TR's "*e<u>o</u>s ou* (while)" is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042 & E 07; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968).   However, a variant, "*e<u>o</u>s* (while)" (M 021 & Minuscule 28) is a minority Byzantine reading[76].   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.   The TR's reading was then followed in both Tischendorf's 8th ed. and Nestle's 21st ed.; but the "*ou*" was placed in square brackets, making its adoption entirely optional in both Westcott-Hort and the NU Text.   But either way, the rendering will still be "while" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:36b the TR's "*proseux<u>o</u>mai* ('[and] I pray' = "and pray," AV, word 1) *ekei* ('yonder,' word 2)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, K 017; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968).   However, a variant using word order 2,1, is found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al*.   On the one hand, the changed word order does not *necessarily* affect English translation since either way, the rendering *may* still be "while I go <u>and pray yonder</u>" (AV & TR; TCNT & W-H).   But on the other hand, this *may* affect English translation since the ASV reads, "while I go <u>yonder and pray</u>."   (The ASV type of rendering is also followed in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, NIV, TEV, NEB, REB, Moffatt, and Papists' JB & NJB.)

For Matt. 26:39a, see Appendix 1, *supra*.

At Matt. 26:39b the TR's "*parelthet<u>o</u>* ('it let pass' = 'let … pass,' imperative active <u>second</u> aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *parerchomai*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032 & V 031; & Lectionaries 2378[77] & 1968; & Eusebius).   However, a variant, "*parelthat<u>o</u>* ('it let pass' = 'let … pass,' imperative active <u>first</u> aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *parerchomai*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, & E 07).   The TR's reading is followed in the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus; whereas 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 rendering will still be "let … pass" (AV &

---

[76]   Another minority Byzantine reading found in A 02 is "*e<u>o</u>s ou an* (*e<u>o</u>s ou* / 'while' + *an* / 'ever' = 'while');" and another minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 is "*e<u>o</u>s an* (*e<u>o</u>s* 'while' + *an* / 'ever' = 'while')."

[77]   In Lectionary 2378 the letter "t" (tau) is written as "τ" over the top and in the middle of a closed "*<u>o</u>*" (omega), written not as in standard seminary Greek like "ω", but rather as something like, "∞".

TR; ASV & W-H), in the wider words, "O my Father, if it be possible, <u>let</u> this cup <u>pass</u> from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt" (AV & TR).

At Matt. 26:44, the TR's "*apelth<u>on</u>* ('[and] going away' = 'and went away,' AV, word 2) *palin* ('again,' word 2) *pros<u>e</u>uxato* ('[and] prayed,' word 3)," is MBT (e.g., E 07, M 021, Y 034; & Lectionaries 2378[78] & 1968).   *Variant 1* in word order 1,3,2 is a minority Byzantine reading (A 02 & W 032).   *Variant 2*, omitting word 2, and in word order 1,3 is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042 & U 030).   (*Variant 2* is also found in e.g., the mixed text type Codex Theta 038, 9th century, and independent text in the Gospels, Minuscule 1, 12th century.   It appealed to the unstable mind of the semi neo-Alexandrian, Moffatt, who followed this erroneous *Variant 2* in the Moffatt Bible's rendering, "he left them <u>and went back</u> for the third time, <u>praying</u>" etc. .)

Variant 3 in word order 2,1,3 is a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscule 28). *Variant 3* is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and Western text's D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.*   On the one hand, the changed word order between that of the TR and *Variant 3* does not *necessarily* affect English translation since either way, the rendering *may* still be "he left them, <u>and went away again</u>, <u>and prayed</u>" etc. (AV & TR; TCNT & W-H).   (The TCNT type of rendering is also followed in the NIV, NEB, REB, and Roman Catholics' JB & NJB.)   But on the other hand, this *may* affect English translation since the ASV reads, "he left them <u>again</u>, <u>and went away</u>, <u>and prayed</u>" etc. .   (The ASV type of rendering is also followed in the NASB, RSV, ESV, NRSV, & TEV.)

At Matt. 26:45b the TR's "*to loipon* (*to* / 'the,' neuter singular accusative, definite article, from *to*; + *loipon* / 'from now on,' neuter singular accusative adjective, from *loipos-<u>e</u>-on*; = 'from the now on' = 'now'[79])," is MBT (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, K 017; & Lectionaries 2378[80] & 1968).   However, a variant omitting the definite article, "*to*," and

---

[78]   In Lectionary 2378 word 1 (at p. 73b, column 1) comes at the end of a line and is written as "άπελθ" with the last two letters abbreviated by a shape something like a "∩" over the final letter, theta, followed by a dash something like "`".

[79]   On the usage of the article with an adjective, see Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 231 & 233; Young's *Greek*, pp. 60-61.   Cf. Matt. 26:9c, *supra*.

[80]   This is written in Lectionary 2378 (p. 73b, column 1), with the final "*ete* (ετε)" of the previous word, "*Katheudete* (Sleep on)" written something like a "G" = "c" (epsilon) + "τ" (tau), and then the cross bar of the "τ" extends into the next two letters of the "*to*" which looks something like a "σ" = "c" (final epsilon of "*Katheudete*") + "τ" (of "*to*") in which the top cross-bar is used simultaneously for this and the joined top cross-bar of the penultimate letter of the "*Katheudete*", and in which the left of the "σ" doubles on its left side for the downward bar of the "τ"; + "o" (omicron of the "*to*").   This type of scribal "abbreviation" in which the top of the "σ" doubles twice for top of "τ" (the last "τ" of "*Katheudete*" & the "τ" of "*to*"), and the left of the "σ" doubles for the downward bar of the second "τ" and the left hand side of an "o" (omicron of the "*to*"), is a lot harder

so reading simply, "*loipon* ('from now on' = 'now')," is a minority Byzantine reading (W 032).   One of the two major Alexandrian text's, Codex Sinaiticus, follows the TR's reading, and hence this is found in Tischendorf's 8th ed.; whereas the other major Alexandrian text, Codex Vaticanus, follows the variant, and hence this is found in Westcott-Hort and Nestle's 21st ed. .   The NU Text Committee, baffled by the matter, placed the "*to*" in square brackets, making its acceptance or denial entirely optional.   But either way, the rendering will still be "now" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:48 Hodges & Farstad's majority text considers the text here is "seriously divided," although Robinson & Pierpont's majority text makes no comparable claim and in its main text simply follows the TR's reading, "*On an* (Whomsoever)[81]," in the wider words of Judas Iscariot's *kiss of death pact*, "Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he: hold him fast" (AV).   Von Soden says the variant, "*On ean* (Whomsoever)," is supported inside his wider K group of *c.* 1,000 manuscripts (with *c.* 860 Gospel manuscripts,) by K1, Ki, & Kr.   Ki consists of just seven manuscripts, all Byzantine; and the combination of K1 and Kr groups gives a reading the support of between *c.* 25% and 33%, or between about one-quarter and one-third of the Byzantine manuscripts[82].   With the residual support of K group going to the TR's reading, this means that on any reasonable statistical projections based on the K group, the TR has the MBT support of between *c.* 67% and 75%, or between about two-thirds and three-quarters, of the Byzantine manuscripts.

Thus the TR's reading of "*On an* (*on* / 'whom' + *an* / 'soever' = 'Whomsoever')," is MBT (e.g., U 030; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; Origen & Chrysostom).   However, a variant reading, "*On ean* (*on* / 'whom' + *ean* / 'ever' = 'Whomsoever')," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02[83], W 032, & Sigma 042; Origen & Eusebius).   The TR's reading is followed by the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus, and hence Westcott-Hort & Nestle's 21st ed.; whereas the variant is followed by the Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus, and hence Tischendorf's 8th ed. and the NU Text.   But either way, the rendering will still be "Whomsoever" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:50 the TR's "*ep'* (*epi* + dative = 'for') *o* ('which,' neuter singular dative relative pronoun, from '*os* / *hos*)," i.e., "For which [reason]?" = "Wherefore?"

---

to read than standard seminary Greek!   It also poses the question, Did a scribe seeing something like this if it was partly misformed or partly faded, wrongly think it was just an accidental marking, and so omit the "*to*" as he copied it out from such a manuscript?

[81]   Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 92; Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 62.

[82]   See textual commentary at Matt. 26:33b, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The Third Matter"

[83]   At the end of a line with a bar symbol (something like "‾") for the final "n."

(AV), in the wider words, "Friend, wherefore art thou come?," is MBT with at least about three-fifths to two-thirds of the Byzantine text manuscripts[84] (e.g., U 030 & Gamma 036; Lectionary 1968; Eusebius & Chrysostom). However, a variant reading, "*ep'* (*epi* + accusative = 'for' / 'about') *o* ('what,' neuter singular <u>accusative</u> relative pronoun, from *'os* / *hos*)," i.e., "For what [reason]?" = "Wherefore?," is a minority Byzantine reading with the support of at least about one-fifth to one-quarter of the Byzantine text manuscripts (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, Pi 041; & Lectionary 2378). 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 will be the same.

At Matt. 26:52a the TR's "*sou* ('of thee' = 'thy,' word 1) *t<u>e</u>n* ('the,' word 2, redundant in English translation) *machairan* ('sword,' word 3)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, E 07; & Lectionary 1968). *Variant 1* omitting word 1, and so reading word order 2,3, is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., K 017, U 030, & Lectionary 2378). *Variant 2* in word order 2,3,1, is a minority Greek reading (Origen). 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 will still be "thy sword" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:52b the TR's "*apothanountai* ('they shall perish' = 'shall perish,' indicative middle future, 3rd person plural verb, from *apoth<u>e</u>nsk<u>o</u>)*" is MBT; but a variant *apolountai* ('they shall perish' = 'shall perish,' indicative middle future, 3rd person plural verb, from *apollumi*)," is a minority Byzantine reading. 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 will still be "shall perish" in the wider words, "shall perish with the sword" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H). (Cf. Matt. 26:52 at Appendix 1, *supra*.)

At Matt. 26:53c the TR's "*pleious* ('more,' feminine plural accusative, comparative adjective) *<u>e</u>* ('than,' particle of comparison often used with a comparative adjective[85])," in the wider words, "he shall presently give me (Matt. 26:53b) more than (Matt. 26:53c) twelve legions of angels?" (AV), is MBT (e.g., A 02; W 032, with spelling variant of "*plious*" / "more;" Sigma 042, U 030; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). It is also found as Latin, "*plus* (more) *quam* (than)," in the Vulgate, Book of Armagh (with compound word *plusquam* = *plus* + *quam*), and all old Latin Versions other than the two of the variant, *infra*; and manifested in the Clementine (with compound word *plusquam* = *plus* + *quam*). But a variant reads Greek, "*plei<u>o</u>* ('more [than],' comparative adverb)."

---

[84] Hodges & Farstad shows "a seriously divided" text with this and the variant, whereas Robinson & Pierpont do not. Von Soden shows the MBT supported by Kx & Kr i.e., *c*. 68-72% of K group, and allowing an error bar of up to *c*. 10% for von Soden's generalist groups, on any reasonable extrapolations the MBT has at least about three-fifths to two-thirds of the Byzantine text manuscripts, and *possibly* more.

[85] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 299.

The reading, "*pleio* (more [than]')," is used rather than the TR's "*pleious* (more)," in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and this can be used to reconstruct a variant of Greek, "*pleio* (more [than])" in place of "*pleious* (more) *e* (than)," through reference to the Latin, "*plus* (more [than])" of old Latin Versions b and d, in contrast to the TR's reading of Latin, "*plus* (more) *quam* (than)" (Vulgate *et al*). The variant is found as Greek, "*pleio* (more [than])," in the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus and Western text's D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al*. But either way, the rendering is "more than" in the wider words, "more than twelve legions of angels" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:53d the TR's "*legeonas* (feminine plural accusative noun, from *legeon*)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, M 021; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). But the root word can be spelt as either *legeon* (TR) or *legion*[86]. For instance, as a genitive singular noun, i.e., "of a legion," we find an inscription in Britain reading, "*lege[o]nos*" (from *legeon*); but in Nicopolis, Greece, we find an inscription with the spelling, "*legionos* (from *legion*)[87]." There are numerous variants at Matt. 26:53d, including the Byzantine text variants, "*legeonon* (feminine plural genitive noun, a variant spelling of *legeonon* from *legeon*)" (A 02) and "*legeonon*" (Sigma 042); the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus, "*legionas* (feminine plural accusative noun, from *legion*)," and Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus, "*legionon* (feminine plural genitive noun, from *legion*)." Tischendorf's 8th ed. follows Codex Sinaiticus; whereas Westcott-Hort, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text follow Codex Vaticanus. But all will be rendered "legions" in the wider words, "twelve legions of angels" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:55a the TR's "*exelthete* (indicative active <u>second</u> aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *exerchomai*)," is MBT (e.g., H 013 & S 028; & Lectionary 1968)[88]. However, a variant, "*exelthate* (indicative active <u>first</u> aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *exerchomai*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, F 09; & Lectionary 2378). The variant is also followed in the Alexandrian text's Codices

---

[86] Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), pp. 9 & 299.

[87] Augustus Boeckhius' *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 1828-1877; Reprint: George Olms Verlag, Hildesheim Germany & New York USA, 1977, (ISBN 3-487-06288-7); Vol. 2 (1843 A.D.), p. 983, Inscription 1813.b (λεγιωνος = *legionos*, from Greece); & Vol. 3 (1853 A.D.), p. 268, Inscription 4639 (λεγε[ω]νος = *lege[o]nos*, from Britain).

[88] Lectionary 1968 here (at p. 164a) first has the "λΗ" ("*le*") of the preceding word, "*lesten* (a thief)," and then on top of the "H" between the lines, places the "E" of "*exelthete*," which is thereafter written normatively on the line. Is this a scribal error? Or is this the "*l*" and the second last "*e*" of "*lesten*," abbreviating the word and regarding the final "*n*" as optional, in which the "E" then doubles as both the "E" of "*exelthete*," while simultaneously using the bottom bar of the "E" as the bar showing "λΗ" is an abbreviation? Or is another explanation to be preferred? Whatever one thinks of all this, it is clear that the Lectionary here supports the TR's usage of the second aorist.

Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al*.   But either way, the rendering will still be "Are ye come out …?" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:55c the TR's Greek, "*pros* ('with,' word 1) *umas* ('you,' word 2) *ekathezomen* ('I sat,' word 3) *didaskon* ('teaching,' word 4) *en* ('in,' word 5) *to* ('the,' word 6) *iero* ('temple,' word 6)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, U 030; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968).   *Variant 1* in word order 3,1,2,4,5,6,7 is a minority Byzantine reading found in *c.* 20-25% of the Byzantine text manuscripts (e.g., A 02)[89]. *Variant 2* in word order 1,2,3,5,6,7,4 is also a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., K 017, Y 034, & Pi 041).   But on all these Greek readings inside the Byzantine textual tradition, the English reading remains, "I sat daily with you teaching in the temple" etc. .   (Cf. comments at Matt. 26:55b.)

For Matt. 26:59b, see Appendix 1, *supra*.

At Matt. 26:60b the TR's Greek, "*pseudomarturon* ('false witnesses,' word 1) *proeselthonton* ('coming' = 'though came,' word 2)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, M 021; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings[90]; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings).   However, a variant in word order 2,1, is a minority Byzantine reading (A 02).   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 "though … false witnesses came" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:61a the TR's "*eipon* ('they said' = 'said,' indicative active <u>second</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *lego*)," in the wider words of Matt. 26:60,61, "At the last came two false witnesses, and <u>said</u>, "This *fellow* said" etc. (AV, showing italics for added word), is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, N 022; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings).   The TR's reading is also followed by the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus.   However, a variant, "*eipan* ('they said,' indicative active <u>first</u> aorist, 3rd person plural, from the verb, *lego*)," is followed by the Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus.   The TR's reading as followed in Codex Vaticanus was adopted by Tischendorf's 8th ed.; whereas the variant as found in Codex Sinaiticus was adopted by Westcott-Hort, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text.

---

[89]   It is found in von Soden's Kr subgroup, see footnote on Matt. 26:33a, *supra*.

[90]   On the state of Lectionary 2378 in this region, see Matt. 26:60a, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The First Matter."   In Lectionary 2378, at the first reading (p. 74a, column 1), word 1 comes at the end of a line and the final nu (transliterated "n") is symbolized by a bar something like "‾"; and word 2, though ending in the middle of a line, has the final two letters of word 2 symbolized by a half semi-circle shape something like, though not as acute as, "∩", over the tau (Greek "τ" transliterated "t").   At the second reading (p. 81a, column 1), word 1 is unabbreviated; and the last five letters of word 2 are abbreviated by the last two letters (transliterated "*on*") with a tau (transliterated "t") on top of the omega (transliterated "*o*").

But either way, the rendering will still be "said" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:65a the TR's "*oti*" is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings[91]). However, a variant omitting the "*oti*" is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus, and Western text's D 05; and hence the "*oti*" is omitted in the NU Text *et al.* But under the rule of *oti recitativum*, "*oti* (that)" is never translated when it introduces a *direct discourse*[92]. Thus either way the rendering will still be, "saying [*oti* in TR], He hath spoken blasphemy" etc. (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:66 the TR's "*eipon* ('they said' = 'said,' indicative active <u>second</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *lego*)," in the wider words, "They answered and <u>said</u>," etc. (AV) is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings[93]; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). The TR's reading is also followed by the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus. However, a variant, "*eipan* ('they said,' indicative active <u>first</u> aorist, 3rd person plural, from the verb, *lego*)," is followed by the Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus. The TR's reading as followed in Codex Vaticanus was adopted by Tischendorf's 8th ed.; whereas the variant as found in Codex Sinaiticus was adopted by Westcott-Hort, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text. But either way, the rendering will still be "said" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:67 the TR's "*errapisan* ('they smote with the palms of their hands,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *rapizo*, declined as a first aorist from *errapisa*)," is MBT (e.g., H 013, K 017, V 031; Lectionary 2378 in one of two readings, p. 74b; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). The *Variant 1* spelling "*eripisan* ('they smote with the palms of their hands,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *rapizo*, declined as a first aorist from *eripisa*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (W 032). The *Variant 2* spelling "*erapisan* ('they smote with the palms of their hands,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *rapizo*, declined as a first

---

[91] The word following "*oti*" is "*eblasphemese* ('He hath spoken blasphemy,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *blasphemeo*)." This is written correctly in the first reading of Lectionary 1968 (p. 165a). But in the second reading of Lectionary 1968 (p. 177a), the scribe accidentally wrote the second letter of this word as a phi ("φ" transliterated as "ph") rather than as a beta (transliterated as "b").

[92] 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.

[93] In the first reading of Lectionary 2378 (p. 74a, column 2), this comes at the end of a line and the nu ("n") is written; but in the second reading (p. 81a, column 2), this comes at the end of a line and the final letter nu ("n") is abbreviated as a bar something like "‾" over the second last letter, omicron ("o").

aorist from *erapisa*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (A 02, Sigma 042; & Lectionary 2378 in one of two readings, p. 81a).   The TR’s reading is found in the Family 1 manuscripts and Erwin Nestle here exercised his non-Alexandrian text pincer arm to adopt it in Nestle’s 21st ed. (cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.).   *Variant 2* is also found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence Tischendorf’s 8th ed., Westcott-Hort, and the NU Text.   But either way, the rendering will still be “smote … with the palms of their hands” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:69 the TR’s “*exo* (‘without,’ word 1) *ekatheto* (‘he sat’ = ‘sat,’ word 2) i.e., “sat without” in the wider words, “Now Peter sat without in the palace” (AV & TR), is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, M 021; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings[94]; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings).   However, a variant is word order 2,1, is a minority Byzantine reading (090, 6th century, from the same manuscript as 064 & 074).   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 will still be the same.

At Matt. 26:71a the TR’s Greek, “*exelthonta* (‘going out’ = ‘when [he] was gone out,[95]’ word 1, masculine singular accusative, active aorist participle, from *exerchomai*) *de* (‘And,’ word 2) *auton* (‘he,’ word 3, masculine accusative, 3rd person singular, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*),” 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).   A variant omitting word 3 is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and hence Westcott-Hort, Nestle’s 21st ed., & the NU Text.   The TR’s reading is found in C 04 *et al*, and hence as an example of a neo-Alexandrian using his non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, it is found in Tischendorf’s 8th ed. .   (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.)   But either way, the rendering will still be “And when he was gone out” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 26:75a Hodges & Farstad’s majority text considers the text here is “seriously divided” between the TR’s “*tou* (‘-,’ word 1) *Iesou* (‘Jesus,’ word 2)” in its main text and the variant “*Iesou* (‘Jesus,’ word 2);” although Robinson & Pierpont’s majority text makes no comparable claim and in its main text simply follows the TR’s reading[96], in the wider words, “And Peter remembered the word of <u>Jesus</u> (*tou Iesou*)” etc.

---

[94]   At Lectionary 2378’s first reading (p. 74a, column 1), the last omicron (“*o*”) of word 2 is revowelled to an omega (“*o*”), and written as a closed omega (something like “∞”) with the tau (“t”) on the top and in the middle of this omega; whereas in the second reading (p. 81a, column 2), this is not revowelled but follows the MBT spelling.

[95]   Supplying e.g., the “he” for such a masculine singular participle, or a “they” for a plural participle in such instances as is contextually required (as occurs with the variant), may be reasonably regarded as part of the act of English translation.

[96]   Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 95; Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii

(AV & TR). Von Soden says that inside the wider K group, the reading "*I<u>e</u>sou* ('Jesus,' word 2)" has the support of K1 except two manuscripts, together with the Ki and Kr. Ki consists of just seven manuscripts, all Byzantine; and the combination of K1 and Kr groups gives a reading the support of between *c.* 25% and 33%, or between about one-quarter and one-third of the Byzantine manuscripts[97]. With the residual support of K group going to the TR's reading, this means that on any reasonable statistical projections based on the K group, the TR has the MBT support of between *c.* 67% and 75%, or between about two-thirds and three-quarters, of the Byzantine manuscripts.

Therefore, the TR's reading, "*tou* ('-,' word 1) *I<u>e</u>sou* ('Jesus,' word 2)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, V 031; & Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings, abbreviating word 2 as "υ" with a bar on top). However, a variant "*I<u>e</u>sou* ('Jesus,' word 2)," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, Minuscule 2; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings, abbreviating word 2 as "υ" with a bar on top). 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 will still be "Jesus" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:3a the TR's "*apestrepse* (indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apostreph<u>o</u>* = *apo* / 'away' + *streph<u>o</u>* / 'turn' / 'turn away' / 'turn back' = 'turned away' = 'brought again' or 'brought back')" (with or without the optional "*n*" on the end of "*apestrepse*,") is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, X 033; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings all without the optional "n" at the end; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings all without the optional "n" at the end). However, a variant, "*estrepse* (indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *streph<u>o</u>* = 'turn' / 'turn away' / 'turn back' = 'turned away' = 'brought again' or 'brought back')," is found in Origen. The variant, (with the optional "*n*" on the end as "*estrepsen*,") 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 "brought again" (AV & TR) or "brought back" (NKJV & TR; ASV & W-H)

At Matt. 27:3b the TR's "*tois* ('the,' or redundant in English translation, word 1) *presbyterois* ('elders,' word 2)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, K 017; Lectionary 2378 in one of three readings, p. 94a, column 1; & 1968, thrice in three different readings; & Chrysostom). However, a variant omitting word 1 but not word 2 is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042; Lectionary 2378 in two of three readings, p. 82b, column1 & p. 86b, column 2; & Origen). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al*. On the one hand it would be possible to translate the "*tois*" here as, "the (*tois*) elders," but on the other hand, it is possible to regard the "*tois*" as redundant in English translation. Thus on this

---

& 63.

[97] See textual commentary at Matt. 26:33b, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The Third Matter"

occasion I have exercised a discretion and put this variant in Appendix 3 rather than in the main part of the commentary. Thus either way, it is possible to give a rendering of "elders" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H), in the wider words that "Judas," "when he saw that" Jesus "was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:4b the TR's "*eipon* ('they said' = 'said,' indicative active <u>second</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *leg<u>o</u>*)," in the wider words, "And <u>they said</u>" is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, H 013; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings; & Origen). However, a variant, "*eipan* ('they said,' indicative active <u>first</u> aorist, 3rd person plural, from the verb, *leg<u>o</u>*)," is a minority Greek reading (Eusebius). The TR's reading is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus, and hence Tischendorf's 8th ed.; but the variant is found in L 019 and the neo-Alexandrians' "queen of minuscules," Minuscule 33, and hence in an exercise of their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, adopted in Westcott-Hort, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text. (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.) But either way, the rendering will still be "they said" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:4c Hodges & Farstad's majority text considers the text here is "seriously divided" between the TR's "*su* (thou) *opsei* (see [to that])" in its main text and the variant "*su* (thou) *ops<u>e</u>* (see [to that]);" although Robinson & Pierpont's majority text makes no comparable claim and in its main text simply follows the TR's reading[98], in the wider words, "see thou *to that*" (showing italics for added words) (AV & TR). Von Soden says that inside the wider K group, the reading with "*opsei*" has the support of his Kx and Kr groups which in broad-brush terms are about 68-72% of the K group. Hence even factoring in a error bar of up to *c.* 10% of this figure for von Soden's generalist groups, on any reasonable statistical extrapolations from this more than adequate sample of von Soden's K group which contains *c.* 1,000 manuscripts (of which *c.* 860 include the Gospels), the MBT has the support of at least about three-fifths to two-thirds of the Byzantine text manuscripts, and *possibly* more.

Therefore, at Matt. 27:4c the TR's "*su* (thou) *opsei* ('see [to that],' indicative active future, 2nd person singular verb, from *'ora<u>o</u>* / *hora<u>o</u>*)," i.e., "see thou *to that*" (AV, showing italics for added words), is MBT (e.g., E 07, Y 034, Gamma 036; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings; Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings; & Origen & Eusebius). However a variant, "*su* (thou) *ops<u>e</u>* ('see [to that],' indicative middle future, 2nd person singular verb, from *'ora<u>o</u>* / *hora<u>o</u>*)," i.e., "see thou *to that*" (showing italics for added words), is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, X 033; & Origen). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al*.

---

[98] Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 96; Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 66.

My later study of NT Greek manuscripts has taught me that things are not always as simple as the standard seminary Greek taught to tertiary students studying the NT. But in the standard seminary Greek I was taught more than 30 years ago in my College days, the future of the Greek *'orao* is active in meaning and declined from the indicative middle (deponent) future form *opsomai* (rather than the indicative active future form, *opso*, which does not exist in standard seminary Greek,) as in the variant[99]. This idea is also found in Liddell & Scott who say, "the only fut[ure]" tense "in use" for *'orao* is "*opsomai*," which is "always in" the "act[ive]" "sense[100]."

However, contrary to such standard seminary Greek, the TR's MBT reading is in fact declined from the indicative active future form *opso*[101]. Both declensions clearly existed in ancient times since Origen (d. 254) uses both, and is the probable originator of the variant. This diversity on the issue of how Greek *'orao* should here be declined, is a point at which we "reach the edges" of Greek grammar and its rules, entering into esoterical questions with regard to, "Who determines such matters anyway?"[102] E.g., if we neo-Byzantines were writing Greek grammars for college / university / seminary students, or Greek lexicons, we would represent the declension here found in the TR's MBT reading at Matt. 27:4c (and also at John 11:40); but because we are not in a position to do so, the neo-Alexandrians produce a form of standard seminary Greek tailored to a neo-Alexandrian NT text rather than a neo-Byzantine NT text. (Cf. my comments on Vine's Dictionary in the Matt. 27:11a footnote, *infra*.) But either way, the rendering will still be the same at Matt. 27:4c, whether "see thou *to that*" (TR & AV, showing italics for added words) or "see thou *to it*" (W-H & ASV, showing italics for added words).

At Matt. 27:6 the TR's "*eipon* ('[and] they said,' indicative active second aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *lego*)," in the wider words, "took the silver pieces, and they said" is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032 written at the end of a line with an abbreviation for the final letter something like "⁻", Sigma 042; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings; & Chrysostom). However, a variant reads, "*eipan* ('[and] they said,' indicative active first aorist, 3rd person plural, from the verb, *lego*)" (Eusebius). 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, L 019, and the neo-Alexandrians' "queen of minuscules," Minuscule 33, and hence adopted in the NU Text *et al*. But either way, the rendering

---

[99]   Whittaker's *New Testament Greek Grammar*, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

[100]   See Liddell & Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 1244 (*'orao*).

[101]   Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), pp. 21 & 341.

[102]   Cf. Textual Commentaries Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Matt. 3:8 (Latin); Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Matt. 15:23 (Greek in App. 3), Matt. 17:6 (Greek in App. 3); Matt. 20:10c (Greek in App. 3); Vol. 3 (Matt. 21-25), Matt. 25:2b (Greek), Matt. 25:9b (Greek), Matt. 23:23 (Greek in App. 3).

will still be the same.

At Matt. 27:11a the TR's "*est<u>e</u>* ('he stood,' indicative <u>active</u> aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *'ist<u>e</u>mi / hist<u>e</u>mi*)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, M 021; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings; & Origen).   However, a variant, "*estath<u>e</u>* ('he stood,' indicative <u>passive</u> aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *'ist<u>e</u>mi*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (Sigma 042; & Origen).   The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al*.   This change appears to have originated with Origen.   Was Origen here influenced by the nearby usage of a passive at Matt. 27:14 in "*apekrith<u>e</u>* ('he answered,' indicative <u>passive</u> aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apokrinomai*)"?   If so, this was a fatal error, since the passive at Matt. 27:14 is a deponent with an active meaning[103].

The same change one finds at Matt. 27:11a from "*est<u>e</u>* (he stood)" (TR) to "*estath<u>e</u>* (he stood)" (NU Text) is found at Matt. 2:9 and Rev. 8:3.   Whereas in the active voice of the TR's reading, a subject performs the action of the verb, i.e., the TR's nuance here is "Jesus stood" with a focus on Jesus performing this action[104]; by contrast, when used transitively in the passive voice, such as in the variants at Matt. 2:9 and Matt. 21:11, it means "it was made to stand" (Matt. 2:9) or "he was made to stand[105]" (Matt. 21:11), i.e., the variant's nuance here is on Jesus being forced or made to stand trial.   Therefore the TR's nuance is one of Jesus in control when <u>he stood</u> trial, despite superficial appearances to the contrary (cf. Matt. 12:40; 16:21; 17:9,12,21-23; 26:52-54; 27:63; Luke 24:25-27,44-47); whereas the variant's nuance is of Jesus not in control when <u>he was made to stand</u> trial.

The TR's nuance at Matt. 27:11a is consistent with things that "are spiritually discerned" (I Cor. 2:14); whereas the variant's nuance is consistent with things that "the natural man receiveth" that are "not the things of the Spirit of God" (I Cor. 2:14).   Origen who knew of both readings appears to have been the originator of this variant.   Origen was a Trinitarian heretic who denied that as touching upon his Divinity, the Son and the Father are "equal" (John 5:18; Philp. 2:6; cf. "even as" in John 5:23 following

---

[103]   Young's *Greek*, p. 136.

[104]   Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 410.

[105]   Unger, M.F. & White, W. (Editors), *Vine's Complete Expository Dictionary of the OT and NT*, 1st edition by William Vine (1873-1949), Thomas Nelson Publishers, Nashville, Tennessee, USA, 1984 & 1996, p. 598.   As with other Greek lexicons and grammars I use, this work is marred by neo-Alexandrianism e.g., here at *hist<u>e</u>mi* the claim is made of the Revised Version of 1881-5, that "in Revelation 13:1 the RV follows the best texts, 'he stood' (not as KJV, 'I stood')."   In fact, it is the King James Version which here follows the best text with "I stood (not as RV, "he stood").   (Cf. my comments on College Greek grammars etc. at Matt. 27:4c, *supra*.)

John 5:18[106]), and instead he regarded the Son as inferior in his Divinity to the Father. Therefore, did the idea of a weaker, trimmed down Christ, unlike the one in control of the situation in Matt. 26:52-52 and John 10:17,18, so appeal to Origen's heretical mind, that he then created this variant to reflect this heresy?

Whatever the origins of the variant, which it must be admitted are speculative, for our immediate purposes in this Appendix, it is suffice to note that these Greek nuance differences do not come across in English translation. Therefore, either way the rendering here at Matt. 27:11a will still be "stood" in the wider words, "Jesus stood before the governor" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:12 Hodges & Farstad (1985) consider the text is "seriously divided" between the reading of their main text, "*ton* ('the' or redundant in English translation)" before "*presbyteron* (elders)," and its omissions[107]; whereas Robinson & Pierpont's (2005) considers the MBT is "*ton*" without any qualification. Von Soden (1913) says the "*ton*" has the support of his K group other than his Kr subgroup and one manuscript in his K1 subgroup. Von Soden's Kr group has 211 manuscripts, and so 212 out of 983 K group manuscripts is between about one-fifth and one-quarter of K group, and so on any reasonable projection about this same percentage in the manuscripts overall.

Therefore at Matt. 27:12 the TR's "*ton* ('the' or redundant in English translation)" before "*presbyteron* (elders)" is MBT with the support of about three-quarters to four-fifths of the Byzantine manuscripts (e.g., A 02, W 032, M 021, U 030, Pi 042; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings[108]; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings[109]). However, a variant omitting the "*ton*" is a minority Byzantine reading with

---

[106]   With regard to the Father and Son being "equal" as "God," and Christ's words, "all men should honour the Son, <u>even as</u> they honour the Father" (John 5:18,23, emphasis mine); n.b. the *Proper Preface* for *The Feast of Trinity* at *The Communion Service* in the Anglican 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, "Who art one God, one Lord; not one only Person, but three Persons in one Substance. <u>For that which we believe of the glory of the Father, the same we believe of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost</u>, <u>without any</u> difference or <u>inequality</u>. Therefore" etc. (emphasis mine).

[107]   Hodges & Farstad, pp. xxi & 96.

[108]   At Lectionary 2378's first reading (p. 83a, column 1), this us written as "τωv;" at the second reading (p. 87a, column 1) as "∞μ" (without the right hand side bar of the "μ"), with a "τ" put in the middle on top of the closed omega ("∞"); and at the third reading (p. 94a, column 2) as "τ∞v".

[109]   In the first reading (p. 180b), Lectionary 1968 reads, "*upo* (of) *ton* (the) *presbyteron* (elders)." Thus in the wider words, "*upo* (of) *ton* (the) *archieron* (chief priests) *kai* (and) *ton* (-) *presbyteron* (elders)," it looks like the eye of the scribe jumped from the first "*ton* (the)" to the second "*ton* (the)," thus inadvertently omitting the intervening words. But the scribe did not make the same mistake at the second reading

between about one-fifth to one-quarter of the Byzantine manuscripts (e.g., Sigma 042, S 028, X 033, & Gamma 036). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al.* On the one hand it would be possible to translate the "*t<u>o</u>n*" here as, "the (*t<u>o</u>n*) elders," but on the other hand, it is possible to regard the "*t<u>o</u>n*" as redundant in English translation. Hence on this occasion I have exercised a discretion and put this variant in Appendix 3 rather than in the main part of the commentary. Thus either way, it is possible to give a rendering of "elders" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H), in the wider words, "the chief priests and elders" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:21a the TR's "*eipon* ('They said,' indicative active <u>second</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *leg<u>o</u>*)," in the wider words, "<u>They said</u>, Barabbas" is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, & M 021; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings). The TR's reading is found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus. However, a variant, "*eipan* ('They said,' indicative active <u>first</u> aorist, 3rd person plural, from the verb, *leg<u>o</u>*)," is found in the Western text's D 05, L 019, and the neo-Alexandrians' "queen of minuscules," Minuscule 33, and hence in an exercise of their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, adopted in the NU Text *et al.* (Cf. my comments on the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm at Matt. 26:17a.) But either way, the rendering will still be the same.

At Matt. 27:21b the TR's "*Barabban* (Barabbas)," in the wider words, "They said, Barabbas," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, U 030; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings). However, a variant which adds before this "*ton* ('the,' redundant in English translation)," is a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscule 122, 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 will still be "Barabbas" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:28 the TR's "*perieth<u>e</u>kan* ('[and] they put on' = '[and] put on,' word 1) *aut<u>o</u>* ('him,' word 2) *chlamuda* ('a robe,' word 3) *kokkin<u>e</u>n* ('scarlet,' word 4)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, Gamma 036; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings[110]; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings[111]).

(p. 188a) or third reading (p. 195a). However, at the third reading, following the "*t<u>o</u>n* (-)" is not "*presbyter<u>o</u>n* (elders)," but a rare variant, "*Pharisa<u>o</u>n* (Pharisees)," which von Soden (1913) says is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic Version.

[110] Amidst various handwriting differences, e.g., differently letter shapes for nu; or at the first reading (p. 83b, column 1) word 2 is written as, "αυ∞" with the "τ" in the middle above the closed omega "∞"; whereas at the second reading (p. 87b, column 1) and third reading (p. 94b, column 2) it is written as, "αυτ∞".

[111] At the first reading (p. 181b) word 2 is written as "αυω" with the "τ" in the middle above the open omega "αυω"; whereas at both the second reading (p. 189a) and third reading (p. 196a) it is written as "αυτω".

However, a variant in word order 3,4,1,2 is found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering will still be "and put on him a scarlet robe" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:29a the TR's "*epi* ('upon,' *epi* + accusative) *t<u>e</u>n* ('the,' feminine singular <u>accusative</u>, definite article from *<u>e</u>*) *kephal<u>e</u>n* ('head,' feminine singular <u>accusative</u> noun, from *kephal<u>e</u>*) *autou* (of him)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, M 021; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings[112]; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings). However, a variant "*epi* ('upon,' *epi* + genitive) *t<u>e</u>s* ('the,' feminine singular <u>genitive</u>, definite article from *<u>e</u>*) *kephal<u>e</u>s* ('head,' feminine singular <u>genitive</u> noun, from *kephal<u>e</u>*) *autou* (of him)," is found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering will still be "upon his head" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:29b the TR's "*epi* ('in,' *epi* + accusative) *t<u>e</u>n* ('the,' feminine singular <u>accusative</u>, definite article from *<u>e</u>*) *dexian* ('right hand,' feminine singular <u>accusative</u>, adjective standing in the place of a noun[113], from *dexios*) *autou* (of him)," is MBT (e.g., W 032, Gamma 036; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings[114]; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings). However, a variant "*en* ('in,' *en* + dative) *t<u>e</u>* ('the,' feminine singular <u>dative</u>, definite article from *<u>e</u>*) *dexia* ('right hand,' feminine singular <u>dative</u>, adjective standing in the place of a noun, from *dexios*) *autou* (of him)," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, & N 022). 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 will still be "in his right hand" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:29c the TR's "*enepaizon* ('they mocked,' indicative active <u>imperfect</u>, 3rd person plural verb, from *empaiz<u>o</u>*)," is MBT (e.g., A 02 revowelling "*ai*" to "*e*" with spelling variant "*enepezon*," W 032 revowelling "*ai*" to "*e*" with spelling variant "*enepezon*," Sigma 042, N 022, K 017; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different

---

[112] At the first (p. 83b, column 1) and second (p. 87b, column 1) readings the *kephal<u>e</u>n* is written as, "κεφαλнν." But at the third reading (p. 95a, column 1) this is written over two lines, with "κφα" on the first line, and the epsilon ("ε") written as "c" above the "κ", and the next line ending "λнν."

[113] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, p. 233.

[114] At the first (p. 83b, column 1) and second (p. 87b, column 1) readings the *epi* is written as in standard seminary Greek, "επι." But at the third reading (p. 95a, column 1) this is written with the epsilon ("ε") looking something like "G", followed by a pi (π) looking something like a closed top omega, i.e., something like "G∞ι." Such are the diversities that may arise in handwritten manuscripts.

readings[115]; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings[116]).   However, a variant "*enepaizan* ('they mocked,' indicative active <u>aorist</u>, 3rd person plural verb, from *empaizo*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscules 53, 14th century & 58, 15th century).   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 will still be "mocked" in the wider words, "and mocked him" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:29d the TR's "*Chaire* (Hail) *o* ('the,' masculine singular <u>nominative</u>, <u>definite article</u> from *o* / *ho*; redundant in English translation) *basileus* ('king,' masculine singular <u>nominative</u> noun, from *basileus*) *ton* (of the) *Ioudaion* (Jews)" i.e., "Hail, King of the Jews!", is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, U 030; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings[117]; Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings; Eusebius & Chrysostom); and with no good textual argument against it, correct. However, a variant "*Chaire* (Hail) *basileu* ('king' or 'O king,' masculine singular <u>vocative</u> noun, from *basileus*) *ton* (of the) *Ioudaion* (Jews)" i.e., "Hail, King of the Jews!" or "Hail, O King of the Jews!", is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Y 034 & S

---

[115]   At the first reading (p. 83b, column 1) this is spelt "*enepaizon*;" at the second reading (p. 87b, column 1) the "*o*" is revowelled to "*o*" and so is spelt, "*enepaizon*;" and at the third reading (p. 95a, column 1) the "*ai*" is revowelled to "*e*" for the spelling, "*enepezon*."   Such diversity in Lectionary 2378 raises the question, Why was a local dialect vowelling not consistently used in a given local region?

[116]   The nu or "*n*" (in standard seminary Greek, "ν") as elsewhere in Lectionary 1968, here looks something like what in standard seminary Greek is a mu (or "*m*"), i.e., "μ," but without the right-hand bar of the "μ".   Without this right-hand bar and representing "n" not "m," this is written at the first reading (p. 181b) with a "c" epsilon (in standard seminary Greek, "ε") the first time but not the second time, a long iota (in standard seminary Greek, "ι") something like "j" without the dot on top of it, and a zeta or "z" (in standard seminary Greek, "ζ") something like a question mark "?" but without the dot underneath it; and so over two lines the first reading looks something like, "cμεπαj" on the first line, and "?oμ" on the second line.   At the second reading (p. 189a), this is written on one line the same way except for the fact that the two epsilons are the same, something like, "εμεπαj?oμ."   At the third reading (p. 196a), this is written with the first epsilon looking something like "G," and the pi (in standard seminary Greek, "π") looking something like a closed top omega, so it looks something like, "Gμε∞αj?oμ."

[117]   At the first (p. 83b, column 1) and second (p. 87b, column 1) readings of Lectionary 2378, the first letter, beta is written as "μ" which joins the following "α" i.e., something like, "μασιλευσ" (although the last two letters merge so the right of the "υ" is used for the left of the "σ"); but at the third reading (p. 95a, column 1) the first letter, beta, is written as "β" and the following alpha as something like a "d" slopping from left to right i.e., something like, "βdσιλευσ" (although the last two letters merge so the right of the "υ" is used for the left of the "σ").

028).   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 & Western text's D 05, and hence Westcott-Hort, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text.

In Greek (and Latin) the vocative is used for direct address of someone.   Due to the more general lack of literary beauty and detail for accuracy of the neo-Alexandrian versions relative to the neo-Byzantine Authorized Version, the rendering has not been the vocative's "O King," with "Hail, O King of the Jews!", but simply "King," with "Hail, King of the Jews!"   Therefore no obvious difference has emerged in the neo-Alexandrian versions, even though one could.   Hence notwithstanding this difference in the underpinning Greek, and possible difference in English translation, at least to date, either way, the rendering has still been, "Hail, King of the Jews!" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

For Matt. 27:33a ("*o*" / "that" word 1a, not "*os*" / "that," word 1b of Scrivener's text) see Appendix 1, *supra* (and the TR's word order is also found in A02 as 1b,2,3a,4,5).   At Matt. 27:33b, the TR's "*o /'o* (or *ho*, 'which' or 'that,' word 1a, neuter singular nominative, pronoun from *'os / hos*)," in the wider words, "*o* ('that,' word 1a) *esti* ('it is' = 'is,' word 2) *legomenos* ('saying' = 'to say,' word 3a, masculine singular <u>nominative</u>, present passive participle, from *leg<u>o</u>*) *kraniou* ('of a skull,' word 4) *topos* ('a place,' word 5)," i.e., "that is to say, a place of a skull," or "that is to say, The place of a skull," or "that is to say, The place of the skull" is MBT (e.g., E 07, G 011; Lectionary 2378 in one of three readings[118]; & Lectionary 1968, twice in three different readings[119]).

---

[118]   Lectionary 2378 second reading (p. 87b, column 2) supports the TR.   The "*legomenos* ('saying,' word 3a)" is not clear in my microfilm copies, original checked at Sydney University and it is written as something like, "λq/oµy" with "oc" written above the line over the "y" i.e., "λ" (lambda) + "q/" = "c" (epsilon) + "γ" (gamma) "o" (omicron) + µ (mu) + y = "c" (epsilon) + "ν" (nu) with a downward bar on it, with "o" (omicron) + "c" (sigma) written above the line over the "y".   But its first reading (p. 84a, column 1) omits word 3 and so reads, words 1a,2,4,5 (original checked at Sydney University and this is not the work of a later "corrector" scribe); and its third reading (p. 95a), reads 1a,2, "*metherm<u>e</u>neuomenon* ('being interpreted,' nominative singular neuter, passive present participle, from *metherm<u>e</u>neu<u>o</u>)*," 4,5; in which the final "n" is unclear in microfilm copies.   Original checked and this is an "ν" shaped nu with an ink blotch in the middle of it that obscures its true form in the microfilm copies, but which is clearly legible in the original manuscript.

[119]   The TR's reading is found in Lectionary 1968's first reading (p. 182b); and second reading (p. 189b), although word 3a "*legomenos*" is written at the end of a line and has some of the flamboyant squiggles'n'wiggles sometimes found in this lectionary, since the nu (n) which usually looks like a standard seminary Greek mu "µ" without the right hand bar, here goes up from the right of its "υ" into the margin on the right hand side of the page to form first a large omicron ("*o*"), and then twirls around with a sigma over the same spot ("σ") ending with a flourish extending out the bar of the sigma (which by this stage has gone from being a top bar to a bottom bar on this letter).   Such are the

The TR's reading is also supported in the similar reading of words 1a, 2, 3b (*legomenon*, 'saying' = 'to say,' word 3b, masculine singular <u>accusative</u>, present passive participle, from *leg<u>o</u>*), 4,5 (W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022).

However, a variant reading, "*o* ('that,' word 1a) *estin* ('it is' = 'is,' word 2) *kraniou* ('of a skull,' word 4) *topos* ('a place,' word 5) *legomenos* ('saying' = 'to say,' word 3)," i.e., "that is to say, a place of a skull," or "that is to say, The place of a skull," or "that is to say, The place of the skull," is a variant found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, in referring to the Hebrew derived form of "Golgotha" (Matt. 27:33) (or the Greek "*kranion*" meaning "skull," found in our AV's at Luke 23:33 as "Calvary" from the Latin Vulgate's "*Calvariae*" declined from Latin, "*calvaria*" meaning "skull,") the rendering will still be the same i.e., "that is to say, a place of a skull" (AV), or "that is to say, The place of a skull" (ASV), or "that is to say, The place of the skull."

At Matt. 27:34b the TR's "*ethele* (indicative active <u>imperfect</u>, 3rd person singular verb, from *thel<u>o</u>*[120])," is MBT (e.g., A 02 spelt with the optional "*n*" on the end, W 032 spelt with the optional "*n*" on the end, M 021 spelt with the optional "*n*" on the end, Y 034; Lectionary 2378[121], thrice in three different readings; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings[122]). However, a variant "*ethel<u>e</u>sen* (indicative active <u>aorist</u>, 3rd

---

scribal handwriting fancies that can occur in this lectionary! At the third reading (p. 196b), the scribe first wrote vs. 33's, "*legonemon* (called)," then left out the following, "*Golgotha* (Golgotha)," then wrote "*o* ('that,' word 1a, Matt. 27:33a), then left out "*esti* ('is,' word 2) *legomenos* ('saying' = 'to say,' word 3)," then wrote a nu ("*n*") which presumably is the 3rd last letter of word 3, and then the text resumes with words 4 & 5. Given the text of verses 33 & 34 is of an uneven standard (see commentary at Matt. 27:34a, "Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion," "The Second Matter") poses the following question, Was the scribe being distracted by an external stimulus when he was writing out verses 33 & 34?

[120] Typical of the problems of neo-Alexandrians having control of colleges, universities, and publishing houses, is the fact that Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), p. 243, does not show a declension for *thel<u>o</u>* from the imperfect i.e., "*ethelon*" (see *Ibid.*, p. 21), since no imperfect forms of this word exist in the neo-Alexandrian texts, though it does in the neo-Byzantine Received Text. Of course, as a package deal I still find Mounce's work a very useful lexicon, nevertheless, some improvements could be made to it, and expanding it to include forms used by neo-Byzantines such as here at Matt. 27:34b would be one such desirable improvement.

[121] At Lectionary 2379's second reading (p. 87b, column 2), the negative microfilm form shows an elevated "c" shaped mark, and the positive microfilm form shows an elevated "v" shaped mark which could be an elevated nu. Original checked at Sydney University and in fact this is just an ink smudge.

[122] At Lectionary 1968's first (p. 182b) and second (p. 189b) readings, this is

person singular verb, from *thelo*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., 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 rendering will still be "he would" in the wider words, "he would not drink" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:35a the TR's "*ballontes* (casting)" is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Gamma 036; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings; & Lectionary 1968, in one of three different readings, p. 182[123]). However, a variant spelling with only one "*l*" (lambda), "*balontes*," is a minority Byzantine reading (A 02, Pi 041; & Lectionary 1968, in two of three different readings, pp. 189b & 196b). The TR's spelling is found in Codex Vaticanus, whereas the variant's spelling is also found in Codex Sinaiticus. The split in the two main Alexandrian texts, saw the variant's spelling of Tischendorf's "beloved" Codex Sinaiticus adopted in Tischendorf's 8th ed.; and the TR's spelling of Westcott & Hort's "beloved" Codex Vaticanus adopted in Westcott-Hort. Thereafter, on this occasion, the correct reading of Codex Vaticanus was followed, and so by a fluke the correct reading also adopted in Nestle's 21st ed. and the NU Text. But either way, the rendering will still be "casting" in the wider words about "casting lots" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

---

written something like, "ηθελε." But there are more than half a dozen different forms of the letter eta used in this lectionary, and in the third reading (p. 196b), one of its forms is used which has a high left bar something like a "Ꮑ" joining with a shape something like a "u", so that it looks something like a back-the-front "J" / "Ꮬ" shape.

[123] At Lectionary 1968's third reading (p. 196b), the variant is written something like, "υαλομτεϲ" (without the right hand bar on the "μ" which is a nu / "*n*" found in standard seminary Greek as "ν"). But at the TR's reading found in the first reading (p. 182b), and the variant found in the second reading (p. 189b), the last two letters *prima facie* look like a closed top omega i.e., "ω" with a bar on top; although the left hand bar of such an "ω" goes up a bit higher on the page. In fact, this is still "*es*" (written in standard seminary Greek as "εϲ"). In Lectionary 1968 about half a dozen different forms exist for epsilon, one of which is something like "c", and about half a dozen different forms exist for the letter sigma, of which one is something like the standard seminary Greek "σ" (although standard seminary Greek uses "ς" at the end of a word such as here). The letters here at Matt. 27:35a are in fact the joining of "cσ" with the bar of the previous tau / "*t*", written in standard seminary Greek as "τ" coming across to the far right, and so joining the tops of the "cσ" together. This Lectionary may also use a closed top omega for pi / "*p*" (in standard seminary Greek, "π;" but as a closed top omega looking something like "∞," e.g., at p. 55b, Matt. 14:29, the second pi of something like "περιε∞αthq~", in standard seminary Greek letters, "περιεπατησεν" / "he walked"), and so what is here an "*es*" (epsilon-sigma) at Matt. 27:35a may *prima facie* appear to be either an "*o*" (omega) or "*p*" (pi). Such are the difficulties one may encounter in handwritten manuscripts such as Lectionary 1968.

At Matt. 27:44a[124] the TR's "*auto* ('with him,' masculine singular dative, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*)," in the wider words, "The thieves also, which were crucified with him" etc. (AV), is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, Y 034; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings[125]; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings). However, a variant, "*sun* ('with,' preposition + dative) *auto* ('him,' masculine singular dative, personal pronoun from *autos-e-o*)," 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 rendering will still be "with him" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:47 the TR's "*ton* (of the [ones]) … *estoton* ('standing,' masculine plural genitive, active perfect participle, from '*istemi* / *histemi*, declining it from a second / strong active perfect participle form, *estotos-estoses-estotos*[126])," i.e., "of them that stood," in the wider words, "Some of them that stood there" etc. (AV) is MBT (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, M 021; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings[127]; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings). However, a variant reads, "*ton* (of the [ones]) … *estekoton* ('standing,' masculine plural genitive, active perfect participle, from *istemi*, declining it from a first / weak active perfect participle form, *estekos-*

---

[124] In my photocopy of a facsimile of A 02, it clearly follows the TR's reading, and both Tischendorf (1869-72) and Swanson (1995) say this is A 02's reading. But the textual apparatus of Nestle-Aland (1993) says the reading of A 02 here in favour of the TR was the work of a "corrector" scribe, and while the original is "illeg[ible]," it appears to read something like the variant. Under the circumstances, I make no further reference to A 02 here at Matt. 27:44a.

[125] In Lectionary 2378, at what one might *prima facie* expect to be the region of a third reading (p. 95b. column 1), on finds that the reading is Matt. 27:39-43, 45-54 (pp.. 95b-96a), and thus this entire verse is omitted from this Lectionary reading.

[126] There is diversity of active perfect participle forms for *istemi* as either a first (weak) form (as masculine-feminine-neuter forms: *estekos-estekuia-estekos*) or a second (strong) form (with two neuter forms as masculine-feminine-neuter forms: *estos-estosa-estos* / *estos*); or as masculine-feminine-neuter forms: *estotos-estoses-estotos*) (Whittaker's *New Testament Greek Grammar*, *op. cit.*, p. 112; & Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT*, pp. 44 & 46). Compare e.g., the Johannean usage at John 3:29 of "*estekos* ('standing' = 'standeth,' AV, masculine singular nominative, active perfect participle, from *istemi*, declined from *estekos*, a first / weak active perfect participle form);" with the John 12:29 usage of "*estos* (standing' = 'stood [by],' AV, masculine singular nominative, active perfect participle, from *istemi*, declined from *estos*, is a second / strong active perfect participle form)."

[127] Lectionary 2378 spells this as "*estoton*" from *estotos* in the first (p. 84b, column 1) and third (p. 95b, column 2) readings; and with a local dialect revowelling of the 4th letter, omega, to an omicron, as "*estoton*" from *estotos* in the second reading (p. 88a, column 2).

estekuia-estekos)[128]." The variant is found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al*. But either way, the rendering will still be "of them that stood" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:51 the TR's "*eis* ('in,' word 1) *duo* ('two,' word 2) *apo* ('from,' word 3) *anothen* ('the top,' word 4) *eos* ('to,' word 5) *kato* ('the bottom,' word 6)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, Pi 041; Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings; & Lectionary 1968, thrice in three different readings). *Variant 1* omitting word 3, in word order 1,2,4,5,6, is found in the Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus and mixed text type Theta 038. *Variant 2* in word order, 3,4,5,6,1,2, is found in the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus and the neo-Alexandrians' "queen of minuscules," Minuscule 33; and hence Tischendorf's 8th ed. and the NU Text. Reflecting the absence of word 3 in Codex Sinaiticus, but the word order of Codex Vaticanus, it is found with optional square brackets around word 3 as [3],4,5,6,1,2 in Westcott-Hort & Nestle's 21st ed. . However, word 4 means "from above," and so in the absence of word 3 may still be rendered "from the top." Thus whichever of the three readings is adopted, the rendering will still be "from the top to the bottom" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:52 the TR's "*polla* (many) *somata* (bodies) *ton* (of the) *kekoimemenon* (which slept) *'agion / hagion* (saints) *egerthe* (arose)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, U 030; & Lectionary 2378, thrice in three different readings; & Lectionary 1968, in two of three readings[129]). The <u>plural</u> <u>subject</u> of the TR's sentence, Greek, "*somata* ('bodies,' <u>neuter</u> <u>plural</u> nominative noun, from *soma*)," is of <u>neuter</u> gender, and so the TR's <u>verb</u> is <u>singular</u>, "*egerthe* ('they arose' = 'arose,' indicative passive aorist, third person <u>singular</u> verb, from *egeiro*)[130]." However, a variant, "*egerthesan* ('they arose' = 'arose,' indicative passive aorist, third person <u>plural</u> verb,

---

[128] As if there were not already enough grammatical intricacies and complexities with *istemi*, which is a reduplicating and prolonged form of the primary root, "*stao / sta*," W 032 presents us with a further issue. A similar form, clearly used synonymously with "*estekoton*," namely, "*stekoton*," is found in W 032. In the previous verse, the scribe of W 032 left off the final "E" of the first "θEE (*Thee*, 'God')," and then added it back in above the line (see Matt. 27:46b & Mark 15:34c, "Preliminary Remarks & Textual Discussion," "The First Matter"). Is this a similar scribal error of accidentally leaving off the "E," in this instance at the start of this word? Or is this a syncopated local dialect form which (possibly on analogy with some aorist forms, or possibly due to a local accent,) considered the "E" suffix here "should be dropped"?

[129] Lectionary 1968 has the TR's reading at its second (p. 190b) and third (p. 197b) readings.

[130] This Greek grammatical construct does not apply in the Latin, and hence at Matt. 27:52 the Latin, "*corpora* ('bodies,' neuter <u>plural</u> nominative <u>noun</u>, from *corpus*)," takes the plural verb, "*surrexerunt* ('they arose' = 'arose,' indicative active perfect, third person <u>plural</u> <u>verb</u>, from *surgo*)," (e.g., the Vulgate & Gregory).

from *egeiro*),” is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., G 011; & Lectionary 1968, in one of three readings[131]).   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 will still be the same i.e., “arose” (AV & TR) or “rose” (TCNT & W-H).

At Matt. 27:59 the TR’s “*auto* (it) *sindoni* (‘in a linen cloth,’ feminine singular <u>dative</u> noun, from *sind<u>o</u>n*),” is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, K 017; & Lectionaries 2378[132] & 1968[133]).   However, a variant adding “*en*” and so reading, “*auto* (it) *en* (in) *sindoni* (in a linen cloth),” is a minority Byzantine reading (Minuscules 399, 9th / 10th century; & 27, 10th century).   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 it is found in optional square brackets in Westcott-Hort, Nestle’s 21st ed., and the NU Text.

In Greek[134], *the dative of manner* refers to how the verbal action, here “he wrapped (*enetulixen*, indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *entuliss<u>o</u>*),” is performed.   Translated with either “in” or “with,” it answers the question of “How?”   Thus here it responds to the question, “How was ‘he wrapped’?,” with the answer, “in a … linen cloth.”   While *the dative of manner* generally uses an abstract noun (whereas *the dative of means* generally uses a concrete noun,) this is not always so e.g., in Mark 5:2,7 we read of “a man with an unclean spirit” who “cried <u>with a</u> loud <u>voice</u> (*ph<u>o</u>ne*, a dative of manner = ‘with a voice,’ feminine singular <u>dative</u> noun, from *ph<u>o</u>ne*).”   But in Koine Greek it was being increasingly supplanted by the grammatical forms of either *en* (‘in’ / ‘with’) + dative or *meta* (‘in’ / ‘with’) + genitive.   Hence the variant looks like a typical scribal “stylistic improvement” designed to “update the language” for “these more modern times.”   But either way, the rendering will still be, “it in a clean linen cloth,” in the wider words about Joseph of Arimithaea wrapping Jesus’ body, namely, that he “wrapped it in a clean linen cloth” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:61 the TR’s “*Maria*” is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042; Minuscule 2; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968).   But a variant, “*Mariam*,” is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al*.   But either way, the rendering will still be “Mary” in the wider words, “Mary Magdalene” (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 27:65 Hodges & Farstad (1985) consider the text is “seriously divided”

---

[131]   Lectionary 1968 has the variant’s reading at its first reading (p. 183b).

[132]   Lectionary 2378 (p. 96a, column 2) revowells the “*auto*” to “*aut<u>o</u>*”.

[133]   Lectionary 1968 (p. 198b) revowells the “*auto*” to “*aut<u>o</u>*”.

[134]   Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, pp. 161-3; Young’s *Greek*, pp. 49-50 & 50-1.

between the reading of their main text, "*de*," and its omissions[135]; whereas Robinson & Pierpont's (2005) considers the MBT is "*de*" without any qualification. Von Soden (1913) says "*de*" has the residual support of his K group (which includes 95 out of 172 counted Kx subgroup manuscripts), other than the support for the omission in the Ki subgroup and 77 out of 172 counted Kx subgroup manuscripts. The Kx subgroup contains 513 manuscripts, and so deducting this from the 983 K group manuscripts gives us 470 manuscripts, and then adding back in the 172 counted in Kx gives us 642 manuscripts. Ki consists of just seven manuscripts. Therefore the variant has the support of 84 manuscripts (77 Kx + 7 Ki), or *c.* 12%, whereas the MBT has the support of *c.* 88% of K group. Notwithstanding the "rubbery" nature of these broad-brush calculations, we do not have to go beyond them to see that Robinson & Pierpont's are correct to unqualifiedly say the "*de*" is MBT.

Hence at Matt. 27:65 the TR's "*de*" is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, M 021). However, a variant omitting the "*de*" is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., K 017 & Gamma 036; Lectionaries 2378 & 1968; also found at the hand of a "corrector" scribe of M 021). The TR's reading is found in the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus and Western text's D 05; whereas the variant is found in the Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus. On the basis of the neo-Alexandrians general rule that "the shorter reading is the better reading," the variant was adopted in the neo-Alexandrians' NU Text *et al*. On the one hand it is possible to translate the "*de*" e.g., "Then (*de*) Pilate said unto them" (Geneva Bible, 1560); but on the other hand, it is possible to regard the "*de*" as redundant in English translation e.g., "Pilate said unto them" (Tyndale 1526 & AV 1611). Of these two possibilities, I personally prefer that of translating it as "Then," so that on this occasion I prefer the rendering of the Geneva Bible (1560) over that of the AV (1611). Nevertheless, to the extent that there is no necessary difference in translation, I have on this occasion exercised a discretion and put this variant in Appendix 3 rather than in the main part of the commentary. We thus find that either way, it is possible to give a rendering of "Pilate said unto them" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 28:1 the TR's "*Maria* (Mary)," in the wider reference to "Mary (*Maria*) Magdalene," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, K 017; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). The TR's reading is found in the Alexandrian text's Codex Vaticanus and Western text's D 05, and hence Westcott-Hort. However a variant reading, "*Mariam* (Mary)," is found in the Alexandrian text's Codex Sinaiticus, and hence Tischendorf's 8th ed., Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text. But either way, the rendering will still be "Mary."

At Matt. 28:2a the TR's "*proselthon* ('coming' = 'and came')" i.e., "and came," in the wider words, "the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door and sat upon it" (AV), is MBT (e.g., A 02, Sigma 042, Y 034; & Lectionaries 2378& 1968). However, a variant reading, "*kai* (and) *proselthon* ('coming' = 'came')," is a minority Byzantine reading (W 032). The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text

---

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

et al. But either way, the rendering will still be "and came" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 28:3a the TR's "*idea* ('countenance' or 'appearance,' feminine singular nominative noun, from *idea*, derived from *eido*[136])" is MBT (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, F 09; & Lectionaries 2378[137] & 1968). However, a variant reading "*eidea* ('appearance' or 'face' / 'countenance,' feminine singular nominative noun, from *eidea*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., A 02 & Minuscule 2). The variant is also found at the hands of "corrector" scribes of both the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus (which originally read "*eide*" with a probable "a" loss by ellipsis on the next word, "*autou*" / "his") & Sinaiticus (which was originally blank here); and it is also found in the Western text's D 05; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering will still be "countenance" (AV & TR) or "appearance" (ASV & W-H) from either word. (For *countenance / face* from *eidea*, see e.g., the NEB & REB.) Thus the Greek here resembles the Latin, "*aspectus*" (e.g., Vulgate & Gregory), which likewise can mean either "countenance" / "face" or "appearance."

At Matt. 28:3b the TR's "*osei* ('as,' a compound particle derived from *os* / 'as' + *ei* / 'if')," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, Gamma 036; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). However, a variant reading "*os* ('as,' a particle of comparison)," is a minority Byzantine reading (K 017 & Pi 041). 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 will still be "as," in the wider words, "and his raiment white as snow" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 28:4a the TR's "*egenonto* ('they became' = 'became,' a deponent verb with active meaning[138], indicative <u>middle</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *ginomai*)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, Minuscule 28; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968[139]). However, a variant reading "*egenethesan* ('they became' = 'became,' a deponent verb with active meaning[140], indicative <u>passive</u> aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *ginomai*),"

---

[136] Our English word, "idea," comes via the Latin, "*idea* (idea)," which in turn comes from the Greek, "*idea* (e.g., 'form' or 'look' or 'countenance')."

[137] In the reading of Lectionary 2378 (p. 96b, column 1), the initial iota is very thick, being about twice as thick as a normal iota (ι). *Prima facie* it could be either an accidental eta "н", which the scribe then "coloured in" to make it an iota, or the accidental repetition of the iota as "ιι", in which the scribe then corrected this error of dittography by "colouring in" the space between the two iotas. Either way, the manuscript clearly supports the TR's reading. Original checked at Sydney University.

[138] Young's *Greek*, p. 135 (middle deponent).

[139] As a local dialect revowelling, Lectionary 1968 revowels the final omicron of "*egenonto*" to an omega, thus reading "*egenont<u>o</u>*".

[140] Young's *Greek*, p.136 (passive deponent, *egen<u>eth</u>en*; the aorist passive of

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 rendering will still be "became," in the wider words, "and <u>became</u> as dead *men*" (AV & TR, showing AV's italics for added word) or "and <u>became</u> as dead men" (ASV & W-H, showing ASV's non-usage of italics for added word "men").

At Matt. 28:4b the TR's "<u>*os*</u>*ei* ('as,' a compound particle derived from <u>*os*</u> / 'as' + *ei* / 'if')," is MBT (e.g., Sigma 042 & Gamma 036; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968[141]). However, a variant reading "<u>*os*</u> ('as,' a particle of comparison)," is a minority Byzantine reading (A 02 & W 032). 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 will still be "as," in the wider words, "and became <u>as</u> dead *men*" (AV & TR, showing AV's italics for added word,) or "and became <u>as</u> dead men" (ASV & W-H, showing ASV's non-usage of italics for added word "men").

At Matt. 28:8 the TR's "*exelthousai* ('departing' = 'they departed,' feminine plural nominative, active aorist participle, from *exerchomai*)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, U 030; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). However, a variant, "*apelthousai* ('departing' = 'they departed,' feminine plural nominative, active aorist participle, from *aperchomai*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (Lectionary 751, 11th century & Lectionary 547, 13th century). Was there a paper fade so that the "*exelthousai*" came to look something like, "::*elthousai*"? Was the scribe then influenced by the usage of *aperchomai* at e.g., the nearby text of Matt. 27:60 ("*app<u>e</u>lthen*" / "departed," indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *aperchomai*) in a "reconstruction"? The variant is also found in the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But though the UBS 4th revised edition (1993) makes much of this variant, either way, the rendering will still be "they departed" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 28:9c the TR's "*ap<u>e</u>nt<u>e</u>sen* ('he met' = 'met,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apanta<u>o</u>*)," is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, K 017; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968). However a variant, "*up<u>e</u>nt<u>e</u>sen* ('he met' = 'met,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *'upanta<u>o</u>*)," is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., Sigma 042 & Pi 041). The variant is followed by the Alexandrian text's Codices Vaticanus & Sinaiticus; and hence the NU Text *et al.* But either way, the rendering will still be "met," in the wider words, "behold, Jesus <u>met</u> them" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 28:11 the TR's "*ap<u>e</u>ggeilan* ('they reported' = 'they shewed,' AV,

---

ginomai is declined from *egen<u>e</u>th<u>e</u>n*, Mounce's *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT*, p. 126).

[141] In Lectionary 1968, this is written at Matt. 28:3b, *supra*, as "ωσει," but just two lines down the page (p. 200b) it is written here at Matt. 28:4b as something like "ωcq" in which the "q" is a combined "c" (sigma) and "ı" (iota). Such are the potential diversities of script from the hand of the same scribe in a handwritten manuscript.

indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *apaggello / apangello*),” is MBT (e.g., Codices A 02, W 032 written as “*ap<u>e</u>ggeilon*[142],” Sigma 042; Minuscules 1010 & 597; & Lectionaries 2378 & 1968[143]).   However, a variant “*an<u>e</u>ggeilan* (‘they told’ or ‘they reported,’ indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *anaggello / anangello*),” is found in e.g., Origen.   The TR’s reading is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codex Vaticanus; whereas the variant is found in the Alexandrian text’s Codex Sinaiticus, and Western text’s D 05.   This split in the two main Alexandrian texts caused a lot of fuss and fuming among the neo-Alexandrians, as seen in the fact that the UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993) *makes much ado about* these two readings, finally settling on the correct reading for the wrong reasons.   Indeed, from the perspective of the neo-Alexandrian paradigm, with the weight of “external evidence” largely favouring the TR’s reading here, it was adopted in the NU Text *et al*.   But either way, the rendering will still be the same.

At Matt. 28:15 the TR’s “*mechri* (until) *t<u>e</u>s* (‘the,’ redundant in English translation) *s<u>e</u>meron* (‘today’ = ‘this day’),” is MBT (e.g., Codices A 02, W 032 spelling “*mechri*” with the optional “*s*” / sigma at the end as “*mechris*”, Sigma 042; Minuscules 1010 & 597; & Lectionaries 2378[144] & 1968).   However, a variant reading, “*mechri* (until) *t<u>e</u>s* (‘the,’ redundant in English translation) *s<u>e</u>meron* (‘today’ = ‘this day’) <u>e</u>*meras* (‘of the day,’ redundant in English translation),” is a minority Byzantine reading (Lectionary 7, 1204 A.D.).   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.

This split in the two main Alexandrian texts was resolved at Matt. 28:15 by

---

[142]   Is this an accidental scribal slip?   Or is this a local dialect <u>second aorist</u> form declined from “*ap<u>e</u>ggeilon*” as opposed to the standard <u>first aorist</u> form declined from *ap<u>e</u>ggeila*?   (Neither Liddell & Scott’s *Greek-English Lexicon* nor Mounce’s *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* makes any reference to a second aorist form of *apaggello*; although this is not conclusive since a local dialect might still have used a second aorist form.)   Or is there another better explanation?

[143]   In Lectionary 1968 (p. 201a), this is written something like, “απηгΓqλαμ” (in which “q” = “c” / epsilon + “ι” / iota, and the final nu lacks a right hand bar on the “μ” which I have here written as a mu).   It is notable that in the double gamma “гΓ” there is a large gamma after a small gamma, a fact reminding us that in “the real world” of handwritten manuscripts, scribal variations of writing style may occur very close to each other.   This is all very different to standard seminary Greek where this word is simply written as, “απηγγειλαν” (or with breathings as “ἀπήγγειλαν”).

[144]   In Lectionary 2379 this is written (at p. 97a, column 1) something like, “σнμ_ρομ” (but without the right hand bar of the final “μ” which is thus a nu), and the epsilon after the mu “μ_” (which is here joined to a longer right hand bar than normal which I represent imperfectly as “μ_”), and before the rho “ρ”, has inserted above the line a “c” shaped epsilon.

Tischendorf following his "beloved" Codex Sinaiticus and hence for the wrong reasons, the right reading of the TR in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). By contrast, Westcott & Hort were "heart-wrenchingly torn" between their desire to follow their "beloved" Codex Vaticanus, and their desire to follow the Alexandrian School's general rule, "The shorter reading is the better reading." This "great struggle" was resolved by Westcott & Hort placing "_emeras_" in square brackets as optional in Westcott-Hort (1881). This "brilliant solution" was much liked by later neo-Alexandrians, and so it is also found in Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

The terminology of the variant at Matt. 28:15 is not Matthean (Matt. 11:23; 27:8), but Pauline (Rom. 11:8). The fact that one of the two main Alexandrian texts here conflates Matt. 28:15 to this terminology, and both Alexandrian texts conflate II Cor. 3:14 to this terminology (which was adopted at II Cor. 3:14 by the NU Text *et al*), indicates that conflation to this terminology was a penchant of the ancient Alexandrian school of scribes. But either way, at Matt. 28:15 the rendering will still be "until this day" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

At Matt. 28:18 the TR's "_ges_ (earth)," in the wider words of Christ, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth" (AV), is MBT (e.g., A 02, W 032, Sigma 042, E 07; Lectionary 2378, twice in two different readings; & Lectionary 1968, twice in two different readings). However a variant, "_tes_ ('the,' redundant in English translation) _ges_ (earth)," is found in Eusebius. 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 it is found in square brackets as optional in Westcott-Hort, Nestle's 21st ed., and the NU Text. But either way, the rendering will still be "earth" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E (Matt. 26-28).
(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. 26:3   {A}
Matt. 26:8   {A}
Matt. 26:9b   {B}
Matt. 26:17a   {A}
Matt. 26:20   {A}
Matt. 26:22   {B}
Matt. 26:26b {B}*
Matt. 26:27   {A}
Matt. 26:28b   {A}
Matt. 26:33b {B}*
Matt. 26:38   {B}*
Matt. 26:42a   {A}

Matt. 26:42b {A}
Matt. 26:43   {A}
Matt. 26:44b {A}
Matt. 26:45a {A}
Matt. 26:53a {A}
Matt. 26:53b {A}
Matt. 26:55b {A}
Matt. 26:59a {A}
Matt. 26:60a {A}
Matt. 26:60c {A}
Matt. 26:61b {A}
Matt. 26:63   {A}
Matt. 26:65b {A}
Matt. 26:70   {B}*
Matt. 26:71c {A}
Matt. 26:75b {A}
Matt. 27:2a   {B}
Matt. 27:2b   {A}
Matt. 27:4a   {B}
Matt. 27:5   {A}
Matt. 27:9,10 {A}
Matt. 27:11b {A}
Matt. 27:16,17{A}
Matt. 27:22   {B}
Matt. 27:23   {A}
Matt. 27:24   {A}
Matt. 27:34a {A}
Matt. 27:35b {B}*
Matt. 27:40   {A}
Matt. 27:41a {B}
Matt. 27:41b {A}*
Matt. 27:42a {A}
Matt. 27:42b {A}*
Matt. 27:43   {A}
The AV's
"lama" at both
Matt. 27:46b &
Mark 15:34c {-}
Matt. 27:49   {A}
Matt. 27:56   {B}
Matt. 27:57   {A}
Matt. 27:58   {A}
Matt. 27:64   {B}
Matt. 28:2b   {A}
Matt. 28:6a   {A}
Matt. 28:6b   {A}

Matt. 28:7   {A}
Matt. 28:9a   {A}
Matt. 28:14   {A}
Matt. 28:17   {A}
Matt. 28:19   {A}*
Matt. 28:20   {A}

Appendix 5: DEDICATION SERMON.
A Sermon preached for Dedication of Vol. 4 (Matt. 26-28) on Monday 6 February (Accession Day), 2012, at Mangrove Mountain Union Church, Mangrove Mountain (just north of Sydney, near Gosford), New South Wales, Australia.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen. *Let us pray* for Queen Elizabeth II, Supreme Governor of the Church of England. "Blessed Lord, who hast called Christian Princes to the defence of thy Faith, and hast made it their duty to promote the spiritual welfare, together with the temporal interest of their people; we acknowledge with humble and thankful hearts thy great goodness to us, in setting thy Servant our most gracious Queen over us; Give her, we beseech thee, all those heavenly graces that are requisite for so high a trust; let the work of thee her God prosper her hands; let her eyes behold the success of her designs for the service of thy true religion as established by law in the *Church of England's* historic formularies of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion and Book of Common Prayer; and make her a blessed instrument of protecting and advancing thy truth, wherever it is persecuted and oppressed; let hypocrisy and profaneness, superstition and idolatry, fly before her face; let not heresies and false doctrines disturb the peace of the Church, nor schisms and causeless divisions weaken it; but grant us to be of one heart and one mind in serving thee our God, and obeying her according to thy will: and that these blessings may be continued to after-ages, let there never be one wanting in her house to succeed her in the government, that our posterity may see her children's children, and peace upon Israel. So we that are thy people, and sheep of thy pasture, shall give thee thanks for ever, and will always be shewing forth thy praise from generation to generation. Amen.[145]"

Let me start by thanking Alex Neil, who is conducting today's inter-Protestant church service, and who's a Free Presbyterian Elder; and on this 60th Accession Day anniversary of the Sovereign it was great to sing the song, "God Save the Queen." The roses that you see on lapels and the other pink roses inside the church today are the Queen Elizabeth rose, named after Queen Elizabeth II.

Today I want to make reference to a number of anniversaries. Firstly, the 100th anniversary of this church in 2012. In conjunction with my mother, I'm giving the piano in the corner next to the organ to this church. A golden plaque on it reads, [quote] "This piano was presented to Mangrove Mountain Union Church on the occasion of its *1912-2012 CENTENARY* by Gavin McGrath. A school teacher by profession, Gavin is an independent lay preacher and Evangelical Anglican who sometimes preaches here. It was bought for his matrilineal grandmother, Alma Davis (1890-1986) around 1900, after winning 1st prize at a Sydney Exhibition. It was the first German iron-frame piano put in a Beale piano case. Alma Davis was an Evangelical Anglican Sunday School teacher

---

[145] A Collect modified from the Accession Service, commanded to be printed and published and annexed to the Book of Common Prayer of 1662 by Royal Warrant of Queen Victoria on 17 Jan. 1859, revoking her earlier Royal Warrant of 21 June 1837, but preserving her earlier Royal Warrant of 1837 for the *Accession Service*.

& church organist at St. Bede's Drummoyne in Sydney in the early 1900s.   She gave this piano to Gavin (b. 1960) and his mother Betty (b. 1924) in the early 1970s. 'The will of the Lord is … singing and making melody … to the Lord' (Eph. 5:17,19; 1611 Authorized Version); 'Praise him upon the strings' (Ps. 150:4; 1662 Book of Common Prayer)." [unquote]   And a little bit later I'll be making reference to some 1662 prayer books I've got through both my mother and this same grandmother.

Secondly, the 400th anniversary of the King James Version which has just passed in 2011, and the 350th anniversary of the King James Version as the Authorized Version is this year of 2012. With regard to the 400th anniversary of 1611 to 2011 which has just passed, Cambridge University Press brought out a special Transetto edition, and the Trinitarian Bible Society brought out a special Commemorative Edition, and you can see a photo of myself holding both of those 400th anniversary King James editions at St. Matthew's Windsor, in which I'm standing in front of the 1821 printed original King James Version Lectern Bible of that Church.   Now my second textual commentaries volume on Matthew 15 to 20 was dedicated on *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, 2009; and this photo of myself with the two 400th anniversary King James Bibles was taken on *Papists' Conspiracy Day*, Saturday 5 November 2011, in memory of the foiled attempt of the Papists to kill King James in the Guy Fawkes Gunpowder Plot of 1605.   You see, once King James I decided in 1604 to produce the King James Version, *hell unleashed its fury*, as Papists sought to murder the Protestant king the next year in 1605.   And you can see that photo at my textual commentaries website of http://www.easy.com.au/~gmbooks/ [2015 update: http://www.gavinmcgrathbooks.com] or on Yahoo or Google type in "Gavin McGrath Books".   And "Remember, remember the fifth of November, The gunpowder treason and plot;" because if you hold in your hand a King James Bible, you're holding in your hand a *Protestant* Bible, that *the unleashed fury of hell* tried to stop the very next year after King James commissioned its translation with the Roman Catholic Guy Fawkes Papists' Conspiracy of 5 November 1605. [pause]

In the late 16th and early 17th centuries, among English speaking Protestants, the Geneva Bible of 1560 had largely, though not entirely become, the Puritans' Bible, and the Bishops' Bible of 1568 had largely become the Anglicans' Bible.   The Bishops' Bible was produced by the Archbishop of Canterbury, His Grace, Matthew Parker, Archbishop from 1559 to 1575, together with other Anglican bishops, Deans, and others. Matthew Parker was a Marian Confessor, having been forced under the Romish Queen, Bloody Mary to resign his position at Cambridge University because of his Protestantism. He's thus one of those referred to in the 1559 Act of Uniformity traditionally printed at the front of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, which refers to [quote] "the Professors of the truth of Christ's religion" who suffered "discomfort" under "Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God."   But in the Hampton Court Conference of 1604, King James I agreed to a request that found favour with both Anglicans and Puritans, to translate a new Bible, which from 1611 became the King James Version.   And from this, the King James Bible gained the support of *both* Puritan Protestants and Anglican Protestants, so that with this broad Protestant support base, in time it became *the* Protestant Bible among English speaking Protestant Christians.

Moreover, Cranmer's prayer book of 1552 was hated by the Roman Catholics because of its Protestantism, and so taken away under Bloody Mary, who martyred Cranmer for his Protestantism, so the Marian martyr, Thomas Cranmer, is also one of those referred to in the 1559 Act of Uniformity traditionally printed at the front of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, which refers to [quote] "the Professors of the truth of Christ's religion" who suffered "discomfort" under "Queen Mary, to the great decay of the due honour of God." Cranmer's prayer book was then reintroduced with revisions in 1559 and 1662, and thus the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* is a symbol of the triumph of Protestantism over Romanism. And so too the *Accession Day* of Elizabeth I in 1558, which was 17 November, remained a holiday long after the death of Elizabeth I in 1603 because it was remembered as the day that Protestantism was restored over Popery.

In the end, the *Accession Day* of Elizabeth I, 17 November, did not endure as such a widespread symbol of Protestantism, although it's still kept as "Queene's Day" at Berry Pomeroy in England, where celebrations start with a *Church of England* service and climax with a bonfire in which an effigy of the Devil is burnt[146]. However, as a more widespread symbol of Protestantism, Cranmer's prayer book of 1552, as revived and revised in the Elizabethan prayer book of 1559, and later Caroline prayer book of 1662, did endure as a symbol of Protestantism triumphing over Popery, and is with us to this very day. And notably, the 1662 prayer book made the King James Version, the Authorized Version. For while its origins in 1552 means that many of the Bible verses in the 1662 prayer book are from Henry VIII's Great Bible which was edited by Coverdale; it's also the case that some of the Bible verses in the services were updated to the King James Version, such as most of the Bible verses at the start of Mattins or Evensong. The Preface of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* says [quote] "such portions of holy Scripture, as are inserted into the Liturgy, … are now ordered to be read according to the last translation" [unquote]. This refers to the Scriptures read in services. This made the King James Version of 1611 "the Authorized Version." Thus we read on the title page of the King James Version, [quote] "Appointed to be read in Churches" [unquote]. Hence the 350th anniversary celebration of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* which spans both 2011 and 2012 because the work of the 1661 *Savoy Conference* preceded the 1662 prayer book, also celebrates the 350th anniversary of the King James

---

[146] See Preface 5, "Accession Day Principles," at Berry Pomeroy, as now modified by Update 2015; & also my later sermon of 20 Sept. 2012 at Mangrove Mtn Union Church (in Textual Commentaries, Volume 5, Appendix 7,) in which I say: "… let me make the announcement that though in my sermon earlier this year on Elizabeth II's Accession Day 2012, I referred to Queene's Day Celebrations for Elizabeth I at Berry Pomeroy in England as ongoing, I've recently learnt that the guy who revived and ran them, and was a lay-preacher there, unexpectedly passed away several years ago aged 41, and so in fact I must now make the correction that such celebrations no longer exist there. But as I also noted in that earlier sermon, Cranmer's prayer book of 1552, as revived in 1559 and preserved for us in the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, has endured as a much wider symbol of Protestantism triumphing over Popery."

Version as the Authorized Version, after the 1661 *Savoy Conference* decided to use the King James Version for the Lessons or Readings in the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*.

In the many attacks made on the Authorized Version, one of them is its name as the Authorized Version. Typical of this kind of disinformation, in the "Introduction" of the religiously liberal Moffatt Bible of 1935, Moffatt says, [quote] "the so-called 'authorized version' … was never authorized, by king, parliament, or convocation" [unquote]. And that lie has been spread repeatedly by others. In fact, the 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer's* Preface which made the King James Version the Authorized Version was approved by all three, and so as at 1662 it was in fact the version Authorized by King, Parliament, and Convocation. It is, by virtue of that authorization, that the words, [quote] "Appointed to be read in Churches" [unquote], meaning Anglican Churches, are placed on the title page of King James Versions. And I also note that when in 1952 Queen Elizabeth II was crowned in the *Church of England's* Westminster Abbey in London, an Authorized King James Version of the Bible was handed to her, and the Presbyterian Moderator of the *Church of Scotland* said, [quote] "Our gracious Queen, to keep Your Majesty ever mindful of the law and the Gospel of God as the rule for the whole of life and government of Christian princes, we present you with this Book, the most valuable thing that this world affords. Here is wisdom, here is the royal law. These are the lively Oracles of God" [unquote]. [pause]

The fourth anniversary I mention is St. Matthew's Day, which on 21 September is a red-letter day with its own Collect and Communion readings from the Authorized Version provided in the lectionary of the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*. I mention this because today I'm dedicating the fourth and final textual commentary on the Received Text of the AV on the holy Gospel according to St. Matthew, which covers St. Matthew 26 to 28. Now one of the Low Church Evangelical Anglican Churches that I attend 1662 prayer book services at is St. Matthew's Windsor in western Sydney. And by tradition they annually hold, "St. Matthew's Fair," and that's generally done in September the same month as St. Matthew's Day; and you can see some photos of the 2011 St. Matthew's Fair at my textual commentaries website. And in this context, I also note "the four beasts" of Revelation 4:7 are traditionally used to symbolize the four Gospels, and also manifest certain parts of the *Nicene Creed*. In the Western tradition of the church doctors St. Jerome and St. Gregory, or the *Book of Armagh* which reproduces these symbols in John Gwynn's edition, St. Matthew's Gospel is symbolized by the "face" of "a man," and in harmony with Matthew 1, the *Nicene Creed* says, "Jesus Christ … was made man." And I note Matthew 10:28 divides a man into a dichotomy of "body" and "soul," and this relates to the orthodox definition of Christ's humanity in the *Athanasian Creed* as, [quote] "man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting" [unquote].

And that now brings me to the fifth anniversary, namely, the 60th anniversary or the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Elizabeth II that we are remembering this year in general, and today in particular on *Accession Day*, Monday 6 February, 2012. If you look at the section in this Volume 4 of my textual commentaries at "Dedication: The Anglican Calendar," under subsection 5, entitled, "Accession Day Principles," you'll find I discuss the fact that the Queen's overall record is a mix of good and bad. But our loyalty to the

Crown derives from our greater loyalty to God who tells us in I Peter 2:17, to "Honour the king." The Queen's good includes her generally modest and dignified dress standards, clean and gracious language, sexual purity as a virgin at her marriage followed by the absence of any adulterous scandal by her; and unlike a secularist President, being *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* some of her Christmas Message statements, e.g., last Christmas on Australian TV on 25 December 2011 she gave a free quote of Luke 2:10,11, and said, [quote] "God sent into the world a unique person, … a Saviour with the power to forgive. Forgiveness lies at the heart of the Christian faith …; in the last verse of this beautiful carol, 'O little town of Bethlehem,' there's a prayer, 'O holy child of Bethlehem, descend to us we pray, cast out our sin, and enter in, be born in us today.' It is my prayer, that on this Christmas Day, we might all find room in our lives for the message of the angels and for the love of God through Christ our Lord" [unquote].

I also note in Volume 3 of my textual commentaries at Matthew 21:7, that St. Matthew puts an emphasis on Christ's kingly elements. This is seen e.g., in the Matthew 1 royal genealogy of his foster-father, St. Joseph, which refers to "David the king;" or he's called in Matt. 2:2, "King of the Jews;" or Matt. 21:5 says, "Behold, thy King cometh." Or in Matthew 2 we learn of "wise men" whom we count to be three in number because they presented three gifts. And while Ps. 72 and Isa. 60 have fulfilments at the First and Second Advents, we know from Ps. 72:10 as found in the Matt. 2 typology pointing to similar, but numerically larger things after the Second Advent, in which white Japhetic kings from the Gen. 10:4,5 Tarshish and isles of the Gentiles, a brown Semitic king from the Gen. 25:3 Sheba, and a black Hamitic king from the Gen. 10:7 Seba, will bring presents to Christ; that at the First Advent the three wise men were a white Japhetic king, a brown Semitic king, and a black Hamitic king. In the 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* Calendar for *Epiphany* on 6 January, the Gospel reading for Communion is Matt. 2:1-12; the First Lesson for Mattins is Isa. 60, and the First Lesson for Evensong is Isa. 49:13-23. The spiritual "light" of Isa. 60:3 is found in the symbol of "a star" in Num. 24:17; an idea captured in the Refrain of the Christmas carol, "We Three Kings": "O star of wonder, star of night, star with royal beauty bright, westward leading, still proceeding, guide us to thy perfect light;" and Isa. 60:6 results in their traditional depiction on camels; and the Establishment Principle of Isa. 49:22,23 under which e.g., the Sovereign is *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and so remembered on *Accession Day*, is also pointed to in a miniature fulfilment with these three kings of Matthew 2 coming to Christ at his Epiphany or Manifestation to the Gentiles. So these three Gentile kings first rendezvoused "east" of "Jerusalem" (Matt. 2:1,2), then followed the star to the manger of Christ the King.

In Revelation 19:16 St. John the Divine calls Christ the "King of Kings." And so with a certain appropriateness, my four volumes on St. Matthew's Gospel have been dedicated to God with special reference to Protestant Christian monarchs: Volume 1 on *King Charles I's Day* 2008 and 2010, Volume 2 on *Papists' Conspiracy Day* 2009 in special memory of King James I and King William III of Orange; Vol. 3 on *Royal Oak Day* 2011 in special memory of the Restoration under King Charles II; and this Volume 4 on the Accession Day of Queen Elizabeth II in 2012. In Genesis 17:5 & 6; and 35:11, God promised Abraham that he would be "a father of many nations," and that "kings

shall come out of" him. This general promise of Abraham being "a father of many nations," is applied in the New Testament in a spiritual way to all Christians, both Jews and Gentiles, in for example, Romans 4; and so this naturally creates the expectation that there will be some Gentile Christian kings as further taught in Isaiah 49:22 & 23.

When we talk about the "Accession" of a monarch, we mean the time that one monarch accedes or takes over from their predecessor, which usually occurs at the death of the predecessor, though it might occur at their predecessor's abdication, for example, in 1936 Edward VIII abdicated in his first regnal year and so no anniversary *Accession Service* was ever held for him. If you look at my website you'll see there some pictures I took in February 2009 at Kingston-Upon-Thames in London, of the old Saxon Coronation Stone where seven Saxon kings were crowned in the 10th century, and also some mosaic pictures of them. When you look at the mosaic tiles of Edward the Elder crowned 900, Athelstan crowned 925, Edmund crowned 940, Edred crowned 946, Edwy crowned 956, Edward crowned 975, and Etheldred the Unready crowned 979, you get a good sense for the idea of Accession. And I should mentioned that in recognition of the Biblical teaching to "Honour the king," the sixth of these seven Saxon kings, Edward, King of the West Saxons, has two black letters days on the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* Calendar. The first one, 18 March, remembers how his evil step-mother, Elfrida, murdered this 16 year old young king while he was drinking the stirrup cup; and so in the mosaics he's pictured being given a stirrup cup by her; and his remains were later translated to Shaftsbury, remembered on the 1662 Anglican Calendar on 20 June. So to get an artistic depiction of Accession, have a look at those Kingston mosaics on my website.

Now one of the notable things about the Kingston mosaics, and indeed the monarchs of England before Henry VIII, is that they are all kings, there are no crowned queens. This raises the issue of Biblical patriarchy and how to apply it to the monarchy. With reference to Genesis 2 & 3, in I Tim. 2:8-3:13 St. Paul teaches that patriarchal structures are to apply in the church and that they transcend cultural values as they are based in the Creation and the Fall. And the same teaching is also found in I Corinthians 11:1-16. Therefore, patriarchal structures *should* more widely apply in the society under the Christian Establishment Principle of Psalm 2:10-12 and Isaiah 49:23. However, Scripture makes a lone exception to this in rare and unusual circumstances seemingly emanating from necessity with Deborah as a judge or ruler in Judges 4 & 5; although even here certain powers are located in Barak who is the judge itemized in Hebrews 11:32. In applying these type of principles, King Henry VIII who reigned from 1509 to 1547, essentially gave us the present system of male or female succession, in which a male priority upholds Biblical patriarchy; but if there is no male heir in the immediate Royal Family, then due to a necessity, the eldest female becomes a crowned Queen; although even here, as also with a king, certain powers are located in the Parliament. Another view of Scripture, looks to the closest related male outside the immediate Royal Family. So before Henry VIII it was male heirs only, and then after Henry VIII, it was a male priority, but if there was no male heir in the immediate royal family, then succession went to the females in order of their seniority. Thus both the male heirs only model that applied before Henry VIII, or the male priority model that applied after Henry

VIII, both seek to uphold the broad Biblical teachings of patriarchy. For example, Queen Elizabeth I who reigned from 1558 to 1603, or Queen Anne who reigned from 1702 to 1714, seeking to be subject to God's Word, both upheld general patriarchal structures in society. They were not feminists seeking the removal of such patriarchy; they were not like feminists in violation of the 8th and 10th commandments, coveting and seeking to steal patriarchal positions from men, and give them to women. For feminists are among those of whom we read in I Corinthians 6:9 & 10, "Be not deceived: neither … thieves, nor covetous, … shall inherit the kingdom of God." [pause]

Now the highest liturgical honour that can be bestowed on a day in the 1662 prayer book, is that of a red-letter day with its own Office, historically attached to the 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* by Royal Warrant of the reigning Sovereign. This honour has always been reserved for *Protestant* figures. Before 1859 the red-letter day Offices of *King Charles Martyr's Day* on 30 January and *The King's Restoration Day* or *Royal Oak Day* on 29 May, both largely celebrated *Anglican* Protestantism as opposed to *Puritan* Protestantism; although notwithstanding the first civil war of 1642 to 1646 in which many Scots fought for Cromwell's side, the majority Presbyterian Puritan group in the *Church of Scotland* were historically also loyalists and royalists in the latter era of the 1640s and 1650s. And of course *Royal Oak Day* celebration of a legally Protestant throne is important in understanding that because the Roman Catholic James II refused to meet those legal obligations, he first *de jure* abdicated from the legally Protestant throne, and then *de facto* abdicated by deserting his post when fleeing from London and discarding the Great Seal in the River Thames. And after 1688, the associated Accession to the throne of Mary II and William III of Orange, with the coming of William of Orange on 5 November 1688, was also integrated into celebrations of *Papists' Conspiracy Day* which before 1859 was a red-letter day with its own Office, and it had a broad-Protestant appeal celebrating God's protection of Protestantism against Popery in 1605 and 1688. Furthermore, in the *Church of Ireland* there was the red-letter day of *Irish Massacre Day* on 23 October from 1663 to 1859, and within these years it to had its own prayer book Office from 1666 to 1800, and a broad-Protestant appeal remembering the Papist massacre of Protestants in 1641. And after 1859 the continuation of the one remaining red-letter day with its own Office, *Accession Day*, has both Anglican Protestant and broad-Protestant elements to it.

And so both before and after 1859, this highest liturgical honour of a red letter day with its own office, has been given to the Accession Day of a reigning Sovereign. And so that raises the issue of what elements of Protestantism are being remembered on this day? And in broad terms, the answer is that the reigning monarch is the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith*, and so legally bound to the great Protestant symbols of the 1662 Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* and *39 Articles*. In more specific terms, we read in Article 37 of the Anglican 39 Articles, [quote] "The King's Majesty hath the chief power in the Realm of England, and other his Dominions, … whether … Ecclesiastical or Civil, … and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction. … The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm …" [unquote]. And so the basic point is, that while we can have the type of religious commitment to the truth that the proto-Protestant Waldensians had on the European

Continent before the Reformation, or the proto-Protestant Lollards had in England before the English Reformation, at the end of the day, we can never have religious freedom as Protestants so long as the Bishop of Rome has some kind of Papal jurisdiction over us. And so *Accession Day* of a reigning monarch, celebrates the fact that as the Supreme Governor of a Protestant Church, the *Church of England*, in England and its Dominions there was given a birth of religious freedom to Protestants who were, by the grace of God, at last free from the tyranny of the Roman Papacy.

And while it's true that in both church and state, the Sovereign is now very largely a titular or ceremonial figure, so that while the present monarch, Queen Elizabeth II, in the temporal realm is Head of State but in general practice the Parliament makes the law; and in the spiritual realm is *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith*, though in general practice the power in the Church of England is with the Convocations and Bishops, and so on; nevertheless, this remains an important symbolism of what in law is a legally Protestant Christian throne. For the purposes of such symbolism, especially when one is dealing with a largely titular or ceremonial monarch such as we now have; though it is deeply regrettable that the *Church of England* has apostasy in many quarters, the basic symbolism of a legally Protestant Christian throne is still usable because it points to what SHOULD BE. And one of the reasons why it remains important is that even though the Sovereign's contemporary role as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* is largely titular or ceremonial, it inhibits anyone else from holding that position and symbolism. Thus for example, a heathen Hindu or Buddhist isn't Head of State, nor is an infidel Mohammedan or Jew, nor is an agnostic or atheist. But rather, the imagery of the Head of State is that of a Christian. There's a Christian Cross on top of the monarch's crown, and we thank God for it!

And it's the Christian imagery of a Protestant. For even though it's now very largely titular or ceremonial, because the Sovereign is *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*, it means that nobody else is, such as the Pope of Rome. You see, the Sovereign is both a temporal and spiritual power; and because the monarch has a vast temporal realm, in, for example, Australia, which if one includes the *Australian Antarctic Territory*, is geographically the world's second largest country, and Canada which is then geographically the world's third largest country; as well as a spiritual realm in England as *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith*; in the battle of images and symbols, the monarch acts as an important counter-weight or counter-balance to the Pope, who also is both a temporal and spiritual power. The Roman Catholic Church and Pope *claims* to have a "universal" jurisdiction in the church, which is what the Preface of the King James Version is getting at when it refers to the Pope as the Antichrist of II Thessalonians 2:3 as "that man of sin," in the wider words, [quote] "James, by the Grace of God, King, … Defender of the Faith," "hath given such a blow unto that man of sin, as will not be healed;" "so … if," "we shall be traduced by Popish persons" "we may rest secure, supported within by the truth and innocency of a good conscience, having walked the ways of simplicity and integrity, as before the Lord" [unquote]. And so when, for example, the Papists try to put out the claim that the Pope has a universal spiritual jurisdiction in the church, in the battle of images, that claim is to some extent counter-balanced by holding up the monarch of the United Kingdom,

Canada, and Australia, and elsewhere, who being legally styled, *Defender of the Faith* in connection with being *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*, acts to help expose and counteract and counterbalance those Roman Catholic claims. *Well may we say, "God save the Queen;" because when Christ returns, nothing will save the Pope!*

Now don't misunderstand me, as Protestants we ultimately look in spiritual terms to Christ as the counter-balance to the Pope, for Christ is the only *universal bishop* whom we acknowledge, being called in I Peter 2:25, the "Bishop of … souls," and in Colossians 1:18, "the head of … the church." But in human terms here on earth, in the same way that before the Bishop of Rome got a jurisdiction as [quote] "universal bishop" [unquote] from the Eastern Emperor, Phocus, over the Patriarch of Constantinople in 607 A.D., so that the incumbent Bishop of Rome in 607, Boniface III, then became the first Pope as we generally use that term; just as before 607 the fact that the Patriarch of Constantinople was a big name religiously independent power from Rome, meant that in the battle of images, Rome clearly lacked a universal jurisdiction in the church; so likewise, the fact that the Sovereign of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and elsewhere is *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and legally styled, *Defender of the Faith*, acts in human terms to more easily and readily expose the false claims of the Roman Pope to a "universal" jurisdiction in the church; and thus as a clearly identifiable legally Protestant figure, the monarch helps to counteract and counterbalance these Papal claims. [pause]

Furthermore, if one looks at the *Accession Service* attached to the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*, one will see that the lessons include Romans 13:1-10, which says in verse 1, "let every soul be subject unto the higher powers;" and in verse 7, "Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom: fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour." Another of the *Accession Service* lessons which is provided from the King James Version is Matthew 22:16-22, which includes Christ's words of verse 21, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." And also provided from the Authorized Version as a lesson is I Peter 2:11-17, which includes verse 17, "Fear God. Honour the king." And so the *Accession Service* is also a manifestation of Protestant theology through reference to these Biblical passages in the Office, because as a manifestation of our Protestant belief in the absolute authority of Holy Scripture, we "Honour the king," and thus honour the reigning monarch in accordance with the dictates of Holy Scripture. For we read in I John 2:4, "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." And of course, we of the holy Protestant Christian faith are very conscious of the fact that *we do not keep God's laws in order to be saved, rather, we keep God's laws because we are saved by God's unmerited favour or grace, accepted by faith alone.* For in the words of 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."

Now when a monarch accedes to the throne, from the time of their Accession, is known as the first regnal year. So, for example, with Queen Elizabeth II, she acceded to the throne on 6 February 1952, and her first regnal year was from 6 February 1952 to 5 February 1953, and then on her first anniversary as Sovereign from 6 February 1953, she started her second regnal year, and so on. So that today, 6 February 2012, on her 60th

anniversary, she starts her 61st regnal year.   Now if you look at my website, you'll see some photos taken 12 months ago, on *Accession Day*, 6 February 2011. These include photos taken at St. Philip's Church Hill, at York Street in the City, near the Sydney Harbour Bridge; and you'll see a picture on my website of a white Church Office built next to the old sandstone church, and that new building was Dedicated on the 20th *Accession Day* of Elizabeth II, 6 February, 1972, which commenced her 21st regnal year. Now I attended a 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* Service at St. Philip's Church Hill on 6 February 2011.   And 2011 was the 59th Anniversary of the Queen's Accession, and it commenced her 60th Regnal Year.   There are only two other monarchs who have reached 60 regnal years, one was King George III, who reigned from 1760 to 1820 and who died during his 60th regnal year; and Queen Victoria who reigned from 1837 to 1901 and who died during her 64th regnal year.   And so George III is the only king to have reached 60 regnal years; and Elizabeth II is one of only two crowned queens to have reached 60 regnal years.   So during the course of the last 12 months, Elizabeth II went from being the third longest reigning English monarch behind George III and Victoria, to being the second longest reigning monarch ahead of George III and behind Victoria. And so, although George III looks set to retain his place into the foreseeable future as the longest reigning English *king*; if the Lord tarries, and if the Lord so wills it, in another three to four years, the Queen of the United Kingdom, the Queen of Australia, and elsewhere, will become the longest reigning English *queen* and monarch in history.

Now Royal Warrants for Offices attached to the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* had to be, and still have to be, issued by every successive monarch.   And I have here ten 1662 prayer books.   The first six I shall refer to have come to me via both my matrilineal grandmother and mother, the 7th belongs to my mother, the 8th & 9th I shall refer to came to me from my mother, and the 10th one printed in 2008 was purchased by myself. And these ten 1662 prayer books are very useful for showing some relevant history on royal warrants from the time of Queen Victoria to our own day under Queen Elizabeth II.

Now these first three 1662 prayer books [*hold up*] contain two Accession Day Warrants for 20 June each year from Queen Victoria who reigned from 1837 to 1901. The first one dated at Kensington on 21 June 1837 says in part, [quote], "Our will and pleasure is, that these four forms of prayer service, made for the fifth of November, the thirtieth of January, and the twenty-ninth of May, and the twentieth of June, be forthwith printed and published and annexed to the Book of Common Prayer and Liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland, to be used yearly on the said days," [unquote] and specifically refers to Anglican Churches at [quote] "Oxford, Cambridge, … Dublin, … Eton and Winchester" [unquote]. And the second one, dated at St. James's on 17 January 1859, says in part, [quote], "whereas, in the last Session of Parliament, addresses were presented to us by both Houses of Parliament, … in relation to the said Forms of Prayer and Service made for the Fifth of November, the Thirtieth of January, and the Twenty-ninth day of May, with a view to their discontinuance: … now, therefore, our will … is, that so much of our said Royal Warrant of the twenty-first day of June one thousand eight hundred and thirty-seven, … be revoked, and that the use of the said Forms of Prayer and Service made for the Fifth of November, the Thirtieth of January, and the Twenty-ninth of May … be not henceforth printed and published with or annexed to the Book of

Common Prayer and Liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland" [unquote].

Now of course, there has been a continuance of these three days beyond these three services that they had before 1859. Anglican Churches named in honour of King Charles the Martyr continued to exist, and by local church tradition continued to remember 30 January; and then in 1962 in Canada, 1978 in Australia, and 1980 in England, 30 January was revived as a black letter day, and in England as an optional red-letter day. So too 29 May or Royal Oak Day continued to be celebrated in various places, and to this day receives royal patronage in the London Oak Apple Day Parade at the Royal Chelsea; the events of the Royal Oak are part of a secondary focus of *King Charles I's Day* which has now been revived in Australia, Canada, and England; and these events are also remembered in place names, such as Royal Oak restaurants e.g., the Royal Oak Grill at Rouse Hill in western Sydney. And 5 November is also remembered, for instance, in Bonfire Night which is still kept throughout England. And so there has been a continuation in the remembrance of these three days after 1859. However, since 1859 they have not received the status of the highest liturgical honour that the Anglican Church can bestow on a day, namely, a red letter day with its own Office or Service.

But I draw your attention to some notable features of this 1859 Royal Warrant. Firstly, the 1837 Royal Warrant refers to the Offices of 5 November, 30 January, 29 May, and then Victoria's Accession Day on 20 June; and then the second Royal Warrant of 1859 revokes those parts of the 1837 Royal Warrant for the Offices of 5 November, 30 January, and 29 May, but retains that part of the 1837 Royal Warrant for the Office of Victoria's *Accession Day* on 20 June. And so this 1859 Royal Warrant continues the pre-1859 position of giving *Accession Day* the highest liturgical honour that the Anglican Church can bestow on a day. The second thing I note about both the 1837 and 1859 Royal Warrants is that they make specific reference to some Anglican Churches in England at "Oxford," "Cambridge," "Eton and Winchester," and also in Ireland at "Dublin;" and in this context refer to [quote] "the United Church of England and Ireland" [unquote]. And so this reminds us that in 1707 the Kingdoms of England and Scotland were united into the Kingdom of Great Britain, and then from 1801 the Kingdom of Great Britain and Kingdom of Ireland became the United Kingdom. And as part of that union, from 1801 the *Church of England* and *Church of Ireland* united as the Established Church in England and Ireland under the name, "the United Church of England and Ireland," also known by the short title of, "the United Church," and the *Church of Ireland* lost its 1666 prayer book as the United Church used the 1662 prayer book

Now after these three 1662 prayer books I've got with the Royal Warrants of Victoria, I've also got these two 1662 prayer books [*hold up*] with the Royal Warrant for *Accession Day* on 22 January by Edward VII who reigned from 1901 to 1910. This Royal Warrant dated at Sandringham on 9 November, 1901, first revokes an earlier Royal Warrant of 29 January 1901, and then says that the Accession Service is to [quote], "be forthwith printed and published and annexed to the Book of Common Prayer and Liturgy of the Church of England, to be used yearly on the twenty-second day of January" [unquote], and then it makes some specific reference to [quote] "Churches and Chapels in England and Wales, and in the Town of Berwick-on-Tweed" [unquote]. Now the first

thing I would note about this Royal Warrant is that rather than referring to "the United Church of England and Ireland," the reference is simply to "the Church of England." And this tells us of the sad Disestablishment of the *Church of Ireland* in 1871. The second thing I would note is the specific reference to "the Town of Berwick-on-Tweed." If you want to know some more of the relevant information about Berwick-on-Tweed, then you'll find it in the Preface to this fourth Volume of my Textual Commentaries. Suffice to note here, that Berwick-upon-Tweed is also referred to in the 1662 Act of Uniformity, and it's a border town between England and Scotland. And the third thing I would note about this 1901 Edwardian Royal Warrant for *Accession Day*, is that it refers to [quote] "Churches and Chapels in England and Wales" [unquote]. And this reminds us that in the old Kingdom of England, Wales was a Dominion of England. That's why the Union Jack contains the Cross of St. Patrick for Ireland, or from 1922 Northern Ireland; the Cross of St. Andrew for Scotland; and the Cross of St. George for England. You see, Wales is covered under the Cross of St. George for England because it was formerly a Dominion of the Kingdom of England. And that's also why jokes are sometimes told about an Englishman, an Irishman, and a Scotsman. In that context, a Welshman is covered under "an Englishman." And as part of this, the Established *Church of England* included Wales; and hence in this Royal Warrant of 1901 reference is made to [quote] "Churches and Chapels in England and Wales" [unquote].

Now the sixth 1662 prayer book I've got passed down to me from my family history is this one [*hold up*] with a Royal Warrant for *Accession Day* on 6 May by George V who reigned from 1910 to 1936. This Royal Warrant, dated at Saint James's Palace in London on 23 June 1910, revokes an earlier Royal Warrant of 12 May 1910, and then authorizes the *Accession Service* [quote] "Forms of Prayer and Service hereunto annexed to the Book of Common Prayer and Liturgy of the Church of England, to be used yearly on the sixth day of May" [unquote], and then it makes some specific reference to [quote] "Churches and Chapels in England and Wales, and in the Town of Berwick-on-Tweed" [unquote]. Interestingly, this Royal Warrant of 1910 was given by the King through [quote] "Winston Spencer-Churchill" [unquote], who was then a Member of Parliament and the Home Secretary, and he later became the well known World War Two British Prime Minister who died in 1965[147].

And the seventh 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* that I have here, which is the only one I don't own because it belongs to my mother, is this one [*hold up*]. And for the purposes of dedicating the 2010 second edition of my book, "The Roman Pope is the Antichrist," which I dedicated after a 1662 prayer book service at St. Matthew's Windsor on the Eve of All Saints' Day, 2010 in memory of the start of the Reformation under Martin Luther on the Eve of All Saints' Day, 1517, my mother requested that I take and use this 1662 prayer book of hers at that service, which I was pleased to do. The covers of this 1662 prayer book are made from beautiful white ivory with a large embossed golden cross on its front cover. In the front, in the copperplate writing of my matrilineal grandfather, we read that this was given to my mother by her parents on 12 January 1952, which was her wedding day. This makes it one of the last prayer books ever produced

---

[147]   Winston Churchill (1874-1965) was Home Secretary, Feb. 1910 to Oct. 1911.

with the Georgian Royal Warrants because shortly later, in February of that year in 1952, Elizabeth II acceded to the throne. And so the Accession Day anniversaries of Elizabeth II and my mother's wedding anniversaries are tied to together. Thus father and she recently celebrated their 60th wedding anniversary on 12 January 2012, and they received a "Diamond Wedding Anniversary" card which says it is "specially designed for" "Australians," and signed by Queen "Elizabeth" II; and then now on 6 February 2012 we celebrate the 60th anniversary of the Queen's accession.

Now this white ivory covered 1662 prayer book [*hold up*] has a Royal Warrant for the *Accession Day* of George VI who reigned from 1936 to 1952. It's dated at Saint James's in London on 21 November 1947, and revokes an earlier Royal Warrant of 21 January 1937, and authorizes the *Accession Service* [quote] "Forms of Prayer and Service hereunto annexed to the Book of Common Prayer and Liturgy of the Church of England, to be used yearly on the eleventh day of December" [unquote], and then it makes some specific reference to [quote] "Churches and Chapels within the Provinces of Canterbury and York" [unquote]. Now what's notable about this 11 December *Accession Service* for George VI, is that the earlier reference to "England and Wales" is replaced by a reference simply to places inside of England in "Canterbury and York." And this tells us of the sad Disestablishment of the *Church of England* in Wales in 1920.

Now the eighth and ninth 1662 prayer books I've got here today are these two [*hold up*] which come to me just from my mother. I'm very familiar with them as the two working copies of the *Book of Common Prayer* that I used as a boy when I was growing up, and I also used as an adult for many years. They've both got the "Hymns Ancient & Modern" attached at the back which used to be the commonly used Hymnal of the Anglican Church, although it no longer is. Now these are both from the time of Queen Elizabeth II who's reigned since 6 February 1952, and whose 60th Accession anniversary we're celebrating today on 6 February 2012. But the Royal Warrants in these two prayer books are different. The first one in this maroon covered prayer book [*hold up*], is a Royal Warrant of Elizabeth II for the Accession Day Service annually on 6 February. It revokes an earlier Royal Warrant of 10 March 1952, and is dated at Saint James's in London on 12 June 1953. However, the second one in this black covered prayer book [*hold up*], is dated at Saint James's on 26 July 1958, and revokes this earlier Royal Warrant of 12 June 1953, in favour of a new Royal Warrant for the Accession Day Service to be [quote] "annexed to the Book of Common Prayer and Liturgy of the Church of England, to be used yearly on the sixth day of February" [unquote].

Now before I answer the question, "What is the difference between the Accession Day Office under the 1953 Royal Warrant of Elizabeth II compared to the 1958 Royal Warrant of Elizabeth II?," I would first make reference to this tenth 1662 prayer book which I have [*hold up*]. This is a 2004 Cambridge University Press edition, as reprinted in 2008, which I bought, and it's my present working copy of the 1662 prayer book. So if, for example, you read some citations from the *Book of Common Prayer* in this Volume 4 of my Textual Commentaries that we're dedicating today, then this is probably the copy of the 1662 prayer book that I had in front of me when I wrote that. I've found it necessary to glue in the front of it a copy of the 1559 Act traditionally printed in the 1662

prayer book, because for some strange reason this edition lacks it; so I photocopied it from one of these earlier editions, and glued it in the front. Furthermore, the correct Table of Kindred & Affinity was tragically altered by the *Church of England* in 1946, and this incorrect Table is published at the back of this prayer book; and so once again I photocopied the correct table, known as Parker's Table, from one of these earlier prayer books, and glued it in the back of this one opposite the incorrect revised table, so as to highlight those differences. And with those two modifications, by God's grace, I was able to bring this 2004 Cambridge University Press edition up to the required standard.

Now this 2008 print of the 2004 Cambridge University Press edition, also contains the identical Royal Warrant of 26 July 1958 for Accession Day on 6 February, as this earlier black covered prayer book. And it is through comparison of these three prayer books that we can now return to the question, "What is the difference between the Accession Day Office under the 1953 Royal Warrant of Elizabeth II compared to the 1958 Royal Warrant of Elizabeth II?," The answer is that in the prayers for the Royal family, the 1953 Royal Warrant refers to [quote] "Charles Duke of Cornwall" [unquote], whereas the 1958 Royal Warrant refers to [quote] "Charles Prince of Wales" [unquote]. And that's the only difference. Now the heir apparent, Charles, was named as "Prince of Wales" on that day of 26 July 1958, although he was not invested as the Prince of Wales till 1 July 1969. And so this tells us that if this type of title for a Royal Family member mentioned in the prayers of this Office change, then a new Royal Warrant has to be issued to change it in the *Accession Service*. Now that's not the case when it comes to subtracting the name of a deceased Royal Family member; because in this older 1662 prayer book I've got with the 1958 Royal Warrant, the *Accession Service* prayers for the Royal Family include, [quote] "Elizabeth the Queen Mother" [unquote], but in this more recent 1662 prayer book, also with the 1958 Royal Warrant, the same prayers omit "Elizabeth the Queen Mother" because she died in 2002. And so comparison of the *Accession Service* in these three 1662 prayer books, tells us that while a new Royal Warrant is required for the *Accession Service* to include the new title of a new "Prince of Wales," by contrast, no such new Royal Warrant is required to subtract the name of a deceased Royal Family Member such as occurred after the Queen Mother's death.

I well remember the time of the Queen Mother's death in 2002, because in March and April 2002, I was on a trip through Europe and en route back to London because I was living there on my first trip to London. In April 2002 I went to a very traditional German restaurant in the old city of Frankfurt which includes the present Local Council Building, and had a meal with what they call, "Frankfurter sausages." The frankfurt's look and taste exactly like the one you get here in Australia, but putting it with sauerkraut, mashed potato, bacon, and cheese, made it a specifically German cuisine. I then traveled by train along the river, and looking out the window I saw some old castles, and then came to Luxembourg. Among other things, I inspected the Roman Catholic Cathedral there, which though containing a mix of truth and error, included the truth of Christ's Epiphany on a stained-glass window which showed three kings at Christ's Epiphany, one white, one light brown, and one black. And as I looked around Luxembourg I there saw a British Union Jack flying at half-mast; and when I made enquiry at the Consulate, I learnt that this was for the death of the Queen Mother. Upon

my later return to London, I saw on the church grounds outside Westminster Abbey, a huge number of bouquets of flowers given by Heads of State and governments from all over the world for the Queen Mother, including, for example, two from the King and Queen of Thailand.   And you can see some relevant photos to do with the Queen Mother's funeral on my website.   Now I watch very little TV as I have better things to do, and most of what's on TV is like the secularist Big Beat music, it's rubbish designed to programme those who choose to be the Devil's secular state puppets. But I was able to access a TV to watch the Queen Mother's funeral which I found to be an emotionally moving experience.   I later joined queues of people to see Windsor Castle, just outside of London, which was open in connection with the Queen Mother's burial there.   But I first visited Eaton College which is next-door to Windsor Castle, finding in the *Church of England* Chapel a tapestry of the three wise men, the first one white, the second one brown, and the third one black.   Then I saw some of the sites in Windsor Castle such as The Throne Room, and some white Caucasian British Grenadiers marching around. Outside Windsor Castle's St. George's Chapel which is where the Queen Mother was buried, once again there were masses of flowers for her on the ground.   Inside the Chapel, I saw the burial places of a number of kings and queens, including King Henry VIII who died in 1547 and King Charles I who died in 1649.   Some ten years ago now, in a long queue, I filed past the graves of both the Queen Mother, and her consort, King George VI, and looking at them together I couldn't but help to note the great disparity in the years they died.   For George VI died in 1952, but his consort, the Queen Mother, died 50 years later in 2002.   There's a big difference in 1952 and 2002.

The fact of the Queen Mother's removal from the prayers for the Royal Family in this *Accession Day* service, thus remind us of the issue of human death.   And more broadly, while *Accession Day* is a day of happiness, it is also a day of sadness when we remember that unless there's been an abdication, then the former monarch has died. Hence one of the *Accession Service* Lessons is Joshua 1:1-9.   And so in this trek through *Accession Days* that we've made in these ten *Books of Common Prayer*, with one Sovereign dying and the next succeeding, I think it's well that we remember our future day of judgment, whether that be at the day of our death or at Christ's Second Advent, whichever comes first.   For we're told in Matthew 16:27 that at the Second Advent "the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels."   But we're also told in Hebrews 9:27, "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment;" and in Hebrews 12:23 of how "in heaven" are "the spirits of just men made perfect;" and then in I Thessalonians 3:13 that "the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" shall be "with all his saints," that is, the souls of the faithful departed.   So at the Second Coming are both his angels and his saints.   Then in I Thessalonians 4:16, we read, "for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air."   And so the saints of God remain on earth till the Second Advent, and they first see the souls of the faithful departed that return with Christ receive their resurrection bodies; and then the saints on earth receive their resurrection bodies and are caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air.   And we're told in Matthew 24:40, "then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left."   So both the good and bad will be on the earth at

Christ's Second Advent, which we know from such passages as Revelation 1:7 that "every eye shall see." So that's the Biblical teaching, it's quite different to the erroneous doctrine of the Futurists about some so called secret rapture. The Bible knows of no such secret rapture; rather, the Bible teaches of a very public Second Coming of Christ, that "every eye shall see," in which the saints of God who have not died are on earth till the very end, and witness that Second Advent.

As we come to my fourth and final textual commentary on the Received Text of the King James Version in St. Matthew's Gospel we are reminded at the end of it of the racial universality of the Gospel in the words of Matthew 28:19, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations." The Bible always has a racial and linguistic cultural definition of a nation. Thus the *Table of Nations* in Genesis 10 refers to various racial "families;" and Abraham is told in Genesis 12:3 that "in thee shall all <u>families</u> of the earth be blessed." Hence in the fulfillment of this prophecy, that concept of racial "families" is rendered in Acts 3:25 as "kindreds," from the Greek *patria*, referring to racial families from a common patriarch, for example, the white Caucasians of Europe come from the patriarch Japheth, or the non-admixed brown Semites of the Middle East come from the patriarch Shem, or the black Ethiopians of Africa come from the patriarch Ham via the patriarch Cush. And then this same word "families" from Genesis 12:3 is rendered in Galatians 3:8 as "nations," and this is the Greek word, *ethnos*, referring to ethnic or national groups, such as those created from the mandate of Genesis 9:27, "God shall enlarge Japheth," when under the British Empire white English speaking Christian nations were established in, for example, North America and Australia.

In Genesis 9:20-27, Ham sinned, and Canaan was cursed. That's a racial curse as it goes from the progenitor Ham to his son, Canaan. Now the names of Noah's three sons carry with them colour codes, "Japheth" has the idea of "shining" or "brightness" and conveys the idea of whiteness; "Ham" has the idea of "heat" and being burnt black, and that idea's also found in the New Testament word for an "Ethiopian" in Acts 8:27 which means to "scorch" the "face," that is, a "black-face." And if one looks at other Semitic tongues, such as Assyrian, one finds *ippatu* means "white" and *samu* "olive coloured," and such comparisons help us understand the word-plays of Japheth as "white," "Ham" as "black," and "Shem" as light brown. Hence, for example, in *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* of 1929, reprinted by Hendrickson in the USA in 1996, T.G. Pinches takes the view that "Japheth" is a word-play on *yaphah* meaning "fair," and indicates Japheth's descendants are "white," and [quote] "Shem means 'dusky,' ... Japheth 'fair,' ... Ham 'black'" [unquote][148]. Of course, the Shemitic group also includes, e.g., the darker brown Mongoloids in the Americas, or the black Australoids in Australia; and the Hamitic group also includes the non-black Mediterranean Caucasoids of North Africa. But in the context of Genesis 9 & 10, this word-play is a God given artistic summary of racial diversity: white Japheth, light brown Shem, black Ham.

---

[148] Orr, J. (General Editor), *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, 1929, Hendrickson Reprint, USA, 1996, Vol. 2, p. 1324, "Ham;" Vol. 3, p. 1568, "Japheth;" Vol. 4, p. 2759, "Shem."

Now with regard to Genesis 9:25, "Cursed be Canaan," it's important to remember that the curse of Canaan is a racial curse that comes about because of Ham's sin. Hence the *Curse on Canaan* is a manifestation of the *Curse on Ham*. Since in the colour word plays, "Ham" means "black," the *Curse on Ham* links with black skin emanating from his sin. Therefore contextually, "Cursed be Canaan," also must have this connotation of Canaan being darkened in his skin. And since both Ham and Canaan are thus contextually isolated, and also the Negroid Cushites by virtue of their Hamitic black skin, it follows that the other Hamites of North Africa which were Mediterranean Caucasoids, are not part of this Hamitic racial curse. So the *Curse on Ham* goes to Ham, the black Negroid Cushites, and Canaan. And so that also means that the words, "Canaan shall be his servant," may apply to Hamitic Negroes as much as Hamitic Canaanites, in terms of being servant races to either the Semitic Jews or Japhetic whites. And we also see this Hamitic curse manifested in nature with, for instance, the generally lower IQs of the Negroes. Hence in the colour plates of the 1881 *Jewish Family Bible* of London, reproduced in the 1979 Hebrew-English Scriptures by Sinai Publishing House, Tel-Aviv in Israel, one sees with a citation from Genesis 9:25, Gustave Dore's picture of a white Japheth bowing before Noah, an olive skinned Shem looking respectfully at Noah, a dark skinned Ham in fear and trepidation, and a dark skinned Canaan the same colour as Ham. Now I don't think the 19th century Frenchman, Gustave Dore's picture is entirely accurate, because to say that Canaan was darkened is not necessarily to say that he was darkened to the point of being black. However, if you understand the contextual word-plays, he must have been darkened. But you won't understand that element of Genesis 9 & 10, if you don't understand the colour word plays. And if you understand the further connected homophone or sound alike word-play on "Cursed be Canaan" in Genesis 9:25 and "Cain" "now art thou cursed" in Genesis 4:9 & 11, then you realize that Cain's race was also darkened for Cain's sin, and so those racially mixed marriages in Genesis 6 were between the lighter skinned race of Seth, and the darker skinned race of Cain. And of course, it was to inhibit such racially mixed marriages, that God created and segregated the races through Noah's three sons in Genesis 9 & 10.

And we see a manifestation of these racial traits of Genesis 9:25 to 27 in St. Matthew's Gospel. For in Matthew 8:5-13 a white Japhethite centurion of the white supremacist Roman Empire petitions Christ for the healing of his servant. He is a humble man, who says, "Lord, I am not worthy that thou should come under my roof: but speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed." And in analogy referring to Christ's power, this Gentile says very Genesis 9:27 Japhetic like things such as, "I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I say to this man, <u>Go</u>, and he goeth; and to another, <u>Come</u>, and he cometh; and to my servant, <u>Do this</u>, and he doeth it." And Christ commends the faith of this Japhethite Gentile. But then in Matthew 15:21-28 a Gentile woman of the accursèd Canaanitish race comes to him, desiring the healing of her daughter; but does so in a spirit that seeks some kind of racial equality with the Jews of the land. She suffers from the sin of opposing those forms of racial discrimination that God has ordained in such passages as Genesis 9 & 10. And Jesus says to her, "It is not meet to take the children bread, and to cast it to dogs." And it is only when this Hamitic "dog" accepts the teaching of Genesis 9:26, "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant;" as seen in her words, "Truth Lord: yet the dogs eat of the

crumbs which fall from their <u>masters'</u> table;" note those words, "<u>masters'</u> table," this is the Semitic master race of Genesis 9:26 being referred to; and only then will our Lord say to this Hamitic Gentile, "O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt."

And the Acts 3:25 Greek word *patria*, related to the patriarch of national racial families, reminds us that the 5th commandment's wider orbit, "Honour thy father," extends to racial patriarchs, and Eph. 6:2,3 refers to its "promise" of "long" "life." And this is relevant also to the issue of Accession by one monarch of another, upon the death of the predecessor monarch. You see, this 60th Anniversary of Queen Elizabeth II's accession, is also the 60th anniversary of the death of her father, George VI in 1952. And when he died, Elizabeth II cried all the way home in the plane from Kenya in Africa. But there were others who had been crying for some years. They had been crying about the fact that in the post World War Two era, the British Empire established under Genesis 9:27 was being dismantled by ungodly politicians; who inside Britain were also setting aside God's holy laws on white race based nationalism, which was also connected to Protestant Christianity, as the political regime brought over coloured persons, and also wanted non-Protestants brought in. Contrary to the 5th commandment, they were not honouring their racial father, the great white patriarch, Noah's son, Japheth. And George VI had a sacred duty to say clearly, definitely, and publicly, "It behooves us to follow the Biblical example of Holy Ezra and Holy Nehemiah, and to forthwith remove from this Realm all coloured and non-Christian persons who have come to this Realm since the end of World War II, and their non-white and non-Christian descendants born in this Realm; and as a civilized white nation upholding the 39 Articles of Religion, with God's help to turn with renewed faith to the Scriptural Christian religion of our forefathers. May he bless us and keep us all." But George VI faltered, and failed to do so, being derelict in his duty to God and man. And God allowed him to die of cancer, to die young in 1952; that men may learn to *t-r-r-e-e-e-mble* before a holy God who created and segregated the races in Genesis 9 & 10. And in the following 60 years, much flow on evil has occurred.

And the same lesson is found in the United States of America, where a Papist President, John F. Kennedy, wickedly sought to destroy the moral fibre and decency of white Protestant values, by pushing the racial desegregation barrow, and attacking the racial values of Genesis 9 & 10. Contrary to the 5th commandment, he was not honouring the great white patriarch, Japheth. And God allowed him to die from an assassin's bullet, once again, allowing him to die young in 1963; that men may learn to *t-r-r-e-e-e-mble* before a holy God who created and segregated the races in Genesis 9 & 10, and like this woman in Matthew 15, learn to put away their sin. [pause][149] And the

---

[149] Lest these comments be misconstrued by certain curious and carnal persons in favour of political assassinations contrary to God's holy law, "Thou shalt not kill" (Exod. 20:13), I here note that one should distinguish between God's *directive will* and *permissive will*. If Kennedy had been under God's *directive will* he would have been indestructible till his job on earth was done (Ps. 91:11-13; Mark 16:18; Acts 28:3-6). But he was clearly acting under God's *permissive will* (Deut. 6:16; Matt. 4:5-7) by e.g., being a Papist (II Thess. 2:10-12) who denied the Gospel of justification by faith (Gal. 1:6-9; 3:11), and by dishonouring his racial father Japheth by promoting racial

same lesson is found in Australia.   For under section 127 of the Constitution, the Aborigines were barred from being citizens of Australia, although they were citizens of the Australian State or Territory that they were in.   Like the Dravidians of India, the Australian Aborigines come down from Shem's son, Elam in Genesis 10:22.   But for tens of thousands of years these Elamites had abused their custodianship of Australia, filling it with a heathen backward hunter-gatherer culture.   And he who in Psalm 24 says "the earth is" his, in harmony with his mandate of Genesis 9:27, dispossessed these Shemites for their sins under the mighty British Empire, giving this land to the white Japhethite. But Harold Holt put a referendum through repealing section 127; and by thus destroying a white Caucasian race based national identity, he opened up the way for the repeal of the *White Australia Policy*.   Contrary to the 5th commandment he was not honouring the great white patriarch, Japheth. And God allowed this Australian Prime Minister to die prematurely and mysteriously, with his body never being recovered from its watery grave, that men may learn to *t-r-r-e-e-e-mble* before a holy God who created and segregated the races in Genesis 9 & 10, and like this woman in Matthew 15, learn to put away their sin and submit to God's racial laws. [pause]

And these Eph. 6:2,3 time markers in UK 1952, USA 1963, and Australia 1967, pose the question, "When will men learn to walk humbly with Almighty God?"   For these events are just little pointers to what will happen to Heads of State and Heads of Government when at the Second Advent we read in Psalm 110:6, "He shall fill the places with dead bodies; he shall wound the heads over many countries."   For we are told in Daniel 2:43 & 44, that at that time when "they" of the white Caucasian "iron" from the white old Roman Empire, together with coloured "miry clay," "shall mingle themselves" in intermarriage, that "in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up" his "kingdom," and "it shall break in pieces and consume all these" other "kingdoms."   So too St. Matthew's Gospel refers to this time, for Christ says in Matthew 24:37 to 39, "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."   And St. John the Divine tells us in Revelation 6:14 to 16, that on that day, "the heaven" will "depart" "as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island" will be "moved out of their places. And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men," will hide "themselves" from one who in Revelation 1:14 is said to have "eyes" "as a flame of fire." And so these men who have spent their life undermining Biblical Christian values, undermining white race based nationalism in Western countries, undermining patriarchy, undermining the Ten Commandments; these men who have spent their life ignoring the injunctions of Psalm 2:10-12, "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with t-r-r-r-e-e-e-embling.   Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him;" these men, I say, who have spent

---

desegregation.   Thus God *permitted* or *allowed* the assassin's bullet to kill him (Gen. 10:2-5; Eph. 6:2,3) i.e., God did not overrule to save this evil man's life.   So likewise, God did not overrule (Mark 16:18) to save the life George VI (Gen. 10:2-5; Eph. 6:2,3).

their lives ignoring these injunctions of Psalm 2:10-12, will say "to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of his wrath is come." The "eyes," the "eyes" "as a flame of fire;" "Hide us from the face!" "HIDE US!!" "H-I-D-E U-S!!!" [pause]

Though the neo-Alexandrian texts date from about 100 years earlier and reflect the 19th century apostasy of religious liberalism, and Westcott & Hort also show the apostasy of Puseyism, most Protestant Churches kept using the New Testament neo-Byzantine text based Authorized Version till after World War II. But in the post World War II era, often forsaking a commitment to racial purity by not upholding white race based nationalism, racial segregation, and opposition to racially mixed marriages; and also by often losing their religious purity through the ecumenical compromise with Papists and other non-Protestants, and sometimes also the inter-faith compromise with infidels and heathens, and not opposing religiously mixed marriages with them; the corrupt text of the neo-Alexandrian Versions came into many of these churches. And so just like the textually corrupt Samaritan Pentateuch symbolizes the Samaritans lack of Jewish racial and religious purity; the neo-Alexandrian text symbolizes these churches departure from Biblically based white Protestant racial and spiritual purity. [pause]

And so when we remember the 60th accession year of Elizabeth II, we also remember the death of George VI, 60 years afore which occurred near the start of the wicked immigration into the UK of coloureds, infidels, and heathens; and the more general departure from Christian morals in the law and society of the post World War II Western World under the so called name of "human rights" and also libertinism. And when we remember the Accession Day of Elizabeth II on this 6th day of February, 2012, we also remember that the death of the Queen Mother in 2002, led to her subsequent removal from the prayers for the Royal Family in the *Accession Service*. And so, like the deaths of successive monarchs that give rise to the next one acceding to the throne and issuing a new Royal Warrant for the *Accession Service* to be attached to the 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* to annually remember the date of their accession, such as the death of Victoria in 1901, Edward VII in 1910, George V in 1936, and George VI in 1952, such deaths point to our common human mortality that results from Adam's primal sin, and should remind us of our future day of judgment, whether that be at the day of our death, or at the day of Christ's Second Advent, whichever comes first.

You see, man is lost in his sins, as most chiefly found in the Ten Commandments. Fallen, sinful man, is unable to keep God's law perfectly, but God's standard is perfection, and so any law breaking is sin. For example, in the *Sermon on the Mount*, our Lord makes it clear in Matthew 5:21 & 22, that the sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," includes any sort of unjustly angry thought, or strong verbal abuse. Or in Matthew 5:27 & 28 that the seventh commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," is violated by any sort of adulterous or other forbidden sexual thought. And so the point being made by Christ is that in the end nobody can ever keep all the commandments to God's required standard of perfection. And so man is lost in his sins. And if that were the end of the matter, his case would be truly hopeless. Every man would go to hell.

But Christ says in Matthew 9:13, "I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance."   And hence in Matthew 4:18 and 20:30, we learn a man must "Repent" or turn away from his sins, and look in saving faith to Jesus Christ, seeking his "mercy."   This is a petition to God the Son, who is the Second Person of the Trinity referred to in Matthew 28:19. For in Matthew 1:23 Christ is called, "God with us;" and in Matthew 3:3 he's identified as the Old Testament Jehovah of Isaiah 40:3.   For Christ's physical healings recorded in the Gospel of Matthew are object lessons pointing to his power of spiritual healing, wherefore he says in Matthew 9, "thy faith hath made thee whole;" and "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee." "For whether is easier to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise and walk?   But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed, and go to thine house.   And he arose, and departed to his house."   For he says in Matthew 20:28, "the Son of man came … to give his life a ransom for many."   You see, Christ is man's redeemer, who buys man back from his captivity to sin and death, through his sacrifice on the cross at Calvary recorded in Matthew 27.   For in Matthew 26:26-28, Jesus "gave" his body as symbolized by the bread of the Lord's Supper, and in this context said his "blood of the new testament" as symbolized by the red Communion wine, "is shed for many for the remission of sins." Thus it's through faith in his sacrificial blood of atonement that we must declare in the centurion's words of Matthew 27:54, "Truly this was the Son of God;" believing that he rose again from the dead on the third day, and is now "sitting on the right hand of power, and coming" again at the Second Advent "in the clouds of heaven" (Matt. 26:64; 28:1-8).

In Matthew 4:1-11, Christ teaches the Divine Inspiration of Scripture and its absolute authority in his words, "It is written," "It is written," "It is written," with quotes from Deuteronomy 8:3; 6:16; and 6:13, integrating the teaching of, e.g., II Kings 17:36 that to "fear" God includes "worship" of God.   But by quoting Deuteronomy 8:3, Christ also teaches the Divine Preservation of Scripture in Matthew 4:4, saying "man" is to "live" "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God," for that requires that "every word … of God" be Divinely preserved, over time, and through time.   But it's not enough to have the Word of God in our midst, it must be applied, and nowhere is that more important than on this issue of salvation, in which we must have repentance of sin, and saving faith in Jesus Christ. [pause] And so when we consider all these Accession Days of reigning Sovereigns, of one monarch living and dying, and another monarch acceding, living, and in turn dying, all the way down to the present monarch, Queen Elizabeth II; we need to remember our own future day of judgment, whether that be at the day of our death, or at the day of Christ's Second Coming, whichever comes first.

The sermon will now end with two prayers, one for the dedication of this fourth Volume of my textual commentaries on Matthew 26 to 28; and the other a Collect from the *Accession Service* attached to the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 by Royal Warrant of the *Supreme Governor of the Church of England* and *Defender of the Faith*, Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth the Second.   The service will then be concluded, and include the singing of Psalm 20, from the Presbyterian Psalter of 1650. [pause]

Let us pray.   "O Lord, shew thy mercy upon us. And grant us thy salvation."

"We praise thee, O God: we acknowledged thee to be the Lord."   Be pleased, O Lord, to use this textual commentary Volume 4 and all other textual commentaries in this series to the honour and glory of thy holy name.   Though thy gift of Divine Inspiration has now ended, being found in thy completed Word of the Holy Bible in the last "Amen" of the Book of Revelation, so that since prophets only existed in, and closely around, Bible times, there are now no new prophets to give us so called, "new revelations of the Spirit;" nevertheless, thy gift of Divine Preservation is an ongoing gift to the church, by which thou dost graciously undertake to preserve thy Holy Word.   And in connection with these purposes, for the first time in over 300 years, thou didst call forth for a neo-Byzantine textual analyst, when thou didst graciously call forth me to this most sacred work. Graciously, then, O Lord, look with favour upon this textual commentary Volume 4 upholding the Received Text and Authorized King James Version of the Bible in this three hundred and fiftieth hundredth anniversary year of its authorization in the Preface of the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, making it "Appointed to be read in Churches." And in doing so, O gracious Lord, forgive me through the blood of Christ for any blemishes or imperfections which due to the frailty of my fallen, sinful, human nature may be found in this or any other volume, blessing it still to thy glory for the general good that is in it.   And this we pray, O most dread Sovereign God, heavenly Father, high and mighty, King of Kings, and Lord of lords, through the precious, atoning, and saving, royal red blood of thy Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, who with thee and the Holy Ghost, is one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, world without end.   Amen.

"O Lord our God, who upholdest and governest all things by the word of thy power: receive our humble prayers for our Sovereign Lady ELIZABETH, *as on this 6th day of February*, set over us by thy grace and providence to be our Queen; and, together with her, bless, we beseech thee, Philip Duke of Edinburgh, Charles Prince of Wales, and all the Royal family; that they, ever trusting in thy goodness, protected by thy power, and crowned with thy gracious and endless favour, may long continue before thee in peace and safety, joy and honour, and after death may obtain everlasting life and glory, by the merits and mediation of Christ Jesus our Saviour, who with thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth ever one God, world without end.   Amen[150]."

At Start of service, song: "God Save the Queen."

Lessons: Matt. 22:16-22; Rom. 13:1-10; & I Peter 2:13-17.

Sing Psalm 101.

After Sermon: Sing Psalm 20.

---

[150]   A Collect from the Accession Service, (supplying the relevant date at "*as on this day*,") commanded to be printed and published and annexed to the Book of Common Prayer of 1662 by Royal Warrant of Queen Elizabeth II on 26 July 1958, revoking her earlier Royal Warrant of 12 June 1953.

Appendix 6: Corrigenda to Former Volumes.

Corrigenda to Volume 4 (Matt. 26-28). The following corrigenda changes are integrated into present internet copies of Volume 3, but will need to be made to earlier printed copies in this textual commentary series. Pagination and footnote numbering corresponds with legal deposit printed library copies at the NSW State Library in Sydney (Volumes 1-3), National Library of Australia in Canberra (Volumes 1-3), Sydney University (Volumes 1 & 2), and Moore Theological College in Sydney (Volume 3).

Pagination and footnote numbering corresponds with printed library copies (not internet copy). Abbreviation for a change, ">" means "goes to"; and "+" means add.

In Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14):

Preface p. iv, "* ***Rating the TR's textual variants A to E"*** > "* ***Rating the TR's textual readings A to E"***; and "*Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual variants A to E*" > "*Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E.*"

Preface p. xx, **"*Rating the TR's textual variants A to E"** > **"*Rating the TR's textual readings A to E"**; & "*Scriptures rating the TR's textual variants A to E*" > "*Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E.*"

Preface p. xxxiii, at footnote starting, "Bob Larson's *Book of Rock*," after, "his works on rock music contain some very useful information.", this now reads, "Thus Larson's works must be used with caution. See my comments on Bob Larson in Textual Commentaries Vol. 4 on Matt. 26-28, at 'Defence of Evangelical Protestant truth,' subsection 'c' entitled, 'A Case Study on Bob Larson Ministries, USA.')"

Preface p. lxvii, "*Rating the TR's textual variants A to E" > ""*Rating the TR's textual readings A to E'"; & "*Scriptures rating the TR's textual variants A to E..*" > "*Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E.*"

Preface p. lxxix, "textual variants" > "textual readings".

Preface p. lxxvii, after, "… etc. ." and before "On the one hand," should read (as it does in some, though not all library copies):

οτι <u>τρεις εισιν οι μαρτυρουντες εν τ</u>ω
ουρανω ο πατηρ ο λογος και το Αγιον
<u>πνευμα και</u> ουτοι οι τρεις εν εισι και
<u>τρεις εισιν οι μαρτυρουντες εν τ</u>η γη το
<u>πνευμα και</u> το υδωρ και το αιμα και οι
<u>τρεις εις</u> το εν εισιν ει την μαρτυριαν

oti **treis eisin oi marturountes en t**<u>o</u>
ouran<u>o</u> *o pat*<u>e</u>*r o logos kai to Agion*
pneuma kai *outoi oi treis en eisi kai*

> ***treis eisin oi marturountes en t**e ge to*
> ***pneuma kai** to ud<u>o</u>r kai to aima kai oi*
> ***treis eis** to en eisin ei t<u>e</u>n marturian*

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

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

Preface p. ccix, para 6, after "and Scotland," and before "as they went" + "then from 1707 to 1800 of the Kingdom of Great Britain (England & Scotland) with the ongoing Kingdom of Ireland, and from 1801 of the United Kingdom,"

Preface p. ccxiii, footnote, after "and Scotland into" + "first the Kingdom of Great Britain with the ongoing Kingdom of Ireland (1707-1800), and then (from 1801)".

Preface p. cclxxv, para 3, after "the three kingdoms" + "and their successors (1707-1800 the Kingdom of Great Britain with the ongoing Kingdom of Ireland, and from 1801 the United Kingdom,)"

Preface p. cclxxxviii, para 4, last line, after "and Scotland" + ", and their successors

(1707-1800 the Kingdom of Great Britain with the ongoing Kingdom of Ireland, and from 1801 the United Kingdom).”

Preface p. ccxciii, para 7, “Limogenes” >” Limoges”; para 8, “the pre 1801 Kingdom of England includes” > “the pre 1707 Kingdom of England included”.

Preface p. cccv, footnote starting “Crowns,” after “from” and before “1801” + “1707 to 1800 of the Kingdom of Great Britain (England & Scotland) with the ongoing Kingdom of Ireland, and from”.

Preface p. cccvi, para 4, before “murder” + “alleged”

At pp. 1-402, The terminology, “the system of rating textual variants A to E” > “the system of rating textual readings A to E”, *passim*.

At p. 1, Title, omit para 2, starting with “However an alternative” etc., and change what is now para 3 (formerly para 4) to read:

> Of course, Bible translators may to some extent stylise such titles, providing they are not thereby unfaithful to the basic meaning of the original.   In all likelihood, this was the intent of the Clementine Vulgate (1592), which changes the title to, “*Sanctum* (Holy) *Iesu* (Jesus) *Christi* (Christ) *Evangelium* (Gospel) *secundum* (according to) *Matthaeum* (Matthew),” i.e., “The Holy Gospel of Jesus Christ according to Matthew.”

At p. 3, para 1 now reads:

> *Variant 1*, which adds Greek, “*agion* (holy),” i.e., “The Holy Gospel,” is found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.

At p. 64, Matt. 5:13, para 2, line 2, after “‘foot of men,’” “is found in” > “supported by”

At p. 352, Matt. 14:9, “perfect passive tense” > “perfect passive voice.”

Appendix p. i, “*Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual variants A to E*” > “*Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E*”.

Appendix p. iv, in Appendix 1 Table, before Matt. 1:6, add:

> Title: Scrivener reads “*Euaggelion* (The Gospel) *to* (-)
>   *kata* (according to) *Mathaion* (Matthew),” rather than
>   “*Euaggelion* (The Gospel) *kata* (according to)
>   *Mathaion* (Matthew)”.

Appendix p. xvi, para 6 at Matt. 5:23, line 1 "read" > "reads"; & after "the earlier footsteps of B & M." + "(Cf. App. 1, in Vol. 4, at Matt. 28:10.)"

Appendix p. xlvi for Matt. 12:13 now reads:

At Matt. 12:13 Hodges & Farstad's majority text considers the text here is "seriously divided[151]," but Robinson & Pierpont's majority text puts "*apokatestath<u>e</u>*" in the main text with no footnote alternative; whereas Burgon & Miller (1899) follow the reading, "*apekatestath<u>e</u>*," and in doing so specifically reject "the Textus Receptus" reading of "*apokatestath<u>e</u>*[152]."   Von Soden says "*apokatestath<u>e</u>*" has the support of Kx and in a limited sample of the Kr group, 9 out of 14 Kr manuscripts counted.   The Kr group has 211 manuscripts, and so in the wider Kg group of 983 manuscripts. 983 – 212 Kr manuscripts + 14 counted Kr manuscripts = 785 K group manuscripts.   In this, 513 Kx manuscripts + 9 Kr manuscripts = 522 out of 785 = *c.* 66% or two-thirds of the manuscripts.   Thus on this occasion I would agree with Robinson & Pierpont that "*apokatestath<u>e</u>*" is the MBT, and with no good textual argument against it, correct.

At Matt. 12:13 the TR's, "*apokatestath<u>e</u>* (declined from the aorist form *apokatestath<u>e</u>n*; indicative passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apokathist<u>e</u>mi = apo + kathist<u>e</u>mi*)" is MBT (e.g., K 017, Y 034, & Pi 041; Scrivener's Text).   However, a variant, "*apekatestath<u>e</u>*" (declined from the aorist form *apekatestath<u>e</u>n*; indicative passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *apokathist<u>e</u>mi = apo + kathist<u>e</u>mi*) is a minority Byzantine reading (e.g., W 032, Sigma 042, & N 022).   The variant is also found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, and hence the NU Text *et al*.   But either way the rendering will still be, "it was restored" (AV & TR; ASV & W-H).

Appendix 4, p. lii, now reads:

Appendix 4
Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E (Matt. 1-14).
(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.)

Title: "The Gospel according to Matthew"
{A}, stylized within reasonable guidelines
by adding "St." before "Matthew" in the AV.

Matt. 1:6   {A}   Matt. 1:7,8   {A}   Matt. 1:10   {A}   Matt. 1:11   {A}

---

[151]   Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 36.

[152]   Burgon & Miller (1899), pp. vii & 92.

Matt. 1:16	{A}	Matt. 1:18	{B}	Matt. 1:22	{A}	Matt. 1:23	{A}
Matt. 1:25	{A}	Matt. 2:11	{B}	Matt. 2:18	{A}	Matt. 3:6	{A}
Matt. 3:7	{A}	**Matt. 3:8**	**{B}***	Matt. 3:10	{A}	**Matt. 3:11**	**{A}***
Matt. 3:12	{A}	Matt. 3:16a	{A}	Matt. 3:16b	{A}	Matt. 3:16c	{B}
Matt. 4:10	**{C}***	Matt. 4:12	{A}	**Matt. 4:18**	**{C}***	Matt. 4:23	{A}
Matt. 4:24	{A}	Matt. 5:4,5	{B}	**Matt. 5:11a**	**{C}***	Matt. 5:11b	{A}
Matt. 5:13	{A}	Matt. 5:22	{A}	Matt. 5:25	{A}	**Matt. 5:27**	**{B}***
Matt. 5:30	{A}	**Matt. 5:31a**	**{C}***	Matt. 5:32a	{B}	Matt. 5:32b	{A}
Matt. 5:37	{A}	Matt. 5:39a	{-}	**Matt. 5:39b**	**{C}***	Matt. 5:44a	{B}
Matt. 5:44b	{B}	**Matt. 5:47a**	**{C}***	Matt. 5:47b	{B}	Matt. 5:48a	{A}
Matt. 5:48b	{B}	Matt. 6:1a	{A}	Matt. 6:1b	{B}	Matt. 6:4a	{B}
Matt. 6:4b,6	{B}	Matt. 6:5a	{A}	Matt. 6:5c	{A}	Matt. 6:12	{A}
Matt. 6:13	{B}	Matt. 6:15	{B}	**Matt. 6:18**	**{C}***	Matt. 6:21	{B}
Matt. 6:25	{A}	Matt. 6:33	{A}	Matt. 6:34	{B}	**Matt. 7:2**	**{C}***
Matt. 7:4	**{B}***	Matt. 7:9	{B}	Matt. 7:10	{A}		
Matt. 7:13 &							
Matt. 7:14b	{A}	**Matt. 7:14a**	**{B}***	**Matt. 7:15**	**{C}***	Matt. 7:22	{A}
Matt. 7:29	{B}	Matt. 8:2	{A}	Matt. 8:3	{A}	**Matt. 8:5**	**{C}***
Matt. 8:7	{A}	**Matt. 8:8a**	**{C}***	Matt. 8:8b	{A}	Matt. 8:9	{A}
Matt. 8:10	{B}	Matt. 8:12	{B}	Matt. 8:13a	{B}	Matt. 8:13b	{B}
Matt. 8:13c	{B}	**Matt. 8:15**	**{B}***	Matt. 8:18	{A}	Matt. 8:21	{A}
Matt. 8:25a	**{C}***	Matt. 8:25b	{A}	Matt. 8:28	{A}	Matt. 8:29	{A}
Matt. 8:31	{B}	Matt. 8:32a	{A}	Matt. 8:32b	{B}	Matt. 9:2b	{A}
Matt. 9:4a	**{C}***	**Matt. 9:5b**	**{B}***	Matt. 9:8	{B}	Matt. 9:10	{-}
Matt. 9:12a	{A}	Matt. 9:12b	{A}	Matt. 9:13	{B}	Matt. 9:14	{A}
Matt. 9:22	{B}	Matt. 9:24	{B}	Matt. 9:26	{A}	Matt. 9:27a	{A}
Matt. 9:27b	**{A}***	Matt. 9:34	{A}	Matt. 9:35	{B}	**Matt. 9:36**	**{C}***
Matt. 10:3	{A}	Matt. 10:4	{A}	**Matt. 10:8**	**{B}***	Matt. 10:10a	{B}
Matt. 10:10b	{A}	Matt. 10:23	{B}	Matt. 10:25	{A}	Matt. 11:2	{A}
Matt. 11:5	{A}	Matt. 11:8	{A}	Matt. 11:9	{A}	Matt. 11:10	{A}
Matt. 11:15	{A}	**Matt. 11:16b**	**{C}***	Matt. 11:16,17	{B}	Matt. 11:17b	{A}
Matt. 11:19	{A}	**Matt. 11:23a**	**{B}***	Matt. 11:23b	{B}	Matt. 11:24	{A}
Matt. 12:4	{A}	**Matt. 12:6**	**{B}***	**Matt. 12:8**	**{C}***	Matt. 12:10	{B}
Matt. 12:15	{B}	Matt. 12:22	{B}	Matt. 12:24	{A}		
Matt. 12:27	(Discussed at Matt. 12:24)		{A}			Matt. 12:25	{A}
Matt. 12:29	{A}	Matt. 12:31	{A}	**Matt. 12:35a**	**{C}***	Matt. 12:38	{B}
Matt. 12:44	{A}	Matt. 12:47	{A}	Matt. 12:49	{B}	Matt. 13:4	{A}
Matt. 13:9	{A}	Matt. 13:11	{A}	**Matt. 13:14**	**{B}***	**Matt. 13:15**	**{A}***
Matt. 13:16	{A}	Matt. 13:22	{A}	Matt. 13:25	{A}	**Matt. 13:28b**	**{C}***
Matt. 13:33	{A}	Matt. 13:34	{A}	Matt. 13:35a	{A}	Matt. 13:35b	{A}
Matt. 13:36	{B}	Matt. 13:37	{B}	Matt. 13:40	{B}	Matt. 13:43	{B}
Matt. 13:44a	{A}	Matt. 13:44b	{A}	Matt. 13:45	{A}	Matt. 13:46	{B}
Matt. 13:48a	{A}	Matt. 13:51a	{B}	Matt. 13:51b	{B}	Matt. 13:55	{B}
Matt. 14:3a	{A}	Matt. 14:3b	{A}	Matt. 14:3d	{A}	Matt. 14:6	{B}
Matt. 14:9	{A}	Matt. 14:12a	{A}	Matt. 14:12b	{A}	Matt. 14:14a	{A}
Matt. 14:15a	{A}	Matt. 14:15b	{A}	Matt. 14:16	{A}	**Matt. 14:19c**	**{C}***

Matt. 14:22a {A}   Matt. 14:22b {B}   **Matt. 14:22c {C}***   Matt. 14:24   {A}
Matt. 14:25a {B}   Matt. 14:25b {B}   Matt. 14:26b {B}   Matt. 14:27   {A}
Matt. 14:29   {A}   Matt. 14:30   {A}   Matt. 14:32   {B}   Matt. 14:33   {A}
Matt. 14:34   {A}   Matt. 14:36   {A}

In Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20):

Preface p. iv, "*   **Rating the TR's textual variants A to E**" > "*   **Rating the TR's textual readings A to E**"; and "*Appendix 5: Scriptures rating the TR's textual variants A to E*" > "*Appendix 5: Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E.*"

Preface p. xvii, **"*Rating the TR's textual variants A to E"** > **"*Rating the TR's textual readings A to E"**; & "*Scriptures rating the TR's textual variants A to E*" > "*Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E.*"

Preface p. xviii, para 5, line 3, after "in what from" and before "to 1870," "1800" > "1801".

Preface p. ciii, para 2, line 6, "Hembt" > "Hembd"

Preface ftn at pp. ccxiv-ccxxv, at p. ccxxv, at "in this Church one also find", "find" > "finds".

At pp. 1-480, The terminology, "the system of rating textual variants A to E" > "the system of rating textual readings A to E", *passim*.

At p. 80, Matt. 15:33, 2nd last para, before "majority text" + "Byzantine".

At p. 105, Matt. 16:2,3, last para, ftn at "*dokimaz<u>o</u>*" now reads:

At p. 202, Matt. 17:21, footnote, after "and Ireland," and before "became the United Kingdom" + "first became the Kingdom of Great Britain (with a flag containing the cross of St. George for England and Cross of St. Andrew for Scotland,) and Kingdom of Ireland from 1707 to 1800; and then"

At p. 381, Matt. 19:29c, second footnote now reads after "Bob Larson's *Book of Rock*," "Tyndale House, Illinois, USA, 1987. Though there is some very useful information in Larson's book, his works must be used with caution. E.g., contrary to Rom. 1:17; 16:17; Gal. 1:6-9; 3:11 he embraces the ecumenical compromise with Papists, so that e.g., contrary to Matt. 7:21-23 he thinks Papist exorcists are true Christians.   See my comments on Bob Larson in Textual Commentaries Vol. 4 (Matt. 26-28), at 'Defence of Evangelical Protestant truth,' subsection 'c) A Case Study on Bob Larson Ministries, USA.'"

Appendix p. i, "*Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual variants A to E*" > "*Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E*".

Appendix p. liii, Matt. 15:39a, para 4, line 2, "seem that" > "that seemingly".

Appendix 4, p. l, now reads:

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

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

Matt. 16:8a   {B}
Matt. 16:8b   {A}
Matt. 16:11b {A}
Matt. 16:12   {A}
Matt. 16:13   {B}
Matt. 16:19a {A}
Matt. 16:20a {A}
Matt. 16:20b {A}
Matt. 16:20c {B}
Matt. 16:21   {A}
Matt. 16:26   {A}
Matt. 17:2b   {B}
Matt. 17:3   {A}
Matt. 17:4   {B}
Matt. 17:8   {A}
Matt. 17:10   {B}
Matt. 17:11a {B}
Matt. 17:11b {B}
Matt. 17:11c {B}
Matt. 17:15   {A}
Matt. 17:20a {B}
Matt. 17:20b {A}
Matt. 17:21   {A}
Matt. 17:22   {A}
Matt. 17:25   {A}
Matt. 17:26   {B}
Matt. 18:2   {A}
Matt. 18:6   {B}*
Matt. 18:7a   {A}
Matt. 18:7b   {A}
Matt. 18:8   {B}
Matt. 18:11   {A}
Matt. 18:14   {A}
Matt. 18:15a {A}
Matt. 18:15b {A}
Matt. 18:19a {B}*
Matt. 18:21   {A}
Matt. 18:26a {B}
Matt. 18:26b {B}
Matt. 18:28a {B}
Matt. 18:29a {B}
Matt. 18:29b {B}*
Matt. 18:34b {B}
Matt. 18:35b {B}
Matt. 19:3a   {A}
Matt. 19:3b   {B}

Matt. 19:3c   {A}
Matt. 19:4a   {A}
Matt. 19:5b   {D}*
Matt. 19:7   {B}
Matt. 19:9b   {A}
Matt. 19:9c   {A}
Matt. 19:10   {A}
Matt. 19:11   {A}
Matt. 19:14   {A}
Matt. 19:16b   {A}
Matt. 19:17a   {A}
Matt. 19:18   {A}
Matt. 19:19   {C}*
Matt. 19:20   {A}
Matt. 19:22   {A}
Matt. 19:25   {B}
Matt. 19:29b   {A}
Matt. 19:29c   {A}
Matt. 20:5a   {A}
Matt. 20:6a   {A}
Matt. 20:6b   {A}
Matt. 20:7   {A}
Matt. 20:15c   {A}
Matt. 20:16   {A}
Matt. 20:17a   {A}
Matt. 20:17b   {A}
Matt. 20:17c   {A}
Matt. 20:19   {A}
Matt. 20:21
Component 1 {A}
Component 2 {B}
Matt. 20:22b,
20:22c; 20:23b
Component 1 {C}*
Component 2 {B}
Component 3 {B}
Matt. 20:23a   {B}
Matt. 20:23c   {B}
Matt. 20:23d   {A}
Matt. 20:26a   {B}
Matt. 20:26b   {A}
Matt. 20:26c &
Matt. 20:27b
Component 1 {B}*
Component 2 {B}
Matt. 20:30a   {A}

Matt. 20:31a   {A}
Matt. 20:34b   {A}

In Volume 3 (Matt. 21-25):

In some, though not all Library copies: At web page photos, at "Gavin at Ely Cathedral" etc., "did lay down" > "he did lay down".

In some, though not all Library copies: Vol. 3, Dedication, Preface p. xcvii, para 1, line 5, "centuries" > "century".

At Preface p. vi, "*   ***Rating the TR's textual variants A to E"*** > "*   ***Rating the TR's textual readings A to E"***.

At Preface p. vii, "*Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual variants A to E (Matt. 21-25)*" > "*Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E (Matt. 21-25).*"

At Preface p. xxvii, **"*Rating the TR's textual variants A to E"** > **"*Rating the TR's textual readings A to E"**; & "*Scriptures rating the TR's textual variants A to E*" > "*Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E.*"

At Preface p. lix, para 3, before, "And this was said", + "(Even though this was a false claim made by the Amalekite to try and ingratiate himself with David, I Sam. 31:4-6.)"

At Preface p. lxxiii, para 2, after "forbidden by God's law" + "(even though the Amalekite's testimony was a fabrication of evidence, I Sam. 31:4-6, false testimony in such an instance was also a capital crime, Deut. 19:15-21)".

At Preface p. cxvii, para 4, after "and Scotland" + "; and from 1707 to 1800 the Kingdom of Great Britain (England and Scotland) and Kingdom of Ireland."

At Preface p. clxxiii, para 1, line 1, after "and Scotland," and before "from 1801" + "from 1707 to 1800 as the Kingdom of Great Britain (England & Scotland) and Kingdom of Ireland, and as the United Kingdom from 1801".

In some, though not all Library copies: Vol. 3, Dedication, Preface p. ccxiii, para 2, line 6, after "Papists, Jacobite", "Anglicans" > "Episcopalians".

At pp. 1-414, The terminology, "the system of rating textual variants A to E" > "the system of rating textual readings A to E", *passim.*

At p. 156, Matt. 22:39, last para, before "and after 1801," + "from 1707 to 1800 the Kingdom of Great Britain (England and Scotland) and Kingdom of Ireland;"

At p. 379, Matt. 25:16c, last footnote, "perfect passive tense" > "perfect passive voice."

At p. 390, Matt. 25:17b, first footnote (continued from p. 389), "perfect passive tense" > "perfect passive voice."

At p. 392, Matt. 25:20, footnote, "perfect passive tenses" > "the perfect passive voice."

At p. 403, Matt. 25:22c, para 2, line 2, after "is supported by" & before "e.g., Codices A 02", + "the majority Byzantine text"

Appendix p. i, "*Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual variants A to E*" > "*Appendix 4: Scriptures rating the TR's textual readings A to E*".

Appendix p. lxxii, after "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*." + footnote "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"

Appendix 4, pp. lvii-lx, now reads:

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}*