Matt. 10:3 "Lebbaeus, whose surname was Thaddaeus" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Scribes sometimes missed short words. E.g., here at Matt. 10:3 in Lectionary 1968, the "*o* (the) *tou* ([son] of)" before "*Alphaiou* (Alphaeus)," is omitted. But for our purposes this does not affect the relevant reading we are considering.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 10:3 the TR's Greek reading, "*Lebbaios* (Lebbaeus) *o* (who) *epikletheis* (was surnamed) *Thaddaios* (Thaddaeus)," i.e., "Lebbaeus, whose surname was Thaddaeus," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century, with diverse spelling, "*Lebbeos*"), N 022 (6th century, with diverse spellings, "*Lebbeos*" and "*Thaddeos*"); Minuscules 1010 (12th century) and 597 (13th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*Lebbeus* (Lebbaeus) *qui* (who) *nominatur* (is named) *Taddeus* (*Thaddaeus*)," in old Latin Version f (6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, the Apostolic Constitutions (3rd or 4th century) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However another reading, *Variant 1*, may be reconstructed from the Latin as Greek, "*Thaddaios* (Thaddaeus)" (cf. *Variant 2* Greek and Latin forms). It is followed as Latin, "*Thaddaeus*" in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and as Latin, "*Thaddeus*" in old Latin Versions aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430). From the Latin support for this reading, the Vulgate's reading is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, reads only, Greek, "*Lebbaios* (Lebbaeus)." *Variant 2* is followed as Latin, "*Lebbeus*" in old Latin Version d (5th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation, and is found in a manuscript according to the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430). Another reading, Latin, "*Iebbacus*," *Variant 3*, is followed by old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries). Another reading, Latin, "*Iudas* (Judas) *Zelotes* (Zealotes) *et* (and) *Thomas* (Thomas)," *Variant 4*, is followed by old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), and q (6th / 7th century). Another reading, Latin, "*Iudas* (Judas) *Zelotes* (Zealotes), *Variant 5*, is followed in old Latin Versions h (5th century) and g1 (8th / 9th century)[1].

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. The origins of *Variant 1*, *2*, *3*, and *4* are speculative. It is possible that *Variant's 1* and *2* were accidental, resulting from ellipsis in the "*eus*" endings of Latin

---

[1] Indicating a failure to understand the context, the UBS textual apparatus combines *Variants 4* and *5* as one variant, i.e., simply, *Iudas Zelotes*. With qualification, one can say Variant 4 supports the basic reading of Variant 5, with respect to the words, *Iudas Zelotes*, or *vice versa*, but this is not what the UBS textual apparatus says.

"*Lebbeus*" and "*Thaddeus*." If the *Variants* originated in the Greek and not the Latin, the same issue of ellipsis could explain how the "*aois*" endings of "*Lebbaios*" and "*Thaddaios*" confused different fatigued or inattentive scribes in different ways, so that in one instance, "*Lebbaios* (Lebbaeus) *o* (who) *epikletheis* (was surnamed)" was lost, when a scribe reading forward, and then looking back, and remembering he was up to the "*aois*" ending wrote down "*Thaddaios* (Thaddaeus)" and kept going (*Variant 1*); whereas in another instance, a scribe first writing down "*Lebbaios* (Lebbaeus)" then looked forward in the passages and back to the "*aois*" ending of "*Thaddaios* (Thaddaeus)," and kept writing (*Variant 2*). Of course, it is also possible that these were deliberate "stylistic improvements." We simply so not know for sure. We only know that somehow these errors arose.

Variant 3 may have originated from a paper loss or fade. The original manuscript probably contained *Variant 2*. But the "*Lebbeus*" may have appeared as "*:ebb::us*" and the scribe then wrongly "reconstructed" this as "*Iebbacus*." If so, there is a sense in which *Variant 3* may be said to be the same as *Variant 2*.

Variant 4 may have originated from a paper loss or fade. The original manuscript probably contained the TR's reading. But the "*Lebbeus qui nominatur Taddeus*" may have appeared as "*::::::::s ::::::o::::::t:::T::::::::s*." The scribe may have "reconstructed" this as "*Iudas* (Judas)" with reference to the "*Iudas* (Judas) *Scarioth* (Iscariot)" of the next verse; and then thinking a surname was required to distinguish it from "*Scarioth* (Iscariot)," "reconstructed" the "*Zelotes*" by interpreting "*Chananaeus*" (old Latin a) or "*Cananeus*" (old Latin b and q), as Simon "Cananaean" with the meaning, "Zealot" (see Matt. 10:4, *infra*). He may then have concluded that "*et Thomas*" was the only thing that could be left, and gotten this from the previous "*Thomas*" in the same verse after "*Bartholomeus*," wrongly thinking that a previous scribe had somehow inadvertently put the name in twice. Hence, he may then removed the earlier reference to "Thomas." Thus with some incompetence, this may have given rise to a "reconstruction" in old Latin a (4th century), b (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), that omitted the first "*Thomas*," and reads, of "*Iudas* (Judas) *Zelotes* (Zealotes) *et* (and) *Thomas* (Thomas)" (*Variant 4*). A later assimilation by another Latin scribe of this reading with other Latin readings containing the earlier "*Thomas*," may then account for the fact that the earlier "*Thomas*" is present in old Latin h (5th century) and g1 (8th / 9th century), which then omit the "*et* (and) *Thomas* (Thomas)" of *Variant 4*, while retaining the *Iudas* (Judas) *Zelotes* (Zealotes) (*Variant 5*). If so, there is a qualified sense in which *Variants 4* and *5* may be said to support the reading of the TR.

The TR's reading has strong support from the Greek, including St. Chrysostom, and some minority support in the Latin; with no good textual argument against it. On the one hand, we cannot be sure as to the origins of *Variants 1-4*; but on the other hand, *Variants 1* and *2* look like typical examples of ellipsis, and *Variants 3* and *4* look like typical examples of "reconstructions" following paper fades or losses. Though the Latin favours *Variants 1-4*; it seems to me that this is a good example of the superiority of the maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 10:3 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 10:3, "Lebbaeus, whose surname was Thaddaeus," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels), 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts), 1071 (12th century, independent), 1243 (independent text outside of the non-Byzantine General Epistles' text, 11th century), 579 (13th century, mixed text type), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles), and 205 (15th century, independent in the Gospels & Revelation); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions, and some independent manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version; as well as the Georgian Version (5th century); Slavic Version (9th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 1, "Thaddaeus," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type); and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

Variant 2, "Lebbaeus," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).

Setting aside the TR's reading which (we know on projections from the reasonable samples of von Soden's over 90% Byzantine text K group of *c.* 1,000 manuscripts in Robinson and Pierpont, or von Soden's over 85% Byzantine text I and K groups of *c.* 1,500 manuscripts in Hodges and Farstad,) enjoys the support of several thousand high quality Byzantine manuscripts dating from the 5th to 16th centuries, with further support from the 3rd or 4th century in *Apostolic Constitutions*; like earlier neo-Alexandrian text composers, the NU Text Committee was evidently impressed by the fact that both of the two leading Alexandrian manuscripts from the 4th century followed *Variant 1*. This followed the earlier Nestle's 21st edition (1952), which has *Thaddaios* (*Variant 1*) in the main text, with a footnote referring to *Variant 2*, the TR, *et al*. *Variant 1* was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Westcott-Hort have "*Thaddaios* (Thaddaeus)" (Variant 1) in the main text; but give "*Lebbaios* (Lebbaeus)" (Variant 2) as a footnote alternative. However, *Variant 1* is found at Matt. 10:3 in the Westcott-Hort based ASV as "Thaddaeus;" as it is in the later, NASB and NIV. Though also present in the RSV, NRSV, and ESV, these three versions have footnotes referring to the alternative readings of *Variant 2* ("Lebbaeus") and the TR ("Lebbaeus, whose surname was Thaddaeus"). Seemingly influenced on this occasion by the Syriac, the TR's reading was followed in the Moffatt Bible.

The RSV, NRSV, and ESV footnotes thus places the well-attested to TR's reading, on the same level as the abstruse Western text's reading. Historically, in the West, the Latin

Church centred at Rome, guided the better scribes to become Latin text scribes, usually redeploying the dross to non-scribal activities, but in relatively rare instances, side-shuffling them to become Greek text scribes. The result is a very high quality Western Latin Text (which is nevertheless not without error), and a correspondingly very low quality Western Greek Text (which is nevertheless not without some accuracy). By contrast, in the East, the Byzantine empire centred at Constantinople (modern Turkey), guided the better brains to become Greek text scribes. The result is a very high quality Byzantine Greek Text (which is nevertheless not without error), which here supports the *Textus Receptus*. Not that by these comments I wish to thereby deny the overriding element of Divine Preservation in the Western Latin and Byzantine Greek Texts, as constituting, with the ancient and mediaeval church writers (if the latter, especially early mediaeval church writers), the basic texts from which in the grace and providence of God is composed the Divinely preserved Greek Received Text (cf. Exod. 28:3; 31:2,3; 35:30-35). Here at Matt. 10:3, the RSV, NRSV, and ESV footnotes, thus place on a par the dross of the Western Greek Text with the gold of the Byzantine Greek Text, and choose for their reading the trash of the African Alexandrian Text. "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (Rom. 1:22).

Matt. 10:4 "Canaanite" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

I am relieved to say that the Greek reading of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) here at Matt. 10:4 (*Kananites*) or at Mark 3:18 (*Kananiten*), i.e., "Canaanite," (or for that matter the variant reading here of *Kananaios* i.e., "Cananaean,") does not mean that Simon was of the accursed Canaanitish race (Gen. 9:25-27; Matt. 15:21-28; Mark 7:24-30). Rather, it is a Hellenized form of a Hebrew term which has two meanings, namely, a Jewish inhabitant of Canaan, and a zealot.

On the one hand, in Scripture "Canaan," is sometimes used in a negative sense in reference to the descendants of Ham (Deut. 7:1,2). But on the other hand, in Scripture "Canaan," is sometimes used in a positive sense in reference to the Promised Land (Deut. 32:49; Isa. 19:18). In Matt. 10:4, "Simon the Canaanite" is a "Canaanite" in the positive sense.

"Canannite" (Matt. 10:4; Mark 3:18) is also a NT Greek word meaning "zealous." (Cf. Hebrew *qanna'* meaning "jealous" in e.g., the second commandment, "I the Lord thy God am a jealous God," Exod. 20:5; and Hebrew *qin'ah* meaning "zeal" in e.g., Ps. 69:9, "the zeal of thine house hath eaten me up," quoted in John 2:17 as Greek *zelos* for "zeal"). Thus "Canaanite" in Matt. 10:4; Mark 3:18 is a *double entendre*, meaning both a Jewish person from the promised land of "Canaan," and also one who is "zealous" or a "Zealot."

The TR's Greek, *o Kananites* (Canannite), is a nominative singular (first declension masculine noun, from *Kananites -ou o*) and the variant Greek, *o Kananaios* (Cananaean) is a nominative singular (second declension masculine noun, from *Kananaios –ou o*). Hence it might be rendered, "Simon the (*o*) Zealot (*Kananites* / *Kananaios*)" from either of these Greek forms. Thus in the double meaning of the Greek, on one level, the AV's "Simon the Canaanite" is correct; but on another level, it also means "Simon the Zealot." In this second sense of this double *entendre*, it thus broadly equates "Simon called Zelotes" in Luke 6:15 (*Zeloten*), or "Simon Zelotes" in Acts 1:13 (*Zelotes*). Thus Simon was the member of an

organization *zealously* committed to the removal of Roman dominion from the promised land of *Canaan*.

As mentioned at *Variant 4* of Matt. 10:3, *supra*, some old Latin Versions appear to have understood the Latin "*Chananaeus*" (old Latin a) or "*Cananeus*" (old Latin b and q) this way, and then used it in their erroneous "reconstruction" of "*Iudas* (Judas) *Zelotes* (Zealotes)." The Latin is nominative singular (masculine adjective, in suffix *us-a-um*), whether its form is "*Cananaeus*" (Jerome's Vulgate & Clementine Vulgate), "*Cananeus*" (old Latin b, h, q, ff1, & g1), "*Chananeus*" (old Latin l & f), or "*Chananaeus*" (old Latin a, d, & aur).

Thus both the Latin form e.g., "*Cananaeus*" (Jerome's Vulgate), and Greek form of the variant reading, *o Kananaios*, are in a nominative singular masculine case (Greek is a noun, Latin is an adjective), and may be rendered, "Cananaean," i.e., "Simon the Cananaean." This may explain why the textual apparatus of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) claims that the variant, Greek *o Kananaios* (Cananaean), is followed in the Latin by the Vulgate and significant old Latin Versions; and why the textual apparatus of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) claims "the entire Latin tradition" is "in support of the" "Greek reading," *o Kananaios* (Cananaean).

But I find these claims by Tischendorf and Nestle-Aland to be excessive and unsubstantiated. The reality is that either of the Greek terms, "*o Kananites* (Canannite)" or "*o Kananaios* (Cananaean)," could be rendered by any of these Latin forms found at Matt. 10:4 e.g., "*Cananaeus*" (Jerome's Vulgate & Clementine Vulgate). Thus we find at Gen. 12:6; 13:7; Num. 21:1; 33:4; Josh. 9:1; that "Canaanite" is rendered in the Latin of Jerome's Vulgate as "*Chananeus*" (the same form as Matt. 10:4 in old Latin Versions l & f); and in the Clementine Vulgate as "*Chananaeus*" (the same form as Matt. 10:4 in old Latin Versions a, d, & aur). The Latin of these OT passages is translated into English by the *Rheims-Douay Version* (NT 1582 & OT 1609/10) as "Chanaanite," which equates our AV's "Canaanite" in these OT verses.

Therefore, far from "the entire Latin tradition" being "in support of the" "Greek reading," *o Kananaios* (Cananaean) at Matt. 10:4, as claimed by Nestle-Aland's 27th edition; the reality is that one cannot use the Latin to determine the primary textual issue in question here at Matt. 10:4, because the Latin could have been translated from either the TR's "*o Kananites* (Canannite)" or the variant reading's "*o Kananaios* (Cananaean)." Hence I shall not refer to the Latin in the principal textual discussion, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 10:4, the TR's Greek reading, "*Kananites* (Canaanite)," in the words, "Simon the Canaanite" at Matt. 10:4, is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, an alternative reading, Greek, "*Kananaios* (Cananaean)," making the reading, "Simon the Cananaean," is a minority Byzantine reading, found in N 022 (6th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine, which must therefore stand as correct. The usage of Greek, "*Kananites* (Canaanite)," here at Matt. 10:4 is consistent with the similar usage of Greek, "*Kananiten* (Canaanite)," at Mark 3:18, and so fits inside a Greek NT normativity that the variant does not. The origins of this obscure variant are conjectural. However, the original *Kananites* (Canaanite), may due to a paper fade or paper loss, have looked to a scribe something like, "..*Kanan::s*.... ." If so, he may have "reconstructed" this from context, by replacing the missing "*ite*" (iota, tau, eta), with "*aio*" (alpha, iota, omicron) to form "...*Kananaios*..." (Cananaean).

With strong support from the Greek, including the church doctor, St. Chrysostom, we cannot doubt the accuracy of the representative Byzantine Greek reading. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 10:4 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 10:4, "Canaanite," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), 579 (13th century, mixed text type); and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

The incorrect reading, "Cananaean," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century, as Greek "*Chananaios*" i.e., the first letter is a Chi / X rather than a Kappa / K); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century). It is further found in Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in the Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

The incorrect reading, "Cananaean (*Kananaios*)," was adopted by the NU Text, as it had been earlier by e.g., Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). Hence at Matt. 10:4, the Westcott-Hort based ASV reads, "Simon the Cananaean," with a footnote saying, "Or, 'Zealot'." The former of these two ASV readings was followed in the NASB's 1st edition; and the latter ASV footnote reading was followed in the NASB's 2nd & 3rd editions. The former ASV reading, "Cananaean" (ASV), was also followed in the RSV, NRSV, and ESV; whereas the latter ASV reading, "Zealot" (ASV ftn) is also found in the NIV and Moffatt Bible.

Matt. 10:8 "raise the dead" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Von Soden says the TR's reading is not found in Sigma 042. However, I am able to confirm from my copy of this codex (Harnack, 1882/3, reprint 1991) that in fact it is present. Hence I show Sigma 042 in support of the TR, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 10:8 the TR's Greek reading, "*nekrous* (dead [ones]) *egeirete* ('ye raise,' present active imperative, 2nd person plural, from *egeiro*)," i.e., "raise the dead" (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading. It is found after "*leprous* (lepers) *katharizete* (ye cleanse)" in Minuscules 108 (11th century, Vienna, Austria). The clause is also supported before "*leprous* (lepers) *katharizete* (ye cleanse)" i.e., "cleanse the lepers" in Codices Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century) and N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century, with variants of spelling); and after "*daimonia* (devils) *ekballete* (ye caste out)" in Codex W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53; with altered localized dialect vowelling of *egeirete* to *egeiretai*[2],) and P 024 (*Codex Guelferbytanus*, 6th century). It is further found in one of these multiple positions in Minuscules 21 (12th century, Paris, France), 270 (12th century, Paris, France), 924 (12th century, Athos, Greece), 998 (12th century, Athos, Greece), 1010 (12th century, Athos, Greece), and 473 (13th century, Lambeth Palace Library, London, UK). It is also the most probable original reading of Minuscule 235 (14th century, Copenhagen, Denmark), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain.

The *Textus Receptus* (TR) is further supported before "cleanse the lepers," as Latin, "*mortuos* (the dead) *suscitate* ('ye raise,' present active imperative, 2nd person plural, from *suscito*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), g2 (10th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), c (12th / 13th century); and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century); and as Latin, "*mortuos* (the dead) *excitate* ('raise,' present active imperative, 2nd person plural, from *excito*)," in old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries). From the Latin support for the Vulgate's reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Chrysostom (d. 407) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Augustine (d. 430), and Cassian (d. *c.* 435); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a variant reading which omits Greek, "*nekrous* (dead) *egeirete* (raise)," is the majority Byzantine reading e.g., Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further omitted in old Latin Version f (6th century). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers Eusebius (d. 339), Basil the Great (d. 379), and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

---

[2] See Commentary Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), Matt. 16:8b, "Preliminary Textual Discussion," "The First Matter."

However the representative Byzantine text here presents a serious contextual textual problem. It is clear from Matt. 11:1-4, that Jesus' words of Matt. 11:5 are linked to his sending forth of the twelve in Matt. 10:5ff. Hence there is a natural correlation between Matt. 10:8 and Matt. 11:5. In Matt. 11:5 the relevant "works of Christ" (Matt. 11:2) wrought through his disciples (Matt. 11:1), are, "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk" (Matt. 11:5) parallelling, "Heal the sick" (Matt. 10:8), "the lepers are cleansed" (Matt. 11:5) parallelling, "cleanse the lepers" (Matt. 10:8), "and the deaf hear" (Matt. 11:5) parallelling "Heal the sick" (Matt. 10:8), "the dead (*nekroi*) are raised up (*egeirontai*)" (Matt. 11:5) parallelling "raise the dead" (Matt. 10:8), "and the poor have the gospel preached to them" (Matt. 11:5) parallelling "freely give" (Matt. 10:8). On the one hand, we can accept that Christ might give a summary in Matt. 11:5 of his commission in Matt. 10:8; but on the other hand, it makes no sense to say he would give a *post facto* expansion of it. Christ's statement in Matt. 11:5, "the dead are raised" is not a reasonable parallel for anything other than "*nekrous* (dead [ones]) *egeirete* (ye raise)" in Matt. 10:8; and so it looks like this was originally in the text. Since the only way to remedy the textual incongruity that would otherwise exist at Matt. 11:5 with "the dead (*nekroi*) are raised up (*egeirontai*)," is to include the words "*nekrous* (dead [ones]) *egeirete* (ye raise)" in Matt. 10:8, it follows that we must do so in order to bring textual tranquillity to Matt. 10 & 11.

The issue of where the words "*nekrous* (dead [ones]) *egeirete* (ye raise)," originally were, is not of crucial importance, since the basic meaning remains the same. E.g., the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine of Hippo (354-430) says, "'As ye go' saith he, 'preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse lepers, cast out devils. Freely ye have received, freely give ...' [Matt. 10:7,8].[3]" So too, the ancient church Latin writer, John Cassian (360-435) quotes Matt. 10:8 as, "the Lord who says, 'Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give'[4]."

Nevertheless, it seems to me that the *Textus Receptus* may well have, though did not certainly, put them at the original place, since it fits well with the parallelism of Matt. 11:5. I.e., Matt. 11:5 first manifests "heal the sick" (Matt. 10:8) with the "blind" and "lame;" then moves to "the lepers are cleansed" like Matt. 10:8; then moves back to "heal the sick" (Matt. 10:8) with the "deaf;" then moves to "the dead are raised" like Matt. 10:8; and then concludes with "the poor," like "freely give" in Matt. 10:8. However, this argument is not conclusive since the summary of Matt. 11:5 clearly uses some poetical licence in moving back and forth on "heal the sick;" and it also omits reference to "cast out devils" (Matt. 10:8). Thus e.g., one might still argue for it to be positionally where it is found in W 032 and P 024 i.e., after "cast out devils."

---

[3] Augustine in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1841 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 40, p. 553 (Of the Work of Monks, 1:5) (Latin). Schaff, P., *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, [first series,] *op. cit.*, Vol. 3, p. 506 (Of the Work of Monks, 6) (English).

[4] Cassian in: Migne (Latin Writers Series) (1846 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 49, pp. 990-1 (Cassian's Conferences, no. 15A) (Latin). Schaff, P. & Wace, H. (Editors), *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers*, second series, 1891, reprint Hendrickson, Massachusetts, USA, 1995, Vol. 11, p. 445 (Cassian's Conferences, no. 15, the second conference on Nestorius) (English).

The origins of the variant are speculative. Omission of these words may be a typical paper fade loss. Alternatively, accidental omission of the words, "raise the dead" (Matt. 10:8), may have occurred due to ellipsis. In Greek it would have looked *something like* ...

... asthenountas therapeuete leprous katharizete
nekrous egeirete daimonia akballete ... .

Having copied out "*leprous* (the lepers) *katharizete* (cleanse)," the copyist may have been momentarily distracted, remembering he was up to the *ete* ending. Looking back and seeing the "*ete*" of *egeirete*, he may wrongly thought it was the "*ete*" ending of "*katharizete*," and kept writing *"daimonia* (devils) *ekballete* (cast out)" etc. . There are a number of variations on this idea of loss due to ellipsis which explain the different variants. E.g., having written out "*asthenountas* (sick [ones]) *therapeute* (ye heal)," the "*leprous* (lepers) *katharizete* (ye cleanse)" might then have been lost due to such ellipsis, and "*nekrous* (dead [ones] *egeirete* (ye raise)" written, but the scribe, realizing his error, may then have written "*leprous* (lepers) *katharizete* (ye cleanse)," which may explain the word order in Sigma 042 and N 022. Or "*nekrous* (dead [ones] *egeirete* (ye raise)" might have been so lost after "*leprous* (lepers) *katharizete* (ye cleanse)," and the scribe wrote "*daimonia* (devils) *ekballete* (ye caste out);" but likewise, realizing his error, may then have written "*nekrous* (dead [ones] *egeirete* (ye raise)," which may explain the word order in P 024 and W 032. On the one hand, it is possible that such a change occurred in the manuscript line of W 032 before the local dialect revowelling of this declension and other declensions, *supra*; but on the other hand, a similar ellipsis may have occurred in W 032 with its "*etai*" endings, after this declension and other declensions had been revowelled to their local dialect spellings.

The Latin reads, "*Informos* (the sick) *curate* (heal), *mortuous* (the dead) *suscitate* (raise), *leprosos* (the lepers) *mundate* (cleanse)." It is therefore possible that this ellipsis also occurred with the (plural present imperative active) Latin "*ate*" endings, ("Ye …!,"). I.e., the "*ate*" ending of "*curate*" being mistaken for the "*ate*" ending of "*mundate*," and so "*mortuous* (the dead) *suscitate* (raise)" being first written, and then the Latin scribe realizing his mistake, adding back in "*leprosos* (lepers) *mundate* (heal)" after "*mortuous* (the dead) *suscitate* (raise)." I.e., this may have proven to be a difficult ellipsis for both Greek and Latin scribes, on quite autonomous occasions. Of course, we cannot be sure of this, and possibly the ellipsis occurred only in the Greek, and the Latin scribes simply copied it out after the error had been made.

Since placing these words were they are in the TR acts to explain both their positioning in those manuscripts that like Sigma 042 and N 022 place them before "*leprous* (lepers) *katharizete* (ye cleanse); and also those manuscripts which like W 032 and P 024 place them after "*daimonia* (devils) *ekballete* (ye caste out);" I think that on the balance of probabilities, the TR's position is the correct one. I make this conclusion autonomously of the inconclusive factors mentioned with respect to order style between Matt. 10:8 and Matt. 11:5, *supra*.

On the one hand, textual analysis favours the TR's reading; and on the balance of probabilities also favours the location of "*nekrous* (dead [ones] *egeirete* (ye raise)" as found in the TR. Though these words are a minority Greek reading, they are the representative Latin reading, with strong support from St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, and e.g., the Latin

writers, St. Austin of Hippo, a learned and godly doctor, and St. Gregory of Rome, a pious doctor. There is also good support for them from a number of ancient church Greek writers, such as e.g., St. John Chrysostom of Constantinople, a godly preacher and doctor, and St. Cyril of Alexandria, an old and holy doctor. Given the importance of the strong Latin textual tradition witness to the TR's reading here at Matt. 10:8, this is an example of the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, bowing low in humble submission to the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, as *after textual analysis of the Greek* the Latin helps to remedy an evident textual problem *in the Greek*. But on the other hand, these words are omitted in the representative Greek Byzantine text, and also by a number of ancient church writers. Balancing out these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 10:8 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 10:8, "raise the dead," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and with slight variation also in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels), 565 (9th century, independent), and 157 (12th century, independent); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Version, Anglo-Saxon Version (8th to 10th centuries), and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, it is omitted in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century), and Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent). It is also omitted in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions; as well as the Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The presence of "raise the dead" in the two main Alexandrian manuscripts, and its other wider attestation, meant that it was adopted in the NU Text *et al* in the same position it is found in the Alexandrian and Western Texts i.e., before "cleanse the lepers." Hence the ASV reads at Matt. 10:8, "Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers" etc.; and the reading, "raise the dead" (ASV), is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

The TR's reading is omitted in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). Burgon was critical of both the Received Text used in the Authorized Version (1611), and also the Westcott-Hort text used in the Revised Version's NT (1881) whose successor is the NU Text. Having rejected the Received Text in favour of the Majority Text, Burgon specifically rejected the usage of e.g., "the Vulgate", or "any ancient Father," e.g., "Chrysostom" or "Cyril," contrary to "the whole

body of ancient authorities" i.e., his Majority Text[5]. Burgon claimed the "'Textus Receptus' *does* call for revision," but "upon the" basis of the "majority of authorities" i.e., Majority Text principles. "To mention an" "instance," Burgon further claims, "When our Lord first sent forth his Twelve Apostle, it was certainly no part of his ministerial commission to them to 'raise the dead' (*nekrous egeirete*, Saint Matthew 10:8). This is easily demonstrable." Burgon first says it is "found in corrupt witnesses" such as "the Latin copies" (used in the Received Text and AV), as well as some Alexandrian Witnesses (used in the Westcott and Hort text and RV). But he then says, "the conclusive evidence is supplied by the Manuscripts; not more than 1 out of 20 of which contain this clause[6]."

Burgon here clearly denies the Providential protection of the NT Received Text in three closed classes of sources. The wonderful truth, "the word of the Lord endureth forever" (I Peter 1:25); was clearly manifested in the historic preservation and accessibility of the Latin text over the centuries; even though it was a translation. Thus the lesser maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, may properly be used, providing it is subject to the greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. In practical terms, this requires that one only uses the Latin where it is clear from the Greek that there is a textual problem in the Greek, that is resolved to the satisfaction of the Greek, by following the Latin reading. In the particular instance of Matt. 10:8, we have the additional testimony of such ancient church Greek writers as e.g., St. Chrysostom, and such ancient church Latin writers as e.g., St. Augustine.

The Burgonite Majority Text is certainly not the Received Text. The Burgonite Majority Text is not composed on the Protestant Text principles of e.g., Beza, Stephanus, Elzevir, and the King James Bible translators. Following on in these errors of their leader, the Burgonite NKJV has a footnote at Matt. 10:8 stating that the Majority Text omits these words. Sadly, the Burgonites' slothful anti-intellectualism puts a premium on ignorance, and denies the Biblical teaching, "study to shew thyself approved unto God" (II Tim. 2:15); by simply reducing all things to a manuscript count *irrespective of textual problems*.

---

[5] Burgon, J.W., *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established op. cit.*, pp. 13,15, 30-1; 47-50.

[6] Burgon, J.W., *The Revision Revised*, *op. cit.*, pp. 107-8.

The Burgonite methodology constitutes gross negligence with respect to the text; since no textual problem is ever recognized. This "ostrich head in the sand" approach by the Burgonites, would be like a medical doctor who always claimed that his evidently ill patients, were in fact in perfect health. The key words of the reading in question here in Matt. 10:8 that Burgon is so critical of, were preserved through time, and over time, by the Latin text in general, and St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate in particular. Thus the Latin here arises as a faithful witness to testify against Burgon. But the Latin arises to testify against Burgon in another way. Ancient Roman Law upheld the Latin maxim, *lata culpa dolo aequiparatur* (gross negligence is equivalent to fraud). I leave the reader to draw his own conclusions as to what this might mean with respect to the Burgonites' gross negligence in dealing with the text of Scripture.

Matt. 10:10a "staves" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's plural reading, Greek "*rabdous* ('staves,' accusative plural, second declension noun, from *rabdos*), in the words, "nor yet staves," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is also supported as the plural in Latin, "*virgas* ('staves,' accusative plural, first declension noun, from Latin *virga*)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, an alternative singular reading is Greek, "*rabdon* ('staff,' accusative singular, second declension noun, from *rabdos*)." This is found as the singular Latin, "*virgam* ('staff,' accusative singular, first declension noun, from *virga*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further found in the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. The origin of the variant is speculative. But possibly due to a paper loss or fade, *rabdous* at the end of a line, looked to a scribe to be *rabdo::* . If so, he may have "reconstructed" it with some cursory reference to the *rabdon* of Mark 6:8.

On the one hand, the TR's reading has solid support from the Greek, no good textual argument against it, minority support from the Latin, and the support of an ancient church writer. On the other hand, the minority Byzantine reading is a stylistically possible reading, with strong support from the Latin, and also an ancient church writer. Balancing out these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 10:10a, a middling "B" (in the range of 69% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 10:10a, "staves," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019

(8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), 579 (13th century, mixed text type); as well as the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; and a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

The incorrect reading, "a staff," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); together with Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in the Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions, and a manuscript of the Coptic Sahidic Version; as well as Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century), and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect singular reading entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 10:10a. Hence the American Standard Version reads, "staff" (ASV), or Moffatt reads "stick" (Moffatt Bible); and this incorrect reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

The TR is clearly the AV's reading at Matt. 10:10. However, while both the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899) and Hodges & Farstad (1985) here follow the MBT reading, both claim that they are doing so in antithesis to the TR which they both claim follows the variant and reads, "staff (*rabdon*)," rather than the MBT's "staves (*rabdous*)" (Scrivener's Text & AV). On the one hand, it is true that "staff (*rabdon*)" was followed by Erasmus (five editions, 1516-1535), Aldus (1518), Colinaeus (1534), Stephanus' four editions (1546-1551), Plantin's Polyglot (1572), Beza (five editions 1560-1598), and Elzevir (1633). This singular reading is translated as "a rod" by Tyndale (1526) or "a staff" in the Geneva Bible (1560). But on the other hand, the TR's reading is found in the Complutensian NT (1514), and this reading, "staves," is clearly found in the AV (1611) also. Hence on this occasion, I would say that Burgon & Miller (1899) and Hodges & Farstad (1985) have simply discovered the true TR, which was clearly found in the Complutensian NT (1514), and wisely adopted by Scrivener (1894 & 1902) as the TR underpinning the Authorized Version.

Matt. 10:10b "is" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Latin of Saint Jerome's Vulgate (5th century for earliest Vulgate Codices in the Gospels), reads at Matt. 10:10b, "*enim* (for) *est* ('is,' literally, 'he is,' from *sum*)," in the words, "for (*enim*) the workman is (*est*) worthy of his meat." From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found as the synonymous, "*est* (is) *enim* (for)," in a number of old Latin Versions (a, b, d, f, q, aur, l, g1, ff1, & c); as well as in a number of Latin Codices, namely, J (Foroiuliensis e, 6th / 7th century, Cividale), T (Toletanus, 8th century, Madrid), Y (Lindisfarnesis, 8th century,

London), E (Egertonensis, 8th / 9th century, London), Ep (Egertonensis e, 9th century, Paris), C (Cavensis, 9th century, La Cava), K (Karolinus, 9th century, London), and H (Hubertianus, 9th / 10th century, London). It is found as "*est* (is) *autem* (indeed)" in old Latin k. It is also supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604). However it is omitted in old Latin h.

The textual apparatus of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), takes the view that the "*est*" of Jerome's Latin Vulgate and significant old Latin versions support the TR's reading. However it seems to me that whether or not the Greek "*estin* ('is,' literally, 'he is,' from *eimi*)" was or was not in a manuscript at Matt. 10:10; one might still translate it with a Latin "*est* (is)" on the basis of context. Indeed a number of modern English translations following a neo-Alexandrian Greek text that omits "*estin* (is)," do this very thing, *infra*. Thus it seems to me that on this occasion, one cannot safely use the Latin texts that include "*est*" to determine the original Greek reading, and so no reference is made to them in the principal textual discussion, *infra*. However, the converse is not so. I.e., the fact that old Latin h omits "*est*," though possibly a clumsy scribal blunder, might also indicate the Latin scribe was following a Greek text that omitted "*estin* (is)." Therefore the Latin of h is included below.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 10:10b, the TR's Greek reading, "*estin* (is)," in the words, "for the workman is (*estin*) worthy (*axios*) of his meat," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), and P 024 (6th century).

However, the Greek "*estin* (is)" or Latin "*est* (is)," is omitted in old Latin Version h (5th century). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Theophilus of Antioch (d. *c.* 181).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. To the extent that it is omitted in a minority Latin text, we see the superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. The origins of the variant are speculative. Possibly "*estin* (is)" was removed as a "stylistic improvement" on the grounds that it was "redundant." But it may also be an accidental omission. The next word after "*estin*" (is) is "*eis*" ("into," in Matt. 10:11, "And into whatsoever city" etc.). Particularly if "*estin*" (is) here was written without the optional "n" (nu) at the end, as "*esti*," as indeed it is in the following verse, Matt. 10:11 ("enquire who in it is worthy"), in Byzantine Text Codices Y 034 (9th century) and S 028 (10th century); then a scribe, having first written the "*E*," possibly suffering from fatigue, looking at " ...*ECTIEIC* ..." may have gotten the "*EC*" and "*I*" of "*ECTI*" mixed up with the following "*EIC*," and accidentally omitted "*ECTI*" (*esti*). Alternatively, *ECTI* / *esti* may have been lost by a paper fade. Notably, in Manuscript Washington, which includes, "*ECTI*," there is a paper space between the end of Matt. 10:11 and beginning of Matt. 10:11, since before Stephanus gave us our verse numbers in 1551 (to earlier pre-existing chapter numbers), many of the traditional verse numbers had an ancient pre-numbered history as unnumbered verses. Thus if "*esti*" / "*estin*" was lost in a paper fade, a subsequent scribe may have thought the space was simply part of this unnumbered verse paper spacing style. We cannot be sure as to this variant's

origins, we only know for sure that it is not the original reading.

The TR's reading has solid support from the Greek, with ancient support inside the Byzantine text, notwithstanding a minority Greek and minority Latin variant reading. With no good textual argument against it, these minority readings cannot amount to much, and must be discarded as aberrant. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 10:10b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 10:10b, "is (*estin*)," is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), where it was moved from the very end of the Greek sentence following "*autou* (his)", to be after immediately after the "*gar* (for)." It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels), 565 (9th century, independent), 1071 (12th century, independent), and 579 (13th century, mixed text type).

However, the incorrect reading, which omits "is (*estin*)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century). It is further omitted in Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent), 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (12th century, independent), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere). It is further omitted in the Coptic Egyptian Bohairic and Sahidic Versions.

The Greek *estin* is omitted at Matt. 10:10b in e.g., Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). It is possible to supply the "is" from context, and so without the usage of italics, the ASV reads, "for the laborer is worthy of his food." This precedent is followed by the NASB and NIV. However, these neo-Alexandrian Texts such as the NU Text, open the way for "is" to be left out altogether. This was first done by Moffatt who reads, "the workman deserves (*axios*) his rations" (Moffatt Bible). This precedent was then followed by the *Revised Standard Version*, and its two sons, the *New Revised Standard Version* and *English Standard Version*. E.g., the latter of these reads, "for the laborer deserves (*axios*) his food" (ESV). We cannot ignore this. The Word of God has been tampered with by the religiously liberal neo-Alexandrians, and the religiously liberal Moffatt and religiously liberal RSV, NRSV, and ESV, have here recognized and exploited the possibility this raises.

Matt. 10:23 "another" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

It would be possible to translate the variant, Greek, "*ten* (the) *eteran* (other)," and thus render it in English as, "another;" or as "*ten* (-) *eteran* (another)," and thus render it, "another." In this context, I note that *eteran* is translated as "another" in Luke 9:56, "And they went to another (*eteran*) village;" and in Luke 16:18, of one that "marrieth another

(*eteran*)." But it is also possible to translate it as "the (*ten*) next (*eteran*)" i.e., "flee into the next " (ASV). The ASV's translation has been followed by other neo-Alexandrian versions, and so I shall translate it this way in order to highlight the issue facing neo-Byzantine defenders of the Received Text.

Some old Latin Versions have an inflated section here (a, k, b, d, h, q, g1, & ff1), and Jerome's Vulgate and some old Latin Versions (a, f, aur, l, & c) support either the TR's shorter reading or principal variant's shorter reading, i.e., they lack the additional rival clauses found in some manuscripts. The Latin "*enim* (for)" translating the Greek "*gar* (for)," in "for verily I say unto you," is found in Jerome's Vulgate, most old Latin Versions (a, k, b, d, h, q, aur, g1, ff1, & c), and a number of Latin Codices (O, 7th century; A, 7th / 8th century; Ma, 8th century; E, 8th / 9th century). However, the "for" is omitted in old some old Latin Versions (f & l), the Clementine Vulgate, and the *Rheims-Douay Version*. The TR's shorter ending is also supported by all four ancient and early mediaeval Western doctors i.e., the Latin church writers, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory (although the brevity of the Gregory quote means one might argue he possibly was only selecting part of a longer reading). *Thus the Latin of St. Jerome's Vulgate and some of the old Latin Versions clearly support the shorter Greek ending of the Textus Receptus.* In order to reduce the discussion to the two main rival variants, I have omitted reference to those variants which inflate this passage. They are contrary to the representative Byzantine text, whose shorter ending poses no textual problem, and so is the correct ending.

A further difficulty exists in the Latin. The TR reads in the Greek, "*ten* (-) *allen* ('another,' singular accusative, feminine adjective, from *allos-e-o*);" whereas the principal variant reads in the Greek, "*ten* (the) *eteran* ('next' / 'other,' singular accusative feminine adjective, from *eteros-a-on*)." The Latin may support either reading. I.e., Latin, "*in* (into) *aliam* ('another;' singular accusative, feminine *-ius* adjective, from *alius-a-ud*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate, and some old Latin Versions (a, b, h , f, aur, l, ff1, & c), and hence in the Clementine Vulgate; and Latin, "*in* (into) *alia* ('another,' singular ablative, feminine *-ius* adjective, for *alius-a-ud*), in old Latin g1. Or in the Latin *alter* form, (from which through the Late Latin, *alterare*, "to make other," we get our English word, "alter,") as Latin "*in* (into) *alteram* ('another,' singular accusative, feminine adjective, from *alter-a-um*), in old Latin, k and q; and as Latin "*in* (into) *altera* ('another,' singular ablative, feminine adjective, from *alter-a-um*)," in old Latin, d. Under the circumstances, I therefore make no reference to the Latin in the following principal textual discussion.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 10:23, the TR's Greek reading, "*ten* (-) *allen* (another)," in the words, "flee ye into another (*ten allen*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and N 022 (6th century); Minuscules 1010 (12th century) and 597 (13th century); and Lectionaries 185 (11th century), 70 (12th century), 333 (13th century), and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215), some manuscript versions of Origen (d. 254), Basil the Great (d. 379), some manuscripts of the Apostolic Constitutions (3rd or 4th century), and Socrates of Constantinople (d. after 439).

However, a variant reading, Greek, "*ten* (the) *eteran* (next)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53),

and Lectionary 813 (1069 A.D.). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Peter of Alexandria (d. 311), Athanasius of Alexandria (d. 373), some manuscripts of the Apostolic Constitutions, Chrysostom (d. 407), Socrates of Constantinople (d. after 439), Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), and Theodoret of Cyrus (d. 460).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand. The origins of this variant are conjectural. Possibly it arose by accident. If due to a paper loss or fade, the original "...*TENALLEN*..." appeared as "...*TEN:::N*...", then a scribe may have reconstructed this as "...*TENETERAN*...", possibly with some reference to the similar theme of Luke 9:51-56, where after a group of bad "Samaritans" "did not receive him" (Luke 9:52,53), we read of Jesus and "his disciples" (Luke 9:54), that "they went to another (*eteran*) village" (Luke 9:56). This may have struck a scribe as a similar, or near similar, application of the general principle, "But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another" etc. (Matt. 10:23).

On the one hand, the TR's reading presents no textual problems, and has strong manuscript support in the generally excellent representative Byzantine Text, as well as support from a number of ancient church writers. But on the other hand, the variant reading has support from a number of ancient church writers, and is a theoretically possible reading. Weighing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 10:23 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 10:23, "another" is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent), 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts), 1071 (12th century, independent), 1243 (independent text outside of the non-Byzantine General Epistles' text, 11th century), 579 (13th century, mixed text type), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles). It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; as well as the Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the incorrect reading, "the next," is followed by the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels) and 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere). From here, the incorrect reading, "the (*ten*) next (*eteran*)," entered the NU Text. The NU Text Committee "preferred" this variant "because of" it presence in "the Alexandrian text" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 28).

This has consistently been the preferred reading of neo-Alexandrians, and is found in e.g., Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881); Nestle's 21st edition (1952), Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). The AV's "*ten* (-) *allen* (another)," might also be translated the same from the variant's "*ten eteran*," and

indeed this is done in the NIV. However, a number of neo-Alexandrian versions have been at pains to exploit this variant reading, so as to make a difference in their translation to that of the AV's "*ten* (-) *allen* (another)," by rendering this "*ten eteran*" at Matt. 10:23 as "the next" (ASV & Moffatt Bible). Demonstrating the maxim, *Like father like* son, the parent ASV's "the next" (ASV), was followed here by both its more liberal son, the RSV, and its less liberal son, the NASB. In turn, the RSV was followed by its more liberal son, the NRSV, and its less liberal son, the ESV. It seems that, "the next" (ASV), is "a chip off the old block" for all the ASV's descendants.

Matt. 10:25a "Beelzebub" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. I do not consider that a textual issue is at stake either here, or at Matt. 12:24,27; Mark 3:22; Luke 11:15,18,19. However, in his Geek NT Appendix, Scrivener claims that at "Matt. 10:25," as well as "Matt. 12:24,27, Mark 3:22; Luke 11:15,18,19," "the Latin Vulgate appears to have been the authority adopted in preference to Beza," whose reading is that of the representative Byzantine Text. Likewise, the textual apparatus of both Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), shows Greek *Beelzeboul* and Latin *Beelzebub* as rival readings. So too, the NKJV follows the AV's reading of *Beelzebub*, but has a footnote stating that the NU Text and Majority Text read *Beelzebul*, thus indicating that they consider the TR's reading, which they evidently take to be *Beelzebub*, is different to the Greek *Beelzebul*. Since the matter has been put in these terms, and there is also a rival Alexandrian reading at Matt. 10:25, I shall discuss this matter, *infra*.

The Second Matter. The TR reads at Matt. 10:25, "… *Kurios* ('Lord," word 1) *autou* ('his,' word 2). *ei* ('If,' word 3) *ton* ('the,' word 4) *oikodespoten* ('master of the house,' word 5) *Beelzeboul* ('Beelzebub,' word 6) *ekalesan* ('they have called,' word 7), *poso* ('how much,' word 8) *mallon* ('more,' word 9) *tous* ('[shall they call] those' / 'them,' word 10) *oikiakous* ('of household,' word 11) *autou* ('his,' word 12)" etc. .

The scribe of Lectionary 1968 uses the sign, "+" to mark out "verse" divisions. In Lectionary 1968 words 3 to 12 are omitted. There is such a "+" after the "*autou* (his) of word 2. On the balance of probabilities this was an accidental omission. The scribe, having written down "*autou* ('his,' word 2)," made the "+" mark, and remembering in his head, "I'm up to the *autou* near the *oik* (i.e., of word 5)," may have become momentarily distracted. If so, any number of possibilities might exist as to how. E.g., perhaps he arose to stand at an open window to take in the sunshine of Cyprus, and feel its cooling sea breezes. Returning to his desk, and knowing approximately where he was up to, he may have looked for "the *autou* near the *oik*", and seeing "*autou* ('his,' word 12)" after the "*oik*" of word 11, simply kept on writing without thinking any more about the matter. One of the significant things to emerge from all this, is that Lectionary 1968 here reminds us that even quite large slices of the text could sometimes be lost by a scribe.

Since the omission covers that part of Matt. 10:25 here being considered, no reference is made to Lectionary 1968, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 10:25a, the majority Byzantine Text here reads, Greek, "*Beelzeboul*" e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). This is the universal Greek reading, and is also found in this form as Latin, "*Beelzebul*," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and 1 (7th / 8th century); or Latin, "*Belzebul*," in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), aur (7th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century); or Latin, "*Belzebub*," in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is further found as Latin, "*Beelzebub*," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century), the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century); the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604); and from the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is additionally followed by the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258).

Despite the claim of various textual commentators that the Greek *Beelzeboul* and Latin *Beelzebub* are rival readings, they are in fact one and the same. "Baalzebub" (II Kgs 1:2,3,6,16) is Hebrew *Baal Zebub* meaning "Baal / Lord of the flies." The Western Church Doctor, St. Jerome, evidently Hebraized the Greek "*Beelzeboul*" to the "*bub*" ending of the Hebrew, to form the Latin "*Beelzebub*." This is a perfectly legitimate technique of transliteration, thereafter followed by e.g., the Western Church Doctor, St. Gregory. We find it with numerous NT names which have been Hellenized from the Hebrew into Greek, e.g., the name of Elijah (e.g., Mal. 4:5) is Hebrew *Eliyah*, containing both the Hebrew name of God as "*Eli*" (cf. Matt. 27:46), and the Hebrew name of God as "*Yah*" (cf. Alleluia, Rev. 19:1,3,4,6). But this becomes the AV's "Elias" (e.g., Matt. 11:14) from (depending on transliteration techniques), the Greek *Helias* / *Elias*.

The AV translators would certainly not have disputed the Greek reading at these passages. The AV translators used similar techniques of transliteration elsewhere with e.g., "bishop" (Acts 1:20 in "bishoprick," I Tim. 3:1), where the Greek *episkopos*, is first Latinized through *biscopus*, and finally Anglicized as "bishop." This is not a translation from the Latin Vulgate (which reads "*episopatum*"), but rather the selection of the correct English word, which has a Latin influence. The same is true of "Beelzebub." This is simply the selection of a more common, English word, which in its English form is taken from a Hebraized Latin form, found in the Vulgate.

As the Anglican Protestant King James Bible translators said in their Prefatory address, "The Translators to the Reader[7]", "we have on the one side avoided the scrupulosity of the Puritans, who leave the old Ecclesiastical words, and betake them to other, as when they [Baptists] put 'washing' for 'baptism,' and [Congregationalists put] 'Congregation' instead of 'Church': as also on the other side we have shunned the obscurity of the Papists, in their 'Azynes,' 'Tunik,' 'Rational,' 'Holocausts,' 'Praepuce,' 'Pasche,' and a number of suchlike, whereof their late [Douay-Rheims] translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sense, that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet by the language thereof it may be kept from being understood. But we desire that the Scripture … may be understood … ."

---

[7] Scrivener's 1873 Cambridge Paragraph Bible, reprint in Trinitarian Bible Society's *Classic Reference Bible*.

The reading of the Received Text is the reading of the representative Byzantine Greek text at Matt. 10:25a. There is no good textual argument against it, and so it must stand. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 10:25a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 10:25a, Greek, "*Beelzeboul*," is followed by (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the "Beelzebul" form in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; all extant Egyptian Coptic Versions; the Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). It is likewise found in the "*Beelzebub*" form in the Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century), celebrated Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century), Anglo-Saxon Version (8th to 10th centuries), and French Version (Andrea Schmeller, 1827).

The Sangallensis Latin-German Diatessaron (9th century) uses the old High German "*Beelzebub*" at Matt. 10:25a; and it uses the old High German "*Belzebube*" at a Luke 11:15,18,19 integration with Matt. 12:24,27 (though I hope that by saying this, those who now like to say that Matt. 10:25a is not a TR based Greek reading, do not use this fact to claim that the Greek of the TR is really "an old High German reading"!). The 19th century Latin of Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), uses the Latin "*Beelzebul*" at Matt. 10:25a.

A variant reading, "*Beezeboul*," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century), and nowhere else. This peculiarly Alexandrian reading thus appears to stand in contradistinction to the Greek *Beelzeboul* or Latin *Beelzebub*. Is this Africanization from Alexandria of "*Beelzeboul*" by those on the dark continent, seeking to make the name sound more like some pagan African god? Or is this a typical Alexandrian School scribal blunder in which the "l" (lambda) was lost by inferior quality scribes? Or was this a typical Alexandrian School "stylistic improvement" by those who for some quirky reason, "just liked the sound" of "*Beezeboul*" over "*Beelzeboul*"? When dealing with the low quality scribes of the Alexandrian School who produced manuscripts like Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus, trying to understand their rhyme'n'reason, is like trying to understand the rhyme'n'reason of a mad woman's custard!

The variant, "*Beezeboul*," is found in Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952); whereas the TR's "*Beelzeboul*" is found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and the NU Text. On this occasion, the idiosyncrasies of the two leading Alexandrian texts were

so great, that none of their devoted neo- Alexandrian *translators* that we consider, other than the NIV, wanted to own up to them here at Matt. 10:25a.

The usage of a non-Alexandrian textual basis to determine both Tischendorf's text and the NU Text here, is akin to the type of methodology more commonly adopted by, Moffatt. (I.e., Moffatt's non-Alexandrian text pincer arm.) Indeed, his translation here at Matt. 10:25a also reads, "Beelzebul" (Moffatt Bible). The erroneous Westcott-Hort text notwithstanding, it is fairly translated in the ASV as "Beelzebub." While this translation is also followed in the NIV; a footnote gives as the Greek either the TR's reading or the Alexandrian variant i.e., placing the two on a par! An ASV footnote says this is Greek "Beelzebul," and it is left in this essentially untranslated state by the ASV's revisors in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NASB, none of whom seem to understand the finer points of the English language on this matter.

Little wonder then some of them also leave the OT "Sheol" in an untranslated state (e.g., Ps. 16:10, NRSV); or a number of them like to crow about the fact they do not follow the AV's Protestant sevenfold usage of "Jehovah" (Gen. 22:14; Exod. 6:3; 17:15; Judg. 6:24; Ps. 83:18; Isa. 12:2; 26:4). E.g., the *New American Standard Bible* Preface says under, "The Proper Names of God in the Old Testament," that "the four letters [of] YHWH … has been transliterated as Yahweh, however, no complete certainty attaches to this pronunciation" (NASB Preface, 1995). Or in the *New Revised Standard Version* Preface, following the parent *Revised Standard Version* Preface on this matter, Bruce Metzger speaking "For the Committee," gives the "two reasons the Committees that produced the RSV and the NRSV" discontinued the usage of Jehovah. "(1) the word 'Jehovah' does not accurately represent any form of the name ever used in Hebrew. (2) The use of any proper name for the … God …, began to be discontinued in Judaism before the Christian era and is inappropriate for the universal faith of the Christian Church" (NRSV Preface). With respect to the second reason, it is true that in general terms the AV wisely uses "LORD" in lower case italics for the OT "YHWH" in accordance with NT practice of using "*Kurios*." But they do not make it *an absolute rule*, as seen in both their sevenfold usage of "Jehovah" and their further usage of the contracted or abbreviated form of this as "Jah" (Ps. 68:4).

As to the NRSV proposition that this "is inappropriate for the universal faith of the Christian Church" (NRSV Preface), if so, this would mean that certain names would be "inappropriate" for Christians, such as "Elijah" or its Hellenized form, "Elias" (Rom. 11:2; Jas. 5:17), meaning, "God of Jehovah," which contains this abbreviated form. At *c.* 18,000 feet or *c.* 5,500 metres, the *St. Elias Mountains* are the second highest peak on the southern part of the border between Yukon, Canada and Alaska, USA, and are named after Elias of Jerusalem. Where does this RSV and NRSV type of logic leave a man like the Egyptian, Elias of Jerusalem, who for his maintenance of the orthodox Christological teaching upheld in the *Council of Chalcedon* (451) that Christ is both fully God and fully man, was exiled in 513 to Aila on the Red Sea after refusing to assent to the heretical monophysitism of Anastasius I (Byzantine Emperor: 491-518)? Are we to believe that Elias of Jerusalem had an "inappropriate" Christian name?

Or "Jeremiah" means "Jah will rise" and is also found in English as "Jeremy" (Matt. 2:17; 27:9). Jeremy Taylor was born in the *Church of England* in 1613 and died in the *Church of Ireland* in 1667. In the civil war, he had joined with King Charles I and the Cavaliers at Oxford by 1642, and was made a Doctor of Divinity by Royal Decree in 1643.

He was captured by Roundheads in Wales in 1645. A spiritual counsellor to the Diarist, John Evelyn (1620-1706), he also ministered to congregations of Royalist Anglicans during the dark'n'bleak days of the Interregnum, and served from 1658 as Chaplain to Edward, 3rd Viscount Conway of Ulster. With the coming of happy'n'sunny days following the Restoration of 1660, he was made Bishop of the united Diocese of Down, Connor, and Dromorne in Ireland (1660-1667)[8]. Are we to believe that Bishop Jeremy Taylor had an "inappropriate" Christian name?

Now lest some curious and deranged persons, hankering after the supercilious logic of the RSV and NRSV translators, should perchance happen to foolishly answer the last two questions in the affirmative, I refer to two further salient facts. Firstly, "Jesus," Greek, *Iesous* (Ιησους), is the Hellenized form of "Joshua," Hebrew, *Yehowshu'a* (יהושע). It means "Jehovah saved," and hence its appropriateness, "and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21). Secondly, in the Revelation of St. John the Divine, we read that when St. John "was in the Spirit" (Rev. 1:10), he "heard a great voice of much people in heaven," as well as the words of "the four and twenty elders and the four beasts" who "worshipped God." They were "saying Alleluia," not once, not twice, not thrice, but four times! (Rev. 19:1,3,4,6). Now the "ia" (iota, alpha) ending in the Greek, "*Allelouia*" (Αλληλούϊα) or English, "Allelulia," means "Praise Jah" i.e., the abbreviated form of "Jehovah"! So it must be concluded that those "in heaven" (Rev. 19:1) do not follow the RSV or NRSV type of logic.

Certainly I would not suggest that we run to the mad extreme of the *American Standard Version* which uses "Jehovah" for "YHWH (יהוה)" throughout the OT. To be sure, the ASV translators "threw the baby out with the bathwater," in failing to appreciate "the big picture" in the NT which is to *generally* use "Lord" for "*YHWH*." I do not say that one would have to use *exactly the same number* as the AV i.e., the sevenfold "Jehovah," and one "Jah" of its Old Testament; but I do say that the AV strikes the right type of balance with regard to this historically Protestant form, "Jehovah." The principles of this balance are evident in the NT, which generally uses "Lord" for the OT "*YHWH*," but makes some relatively small amount of usage of its abbreviated form, "Jah," *supra*. As to the proposition that unlike the Greek of the New Testament which Hellenized its Old Testament Hebrew form to "ια" in various names and the proclamation "Allelulia," we should not Anglicize it, but rather we should leave it in some untranslated state like "Yahweh," I ask, do we speak Hebrew or English? As to the types of views found in the RSV and NRSV, this is the type of nonsense that those past masters of the English language, the AV translators, specifically say they have "avoided." *Let us thank God they did so "avoid" this type of absurdity!*

---

[8] This Anglican Diocese (which was split in 1944,) should not be confused with the Roman Catholic Diocese of Down and Connor.

Matt. 11:2 "two" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion: Diatessaron studies in formatting.

On the one hand, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century), which is inside the closed class of sources, and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), which is outside the closed class of sources; both make reference to these "two" disciples. But their Diatessaron "harmony" of the gospels format so intertwines Matt. 11:2 and Luke 7:19, that one could not with any confidence say that the source is Matt. 11:2 as opposed to Luke 7:19. Thus with regard to the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, its appearance may be the result of adopting Tatian's ideas about Diatessaron formatting, when composing this Latin Diatessaron from Vulgate readings. So likewise with Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, its appearance in this Arabic Diatessaron may be the result of adopting Diatessaron formatting.

While one might argue that it would have been possible for either Diatessaron to have combined two diverse readings if *Variant 1*, *infra*, had been present in Matt. 11:2 i.e., "sending [word] by his two disciples," one could not be confident that either Diatessaron would always make such an assimilation if the two readings were present. Moreover, one might still argue that either Diatessaron is a conflated reading of *Variant 2*, *infra*, and Luke 7:19. Therefore, in this instance neither Diatessaron is of interest to us in understanding the textual transmission of Matt. 11:2. Therefore I shall not refer to either Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 11:2, the TR's Greek reading, "*duo* (two)," in the words, "sending (*pempsas*) two (*duo*) of the (*ton*) disciples (*mathetON*) *autou* (of him)," i.e., "he [John] sent two of his disciples" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*duos* (two)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century); and as Latin, "*duo* (two)," in old Latin Version g1 (8th / 9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, the Vulgate's reading is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407); ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a variant reading, Greek, "*dia* (through)" i.e., "he sent [word] through (*dia*) his disciples," is a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) (*Variant 1*). *Variant 1* is followed as Latin, "*per* (through)," in old Latin Versions d (5th century) and q (6th / 7th century).

Another variant, omits "two" (Greek *duo*) (*Variant 2*). In slightly different forms, this is found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), and c (12th / 13th century). This omission is also followed by the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Jerome (d. 420).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. *Variant 1* poses a textual problem, which requires the

addition of the "word" or something similar, to make sense of the clause. Were *Variant 1* original it seems unlikely that something like "word (*logos*)" would not have been present i.e., "sending (*pempsas*) word (*logon*) through (*dia*) the disciples (*ton mathetON*, plural genitive first declension masculine noun) *autou* (of him)." Thus its absence indicates some difficulty in the text, which is resolved by following the representative Byzantine reading.

Were *Variant 2* original, "the (*ton*) disciples (*mathetON*)" would not be in the genitive as in either the TR where it means "of," in "two (*duo*) of the (*ton*) disciples (*mathetON*);" nor as in *Variant 1*, where the rule that the Greek *dia* with the genitive means "through" or "by," justifies the genitive, "through (*dia*) the disciples (*ton mathetON*)." Rather we would expect it to be in the accusative making "the disciples" the object of the clause i.e., "sending (*pempsas*) the disciples (*tous mathetas*, plural accusative first declension masculine noun) *autou* (of him)." Indeed, where it is absent in the Latin text, the Latin is in the accusative, reading (in e.g., old Latin Versions a, b, h, f, & c), "sending (*mittens*) the disciples (*discipulos*, accusative plural, second declension masculine noun, from *discipulos-i*) *suos* (his)." Thus it is notable that "the disciples" is in the genitive in all Greek manuscripts.

The origins of *Variants 1 & 2* are speculative. Possibly the letters "*uo*" of "*duo*" were either lost in a paper fade / loss, or obscured by some alien substance. If so, a scribe may have "reconstructed" this as "*dia*," perhaps with some reference to the nearby usage of "*dia*" with a plural genitive of "corn" (AV) or "grainfields" (ASV) in Matt. 12:1, "through (*dia*) the corn (*ton sporimon*, plural genitive second declension masculine noun)." A similar paper fade or loss at the end of a line, may have resulted in a Latin scribe wrongly concluding that a scribe had written down "the disciples" in "the wrong" genitive declensions, resulting in the Latin form omitting this word and the Latin scribe "correcting" the declensions of "the disciples" to make them accusative. Of course, we cannot be certain as to the origins of these variants, we only know for sure that they were changes from the original TR's reading.

Lectionary 2378 helps us better understand how *Variant 1* may have arisen accidentally. In the cursive continuous script of both Lectionaries 2378 (which includes Matt. 11:2) and 1968 (which does not include Matt. 11:2) letters are often joined. *Prima facie* a "*duo* (two)" may look like a "*dia* (through)" because the right hand side of the upsilon (υ) is also used in this script to form the left hand side of the omega (ο). To avoid such obvious confusions between the upsilon and iota, in both Lectionaries the iota is never so joined on the right, but always stands with a slight gap to the right (but may be joined to the preceding letter on the left). But the omicron may also be joined by a closed adjoining letter to the right. E.g., here in Lectionary 2378, two verses down, the "*autois* (unto them)" (Matt. 11:4) is so joined between the omicron and iota, so that *prima facie* it looks like an alpha, "α". Moreover, here in Lectionary 2378 one finds an accent (/) over the omicron of "*duo* (two)". Furthermore, handwritten manuscripts sometimes leave something to be desired e.g., in the next reading, Matt. 11:5, *infra*, in word 3, "*euaggelizontai* (are evangelized)," Lectionary 2378 has a badly formed "z" or zeta (ζ), which *prima facie* looks more like a beta (β); or two readings down at Matt. 11:8, *infra*, "*imatiois / ιματιοις* ('raiment')," is written in Lectionary 2378 is such a way that the "*ις*" suffix *prima facie* looks something like a kappa (κ).

None of us is perfect, and we all have to learn. Sometimes we learn by our mistakes. Did a beginning scribe, who as yet did know the cursive script very well, see such a script in which he took the upsilon sharing its right side with the omicron to be an "iota"? Was there

also an accent which due to the last scribe's inadvertence, or perhaps an ink blotching, joined the omicron at the top, so that it looked more like an alpha? If so, did such an inexperienced scribe then wrongly read the Received Text's "*duo* (two)" for "*dia* (through)"?

Given that we know of the "*dia* (through)" reading in the 5th century, is this too earlier for such a conjecture based on a cursive script? Certainly the cursive script comes into manuscripts we know with the minuscules (with lower case letters) from the 9th century on. But it is worth remembering that by early Byzantine times, two scripts were used, the unical (capital letters) for formal works such as books and stone carvings; but also the cursive for private letters, everyday writings, and some documents. And Greek accents date from the 3rd century B.C., when introduced by Aristophanes of Byzantium (*c.* 257-185 B.C.)[9]. The idea that some ancient manuscripts might have been written in this cursive script has not, to my knowledge, been formerly speculated by anyone; and as far as I know there is no positive evidence for any such conjecture i.e., there are no such known Biblical manuscripts. But *might* the existence of this variant from ancient times provide us with the implication that some such cursive Biblical manuscripts did in fact exist?

Textual analysis strongly favours the TR's reading, which is not only the representative Byzantine Greek reading, but also the reading of the church doctor, St. Jerome, in his Latin Vulgate, and several ancient and early mediaeval church writers, including the church doctors St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 11:2 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses[10].

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 11:2, "two," is followed by (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (12th century, independent),180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts), 1071 (12th century, independent), 1243 (independent text outside of the non-Byzantine General Epistles' text, 11th century), 828 (12th century, independent), 579 (13th century, mixed text type), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles), 1342 (13th / 14th century, mixed text type), and 205 (15th century, independent in the Gospels & Revelation). It is additionally followed by the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further followed by a variant reading in the

---

[9] "History of the Greek alphabet" *Wikipedia* (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_the_ Greek_alphabet). For an interesting reproduction of a Greek manuscript in ancient cursive script, dated 545 A.D. (British Museum Papyrus 1319), with a transcription into modern script provided below, see "File: Greek manuscript cursive 6th century.png" (en.wikipdia.org/wiki/File:Greek_ mansuscript_cursive_6th_century.png).

[10] Swanson says Family 13 manuscripts follow the TR's *duo* here; whereas UBS and Nestle-Aland say Family 13 has the NU Text's *dia* here, although UBS then lists Minuscule 13 as following the TR.

margin of the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; as well as in the Syriac Palestinian Version (*c.* 6th century); the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Georgian "A" Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading, *Variant 1*, which changes "two" to "through," is followed by the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century), and Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels). It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; as well as the Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Slavic Version (9th century).

The incorrect *Variant 2*, which omits "two," with minor differences of sentence segmentation, is found in the Georgian "1" and "B" Versions (5th century).

The incorrect *Variant 1* reading, "through" or "by" (ASV), entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 11:2. The incorrect reading also found in the earlier Westcott-Hort text, is found in the ASV as, "he [John the Baptist] sent by his disciples." It is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV (which has a footnote giving the TR as an alternative), and ESV. The NASB adds the word, "word" in italics after "sent," to show that it is added, thus reading, "he sent *word* by his disciples" (NASB). This same addition appears in the RSV, NRSV, and ESV, but it is not put it in italics to show that it has been added. The incorrect *Variant 2* reading which omits "two" and replaces it with nothing, is found in the NIV and Moffatt Bible. E.g., at Matt.11:2, Moffatt simply reads, "he sent his disciples" (Moffatt Bible).

Matt. 11:5 "and the poor have the gospel preached to them" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Latin words, "*pauperes* ('the poor,' word 2, plural) *evangelizantur* ('they are evangelized,' i.e., 'have the gospel preached to them,' word 3)," are found in both the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century), and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century). However, the Diatessaron's integration of Gospel readings means one cannot be sure if the source is Matt. 11:5, or Luke 7:22, or both.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 11:5, the TR's "*kai* ('and,' word 1) *pt<u>o</u>choi* ('the poor,' word 2, plural) *euaggelizontai* ('are evangelized' or 'have the gospel preached to them,' word 3, present indicative passive, 3rd person plural verb, from *euaggeliz<u>o</u>*)," i.e., "and the poor have the gospel preached to them," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), P 024 (6th century), Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is also supported with Words 2 & 3 as Latin, "*pauperes* ('poor,' word 2, plural) *evangelizantur* ('they are evangelized' or 'have the gospel preached to them,' word 3, present indicative passive, 3rd person plural verb, from *evangelizo*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century),

1 (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported with Words 1,2, & 3 as Latin, "*et* ('and,' word 1) *pauperes* ('poor,' word 2, plural,) *evangelizantur* ('have the gospel preached to them,' word 3)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a variant omitting Words 1,2, & 3 is found in old Latin k (Africa, 4th / 5th centuries), i.e., omitting "and the poor have the gospel preached unto them."

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. The origins of the variant are speculative. Possibly the Latin scribe of k was copying from a Greek manuscript in which these words had been lost from ellipsis, i.e., when copying out "*egeirontai* (are raised up) *kai* ('and,' word 1) *pt<u>o</u>choi* ('poor,' word 2) *euaggelizontai* ('have the gospel preached to them,' word 3)," the Greek scribe's eye became confused with the "*ontai*" endings of "*egeirontai*" and "*euaggelizontai*" as his eye went forward and then back after writing "*egeirontai*," and then he started writing verse 6, and so these three words were lost. Perhaps they were lost by a paper fade, and the gap was taken as a "stylistic break." On this occasion, there are however, good grounds for concluding that this was a deliberate "stylistic" pruning of the text (see my comments at Matt. 13:9). Nevertheless, we cannot be sure as to how the three words were lost; we can only be sure that they were lost. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 11:5 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 11:5, "and the poor have the gospel preached to them," is followed by the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)*, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent).

There is no further support for the variant reading which omits, "and the poor have the gospel preached unto them." With strong support from the Alexandrian Texts *et al*, the correct reading at Matt. 11:5 entered Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott & Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952), Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). Hence it is found in the ASV as, "the poor have good tidings

preached to them." It is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

However, like the variant these words are omitted in the Moffatt Bible, and a footnote says, "Omitting *kai ptochoi euaggelizontai*, which seems a harmonistic interpolation from Luke 7:22. Matthew never uses *euaggelizesthai*." *Euaggelizesthai* is (present middle) infinitive, from *euaggelizo*. Whether in this or another conjugation, *to evangelize*, is or is not used elsewhere in St. Matthew's Gospel, is not the crushing argument that Moffatt thinks it is. As already stated in the section inside the closed class of sources, *supra*, there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading. But in view of Moffatt's bizarre claims, (which are so crazy that it would never have occurred to me that someone would use them to claim a textual problem in the TR of Matt. 11:5,) let us consider three textual matters: the parallelism of Matt. 10:8 and 11:5; the relationship of Matt. 11:5 to Isa. 61:1; and the more general interconnected usage of the terms "the gospel" (*euaggelion*) and "to preach the gospel" (*euaggelizo*) in NT Greek.

Firstly, as noted in the commentary on Matt. 10:8, *supra*, there is a stylistic parallelism between Matt. 10:8 and 11:5. "Heal the sick" (Matt. 10:8) // "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk" (Matt. 11:5); "cleanse the lepers" (Matt. 10:8) // "the lepers are cleansed" (Matt. 11:5); "Heal the sick" (Matt. 10:8) // "and the deaf hear" (Matt. 11:5); "raise the dead" (Matt. 10:8) // "the dead are raised up" (Matt. 11:5); and "freely give" (Matt. 10:8) // "and the poor have the gospel preached to them" (Matt. 11:5). St. Paul could say to the Corinthians, "I have preached to you the gospel of God freely" (I Cor. 11:7). This is the same type of teaching as Matt. 10:8, when Christ said to his disciples in Matt. 10:8, "Freely ye have received" i.e., the gospel; "freely give" i.e., preach the gospel. Thus the omission of "and the poor have the gospel preached to them" (Matt. 11:5), as occurs in old Latin k, *supra*, creates a textual problem crying out for remedy; which remedy is found in following the representative Byzantine reading. Yet Moffatt misses this important textual point.

Secondly, these words of Matt. 11:5 are a fulfilment of Isa. 61:1, and indeed are regarded by some as a specific quotation of Isa. 61:1. In the Septuagint, Isa. 61:1 reads, "he has sent me to preach good tidings (*euaggelisasthai*, first aorist middle infinitive, from *euaggelion*) to the poor (*ptochois*)" (LXX), and the Hebrew word translated in the AV as "meek" (*'anav*), can mean "poor." The Septuagint OT thus use an infinitive from *euaggelion* at Isa. 61:1; whereas St. Matthew uses an infinitive from *euaggelizo* at Matt. 11:5. Recognizing that there is a clear inter-relationship between these two verses, thus leads to the conclusion that in some contexts, when put into the infinitive declension, these two Greek words can be used interchangeably. As more fully considered in the third point, *infra*, this interchangeability of terms strikes at Moffatt's attempt to depict them as essentially different, and belonging to fundamentally different vocabularies. If they were so different why does St. Luke, who uses both terms, *infra*, not follow the Septuagint at Luke 7:22 and read "*euaggelisasthai*" (LXX) rather than "*euaggelizontai*" (TR)?

Thirdly, Moffatt's basic point is incongruous with the more generally evident interrelated and interconnected nature of these two terms in NT Greek. I.e., *Euaggelizontai* (have the gospel preached to them) is from *euaggelizo*; and *euaggelion* means "the gospel." When one of these terms is used by a NT writer, the other may also reasonably be expected to be found in the works of that writer where appropriate. St. Luke uses both *euaggelizo* (Luke 4:18; 7:22; 9:6; 20:1; Acts 8:25; 14:7,21; 16:10) and *euaggelion* (Acts 15:7; 20:24). St. Paul in e.g., the Book of Romans and elsewhere, uses both *euaggelizo* (Rom. 1:15; 10:15; 15:20)

and *euaggelion* (Rom. 1:1,9,16; 2:16; 10:16; 11:28; 15:16,19,29; 16:25). And St. Peter uses both *euaggelizo* (1 Peter 1:12,25; 4:6) and *euaggelion* (I Peter 4:17).

St. Luke, St. Paul, and St. Peter do so, precisely for the same reason that St. Matthew uses both *euaggelizo* (Matt. 11:5) and *euaggelion* (Matt. 4:23; 9:35; 24:14; 26:13). I.e., "the gospel" (*euaggelion*) and "to preach the gospel" (*euaggelizo*) are complementary NT Greek or Ecclesiastical Greek terms, and context determines which one is so used. This is e.g., seen in Rom. 1:15,16, where St. Paul first says, "I am ready to preach the gospel (*euaggelisasthai*, first aorist middle deponent infinitive, from *euaggelizo*)" and then says, "For I am not ashamed of the gospel (*euaggelion*)." They are, as seen in the parallelism of Matt. 10:8 and 11:5, the two sides of the one coin. One cannot truly have and understand "the gospel" (*euaggelion*), without simultaneously supporting the recognition that this requires someone "to preach the gospel" (*euaggelizo*), because evangelism is an integral component of the gospel this side of eternity (Matt. 28:18-20). If Moffatt's silly argument were taken seriously, one might have to also omit "the gospel" from I Peter 4:17, which Moffatt does not do i.e., on the converse corollary logic of Moffatt, since St. Peter nowhere else uses "the gospel" (*euaggelion*), but only, "to preach the gospel" (*euaggelizo*). But I fear that by advancing this argument, some of Moffatt's followers will now also cross I Peter 4:17 out of their Moffatt Bibles! I for one, will not be crossing out these words from either Matt. 11:5 or I Peter 4:17 in my King James Bible!

Matt. 11:8 "raiment" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Three matters will be considered in this preliminary textual discussion.

The First Matter. Though this passage is not found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); it is found in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century), where it reads "*hominem* (a man) *mollibus* (soft) *vestimentis* (raiment) *indutum* (clothed in)." However, this same reading is found in the Vulgate at Luke 7:25, and it is not possible to tell if the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is getting this reading from Matt. 11:8 or Luke 7:25, or some combination thereof. Therefore it cannot be definitively said to follow either reading.

The Second Matter. The Greek clause reads, "*anthropon* (a man) *en* (in) *malakois* (soft) *imatiois* (raiment) *emphiesmenon* (clothed)." Old Latin Versions b, h, f, & l, read, "*hominem* (a man) *mollibus* (in soft) *vestimentis* (raiment) *indutum* (clothed);" and thus is a fairly literal translation of the Greek TR.

However, the Latin Vulgate, and old Latin Versions a, q, aur, g1, ff1, & c, read, "*hominem* (a man) *mollibus* (in soft) *vestitum* (clothed)," and is rendered in the Douay-Rheims (Douai-Rheims) as, "A man clothed in soft garments" i.e., regarding "garments" (raiment) as inferred from "clothed." This reading is also found in the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate. So too, old Latin Version d reads, "*hominem* (a man) *mollibus* (in soft) *indutum* (clothed);" and old Latin Version k, reads, "*hominem* (a man) *mellibus* ('in sweet,' literally, 'in honey') *vestitum* (clothed)." Thus all these Latin Versions regard "raiment" or "garments" as inferred from context.

And the following Latin clause in Matt. 11:8, i.e., "*Ecce* (Behold) *qui* (who / that) *mollibus* (in soft) *vestiuntur* (they are clothed)," is also rendered in the Douay-Rheims, "Behold, they that are clothed in soft garments," once again, considering that "garments" can be inferred from "clothed" (*vestiuntur*). So too in the Greek, this second clause reads, "*idou* (behold), *oi* (the ones / they) *ta* (-) *malaka* (soft) *phorountes* (wearing / that wear)," i.e., with "clothing" (or raiment) added in italics, "behold, they that wear soft clothing" (AV).

The textual apparatuses of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), take the view that because the Latin Vulgate *et al* reads "*vestitum* (clothed)," rather than "*vestimentis* (raiment) *indutum* (clothed)" (old Latin b, h, f, & l); that these Latin Versions therefore equate a Greek variant which instead of reading "*imatiois* (raiment) *emphiesmenon* (clothed)," reads only, "*emphiesmenon* (clothed)." On the one hand, *prima facie*, this seems a reasonable enough conclusion to draw, and it might possibly be the correct one. But on the other hand, with some reference to the following clause, "*Ecce* (Behold) *qui* (who / that) *mollibus* (in soft) *vestiuntur* (they are clothed)," it is possible to argue that the Latin "*hominem* (a man) *mollibus* (in soft) *vestitum* (clothed)," was considered an adequate translation of the Greek, "*anthropon* (a man) *en* (in) *malakois* (soft) *imatiois* (raiment) *emphiesmenon* (clothed)." The Douay-Rheims translators evidently thought so, since they did not translate this from the Latin as simply, "A man clothed in soft," but rather, "A man clothed in soft garments."

Under these circumstances, I do not think it is safe to make reference to the Latin text of Jerome's Vulgate *et al* in the principal textual discussion, since these versions may have been following either the TR's Greek reading or the Greek variant. However, I do think it is safe to make reference to the Latin text of old Latin b, h, f, & l, since these versions evidently must have followed the TR's Greek reading.

The Third Matter: Flying a Kite.

To float an idea that is highly speculative, and beyond the normal limits of conjecture, which may well be wrong, but which is nevertheless a theoretical idea thought to be worth raising for some reason, is sometimes referred to as "flying a kite." On this third matter of *malakos* as it relates to a variant in Matt. 11:8 followed by scribes of the Alexandrian School and Western Greek School, I have decided to "fly" such "a kite." Though this discussion of *malakos* is somewhat abstruse, I nevertheless hope that the reader will find this "kite-flying" to be an intellectually stimulating experience. Whether or not the reader does, *C'est la vie!*[11]

Another matter arises, this time with respect to the Greek word, *malakos*. The word has the sense of "soft" or "fine." In Matt. 11:8, it first occurs with "raiment" i.e., "*malakois* (soft) *imatiois* (raiment);" and then immediately after it stands by itself i.e., as "*malaka* (soft)," so that the AV adds in italics after it, "raiment." The question that arises, is whether the Alexandrian and Western Greek copyists considered that in NT Greek *malakos* carried with it a connotation of clothing, and hence e.g., it was not used in Matt. 11:8b? If so, why was it then used in Matt. 11:8a? It is *prima facie* possible to argue that comparison of these occurrences in Matt. 11:8, suggests that it *might* carry such a connotation, for which reason it stands by itself in Matt. 11:8b; but it *might not* carry such a connotation, for which reason

[11] French, "That's life."

"raiment" was added in Matt. 11:8a. But this argument is inclusive, and in my opinion ultimately flawed, since one might argue that the omission in Matt. 11:8b is abnormal, and only possible because Matt. 11:8a has first set a context in which "soft" must refer to clothing.

The issue of whether or not *malakos* was considered by Alexandrian and Western Greek prunists to have carried such a connotation in NT Greek is highly esoterical. Is the basic proposition that Alexandrian and Western Greek scribes considered there was such a nexus fact or fiction? We cannot be sure. Nevertheless, since the omission of *imatiois* (raiment) looks to me like the sort of thing that Alexandrian or Western Greek prunists might do on the basis of redundancy, it seems to me that a pruning of it may have occurred as a stylistic assimilation to the second absence of "raiment" (*imatiois*) after "soft" (*malakois*) in Matt. 11:8. It should be remembered that both the Alexandrian and Western Greek scribes were of a very low quality, and so they may well have wrongly thought that such a connotation attached to *malakos* on the basis of immediate "context" in Matt. 11:8. If so, seeing nothing against this in any other NT passages, they may have then leapt to the wrong conclusion that such a nexus existed, and so pruned away "raiment." Certainly I would not put this type of thing past the scribes of either the Alexandrian or Western Greek Schools.

Let us now try put ourselves in the confused mind of an Alexandrian or Western Greek scribe, to better understand how they *might* have seen this issue. If on the flimsy and inaccurate basis of "immediate context" in Matt. 11:8b, one were to argue that *malakos* does have such a connotation of clothing (cf. Luke 7:25); then it would become possible for an Alexandrian or Western Greek scribe to argue for its omission as a "stylistic improvement" on the basis of redundancy.

Malakos is also found in I Cor. 6:9. Here its basic meaning is "effeminate" (AV). Therefore, it certainly follows, that in a derivative sense, this includes, though is not exhausted in its meaning by, reference to male transvestites who dress up as females. By overdeveloping this concept, an Alexandrian or Western Greek scribe might have concluded that in I Cor. 6:9 "effeminate (*malakoi*)" had this connotation of men dressing up in woman's clothing i.e., so called "drag queens" (cf. Deut. 22:5), as either one of its meaning, or its exclusive meaning. Though not all homosexuals are involved in such transvestism, either themselves, or in terms of their sexual perverted partners, some are. After the "effeminate," reference is made in I Cor. 6:9 to "*arsenokoitai*." The Septuagint translation of Lev. 18:22 says, "And thou shalt not lie (*koit<u>e</u>n*, Greek *koit<u>e</u>*) with a man (Greek *arsenos*), as with a woman, for it is an abomination" (LXX). Thus both root words from the Greek, *arsenokoites* are found in Lev. 18:22 (LXX); and this includes a plain Greek word *koit<u>e</u>*, being the same as the Latin "coitus" or English "sex," and so this Greek word may be fairly rendered by something as plain as "homosexuals" or "sodomites." However, recognizing that there are contexts in which "it is a shame even to speak of those things which are done of them in secret" (Eph. 5:12), in the more discreet and learned language of the Authorized Version, I Cor. 6:9 becomes, not "sodomites" as in e.g., I Kgs 14:24, but rather, "abusers of themselves with mankind[12]." The fact that the "effeminate" (*malakoi*) precedes "abusers of

---

[12] In this more discreet (Eph. 5:12) and learned form: "abusers" (I Cor. 6:9) // "against" "the natural use" (Rom. 1:26,27); "of themselves" (I Cor. 6:9) // "sinneth against his own body" (I Cor. 6:18); and "with mankind" (I Cor. 6:9) // "with mankind" (Lev. 18:22).

themselves with mankind" at I Cor. 6:9, is significant for showing that in broad terms, this type of thinking is being focused on.

With regard to the neo-Alexandrian RSV's and Moffatt's "soft raiment" (Moffatt Bible), or the neo-Alexandrian NIV's "fine clothes" at Matt. 11:8, (see my comments on the RSV and NIV translation of Matt. 11:8, *infra*,) the question arises, Did they follow the variant reading but think *raiment* was inferred from *malakos*? In the case of the NIV, its subsequent translation of *malakos* at I Cor. 6:9 would *prima facie* indicate to me that they did not; although to this must be added the qualification that different NIV translators at different parts of the NIV, or even at the same part of the NIV, may have taken different views on the matter. Moreover it may have been considered to be a possible, but not a necessary, connotation.

In the case of the RSV, it is notable that these translators avoided a specific translation of *malakos* at I Cor. 6:9, considering that both *malakoi* and *arsenokoitai* refers to homosexuals, and saying in a footnote that these two words are rendered by their one word. Is this the view that the *malakoi* refers to the sexually passive homosexual partner, and the *arsenokoitai* refers to the sexually active homosexual partner? If so, the RSV's view was followed by the ESV, which translates this as "men who practice homosexuality" (ESV), with a footnote at I Cor. 6:9 saying, "The two Greek terms translated by this phrase refers to the passive and active partners in consensual homosexual acts" (ESV footnote). (Cf. the Roman Catholic *Jerusalem Bible's*, which considers the contrasts between a catamite and sodomite is meant by *malakoi* and *arsenokoitai* respectively; although this view is not maintained in the *New Jerusalem Bible*. This same view was found earlier in Moffatt's Bible which renders these words at I Cor. 6:9 as "catamites" and "sodomites" respectively.) Or is the RSV following some view that *malakoi* refers to effeminate male homosexuals, who dress up, or may dress up, as females, and *arsenokoitai* refers to both, and so on the basis of "redundancy," one can translate them both by one English word referring to homosexuals? Certainly at I Tim. 1:10 the RSV translators rendered *arsenokoitais* by itself with reference to the sin of Sodom, and this is continued in the NRSV's "sodomites" (NRSV) (thus equating the AV's more discreet and learned language of "them that defile themselves with mankind[13]"). Were the RSV and ESV translators divided between, or uncertain about, these two views at I Cor. 6:9, and so came up with this as a compromise to both sides?

Certainly in the Septuagint OT, it is clear that *malakos* does not have such a connotation. In the Septuagint, we read, "Will he address thee with a petition? Softly (*malakos*), with the voice of a supplicant?" (Job 40:22, LXX). "In long-suffering is prosperity to kings, and a soft (*malake*) tongue breaks the bones" (Prov. 25:15, LXX). And "The words of cunning knaves are soft (*malakoi*); but they smite to the inmost parts of the bowels" (Prov. 26:22, LXX). There is certainly no connotation of clothing here, nor in the wider usage of *malakos* in classical Greek (Liddell & Scott)[14].

---

[13] In this more discreet (Eph. 5:12) and learned form: "them that defile" (I Tim. 1:10) // "defiled" (Lev. 18:24,25,27,28,30); "themselves" (I Tim. 1:10) // I Cor. 6:18; and "with mankind" (I Tim. 1:10) // "with mankind" (Lev. 18:22). For sodomy with mankind will defile a person, just as sodomy with a beast will "defile" a person (Lev. 18:23).

[14] Liddell & Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*, pp. 1076,1077, Supplement p. 96.

On the basis of this Septuagint usage, and wider classical Greek usage referred to in Liddell & Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*, I think one can confidently dismiss any general proposition that the connotation of clothing necessarily attaches to *malakos*. Nevertheless, such wider analysis may have been avoided by the more superficial scribes of the Alexandrian School and Western Greek School, who may simply have flicked through the NT references to *malakos* in Matt. 11:8; Luke 7:25; I Cor. 6:9; and then based their conclusions on the "immediate context" of Matt. 11:8. Alternatively, they may have distinguished between such a connotation being in some contexts possible, "as in the NT," but not necessary, as in the Septuagint OT.

However, since one cannot ever enter into the head of another, and we cannot be sure that any Alexandrian or Western Greek scribe did prune away "raiment (*imatiois*)" at Matt. 11:8 as a deliberate "stylistic improvement," rather than an accidental omission due to negligence, for which both Schools of scribes were also notorious, I have decided to raise this issue mainly as a preliminary textual discussion, and I have further maintained that the associated possibility that the omission of "*imatiois* (raiment)" after "*malakois* (soft)," was a deliberate "stylistic improvement" brought about on the basis that it was "redundant," is only one of two possibilities. Nevertheless, notwithstanding these important qualifications, it seems to me that this is very much the type of fantasy that the inferior scribes of the Alexandrian School and Western Greek School may well have entered into, even though we cannot be sure that on this occasion they did so.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 11:8, the TR's Greek, "*imatiois* (raiment)," in the clause, "A man clothed in soft raiment," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), P 024 (6th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). As discussed in the preliminary textual discussion, *supra*, it is further supported as Latin, "*vestimentis* (raiment)," by old Latin Versions b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), and 1 (7th / 8th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. The Greek *en* plus a dative makes *en* mean "in" (or "on," "at," etc.), and so here the *en* with the dative adjective *malakos* i.e., "*en* (in) *malakois* (soft)" naturally expects a noun in the plural dative case. Therefore the neuter noun, *imation*, follows very naturally (cf. Lk 7:25). It is well attested to in the Greek, and further attested to in some Latin texts. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 11:8 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 11:8, "raiment," is followed by (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also followed in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text in the Gospels); 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (12th

century, independent), 579 (13th century, mixed text type). It is additionally followed the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in all extant Egyptian Coptic Versions e.g., the Bohairic Version (3rd century); all extant Syriac Versions e.g., the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); as well as the Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant that omits "*imatiois* (raiment)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the independent text type) Z 035 (6th century). Whereas in general terms the Alexandrian School liked to prune the text; in general terms the Western School liked to conflate the text. The more talented scribes in the West were generally syphoned off as Latin scribes for many centuries before the Reformation; resulting in higher quality Western Latin scribes who produced a high quality Western Latin text. The lower quality scribes were generally moved to non-scribal activities, though occasionally were side-lined to become the lower quality Western Greek scribes who produced a low quality Western Greek text. The Western Greek text is thus as notoriously bad as the Alexandrian Greek text, even though the two schools tended to err in opposite directions of pruning (Alexandrian Greek scribes) and conflation (Western Greek scribes).

The fact that this same omission occurs in both the leading Alexandrian and leading Western Texts, together with an independent text, therefore strongly suggests one of two things. The first possibility is that a view was formed, albeit an erroneous view, that *malakos* carried with it a connotation of clothing, in which instance it could be removed as a "stylistic improvement" on the basis that it was "redundant." On the one hand, this looks to me like the type of erroneous conclusion that these Alexandrian and Western Greek scribes may well form. But on the other hand, we cannot say with certainty that such a connotation was thought to exist in the minds of these scribes reading NT Greek. (See Preliminary Textual Discussion, *supra*.)

The second possibility, is that this was an accidental, rather than a deliberate, omission. If so, for this to be a common mistake, it must have been relatively easy to make it. If so, the loss probably came about due to ellipsis from the "*ois*" endings of "*malakois* (soft) *imatiois* (raiment)," with the eye of different copyists in these two inferior schools of scribes, like the independent scribe of Z, jumping from one to the other. Certainly such slip-shod negligence was also a hallmark of scribes in both the Alexandrian and Western Greek Schools. If so, this appears to have occurred multiple autonomous times in the different textual traditions, e.g., possibly when disrupted by an external stimulus after writing "*malakois* (soft)," and working back from the right hand side of the line to the "*ois*" ending they remembered they were up to, they saw the "*ois*" ending of "*imatiois* (raiment)" and kept writing.

The incorrect reading which omits "*imatiois* (raiment)" at Matt. 11:8, unsurprisingly

entered the NU Text *et al*. In the ASV, it is supplied in italics i.e., "a man clothed in soft *raiment*." This same technique is followed by the NASB. Though it is supplied in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, and Moffatt Bible, the fact that these translations do not use italics, means we cannot be sure which of the two readings the RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, or Moffatt Bible translators were following; and possibly they themselves were confused about, and uncertain, as to which one they were following. Did the RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, and Moffatt Bible translators follow the TR or variant reading? Did they follow the variant reading but think *raiment* was inferred from *malakos*? Did they divide on the issue? Did they know what they were doing? Believing as they did in a non-literal translation that does not use italics (RSV, NRSV, ESV), or the more developed idea of "dynamic equivalence" (NIV & Moffatt), did any of these translators even care? If they cared so little for the Word of God, why should we or any good Christian man care for their neo-Alexandrian translations?

Matt. 11:9 "But what went ye out for to see? A prophet?" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Three matters will be considered in this preliminary textual discussion.

The First Matter. In the chapters leading up to Matt. 11, the Greek *tis / ti* and Latin *quid / quis* can mean either "what?" (e.g., Matt. 5:47; 6:3,25,31; 8:29; 9:4,13; 10:19) or "why?" (e.g., Matt. 6:28; 7:3; 8:26). Thus it is possible to translate the TR at Matt. 11:8,9, as either, "But what (*ti*) went ye out for the see? A man … ?" etc. (AV), and "But what (*ti*) went ye out for the see? A prophet?" etc. (AV). However it is also possible to translate the TR as, "But why (*ti*) went ye out? To see a man …?" etc., and "But why (*ti*) went ye out? To see prophet?" etc.

This same ambiguity exists in the Latin. I.e., depending on how one translates the Latin *quid*, it is possible to punctuate the Latin reading at Matt. 11:8,9, as either the "what?" or "why?" reading, *supra*. E.g., the punctuation of Colunga & Turrado's Clementine Vulgate uses "*quid*" for "what?;" whereas the punctuation of Wordsworth and White's edition of Jerome's Vulgate at Matt. 11:9 uses "*quid*" for "why?"

The AV follows the translation, "What?" at Matt. 11:8,9. By contrast, the RSV follows the translation "Why?" at Matt. 11:8,9, although an RSV footnote gives the "What?" translation as an alternative. This is a matter of legitimate diversity of translation (as is also the same issue at Matt. 11:7). I do not intend to enter discussion here on *what* I think is the better translation, and *why*? Rather, for the purposes of textual analysis, I shall simply stipulate that the AV's reading is one correct translation, and I am happy to follow it.

The Second Matter. The UBS textual apparatus shows the Vulgate in support of the TR, together with the ancient church Latin writers, Ambroisaster, Hilary, Jerome, and Augustine. The Nestle-Aland textual apparatus shows "the entire Latin tradition in support of the same Greek reading" as that of the TR. Additionally, as punctuated in Migne, the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604), follows the TR and reads, "*Sed* (But) *quid* (what) *existis* (went ye for) *videre* (to see)? *Prophetam* (A Prophet)?"

To the extent that the Latin texts all have the same word order as the TR i.e., Greek "*idein* (to see) *prophe<u>te</u>n* (a prophet)," is rendered by Latin, "*videre* (to see) *prophetam* (a

prophet);" there is arguably some merit in the claim of the Nestle-Aland and UBS textual apparatuses here. However, in broad terms I think they are both misleading.

Specifically, I do not think one can put so fine a distinction on the Latin word order as to say that it here supports the TR as opposed to the variant. That is because the Latin could arguably have been translated from either the Greek word order of the TR i.e., "*idein* (to see) *prophetten* (a prophet)," or the Greek word order of the minority Byzantine variant i.e., "*prophetten* (prophet) *idein* (to see)?" Latin translation of the Greek is not so precise as to guarantee preservation of Greek word order in the Latin, where the same sense may be conveyed by a slightly different word order in the Latin. (In turn, the same is true with English translation of the Greek or Latin.) If the latter word order of the variant was used by the Latin scribes, then the Latin scribes responsible presumably preferred the "Why?" readings as found in the punctuation of Wordsworth and White's edition of Jerome's Vulgate. Therefore I will make no reference to the evidently ambiguous Latin text in the principal textual discussion, *infra*.

The Third Matter. The TR's reading includes the word, "*exelthete* ('went ye out for,' indicative active first aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *exerchomai*)." The Greek, "*exerchomai*," is a compound word made up of "*ek*" / "*ex*" (out) and "*erchomai*" ('come' or 'go'). But as an aorist, "*erchomai*" can take either the form of a first aorist (declined from *eltha*), in which instance the reading here at Matt. 11:9 is "*exelthete*"; or the form of a second aorist (declined from *elthon*), in which instance the reading here at Matt. 11:9 would be "*exelthate*." There is no difference in meaning between the first and second aorist, and the difference between these two possibilities is thus of no consequence with respect to either the basic propounding of the Scripture (called in academic theological language, "exegesis,") or translation. The difference is like such variant English spellings as, "realise" or "realize," "defence" or "defense," and "program" or "programme."

Here at Matt. 11:9, inside the closed class of sources, W 032 (*Variant 1a*), Sigma 042, N 022, P 024, and Lectionary 2378, all use the second aorist form, "*exelthate*;" rather than the correct first aorist form of the representative Byzantine text, "*exelthete*" (e.g., E 07, G 011, & S 028). The same is true outside the closed class of sources, with Rome Vaticanus, London Sinaiticus, D05, L 019, Delta 037, and Theta 038, which likewise use the second aorist form. But for my primary purposes, I show such readings as simply following that of the Received Text, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 11:9, the TR's Greek reading, "*Alla* (But) *ti* (what) *exelthete* (went ye out for) *idein* (to see) ; (?) *Prophetten* (A prophet) ; (?)", is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), P 024 (6th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). With minor variation, it is found as "*exeleluthate* (went ye out for) to see (*idein*)? A prophet (*Prophetten*)?" in the Byzantine codex, F 09 (9th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

However, a minority Byzantine variant reads, Greek, "*exeleluthate* (went ye out for) *prophetten* (prophet) *idein* (to see)?" (*Variant 1a*) I.e., the sentences thus reads, "But (*Alla*) why (*ti*) went ye out (*exeleluthate*)? A prophet (*prophetten*) to see (*eiden*)?" although in

English translation, one would still render the last sentence, "To see a prophet?" This is followed by W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). The alternative word order, "*propheten* (prophet) *idein* (to see)?" (*Variant 1b*) i.e., without the change from the TR's "*exelthete* (went ye out for)" to *Variant 1a's* "*exeleluthate* (went ye out for)," is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407). It is possible to get the same English reading from the TR as that in *Variants 1a & 1b* (see preliminary textual discussion, *supra*), though it is not necessary to get this reading from the TR.

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. There is also a good textual argument in favour of the TR's reading. There is a clear contextual parallelism in Christ's two questions in Matt. 11:8,9, "But (*Alla*) what (*ti*) went ye out for (*exelthete*) to see (*idein*)? A man (*Anthropon*)" etc.?; and "But (*Alla*) what (*ti*) went ye out for (*exelthete*) to see (*idein*)? A prophet (*Propheten*)?" etc. . This makes the TR's reading at Matt. 11:9 the more expected and natural reading, since if "to see (*idein*)? A prophet (*Propheten*)?" (TR) is reversed to "A prophet (*propheten*) to see (*eiden*)?" then this Hebraic (or Aramaic) style parallelism is broken, producing a jarring effect that indicates a contextual textual problem. This same point remains valid if one follows the "why?" translation of *ti* (see preliminary textual discussion, *supra*), since the basic structural parallelism of Matt. 11:8,9 still favours the TR's reading.

The origins of the variant, both when preceded by "*exeleluthate*" (*Variant 1a*) and when preceded by "*exelthete*" (*Variant 1b*), are speculative. But with respect to *Variant 1b*, it is notable that in its earliest appearance by Origin, he was also aware of the TR's reading. It seems likely to me that Origen was the originator of this variant; and that the textual argument in favour of the TR's reading was lost on him. If so, it was presumably motivated by the fact that Origen took the Greek *ti* to mean "Why?" rather than "What?" I.e., "But (*Alla*) why (*ti*) went ye out (*exeleluthate*)?" etc. . Thus in a desire to stop people taking what he thought of as "the wrong" interpretation of *ti* as "what," he may well have made a deliberate "stylistic improvement," and changed the word order of "*eiden* (to see) *propheten;* (a prophet?)" to "*propheten* (a prophet) *eiden;* (to see?)" Of course, we cannot be sure of this, but it strikes me as the type of thing Origen would *sometimes* do. Chrysostom, aware of the two variants that had originated with Origen, did not on this occasion think the matter through, and simply reflected what was a known ambiguity to him.

What of *Variant 1a*? I think its base is once again that of the Origen line i.e., the word order, "*propheten* (prophet) *idein* (to see)?" Though the matter is conjectural, it seems probable to me, that the original line, putting into continuous script, "ALLA / ΑΛΛΑ (But) TI / TI (why) EXELTHETE / ΕΧΗΛΘΕΤΕ (went ye out for) PROPHETEN / ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΝ (prophet) IDEIN / ΙΔΕΙΝ (to see)" i.e., "...*ALLATIEXELTHETEPROPHETENIDEIN*..." or in Greek script, "…*ΑΛΛΑΤΙΕΧΗΛΘΕΤΕΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΝΙΔΕΙΝ* …" was damaged and at the end of a line, so the scribe of W 032 or an antecedent scribe whose manuscript line he was copying, saw instead, something like "...*ALLATIEXEL*:::|:|*E*|:|:::|:…", or in Greek script, "…*ΑΛΛΑΤΙΕΧΗΛ*::::::|:|*Η*|:|:::|:…". All or some of these downward bars may or may not have been present, but if they were, the first downward bar was from the PH (Φ) of PROPHETHN, the second bar from the T of PROPHETHN, the third bar from the N of PROPHETHN, the fourth bar from the I of IDEIN, and the fifth bar from the N of IDEIN.

The scribe, appears to have "reconstructed" this from Luke 7:26, where we read, "ALLA / ΑΛΛΑ (But) TI / TI (what) EXELELYTHATE / ΕΧΕΛΗΛΥΘΑΤΕ (went ye out for) IDEIN / ΙΔΕΙΝ (to see)? PROPHETEN / ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΝ (A prophet)?" The scribe then appears to have supplied the "missing" letters i.e., from "EXELELYTHATE / ΕΧΕΛΗΛΥΘΑΤΕ (went ye out for)" the "ELYTHATE / ΗΛΥΘΑΤΕ" (Luke 7:26). The first bar may have been taken to be the | of the letter rho, R (P) in PROPHETEN / ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΝ (A prophet), the last letter eta, E (H) in PROPHETEN / ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΝ (A prophet) taken by the scribe to be the first eta E (H) in PROPHETEN / ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΝ; the third bar | taken to be from the T (tau) in PROPHETEN / ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΝ; the fourth bar | taken to be the last eta E (H) in PROPHETEN / ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΝ; and the last bar | taken to be from the letter E (epsilon) of IDEIN / ΙΔΕΙΝ (to see).

Alternatively, the scribe may have made this reconstruction without reference to some or all of these bars, simply from"...*ALLATIEXEL*:::::::*E*::::::::…", or in Greek script, "…*ΑΛΛΑΤΙΕΧΗΛ*::::::::Η:::::::: …"; but if so, I think it highly likely that the last letter eta, E (H) in PROPHETEN / ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΝ (A prophet) was present, and taken by the scribe to be the first eta E (H) in PROPHETEN / ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΝ; since this accounts for his word order of "*prophet*en (prophet) *idein* (to see)?" as opposed to the word order of Luke 7:26 which is "*idein* (to see) *prophet*en (prophet)?"

A similar though less complex origin to "*exelel*uthate (went ye out for)" in Byzantine Codex F 09, probably occurred when due to a paper loss at the end of a line at Matt. 11:9, a simple "reconstruction" was made from Luke 7:26.

Of course, we cannot be certain as to how the variant of F 09, or *Variants 1a* or *1b* came about, we can only know for sure that in some way they did.

The reading of the *Textus Receptus* at Matt. 11:9 has strong support from the Greek, and a number of ancient church writers. Textual analysis strongly favour this reading. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 11:9, "But what went ye out for to see? A prophet?," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); in the hand of a later corrector of one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in e.g., the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century),

Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); and also the Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500); and Slavic (Slavonic) Version (9th century).

However, *Variant 1b* is found in of one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); in the hand of a later "corrector" of one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with (the independent text type) Z 035 (6th century); and Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in the Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; together with the Georgian Version (5th century); and the Ethiopic Version (Roman edition of 1548-9).

With the two major Alexandrian texts in disagreement, and fiddling'n'fudging among Alexandrian scribes rampart, with one Alexandrian scribe trying to change the correct reading of London Sinaiticus to the incorrect reading, and another Alexandrian scribe trying to change the incorrect reading of Rome Vaticanus to the correct reading, the neo-Alexandrians, like their Alexandrian forbears, have been fiddling and faddling and fudging with their readings. The incorrect *Variant 1b*, favoured by Rome Vaticanus and the later fudged London Sinaiticus, was followed at Matt. 11:9 in the neo-Alexandrian text of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). But then the correct reading, found in London Sinaiticus and the later fudged Rome Vaticanus, was followed in the UBS 3rd and 3rd corrected editions, whose NU Text Committee said, "there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text or the [alternative footnote reading in the textual] apparatus contains the superior reading." The Nestle-Aland 27th edition and UBS 4th revised edition also followed this same reading, but the NU Text Committee said of it, "that the text is almost certain." With this type of vacillation, we cannot be sure as to what a future NU Text Committee or neo-Alexandrian text may or may not do with this reading.

The ASV main text at Matt. 11:9, *prima facie* might be based on either one reading of the TR, or the reading of *Variant 1b*, "But wherefore went ye out? To see a prophet?" But an ASV footnote says, "Many ancient authorities read, 'But what went ye out to see? A prophet?'." The effect of this contrast, is that the ASV must be endorsing *Variant 1b* in the main text, otherwise they would say simply, "Or," followed by the alternative reading. Instead, they here represent this as a textual difference, and thus endorse the variant. This same dichotomy in the main text and footnote, is maintained in the RSV. However, it is reversed in the NRSV and ESV, both of which follow the correct reading of the ASV and RSV footnote as the reading of their main text at Matt. 11:9, and then place as a footnote alternative, the reading that is in the main text of their RSV and ASV. The NASB in its 1st and 2nd editions, follows the ASV's main text reading but without any footnote alternative, thus leaving the issue of which variant it is following as a mystery, since the "Why?" or "Wherefore?" reading could come from either Greek reading. The 3rd edition of the NASB then changes this, and follows the same correct reading as was in the ASV's footnote. The NIV follows the correct "What?" reading.

It is clear that some of the fiddling, faddling, and fudging of the original Alexandrian texts; has been replicated in the neo-Alexandrian texts, which have fiddled and faddled between readings, and sometimes fudged support for their reading (see preliminary textual discussion, second matter, *supra*); and also in the neo-Alexandrian versions, which have fiddled and faddled between different Alexandrian readings. Just looking at the versions

related to the ASV alone, it is clear that at Matt. 11:9 they have fluctuated between supporting the correct reading (ASV ftn, RSV ftn, NRSV, ESV, & NASB 3rd ed.), the incorrect reading (ASV, RSV, NRSV ftn, ESV ftn), and being non-committal on which reading is correct (NASB 1st ed. & 2nd ed.). By contrast, the TR and AV have remained rock solid in their constancy. Now what saith the Word of the Lord? The "wise man" "built his house upon a rock" (Matt. 7:24). And what saith our Lord? "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Matt. 24:35).

Matt. 11:10 "For" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading, "*gar* (for)," in the words, "*outos* (this) *gar* (for) *esti* (is he)," i.e., "For (*gar*) this is he" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century), P 024 (*Codex Guelferbytanus*, 6th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*). It is also supported as Latin, "*Hic* (this) *enim* (for) *est* (is he)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), Codices e (Sangallensis) and 1 (Sangallensis) (St. Gallen, 6th & 8th centuries respectively), Codices J (Gospels, Foroiulliensis) and ar (Juvenianus) (Cividale, 6th / 7th centuries & Roma Vall. 8th / 9th centuries respectively), Codices O (Gospels, Oxoniensis) and a (Seldenianus) (Oxford, 7th & 7th / 8th centuries respectively), Codex C (Cavensis, La Cava, 9th century), and old Latin Version 1 (7th / 8th century); and as Latin, "*Hic* (this) *est* (is he) *enim* (for)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), g2 (10th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading with the latter word order, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, "For" (Greek, *gar*; Latin, *enim*), is omitted in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and ancient church Latin writer, Ambrose (d. 397).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. The origins of the variant are speculative. Did Origen regard it as a "stylistic improvement" to prune the text of its "redundant" and "flowery" Greek *gar*, in order to make it "more succinct"? Alternatively, we know from *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, Manuscript Washington) where a short word was dropped out and then the scribe realizing his error reinserted it between the lines (Matt. 24:2, the reinsertion of *ode* / here), that it was possible for a scribe to miss a short word like *gar* / for, possibly due to fatigue. Is that what happened here? Whether this omission was by accident or design we do not know. Either way, once again, it looks like Origen "had his finger in the pie."

With strong support from both the Greek and Latin, the support of the ancient church Greek writing father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom, and early mediaeval church Latin writing doctor, St. Gregory; and with no good textual argument against it, the reading of the *Textus Receptus* stands sure. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 11:10 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 11:10, "For," is found in such Codices as (the mixed text type) C 04 (*Codex Paris Ephraemi Rescriptus*, 5th century), (the mixed text type) L 019 (*Codex Regius*, 8th century), (the independent text type) 0233 (Munster, 8th century), (the independent) Delta 037 (*Codex Sangallensis*, 9th century), and (the mixed text type) Theta 038 (*Codex Coridethianus*, 9th century). It is further found in all extant Egyptian Coptic Versions other than some Bohairic manuscripts, *infra*, e.g., the Sahidic Version (3rd century); as well the Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); celebrated Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Version.

However, the incorrect reading which omits "For" at Matt. 11:10, is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century) and Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; some independent manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al*. At Matt. 11:10, "For" is omitted in the ASV which (based on the earlier Westcott-Hort text,) reads simply, "This is he." The erroneous shorter reading was also followed in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Matt. 11:15 "to hear" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading, "*akouein* (to hear)," in the words, "He that hath ears to hear (*akouein*), let him hear" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*audiendi* ('to hear,' literally 'of hearing'), in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Justin Martyr (d. *c.* 165), Origen (d. 254), Docetists (2nd / 3rd centuries) according to Hippolytus (d. 235), Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

However, "to hear" (Greek, *akouein*; Latin, *audiendi*), is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 32 (12th century). It is also omitted in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries) and d (5th century).

There is no good textual reason to doubt the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Certainly one cannot confidently rule out the possibility that the earlier Latin manuscripts omitting "to hear," were copying out and translating their Latin manuscripts from Greek manuscripts in which the Greek "*akouein*" (to hear) had been omitted as a "stylistic improvement" on the basis that "it

was redundant." However, this is not the only possibility.

It seems unlikely that the 12th century minority reading Byzantine Greek manuscript comes from the same line as the Latin manuscripts, indicating the presence of a textual matter likely to give rise to this error on multiple occasions at Matt. 11:15. The words, "*O* (He) *ECHON* (that hath) *OTA* (ears) *AKOYEIN* (to hear) *AKOYETO* (let him hear)," originally would have looked something like, "... *OECHONOTAAKOYEINAKOYETO* …." Thus having first written down the "*AKOYE*" of "*AKOYEIN* (to hear)," a scribe may have looked back up, and seeing the "*AKOYE*" of "*AKOYETO* (let him hear)," through ellipsis have then written down the "*TO*" ending of "*AKOYETO*," and thus "*AKOYEIN* / *akouein* (to hear)" was lost.

Such ellipsis may have first occurred in a Greek manuscript copied by the Latin scribes of the variant; though it is also possible that a similar loss occurred by ellipsis inside the Latin tradition, with a similar ellipsis in the Latin sentence, "*qui* (that) *habet* (he hath) *aures* (ears) *audendi* (to hear), *audiat* (let him hear)." I.e., with a Latin copyist's eye jumping from the "*aud*" of "*audendi*" to the "*iat*" ending of "*audiat*." Whether the Latin omission of "to hear" is one more of multiple losses of "to hear" from ellipsis, or whether the Latin scribes copied from a Greek manuscript where such ellipsis had already occurred, is unknown. We only know for certain that the original reading of "to hear" (Greek, *akouein*; Latin, *audiendi*,) was lost.

The TR's reading has good support from both the Greek and Latin, and no good textual argument against it. It is well supported by a number of ancient church writers. One can readily see how "to hear (*akouein*)" could have been omitted by design or accident. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 11:15 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 11:15, "to hear," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in such Codices as (the mixed text type) C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Z 035 (6th century), (the independent) Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Theta 038 (9th century). It appears to be found in the Gothic Version (4th century), however the state of preservation of this manuscript at Matt. 11:15 means complete verification is not possible. It is further found in the Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the incorrect reading which omits "to hear" is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent).

Though the textual basis is very flimsy, this incorrect reading has entered various neo-Alexandrian texts, such as Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text's Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). However, with the two main Alexandrian texts split down

the middle, neo-Alexandrian translators have been uncertain as to which of their two main texts they should follow.

At Matt. 11:15, the ASV follows the correct reading in the main text, "He that hath ears to hear (*akouein*), let him hear." But then an ASV footnote says, "Some ancient authorities omit 'to hear.'" The ASV's elder son, the RSV, follows this same dichotomy. The RSV's elder son, the NRSV, reverses this order, making the reading found in the ASV's and RSV's footnote the main reading, and the reading found in the main text of ASV and RSV the footnote reading. The RSV's younger son, the ESV, then changes this back to the same dichotomy as the ASV and RSV. The ASV's younger son, the NASB, followed the ASV's correct main text reading, and wisely provided no footnote alternative; thus finally getting back to where the AV always was on this verse. By contrast, the NIV followed the incorrect reading which omits "to hear," and did not so much as provide a footnote giving the correct reading as an alternative. When with the neo-Alexandrians, one discounts the several thousand Byzantine manuscripts whose wider general picture we know from e.g., the large representative sample of manuscripts we have in von Soden's K group (Robinson & Pierpont) of *c.* 860 Gospel manuscripts in the K group's *c.* 980 manuscripts, as well as the Latin manuscripts, ancient and mediaeval church writers and if the latter, especially early mediaeval church writers, all of which had reasonable accessibility over the centuries; so that one has first and foremost in one's mind just two main Alexandrian texts, the general knowledge about which essentially popped up from nowhere in the 19th century (although some more knowledge of the Alexandrian text existed before this time since Erasmus rejected it in the 16th century), and these two "Johnny come lately" manuscripts are in disagreement, these type of backwards and forwards "flip-flops" become understandable.

Matt. 11:16b "markets" (TR & AV) {C}

The TR's Greek reading, "*en* (in) *agorais* ('the markets' or 'the marketplaces,' dative plural, first declension feminine noun, from *agora*)," is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Clement of Rome (*c.* 150).

However, there is a variant Greek reading, "*en* (in) *agora* ('the market' or 'the marketplace,' dative singular, first declension feminine noun, from *agora*)." It is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts. It is also followed as Latin, "*in* (in) *foro* ('the market' or 'the marketplace,' ablative singular, second declension neuter noun, from *forum*)," by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Theophilus of Antioch (d. after 180) and Euthalius of Egypt (5th century).

The singular here at Matt. 11:16b makes it sound very specific to a particular marketplace, whereas the context and ditty makes it sound as though it could be any marketplace. Thus one would naturally expect some contextual factor e.g., a plural usage of "marketplaces" to indicate *any* market place, such as one finds in about half the Byzantine

manuscripts. Thus on the balance of probabilities, the plural is the more likely reading i.e., "But whereunto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the markets (*agorais*), and calling unto their fellows, and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced: we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented" (Matt. 11:16,17).

Nevertheless, in Luke 7:32, one finds a similar reading that uses the singular "marketplace (*agora*)." Is this an exception to a general rule of NT Greek, i.e., that the singular refers to a *specific* marketplace (cf. Matt. 20:3; Mark 7:4; Acts 16:19; 17:17), whereas the plural refers to *any* marketplace (cf. Matt. 23:7; Mark 12:38; Luke 11:43; 20:46)? That the words of Luke 7:32 were not said at the same time as those of Matt. 11:16b, is evident from other stylistic dissimilarities, such as "unto their (*aut<u>o</u>n*) fellows (*tois etairous*)" (Matt. 11:16), rather than "one to another" (*all<u>e</u>lois*) (Luke 7:32). Of course, that does not mean that Christ may not have said such things at broadly the same time i.e., walking around and talking to different people in the same general location, on the same day, giving the same general message to different groups, he might say the words of Matt. 11:16 to one group, Luke 7:32 to another group, and possibly similar though slightly different words again to other groups that we do not have recorded. He might then have repeated this same message with its variants, every three or so months to other groups, or perhaps more frequently than this. The gospels give us an account of Christ's teachings, often repeated with a slightly different emphasis in different contexts. Hence one must be wary of so called "parallel" gospel readings. Thus it can only be assumed that in the Luke 7:32 passage, Christ may e.g., have gestured with his hand to some *particular* marketplace, or be speaking to persons whom he knew had just come from some *particular* marketplace. I think we can fairly safely surmise this from the contrast between Luke 7:32 (market) and Matt. 11:16 (markets), and the unusualness of the singular in Luke 7:32.

Such a conclusion also fits better with the general context of Matt. 11 and Luke 7. Matt. 11:16 is placed in a general location context in which Christ went to "teach and to preach in" various "cities" (Matt. 11:1), and thus a non-specific and general reference to "the markets" (Matt. 11:16) is appropriate. By contrast, Luke 7:32 is placed in a specific location context in which Christ "went into a city called Nain" (Luke 7:11), and thus a specific reference to "the marketplace" (Luke 7:32) of Nain is appropriate.

The origins of the variant are conjectural. The absence of the definite article in Matt. 11:16b i.e., "*agorais*" not "*tais agorais*," would mean that if due to a paper fade, the "*is*" suffix was missing, it might go undetected by a copyist regarding it as a stylistic paper space. This could occur even more easily if the remaining "*agora*" was at the end of a line. Alternatively, if "reconstructed" from e.g., "*ago*" it may have been accidentally assimilated to "*agora*" from Luke 7:32. In such a context, the subtleties of nuance in the NT Greek which use the singular for a specific marketplace and the plural for any marketplace, could easily have been lost on these scribes as they made their "reconstruction" of Matt. 11:16b to "*agora*," confident that "they were right" on the basis of the so called "parallel reading" at Luke 7:32.

Both readings have the support of about half the Byzantine manuscripts, and both readings have support from ancient church writers back to the second century A.D. . On the one hand, stylistic analysis indicates that the plural usage of "markets (*agorais*)" is the more expected contextual reading, and therefore the more probable reading in the context of Matt.

11:16b. But on the other hand, it is possible to rebut this presumption in favour of the plural as indeed occurs at Luke 7:32. Nevertheless, context distinguishes a general location context in Matt. 11:1,16, from a specific location context in Luke 7:11,32. Thus we cannot safely so argue for a rebuttal of this presumption here at Matt. 11:16b, since this would be an argument from silence for which we have no certain basis in fact; even though we know that this kind of contextual specificity was so applicable to the group Christ spoke slightly different words to in Luke 7:32. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 11:16b, a solid "C" (in the range of 60% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct plural reading at Matt. 11:16b, "markets," is found in such Codices as (the mixed text type) C 04 (5th century); (the mixed text type) L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), and 157 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). Though not affecting English translation, it is also followed with the addition of the definite article, thus reading, Greek, "*tais* (the) *agorais* (markets)," in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the independent text type) Z 035 (6th century). This addition of "*tais* (the)" here, whether a gratuitous addition from thin air, or possibly a conflation from "*tais agorais*" in Matt. 23:7 or elsewhere (cf. Mark 12:38; Luke 11:43; 20:46), was evidently an Alexandrian "stylistic improvement." It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Syriac Harclean h (616) Version..

However, the incorrect singular reading, "market," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version; Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

For the wrong reasons, primarily because of its support in the two major Alexandrian texts, but secondarily because of its wider "external" support beyond these two texts, the right reading entered the NU Text *et al.* It is thus found at Matt. 11:16 in the ASV as "marketplaces." The correct reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

It is difficult to find a more unreliable and more unsound Bible than the Moffatt Bible. Moffatt's *modus operandi* involved a two-armed pincer approach. One pincer, used more than 90% of the time, was Moffatt's Alexandrian text pincer arm; and the other pincer was Moffatt's unpredictable non-Alexandrian text pincer arm. On this occasion, Moffatt employed his non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, and seemingly influenced by the combined strength of both the Western and Syriac readings, adopted the singular reading, "market place" (Moffatt Bible).

Matt. 11:16c,17 "and calling unto their fellows, and saying" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek reading is, "*kai* ('and,' word 1) *prosphonousi*[15] ('calling ,' word 2) *tois* ('unto the,' word 3) *etairois* ('fellows,' word 4) *auton* ('of them,' word 5), *kai* ('and,' word 6) *legousin* ('saying,' word 7)" i.e., "and calling unto their fellows, and saying" (AV). This reading is supported by the majority Byzantine Text, other than Word 4, which is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts.

Dividing it up into its constituent parts, the TR's Greek, "*kai* ('and,' word 1) *prosphonousi* ('calling ,' word 2) *tois* ('unto the,' word 3) … *auton* ('of them,' word 5), *kai* ('and,' word 6) *legousin* ('saying,' word 7)," is a majority Byzantine reading, supported by e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). The TR's words 1 & 2 are also supported by the Latin "*et* (and) *clamantibus* (calling / crying out)" of old Latin Versions b (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). Word 6 is supported as Latin "*et*" in old Latin Versions ff2 (5th century) and g1 (8th / 9th century).

The TR's Greek, "*etairois* ('fellows,' word 4)," is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts e.g., G 011 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), V 031 (9th century), Y 034 (9th century), and 028 (10th century). It is supported as Latin, "*coaequalibus* (co-equals),[16]" in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions aur (7th century) and 1 (7th / 8th century). Word 4, "fellows," is also found in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century); and since "*coaequalibus* (co-equals)" is not found at Luke 7:32 it must be derived from Matt. 11:16c. From the Latin support for this reading, "*coaequalibus*" is also manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, an alternative reading (*Variant 1*) for words 1 & 2, "who [word 1] calling [word 2]," is found as Latin, "*qui* (who) *clamantes* (calling)" (*Variant 1*) in Jerome's Latin

---

[15] Von Soden's work upon which both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont is based, is generally not detailed enough for us to know what the majority Byzantine reading is on optional letters. Thus the decision on texts is made on preferred stylistic grounds. While Hodges & Farstad's majority text prefers to stylistic practice of Scrivener's Text which here lacks the optional "n" at the end of *prosphonousin*; by contrast, the majority text of Robinson & Pierpont includes the optional "n" at the end, thus reading, *prosphonousin*. This issue has no impact on English translation.

[16] Rendered "companions" in the *Douay-Rheims Version*, the more general Latin term, *coaequalis*, conveys the idea of the same age. However in Ecclesiastical Latin, the meaning is simply, "co-equals." Thus e.g., the three Divine Persons of the Trinity, all being from eternity, are in the Ecclesiastical Latin sense of the word, *coaequalis*; i.e., with respect to their Divinity they are co-equal *per se*, not just with regard to their eternal existence (Ps. 90:2). Nevertheless, when the Son who is co-equal with the Father (Philp. 2:6), was by his words and conduct clearly "making himself equal (Greek, *ison*; Latin, *aequalem*) with God" (John 5:18), *one element* of this was the idea conveyed in the more general Latin term, *coaequalis*, i.e., he was claiming to be from all eternity (cf. John 8:58), a claim which we orthodox Trinitarians accept (Micah 5:2).

Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin 1 (4th century), aur (7th century), g2 (10th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). Upon reconstruction, in the Greek this would be, "*a* ('who,' variant word 1) *propho nounta* ('calling,' variant word 2]," and the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407), reads, "*kai* ('and,' word 1) *prophonounta* ('calling,' variant word 2)," thus following the *Variant 1's* word 2 (*prophonounta*), with the majority Byzantine text's word 1 (*kai*).

There is also an alternative Byzantine reading (*Variant 2*) for word 4 as Greek, "*eterois* (others)," thus making the reading, "*tois* ('unto the,' word 3) *eterois* ('others,' variant word 4]," i.e., "and calling unto the others of them … ." This Variant Word 4 is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), E 07 (8th century), and K 017 (9th century). It is also followed as Latin, "*ad* ('unto,' word 3) *invicem* ('one another,' variant word 4]" in old Latin Versions b (5th century), h (5th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); or as "*in* (unto, word 3) *invicem* ('one another,' variant word 4)" in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century); or as "*aliis* (unto the others) [word 3 & variant word 4]" in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), d (5th century), g2 (10th century)[17]. This is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is also a variant (*Variant 3*) in which Word 6, "*kai* (and)" is omitted, so that the reading becomes "they say (Greek *legousin*; Latin *dicunt*)," translated as simply, "say" (*Variant 3*) This is found in the Latin in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions d (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g2 (10th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

In another reading (*Variant 4*), the reading *Variant 1*, "*a* ('who,' variant word 1) *prophonounta* ('calling,' variant word 2]," is combined with the reading of *Variant 2*, "*eterois* ('others,' variant word 4]," and the reading of *Variant 3*, "*legousin* (say);" and "*auton* ('of them,' or 'their,' word 5) is omitted. In a reconstruction of the Greek, *Variant 4* thus reads, "*a* ('who,' variant word 1) *prophonounta* ('calling,' variant word 2] *tois* ('unto the,' word 3) *eterois* ('others,' variant word 4] *legousin* ('say,' word 7)." This is found in old Latin Version g2 (10th century), as Latin, "*qui* ('who,' variant word 1) *clamantes* ('calling,' variant word 2) *aliis* ('unto the others,') [word 3 & variant word 4], *dicunt* ('say,' word 7)[18]."

---

[17] Re: Words 3 & 4 from Latin, "*aliis*." This is a dative plural of the adjective *alius*, i.e., "to" / "unto" [word 3], and the definitive article, "the" [word 3] does not generally exist in Latin. Hence I give one Latin word, "*aliis*," as equating two Greek words, Words 3 ("*tois*") and 4 ("*eterois*"), and three English words, "unto the others."

[18] *Variant 4* is a reconstruction of g2, based on the fact that Tischendorf says words 1,2, & 7 (omitting 5 & 6) are the same for old Latin 1, ff1, and g2, and in Julicher l & ff1 are "*qui clamantes*" (words 1 & 2) and "*dicunt*" (word 7); and Tischendorf says words 3 & 4 are the same for old Latin d,k, & g2, specifying this is "*aliis*," and in Julicher "*aliis*" is given for d & k.

Words 1,2,3,5,6,7, are the words of the representative Byzantine text; and since there is no good textual argument against these six words, they must therefore stand as correct. With regard to word 4, the Byzantine manuscripts are fairly evenly divided between "*etairois* (fellows)" (TR) and "*eterois* (others)" (*Variant 2*). However, the reading "*eterois* (others)" presents a textual problem. "Children sitting in the markets, and calling" to others, would contextually be calling to their peers. Yet if the reading "*eterois* (others)" is allowed to stand, no such qualification exists, and so "the others" here may also refer to adults. The proposition that these children would be calling out to "the others" in the marketplace *without qualification*, thus creates a fundamental absurdity. This stylistic ailment of the reading, "*eterois* (others)," can only be cured by adopting the reading, "*etairois* (fellows)," which is therefore the correct reading. Confirmation of the fact that this is indeed a correct analysis is found in Luke 7:32, where the children are said to call "to one another (*allelois*)." On the one hand, Luke 7:32 supports the requirement of a qualification to the unqualified "*eterois* (others)" reading, but on the other hand, it is clear that "*etairois* (fellows)" at Matt. 11:16c is not an assimilation to Luke 7:32 which does not read "*etairois* (fellows)" but rather "*allelois* (to one another)."

On the other hand, the variant "*eterois* (others)" has the support of half of the Byzantine manuscripts, as well as ancient support. But on the other hand, textual factors strongly support the reading found in the other half of the Byzantine manuscripts, "*etairois* (fellows)," which also has the impressive ancient support of St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century). Thus the reading of Word 4 in the *Textus Receptus* stands sure. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading for Word 4, "*etairois* (fellows)," a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

The origins of the variants are speculative. But is seems likely to me that these were accidental errors, being "reconstructions" after a paper loss or fade. Due to a paper fade, the original "*KAI* (and) *PROSPHONOYCI* (calling)," instead of looking like "*KAIPROSPHONOYCI*", may have looked something like "*:A:PRO::ONOY:::*", and this may have been "reconstructed" by a scribe as "A (who) PROPHONOYNTA (calling)" (*Variant 1*). The usage of "*a* (who)" may have seemed natural enough on the basis that just two verses before, at Matt. 11:4, Jesus uses "*a* (what)," saying, "Go and shew John again *those things which* (*a*, or 'what') ye do hear and see." On another occasion, a paper fade of "*ETAIROIS*" (fellows) so that it looked like "*ET::ROIS*", probably resulted in the "reconstruction" "*ETEROIS*" (*Variant 2*) This was probably done with some influence from Luke 7:32 where reference is made, "to one another," as Greek "*allelois*" (and possibly, though less probably, the usage of "*eterois*" in Luke-Acts was noted at Acts 2:40). Another paper fade of the Greek "*KAI*" (word 6) probably accounts for *Variant 3*. *Variant 4* appears to be some kind of scribal assimilation of *Variant 1,2, & 3*, to which was added the complexity of a further paper fade / loss of "their" (Greek *auton*) [word 5] by the time it was translated into the Latin.

The intact reading of the TR, "*kai* ('and,' word 1) *prosphonousi* ('calling ,' word 2) *tois* ('unto the,' word 3) *etairois* ('fellows,' word 4) *auton* ('of them,' word 5), *kai* ('and,' word 6) *legousin* ('saying,' word 7)," is preserved for us in multitudes of the Byzantine text's precious jewels e.g., the Byzantine text's diamond, U 030 (*Codex Nanianus*, 9th century). Though these seven words were sliced and diced by some copyists in ancient times, it is still nevertheless possible to find its constituent parts from ancient manuscripts. Word 1, "*kai*

(and)" is attested to by St. Chrysostom. Words 1,2,3,5,6, & 7 are witnessed to by e.g., W 032 (5th century) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). Word 4 is testified to by e.g., St. Jerome's Vulgate. The sum of these total parts is greater than the sum of the individual constituent parts, for it is the sum of the *Textus Receptus*, and these are the very oracles of God.

On the one hand, the representative Byzantine text's reading for Words 1,2,3,5,6,7, have no good textual argument against them, and the constituent parts of these six words are well attested to. But on the other hand, these six words, like word 4, have been spliced and sliced and diced to form multiple variants. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading, for Words 1,2,3,5,6,7 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Since the independent rating for Word 4, *supra*, is a "B," and the independent rating for Words 1,2,3,5,6,7, *supra*, is a "B," it happens by a coincidence, that on this occasion one can give an overall rating for Words 1 to 7 as a "B." Therefore, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 11:16c,17, "and calling unto their fellows, and saying" a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the seven words of the correct reading at Matt. 11:16c, Greek, "*kai* ('and,' word 1) *prosphonousi* ('calling ,' word 2) *tois* ('unto the,' word 3) *etairois* ('fellows,' word 4) *auton* ('of them,' word 5), *kai* ('and,' word 6) *legousin* ('saying,' word 7)," are found intact in e.g., Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent) and 157 (independent, 12th century). Words 1,2,3,5,6, & 7 are found in e.g., such Codices as (the mixed text type) L 019 (8th century) and (the independent) Delta 037 (9th century); together with Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 1071 (independent, 12th century). Words 3 & 4 are also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century) and Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century). Words 3,4, & 5 are also found in both the Armenian Version (5th century) and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The TR's "*etairois* ('fellows,' word 4)," is followed in the main text of Robinson & Pierpont (2005), although they show "*eterois* ('others,' variant word 4)," as a sidenote thus indicating that the Byzantine majority text is "significantly divided." By contrast, both Burgon & Miller (1899) and Hodges & Farstad (1985) have "*eterois* ('others,' variant word 4)," in their main majority text, and both incorrectly reject "*etairois* ('fellows,' word 4)," which they nevertheless both correctly refer to as the TR's reading.

Variant 4 reads, Greek, "*a* ('who,' variant word 1) *prophonounta* ('calling,' variant word 2) *tois* ('unto the,' word 3) *eterois* ('others,' variant word 4) *legousin* ('say,' word 7)." *Variant 4* is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); as well as (the independent text type) Z 035 (6th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century).

Variant 2's "others (*eterois*)," is also found in the Gothic Version (4th century).

The erroneous *Variant 4* is found at Matt. 11:16c,17 in such neo-Alexandrian texts as Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text's Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). The slicing and dicing of these two verses has continued in the neo-Alexandrian's new versions. Unlike Westcott-Hort which adopted *Variant 4*, the ASV adopts *Variant 1* (words 1 & 2), and so reads, "who call unto their fellows and say." *Variant 1* is also followed by Moffatt, who first uses an unnecessarily interpretive dynamic equivalent for "fellows" (AV), namely, "playmates," and then gratuitously omits words 6 & 7. Thus Moffatt reads, "who call to their playmates" (Moffatt Bible).

The RSV, followed by the ESV, first corrects this by reverting to the TR's reading, although the RSV then uses the same unnecessarily interpretive dynamic equivalent for "fellows" (AV), first found in Moffatt, *supra*, and then continued in the ESV as "playmates" (ESV). Both the RSV and ESV then further gratuitously omit words 6 and 7, "and (*kai*) saying (*legousin*)," even though word 7 (*legousin*), as either "saying" or "say," is found in all the manuscripts and not in dispute by neo-Alexandrians. It thus reads in e.g., the ESV, "and calling to their playmates" (ESV).

However, the NRSV, largely follows *Variant 2*, but with the omission of "of them (*aut<u>o</u>n*, word 5)," as in *Variant 4*, and once again, gratuitously omits words 6 & 7, thus making the reading, "and calling to one another" (NRSV). The NASB adopts *Variant 1* (words 1 & 2), *Variant 2* (word 4); and *part* of *Variant 4* by omitting "of them (*aut<u>o</u>n*, word 5)," thus reading with "children" in italics as an added word, "who call out to the other children, and say" (NASB). The NIV adopts the "others" of *Variant 2* (word 4); but like the RSV, NRSV, and ESV, then gratuitously omits words 6 & 7, thus reading, "and calling out to others" (NIV).

Why have these seven words been so badly sliced'n'diced first in the Greek and Latin manuscripts; then cut'n'splattered in both Burgonite majority texts such as Burgon & Miller (1899) and Hodges & Farstad (1985), as well as neo-Alexandrian texts such as the NU Text (1993); and then smashed'n'smattered all over the neo-Alexandrian versions? Whatever the reason is, we are confident, that though one takes a "penknife" to "cut" "the roll" of Scripture, yet shall it prove indestructible. That is because he who in the OT by special command of royal decree stated, "Take thee again another roll, and write in it all the former words that were in the first roll" (Jer. 36:23,28), namely, His Divine Majesty, the Lord Jehovah; even he, has also decreed the preservation of the *Textus Receptus*, saying by another special command of royal decree, "the word of … God shall stand for ever" (Isa. 40:8). Behold, good Christian reader these words, "and calling unto their fellows, and saying" (Matt. 11:16c,17). Now these seven words have proven to be indestructible; for these are the oracles of the living God!

Matt. 11:17b "unto you" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion: A Diatessaron conundrum.

This reading is absent in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). A difficulty arises in Diatessaron studies of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron due to the fact that there is some evidence of old Latin Version influence (see commentary at Matt. 9:27a;

9:34, *supra*). Nevertheless, in general terms, and some might say absolute terms, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is regarded as a Latin Vulgate Codex. If on the one hand, one considers that it is only a Vulgate Codex in general terms, then it remains possible that the omission of these words occurred as a consequence of following Diatessaron formatting principles when assimilating old Latin readings to Vulgate readings. If on the other hand, one considers it is a Vulgate Codex in absolute terms, its absence in the Latin Vulgate at both Matt. 11:17 and Luke 7:32 means it should be shown in support of the variant. While this involves the exercise of discretion, and while I generally take the view that the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, (though another neo-Byzantine textual analyst may reach a different conclusion,) on this occasion, I find the level of uncertainty about this matter to be such that I shall not refer to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

The TR's Greek reading, "*umin* (unto you)," in the words, "We have mourned (*ethrenesamen*) unto you (*umin*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), and U 030 (9th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*lamentavimus* (we have lamented) *vobis* (unto you)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), and q (6th / 7th century). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394) in some manuscripts of his text; Didymus (d. 398), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Hesychius of Jerusalem (d. after 450); and ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

However, the Greek, "*umin* (unto you)," is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionaries 292 (9th century) and 211 (12th century), as well as Minuscule 248 (13th century). The Latin, "*vobis* (unto you)," is also omitted in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), d (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), g2 (10th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is also omitted in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Clement of Rome (*c.* 150), Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394) in some copies of his text, and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Text's reading, which must therefore stand as correct. Indeed, there is a good argument in favour of the TR's reading here. This is clearly a little ditty, and there is a rhyming poetical echo of the "- samen umin" endings in lines 1 and 3, matched by the rhyming "-sasthe" endings of lines 2 and 4.

Greek	English
"*Eulesamen* (we have piped) *umin* (unto you)	"We have piped unto you (*umin*),
Kai (and) *ouk* (not) *orchesasthe* (ye danced)	And ye have not danced;
Esthionsamen (we have mourned) *umin* (unto you)	We have mourned unto you (*umin*),
Kai (and) *ouk* (not) *ekopsasthe* (ye lamented)."	And ye have not lamented."

This means that were the second "*umin* (unto you)" found in the TR absent, it would present a textual difficulty that would cry out for remedy. Hence we may be confident of the TR's reading.

The origins of the variant are conjectural. Perhaps the Latin variant reflects an earlier Greek text which was deliberately pruned on the basis of "redundancy." Alternatively, the loss may have been accidental. The "*men*" ending of "*ethrenesamen* (we have mourned)" and the "*min*" ending of "*umin* (unto you)," may have become confused in the fatigued mind of a copyist, and lost by a form of ellipsis. This would have been even more likely if the "*E*" in the ending of "*MEN*" was poorly written in narrower form than normal. Was "*umin* (unto you)" lost by accident or design? We do not know. We only know that it was lost in some manuscripts.

On the one hand, the TR's reading has solid support in the Greek and some good support in the Latin, with no good textual reason to doubt it. Both the TR and the variant were known to Chrysostom, Jerome, and Austin. Chrysostom used each reading once; Austin favoured the TR, using it in two of three readings; and Jerome used each reading once, though he evidently preferred the variant since he placed it in his Latin Vulgate. Though these learned doctors were great and godly men, they were not infallible. Their uncertainty evidentially stemmed from their failure to appreciate the rhythmical and rhyming units of this ditty. The correct reading has been preserved for us in the representative Byzantine Text. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 11:17b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 11:17b, "unto you," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the incorrect reading which omits "unto you" at Matt. 11:17b is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); as well as (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century); and Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere). It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and the Gothic Version (4th century).

The incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 11:17b. Hence it is found in the American Standard Versions as, "we wailed" (ASV). This omission is continued in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, and Moffatt Bible.

The reading found in the TR, "unto you," is Greek "*umin* (plural dative 'you' from *su*)" or Latin "*vobis* (plural dative 'you' from *tu*)." It is found in this singular form in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, where Caesar says to Brutus in Act 3, Scene 1, "*Et tu*, *Brute!*" i.e., "Thou [*tu*] also, O Brutus!" In Matt. 11:17b, this is thus a plural "you," and hence the AV translates it as "you" (you plural) rather than "thee" (you singular). While the NKJV also here renders it, "to you" (NKJV), how are we to know that this is a "you" plural here, rather than a "you" singular, since the NKJV makes no distinction between the two? Let us thank God that the King James translators wisely recognized that the usage of mildly archaic English to create the aura of antiquity, could be used in a Bible translation not only to create the aura of antiquity for the Bible's words as being ancient words, but also to more accurately render the Hebrew and Greek's "you" singular and "you" plural into English. After all, *for the Protestant* accuracy of translation must be paramount! The AV translators sought what the modern versions do not, namely, a great piece of English literature, and also great accuracy for the verbally inspired Word of God.

Matt. 11:19 "children" (TR & AV) {A}

The Greek reading of the *Textus Receptus* (TR), "*teknon* (children)," in the words, "But wisdom is justified of her children (*teknon*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and N 022 (6th century); or Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation), 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels); 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts); 1010 (12th century, Byzantine); 597 (13th century, Byzantine), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles); and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). It is also supported as Latin, "*filiis* (children)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), 1 (4th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Epiphanius (d. 403), and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Ambrose (d. 397), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

However, an alternative reading (*Variant 1*), adds Greek, "*panton* (all)," thus making the reading, "But wisdom is justified of all (*panton*) her children (*teknon*)." With the Greek words arranged in a slightly different order, not affecting English translation, this is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 950 (1289 or 1290 A.D.). It is also found as Latin, "*omnibus* (all)," in the African old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries).

Yet another reading (*Variant 2*), reads Greek, "*ergon* (works)" rather than "*teknon* (children)," thus making the reading, "But wisdom is justified of her works (*ergon*)." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). It is also found in a manuscript according to the ancient church writer, Jerome (d. 420).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. *Variant 1* looks like an assimilation with Luke 7:35, which reads,

"But wisdom is justified of all (*panton*) her children."

The origins of the variants are speculative. Was *Variant 2* an accidental "reconstruction" following a paper fade / loss? Had the original "…*teknon* …" come to look something like "…*:::on*…", and did a scribe then "reconstruct" this as "*ergon*"? If so, was his "reconstruction" of, "But wisdom (*sophia*) is justified of her works (*ergon*)," made with some reference to the nexus between "works" and "wisdom" in the Bible's wisdom literature? E.g., in Prov. 24:12,14, there is a nexus between "the works (*ta erga*) of him (*autou*)" (Prov. 24:12, LXX) and "wisdom (*sophian*)" (Prov. 24:14, LXX). If so, the lead in idea to such OT passages was surely "the works (*erga*) of Christ" in Matt. 11:2; since Matt. 11:7-19 occurred "as they departed" (Matt. 11:7) from the scene of Matt. 11:2-6.

With strong support from both the Greek and Latin, and no good textual argument against it, we cannot doubt that the TR's reading is correct. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 11:19 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 11:19, "children," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions, and the margin of the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; as well as the Gothic Version (4th century); Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (an independent Pell Platt manuscript); and some independent manuscripts of the Slavic Version.

The erroneous *Variant 1* which adds "all," is found in Minuscules 828 (12th century, independent) and 13 (13th century, independent). The erroneous *Variant 2* which substitutes "works" for "children," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century), and some independent manuscripts of the Coptic Sahidic Version; Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and some independent manuscripts of the Slavic Version.

The erroneous *Variant 2* entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 11:19. It is found in the ASV as, "And wisdom is justified by her works." The erroneous reading likewise entered the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV; although footnotes in the RSV, NRSV, and ESV refer to the TR's reading.

Matt. 11:23a "which art exalted unto heaven" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Four matters will be considered in this preliminary textual discussion.

The First Matter. Due to the imprecise nature of translation some divergent level of emphasis or interpretation may sometimes exist as to what extent a given Latin reading in fact supports, or was based upon, a given Greek reading. E.g., Tischendorf, perhaps focusing in his mind primarily on the issue of the Greek "*e* (which)" and Latin "*quae* (which)," characterizes old Latin h as supporting *Variant 1*. Tischendorf also characterizes old Latin f and q as supporting *Variant 1*. So too, with the same qualification as Tischendorf on *Variant 1*, Nestle-Aland considers old Latin h, f, and q support the TR's reading i.e., equating the Greek "*e* (which)" and Latin "*quae* (which)." However, Nestle-Aland also considers old Latin f and q follow *Variant 1* with respect to the "*upsothes*" of *Variant 1*, i.e., since both are 2nd person singulars. By contrast, UBS, like myself, *infra*, shows old Latin h supporting the TR's reading, and old Latin f and q following *Variant 1*. *Ad libitum!*[19]

The Second Matter. Generally where about half the Byzantine texts support one reading, and about half another reading, I do not refer to this in a preliminary textual discussion; but simply state this fact in the principal textual discussion. However, on this occasion I shall do so in order to help the reader better understand the issues. Green's Majority Text textual apparatus indicates both readings i.e., "*upsotheisa*" (TR) and "*upsothes*" / "*upsothesa*" (*Variant 1*) are under the 55% mark, and split in the 50%-50% range. Robinson and Pierpont's *New Testament ... According to the Byzantine / Majority Textform* (1991), says "*upsotheisa*" is the majority reading, and do not give an alternative reading. So too, Hodges and Farstad's *Greek NT According to the Majority Text*, puts *upsotheisa* in the main text, and says that while there is a major textual division, the manuscripts favour *upsotheisa* over *upsothes*.

Prima facie this may look like "*upsotheisa*" is the representative Byzantine reading, but only by a relatively small margin. Possibly it is. But for a number of reasons, this is not a safe conclusion to draw when the count is so close. In the first place, it is possible that the relatively small number of non-Byzantine manuscripts in the majority text counts of Robinson & Pierpont (less than 10% of von Soden's K group) or Hodges & Farstad (less than 15% of von Soden's I and K groups), have in fact tipped the balance in favour of the majority text reading. Additionally, it should be remembered, that the representative Byzantine count is meant to be determined either, as occurred in former times, by taking a reasonable sample of Byzantine texts e.g., twenty manuscripts; or as generally occurs now-a-days, by considering hundreds or thousands of manuscripts. But if one was taking a sample of about twenty Byzantine manuscripts, all one could safely conclude on this basis, would be that both readings are supported by about half of the Byzantine texts. Under the circumstances, the position of *Green's Textual Apparatus* (1986), which was composed by the same Pierpont as that of the Robinson & Pierpont's majority text (1991), is the safest. Indeed, (though I have not generally reviewed this Revised Volume 1 on Matt. 1-14 with regard to their revised 2005 edition,) upon matured consideration, the revised edition of Robinson and Pierpont (2005)

---

[19] A Latin saying ("toward pleasure"), meaning for someone to do, "As you wish!"

has now put "*upsotheisa*" in the main text, with "*upsothes*" as a sidenote alternative, indicating "the manuscripts comprising the Byzantine Textform are significant divided[20]."

The Third Matter.

When *about half* of the Byzantine manuscripts have one reading, and *about half* of the Byzantine manuscripts reading the other way, textual analysis of the Greek is required to determine the better reading. But after this is done, because the better reading has the support of about half of the Byzantine manuscripts, it is reasonable to the treat it as the *prima facie* correct reading. Thus one should then accept it against any other variants inside the closed class of sources, unless there is a textual problem with even the better of the two main Byzantine readings, that is remedied by another reading inside the closed class of sources. Hence in dealing with *Variant 2*, *infra*, it would be sufficient to say that since there is no good textual argument against the better of the two Byzantine readings, which has the support of about half the Byzantine manuscripts, it therefore follows that the minority Byzantine reading of *Variant 2* is incorrect. While space and time constraints mean this may often be the better way to deal with such matters, as always, I reserve the right to undertake further textual analysis, and at least on this occasion, I have done so with *Variant 2*.

The Fourth Matter. In both the reading of the Received Text and *Variant 1*, I have rendered the Greek letter eta (η), i.e., "*e*" as "which" (in modern English, "who"). This is the Greek article, *e*, "the [one which / who] (feminine)" i.e., "which (who)" with the TR's reading, "*upsotheisa* (having been exalted);" whereas this is the relative pronoun, *e*, "which (who)" (nominative singular feminine, from *os-e-o*) with *Variant 1's* reading, "*upsothes* (thou wast exalted)."

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 11:23, the TR's Greek reading using "*e*" with "*upsotheisa*," is, "*Kai* (And) *su* (thou), *Kapernaoum* (Capernaum), *e* (which) *eos* (unto) *tou* (-) *ouranou* (heaven) *upsotheisa* ('having been exalted,' first aorist passive, nominative singular feminine participle, from *upsoo*)," i.e., "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven." This reading is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts, e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), X 033 (10th century); and Minuscules 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels), 2 (12th century), 597 (13th century, without the unnecessary "*tou*" / "the" before "*ouranou*" / "heaven"), and 1292 (13th century, without the unnecessary "*tou*" / "the" before "*ouranou*" / "heaven," Byzantine outside of the General Epistles). It is also supported by a Latin reading with "*quae* (which)," a perfect passive participle (from *exalto*), "*exaltata* (having been exalted)," and "*est* ('it is,' present indicative active, 3rd person singular, from *sum*)," in the reading, "*quae* (which) *usque ad* (unto) *caelum* (heaven) *exaltata* (exalted) *est* (is)" i.e., "which art exalted unto heaven," in old Latin Version h (5th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, *Variant 1* using "*e*" with "*upsothes*" / "*upsothesa,*" and employing the second person singular for "Capernaum," reads, Greek, "*Kapernaoum* (Capernaum), *e*

[20] Robinson & Pierpont (2005), Preface p. xviii & main text p. 22.

(which) *eos* (unto) *tou* (-) *ouranou* (heaven) *upsothes* ('thou wast exalted,' aorist passive subjunctive, 2nd person singular verb, from *upsoe*)" i.e., "And thou, Capernaum, which were exalted unto heaven," is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts, e.g., E 07 (8th century, *upsothesa*), F 09 (9th century), G 011 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); and Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation), 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). It is also followed by a Latin reading with "*quae* (which)," a perfect passive participle, "*exaltata* (having been exalted)," and "*es* ('thou art,' present indicative active, 2nd person singular verb, from *sum*)," in the reading, "*quae* (which) *usque ad* (unto) *caelum* (heaven) *exaltata* (exalted) *es* (thou art)" i.e., "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven," in old Latin Versions f (6th / 7th century) and q (6th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

Variant 2, using "*me*" with "*upsothese*," is a minority Byzantine reading. This reads, Greek, "*Me* (not) *eos* (unto) *ouranou* (heaven) *upsothese* ('wilt thou be exalted,' future indicative passive, 2nd person singular verb, from *upsoo*)?," i.e., "And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven?" This reading is followed in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). In Latin, one can ask a direct question by starting a sentence with (an interrogative pronoun such as,) "*quid*" ("*Numquid*"). And like the Greek (particle,) "*Me*," the Latin (interrogative particle,) "*num*" ("*Numquid*"), starts a direct question in which the expected answer is "No." The Latin thus also asks a question, expecting a negative answer, with a second person singular, "*exaltaberis* ('thou shalt be exalted,' future indicative passive, 2nd person singular verb, from *exalto*)." The Latin reading, "*Numquid* (Not what) *usque* (all the way) *in* (to) *caelum* (heaven) *exaltaberis* (thou shalt be exalted) i.e., "And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven?" is found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century) and old Latin Versions a (4th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century); and with Latin "*ad*" (to) in place of "*in* (to)," in old Latin Versions b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), and aur (7th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (*c.* 395); and the ancient church Latin writers, Gaudentius (d. after 406) and Jerome (d. 420). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

The Byzantine Greek manuscripts are divided about half and half between two main readings, namely, that of the *Textus Receptus* and that of *Variant 1*, with *Variant 2* being a very small minority reading. These two main rival readings, i.e., the TR and Variant 1, contextually form part of a couplet, that ends with, "thou shalt be brought down to hell." Though the "thou" before "shalt" is omitted in the AV's English translation as redundant, I shall refer to it in this section of textual analysis. The key words for our purposes are the second part in the couplet, "thou shalt be brought down (*katabibasthese*, <u>indicative</u> <u>passive</u> future, 2nd person singular verb, from *katabibazo*)" (see commentary at 11:23b, *infra*). The passive voice is frequently used in order to retain the previous subject as the subject, and so here in the second part of this couplet, the emphasis is kept on "*Kapernaoum* (Capernaum)." The indicative mood indicates that an action is regarded as a reality (whether or not it actually is true) i.e., the statement in the second part of this couplet, "thou shalt be brought down" is regarded as factual (and certainly we Christians would consider this is authoritative).

The first part of this couplet mainly divides between the reading of *Variant 1*, which is followed by about half of the Byzantine Greek manuscripts; and the reading of the TR,

which is also followed by about half of the Byzantine Greek manuscripts.

Variant 1, reads, "*Kapernaoum* (Capernaum), *e* (which) *eos* (unto) *tou* (-) *ouranou* (heaven) *upsothes* ('thou wast exalted,' aorist passive subjunctive, 2nd person singular verb, from *upsoe*)" i.e., "And thou, Capernaum, which were exalted unto heaven." The subjunctive moods here indicates that what is described by the verb is not a fact, but a contingency, or a possibility, or something that might occur. This creates a contextual stylistic tension inside the couplet, since there is nothing suppositional about the second part of the couplet, "thou shalt be brought down to hell." The indicative mood in the second part of the couplet indicates that the action of Capernaum being "brought down to hell" is regarded as a reality. In the context of Matt. 11:23, the usage of the subjunctive in the first part of the couplet, indicating a possibility i.e., *Variant 1*, does not sit well with certainty of judgement in the second part of the couplet.

By contrast, the TR reads, "*Kapernaoum* (Capernaum), *e* (which) *eos* (unto) *tou* (-) *ouranou* (heaven) *upsotheisa* ('having been exalted,' first aorist passive, nominative singular feminine participle, from *upsoo*)," i.e., "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven." The Greek aorist has no precise equivalent in English, Young prefers to see it as the speaker's overall perception of an event "in its entirety, or as a single whole;" whereas Wallace likes to talk about the aorist a "snapshot" of the action (whereas the present and imperfect tenses are like a moving picture)[21]. It is simplistically sometimes said to be "the past tense" (which is sometimes so, but certainly not always so), and elements of it have been the subject of debate and dispute among Greek grammarians. But in broad terms, it carries the idea of *conceptualizing the whole event*. It is commonly rendered into English as a past tense (although there are future aorists[22]), but such an English past tense does not denote if the action is completed (as in the English past tense), continued, or repeated. Here the aorist brings a clear definiteness to the first part of the couplet, "And thou, Capernaum, *which art exalted* unto heaven;" and so it is an appropriate match for the definiteness of the second part of the couplet, "thou shalt be brought down (*katabibasthese*, indicative passive future, 2nd person singular verb, from *katabibazo*) to hell."

Since the contextual stylistic tension created by *Variant 1*, can be relieved by adopting the TR's Byzantine reading, it follows that this is the better reading.

The very small minority reading of *Variant 2* creates a stylistic jarring effect. It is incongruous with the wider form of addressing these cities in Matt. 11:20-24, which is not by a question. I.e., "*Ouai* (Woe) *soi* (unto thee), *Chorazin* (Chorazin!), *ouai* (Woe) *soi* (unto thee), *Bethsaida* (Bethsaida!)." Furthermore, the usage of the future tense, "*upsothese* (wilt thou be exalted)," does not sit well with the fact that Christ here "upbraided the cities," "because they repented (*metenoesan,* aorist indicative active, 3rd person plural, from *metenoesan*) not" (Matt. 11:20). It is contextually clear that Capernaum already is "exalted unto heaven" in its arrogant thinking, not *will be* at some future time if it continues in its wicked ways.

---

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

[22] Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 566-71; Young's *Greek*, pp. 125-6,128-9.

To this it might be objected that the Greek future does not necessarily always indicate the future. True enough, but it usually does. If not here, one might argue that this was meant as the *deliberative future*, which is used in questions involving doubt about a person's direction. This would require that this is a rhetorical question, in which either Christ was uncertain about what to do, or the citizens of Capernaum were meant to think about what Christ was saying. But once again, such a construction on the first part of the couplet, does not sit well with certainty of judgement in the second part of the couplet, "thou shalt be brought down to hell." *Variant 2* is evidently an aberrant reading.

The origins of the two variants are speculative. Was *Variant 1* an accidental "correction"? Due to a paper loss or fade at the end of "*upsotheisa* (hast been exalted)" (TR) did a manuscript come to look something like, " … *upsothe:::….*" Was this then "reconstructed" as "*upsothes* (thou wast exalted)" (*Variant 1*)? However, old Latin f and q have the same "correction" at Luke 10:15, which reads in them both, "*quae* (which) *usque ad* ('unto;' in f "*usque in*" with the same meaning) *caelum* (heaven) *exaltata* (exalted) *es* (thou art)" i.e., "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven." This suggests that the manuscripts they were following were probably changed deliberately. I.e., a deliberate "stylistic improvement" may appear to be the likely explanation for the origins of *Variant 1*. However, it is also possible that *Variant 1* arose as a accidental "reconstruction," and that Luke 10:15 was then deliberately "assimilated" to Matt. 11:21, or *vice versa*. Thus we cannot be certain as to how *Variant 1* arose, we only know for sure that it is a change from the original text of the TR.

Variant 2 had minimal influence on the Greek manuscripts, but a major impact on the Latin manuscripts, and possibly originated from an aberrant groups of Greek manuscripts in which scribes made a deliberate "stylistic improvement." Perhaps they wanted to place a the *deliberative future* construction on it, and then use the verse in some "pastoral" or other context? Perhaps they thought that the question form, "And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven?," had a "more vibrant and striking ring" to it, than "the duller words of Jesus," i.e., "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven." But if so, why was no similar change made in the Vulgate at Luke 10:15? (Compare discussion on *Variant 2* in *Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses*, *infra*). Therefore, it seems to be more probable that this was an accidental omission in the case of manuscripts that the Vulgate was based on. Thus *Variant 2* probably arose in the manuscripts underpinning the Vulgate when due to a paper fade or loss, "*upsotheisa* (hast been exalted)" in a line starting with "*e*" that had suffered a paper loss, and a further paper loss or fade at the end of *upsotheisa*, meant that it looked something like, "::*e eos tou ouranou upsothe:::….*" Though the paper loss before the "*e*" had lost nothing, having first "reconstructed" the last word as "*upsothes* (thou wast exalted)," the scribe then added an "*M*" before the "*e*," since it now looked like a question, and so *Variant 2* arose.

However, in old Latin b (and a similar reading in old Latin a and d), Luke 10:15 reads, "*Numquid* (Not what) *usque* (all the way) *in* (to) *caelum* (heaven) *exaltaberis* (thou shalt be exalted) i.e., "And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven?" This seems to indicate some standardization of the verses, so that an alternative line of manuscripts upon which e.g., old Latin b was based, may reflect a deliberate "stylistic improvement" of Matt. 11:23a, which was then also applied to Luke 10:15. This further beclouds the issue of how the *Variant 2* followed by the Vulgate arose, since this raises the further complication that the Vulgate may have had access to these manuscripts for Matt.

11:23a, but a purer manuscript for Luke 10:15. Alternatively, it is also possible that *Variant 2* arose as a accidental "reconstruction," and that Luke 10:15 was then deliberately "assimilated" to Matt. 11:23a, or *vice versa*. Therefore we are left in an even greater quandary with *Variant 2* than *Variant 1*, as to whether or not *Variant 2* was both an accidental alteration in one line of manuscripts, and a deliberate alteration in another line of manuscripts, or whether there is only one line of manuscripts, i.e., the deliberately changed line; or whether it was an accidental "reconstruction" in either Matt. 11:21 or Luke 10:15, and then the other verses was deliberately "assimilated" to this erroneous reading. Thus we cannot be certain as to how *Variant 2* arose, we only know for sure that it is a change from the original text of the TR.

On the one hand, the TR's reading has the support of about half of the Byzantine texts, is supported by textual analysis as the best reading, and further supported from one ancient Latin Version, and citation of St. Chrysostom. Though the origins of the two variants are susceptible to multiple possibilities, it is clear that they can be reasonably accounted for. But on the other hand, the Latin text is generally in favour of one of the two variants, both of which also have support in the Greek as minority Byzantine readings and as ancient church writer citations. Weighing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 11:23a a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 11:23a, "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven," is found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century, without the unnecessary "*tou*" / "the" before "*ouranou*" / "heaven"), 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Gothic Version (4th century), although the state of preservation of the Gothic Version makes complete verification of this impossible.

Variant 1, "And thou, Capernaum, which were exalted unto heaven," is also found in Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (independent, 12th century, *ups<u>o</u>th<u>e</u>sa*), 13 (13th century, independent), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), as Latin, "*quae* (which) *exaltata* (exalted) *es* (thou art) *usque in* (unto) *caelum* (heaven)."

Variant 2, "And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven?," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 2 appears to have originated in the Alexandrian School. Alexandrian scribes evidently made a deliberate "stylistic improvement." This explains why a similar change was also made at Luke 10:15. What was their *raison d'etre*? We do not know. This style of questioning, possibly reflected an Alexandrian cultural style of interrogation used against religious dissidents. If so, it may have been thought by them, that the question form, "And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven?," had a "more vibrant and striking ring" to it, than "the duller words of Jesus," i.e., "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven." "If so, blasphemy by the Alexandrian scribes!" I hear you say, good Christian reader, and you are right. Sadly, the Alexandrian scribes appear to have possessed a most arrogant disposition, in which they put themselves *over* the Word of God, rather than *under* the Word of God. But is not this common to many people today, who likewise will not submit to the Word of God? What about ourselves? Are we careful and diligent in all things, by the grace of God, to humbly submit ourselves to God's directive will? Or do we live under God's permissive will, worshiping ourselves and seeking worldly pleasures?

Of course, we cannot enter their minds and be sure as to why the Alexandrian scribes made this change, and perhaps we have judged their motives wrongly. This erroneous change of *Variant 2*, has been adopted by the neo-Alexandrian texts, such as Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), UBS 3rd edition (1975) & 3rd corrected edition (1983), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

At Matt. 11:23a, the erroneous *Variant 2* is found in the American Standard Version as, "And thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven?" (ASV). It is likewise found in the ASV's descendants, the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NASB; as well as the NIV. But we need not fear. For God has preserved his Word for us, in our AV's. What? Hast thou not heard? Or has it not been told unto thee, good Christian reader? That in these same Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke that we have considered our Lord himself has said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Matt. 24:35; Luke 21:33). The Alexandrians and neo-Alexandrians have done their best to expunge these words. But heaven and earth still stand, and so does the Word of our God in our Authorized Versions!

Matt. 11:23b "shalt be brought down to hell" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

At the Greek variant's reading, the middle voice (*katabese*), arguably conveys the idea that the subject (Capernaum) participates in the results of the action i.e., personal involvement. Alternatively, because the middle voice was falling into disuse in Koine Greek, one might argue that the Greek middle voice here is a *deponent middle* i.e., like a number of NT verbs in the middle voice, having a middle voice declension but an active voice meaning. If so, the Greek middle voice simply indicates that the action of the verb (going down), is directly performed by the subject (Capernaum). If so, the first reading of variant which is in the Latin Vulgate, "*descendes*" (indicative active future, 2nd person singular verb), precisely equates the Greek reading, "*katabese* (indicative middle future, 2nd person singular verb).

I have also included the final Latin reading, "*descendis* (indicative active present, 2nd person singular verb)," notwithstanding the fact that it is in the present tense, rather than the

future tense. It is found in old Latin Versions b and ff2; and for my purposes, contextually I think it can be included as a translation based on the variant. I am joined in this assessment by the textual apparatus in the UBS 4th revised edition.

Without discussing these Latin and Greek declensions in greater detail, and leaving open the two possible interpretations of the Greek middle voice here; as occurs elsewhere, this raises issues of whether or not one can say the Latin is following the Greek, or *to what extent* is the Latin following the Greek. Though I do not generally draw attention to this matter, as elsewhere, where no specific comment on the matter may be made in this commentary, it should be understood that an element of subjective judgment is required that some may dispute. *Que sera sera*[23].

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 11:23b, the TR's Greek reading, "*katabibasthese* ('thou shalt be brought down,' indicative passive future, 2nd person singular verb, from *katabibazo*)," in the words, "shalt be brought down to hell," i.e., "And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down (*katabibasthese*) to hell," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., the two purple parchments, Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and N 022 (6th century), and Minuscule 597 (13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Gaudentius (d. after 406) and Pelagius (d. after 418).

However, an alternative reading, Greek, "*katabese* ('thou shalt go down,' indicative middle future, 2nd person singular verb, from *katabaino*)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). It is (given that the Greek middle here is a deponent, i.e., a middle voice with an active voice meaning,) also followed as Latin, "*usque in* (unto) *infernum* (hell) *descendes* ('thou shalt descend' / 'go down,' indicative active future, 2nd person singular verb, from, *descendo*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and aur (7th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found, with some minor Latin variants in some other old Latin Versions, for instance, h (5th century, '*ad*' for '*in*' with the same meaning); or with "*descendis*" ('thou shalt go down,' indicative active present, 2nd person singular verb, from *descendo*), in b (5th century) and ff2 (5th century). This is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (*c.* 395); and the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. We here see the maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was this an accidental error stemming from a "reconstruction"? Did the original "*katabibasthese* (thou shalt be brought down)" look something like "*katab::::::::*" due to a paper loss or fade? If so, did a scribe then

[23] "What will be, will be." Inside the Latin languages, Spanish or French or both? From the Latin language of Italian, *Che sara sara*.

"reconstruct" this with minimal effort by adding just three letters, to form "*katabese* (thou shalt go down)"? It is notable that in Manuscript Washington (W 032), "*katabese*" is at the end of a line, with three to four letters space left blank, and then on the next line is the three lettered "*oti* (for)." Given that this "*oti*" clause flows on without any major break from that that which precedes it, does this indicate that *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) either originated, or continued a line of manuscripts, where this reconstruction had been made, and that a paper space of 3 or 4 letters was then left as what was thought of as a "stylistic break"?

The scribe may have also noted the usage of *katabaino* in the Matthean Greek of Matt. 3:16; 7:25,27; 17:9; 24:17; 27:40; 28:2. Possibly this "reconstruction" was made with some reference to the fact that St. Luke also uses *katabaino* via *katabasis* for "the descent (*katabasei*, dative singular from 3rd declension noun, *katabasis*,) of the mount of Olives" (Luke 19:37). If so, this implies that comparisons between Matthean and Lucian Greek were being made. This is highly speculative. Nevertheless, I note that the same reading as Matt. 11:23b, "thou shalt be brought down (*katabibasthese*)," is found in Luke 10:15; and notably, it is found (with minor variation) in the Matt. 11:23b variant form at both Matt. 11:23b and Luke 10:15 in old Latin Version d (5th century). This raises the possibility, that the scribes of the Matt. 11:23b variant, had access to the Greek variant at Luke 10:15 underpinning old Latin d, and were influenced by this in their "reconstruction" of Matt. 10:15. If so, some reference may therefore also have been made to Luke 19:37.

On the one hand, the TR's reading has the support of the representative Byzantine Text, no good textual argument against it, and the further support of a number of ancient church writers, e.g., the learned church doctor, St. John Chrysostom. One can also see how the erroneous variant arose. But on the other hand, in one form or another, the minority Byzantine variant is supported by the Latin text, and some ancient church writers. Balancing out these competing factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 11:23b a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 11:23b, "thou shalt be brought down," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; the Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Armenian Version (5th century).

The incorrect variant, "thou shalt go down," is found one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); and the leading representative of the

Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); Gothic Version (4th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Slavic Version (9th century); and Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). It appears to be the base from which (with minor variation in Ciasca's Latin,) came the reading in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

With the two major Alexandrian Texts in disagreement, the neo-Alexandrians have been in a state of some confusion. At Matt. 11:23b (and Luke 10:15), Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) confidently followed London Sinaiticus, and thus for the wrong reasons, the TR. By contrast, at Matt. 11:23b (and Luke 10:15), Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952) just as confidently followed Rome Vaticanus and thus the variant (although both give the TR's readings in footnotes).

The NU Text has followed the variant at Matt. 11:23b (and Luke 10:15). The UBS 3rd edition (1975) and UBS 3rd corrected edition (1983) followed the variant, though with some hesitancy, giving it a "D" and saying "there is a very high degree of doubt concerning the reading" they "selected for the text." The reading was also followed in UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), and though the UBS were more confident of it this time, raising their assessment of it to a "C," they still said, "the [NU Text] Committee had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text." Besides the fact that NU Text Committee Member, Carlo Martini, was made a Cardinal in 1983, what changed between 1975 and 1993 for the NU Text Committee to become more confident of this variant? *Does the answer lie in the fact some of the Committee members had changed between the earlier and latter editions?* Notably both Committees had the "two leading lights" of Metzger and Aland, and also the man who even before he was made a Cardinal with direct access to the Roman Pope, had via "the black Pope" (i.e., the Jesuit's Superior General,) a two way contact with the Roman Pope, to wit, the blacked robed Jesuit, Carlo Martini. Or was it just that the same Committee members were fickle? Does this mean that a future NU Text Committee with neo-Alexandrians who think more like Tischendorf and less like Metzger might change this reading? Whatever the undoubted instabilities of the NU Text, it should be noted that with the same UBS and Nestle-Aland text this variant is also in Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993).

Metzger notes there is also some stylistic similarity between the variant's "*eos* (to) *hadou* (hell) *katabese* (thou shalt go down)" and a Septuagint reading. This reads at Isa. 14:15, "But now thou shalt go down (*katabese*) to (*eis*) hell (*hades*)" (LXX). Metzger then wisely shies away from the suggestion he first raises, that there might be some assimilation of Matt. 11:23b to Isa. 14:15 (LXX) (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1994, p. 25). The two passages are quite different in focus, with Isaiah 14:15 addressing "Lucifer" (Isa. 14:12) who has devil-possessed "the king of Babylon" (Isa. 14:4), and then in a passage clearly going beyond the king of Babylon and applying to Satan himself, Isaiah says to Lucifer, "thou shalt go down (*katabese*) to (*eis*) hell (*hades*)" (LXX). By contrast, Matt. 11:23b is addressing the general inhabitants of Capernaum, who as best we know were not in general devil-possessed by any devil, let alone the chief devil, Lucifer. With no real contextual reason to think a scribe may have been looking at Isa. 14:15, Metzger and the NU Text Committee, first raised it as a paper tiger, and then knocked it down. They then gave this paper tiger of a possible assimilation with Isa. 14:15 (LXX), as some kind of evidence for what they presumably regarded as "the deep thinking of their great neo-Alexandrian minds," with respect to why they "had considered the possibility of assimilation," but then rejected it in order to adopt the

variant. I think Metzger's and the NU Text Committee's reference to Isa. 14:15 is *ignoratio elenchi*[24].

The erroneous variant at Matt. 11:23b is found in the ASV as, "thou shalt go down unto Hades;" although a footnote reading says, "Many ancient authorities read 'be brought down'." Reflecting the split in the Alexandrian texts and neo-Alexandrian texts; on the one hand, the incorrect variant of the ASV is also followed in the ASV's descendant, the NASB, as well as the NIV; but on the other hand, the correct reading of the ASV's footnote is followed in the ASV's descendants of the RSV, NRSV, and ESV. It is notable, that except for the ASV, all these neo-Alexandrian translations are sufficiently confident that they have followed the right Alexandrian text on this occasion as to not provide a footnote alternative.

Matt. 11:24 "for thee" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading, "*e* (than) *soi* ('for thee,' dative, 2nd person singular, personal pronoun, from *su*)" at the end of the verse, "But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgement, *than for thee*" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*quam* (than) *tibi* ('for thee,' dative, 2nd person singular, personal pronoun from *tu*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and z (8th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, a variant reading, "*e* (than) *umin* ('for you,' dative, 2nd person plural personal pronoun, from *su-umeis*)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in the margin of M 021 (*Codex Campanius*, 9th century). It is also followed as Latin, "*quam* (than) *vobis* ('for you,' ablative, 2nd person plural, personal pronoun, from *tu-vos*)," in Latin Codices L (*Codex Lichfildensis*, 7th / 8th centuries) and D (*Codex Dublinensis*, 8th / 9th centuries); as well as old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (*c.* 395).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. The origins of the variant are speculative. Due to a paper fade or loss, did "…*esoi* …" look something like"…*e::: …*"? If so, did a scribe "reconstruct" this from context as "…*eumin* …"? If so, was he influenced by the "*umin*" at the beginning of the verse i.e., "But I say unto you (*umin*), That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom, in the day of judgement, than for thee (*soi*)"? Since our Lord is here addressing "Capernaum" which is a plural singular, i.e., this singular entity includes a plurality of inhabitants, he refers to it in the singular. However, did a scribe who just quickly

---

[24] A Latin saying ("ignorance of the issue"), referring to a logical fallacy in an irrelevant conclusion. I.e., the argument of "assimilation" from Isa. 14:15 (LXX) having been safely dismissed, does not disprove the wider proposition that this variant was an assimilation *per se*, or "reconstructed" with reference to some other similar Scriptures.

glanced back at the "*umin*" at the beginning of the verse, miss this context and so incorrectly "reconstruct" this as "*umin*" also?

Alternatively, the scribe may have seen the ending of verse 22, "But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgement, than for you (*e umin*)." Then, without stopping to think that "Tyre and Sidon" is a plural, wrongly used the same *umin* here. But at the beginning of Matt. 11:23, Jesus clearly conceptualized Capernaum in the singular "And thou (*su*, 2nd person singular nominative personal pronoun), and so the plural "*umin*" of the variant creates a textual problem that cries out for relief. Hence we would be compelled to adopt "for thee (*soi*)" here even if it was a minority reading, although it is in fact the representative Byzantine reading.

The TR's reading is supported by the representative Byzantine text and St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate. There is no good textual argument against it, and indeed a very good textual argument in its favour. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 11:24 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 11:24, "for thee," is found one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is also found in the Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading, "for you," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and Minuscule 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere). It is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version, and an independent manuscript of the Coptic Sahidic Version.

There is a clear vacillation between Tischendorf's 2nd edition (1842) which lists Stephanus's "*e soi*" (for thee) (TR) at Matt. 11:24 as incorrect (Lectiones Variantes, "discrepant," pp. 1,4); and Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) which has the reading that he previously regarded as incorrect, "*e soi* (for thee)," adopted in the main text as the correct reading. It seems that the instability we find in the neo-Alexandrian's minds and associated texts are nothing new. Subsequent neo-Alexandrian texts, including the NU Text, have followed Tischendorf's 8th edition which for the wrong reasons, supports the correct reading of the Received Text.

However, the variant is found as a footnote reading in both Nestle's 21st edition (1952) and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993). Do any of the "new" neo-Alexandrian versions follow the footnote alternative found in e.g., Nestle's 21st edition or Nestle-Aland's 27th edition, and thus agree with Tischendorf's 2nd edition (1842)? While we can say the ASV did not, the fact that the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV, have all abandoned the distinction between the singular "thee" and plural "you," means that we simply do not know. But we are not alone in our uncertainty. For nor do any of their readers. This confusion is also heightened by the Burgonite Majority Text's NKJV which likewise makes no distinction between the singular "thee" and plural "you." How is one meant to distinguish between the

Burgonite NKJV which we know is translating "you" singular as "you," and a neo-Alexandrian version which may mean either a singular or plural "you" by its "you" at Matt. 11:24? Let us thank God for our Authorized Versions, which bring a crisp, clear, accuracy to the Word of God in our mother-tongue, since for we who believe in the verbal inspiration of Holy Scripture, it is important to have the accuracy that the AV brings, which inferior "dumbed down[25]" translations such as the NKJV, NASB, RSV, *et al*, simply lack.

Matt. 12:4 "ate" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading, "*ephagen* ('he ate,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular, from *esthio*)," i.e., "ate" in the words, "and did eat (*ephagen*) the shewbread," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*manducavit*" ('he ate,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular, from *manduco*)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), c (12th / 13th century); and as Latin, "*comedit* ('he ate,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular, from *comedo*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions aur (7th century) and 1 (7th / 8th century). From the Latin support for this latter reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Latin writers, Ambrose (d. 397), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

However, a variant reads, "they ate (*ephagon*, indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural of *esthio*)," i.e., "and they eat (*ephagen*) the shewbread." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 481 (10th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Text, which must therefore stand as correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural. However, it seems likely to me that it arose as an accidental "reconstruction" in the Byzantine tradition. A paper fade or loss of the "*e*" (epsilon) in the suffix, "*en*," probably led a scribe to "reconstruct" this as an "*o*" (omicron) on the basis that reference is made to both "David (*Dabid*)" (singular) and "they (*oi*, plural, or 'the [ones]') that were with him" (Matt. 12:3), and both "him" (David) and "them which were with him" are then mentioned after this (Matt. 12:4). Hence it was "reconstructed" as "*ephagon* (they ate)."

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Text. This reading has the clear support of the Greek and Latin texts. Its accuracy is beyond any reasonable shadow of a doubt, and the same word and declension "*ephagen* (he ate)" is also found at Luke 6:4. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 12:4 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

---

[25] An Australian saying (colloquial), meaning the standard or complexity of something has been greatly reduced for "dumb" or intellectually inferior persons.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 12:4, "ate," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere); 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in all the extant Syriac Versions e.g., the Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500).

However, the variant reading, "they eat (*ephagon*) the shewbread," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). The distance in time and text type between the appearance of this variant in the Alexandrian text and Byzantine text, *supra*, indicates that in all likelihood, this error arose independently on two separate occasions. It is possible that the Alexandrian text arose as an accidental "reconstruction" on the same lines as the likely origins of the minority Byzantine reading, *supra*. However, the well-known Alexandrian penchant for "stylistic improvements," means that it is also quite possible that the plural, "they (*oi*, plural) that were with him" of verse 3, produced a deliberate "stylistic improvement" by the Alexandrians. Whether by accident or design, this alteration to "*ephagon* (they ate)[26]," changes the text, since Christ is referring to "David" as a primary focus, so that "they that were with him" or "them that were with him" (Matt. 12:3,4) are a secondary focus.

The erroneous variant, unknown as it is by the scores upon scores of Latin texts in the Latin textual tradition, and the hundreds upon hundreds of Greek texts in the Byzantine textual tradition; and able to adduce for its support, just one faulty Byzantine text from the 10th century, and two obscure Alexandrian texts that came to light in the 19th century, has repeatedly entered the neo-Alexandrian texts such as Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). The perverse logic for this, as expressed by Metzger, is that "the non-parallel reading [Luke 6:4 reads *ephagen* / *ephage*] … is more likely to have been altered to *ephagen* than vice versa" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1994, p. 26). Such superficial thinking acts to favour the "many which corrupt the Word of God" (II Cor. 2:17). Even on this circular neo-Alexandrian reasoning, who is to

[26] The Greek *ephagon* is a homograph, and can mean either "I ate" or "they ate;" but contextually, it here means the latter.

say that these scribes even looked at Luke 6:4? The evidence, such as we have it, is that they probably did not look at Luke 6:4 at all! Thus on the basis of a most uncertain and questionable speculation, the neo-Alexandrians repeatedly put this reading in their main text; even though they can find no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading. *Such are the follies that chararacterize the Neo-Alexandrian School.*

Though Westcott-Hort reads "*ephagon* (they ate)" the ASV retained the correct reading of the TR in their main text as, "and ate the showbread," though included a footnote which reads, "Some ancient authorities read 'they ate'." On the one hand, this was corrected by the RSV, NRSV, and ESV, all of whom simply followed the ASV's correct main text reading, providing no footnote alternative. But on the other hand, the NASB, adopted the erroneous variant of the ASV's footnote into its main text, giving no footnote alternative. The NIV did likewise, adding a gratuitous dynamic equivalent to emphasis this plurality of persons in the "they," adding in the place of the simple "they," the words, "he and his companions" (NIV). So too, Moffatt reads, "they ate" (Moffatt Bible).

Metzger could not persuade his generally compliant minions who composed the NRSV under his supervision as to the desirability of this reading; but the NASB and NIV translators readily submitted to Metzger's logic on this verse. Thus at this point of Matt. 12:4, the generally more liberal RSV, NRSV, and ESV, are in fact more literal and accurate that the generally more conservative NASB and NIV. *When Metzger and his neo-Alexandrian cronies "came a hollerin'"* on Matthew 12:4, *the NASB and NIV translators "came a runnin'," to the sound of their master's voice.* We have come to strange and sad days indeed when we have to admit that at Matt. 12:4, the generally more religiously liberal neo-Alexandrian translators are more accurate than the generally more religiously conservative neo-Alexandrian translators. Such are the dangerous effects of the poison-pill of these Alexandrian texts; and the pernicious influence of neo-Alexandrian religious liberals such as Tischendorf, Westcott, Hort, Nestle, Aland, and Metzger, intermingled with the cunning and deceitful Jesuitry of Cardinal Martini. For suchlike "are shepherds that cannot understand" (Isa. 56:11). Let us pray God to "set up" the Christian teachings of good neo-Byzantine religiously conservative "shepherds" of the Received Text "over" his "flock," such as the teachings of Stephanus, Beza, and Elzevir, that the flock may "no more" "be dismayed" (Isa. 23:3,4).

Matt. 12:6 "one greater than" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Von Soden shows Sigma 042 as following the TR's reading. However, my type-set printed (not photolithic) copy of Sigma 042 (Harnack 1882/3, reprint 1991) shows it following the variant. Therefore I make no reference to this codex, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 12:6, the TR's Greek reading, "*meizon* ('a greater than,[27]' nominative

[27] For the purposes of translation, one must consider the wider terminology, "*tou* (the) *ierou* ('temple,' singular genitive, second declension neuter noun, from *ieron*) *meizon* (a greater)." In Greek, the combination of a noun in the genitive, "the (*tou*) temple (*ierou*),"

singular masculine, comparative adjective, from *megas* via *meizon*)," i.e., with "one" it italics as added, "*one* greater than," is found in the sentence, "But I say unto you, That in this place is one greater than the temple." It is a minority Byzantine reading supported by *Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus* (N 022, 6th century, St. Petersburg, Russia; London, UK; Athens, Greece; Lerma, Spain; New York, USA; Vatican City, Rome; & Vienna, Austria) and *Codex Sinopensis* (O 023, St. Matthew's Gospel, 6th century, Paris, France); together with Minuscules 1010 (12th century, Athos, Greece) and 1200 (12th century, Sinai, Arabia). Both the Greek and the Latin is in the masculine gender. It is supported by the Latin, "*major* ('a greater than,[28]' nominative singular masculine, comparative adjective, from *magnus*)," i.e., "a greater than the temple," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), d (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also manifested in the Greek New Testament editions of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

However, an alternative reading has Greek, "*meizon* ('a greater thing than,' nominative singular neuter, comparative adjective, from *megas* via *meizon*)," i.e., with "some" in italics as added, "*some*thing greater than the temple." This is the majority Byzantine reading found in e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, with variant spelling, "*mizon*"). It is also found as Latin, "*majus* ('a greater thing,' nominative singular neuter, comparative adjective, from *magnus*) … *quam* (than) *templum* (the temple)," in old Latin Versions q (6th / 7th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (d. 2nd century), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

The representative Byzantine Text's "*meizon* (a greater thing than) the temple," here presents a serious textual problem. It is in the neuter gender. Thus it can be used of a person, here Christ, in order to emphasis *a quality of that person*. However, in the context of Matt. 12:6-8, Jesus specifies states that this "greater thing" is not some quality or principle or teaching, but specifically, is himself, since the passage ends, "For the Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath day" (Matt. 12:8). But "*o* (the) *Yios* (Son) *tou* (-) *anthropou* (man)," is a *male person*, not a *thing*. Hence one would expect that Matt. 12:6 was in the masculine gender i.e., "*meizon* (a greater than)." This in fact is the reading that one does find in St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, together with some old Latin Versions.

Therefore, the Latin of St. Jerome's Vulgate is word perfect, and has an elegant harmonic ring on the ears, as being good contextually appropriate Latin. By contrast, the representative Byzantine Greek reading clangs on the ears as being bad Greek. To overcome this evident textual defect in the Greek, so that it too has a contextually appropriate harmonic

---

with a comparative adjective, "*meizon* (a greater)," results in the usage of "than" i.e., "a greater than."

[28] The wider Latin terminology is very much like the Greek terminology i.e., Latin, "*templo* ('temple,' singular ablative, second declension neuter noun, from *templum*) *major* (a greater)." In Latin, the combination of a noun in the ablative, "*templo* (temple)," with a comparative adjective, "*major* (a greater)," results in the *ablative of comparison* usage of "than" i.e., "a greater than."

ring between Matt. 12:6 and Matt. 12:8, it is therefore necessary to adopt the minority Byzantine reading, which may well have been known to the 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantines through a reconstruction of the Latin, since e.g., St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate clearly preserves the original Greek reading here at Matt. 12:6. Our analysis starts with the Greek, is primarily focused on the Greek, and ends with the Greek. Thus if this is how the neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries came to learn of this reading then it manifests the lesser maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, being in subjection to the greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*.

The origins of this variant are speculative. But it seems likely to me that due to a paper fade or loss, the TR's "…*meizon*…" looked something like "…*meiz::n*…", and a scribe then "reconstructed" this as "…*meizon*…". This was possibly done with reference to the usage of "*meizon*" in one or more of the following verses: Matt. 13:32; 20:31; 23:19. It may also have been done with some reference to the nearby "*pleion* (a greater thing than)" of Matt. 12:41,42. The Greek *pleion* from *polus*, is also a neuter comparative adjective. But contextually it refers not to Christ, but his preaching or wisdom. Thus the contrast is made between "the preaching of Jonas," and "a greater" *preaching of Christ* "than" *the preaching of* "Jonas;" or "the wisdom of Solomon" and "a greater" *wisdom of Christ* "than" *the wisdom of* "Solomon" (Matt. 12:41,42)[29]. This "reconstruction" error at Matt. 12:6 therefore evidently resulted from an insufficiently rigorous consideration of the context.

On the one hand, the reading of the *Textus Receptus* is strongly supported by textual analysis, and has strong support in the Latin textual tradition with St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate and dating from ancient times most of the old Latin Versions. The origins of the variant are also understandable. But on the other hand, the TR's reading has slim support in the Greek whereas the variant has the support of the representative Byzantine text, together with a number of ancient church writers. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 12:6 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 12:6, "one greater than," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is also found the in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826

[29] Lest some heretic seek to use this to argue for "degrees of inspiration," I note that the preaching and wisdom of Christ is "greater" (Matt. 12:41,42), not because it is any "more" or "less inspired" (II Tim. 3:16). Rather it is because, in the words of the Apostle Peter, "the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven;" are "things the angels desire to look into," and things which the OT "prophets" "enquired" about (I Peter 1:10,12). All of Scripture is equally inspired, and all of Scripture is fully inspired, being the verbally inspired Word of God (Deut. 18:18; Isa. 51:16; Jer. 1:7; John 3:34; II Tim. 3:16).

(12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect variant is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), and 700 (11th century, independent). It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century).

The incorrect reading entered the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), as it earlier had entered neo-Alexandrian texts such as those of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott –Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). The ASV retains the correct reading in the main text, "one greater than the temple is here," but an ASV footnote says the "Gr[eek]," reads, "'a greater thing'." If so, why then translate it as "one" in the main text? This obvious and unsustainable contradiction was removed in the ASV's descendants, the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV, all of which adopted the erroneous variant into their main text.

Burgon claimed, "the *'Textus Receptus'* …, calls for … revision," "upon the" basis of the "majority of authorities" (*Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15); and his arrogant Puseyite brag was this, "Again and again we shall have occasion to point out … that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction" (*Revision Revised*, p. 21). Thus the incorrect Burgonite Majority Text reading earlier found in Burgon & Miller (1899), is also found in the later Burgonite Majority Texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson and Pierpont (1991), or Green's Textual Apparatus (1986).

Moffatt's two pincer arm approach to textual criticism, on this verse laid aside his more commonly used Alexandrian text pincer arm in favour of his less commonly used non-Alexandrian text "anything goes" pincer arm. Probably influenced by a combination of the Latin, together with Codices L 019 (mixed text type, 8th century) and Delta 037 (independent text type, 9th century); for partly the right reasons (the Latin), and partly the wrong reasons (Greek Codices L 019 & Delta 037), Moffatt adopted the correct reading at Matt. 12:6. "I tell you, One is here who is greater than the temple" (Moffatt Bible).

The NIV *prima facie* places the correct reading, "one greater," in the main text of Matt. 12:6. But it then gives the erroneous variant as an equal alternative in a footnote, saying, "Or 'something;' also in verses 41 and 42." At Matt. 12:41,42, the NIV translates the neuter comparative adjective *pleion* as "one greater" with a footnote saying, "Or 'something'." The NIV thus claims that "one" can be thrice translated from a neuter comparative adjective in Matt. 12:6,41,42, as though it were male gendered[30]. This is ridiculous, for if the meaning is "one," then it must be male gendered to "*meizon*" (Matt. 12:6, TR) and "*pleion*" (Matt. 12:41,42). Thus we once again see the dangers of these loose "dynamic equivalent" translations such as the NIV, which claim the text of Scripture is

[30] When gendered in the Greek with the suffix -*on*, these comparative adjectives could be *prima facie* masculine or feminine gender, but contextually would here be masculine.

sufficiently elastic as to be pulled and stretched in all kinds of directions, in order to suit the translators' fleeting whims and fancies. As elsewhere, the NIV is here *ab absurdo*[31].

Matt. 12:8 "even" (TR & AV) {C}

The TR's Greek reading, "*kai* (even)," in the sentence, "For the Son of man is Lord even (*kai*) of the sabbath day" (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading supported in the purple parchment *Codex Beratinus* (Phi 043, 6th century, St. Matthew's & St. Mark's Gospel, Tirana, Albania); together with Minuscules 476 (11th century, British Library, London, England, UK) and 1188 (11th / 12th century, vacant in Matt. 5:42-8:33; John 9:14-18:22, Sinai, Arabia). It is further supported as Latin, "*etiam* (even)," in the *Versio Vulgata Hieronymi* (Jerome's Vulgate Version, 4th / 5th centuries), *Codex Aureus* (old Latin Version aur, 7th century), and *Codex Rehdigeranus* (old Latin Version 1, 7th / 8th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the *Vulgata Clementina* (Clementine Vulgate, 1592). It is also manifested in the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of e.g., Erasmus (1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

However a variant, which omits "even (*kai*)," is the majority Byzantine reading, found in e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). This omission is also found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century)[32]. It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writer, Tertullian (d. after 220). It is also manifested in Erasmus's Greek NT (1516).

A serious textual problem exist here with the representative Byzantine reading. Matt. 12:8 is part of both a *comparison* and a *conclusion* in which "even (Greek, *kai*; Latin, *etiam*)," is expected.

In this passage, there is a clear *comparison* made between the "Pharisees" on the one hand (Matt. 12:1,2; cf. Mark 2:23,24; Luke 6:1,2), and "the Son of man" on the other hand (Matt. 12:8; cf. Mark 2:24; Luke 6:2). Contrast is a form of emphasis in NT Greek. When a particularly stark contrast is made in the NT Greek, typically one places the things being contrasted before the verbs. Thus while this technique is absent in some contrasts (e.g., Matt. 5:43; 11:19), it is present in e.g., the particularly stark contrast of Matt. 7:2. "For with what (*e*) judgment (*krimati*) ye judge (*krinete*), ye shall be judged; and with what (*e*) measure (*metro)* ye mete (*metreite*), it shall be measured to you again." Notably then, we find this technique used in the contrast of this passage. I.e., "*Pharisaioi* (Pharisees)" (Matt. 12:2; Mark 2:24) or "*Pharisaion*" (Luke 6:2) before "*idonted*" ('saw,' Matt. 12:2) and "*eipon* ('they said,' Matt. 12:2; Luke 6:2)" or "*elegon* ('they said,' Mark 2:24);" and then "*Kurios*

---

[31] A Latin saying, meaning, "from the absurd."

[32] Tischendorf says old Latin f (6th century) follows the TR, whereas Julicher says it follows the variant. I therefore exclude it from consideration altogether.

(the Lord) … *esti* (he is)" (Matt. 12:8; Mark 2:28; Luke 6:5). Thus Matt. 12:8 reads, "*Kurios* (the Lord) *gar* (for) *esti* (is)" followed by "*tou* (of the) *sabbatou* (sabbath) *o* (the) *Yios* (Son) *tou* (-) *anthropou* (of man)."

Furthermore, sometimes a contrast is accomplished with personal pronouns e.g., "I (*ego*) indeed baptize (*baptizo*) you with water …: but (*de*) … he shall baptize (*baptisei*) you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire" (Matt. 3:11). Here a similar technique is used in a softer comparison between "the Pharisees" (Matt. 12:2; cf. Mark 2:24; Luke 6:2) i.e., *them*, and "the Son of man" (Matt. 12:8; cf. Mark 2:28; Luke 6:5) i.e., *I* (*ego*). Though the form is softer, the style is unmistakable.

Given that the Greek is clearly working both with respect to word order (location of what is contrasted relative to the verbs,) and a *them* versus *I* dichotomy, to make it clear that this not just any contrast, but a particularly stark contrast, the absence of either a *kai* or *de* in Matt. 12:8 is very peculiar. The natural expectation is that there will be a conjunctive *kai* (or *de*), to unite and manifest these other elements of the stark contrast. Confirmation that this is indeed expected is evident in the parallel passage of Mark 2:28, where there is such a *kai*.

Moreover, in the pregnant *economy* of words that our Lord uses, Matt. 12:8 (like Mark 2:28; Luke 6:5), also acts as a *conclusion*. Matt. 12:8 (cf. Mark 2:28; Luke 6:5) follows on from a teaching drawn from the OT, "Have ye not read what David did, when he was an hungered, and they that were with him; how he entered into the house of God, and did eat the shewbread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the priests?" (Matt. 12:3,4; cf. Mark 2:25,26; Luke 6:3,4). Further elucidation follows in Matt. 12:5-7. Thus in the associated *conclusion* flowing from the first OT example of David (Matt. 12:3,4), second OT example of priests in the temple (Matt. 12:5), fulfilment of OT temple types in Christ (Matt. 12:6), and third OT example of Hosea 6:6 (Matt. 12:7); once again, the expectation is that a "therefore" or "thus" i.e., Greek *kai* will be present. Its absence is particularly noticeable in a language like Greek where *kai* is quite commonly used, so that its absence in this context seems almost inexplicable. Once again, confirmation that this is indeed expected is found in the parallel passage of Mark 2:28, where there is such a *kai*.

Given that the elements of a stark contrast between Matt. 12:2 and Matt. 12:8 lead to the expectation of a *kai* ("even"), and the elements of a conclusion between Matt. 12:3-7 and Matt. 12:8 also lead to the expectation of a *kai* ("therefore") (only one of these two meanings can be translated into English at once); the absence of a *kai* in Matt. 12:8 is both unexpected and jarring. In order to overcome this evident textual deficit in the Greek, the *kai* in Matt. 12:8 may therefore be reasonably restored to this passage by adopting the minority Byzantine reading further attested to in the Latin.

It is possible that the 16th and 17th century neo-Byzantine reconstructed this Greek reading from the Latin *etiam* of St. Jerome's Vulgate (as indeed I did for the original Volume 1, before for the purposes of this revised volume 1 gaining knowledge of the three Greek manuscripts supporting it, *supra*, from von Soden). But that would be perfectly acceptable. Our analysis is first and foremost of the Greek text, not the Latin text. Thus the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, is clearly subject to the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. To the question, "Where was this *kai* over time and through time?;" I reply, "It was in the many thousands of copies of Saint Jerome's Latin Vulgate, and before

that, it was in the Greek manuscripts that St. Jerome translated the Latin Vulgate from." *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!*[33]

The origins of the variant which omits the *kai* are speculative. Was the omission deliberate? Given that we can trace the variant back to Origen, we cannot rule out the possibility that Origen regarded it as some kine of "stylistic improvement" to prune away "an unnecessary word." Was the omission accidental? We know from Manuscript Washington (W 032) that short words were sometimes accidentally omitted, as seen by the initial omission of "*ode* (here)" at Matt. 24:2, which was then added between the lines by the scribe. We also know that due to a paper fade, a short word could be left out, and wrongly regarded as a "stylistic break" by a later scribe. We cannot be certain as to the variant's origins. We only know for certain that the omission occurred.

On the one hand, the reading of the *Textus Receptus* is a minority Byzantine reading, and can be found in the Greek from the 6th century. It is supported by textual analysis with respect to the stylistic balance of the expected "*kai*," evident in the stylistic elegance of "*etiam* (even)" in e.g., both St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate and a couple of old Latin Versions, one of which is ancient (the 300s A.D.). But on the other hand, the TR's reading is a slim minority Byzantine reading, and the omission of the "*kai*" is supported by the representative Greek Byzantine text and a few ancient church writers. Taking into account these competing factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 12:8, a solid "C" (in the range of 60% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 12:8, "even," is found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), and 157 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

The incorrect variant which omits "even" (or "therefore"), is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous variant which omits the "*kai*," entered both the NU Text *et al* and the Burgonite Majority Texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). It is omitted in the (Westcott-Hort based) ASV which reads at Matt. 8:12, "For the Son of man is lord of the sabbath." It is likewise omitted in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. A footnote in the Burgonite NKJV says it is omitted in both the NU Text and Majority Text.

---

[33] Latin Motto of the Lutheran Reformation, drawn from I Peter 1:25 in St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, "The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever."

The neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites thus embrace one another on this verse, being in alliance against the Received Text. Do either of them suppose that the neo-Byzantine Received Text compliers were unaware of its general absence in the Greek manuscripts? Do the neo-Alexandrians think that these neo-Byzantines would change the TR's reading if two more non-Byzantine manuscripts from e.g., Africa suddenly gained great prominence and also contained this same omission? They recognized the Byzantine Text when with Beza they rejected the Western Text of *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (D 05, 5th century) and with Erasmus they rejected the Alexandrian Text of *Codex Vaticanus* (B 03, 4th century). If they did not accept a representative Greek Byzantine text reading here, they certainly would not accept the Alexandrian Greek text reading or the Western Greek text reading here.

Do the Burgonites think that these neo-Byzantines would change the TR's reading if they were told the majority text has this omission? The reality is that the representative Byzantine Text available to them from several dozen Greek manuscripts does not fundamentally change even if one has access to several thousand Greek manuscripts. These are not "new" discoveries in the way the neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites like to think and portray them. They are simply "new opinions" by men who lack the requisite skills of textual analysis evident in the great neo-Byzantine textual scholars such as Erasmus of Rotterdam, Stephanus of Geneva, Beza of Geneva, or the Elzevirs of Leiden. As King Solomon said, "There is no new thing under the sun" (Eccl. 1:9); and "I know that whatsoever God doeth, it shall be forever: nothing can be put to it, nor any thing taken from it: and God doeth it, that men should fear before him" (Eccl. 3:14).

Matt. 12:10 "there was" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Remarks.

I state below that "I would need access and higher technological analysis of W 032 at this point to know if" a certain "conjecture is viable." Though I was privileged to view this manuscript in March 2009 in Washington, D.C., USA, I was not permitted by the librarian to go though the leaves of this manuscript due to its frail condition. I was told by the librarian in the Freer Gallery of the Smithsonian Institution that houses this amazing manuscript, that every time permission was given for someone to examine a portion of this manuscript damage was done to as bits of paper fall of the binding section due to it frail condition. Indeed, such paper fragments were clearly visible in the box containing W 032.

I shall discuss this exciting trip to the Smithsonian Institution in further detail in a future volume. Suffice to now note that I am grateful for my photocopy of the Facsimile of *Manuscript Washington* published by Michigan University, USA, in 1912, of which copy number 158 of 435 copies was generously presented to Sydney University. I thank God for the generosity and foresight of those involved in both the process of producing this facsimile and also sending it out to libraries such as that of Sydney University in Australia, which is where I procured my photocopy of it. By this act we now have many photolithic copies around the world of one of the most ancient Byzantine texts of Matt. 1-28 and Luke 8:13-24:53 in existence. In the words of St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, "*Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!*," which is, being interpreted, "The Word of the Lord endureth forever" (AV) (I Peter 1:25).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 12:10 the Greek reading of the *Textus Receptus* (TR), "*en* ('he was' i.e., 'there was,' imperfect indicative, 3rd person singular of the verb 'to be,' *eimi*) *ten* (-)," in the words, "*kai* (and) *idou* (behold), *anthropos* (a man) *en* ('he was' i.e., 'there was[34]') *ten* (the) *cheira* (hand) *echon* (having) *xeran* (withered)" i.e., with "his" in italics as added, "And, behold, there was a man which had *his* hand withered" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text. E.g., such Byzantine treasures as, G 011 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century), K 017 (*Codex Cyprius*, 9th century), V 031 (*Codex Mosquensis*, 9th century), Pi 041 (*Codex Petropolitanus*, 9th century), X 033 (*Codex Monacensis*, 10th century), and Gamma 036 (*Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus*, 10th century).

The TR's Greek reading is also supported in the Latin as, "*Et* (and) *ecce* (behold), *homo* (man) e*rat* ('he was' i.e., 'there was,' imperfect indicative, 3rd person singular of the verb 'to be,' *sum*) *manum* (hand) *habens* (having) *aridam* (withered)," i.e., "And behold, there was a man which had a withered hand," in old Latin Versions b (5th century), g2 (10th century), and c (12th / 13th century).

However, another reading, *Variant 1*, adds "*ekei* (there)." This minority Byzantine variant reads, "*kai* (and) *idou* (behold), *anthropos* (a man) *en* (he was) *ekei* (there) *echon* (having) *ten* (the) *cheira* (hand) *xeran* (withered)," and is found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and N 022 (6th century). The minority Byzantine reading addition of "*ekei* (there)," (with "*echon*" / "having" coming after, not before, "*ten*" / "the" "*cheira*" / "hand") is also found in Codex M 021 (9th century). It is further supported with the addition of "*ibi* (there)" either after "*erat*," or elsewhere with a rearrangement of word order, in old Latin Versions a (4th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century). The inclusion of "e*rat* (there was)," is also found in Latin Codices L (Lichfildensis, 7th / 8th centuries), Q (Kenanensis, 7th / 8th centuries), D (Dublinensis, 8th / 9th centuries), and Ep (Epternacensis, 9th century).

A difficulty exists in the question of how to best render this *Variant 1* once "*ekei* (there)" is so added. One might translate it differently to the TR's reading by rendering it, "And, behold, there was a man there …" etc. . This would be harmonious with the type of translation one finds in the AV for "*en* ('he / she / it was')" and "*ekei* (there)" at, for instance, Matt. 14:23 and Luke 8:32. Alternatively, one might regard this "*ekei* (there)" as redundant, and so render this the same as the TR i.e., "And, behold, there was a man … " etc. . This would be harmonious with the type of translation one finds in the AV for "*en* ('he / she / it was')" and "*ekei* (there)" at, for instance, Luke 6:6. Thus the Greek, "*kai* (and) *en* (he was) *ekei* (-) *anthropos* (a man)" at Luke 6:6 is rendered, "and there was a man …" etc., in Tyndale's NT (1526), the Geneva Bible (1560), and the Authorized Version (1611). A similar feature may be found in the Latin, for whereas both the Vulgate and Clementine read

---

[34] The Greek "*en*," like the Latin "e*rat*," is generally said to mean either, "he / she / it was." However, depending on context, this Greek or Latin 3rd person singular verb can be rendered, "there was." Cf. in the AV, "there were" in Mark 4:36 (*en*, 3rd person singular, imperfect indicative of *eimi*); "there were (*esan,* 3rd person plural, imperfect indicative of *eimi*) two debtors" which becomes, "There was a creditor which had two debtors" (AV) in Luke 7:41; "there is" in Mark 12:32 (*estin*, 3rd person singular present indicative of *eimi*); or "there be" in Matt. 7:13,14 (*eisin*, 3rd person plural present indicative of *eimi*).

at Luke 6:6, "*Et* (And) *erat* ('he was' i.e., 'there was') *ibi* (-) *homo* (a man)," this is rendered in the Douay-Rheims as, "And there was a man" etc. . Should we view *Variant 1* as translating into English differently to the TR or the same as the TR?

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, omits "*en* (there was) *ten* (the)," and so reads, "*kai* (and) *idou* (behold), *anos* ('a man,' an abbreviation with a line over the top of it, for *anthropos*) *cheiran* (hand) *echon* (having) *xeran* (withered)" i.e., "And, behold, a man which had a withered hand;" or with "his" in italics as added, "And, behold, a man which had *his* hand withered." This is the reading of W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), as interpreted by Swanson, although the abbreviation of "*anos*" does not look like, "*ANOC*," but rather as "*ANOO*" (see textual discussion of variant, *infra*). This reading is followed in the Latin as, "*Et* (and) *ecce* (behold), *homo* (man) *manum* (hand) *habens* (having) *aridam* (withered)," i.e., "And behold, a man which had a withered hand," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century) and old Latin Version 1 (7th / 8th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further followed with a rearranged word order and inclusion of *ten* (the)," neither of which affects English translation, as "*kai* (and) *idou* (behold), *anthropos* (a man) *echon* (having) *ten* (the) *cheiran* (hand) *xeran* (withered)," by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

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

Was *Variant 1* added in for "greater contextual clarity"? Was this accidental due to "*en* (he was)" coming at the end of a line, followed by a paper space, and a scribe "reconstructing" this reading after wrongly thinking "there must have been a paper fade"? Or was this a deliberate additional insertion into the text?

Was the "*en*" of *Variant 2* first lost in ellipsis on "*en* (there was) *ten* (the)"? This may explain why Chrysostom has the "*ten* (the)," but not the "*en* (there was)." We do not generally have the data from von Soden (1913) to know which optional letters are majority Byzantine text and which are not; but this matter is of no consequence for the purposes of translation. Scrivener's Text reads "*cheira* (hand)" and so lacks the optional "*n*" at the end. But if *on one line of manuscripts coming from this variant,* a scribe was working in a manuscript line that had "*ten* (the) *cheiran* (hand) *echon* (having)," he may have gotten confused looking back at the page after some distraction, and remembering he was up to a word ending with "n" (nu), and seeing the "n" ending of *echon* (having)," written this down. Then realizing his mistake, added the "*ten* (the) *cheiran* (hand)" back in. This may explain the word order of Chrysostom's reading. But *on another line of manuscripts coming from this variant*, the "*ten* (the)" may then have been removed for reasons of "redundancy" by the same scribes.

Or was *Variant 2* an error due to fatigue? The omission of "*en* (there was) *ten* (the)" just after "*anthropos* (a man)" and before "*cheira* (hand)," is matched in Codex W 032 by some difficult to read writing. Swanson takes the "*ANOO*" looking writing of W to be the standard abbreviation for *anthropos* of "*ANOC*" (e.g., W just two verses earlier at Matt. 12:8, abbreviates *anthropou* to "*ANOY*" with a bar over it). But Swanson is not always careful about such matters, for he also says that two verse later at Matt. 12:12, W is one of the manuscripts to abbreviate *anthropos* as "*ANOC*," whereas inspection of the Facsimile edition of W 032 by myself clearly shows that at Matt. 12:12 W 032 is unabbreviated as

"*anthropos*." On the basis of the Facsimile available to me; it is certainly within reason to conjecture that some kind of error occurred here. E.g., did the scribe of W 032 become befuddled, for instance, due to fatigue, and did this sleepy eyed scribe then write the nonsensical "*ANOO*" as he dosed in and out of sleep? Then reawakening, and shaking his head back into life, did he move the flickering candle light to the left of the page, and keep writing on the next line, "*cheiran* (hand)" etc.? I would need access and higher technological analysis of W 032 at this point to know if this conjecture is viable. Perhaps it is not, and perhaps Swanson's reconstruction of W is correct. I simply do not know.

Was *Variant 2* an accidental omission due to a paper fade? I.e., was "*en* (there was) *ten* (the)" lost due to a paper fade, and taken by a subsequent scribe as a "stylistic break" in the line? If so, the later scribe removed this "stylistic feature," and thus the variant may have arisen by this means.

So many different conjectures may account for the variants. We cannot be certain whether these, or some other speculation, is the correct explanation. We can only be confident that in some way the original words "*en* (there was) *ten* (the)" were lost in the line of manuscripts containing the two variants.

The TR's reading has solid support from the Greek in the representative Byzantine Text; ancient support from an old Latin Version; and no good textual argument against it. There are a variety of plausible explanations as to how the variants arose, and possibly the loss of either variant may have occurred on different manuscript lines for different reasons. A complicating factor is that it is possible to take the view that *Variant 1* translates into English the same way as the TR; but it is also possible to take a different view. Moreover, *Variant 2* has the support of Jerome's Latin Vulgate, and ancient support from an old Latin Version and an ancient church writer. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 12:10 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 12:10, "there was a man which had *his* hand withered," is found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), and 1071 (independent, 12th century).

Variant 1, which may be rendered either the same at the TR's reading, or rendered differently as, "there was a man there which had *his* hand withered," is found (with "*echon*" / "having" coming after, not before, "*ten*" / "the" "*cheira*" / "hand") is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century, with the optional "n" on the end of "*cheira*" / "hand"), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere); the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century,

independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; and Armenian Version.

Variant 2, which omits "there was," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous *Variant 2* entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 12:10. It is earlier found in the ASV as, "and behold, a man having a withered hand." Unfortunately, the relative lack of literalness in these neo-Alexandrian versions means that one cannot always be entirely sure what the translators are doing relative to their neo-Alexandrian Greek text. The Greek "*en*" literally means "he was," and so "*anthropose* (a man) *en* (he was)" is rendered, "there was a man" (AV). Through italics, this idea was preserved in the NASB's 1st and 2nd editions; which thus follows the TR through its italics in what is classified as a variant in the footnotes of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993).

But the NASB's 3rd edition moves to something like *Variant 1*, which simultaneously accepts the omission of *Variant 2*. Thus in its last edition the NASB adds "was there" in italics and unlike its 1st and 2nd editions gratuitously omits "*idou* (behold)," thus reading, "And a man *was there* whose hand was withered" (NASB 3rd ed. 1995)." I.e., this is *Variant 2* with words added in like those of *Variant 1*. This type of translation is also found, without such italics, in the NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, TEV, JB and NJB. E.g., the ESV which like the NASB (3rd ed.), NRSV, and NIV gratuitously omits "*idou* (behold)," reads, "And a man was there with a withered hand" (ESV). But there are no italics in these other neo-Alexandrians versions. Additionally, we find that the Twentieth Century New Testament gratuitously adds in "he saw" without using italics, thus reading, "and there he saw a man with a withered hand" (TCNT). Therefore, what exactly are all these versions doing relative to their Greek texts? We do not know. Neither do their readers. For those of us who believe in the verbal inspiration of Scripture, such a situation is truly unsatisfactory. *Let us thank God for the comparative clarity of our Authorized Versions!*

Of some interest also is the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582), which reads at Matt. 12:10, "And behold there was a man with a withered hand." This rendering by the pre-Vatican II Latin Papists is certainly more accurate than the variant reading found in the post-Vatican II neo-Alexandrian Papists of e.g., the Jerusalem Bible, *supra*. But the Douay-Rheims still shares an important feature with the Jerusalem Bible, namely the lack of italics. For those of us who believe in the verbal inspiration of Scripture, such a situation is truly unsatisfactory. On a number of occasions we are simply left guessing as to what such translators were doing relative to the text, and we may be guessing wrongly. *Let us thank God for the comparative clarity of our King James Bibles!*

Matt. 12:15 "multitudes" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The TR here reads, "*Kai* ('And,' word 1) *ekolouthesan* ('followed,' word 2) *auto* ('him,' word 3) *ochloi* ('multitudes,' word 4) *polloi* ('great,' word 5)" i.e., "and great multitudes followed him" (AV). But both Lectionaries 2378 (abbreviating "ιηcoυ" to "ιυ" with a bar over both letters) and 1968 (abbreviating "ιηcoυ" to "ιυ" with a bar over the "ιυ") change word 3 for the two words, "*to* ('the,' untranslated in English) *Ieso* (Jesus)." I.e., reading, "and great multitudes followed Jesus." To the best of my knowledge, this is a previously unrecorded minority Byzantine reading; and certainly it is incorrect. But for the purposes of our interest at Matt. 12:15, *infra*, the matter is of no consequence.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 12:15, the TR's Greek reading, "*ochloi* (multitudes)," in the words, "*kai* (and) *ekolouthesan* (followed) *auto* (him) *ochloi* ('multitudes,' nominative plural, second declension masculine noun, from *ochlos*) *polloi* ('great,' nominative plural, masculine adjective, from *polus*)," i.e., "and great multitudes followed him" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); Minuscules 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels), 1010 (12th century), and 597 (13th century); and Lectionaries 150 (995 A.D.), 32 (11th century), 185 (11th century), 1627 (11th century), 2378 (11th century), 70 (12th century), 12 (13th century), 1663 (14th century), 1761 (15th century), and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*turbae* ('multitudes,' nominative plural, first declension feminine noun, from *turba*) *multae* ('great,' nominative plural, feminine adjective, from *multus*)," in old Latin Versions d (5th century), h (5th century), and f (6th century); and in a similar reading as Latin, "*turba* ('multitude,' nominative singular, first declension feminine noun, from *turba*) *multa* ('great,' nominative singular feminine adjective, from *multus*)," in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), and Chrysostom (d. 407); and in a similar reading by the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

However, an alternative reading (*Variant 1*), omits "great (*polloi*)," and reads only "multitudes (*ochloi*)." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in N 022 (6th century).

Another alternative reading (*Variant 2*), omits "multitudes (*ochloi*)," and reads only "many (*polloi*)." This is found as Latin "*multi* ('many,' nominative plural, masculine adjective, from *multus*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339); and the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Greek Byzantine text, which is therefore the correct reading. The origins of these variants are conjectural. Was one or both of them were a deliberate "stylistic pruning" to make "a more succinct text"? Were they accidental omissions? If so, was the loss was due to their like endings (homoeoteleuton), i.e., the "*loi*" in the Greek terminology, "*ochloi* (multitudes) *polloi* (great)," resulting in the loss by ellipsis found in both *Variants 1 & 2*? In the case of *Variant 1*, having written, "*ochloi*," did the scribe's eye catch the "*loi*" ending of "*polloi*," and then

did he keep writing? In the case of *Variant 2*, did the scribe scan forward in the sentence and then look back, remembering in his head he was up to the "*loi*" ending i.e., of "*ochloi*," see the "*loi*" ending of "*polloi*," then write this down and keep going? Or did *Variants 1 & 2* arise from paper fades / losses, in which the gap was taken by a scribe as a "stylistic break" which he then "closed" in his copy? We cannot be certain as to these variants origins, we only know for sure that these omissions were made.

The TR's reading has strong support from the representative Byzantine Text, no good textual argument against it, and the further support of two ancient old Latin Versions, together with a number of ancient church writers (although one of these uses the variant as well). *Variant 1* has very little textual support and may be safely dismissed. *Variant 2* is primarily a Latin reading, and has the support of the Latin Vulgate, some ancient old Latin Versions, and ancient church writers. Nevertheless, we maintain the superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 12:15 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 12:15, "multitudes (*ochloi*) great (*polloi*)," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century), an independent manuscript of the Coptic Sahidic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Slavic Version (9th century); Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries), and with minor differences in the Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500).

The incorrect *Variant 2*, which omits "multitudes (*ochloi*)," and reads only "many (*polloi*)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in the Ethiopic Version (6th century, Rome); and with minor variation the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions. *Variant 2* was adopted by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott & Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952).

Inside the closed class of sources, Eusebius refers to both readings. Outside the closed class of sources, the Arabic Diatessaron, the Armenian ("Caesarean Text"), the Coptic Bohairic, the Syriac (Pesitto & Harclean), and the Ethiopic (Dillmann) all follow the TR's reading; whereas the Syriac (Curetonian & Sinaitic) and the Ethiopic (Rome), follow *Variant 2*. On neo-Alexandrian principles, which Syriac and Ethiopic are correct? The matter was baffling to the NU Text Committee, which in Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), placed "*ochloi* (multitudes)" in square brackets before "*polloi* (great / many)," thus making the inclusion or omission of "*ochloi* (multitudes)" entirely optional. But with both major Alexandrian texts supporting *Variant 2*, other neo-Alexandrians have been more decisive. Thus "*ochloi* (multitudes)" is omitted in both Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). It seems that in the future, much will depend on either the particular neo-Alexandrian composing a text, or which neo-Alexandrians are or are not on a particular neo-Alexandrian Committee, as to what this reading will be "authoritatively" said to be. Of course, any such neo-Alexandrian "determination," will only be "authoritative" for a relatively short while, i.e., till another neo-Alexandrian text is produced; and even before that time, whatever is so "determined," will be disagreed with by some other neo-Alexandrians.

Variant 2 is found in the ASV, which reads at Matt. 12:15, "and many followed him" (ASV). It was likewise followed in the NASB, RSV, and ESV; and also found in the NIV and Moffatt Bible. But it was not followed in the NRSV which for the wrong reasons, contains the TR's reading in the main text. On the one hand, the ESV reads, "And many followed him" (ESV). But on the other hand, the NRSV reads, "Many crowds followed him," with a footnote at "crowds" saying, "Other ancient authorities lack 'crowds'" (NRSV). Which is the "authoritative" revision of the RSV on this verse, the NRSV or the ESV?

Matt. 12:22 "the blind and dumb both" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek reading, "*ton* ('the,' word 1) *tuphlon* ('blind,' word 2) *kai* ('and,' word 3) *kophon* ('dumb,' word 4) *kai* ('both,' word 5)," in the words, "insomuch that the (*ton*) blind (*tuphlon*) and (*kai*) dumb (*kophon*) both spake and saw," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., N 022 (6th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*caecus* (the blind) *et* (and) *mutus* (the dumb)," in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century).

Another reading (*Variant 1*), not affecting the basic meaning of the text, and so essentially supporting the reading of the Received Text, has these five words in a different word order as word order 1,4,3,2,5, "*ton* ('the,' word 1) *kophon* ('dumb,' word 4) *kai* ('and,' word 3) *tuphlon* ('blind,' word 2) *kai* ('both,' word 5)." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century).

Yet another reading (*Variant 2*), omits words 1,2,3, & 5, and reads only "*kophon* ('dumb,' word 4)." This is found as Latin "*mutus* (dumb)," in old Latin Version g1 (8th / 9th century); and as Latin "*surdus* (mute / deaf)," in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), d (5th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century).

Yet another reading again (*Variant 3*), omits words 1,2,3,4, & 5. This is found as Latin, "*ita* (so) *ut* (that) *loqueretur* (he might speak) *et* (and) *videret* (he might see)" i.e., "so

that he spake and saw." This reading is found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is thus correct. The origins of these variants are speculative. Did *Variant 1* come about as a deliberate "stylistic improvement" on the basis that "dumb and blind" equates the opposites of "spake and saw" respectively in the clause, "the blind and dumb both spake and saw"? If so, the error of the scribe was in failing to see that the parallelism of "dumb and blind" here, contextually acts to echo the "blind (*tuphlos*) and (*kai*) *kophos* (dumb)" earlier in this verse. Alternatively, did *Variant 1* come about from an initial ellipsis in which the scribe first wrote, "*ton* (the)" then looking forward and back, saw the "*on*" suffix of "*kophon* (dumb)" and so wrote "*kophon*;" but then immediately realizing his mistake, wrote back in, "*kai* (and) *tuphlon* (blind)," on the basis that the meaning was the same? This type of thing accounts for a number of rearrangements of word order in NT variants. Whether by deliberate "stylistic improvement," or accidental omission followed by immediate "correction," the scribe was correct in thinking that the basic meaning was the same, and so in this sense I take *Variant 1* to really support the *Textus Receptus*.

Words 1,2, & 3 in *Variant 2* possibly were lost from the ellipsis possibility mentioned at *Variant 1*, *supra*. If so, the scribe was not sufficiently adroit to detect his error, and so he kept writing. Notably, this error may have occurred in either an underpinning Greek manuscript that the Latin was translated from, or by ellipsis from the "*us*" suffix of the Latin "*caecus* (the blind) *et* (and) *mutus* / *surdus* (dumb);" or perhaps both i.e., some Latin manuscripts may have been copied from a Greek manuscript which originated this error in that line of manuscripts, and others from a Latin manuscript which originated this error in that line of manuscripts. Alternatively, the Greek or Latin words "(Greek, *ton*) blind (Greek *tuphlon*; Latin *caecus*) and (Greek *kai*; Latin *et*)," may have been lost by an undetected paper fade / loss. Word 5 was may have been removed as "redundant," or lost due to an undetected paper fade / loss.

Variant 2 poses a clear textual problem since reference is made to only the "dumb" who then both "spake and saw." The stylistic incongruity of this in St. Matthew's Gospel is e.g., seen in the fact that the Matthew 12 passage continues "the same day" (Matt. 13:1) in Matt. 13. It is clear that this physical healing of the blind and dumb man was an object lesson for the spiritual healing Christ gives. The link between eyes and sight, or ears and hearing, is manifested in Matt. 13:13-16. Here I especially note the words, "For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them" (Matt. 13:15). (If hypothetically, the situation were reversed, and *Variant 2* were the representative Byzantine reading; and the representative Byzantine reading were a minority variant; then we would be compelled to reject what is now *Variant 2*, and adopt what is now the representative Byzantine reading for reasons of textual analysis.)

Variant 3 was possibly a "stylistic improvement" by scribes copying out *Variant 2*; and realizing that to simply say "the dumb (*mutus* / *surdus*) spake (*loqueretur*) and (*et*) saw (*videret*)," does not make sense. It clangs on the ears as both bad Greek and bad Latin. If

so, then scribes evidently reached the wrong conclusion, i.e., that a former scribe must have "added in saw (*videret*)," and so they then "corrected this addition," by omitting it. It is possible that Greek scribes working from *Variant 2* made this omission, and / or Latin scribes working from *Variant 2* made this omission. Alternatively, the Greek or Latin words "(Greek, *ton*) blind (Greek *tuphlon*; Latin *caecus*) and (Greek *kai*; Latin *et*) dumb (Greek *kophon*; Latin *mutus* / *surdus*)," were possibly lost in an undetected paper fade / loss in an originating Greek and / or Latin manuscript line, and wrongly taken for a stylistic space, a later scribe wrote the text without them. But I think it more likely that it was originally lost in a Greek manuscript line, since no Latin manuscripts have Word 5, indicating that the change was probably made before it entered the Latin text.

On the one hand, the TR is supported by the representative Byzantine text, has no good textual argument against it, and is basically supported by *Variant 1*, which includes support from the fifth and sixth centuries. *Variant 2* poses an obvious textual problem and so may be safely dismissed. But on the other hand, *Variant 3* has the support of Jerome's Latin Vulgate and a number of old Latin Versions, some ancient. Balancing out these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 12:22 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 12:22, "the blind and dumb both," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in the Armenian Version (5th century).

With the omission of Word 5, "*kai* (both)," it is also found in Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type).

Variant 1, which in substance supports the five words of the Received Text, "the blind and dumb both," but has a different word order i.e., with "dumb" before not after these words, is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent), and Syriac Harclean h (616) Versions.

Words 1,2,3,4 in the *Variant 1* word order (either with or without Word 5[35]) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), *et al*. Word 5 is omitted in the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)*, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), and 1582 (12th century, independent

[35] Textual apparatus information is deficient here.

Matt.-Jude); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 13 (13th century, independent).

Word 1,2,3,4 in *Variant 1* word order, and without Word 5 is further found in the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

Variant 2, which omits words 1,2,3, & 5 "the blind and … both," and reads only, "dumb," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found (either with or without Word 5[36]) in Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); (either with or without Word 5[37] in the following three versions,) Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions, and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 2 with Word 5 added, is found by the hand of a later corrector in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus.

Variant 3 which omits words 1,2,3,4, & 5 (either with or without Word 5[38] in the following two versions,) is found in the Anglo-Saxon Version (8th to 10th centuries) and French Version (Andrea Schmeller, 1827).

As already observed, *supra*, *Variant 2* is such an improbable reading that it may be safely dismissed. Yet it was adopted by the NU Text in Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993); and before that, in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). At this point, I think the Roman Catholic Latin scholars who adopted the erroneous *Variant 3*, found in the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Versions as, "so that he spoke and saw," working from the Latin were better textual scholars than the neo-Alexandrians working from the Alexandrian Greek who followed *Variant 2*, which is found in e.g., the neo-Alexandrian Roman Catholic's Jerusalem Bible. That is because, on the basis of stylistic analysis, *Variant 3* is a more probable reading than *Variant 2*. If *Variant 3* did not exist the TR's rating for this verse would be an A and not a B. From here, I leave the reader to draw his own conclusions as to the quality of textual analysis that characterizes these neo-Alexandrians.

The erroneous *Variant 2* which omits words 1,2,3, & 5 entered the NU Text at Matt. 12:22. It is found in the ASV and Moffatt Bible, e.g., the ASV reads, "insomuch that the dumb man spake and saw" (ASV). It was likewise followed in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, TCNT, JB and NJB. But whereas the *Twentieth Century New Testament* reads, "so that the man who had been dumb both talked and saw" (TCNT); the *Today's English Version* (TEV)

---

[36] Textual apparatus information is deficient here.

[37] Textual apparatus information is deficient here.

[38] Textual apparatus information is deficient here.

tries to skirt around the issue with a similar reading omitting altogether the reference to the fact the man had been "dumb," by usage of one of its many loose and unreliable "dynamic equivalents" that thus here prunes the text of Scripture *even more* than *Variant 2*.

Variant 3 was adopted by the ESV which reads at Matt. 12:22, "so that the man spoke and saw" (ESV). A hybrid of *Variant 3* coupled with the Word 5 (both) of the TR and *Variant 1* i.e., like the later corrector of London Sinaiticus (*Variant 2*, *supra*), adding in Word 5, is found in the NIV, which reads, "so that he could both talk and see" (NIV).

Matt. 12:24,27 "Beelzebub" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century) uses the Latin "*Beelzebub*" and old High German "*Belzebube*" as a Matt. 12:24,27 and Luke 11:15,18,19 conflation as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting. (I hope that by saying this, those who now like to say that Matt. 12:24,27 is not a TR based Greek reading, do not start to say that the Greek of the TR is really "a Latin reading" or "a German reading"!). The 19th century Latin of Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), uses the Latin "*Beelzebul*" as a Matt. 12:24,27 and Luke 11:15,18 conflation as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting.

Principal Textual Discussion.

See comments at Matt. 10:25. Once again, at both Matt. 12:24 and Matt. 12:27, the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century), reads Greek "*Beelzeboul*;" and the Latin of St. Jerome's Vulgate *et al* reads, "*Beelzebub*." Once again, I am horrified by the absurdity of the claim that the TR here follows a different reading to the representative Byzantine Text. This would be like claiming that the English word, "Negro," used e.g., with reference to the "Negro Spirituals," is not an English word because it is derived from the Latin languages of Spanish and Portuguese, "*negro*" (black), and found in such non-English place names as "Montenegro" (Black Mountain) in the Balkans of Eastern Europe[39].

---

[39] The name of "Montenegro," is derived from the Latin language of Venetian (Italian is "Montenero"); and refers to Mount Loucen (*c.* 5,740 feet or *c.* 1,750 metres high). Though Venetian, it also looks like Spanish. E.g., "Monte" is used for "Montevideo," the capital city of Uruguay, South America. The Spanish word for "black" is *negro*, and thus, *Montenegro* looks like, though is not, Spanish. (Cf. in the Latin, *niger* = black; see Greek, "*Niger*" in the TR, and Latin, "*Niger*" in the Vulgate, as a name in Acts 13:1. Greek uses *melas* for "black," so "Niger" in Acts 13:1 is a name of Latin derivation; also found in such African place names as Niger River, Niger, or Nigeria.) Re: the "video" of "Montevideo." Two rival explanations for this name "Montevideo" are generally given. Either it comes from the Portuguese, "Monte vide eu (I see a mountain);" or, as an abbreviation from when the Spanish recorded its location as "Vi De Este a Oeste (the sixth mountain from east to west)." I consider these rival interpretations are both too narrow. I think that rather cleverly, the Spanish used what is *prima facie* a combination of the Spanish, "Monte (a mountain)" and Latin, "video (I see)." In doing so, they made the Latin "video" fit the

As discussed at Matt. 10:25, the AV translators would not have disputed the Greek reading at these passages. "Beelzebub" is simply the selection of a more common English word, which in its English form is taken from a Latinized Hebraic form found in the Vulgate. The reading of the Received Text is thus the reading of the representative Byzantine Greek text at Matt. 12:24,27. There is no good textual argument against it, and so it must stand. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at these two verses an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt.12:24,27 Greek, "*Beelzeboul*," is followed by (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. Matt. 12:24 is found in the "*Beelzebub*" from in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century). Matt. 24:27 is further found in the "Beelzebul" form in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions.

A variant reading at Matt. 12:24,27, "*Beezeboul*," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century), and nowhere else. (Although a similar reading is found in a lone manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version at Matt. 12:27.) It was adopted by Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). It is a uniquely Alexandrian text reading. See my comments at Matt. 10:25.

On this occasion, the correct reading entered the NU Text, as it had earlier entered Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). This is fairly translated at Matt. 12:24,27 in the ASV as "Beelzebub," (which here departs from Westcott-Hort's text,) and a footnote says, "Gr[eek] 'Beelzebul'." This is followed in the NIV, where a footnote gives as the Greek either the TR's reading or the Alexandrian variant; thus foolishly placing the two on a par! The ASV footnote at Matt. 12:24,27 rightly says this is Greek "Beelzebul," but it is left in this essentially untranslated state by the ASV's revisors in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NASB, none of whom seem to understand the finer points of the English language on this matter. A footnote to the NASB's 1st edition which was discontinued in its 2nd and 3rd editions, gives as the Greek either the TR's reading or the Alexandrian variant i.e., like the NIV, placing the two on a par! Though the NKJV follows the AV's reading, as at Matt. 10:25, so also at

---

letters from the Latin language of Spanish, "Vi De Este a Oeste," thus creating a *double entendre* that on one level, preserves the original meaning of the city in the Latin language of Portuguese.

Matt. 12:23,27, an NKJV footnote gives as the NU Text and Majority Text reading the same reading as the ASV's footnote. Thus the NKJV footnote gives the false impression that the TR is at variance here with the Burgonites' Majority Text., which in fact here equates the majority Byzantine text.

Once again, I am pained by the folly of the neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites lack of grip on the English language. But perhaps we should not be surprised. After all, they clearly fail to understand quality textual analysis of the Greek, so their comparable failure to understand the English language is, if nothing else, consistent scholarship. We see a similar issue in the frequent failure of e.g., the NASB and RSV, to translate the Hebrew "*sheol*" in the OT; or e.g., the NIV's failure to adequately translated Dan. 9:25,26 as "Messiah" (AV). It seems the art of English translation has alluded these neo-Alexandrian new versions, which given the task they set themselves, is rather unfortunate.

Matt. 12:25 "And Jesus knew" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading, "*eidos* (knowing) *de* (and) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," i.e., "And Jesus knew," in the words, "And Jesus knew their thoughts" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Minuscules 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels); 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts); 1010 (12th century, Byzantine); 597 (13th century, Byzantine). It is also supported as Latin, "*Iesus* ('Jesus,' Latin word 1) *autem* ('but' / 'and,' Latin word 2) *sciens* ('knowing,' Latin word 3)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported with the same meaning in Latin word order 3,2,1 in old Latin Versions ff2 (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

However, another reading (*Variant 1*), would read in a reconstruction of the Greek, "*idon* (seeing) *de* (and) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," i.e., "And Jesus saw." This is found as Latin, "Videns (seeing) *autem* (but / and) *Iesus* (Jesus)," in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century).

Yet another reading (*Variant 2*), Greek "*idon* (seeing) *de* (and)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 387 (11th century). This reading is also found as Latin, "Videns (seeing) *autem* (but / and)," in old Latin Version d (5th century). I.e., the Greek "*o Iesous* (Jesus)" or Latin "*Iesus* (Jesus)," is here omitted.

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must therefore stand. The origins of these variants are speculative. But I think the more likely explanation is that due to a paper loss / fade, the original "... *eidos* … (knowing)" looked something like " …*::idoo::* …," and was "reconstructed" by a scribe as "*idon* (seeing)." A similar paper fade / loss may account for the absence of "*o Iesous* (Jesus)," which was probably abbreviated to "*OIC*" (i.e., in continuous script, *OIC* since usage of the first and last letter of *O IHCOYC* / "Jesus," with a bar over the top of it, is a common manuscript

abbreviation). However, it may also have been lost by ellipsis, as the line, "*O* (-) *IC* (Jesus) *TAC* ('the' in 'the thoughts of them')," would have looked in continuous script, as "…*OICTAC*… ." Thus it would be possible that e.g., a scribe remembering he was up to a few letters ending with "*C*," looked forward and then back, saw the "*TAC*" and wrote this, thus omitting "*OIC*" i.e., "*o Iesous* (Jesus)." We cannot be certain as to the origins of these variants, we can only know that they somehow arose.

The TR's reading is well attested to in the Greek and Latin, and reads much better than the curious terminology, "seeing their thoughts." On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 12:25 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt.12:25, "And Jesus knew," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the Family 13 Manuscripts, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

Variant 1, "And Jesus saw," is found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 13 (13th century, independent). It is also found in some independent manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and some independent manuscripts of the Slavic Version.

Variant 2, "And seeing," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and by the hand of a later "corrector" in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus. It is also found in Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type).

Another reading, *Variant 3*, "*eidos* (knowing) *de* (and)," i.e., "And knowing," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It was the original reading of London Sinaiticus, and after an earlier "corrector" changed it to *Variant 2*, a later "corrector" then changed it back to *Variant 3*. It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century).

Variant 3 is another uniquely Alexandrian text reading. It may have originally arisen

as either a deliberate "stylistic improvement" to create "a more concise text;" or accidentally as a paper fade / loss of "*OIC*" (*o Iesous*). The back and forth history of different "correctors" of London Sinaiticus reminds us that for those in the Alexandrian School, "a little bit of chicanery never went astray." *When one is resting primarily on just two Alexandrian manuscripts, here with the support of one Arabian Version, this murky side of the Alexandrian School might have given our neo-Alexandrians thought to pause and think.* In fact, this Alexandrian reading has been readily received by the neo-Alexandrians, being found in e.g., Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

Variant 3 is found at Matt. 12:25 in the American Standard Version as, "And knowing" (ASV). The ASV's embrace of this variant was followed by its descendants, the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV. By contrast, on this occasion the NIV followed the TR; as did Moffatt, who was possibly here swayed by the Syriac.

Matt. 12:29 "he will spoil" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Von Soden's "K" group has 983 manuscripts, of which *c.* 949 are Byzantine, i.e., *c.* 914 are exclusively Byzantine and *c.* 35 are Byzantine text in parts only. Von Soden's Kr group of manuscripts which represents *c.* 20% or about one-fifth of the 914 exclusively Byzantine text manuscripts in von Soden's K group[40].

In more precise terms, about 860 or *c.* 88% of these K group manuscripts cover the Gospels (see commentary at Matt. 9:5b). Within the K group, von Soden says the variant is here followed by the Kr subgroup and two other K group manuscripts. The Kr group contains 211 manuscripts, and of these, *c.* 209 are Byzantine, of which *c.* 189 are completely Byzantine, *c.* 20 are Byzantine only in parts, and 2 are outside the closed class of sources. 211 Kr manuscripts plus 2 other K group manuscripts that here follow the variant, mean 213 manuscripts out of 860 manuscripts i.e., 24.7 or *c.* 25%, most of which are Byzantine text.

Factoring in a 10% error bar for von Soden's generalist groups means the count is *c.* 18-20% on a generalist count, or *c.* 22.5-25% on a more precise Gospel manuscripts count. Either way, it is clear that the variant is a sizeable minority Byzantine reading.

Principal Textual Discussion.

The TR's Greek reading, "*diarpasei* ('he will spoil,' indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *diarpazo*)," in the words, "and then he will spoil (*diarpasei*) his house" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., N 022 (6th century), E 07 (8th century), X 033 (10th century), and Minuscule 2 (12th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*diripiet* ('he will spoil,' indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from

[40] See Textual Commentary, Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) at Matt. 5:31a, & Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), at Matt. 20:15c.

diripio)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However a variant reading, Greek, "*diarpase* ('he may spoil,' subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *diarpazo*)," making the reading, "and then he might spoil (*diarpase*) his house," is a sizeable minority Byzantine reading. It is found in e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th century), and Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). It is also found as Latin, "*diripiat* ('he may spoil,' subjunctive active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *diripio*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), old Latin Version 1 (7th / 8th century), and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is further followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must therefore stand. However in view of the fact that the variant is a sizeable minority Byzantine reading, I shall undertake some further textual analysis. In doing so, I note that the subjunctive found in the variant, which introduces the sense of uncertainty, i.e., "he may spoil" (variant) rather than "he will spoil" (TR), is contextually very inappropriate. To first say, "enter into a strong man's house, and spoil (*diarpasai*, active infinitive aorist, from *diapazo*)[41] his goods," has a clear definiteness about it, and this is incongruous with then saying, "he" only "may spoil (subjunctive) his house." The fact that just before this, the subjunctive is used in the words, "except he first binds (*dese*, subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *deo*) the strong man," is no argument for the subjunctive here, since the latter clause is premised upon the fact that the contingency of "except he first binds" has been fulfilled, and thus the expected reading is a parallel with the certainty of the earlier "spoil (*diarpasai*)," found in the TR's "*diarpasei* (he will spoil)," but not found in the variant's "*diarpase* (he may spoil)," which clangs on the ears as bad Greek. The reading of the TR thus stands sure, and would have to be adopted even if it were the minority Byzantine reading, even though it is here the representative Byzantine reading.

The TR's reading is well attested to in both the Greek and Latin, and is favoured by textual analysis. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 12:29 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt.12:29, "he will spoil," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 1071 (independent, 12th

---

[41] A minority Byzantine variant, "*arpasai* (active infinitive aorist, from *apazo*)," is found in X 033 (10th century). It is also found outside the closed class of sources, and adopted in the NU Text *et al*; but it also means "spoil" (ASV).

century) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude, mixed text type in Revelation).

However, the incorrect reading, "he may spoil," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), and 157 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

Reflecting the major split between the two leading Alexandrian texts, the variant found in Tischendorf's beloved London Sinaiticus is followed in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72); whereas the TR's reading found in Rome Vaticanus is followed by Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text's Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). At Matt. 12:29, the correct reading of Rome Vaticanus is thus found in the ASV's "he will spoil;" and further retained by the ASV's revisors of the NASB. But the ASV's revisors of the RSV and ESV went the other way, following the incorrect reading of the variant found in London Sinaiticus, and thus e.g., the ESV reads, "Then indeed he may plunder his house" (ESV).

An imprecise reading, "he can" is used by Moffatt i.e., "Then he can plunder his house" (Moffatt Bible), and this loose reading is also found in the NRSV and NIV. While "can" may refer to the definiteness of *being able* to do something found in the future tense of the TR's reading, it also can mean "may" in colloquial usage. This is the difference between, "He *can* do it from now on," and "He *can* do it if he wants to." This raises the question of whether Moffatt *et al* were trying to *straddle two horses* and produce a reading that might be interpreted to mean either of the two Alexandrian readings, while not clearly being one or the other? If so, the fact that these two Alexandrian "horses" here bolt in different directions, must result in a painful splitting sensation for those seeking to "stay in the saddles" of the Moffatt Bible, NRSV, or NIV.

Matt. 12:31 "unto men" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading, "*tois anthr<u>o</u>pois* ('unto men,' plural dative, 2nd declension masculine noun, from *anthropos*)," in the words, "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 1010 (12th century, Byzantine), and 1242 (13th century, Byzantine); and (in both instances abbreviating the "*anthr<u>o</u>pois*" to "*anois*" with a bar over the "*oi*,") Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*hominibus* ('unto men,' plural dative, 3rd declension masculine noun, from *homo*, *hominis*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate

(1592).

However, an alternative reading adds "*umin* ('you,' plural dative, from *su-umeis*)," and so reads, "*umin* (you) *tois anthropois* (unto men)," i.e., "unto you men." This variant is followed by the ancient church Greek writers Origen (d. 254) and Athanasius of Alexandria (d. 373).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Text which must therefore stand. The origins of this variant are speculative. Was there a stylistic paper space before "*tois anthropois* (unto men)," and Origen or another wrongly assumed a paper fade / loss? Alternatively, this looks very much like the type of thing that Origen sometimes liked to do. I.e., did Origen probably regard it as a "stylistic improvement" to "focus in a more personal way" by saying, "*you* men"? If so, in doing so, he possibly made some reference to the "*umin* (you)" of the nearby Matt. 12:6; 13:11. The fact that Athanasius made the error of following this reading, indicates it was circulating at Alexandria, where the corrupting Alexandrian School of scribes are notorious for such "stylistic improvements."

The TR's reading has solid support from the Greek and Latin. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 12:31 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 12:31, "unto men," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century, omitting *tois* / 'the'), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and an independent manuscript of the Ethiopic Version (Pell Platt).

However, the incorrect reading which adds "you," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in some independent manuscripts of the Palestinian Syriac Version; as well as the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century).

The two main Alexandrian texts are split down the middle on this reading. But one

of the peculiarities of the neo-Alexandrian mind is that it can understand that a text may be conflated, but has enormous difficulty in comprehending that a text can be pruned. Heresy sometimes consists in maintaining one Biblical truth to the exclusion of another. The neo-Alexandrian mind can readily accept that a "man" may "add unto these things" "in this book;" but balks at the prospect that a "man" might "take away from the words of the book" (Rev. 22:18,19). Therefore, under the stridently anti-intellectual and spiritually blinded approach of the neo-Alexandrians, there is a strong tendency to favour the shorter reading. Thus by a curious fluke, on this occasion, the neo-Alexandrians have generally gotten it correct in both their Greek NT texts and versions, in that they have followed the shorter reading of the TR largely because it is found in London Sinaiticus. (So likewise, the heretical teaching of Rome Vaticanus at Matt. 12:32, which adds "*ouk*" / "not," to make the passage read, "And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall *not* be forgiven him," is likewise generally rejected by neo-Alexandrians on this type of logic; once again, on this occasion following the correct reading of the TR for the wrong reason[42].)

Hence for largely the wrong reasons, because it is *the shorter reading*, the correct reading is found in the NU Text *et al*. Thus it is found at Matt. 12:31 in the American Standard Version (although Westcott-Hort give *umin* as a footnote alternative) as, "Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men" (ASV). This correct reading is also followed in the RSV and NASB's first and second editions; together with the NIV. But when one comes to the NASB's 3rd edition, as well as the NRSV and ESV, one may be excused for thinking that there is yet another variant of substance, one that reads "*lao* (unto people)" rather than "*anthropois* (unto men)." But further inspection will show that no such variant exists. The readings of the NASB (3rd ed.), NRSV, and ESV, are not translations, but feminist language perversions of God's Word.

The ungodly anti-patriarchy sex role perverts deny the glorious truth that "a man" "is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man" (I Cor. 11:7). Thus because of her identity through men, whether her husband, father, or Adam; a female is, like Eve, derivatively in God's "image;" for "in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them" (Gen. 1:27). Because the sex role perverts deny that "a man" "is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man" (I Cor. 11:7); they further seek to deny masculine generics. Now the Greek is very specific. While there are a number of relevant Greek words, let us consider just two of them in order to make the basic point. If "people" is meant, an appropriate Greek word is *laos*, found in e.g., Matt. 1:21; 2:4,6; 4:16,23,23,25 *et al*, and so reasonably translated as "people" in the AV. However, if a singular man is meant, the Greek word is *anthropos*, found in e.g., Matt. 8:9; 9:32; 11:8,19 *et al*. If a generic for the human race is meant in clearly male gendered generics, then likewise *anthropos* is used e.g., "Man shall not live by bread alone" (Matt. 4:4); or "the Son of man"

---

[42] The added "not" of *Rome Vaticanus* at Matt. 12:32, shows the disturbing extent to which Alexandrian School scribes were prepared to incorporate "theological refinements" into their "improvements" of the text. The neo-Alexandrians like to play down the significance of such a heretical teaching in this very corrupt and very unreliable manuscript. Their embarrassment at such flagrant heresy in *Rome Vaticanus* is understandable, and something we neo-Byzantines of the Received Text can certainly understand; but their failure to clearly and audibly condemn this and other corrupting practices of the Alexandrian School, is something that we neo-Byzantines of the Received Text have no sympathy for.

(Matt. 8:20; 9:6; 11:19 *et al*). Those employing feminist language seek to take English words such as "people" and universalize their usage, so as to deny this Biblical distinction. Thus e.g., the English Standard Version reads "people" at Matt. 12:31 i.e., "every sin and blasphemy will be forgiven people" (ESV).

That the Word of God should be perverted through feminist language in order to pander to sex role perverts whose philosophy of life is an embodiment of covetousness and lust in direct violation of the tenth commandment, "Thou shalt not covet" (Exod. 20:17), is a truly pitiful thing to behold. "They declare their sin as Sodom." "Women rule over them. O my people," says "the Lord of hosts," "they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths" (Isa. 3:1,9,12).

Matt. 12:35a "of the heart" (TR & AV) {C}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Von Soden lists four Greek manuscripts in his I group, that are otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system which follow the TR's reading, "*tes* (of the) *kardias* (heart)." These are Minuscules 1689 (10th century, Serres, Greek Macedonia, Greece, von Soden's ε 1054, Iιa group), 517 (11th century, Christ Church College, Oxford University, England, UK, von Soden's ε 167, Iφa group), 1093 (14th century, Athos, Greece, von Soden's ε 1443, Il group), and 372 (16th century, Vatican City State, Rome, von Soden's ε 600, Ia group). Additionally, von Soden lists two Greek manuscripts in his I group, that are otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system, and which to some extent further support the TR by a similar Greek reading, "*tes* (of the) *kardias* (heart) *autou* (of him)." These are Minuscules 713 (13th century, Cambridgeshire, England, von Soden's ε 207f = 351, Iσ group) and 1365 (13th century, Jerusalem, Israel, von Soden's ε 381, Il group). Given that in von Soden's I group, *c.* 78% of manuscripts are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., *c.* 68% of I group manuscripts are completely Byzantine, 10% are Byzantine only in specific parts, and *c.* 22 % are non-Byzantine, there is a reasonable possibility, though not a definite certainty, that some of these six manuscripts are in fact Byzantine text. But when the numbers are this small, such statistics do not necessarily hold up, and hence we cannot be certain that any of these half-dozen manuscripts are Byzantine text.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 12:35a the TR's Greek reading, "*tes* (of the) *kardias* (heart)," in the words, "A good man out of the good treasure of the heart," is supported as Latin, "*cordis* (of the heart)," in *Codex Brixianus* (old Latin Version f, 6th century)[43]. It is to some extent further supported by a similar reading, Greek, "*tes* (of the) *kardias* (heart) *autou* (of him)," i.e., "of his heart," in Minuscule 924 (12th century, Athos, Greece); and likewise, in the Latin, "*cordis* (of heart) *sui* (his)," i.e., "of his heart," in *Codex Aureus* (old Latin Version aur, 7th century), together with some independent manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate. The TR's reading is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Clement of Rome (*c.* 150) and Origen (d. 254). The TR's reading was manifested in the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598),

[43] Tischendorf says old Latin ff2 (5th century) follows the TR, whereas Julicher says it follows the variant. I therefore exclude it from consideration altogether.

and Elzevir (1633).

However a variant, which omits these words, is the majority Byzantine reading e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). This omission is also found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this variant reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254), Didymus of Alexandria (d. 398), and Chrysostom (d. 407); ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

A serious textual problem here presents itself in the representative Byzantine Text. Matt. 12:33-35 distinguishes between the unregenerate heart which first exhibits lust or covetousness (10th commandment, Exod. 20:17; Rom. 7:7), and the manifestation of this in the bad fruits of sin (1st – 9th commandments, Exod. 20:1-16; I Tim. 1:8-10). It is something like the words of St. James, "Ye lust [antecedent, 10th commandment], and have not: ye kill [action, 6th commandment], and desire to have, and cannot obtain." (James 4:2; cf. James 1:25; 2:7-12; 4:3,4). Thus in Matt. 12:33 we find this duality three times i.e., "[1] Either make *the tree* good, and his *fruit* good; or else [2] make *the tree* corrupt, and his *fruit* corrupt: [3] for *the tree* is known by his *fruit*." Christ then again refers to this duality in Matt. 12:34, saying, "O generation of vipers, how can ye, *being evil*, speak *good things*? For out of *the abundance of the heart* the mouth speaketh."

We then read in the representative Byzantine text of Matt. 12:35a, "A good man out of *the good treasure* bringeth forth good things … ." At this point, verse 35a seems incomplete. What is this "good treasure" that has suddenly been introduced from nowhere? Some "good treasure" of works? Or some "good treasure" of his heart? The change of metaphor is confusing and the matter is not immediately clear. Context indicates the "good treasure" (vs. 35a) "out of the abundance of the heart" (vs. 34); and the natural expectation is to find a genitive after "good treasure," such as "of the abundance of the heart." Further stylistic analysis confirms this expectation, since verse 34 says, "speak *good things*;" and verse 35a says, "bringeth forth *good things*." Therefore the stylistic parallelism of "good things" (vss. 34 & 35a) expects a matching stylistic parallelism in verse 35a of something like, "of the abundance of the heart." However, once this transition linkage were supplied, it would not be necessary to repeat it for the second part of this verse, since the clarification would have first been made. Hence no such expectation *necessarily* exists for, "and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things" (verse 35b) i.e., it may or may not be present in this verse 35b, but it is not present *of necessity*.

Given that in the first place, "A good man out of *the good treasure* bringeth forth good things" falls flat, as the reader asks, "What treasure?" or "the good treasure of what"?; and given that in the second instance, the stylistic parallelism of "good things" in verses 34 and 35 expects a matching concomitant stylistic parallelism in verse 34 of something like, "A good man out of the good treasure *of the abundance of the heart* bringeth forth good things;" it follows that the representative Byzantine Text is crying out for the restoration of some kind

of omission. Of the two possibilities found in the closed class of sources i.e., the Greek and Latin, "of the heart (Greek, *tes kardias*; Latin *cordis*)" or the Greek and Latin, "of his heart (Greek, *tes kardias autou*; Latin, *cordis sui*); the former seems more stylistically congruous at Matt. 12:35a, since we do not read in verse 34, "out of the abundance of *his* heart," but rather, "out of the abundance of *the* heart."

It is also clear from comparison with similar words of Christ said on another occasion in Luke 6:45, that Matt. 12:35a is a more concise summary form of this teaching of Christ, and the absence of a counter-balancing "his" here means it does not appear to be original in the Matthean account; although from the longer Lucian account we know that Christ might include it. The addition of "his" at Matt. 12:35a was possibly an assimilation to Luke 6:45; but given the absence of any comparable assimilation of the second "his" in the second part of Matt. 12:35, this is probably not the source. Thus it more probably came from the "his" (twice) of Matt. 12:33. Therefore "the heart" is evidently the correct reading here at Matt 12:35a.

The issue of how this variant arose is necessarily in the realm of conjecture. Was it inadvertently lost due to an early paper fade / loss? Or was it deliberately pruned, since on a superficial analysis, a scribe may have sought to create an internal stylistic balance in verse 35 i.e., "A good man out of the good treasure bringeth forth good things," paralleling, "and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things"? If so, while omitting the words, "of the heart," achieved this end; it also broke the greater parallelism and stylistic transition from verse 34 to verse 35. The only way to maintain a stylistic balance in both, would thus be to add "of the heart" in verse 35b. On another occasion, Christ did this (Luke 6:45), but such a stylistic balance is optional, since the second clause is intelligible without it; and evidently Christ did not use this technique here at Matt. 12:35a. Both the TR's reading and the variant were known to Origen. This painful pruning looks like the type of gory hacking away that Origen would do, and so it seems to be quite probable that he is the originator of this variant and that it was a deliberate "stylistic improvement." *Oh Origen! … Thou hast castrated the text just like thou hast castrated thyself!*[44]

On the one hand, textual analysis clearly favours the TR's reading due to the clarity and expected stylistic balance of the words "of the heart." The reading has support as both a minority Greek and minority Latin reading. It is followed by ancient church writers, and this includes the impressive ancient support of Clement of Rome (Clemens Romanus). But on the other hand, the omission is followed by both the representative Byzantine Greek text and the representative Latin text, together with a number of ancient church writers. Taking these competing considerations into account, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 12:35a a middling "C" (in the range of 56% +/- 2%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

---

[44] Eusebius's (d. 339) *Church History*, Life of Constantine, Oration in Praise of Constantine, chapter 8, says "while Origen was … at Alexandria, … he took the words, 'there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake' [Matt. 12:12] in too literal and extreme a sense. And … he carried out in action the word of the Saviour." (*Christian Classics Ethereal Library*, http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff//npnf201.iii.xi.viii.html .)

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the similar reading at Matt.12:35a, "of his heart," is found as Greek, "of the (*tes*) heart (*kardias*) of him (*autou*)," in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); together with Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 157 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)*, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude). It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). While Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) includes these words, it is clear that the Diatessaron labours under the error of "parallel Gospel readings." I.e., while it is true that there are some parallel Gospel accounts, the Diatessaron fails to recognize that Christ repeated the same basic teachings on many occasions during his three and a half year ministry (Dan. 9:27), sometimes slightly varying his words. Thus e.g., while Matt. 12:35 and Luke 6:45 are said on different occasions, they are so integrated in the Arabic Diatessaron reading, that one could not with any confidence say whether or not these words were present in the original Matt. 12:35 that this Diatessaron Version came from.

The variant omitting the words, "of his heart," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 788 (11th century, independent text), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). The omission is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century), the Anglo-Saxon Version (8th to 10th centuries), and French Version (Andrea Schmeller, 1827).

The erroneous reading which omits "of the heart" at Matt. 12:35a, entered the NU Text as it had earlier neo-Alexandrian texts. Hence the ASV, gratuitously adding "his" without italics before "good treasure" and "evil treasure," reads, "The good man out of his good treasure bringeth forth good things: and the evil man out of his evil treasure bringeth forth evil things." The erroneous variant is also found in the NASB (which puts the ASV's "his" in italics as an added word), RSV, NRSV, and ESV; and it also appears in the NIV (which adds much to the verse under the name of "dynamic equivalence"). Moffatt also follows this variant, once again gratuitously adding "his," and in his instance alone, just as gratuitously omitting "treasure" after "good," with the sliced and diced reading, "The good man brings good out of his good store" (Moffatt Bible).

The incorrect reading omitting "of the heart" at Matt. 12:35a is found in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). Burgon & Miller (1899) give this as a specific example of where they consider their majority text should replace the "Textus Receptus[45];" and Hodges & Farstad likewise give this as an

[45] Burgon & Miller (1899), pp. vii & 96.

example of where they think their majority text should replace the "TR" or "Textus Receptus[46]." Their minions in the New King James Version respond, "Yes Sir, Yes Sir, three bags full, one for the master, Burgon & Miller; one for the Burgonite name, Hodges & Farstad; and one for the new toy, Robinson & Pierpont, who live down Burgon's lane." Thus a footnote in the NKJV says that both the NU Text and Burgonite Majority Text omits these words.

Both the neo-Alexandrians and the Majority Text Burgonites have been beating the air with shadow-boxing in their criticism of the TR's reading at Matt. 12:35a, and accomplishing nothing but wearing themselves out. So much effort and fatigue, for so unrewarding a goal! The Received Text stands secure and upright; while the neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites lie in a tired and worn out collapsed heap on the ground.

This type of thing is nothing new. The old Latin Papists omitted, "of the heart (Latin, *cordis*)" in both the Clementine and Douay-Rheims. That the ever Romeward and homeward Puseyites, such as Burgon, should here join forces with the Romanists is notable; and of course, the NU Text has had as one of their three constant NU Text Committee members across Nestle-Aland's 26th edition (1979), 27th edition (1993), and the United Bible Society's 3rd edition (1975), 3rd Corrected edition (1983), and 4th Revised edition (1993); a Papist skilled in the arts of Jesuitry, to wit, Carlo Martini, S.J. .

In old sword-fights here at Matt. 12:35a, the Latin Papists with the Clementine Vulgate as their shield and the Douay-Rheims as their sword, would come charging at the Protestants who held the Received Text as their shield and the Authorized Version as their sword. "Fee-fie-fo-fum," the Romanists declared, "We Papists who here support Origen, will cut off these words from the Textus Receptus, and we smell the Protestant blood of an Englishman!" And as the Papists thrust their sword down at the Protestants, it was deflected by the Protestant shield of the *Textus Receptus* back onto the Papists themselves, as indeed it is now likewise deflected back onto Puseyites like Burgon, or back onto neo-Alexandrians like the Papist Cardinal Martini. And as the Latin Papists own swords thus struck back into their own Papistical bodies, the Papists repeatedly screamed, as do now the Burgonites and neo-Alexandrians, "Ouuuuuuch!!!! Ouuuuuuch!!!!;" as the Protestants of the *Textus Receptus* and Authorized King James Version declare, "Ye Papists, ye Burgonites, ye neo-Alexandrians, who here support Origen, be "cut off" (Gal. 5:12) even as was Origen!"

Matt. 12:38 "answered" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek reading, "*apekrithesan* (answered)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, Washington D.C., 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), the purple parchment, N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, London, New York, Athens, *et al*, 6th century), E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, Basel, 8th century), G 011 (*Codex Seidelianus*, Trinity College, Cambridge, 9th century), K 017 (*Codex Cyprius*, Paris, 9th century), U 030 (*Codex Nanianus*, Venice, 9th century), V 031 (*Codex Mosquensis*, Moscow, 9th century), Pi 041 (*Codex Petropolitanus*, St. Petersburg, 9th century), S 028 (*Codex Vaticanus*, Rome, 10th century), X 033 (*Codex*

---

[46] Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xviii & 38. The TR is defined by Hodges & Farstad as that printed at Oxford (1825) rather than that of Scrivener (1894 & 1902).

Monacensis, Munich, 10th century), Gamma 036 (*Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus*, Oxford, 10th century); and Minuscule 28 (11th century, Paris, Byzantine other than in Mark).

However, a minority Byzantine reading (*Variant 1*) adds "*auto* ('to him,' masculine singular dative, personal pronoun, from *autos*)," and so reads, "answered him" or more literally, "said to him." This is found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and M 021 (9th century). It is also found as a Latin reading, "*ei* ('unto him,' masculine singular dative, demonstrative pronoun, from *is-ea-id*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further found as Latin, "*illi* ('that [man],' masculine singular dative, demonstrative pronoun, from *ille*)," i.e., "him," in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries) and ff1 (10th / 11th century); and as Latin "*eum* ('him' masculine singular accusative, demonstrative pronoun, from *is-ea-id*)," in old Latin Version b (5th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

Another reading (*Variant 2*), adding Latin, "*ad* (to) *Iesum* (Jesus)," is found in old Latin g1 (8th / 9th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text, which is thus the correct reading. The origins of these variants are speculative. *Variant 1* was seemingly added as a "stylistic improvement" of "clarification," possibly with some reference to the "*auto*" in Matt. 12:2; 13:10, *et al*. But demonstrating the maxim, "O what a web we weave, when at first we try to deceive," this addition did not satisfy everyone, and "even greater clarification" was demanded by the Latin scribe of g1, who made this "to Jesus," possibly with some reference to the "*ad Iesum*" of Matt. 14:29; 17:4, *et al*.

On the one hand, the TR's reading has support in the representative Greek Byzantine Text from ancient times. But on the other hand, the addition of "to him" is a minority Byzantine reading, and has support in the Latin Text from ancient times. Balancing out these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 12:38 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 12:38, "answered," is found in (the independent) Codex 0250 (*Codex Climaci rescriptus*, Cambridge, 8th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (*Codex Sangallensis*, St. Gallen, 9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century) and Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century).

However the addition of "to him" (*Variant 1*), is found in the two leading Alexandrian

texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 788 (11th century, independent text), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); together with the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. This addition is also found in the Syriac Harclean h Version (616); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous *Variant 1* entered the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993); as it had earlier entered Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). It is found at Matt. 12:38 in the American Standard Version as, "answered him" (ASV), and this is followed in the ESV. It is likewise found more literally as a dative in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and NIV. E.g., it is appears in the New Revised Standard Version as, "to him" (NRSV). It is also found in the Latin based Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version as, "answered him."

Matt. 12:44 "empty, swept" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading, "*scholazonta* (empty), *sesaromenon* (swept)," in the words, "he findeth it empty, swept, and garnished," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*vacantem* (empty), *scopis* (swept)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, a variant adds Greek, "*kai* (and)," between these two words, thus reading, "*scholazonta* (empty) *kai* (and) *sesaromenon* (swept)." This is found as Latin, "*et* (and)," in old Latin Versions h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text, which thus stands as correct. The origins of this variant are conjectural. But it looks like a scribe added in "*kai* (and)" in order to create "a stylistic balance" with a "*kai* couplet" i.e., "*scholazonta* (empty) *kai* (and) *sesaromenon* (swept) *kai* (and) *kekosmemenon* (garnished)." Such a "stylistic balance" which adds "*kai* (and)" between "*scholazonta* (empty), *sesaromenon* (swept)," in order "to form a matching "*kai* (and)" couplet with "*sesaromenon* (swept) *kai* (and) *kekosmemenon* (garnished)," is both gratuitous and unwarranted. No such "stylistic improvement" is required or warranted. Arrogant men have no business tampering with the Word of God, creating such new readings from thin air in order to suit their fleeting

fallacies and fancies.

The TR's reading has good support in the Greek and Latin, and no good textual argument against it. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 12:44 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 12:44, "empty, swept," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also the probable reading of (the independent text type) Z 035 (6th century), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. The reading is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The variant which adds, "and," i.e., "empty and swept," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century), (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), and Minuscule 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere). It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century).

With the two leading Alexandrian texts in disagreement, the neo-Alexandrians have found themselves in a painful conundrum. How can they be sure that they have followed "the right one"? Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) confidently followed London Sinaiticus and added the "*kai* (and)." But neither Westcott & Hort (1881) nor Nestle's 21st edition (1952) were so sure, and finding their problem to be insoluble, placed the "*kai* (and)" in square brackets as optional. The NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) confidently followed Rome Vaticanus and omitted the "*kai* (and)," thus achieving the correct result for the wrong reason. It seems that amidst such instability in the neo-Alexandrian's texts, what for neo-Alexandrians is "the vexed question" of whether or not any future neo-Alexandrian text will or will not have this "*kai* (and)," will depend very much on which neo-Alexandrians views are followed on it. The only thing we can be confident about in all this chopping and changing of neo-Alexandrian texts, is that our stable neo-Byzantine Received Text will not have it.

Prima facie, the ASV followed the Westcott-Hort option of not including this "*kai* (and)," and so correctly reads at Matt. 12:44, "empty, swept" (ASV). *Prima facie*, this correct reading was also followed in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. But does this

prima facie conclusion reflect a neo- Alexandrian preference for Rome Vaticanus over London Sinaiticus at Matt. 12:44, or does it reflect the fact that these versions think that while the "*kai* (and)" is "in the Greek text," it is omitted as redundant for the purposes of English translation? We do not know, and nor do their readers.

Matt. 12:47 "Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak to thee" (entire verse) (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading, "*eipe* ('he said' = 'said') *de* (then) *tis* (one) *auto* (unto him), *Idou* (Behold), *e* (the) *meter* (mother) *sou* (of thee) *kai* (and) *oi* (the) *adelphoi* (brethren) *sou* (of thee) *exo* (outside / without) *estekasi* ('they are standing' = 'stand'), *zetountes* (desiring) *soi* (to thee) *lalesai* (to speak)," i.e., "Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak to thee" (entire verse), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also supported by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). E.g., it reads in the Vulgate, Latin, "*Dixit* ('he said' = 'said') *autem* (And) *ei* (unto him) *quidam* ('a certain one' = 'one'): *Ecce* (Behold) *mater* (mother) *tua* (thy) *et* (and) *fratres* (brethren) *tui* (thy) *foris* ('out of doors' = 'without') *stant* ('they are standing' = 'stand'), *quaerentes* (seeking) *te* (thee)." From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation, and Chrysostom (d. 407); the ancient church Latin writers Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a variant omitting this entire verse is a minority Byzantine reading, found in Lectionaries 387 (11th century) and 12 (13th century); as well as Minuscule 597 (13th century, Byzantine). This omission is also found in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries) and ff1 (10th / 11th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct. Indeed, the absence of this verse posses a stylistic incongruity raising a textual problem, since the response of verse 48 presumes that Christ has either heard his mother and brethren calling him, or been told that his mother and brethren have been calling him. Since no such information is provided in verse 46, it follows that verse 47 is a necessary stylistic prelude to verse 48. Its absence thus poses a serious textual problem in the slim number of Greek and Latin manuscripts that it is missing from.

The manner in which this verse was lost lies in the realm of speculation. E.g., was it deliberately omitted by some heretic because for some reason it was contrary to his heretical beliefs? For instance, did a monophysitist heretic who denied that Christ is both fully God and fully man, maintaining belief in his Divinity but not his humanity, consider that this statement of Matt. 12:27, "sounded too much like the humanity of Christ, because reference

his made to his 'mother and' 'brethren'[47]"?

Was it omitted accidentally by ellipsis? Reading from verse 46, "*lalountos* (talking) *tois* (to the) *ochlois* (people) *idou* (behold) *e* (-) *meter* (mother) *kai* (and) *oi* (-) *adelphoi* (brethren) *autou* (of him) *eistekeisan* (stood) *exo* (outside / without) *zetountes* (desiring) *auto* (to him) *lalesai*(to speak);" the original lines may have looked something like this; and possibly this was also at the end of a page.

lalountos tois ochlois idou e meter kai oi adelphoi
autou eistekeisan exo zetountes auto lalesai
eipe de tis auto Idou e meter sou kai oi adelphoi
sou exo estekasi zetountes soi lalesai

Did a scribe, confusing the endings of "*adelphoi* (brethren)" from verses 46 and 47 in lines 1 and 3 respectively, and the endings of *lalesai* (to speak)" from verses 46 and 47 in lines 2 and 4 respectively, thus first write verse 46, and then looking back quickly, think the endings from verse 47 were those of verse 46, and so start writing verse 48? Was verse 47 thus omitted by accident?

The spacing I here put between words may imply an early loss in one or more manuscript lines before continuous script was used. But this is not necessarily the case, since where continuous script is used, scribes sometimes left "stylistic" spaces for no apparent reason between some words (a fact meaning paper fades of words were missed by later scribes). It is of course, also possible that in a continuous script manuscript, a copyist might have lost his place by a line or two, and his eye may simply have caught and rested upon the last "*lalesai*(to speak)." We cannot be sure as to how this variant arose. We only know for sure that at some point verse 47 was omitted, quite probably by some type of accident along the line suggested, *supra*.

The Received Text reading has good support in the Greek and Latin; is followed by one the four traditional ancient Greek doctors of the Eastern Church, St. Chrysostom, and three of the four traditional ancient and early mediaeval Latin doctors of the Western Church, St. Jerome, St. Austin, and St. Gregory; and is further supported by textual analysis. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 12:47 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

---

[47] The Trinitarian and anti-Pelagian teachings of the first four General Councils, Nicea (325), Constantinople (381), Ephesus (431), and Constantinople (451), together with the associated Christological elucidations or clarifications of the fifth and sixth general councils Constantinople II (553) and Constantinople III (680-1), state the orthodox understanding of the Trinity (though these fifth and sixth councils were a mix of truth and error, containing some serious errors in other areas, for instance, the claim of Mary as "ever-virgin" in 553, or the claim in 680 of "God-inspired" status for general councils; see the standard of the "Word of God" applied to general councils in Article 21 of the Anglican 39 Articles); as do also the three creeds, *Apostles'*, *Athanasian*, and *Nicene*. The monophysitist heresy was e.g., condemned at the fourth general council, Chalcedon in 451.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 12:47, "Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak to thee," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century); (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Slavic Version (9th century); Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the incorrect reading which omits Matt. 12:47 is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); and Minuscule 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; and Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century).

Matt. 12:47 was placed in square brackets as optional in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993); and omitted and placed in a footnote by Westcott-Hort (1881). It was included in the ASV, but with a footnote saying, "Some ancient authorities omit ver. 47;" and this format was followed by the NRSV and NIV. This ASV order was reversed in the RSV and ESV which omitted verse 47 from the main text and placed it in a footnote e.g., the ESV footnote says, "Some manuscripts insert verse 47: Someone told him, 'Your mother and your brothers are standing outside, asking to speak to you'" (ESV footnote). It is included in the NASB main text without a footnote.

Moffatt's Bible omits it and a footnote claims, "Ver. 47 has been interpolated by an early copyist who wished to prepare for ver. 48 by using the material of Mark 3:32 … " (Moffatt). However, Mark 3:32 says, "and the multitude sat about him, and they said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek thee;" whereas Matt. 12:47 says, "Then one said unto him, Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee." If Moffatt was correct, we would expect to see reference to what "the multitude" said (Mark 3:32), not what "one said" from the multitude (Matt. 12:47). For the reasons already itemized, *supra*, textual analysis supports the inclusion of this verse, and Moffatt's claims are more a comment on the low academic standard of such religiously liberal textual analysts, than anything else.

Matt. 12:49 "his hand" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek reading, "*ten* (-) *cheira* (hand) *autou* ('his,' literally, 'of him')," in

the words, "and he stretched forth his hand," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Pi 041 (9th century), Gamma 036 (10th century), and Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). It is supported as Latin, "*manum* (hand) *suam* (his[48])," in old Latin Versions h (5th century), f (6th century), and c (12th / 13th century)[49]. It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However a variant, which omits "his (Greek, *autou*; Latin, *suam*)," and reads simply, Greek, "*ten* (the) *cheira* (hand)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also followed as Latin, "*manum* (hand)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Both readings were known to Origen, who was quite possibly the originator of the variant as some kind of "stylistic improvement" that took his curious fancy. Alternatively, it may predate Origen. We know from Manuscript Washington (W 032) that short words were sometimes accidentally omitted, as seen by the initial omission of "*ode* (here)" at Matt. 24:2, which was then correctively added back in between the lines by the scribe. We also know that due to a paper fade a short word could be left out, and wrongly regarded as a "stylistic break" by a later scribe. While we cannot be certain as to the *raison d'etre* for this variant's origins, one of these speculative possibilities may account for the loss of "his (*autou*)." However, we can be sure as to the loss of "his (*autou*)" from the original text.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 12:49 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 12:49, "his hand," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as Codices (mixed text type) C 04 (5th century), (independent text type) Z 035 (6th century), and (independent text type) Delta 037 (9th century).

---

[48] The reflexive possessive for the third person, namely, the adjective *suus – a – um*, as "*suam*" is feminine singular accusative. But that is in order to match in gender, number, and case the *feminine* noun, *manus*, here declined as a feminine singular accusative (fourth declension). But obviously its English translation must be the gender and number of *the subject* to which it refers, and so it is here rendered "his hand" not "her hand."

[49] Tischendorf says old Latin ff1 (8th century) follows the variant, whereas Julicher says it follows the TR. I therefore exclude it from consideration altogether.

The incorrect reading which omits "his," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, D 05 (5th century). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

With the two main Alexandrian texts in disagreement, the neo-Alexandrians have also been in disagreement over this reading. Tischendorf wanted nothing to do with it, and omitted it from the main text of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) in harmony with his beloved Codex Sinaiticus. Both Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952) were baffled by this division between these two texts, and so placed "*autou* (his)" in square brackets, making its acceptance or denial an open matter, thus encapsulating the ambiguity of these two Alexandrian texts. The NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) included the reading in their main text, in harmony with Rome's Codex Vaticanus. Thus the neo-Alexandrians divided every way possible over this reading.

The ASV followed the Westcott-Hort option of including the reading, and so reads at Matt. 12:49, "And he stretched forth his hand" etc. (ASV). Thus the ASV adopted the right reading for the wrong reasons. The ASV was followed by its descendants, the NASB, RSV, and ESV; as well as the Moffatt Bible. By contrast, the NRSV and NIV appear to have preferred the variant. E.g., this is translated in the New Revised Standard Version somewhat loosely as, "And pointing to his disciples" (NRSV).

Matt. 13:4 "and" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Migne raises the question of whether the citation in Gregory's writings at Migne 75:96, is from Matt. 13:4 or Luke 8:5? I do not think it is from the latter which in the Vulgate lacks the "*et* (and)" immediately before "*comederunt* (ate up)" (and so resembles the Greek here). But if, as he did not, Migne had raised the possibility of some reliance on Mark 4:4 where in the Vulgate there is an "*et* (and)" immediately before "*comederunt* (ate up)," (and so once again the Latin resembles the Greek,) then he would have been on safer ground in raising the issue of a possibly conflated reading. Thus on this occasion, I shall make no reference to Gregory on the basis of this citation, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 13:4 the TR's Greek reading, "*kai* (and)," in the clause, "and (*kai*) devoured them up" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*et* (and)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which is thus correct. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:4 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt.13:4, "and" in the clause, "and devoured them up," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.

However, the Greek, "*kai* (and)," is omitted in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century), and (the mixed text type) Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscule 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

The origins of the variant are speculative. Possibly it was lost due to the negligent human frailties of a scribe, since short words were sometimes so lost. Possibly it dropped out due to a paper fade / loss. Or possibly it was a deliberate pruning, if so, possibly also influenced by Luke 8:5.

Great confusion has reigned in the neo-Alexandrian texts over this "and (*kai*)." With the support of London Sinaiticus, Tischendorf confidently included it in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). With London Sinaiticus and Rome Vaticanus in disagreement, Westcott & Hort (1881), predictably put *the shorter reading* which omitted "*kai*" in their main text, and thus also followed their preferred more "neutral" text of Codex Vaticanus; but then put the longer reading which included "*kai*" in a footnote. This Westcott-Hort format was followed by both Nestle's 21st edition (1952) and the NU Text's Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993); although both of these Nestle editions provide manuscript references in their footnotes that is lacking in Westcott-Hort's footnote. With the support of Rome Vaticanus, the NU Text's UBS 4th revised edition (1993) confidently omitted the "*kai*."

This confusion among neo-Alexandrian Greek texts is matched by the confusion of neo-Alexandrian versions which do not use italics for added words. The ASV reads at Matt. 13:4, "the birds came and (*kai*) devoured them;" and since "and" is not in italics, we can conclude that the ASV translators have here followed the Westcott-Hort footnote alternative; and a similar conclusion may be drawn about the NASB. But while the RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, and Moffatt Bible, *prima facie* appear to have included the *kai*, the fact that they do not

use italics raises the possibility that they did not think it was in the neo-Alexandrian text they were following, and so they then added it in English translation. Thus the confusion of the rival neo-Alexandrian Greek texts here is further confounded by the lack of italics in so many neo-Alexandrian versions. We do not know what the underpinning Greek text is of so many of the neo-Alexandrian versions here, and nor do their readers. We do know what Christ said, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away" (Matt. 24:35). Let us thank God for our Authorized Versions which recognize the verbal inspiration of Scripture, and thus use italics for added words!

Matt. 13:9 "to hear" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek reading, "*akouein* (to hear)," in the words, "who hath ears to hear (*akouein*), let him hear" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation), 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels); 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts); 1010 (12th century, Byzantine); 597 (13th century, Byzantine), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles); and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). It is also supported as Latin, "*audiendi* (of hearing)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), Pi (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Docetists (2nd / 3rd centuries) and Naassenes (2nd / 3rd centuries) according to Hippolytus (d. 235), and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Speculum (d. 5th century).

However, these words are omitted in a minority Latin reading found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), e (5th & 6th centuries), and ff1 (10th / 11th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Were they deliberately removed as a "stylistic improvement" on the basis of "redundancy"? Were they lost by ellipsis when a scribe copying out, "*akouein* (to hear) *akoueto* (let him hear)" first wrote the "*akou*" of "*akouein*," then his eye went forward and back along one or two lines, and seeing the "*akou*" of "*akoueto*" thought that was where he was up to, and so wrote, "*eto*" and kept going? Was "*akouein*" lost in a paper fade / loss, and taken for a "stylistic gap" by a subsequent scribe? But the fact that "*akouein* (to hear)" is also absent at Matt. 11:15 in old Latin k, and at Matt. 13:43 in old Latin a and k, indicates to me that old Latin manuscript a most probably came from a "stylistically" pruned Greek manuscript, and old Latin k surely came from a "stylistically" pruned Greek manuscript. The African origins of old Latin k further means that the possibility of textual corruption from an Alexandrian School Greek manuscript raises its ugly African head over the situation. Nevertheless, we cannot be certain as to the variant's origins, we can only be sure that it is not original.

The TR's reading is well attested to in the Greek and Latin, and is common terminology of Christ recorded elsewhere by St. Matthew (Matt. 11:15; 13:43). On the

system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:9 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses
(with some reference to "ears" or "ear" inside the closed class of sources).

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt.13:9, "to hear," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500), and Slavic Version (9th century).

The incorrect reading which omits "to hear" is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); and Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century).

This incorrect and relatively poorly attested to reading was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. This omission is found at Matt. 13:9 in the American Standard Version as, "He that hath ears, let him hear" (ASV), although a footnote says, "Some ancient authorities add here," the words, "'to hear'" (ASV ftn). This incorrect reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV (with a footnote giving the TR's reading in the RSV, NRSV, ESV), and NIV.

Moffatt also follows the neo-Alexandrian texts in omitting "to hear." But he makes an additional change, altering the plural "ears (TR Greek, *ōta*, accusative plural neuter, third declension irregular noun, from *ous*, *ōtos*)," to the singular "an ear (Greek, *ous*, accusative singular neuter)." Is this is a loose "dynamic equivalent" for "ears"? If so, why does Moffatt then use "ears" at Mark 4:9; 7:16? Alternatively, while the Vulgate and old Latin Versions here read the plural, "ears (*aures*)," the ancient church Latin writer, Tertullian (d. after 220) (Against Marcion, 4,19), referring to Isaiah, uses the singular Latin terminology of "an ear (*aure*) of hearing (*audientis*)." There is no textual analytical warrant to set aside the universal Byzantine Greek textual tradition and Latin textual tradition which are inside the closed class of sources (here also followed by all sources outside the closed class of sources).

But was it due to this one curious reference by Tertullian (inside the closed class of sources), that Moffatt adopted the singular, "ear" at Matt. 11:15; 13:9,43; Mark 4:23; Luke 8:8; 14:35? If so, showing Moffatt's instability of mind, he inconsistently did not do so at Mark 4:9; 7:16. If so, why does Moffatt not also follow Tertullian's "of hearing," i.e., rendering the Latin, "*aure audientis*" as "an ear to hear," but only follows the singular, "*aure* (ear)"? The highly unreliable and unstable Moffatt Bible reads at Matt. 13:9 (as it also reads at Matt. 11:15; 13:43; Luke 8:8; 14:35), "He who has an ear, let him listen to this" (or at Mark 4:23, "If anyone has an ear to hear, let him listen to this;" but showing his instability of mind, at Mark 4:9, "Anyone who has ears to hear, let him listen," and at Mark 7:16, "If anyone has ears to hear, let him listen to this"). Is Moffatt's usage of the singular "ear" a loose "dynamic equivalent" based on an underpinning Greek text reading, "ears (*ota*)," or a "reconstruction" based on Tertullian's usage of the Latin "an ear (*aure*)"? We cannot be sure, and neither can the reader of Moffatt's Bible. We can only be sure that either way the rendering is incorrect, and is typical of the types of errors one finds in the highly unreliable Moffatt Bible.

Matt. 13:11 "unto them" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The TR reads, "*eipen* (he said) *autois* (unto them) *oti* (because)" etc. . The Byzantine text's Codex N 022, is damaged and incomplete. At Matt. 13:11 it is damaged and Cronin's printed copy of N 022 (Robinson's *Texts and Studies*, Vol. V, No. 4, Cambridge, 1899), reads "*eipen :::::s oti*." Thus if the dots in this secondary source, one for each letter space, accurately reflect the letters spaces in the primary source of Codex N 022, then the damaged space gap fits the word "*autois*," and there is the appearance of a sigma ("s") in the place of the expected last letter. While I do not have a photolithic / microfilm / digital camera copy of N 022, or access to the original codex; I can only assume (both here and elsewhere,) that Cronin has a sufficient level of professionalism for his dots to accurately reflect letter spaces. Thus I show the TR's reading as the most probable reading of N 022, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 13:11, the Greek of the *Textus Receptus*, "*autois* (unto them)," in the words, "He answered and said unto them," is supported by the majority Byzantine text, e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); the purple parchment, Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century); and the purple parchment, N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*illis* ('unto those [people],' i.e., 'unto them')," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), Pi (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin, "*eis* (unto them)," in old Latin Version d (5th century).

However, these words are omitted in a variant found in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries) and ff1 (10th / 11th century). They are also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which must therefore stand as correct. The origins of this variant are conjectural. Was it deliberately removed as a "stylistic improvement" on the basis that it was "redundant"? Or was it accidentally lost in a paper fade, and then taken to be a stylistic paper space by a subsequent scribe? We cannot be sure. We can only be sure that this omission is not original.

The reading of the *Textus Receptus* has solid support from the Greek and Latin, with no good textual argument against it. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:11 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 13:11, "unto them," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century), and Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in all extant Syriac Versions e.g., the celebrated Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century), whose general, though not absolute faithfulness to the TR, is a source of irritation to the neo-Alexandrians, since the evidence is that this is an ancient version pre-dating the Alexandrian texts; as well as the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions.

However, the incorrect reading which omits "unto them," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century); and Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century), as well as the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

With the two major Alexandrian Texts split down the middle, neo-Alexandrians have had a splitting headache as to what to do with this reading. With the name of his beloved London Sinaiticus on the line, Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) definitely did not want the reading in his main text; and this omission sentiment was followed by Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). But the neo-Alexandrian Text is not stable, and with Rome Vaticanus supporting the reading, the NU Text Committee took a different tact and definitely did want it in their main text, for which reason it is found in Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). What future neo-Alexandrians will do with this reading after they have taken a headache tablet is uncertain.

The neo-Alexandrian versions also reflect this painful split. Following the footnote reading of Westcott-Hort, the ASV translators disagreed with Westcott and Hort's main text,

and placed the correct reading in their translation, which reads at Matt. 13:11, "said unto them" (ASV). So too the correct reading was followed in the NASB, RSV, and ESV. But the NRSV revisors of the RSV disagreed, and omitted these words. So too did the NIV and Moffatt, e.g., the Moffatt Bible simply renders this as, "He replied."

Matt. 13:14 "in" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek, "*ep'* (abbreviation of *epi*, 'in' with a dative) *autois* ('them,' without the *epi*, 'unto them,' dative plural masculine pronoun, from *autos*)," in the words, "And in (*ep'*) them (*autois*) is fulfilled the prophecy" etc., is a minority Byzantine reading supported by the purple parchment *Codex Beratinus* (Phi 043, 6th century, St. Matthew's & St. Mark's Gospel, Tirana, Albania) and *Codex Campianus* (M 021, 9th century, Paris, *Bibliotheque Nationale*, France); together with Minuscules 28 (11th century, Paris, France, Byzantine other than in Mark), 880 (11th century, Vatican City State, Rome), 119 (12th century, Paris, France), 120 (12th century, Paris, France), 217 (12th century, Venice, Italy), 485 (12th century, British Library, London, UK), 2127 (12th century, Palermo, Italy, Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles); 477 (13th century, Trinity College, Cambridge University, England), 232 (14th century, Escorial, Spain), 578 (14th century, Arras, France), 70 (15th century, Cambridge University, England), 287 (15th century, Paris, France), 288 (15th century, Oxford University, England, 15th century), and 745 (16th century, Paris, France).

The TR's reading is also supported as Latin, "*in* ('in' as a preposition with ablative) *illis* ('them,' ablative plural, from *ille*)," in *Codex Veronensis* (old Latin Version b, 5th century), *Codex Claromontanus* (old Latin Version h, 5th century), *Codex Aureus* (old Latin Version aur, 7th century), *Codex Stuttgartensis* (old Latin Version Pi, 7th century), and *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff1, 10th / 11th century); as "*in* (in) *eis* (them)," in *Codex Palatinus* (old Latin Version e, 4th / 5th century), *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff2, 5th century), *Codex Brixianus* (old Latin Version f, 6th century), *Codex Rehdigeranus* (old Latin Version 1, 7th / 8th century), and *Codex Sangermanensis* (old Latin Version g1, 8th / 9th century), the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century) which here shows an independent reading from the Vulgate, and from the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the *Vulgata Clementina* (Clementine Vulgate, 1592); and as "*super* (upon) *eos* (them)," in *Codex Bobiensis* (old Latin Version k, 4th / 5th centuries) and *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis* (old Latin Version d, 5th century).

The TR's reading is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (d. 2nd century) and Eusebius (d. 339). It is also manifested in the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

However, in a variant reading (*Variant 1*), the Greek, "*ep'*" is omitted, thus making the Greek, "*autois*" read, "unto them," i.e., "And unto them (*autois*, dative plural, from *autos-e-o*) is fulfilled the prophecy" etc. . This is followed by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is also followed as Latin, "*eis* ('unto them,' dative plural pronoun, from *is-ea-id*) in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century); or "*illis* ('unto them,' dative plural, from *ille*)," in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

In another variant (*Variant 2*), both "in" and "them" / "unto them" are omitted. This is followed in old Latin Versions a (4th century), g2 (10th century), and c (12th / 13th century).

The representative Byzantine Text here presents a textual problem with its dative reading, "unto them (*autois*)." This prophecy from Isaiah, cannot possibly be "fulfilled" "unto them," since they clearly do not understand it, for "hearing" they "shall not understand; and seeing" they "shall not perceive" (Matt. 13:14). Thus the dative Greek, "*autois* (unto them)," clangs on the ears as bad Greek and is contextually inappropriate. This textual tension created by the reading "*autois*," can only be relieved by adopting the variant, which by adding the "*ep'*" makes the text read that the prophecy is fulfilled "*in* them." Thus the fact that they neither "understand" nor "perceive" becomes contextually appropriate. Hence this variant reading brings contextual harmony to the passage and so undoubtedly is correct. And certainly "*ep' autois*" is established terminology of Matthean Greek (Matt. 14:14). Thus we see the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, working dutifully under its perpetual master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*; for we follow the variant which is found in just over a dozen Greek manuscripts, and just over a dozen Latin manuscripts, so that combining the strength of both gives us more than two dozen manuscripts in support of the Received Text's reading. But though we support it from both Greek and Latin manuscripts, we neo-Byzantines adopt it due to textual analysis of the Greek, and not like the old Latin Papists due to textual analysis of the Latin. *For we are Protestants, and not Papists!*

The origins of the two variants are speculative. I think the most likely explanation for the loss of the Greek, "*ep'* (in)" in *Variant 1*, was an accidental loss due to a paper fade, which was taken by copyists as simply a stylistic paper gap. With regard to *Variant 2*, it was possibly a deliberate "stylistic improvement" of *Variant 1*, undertaken by more adroit, but not adroit enough scribes, who realized there was a textual problem, and wrongly concluding that the "*autois* (unto them)" must have been added, then wrongly omitted it. Alternatively, *Variant 2* may have arisen accidentally, due to a paper fade of both the "*ep'*" and "*autois*."

On the one hand, textual analysis strongly favours the TR's reading, and it is notable that it appears inside the Byzantine textual tradition, albeit as a minority reading[50]. Moreover, this reading has support from ancient Greek writers, together with strong support in the old Latin Versions. But on the other hand, the variant is the representative Byzantine reading and is followed by the Latin Vulgate. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:14 a middling "B" (in the range of 69% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

---

[50] Its support is less than 5% of all manuscripts (Green's Textual Apparatus). I state in Volume 1 (2008), "Even if the 9th century M 021 were the only manuscript inside the closed class of sources to have this reading, the persuasive power of the textual argument is so great, that we would still be inexorably drawn to, and compelled to adopt its logic; for we neo-Byzantines are attracted to it like moths flying to a flame. But if M 021 were its only manuscript support, the rating given would be much reduced, down to a low level 'C' (in the range of 52% +/- 1%)." Having now found about a dozen more Greek manuscripts for it from von Soden for this Revised Volume 1 (2010), it is fascinating to learn that its support in the Greek proves to be about the same strength as it support in the Latin!

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 13:14, "in" in the words, "And in them is fulfilled the prophecy" etc., is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), reading in Ciasca's Latin, "*in* (in) *eis* (them);" Syriac Version (1708, Schaafius); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect *Variant 1* which reads, "unto them," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; and Armenian Version (5th century).

The incorrect reading was adopted in the NU Text *et al*. Hence it is found in what with the *Revised Version* (1881-5) is the most literal of the neo-Alexandrian Versions, the *American Standard Versi*on (1901) as, "and unto them (*autois*) is fulfilled the prophecy" etc. . Recognizing the serious textual problem presented by this reading at Matt. 13:14, a number of neo-Alexandrian versions have attempted a side-shuffle translation of the dative, rendering it as e.g., "with them" (NRSV; cf. RSV), or the even looser, "in the case" (Moffatt Bible, cf. NASB & ESV). So too the Burgonites' NKJV renders it, "in them" (NKJV; cf. NIV), though they have no footnote referring to the Majority Text. Is this simply another example of the NKJV selectively only showing a fraction of the differences between the Received Text and Majority Text so as to give the false impression that the two are much closer together than what they really are? Or does this mean that the NJKV translators think the rendering is the same whether following the Received Text's "*ep' autois*" or their Majority Text's "*autois*"? We do not know. And nor do their readers who have exchanged the glory of the *King James Version* for the much inferior *New King James Version*.

It must be admitted that the dative can sometimes be rendered by "in" or "with," but to this statement there are important qualifications. The normative translation of the dative is "to" or "unto," and one needs to justify a movement away from this rendering. The proper question is not, "What *can* the dative mean *if we stretch and strain the Greek*?", but rather, "What *in a particular context does* the dative *most naturally* mean in the Greek?" Let us consider some of the "more likely" of the highly unlikely possibilities that would warrant such a translation here[51].

Could it be a *dative of reference*? This may be rendered, e.g., "with regard to," or "with reference to," or "concerning." Its function is to *limit* the *reference* of the verb (or

[51] See e.g., Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 144-5,159-63; Young's *Greek*, pp. 43-54.

adjective) to a specific frame of *reference* e.g., "dead to sin" (Rom. 6:2) means "dead with regard to sin," but not "dead with regard to whether or not one is still breathing." If this is the meaning, when the dative's noun is a *thing*, then the sentence will typically not make sense if it is removed e.g., if "to (*te*, dative singular feminine, definite article) sin (*amartia*, dative singular feminine noun, from *amartia* / *hamartia*)," is removed from Rom. 6:2, it makes no sense to say, "How shall we that are dead [to sin], live any longer therein?" But in Matt. 13:14, if "the (*e*, nominative singular feminine definite article) prophecy (*prophetia*, nominative singular feminine noun, from *propheteia*)," is removed, the sentence still makes sense as, "Thus (*kai*) is fulfilled the prophecy" etc., and indeed this is the reading of *Variant 2*. Thus the grammar of the sentence strongly suggests that "*autois* (unto them)" at Matt. 13:14 is not a *dative of reference*.

Could it be a *dative of association*? This too may be rendered, "with" or "in." This refers to the person or the thing *with* whom something is done *in association*, and frequently is used in conjunction with verbs that have a *sun* prefix e.g., Acts 9:7, "And the men which journeyed (*sunodeuontes*) with him (*auto*, dative masculine, 3rd person singular pronoun, from *autos*). Christ is not here in Matt. 13:14 doing something in *association with* these people, and the verb, "is fulfilled (*anapleroutai*, indicative passive present, 3rd person singular verb, from *anapleroo*)," does not have a *sun* suffix. It is clear that "*autois* (unto them)" at Matt. 13:14 is not a *dative of association*.

Could it be a *dative of manner*? This too may be rendered, "with" or "in." This refers to the manner in which the action of the verb is performed. It answers the question, "How?" E.g., John 7:26, "he speaketh (*lalei*) boldly (*parresia*, dative singular feminine noun, from *parresia*)" (AV), or more literally, "he speaketh *with boldness*." To the question, "How does he speak?" the answer is, "with boldness." This is clearly not what is occurring in Matt. 13:14, since to the question, "How is it fulfilled?" the answer is not, "with them."

Could it be a *dative of means*? This also may be rendered, "with" or "in" or "by." This is used in reference to the *means* by which the action of the verb is performed. E.g., "he cast out the spirits with [his] word (*logo*, dative singular masculine noun, from *logos*)" (Matt. 8:16). But these people are not simply *the means* Christ is using to accomplish the fulfilment of this prophecy. Therefore it would be surely strained to try and claim this!

It is possible that by some form of straining the rules of Greek grammar, e.g., the *dative of means*, one might try to "justify" the translation of Matt. 13:14 as "with them" or "in them," i.e., "and through them is fulfilled the prophecy" etc., hence "and with them is fulfilled the prophecy" etc. . *But this is certainly not the natural or obvious way to understand and render it.*

The reality is that the most natural way to render this without the "*ep'* (in)," is the rendering of the ASV, "and unto them (*autois*) is fulfilled the prophecy" etc. . I.e., this is the *normative dative of indirect object* rendered "unto" or "to" or "for." It is not a dative functioning adverbially e.g., *dative of reference*, *dative of association*, or *dative of manner*, nor a dative functioning adjectivally e.g., a *dative of possession*.

The dative of Matt. 13:14 is what is sometimes called, the *true dative*, i.e., the common dative constituting that "to" which, or that "for" which, the verb's action is performed. Here at Matt. 13:14, the verb, "fulfilled (*anaplerouta*)," is passive, and so as the

indirect object, "them (*autois*, pronoun)" receives the verb's subject, "the prophecy (*prophetia*) i.e., "the prophecy" "is fulfilled" "*unto them* (*autois*)." When the common dative or true dative is used, the verb must be transitive i.e., if the verb is active there will be a recipient of the action; or if the verb is passive (as here at Matt. 13:14), it must be derived from an active verb. (This contrasts with intransitive verbs where there is no direct object or recipient of the action e.g., "He was lashing out blindly.") Where this is the case, and we cannot doubt that this is the case here at Matt. 13:14, for the verb is passive and receives the action of being "fulfilled," then the *most common*, the *most expected*, the *most natural* reading is to translate the dative with either "to" or for." I.e., here at Matt. 13:14, the expected translation is "and unto them (*autois*) is fulfilled the prophecy" etc. (ASV).

This conclusion is further supported by the parallelism of Matt. 13:13,14 that one finds in the variant's reading. I.e., "Therefore speak I *to them* (*autois*) in parables: because seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand. And *unto them* (*autois*) is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall in no wise understand; and seeing ye shall see, and in no wise perceive" (ASV).

To the extent that these neo-Alexandrian and Burgonite translations, *supra*, maintain the basic rendering into English of the AV based on the TR, they give a perverse witness against their own texts, since they admit that there is a textual problem with the reading, "and unto them (*autois*) is fulfilled the prophecy" etc. (Matt. 13:14, ASV). But their solution to this problem, i.e., to say that because the dative can sometimes be rendered "with" or "in" etc., that this is how it should be rendered here, is at best either an unlikely and improbable characterization of e.g., a *dative of means*, and at worst, a bashing of the proverbial *square peg* of the dative at Matt. 13:14, *into the round hole* of such a characterization. It seems to me that the ASV, which (together with the RV) is the most literal of the neo-Alexandrian versions, alone of the versions we consider in these commentaries, deserves to be taken seriously as a reasonable translation of this Greek reading's variant here at Matt. 13:14. The looseness and imprecision with which these neo-Alexandrian and Burgonite versions here render "*autois*" is sadly typical of a more general looseness and imprecision which in varying degrees characterizes the rest of their versions.

Matt. 13:15 "I should heal" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Swanson takes the view that W 032 can be read as supporting either the TR's reading *iasomai* or the variant reading, "*iasomai*." But in my opinion the omicron or short "o" is clearly visible, and so W 032 reads "*iasomai*." Some ink from the other side of the page is coming through around this point of the page, and this possibly threw Swanson's assessment out, and hence his inaccurate conclusion that this might be interpreted as an omega or long "o (Greek letter, ω)." Alternatively, the citation of W 032 in support of both readings, might be a typographical error by the printers. Either way, I consider W 032 supports the variant reading.

Codex N 022 is damaged around this point, but according to Cronin's printed copy of it (Robinson's *Texts and Studies*, Vol. V, No. 4, Cambridge, 1899), one can still read "*kai ::somai aut:::*". Thus if the dots in this secondary source, one for each letter space, accurately reflect the letters spaces in the primary source of Codex N 022, then the damaged

space gap fits the words which upon reconstruction are "*kai* (and) *iasomai* (I would heal) *autous* (them)." While I do not have a photolithic / microfilm / digital camera copy of N 022, or access to the original codex; I can only assume (both here and elsewhere,) that Cronin has a sufficient level of professionalism for his dots to accurately reflect letter spaces. Thus I show the variant's reading as the most probable reading of N 022, *infra*.

The Second Matter. (See also my comments at Matt. 13:28b, "The Third Matter.") I generally follow Green's Majority Text Apparatus (1986) which represents Pierpont's work based on von Soden. It is a piecemeal work in that it only covers readings that the Burgonite, William Pierpont, thought were instances that on his Majority Text principles meant that the Received Text had to be "corrected." In using this textual apparatus, I do so with the view that it is a broad-brush, rather than a precise guide. But where it has the relevant information it is a great time-saving device as I simply do not have the time to normally go through and make these type of calculations afresh.

It says the TR's reading has the support of between 20% and 39% of all manuscripts. This contains wide error bars i.e., *c.* 30% +/- 9%; but on these figures this is clearly a strong minority reading even if the lower figure is closest to the actual number, i.e., 20% support of the manuscripts (or allowing an error bar of up to 10% for the generalist nature of von Soden's groups, 18-20% support), more that 85% of which are Byzantine text.

But as a feature of this Revised Volume 1, unlike the original Volume 1, I have gone through von Soden for a number of minority Byzantine readings of the TR. Within the K group, von Soden here shows that the TR's reading has the support of the Kr group and inside the Kx group, of a sample of 50 manuscripts counted, 15 supported the TR and 35 the variant.

Von Soden's "K" group has 983 manuscripts, of which *c.* 949 are Byzantine, i.e., *c.* 914 are exclusively Byzantine and *c.* 35 are Byzantine text in parts only[52]. Von Soden's Kr group of manuscripts which represents *c.* 20% or about one-fifth of the 914 exclusively Byzantine text manuscripts in von Soden's K group. Von Soden's Kx group contains 513 manuscripts; but only 50 of those in his Kx group were counted for this reading. Subtracting the 513 Kx manuscripts in von Soden's K group from the 983 manuscripts, yields a total of 470 manuscripts; and then adding back in the 50 from the Kx group counted for this reading, means a total of 520 manuscripts are of relevance to us here at Matt. 9:5b from the K group.

The Kr group contains 211 manuscripts, and of these, *c.* 209 are Byzantine, of which *c.* 189 are completely Byzantine, *c.* 20 are Byzantine only in parts, and 2 are outside the closed class of sources. 211 Kr manuscripts plus 15 Kx manuscripts means 226 out of 520 manuscripts, or *c.* 43.5% of manuscripts counted in the K group support the TR. Allowing a 10% error bar for von Soden's generalist groups, yields a figure of *c.* 39-44%. *This indicates that Green's Textual Apparatus has understated the strength of the TR's reading here at Matt. 13:15. To pursue this matter in greater detail requires a finer analysis of the K group that these broad-brush and generally useful type of figures will yield us.*

In more precise terms, about 860 or *c.* 88% of these K group manuscripts cover the

---

[52] See Textual Commentary, Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) at Matt. 5:31a; 9:5b; & Volume 2 (Matt. 15-20), at Matt. 20:15c.

Gospels[53]. Of these (using rounded numbers and for our generalist purposes omitting reference to the fact some manuscript contain textual vacancies in parts of them), the Kx group contains about 50 manuscripts in δ group (all of NT), about 15 manuscripts in α group (Apostolos, i.e., Acts to Jude), and about 450 manuscripts in ε group (Gospels). Thus δ group is *c.* 10%, α group is *c.* 3%, and ε group is *c.* 87% of Kx group. Since δ group covers the NT, with regard to Gospel manuscripts, δ + ε = *c.* 50 + *c.* 450 = *c.* 500 manuscripts or *c.* 97% of Kx group; and for Acts to Jude, δ + α = *c.* 50 + *c.* 15 = *c.* 65 or *c.* 12.5% of Kx group.

Of these about 210 Kr group manuscripts (using rounded numbers and for our generalist purposes omitting reference to the fact some manuscript contain textual vacancies in parts of them), the Kr group contains about 50 manuscripts in δ group (all of NT), about 20 manuscripts in α group (Apostolos, i.e., Acts to Jude)[54], and about 140 manuscripts in ε group (Gospels). Thus δ group is *c.* 24%, α group is *c.* 9%, and ε group is *c.* 67% of Kr group. Since δ group covers the NT, with regard to Gospel manuscripts, δ + ε = *c.* 50 + *c.* 140 = *c.* 190 manuscripts or *c.* 90% of Kr group; and for Acts to Jude, δ + α = *c.* 50 + *c.* 20 = *c.* 70 or *c.* 33% of Kr group (reducing this higher rounded number "20" count for the relatively small α group, this is more accurately *c.* 32-33%).

Therefore, starting with a Gospels only K group of 860 manuscripts, subtracting 500 Kx Gospel manuscripts yields 360 manuscripts. Adding back in the 50 Kx manuscripts used in von Soden's Matt. 14:15 count means we are looking at 410 K group Gospel manuscripts. Of these 410 manuscripts, 15 Kx Gospel manuscripts and *c.* 190 Kr Gospel manuscripts i.e., *c.* 205 manuscripts support the TR's reading. This 205 is 50% of 410, and so on these figures it would be more accurate to say that *on the presently available data*, basing our projections on von Soden's K group, then the majority Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided between the TR's reading and the Variant.

As a consequence of time constraints, I am not usually able to check Pierpont's percentage figures found in *Green's Textual Apparatus* (1986). Thus I normatively just use them as a broad-brush guide. Hence on the basis that *Green's Textual Apparatus* says the TR's reading should, on its Majority text principles, be changed to the variant since "61-79% of all manuscripts support the change" on Burgonite principles; in the original Volume 1 (2008) I simply accepted these figures by Pierpont. At the time, this seemed straight-forward enough since there is also a Matt. 13:15 footnote in the NKJV that claims that unlike the TR, the variant reading is followed by the "M[ajority]-Text," *infra*. Hence a footnote in

---

[53] See commentary at Matt. 9:5b.

[54] There are 19 manuscripts in the α group, of which one (α 751) is excluded as being too late in time. But to show the reader some of the complexities in using von Soden which means my figures are always "rubbery" even when they are *more precise*, let him note in the following list those from α group those that have more than one classification, or only part of a manuscript in the Kr group in the following Kr manuscripts. Minuscules 604 (α 459), 634 (α 462), 676 (ε 268 & α 273), 1003 (ε 1346 & α 484), 1100 (α 474), 1101 (α 751, Byzantine text type, 17th century; outside closed class of sources); 1140 (α 371), 1249 (α 454), 1250 (ε 571 & α 564), 1551 (ε 3041 & α 1376), 1725 (α 385), 1732 (α 405), 1749 (α 655), 1752 (α 362), 1855 (α 372), 1856 (α 373), 1865 (α 380), 2080 (α 406, Kr in Acts), & 2218 (α 652).

this Volume 1 says, "Green's Majority Text apparatus says the reading has the support of between 20% and 39% of all manuscripts. This contains wide error bars i.e., *c.* 30% +/- 9%; but even if the lower figure is closest to the actual number, 20% support of the manuscripts, most of which are Byzantine, is clearly a strong minority."

Nevertheless, having now examined von Soden's figures as part of my Revised Volume 1 (2010) von Soden based review of TR readings that have minority Byzantine support, I would also have to change this conclusion about relative manuscript strength. Thus I would now say that the representative Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided between the TR's reading and the variant. And here I note that this error appears to have also been later detected by Pierpont himself, since in the 2005 revised edition of Robinson & Pierpont's 1991 Majority Text (which 2005 revision I was unaware of when I undertook the original Volume 1), we find that while the variant is still found in the main text, a side-note gives the TR's reading, thus indicating "the manuscripts comprising the Byzantine Textform are significantly divided" here at Matt. 13:15[55].

Though I was unaware of all this when I undertook the original Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14); it should be remembered that where the representative Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided, one must still apply textual analysis to determine the better reading. Therefore, the basic textual analysis I did in the original Volume 1 (2008) when I thought the TR's reading was a minority Byzantine reading remains valid for this revised Volume 1 (2010).

This side of glorification, none of us are "perfect" (Jas. 3:2). "Who can understand his errors?" (Ps. 19:12). "God be merciful to me a sinner" (Luke 18:13).

The Third Matter. In reading this section the reader should remember the distinction between "should" from "shall," and "would" from "will." Limiting this discussion to that which is relevant to Matt. 13:15, "will," in all three persons, refers to a *want* or *desire*, an *aspiration* or *intention*. In the first person ("I"), it may form a future or conditional statement. It is used this way as a simple future statement in the NASB's 3rd edition *et al* rendering of Matt. 13:15, *infra*. "Shall" in first person ("I"), may be used for a simple future, and it is used this way in the ASV's rendering of Matt. 13:15, *infra*, so that the meaning of *should* in Matt. 13:15 (ASV) is the same as *would* in Matt. 13:15 (NASB 3rd ed.). But in the first person ("I"), it may also be used for a conditional statement, and this is how it is used in the AV, and so "I should [conditional] heal them" (AV) does not equate, "I should [future] heal them" (ASV).

The failure to understand these type of distinctions is illustrated by the following (fictional jocular) story. *There was an Englishman, an Irishman, and a Scotsman.* It was the year 1745, and a *Church of Ireland* Protestant called Patrick, a *Church of England* Protestant called George, and a Papist Highlander from Scotland, called Culloden (a family name), were all standing next to the River Boyne in Ireland. The Irish Anglican and English Anglican both spoke, *The King's English*; whereas the Scottish Papist spoke something called, *The Pretender's English*[56]. The Irish Anglican fell in, and called out, "I shall

---

[55] Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 27.

[56] The Papist James II's son, James Edward, was known as the *Old Pretender*, and James II's grandson, Charles Edward, was known as the *Young Pretender*, because these

(conditional) drown; nobody will (wants to) help me." The Englishman threw out a rope, and helped pull him to safety. Then the English Anglican fell in, and called out, "I shall (conditional) drown; nobody will (wants to) help me." The Irishman threw out a rope, and helped pull him to safety. Then the Scottish Papist fell in, and called out, "I will (wants to) drown; nobody shall (future, indicating an emphatic intention) help me." Hence nobody threw him a rope, and so he drowned.

The moral of this story is that one should be aware of the potential hazards of not understanding the English language!

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 13:15, the representative Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided between two readings (*Readings 1 & 2*). The TR's Greek, "*iasomai* ('I should heal,' subjunctive middle aorist, 1st person singular verb, from *iaomai*)," is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts (*Reading 1*). It is supported by e.g., *Codex Beratinus* (Phi 043, 6th century, St. Matthew's & St. Mark's Gospel, Tirana, Albania), *Codex Basilensis* (E 07, 8th century, Basel, Switzerland), *Codex Cyprius* (K 017, 9th century, Paris, France), *Codex Nanianus* (U 030, 9th century, Venice, Italy), *Codex Monacensis* (X 033, 10th century, Munich, Germany); together with Minuscules 28 (11th century, Paris, France, Byzantine other than in Mark), 187 (12th century, Florence, Italy), 998 (12th century, Athos, Greece), and 482 (13th century, British Library, London, UK). It is also supported by the Latin "*sanem* ('I should heal,' subjunctive active present, 1st person singular verb, from *sano*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), Pi (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407). It is also manifested in the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550).

However, a variant (*Reading 2*), Greek, "*iasomai* ('I would heal,' indicative middle future, 1st person singular verb, from *iaomai*), is also followed by about half of the Byzantine texts e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is (given that the Greek middle here is a deponent, i.e., a middle voice with an active voice meaning,) also followed as Latin, "*sanabo* ('I shall heal,' indicative active future, 1st person singular verb, from *sano*)," in old Latin Version d (5th century).

There is a textual problem with *Reading 2* followed by about half of the Byzantine texts. Contextually, this section of Matt. 13:15 reads, "*mepote* (lest [at any time]) *idosi* ('they should see,' subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, used as an aorist of *orao*) *tois* (-) *ophthalmois* (with [their] eyes), *kai* (and) *tois* (-) *osin* (with [their] ears) *akousosi* ('they should hear,' subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *akouo*), *kai* (and) *te* (-) *kardia* (with [their] heart) *sunosi* ('they should understand,' subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *suniemi*), *kai* (and) *epistrepsosi* ('they should be converted,'

Jacobite Papists pretended to be in the line of legitimate British Kings.

subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, from *epistrepho*), *kai* (and) *iasomai* ('I would heal,' indicative middle future, 1st person singular verb, from *iaomai*) *autous* (them)."

The verbs saying *they should* "see (*idosi*)," "hear (*akousosi*)," "understand (*sunosi*)," and "be converted (*epistrepsosi*)" are all subjunctive active aorists, i.e., "they should," since the subjunctive mood here carries the idea of *possibility*. Since these are expressed in the subjunctive, the natural expectation is that the corollary response will also be in the subjunctive mood i.e., as *Reading 1*, "I should heal (*iasomai*, subjunctive middle aorist) them." But instead, the *Reading 2* text makes this quite emphatic, "I would heal (*iasomai*, indicative middle future) them." The stylistic tension created by the *supposition* subjunctives, *they should* "see," "hear," "understand," and "be converted," juxtaposed with the definiteness of the indicative which expresses an action *as though it were a reality*, i.e., "I would heal them," clangs on the ears as bad Greek. The pain to the ear drums of this Greek *Reading 2*, "*iasomai* (I would heal)," can only be relieved and healed by adopting Greek *Reading 1*, "*iasomai* (I should heal)," which therefore must be the correct reading.

The origins of the *Reading 2* variant are conjectural. Was this some kind of misguided "stylistic improvement" in which a scribe "felt sure" that that "they would repent," and so Christ "would heal them"? Or following a paper fade / loss, in which "*iasomai*" became "*ias::mai*", was then "reconstructed" as "*iasomai*", by a scribe exercising insufficient thought and diligence?

On the one hand, the Received Text's *Reading 1* is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts and so lack clear majority support in the representative Byzantine Text. But on the other hand, *Reading 1* of the *Textus Receptus* is strongly favoured by textual analysis, and has strong support in the Greek with about half of the Byzantine texts. It is also well supported from ancient times by old Latin Versions. Among the church fathers, it has the impressive support of two church doctors, being found in both St. Chrysostom's Greek and St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:15 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 13:15, *Reading 1*, "I should," is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); together with Minuscules 1071 (independent, 12th century) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading, *Reading 2*, "I would," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) C 04 (5th century), the leading representative of the Western text, D 05 (5th century), and (the mixed text type) L 019 (8th century).

The incorrect variant, *Reading 2*, entered the NU Text *et al*. It is also found in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). But whereas Burgon & Miller (1899) consider it should replace the TR's reading; by contrast, while *Reading 2* is the preferred reading in the main texts of both Hodges & Farstad (1982 & 1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (1991 & 2005), both Hodges &

Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005) indicate their von Soden (1913) based majority texts have a significant manuscript division at this point, with the TR's *Reading 1* given in their respective Matt. 13:15 footnotes.

Reading 2 was translated at Matt. 13:15 in the ASV as, "And I should heal them" (ASV). This is somewhat confusing. (See discussion of "shall" and "will" at *Preliminary Textual Discussion*, *supra*.) "Should" is from "shall" or "shalt." It can be used for the future, i.e., "And I should heal them" (ASV), or for a conditional statement i.e., "And I should heal them" (AV). The ASV is not an inaccurate rendering of the *Reading 2* variant, but there is a difference in the underpinning Greek of what is meant by "should" (ASV) from Westcott-Hort's *iasomai*; compared with what is meant by "should" (AV) from the Received Text's "*iasomai*." The ASV's English reading based on the Greek's variant *Reading 2* is followed in the NASB's 1st and 2nd editions, but then rendered with greater clarity as, "I would heal," in the NASB's 3rd edition. This greater clarity is also found in the NRSV, ESV, and NIV. But showing a misleading lack of literalness, this is made a common dative reading, "to cure them," in the Moffatt Bible's rendering, "and turn again for me to cure them;" and this lack of literalness is also found in the RSV.

At Matt. 13:15, the NKJV reads, "I should heal," in the main text; but a footnote says, the "NU-Text and M[ajority]-Text read 'would'." Therefore the NKJV translators evidently used a different methodology to what I have in their view that *Reading 2* is the Majority Text. But even if they were right, and *Reading 1* were a minority reading (as I thought it was when I undertook the original Volume 1, *supra*,) this would make no difference to my basic conclusion that *Reading 1* is clearly the correct reading, and worthy of an "A" rating, *supra*.

Thus the Burgonites, whose sloth allows no textual analysis where they have, or in the case of Matt. 13:15, Burgon & Miller (1899) and the NKJV Burgonites think they have, "the majority text reading;" and the neo-Alexandrians, whose indolence fails to give proper regard to a more rigorous textual analysis whose starting point is the representative Byzantine Text; both here have the NKJV to trumpet out their NU Text and "Majority Text" claims for the variant *Reading 2*. But what saith the Word of the Lord? "By much slothfulness the building decayeth; and through idleness of the hands the house droppeth through" (Eccl. 10:18). We cannot doubt that under the slothful Burgonites, "the building" of the *Textus Receptus* "decayeth," and under the indolent neo-Alexandrians, "the house" of the Received Text "droppeth through." But in the final analysis we care not for either the neo-Alexandrian's texts such as Westcott-Hort and the NU Text, nor for the Burgonites' Majority Text. We care only for the Received Text. For we know and are persuaded of this precious truth, *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!*[57]

Matt. 13:16 "your" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*umon* (your)," in the words, "and your (*umon*) ears," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is also

[57] Latin Motto of the Lutheran Reformation, i.e., the First Stage of the Protestant Reformation, drawn from I Peter 1:25 in St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, "The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever."

supported as Latin, "*vestrae* (your)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), d (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Hegesippus (d. after 180), Origen (d. 254), and Irenaeus (2nd century).

However, "your (Greek, *umon*; Latin, *vestrae*)," is omitted in a variant reading. This omission is found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), Pi (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. The origins of the variant are speculative. Was this a deliberate "stylistic improvement" by a scribe who considered that having first said, "your (*umon*) eyes (*oi ophthalmoi*)," then thereafter "the reader would naturally imply the meaning of 'your' when reading, 'and (*kai*) ears (*ta ota*)'," and thus he removed "*umon* (your)" on the basis of "redundancy"? Alternatively, was "*umon*" lost in a paper fade and regarded as a stylistic paper space (possibly at then end of a line), and the copyist scribe saw no textual problem on the basis of this same logic, that having first said, "your (*umon*) eyes (*oi ophthalmoi*)," that thereafter "the reader would naturally imply the meaning of 'your' when reading, 'and (*kai*) ears (*ta ota*)'"? We cannot be sure of the variant's origins, we only know for sure that it was omitted from the text.

With no good textual argument against it, and strong support from both the Greek and Latin, the reading of the Received Text stands sure. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:16 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses[58].

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 13:16, "and your (*umon*) ears," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) C 04 (5th century); (the mixed text type) L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version; as well as Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However the incorrect reading which omits "your (*umon*)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century).

---

[58] Swanson says Minuscule 1424 (9th / 10th century, which is mixed text type in Matthew and Luke), supports the TR's reading by including *umon*, whereas Nestle-Aland (27th ed.) says Minuscule 1424 omits *umon*. Hence I do not refer to it.

Despite attempts by some neo-Alexandrians, such as those of the NU Text, to broaden their textual base from beyond the two leading Alexandrian texts; the reality is and remains, that this, and a small number of other incomplete Alexandrian texts, is the neo-Alexandrians starting point, from which they rarely move away, even as the Byzantine text is the neo-Byzantine's starting point. But the principles of "textual analysis" that neo-Alexandrians use before moving away from the Alexandrian text, are very different to the stylistic type reasons of textual analysis that neo-Byzantines use before moving away from the representative Byzantine text. E.g., neo-Alexandrians tend to favour a shorter text over a longer text, since they have a phobia about scribes "adding" things, which it must be admitted, *sometimes* occurred, though far less frequently than the neo-Alexandrians claim.

Thus when we come to this passage here at Matt. 13:16, the fact that the two major Alexandrian texts are in disagreement, acts to create a gaping hole in neo-Alexandrian confidence as to what to do. Their powers of true textual analysis being very weak, they are caught in a quandary, and either take a leaf out of the Burgonites' book and start to look for "wider support," but in their instance from all kinds of unreliable texts outside the closed class of sources; or, they take a leaf out of Moffatt's book, and engage in a crazy kind of "textual analysis," that can end up just about anywhere.

And so it was that the TR's reading, supported by Tischendorf's favourite text, London Sinaiticus, was followed in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), and the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). In the case of the NU Text, it can only be presumed that they were swayed by the "external support" of texts outside the closed class of sources, such as Codex C 04 and the Syriac Curetonian Version; and some inside the closed class of sources as well. By contrast, other neo-Alexandrians have been stalemated by this great divide between the two leading Alexandrian texts, and so "*umon* (your)" is put in square brackets as optional, in both Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952).

On the one hand, neo-Alexandrian versions such as the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV, have included this word at Matt. 13:16 e.g., the ASV reads, "and your ears." But on the other hand, we cannot ignore the clear uncertainty evident in both Westcott-Hort and Nestle's 21st edition, so that we cannot with confidence know if at some future point in time, one or more neo-Alexandrian texts or versions may omit this word. Time will tell.

Matt. 13:22 "this" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*toutou* (of this)," in the words, "and the care of this (*toutou*) world," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*istius* (of this)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions 1 (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century), as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin, "*huius* (of this)," in old Latin Versions b (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and aur (7th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

However, "of this" (Greek, *toutou*; Latin, *istius* or *huius*), is omitted in a variant reading. This omission is found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is thus correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was it removed as a "stylistic improvement" on the grounds of "redundancy"? Or was it lost in a paper fade, and taken as a stylistic paper gap? We cannot be sure. We only know that it is not original. Cf. Matt. 13:40, *infra*.

The Received Text's reading stands secure with strong support from the Byzantine Greek Text, St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, old Latin Versions, and an ancient church writer. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:22 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 13:22, "of this" in the words, "and the care of this world," is found in (the mixed text type) C 04 (5th century); (the mixed text type) L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent); 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in all extant Syriac Versions e.g., the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and also the Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions. It is also found as Latin, "*istius*," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading which omits, "of this," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, D 05 (5th century). It is also found in a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and the Armenian Version (5th century).

From such sources the incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al*. It thus appears at Matt. 13:22 in the ASV as, "the care of the world." So too, this omission occurs in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV. Though harnessed to a very loose rendering of "*tou* (the) *aionos* (world)," and perhaps influenced by the Syriac and Egyptian Versions, the correct reading is found in the NIV as, "the worries of this (*toutou*) life (*tou aionos*)."

Matt. 13:25 "sowed" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*espeire* ('sowed,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *speiro*) *zizania* (tares)," in the words, "his enemy came and sowed (*espeire*) tares among the wheat," is supported by the majority Byzantine text[59]. E.g., it is supported by such

[59] With or without the optional "n" (nu) ending i.e., *espeire* / *espeiren*. W 032 has a

Byzantine textual jewels as W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century), F 09 (*Codex Boreelianus*, 9th century), G 011 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century), K 017 (*Codex Cyprius*, 9th century), M 021 (*Codex Campianus*, 9th century), U 030 (*Codex Nanianus*, 9th century), V 031 (*Codex Mosquensis*, 9th century), Pi 041 (*Codex Petropolitanus*, 9th century), S 028 (*Codex Vaticanus*, 10th century), and X 033 (*Codex Monacensis*, 10th century); or Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century). It is supported as Latin, "*seminavit* ('sowed,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *semino*)," in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century) and q (6th / 7th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a minority Byzantine reading (*Variant 1a*), is Greek, "*epespeiren* ('oversowed,' i.e., 'sowed over,' or 'sowed upon,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from, "*epispeiro*, from prefix *epi* with accusative = "over" / "upon" + *speiro* = "sowed") *zizania* ('tares,' accusative plural neuter noun, from *zizanion*)." This is found in Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and N 022 (6th century, variant spelling, *epespiren*), as well as Minuscule 119 (12th century). It is also found as Latin, "*superseminavit* ('oversowed,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from prefix *super* = "over" / "upon" + *semino* = 'sowed')," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed in a later Latin translation (*c.* 395) of the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) (see previous reference, *supra*); and it is also followed by the ancient Greek writer, Clement of Alexandria (before 215); ancient church Latin writer, Ambrose (d. 397); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text, which is thus correct. The Greek reads that these tares were sown, "*ana* ('in' or 'through,' preposition used distributively with the accusative, from *ana*) *meson* ('middle,' accusative singular neuter noun, from *mesos*)" i.e., "among" (AV) or "in between" the wheat. Thus the sense of the Greek is that these tares were sown *in between* the wheat, *not on top of* the wheat, and so the more natural rendering is the TR's "*espeire* (sowed)," not the variant's "*epespeiren* (oversowed)." The origins of the variant are speculative. Was this a wilful "stylistic improvement," in which the prefix *epi* was added "in a broad impressionistic way," rather than "a literal way"? If so, it actually introduced a confusion into the text with "*epespeiren* (oversowed)" i.e., "*in between* the wheat," where formerly there was perfect clarity with "*speiren* (sowed)" "*in between* the wheat." Was this an accidental change? If e.g., the *speiren* was at the beginning of a line, or possibly on a line with a stylistic space gap before it, a scribe thinking there had been a paper fade / loss, possibly because the *speiren* was incomplete, may have "reconstructed" this as *epespeiren*. A wilful or accidental change? We cannot be sure. We can only be sure that it is a change to the text.

---

bar over the final "e" (epsilon) signifying it is an abbreviation i.e., of the "en" ending.

With strong support from the representative Byzantine Text for what is clearly the most natural reading, and support from ancient times from an old Latin Version and some ancient church writers, the reading of the Received Text is rock solid. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:25 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 13:25, "sowed," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent)[60], *et al*. It is further found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, *Variant 1a*, "oversowed," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); and by the hand of a later "corrector" of one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus. It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 157 (12th century, independent), 1241 (12th century, independent in e.g., Gospels); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.

It also appears as *Variant 1b*, as Greek, "*epesparken* ('oversowed,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from prefix *epi* = 'over' / 'upon' + *speiro* = 'sowed')." This reading is followed by one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). Though this Greek *perfect* form is found in neither NT Greek nor Septuagint Greek, Liddell & Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*, refers to the usage in classical Greek of "*esparka* ('I sowed,' indicative active perfect, 1st person singular verb, from *speiro*)," in Julius Polyaenus' *Epigrammaticus* 2:1:1 (1st century B.C.?). Was this *Variant 1b* a deliberate "stylistic improvement;" or was it e.g., a "reconstruction" following a paper fade / loss of *Variant 1a*, "*epespeiren*" which may have looked something like "*epesp:::en*"?

The erroneous *Variant 1a* entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 13:25. However, it is not literally rendered as "oversowed" in most neo-Alexandrian Versions. Rather it is translated as "sowed" in the ASV. So too, the ASV's non-literal rendering of "*epespeiren* (oversowed)," is also followed in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV. However, it is

---

[60] Both Nestle-Aland (27th ed.) and Swanson include Minuscule 13 in their respective Family 13 selections, which they both show as supporting the TR's reading. However, Tischendorf shows Minuscule 13 as supporting the *Variant 1* reading. Therefore I exclude reference to Minuscule 13 (13th century, independent).

rendered in the Moffatt Bible as "resowed."

On the one hand, Moffatt's "resowed" is a dynamic equivalent for "oversowed." But on the other hand, in broad terms, Moffatt's translation here is actually, though most unusually, more literal in its rendering of the Alexandrian reading, than the other neo-Alexandrian versions, *supra*. With the strong support of such neo-Alexandrian texts as Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the NU Text's Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), together with the precedent of Moffatt's translation, we cannot rule out the possibility of future neo-Alexandrian translations following Moffatt's "resowed." Whether or not they do, the meaning in the underpinning Greek of these neo-Alexandrian texts, such as the NU Text, is clearly not the same here as the meaning in the underpinning Greek of the *Textus Receptus*.

Moreover, it should be remembered that while the pre-Vatican II Council (1962-5), Roman or Latin Church, historically recognized the religiously conservative teaching that, "the Word of the Lord Endureth Forever" (I Peter 1:25), she limited this to the Latin manuscripts and Latin writers in the closed class of three Greek and Latin sources; and so made the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, the unlawful ruler over the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. The variant at Matt. 13:25 is followed in the Latin Vulgate, most old Latin Versions, a later Latin translation (*c.* 395) of the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) which may be reasonably doubted as inconsistent with the earlier Greek reading, and the ancient church Latin writer, Ambrose (d. 397). Hence it was adopted in the Clementine Vulgate. It is also found in the Latin Church's Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582) as "oversowed," in the translation from the Latin, "his enemy came and oversowed (*superseminavit*) cockle among the wheat."

Matt. 13:28b "we … gather … up" (TR & AV) {C}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter (revised policy on Clementine edition). The revised Clementine Vulgate of Merk's *Novum Testamentum* reads, Latin, "*colligemus* ('we will gather up,' indicative active future, 1st person plural verb, from *colligo*);" whereas Colunga and Turrado's *Clementine Vulgate* reads, Latin, "*colligimus* ('we gather up,' indicative active present, 1st person plural verb, from *colligo*)." The textual apparatus of Wordsworth and White's *Nouum Testamentum Latine* shows no variation at this point between Jerome's Vulgate, which reads, Latin, "*colligimus*," and the Clementine Vulgate, so that they are evidently following the same *Clementine Vulgate* as Colunga and Turrado. Though my former stronger usage of Merk's revised Clementine meant I omitted reference to the Clementine in the original Volume 1, given the clear preference I am now employing for both Colunga and Turrado's edition and Wordsworth and White's footnote readings on the Clementine, in this revised Volume 1, I shall indeed show this reading, *infra*.

The Second Matter. In the discussion outside the closed class of sources, *infra*, Minuscule 33 is incomplete, and instead of reading, "*Theleis* (Wilt thou) *oun* (then) *apelthontes* (having gone) *sullexomen* (we may gather up) *auta* (them)," it instead reads, "*::::::: oun apelth::::: :::::xomen auta*." But this is sufficiently clear to say that the minuscule follows the TR's reading, since the "*xomen*" ending of "*sullexomen*" is legible,

and is clearly not one of the two variants endings. Therefore I include this miniscule as following the TR, *infra*.

The Third Matter. See my comments at Matt. 13:15, "The Second Matter." Von Soden's K1 group is quite small and so on this occasion I shall not use rounded numbers for this group. It contains 5 manuscripts in δ group (all of NT), no manuscripts in α group (Apostolos, i.e., Acts to Jude), and 48 manuscripts in ε group (Gospels). Thus δ group is *c.* 9.5%, α group is 0%, and ε group is *c.* 90.5% of K1 group. Since δ group covers the NT, with regard to Gospel manuscripts, δ + ε = 5 + 48 = 53 manuscripts or 100% of K1 group; and for Acts to Jude, δ + α = 5 + 0 = 5 or *c.* 9.5% of K1 group.

Von Soden's selections from the K group at Matt. 13:28b are limited to the Kx, Kr, K1, and Ki groups. Von Soden says the variant has the support of the Kx and Kr groups, whereas the TR's reading has the support of a few K1 manuscripts, and all the Ki group except one manuscript, although the entire Ki group consists of just 7 manuscripts. Therefore 10 Gospel manuscripts in the K group selections support the TR's reading. This compares with *c.* 500 Kx Gospel manuscripts, *c.* 190 Kr Gospel manuscripts, and the remaining 50 K1 manuscripts (53 K1 manuscripts minus 3 that support the TR). 10 manuscripts out of 740 manuscripts (500 + 190 + 50) is *c.* 1.35%.

This figure is radically less than claimed by Pierpont. In my original Volume 1 of Matt. 1-14 (2008), I state in a footnote at Matt. 13:28, "Green's Majority Text apparatus says the reading [of the TR] has the support of between 20% and 39% of all manuscripts. This contains wide error bars i.e., *c.* 30% +/- 9%; but even if the lower figure is closest to the actual number, i.e., 20% support of the manuscripts, most of which are Byzantine, [it] is clearly a strong minority [reading]." But having gone over von Soden first hand as part of my special review of all TR minority Byzantine readings in the Revised Volume 1 (2010), I would now have to change this assessment and say that the TR's reading at Matt. 13:28b is in fact *a fairly small minority reading*, rather than "a strong minority" reading.

This error does not appear to have been detected by Pierpont after he complied his 1986 figures in Green's Textual Apparatus, since in Robinson & Pierpont's 2005 edition, the variant is put in the main text, and the TR's reading is put in a side-note thus indicating "the manuscripts comprising the Byzantine Textform are significantly divided" at Matt. 13:28b[61]. By contrast, while Hodges & Farstad who employ not only von Soden's K group, but also his I group, use a normal "M" i.e., meaning the variant is the Majority Text reading because support within von Soden's "I" group "is not so great[62]." Therefore, though I employ the priority K group methodology of Robinson & Pierpont for determining the majority Byzantine text and calculations within it, rather than the K and I group methodology of Hodges & Farstad, *there should be no appreciable differences between the results of these two methodologies* since von Soden's K group is more than 90% Byzantine text (Robinson & Pierpont) and von Soden's I & K groups are more than 85% Byzantine text (Hodges & Farstad). In broad terms my percentage results at Matt. 13:28b are a lot closer to those of Hodges & Farstad than they are to those of Robinson & Pierpont.

---

[61] Robinson & Pierpont (2005), pp. xviii & 27.

[62] Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xxi & 42.

On the one hand, the fact that I have now learnt that the minority Byzantine reading underpinning the TR has less than 5% manuscript support rather than at least 20% support, in no way affects the basic textual analysis I undertook in the original Volume 1 showing that the TR's reading is correct. But on the other hand, this substantial drop in manuscript support, coupled with the facts that it is also a slim minority Latin text reading not found in the Vulgate, and the support of Chrysostom is divided between this reading and the majority Byzantine text reading; means that I must decrease the rating I had given it in my original Volume 1 (2008), which was a low level "B" (in the range of 66% +/- 1%), down in this Revised Volume 1 (2010) to a high level "C" (in the range of 63% +/- 1%), *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 13:28b, the TR's Greek, "*sullexomen* ('we may gather up,' subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *sullego*)," in the words, "Wilt thou then that *we* go and *gather* them *up*?," is a minority Byzantine reading, *infra*. It is supported by e.g., Codices W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, Washington, D.C., USA), the purple parchment, Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century, Rossano, Italy), the purple parchment, N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century, London, UK; Athens, Greece; Lerma, Spain; New York, USA; Vatican City, Rome; & Vienna, Austria), Codices E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century, Basel, Switzerland), G 011 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century, Trinity College, Cambridge University, England), H 013 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century, Trinity College, Cambridge University, England), U 030 (*Codex Nanianus*, Venice, 9th century, Venice, Italy), V 031 (*Codex Mosquensis*, 9th century, Moscow, Russia), X 033 (*Codex Monacensis*, 10th century, Munich, Germany), Gamma 036 (*Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus*, 10th century, Oxford University, England); and Minuscules 461 (9th century, St. Petersburg, Russia), 28 (11th century, Paris, France, Byzantine other than in Mark), 880 (11th century, Vatican City State, Rome), 660 (11th / 12th century, Berlin, Germany), 2 (12th century, Basel, Switzerland), 21 (12th century, Paris, France), 119 (12th century, Paris, France), 120 (12th century, Paris, France), 217 (12th century, Venice, Italy), 245 (12th century, Moscow, Russia), 280 (12th century, Paris, France), 1200 (12th century, Sinai, Arabia), 1355 (12th century, Jerusalem, Israel), 2127 (12th century, Palermo, Italy, Byzantine outside Pauline Epistles); 473 (13th century, Lambeth Palace, London, UK), 477 (13th century, Trinity College, Cambridge University, England), 1604 (13th century, Athos, Greece), 232 (14th century, Escorial, Spain), 578 (14th century, Arras, France), 70 (15th century, Cambridge University, England), 287 (15th century, Paris, France), 288 (15th century, Oxford University, England), 745 (16th century, Paris, France). It is also supported as Latin, "*colligamus*" ('we may gather up,' subjunctive active present, 1st person plural verb, from *colligo*), in *Codex Bobiensis* (old Latin Version k, 4th / 5th centuries) and *Codex Monacensis* (old Latin Version q, 6th / 7th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, an alternative reading, *Variant 1*, Greek, "*sullexomen* ('we should gather up[63],' or 'we will gather up,' indicative active future, 1st person plural verb, from *sullego*),"

[63] "Shall" in the 1st person, such as here in "we should," may be used for simple future or conditional statements or questions, and it is here so used in the future. "Shall" in the 2nd or 3rd person may form a future or conditional statement, and it is so used for the future in Matt. 13:41, "and they shall gather out."

is followed by the majority Byzantine Text. It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, (upon reconstruction) Greek, "*sullegomen* ('we gather up,' indicative active present, 1st person plural verb, from *sullego*)," is found as Latin, "*colligimus* ('we gather up,' indicative active present, 1st person plural verb, from *colligo*)." This is followed by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), Pi (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However there is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading here at Matt. 13:28b. At Matt. 13:28,29, Christ's parable reads, "… The servants said unto him, Wilt thou (*theleis*) then that *we should* go and *gather* them *up* (*sullexomen*, indicative active future)? But he said, Nay; lest (*mepote*) while ye gather up the tares, ye root up (*ekrisosete*, subjunctive active aorist, 2nd person plural verb, from *ekrizoo*) also the wheat with them." The usage of an indicative future, "*sullexomen* (we should / will gather up)," with a subjunctive, "*ekrisosete* ('ye root up' or more literally, 'ye might root up')," clangs on the ears as bad Greek. There is no serious doubt about the accuracy of the reading, "*ekrisosete* (ye root up)," which is in the subjunctive mood, and the subjunctive conveys the notion of possibility. If there is such definiteness about the fact that these people "should" or "will go and gather them up," why is there such indefiniteness about whether or not by such an action, "ye root up (subjunctive) also the wheat with them"? The more natural expectation is surely that *sullego* will also be declined as a subjunctive, as in the minority Byzantine reading, "*sullexomen* ('we may gather up,' subjunctive)."

Having reached the conclusion that on the balance of probabilities, the original reading is the subjunctive, "*sullexomen* (we may gather up)," we are further confirmed in this opinion, (not that we require such further confirmation,) by the presence of "*theleis* ('Wilt thou,' indicative active present, 2nd person singular verb, from *thelo*)," before "*sullexomen*." It is certainly not the case that "*theleis*" always precedes a subjunctive (e.g., Matt. 19:17). Nevertheless, the *deliberative subjunctive* i.e., subjunctives found in questions where some uncertainty exists as to the response, are introduced by e.g., *theleis* (Luke 9:54; 18:41)[64].

We certainly see such a usage in Matthean Greek of *theleis* with a subjunctive in Matt. 17:4, "Then answered Peter, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here: if thou wilt (*theleis*), let us make (*poiesomen*, subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *poieo*,) here three tabernacles" etc. . Or at Matt. 26:17, "Where (*Pou*) wilt thou (*theleis*) that we prepare (*etoimasomen*, subjunctive active aorist, 1st person plural verb, from *etoimazo*) for thee to eat the passover?"

So likewise here at Matt. 13:28b, there contextually seems to be some uncertainty as to how the servants question will answered. For on the one hand, while "the householder"

---

[64] Moulton's *Grammar of NT Greek*, Vol. 3, p. 99; cf. Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 465-8; Young's *Greek*, p. 139.

had "sowed good seed" (Matt. 13:24,27), nevertheless, there were now "tares" "in" the "field" and "an enemy hath done this" (Matt. 13:27,28), so that a moral dilemma is here presented to us. Hence the usage of "*theleis* (Wilt thou)," seems to most naturally be suited here to a role as a primer for a subjunctive, in order to create a *deliberative subjunctive*. Thus the reading of the subjunctive, "*sullexomen* (we may gather up)," flows more naturally from the "*theleis* (Wilt thou)" primer, than does the indicative future reading, "*sullexomen* (we should / will gather up)," which does not seem to recognize the contextual moral dilemma.

The combination of these two independent textual arguments, i.e., the Matt. 13:28,29 context with the usage of the subjunctive "*ekrisosete* (ye root up)," naturally expects a matching usage of the subjunctive "*sullexomen* (we may gather up);" and the usage of the "*theleis* (Wilt thou)," *contextually* in Matt. 13:28b (though not necessarily in other contexts) seems to be a primer for a subjunctive in order to create a *deliberative subjunctive*, and so naturally seems to expect the subjunctive "*sullexomen* (we may gather up);" acts to confirm one another in an autonomous manner. These two arguments are like two sticks, which when bound together form a stronger bundle; so that the sum of the two arguments when put together, is greater than the individual strength of the two arguments when considered separately. Hence *the sum of the total is greater than the addition of the constituent parts if counted individually*. Since only the first argument was needed to show that on the balance of probabilities the reading of the Received Text is correct; and since an already certain reading was then further strengthened by the second argument; and since *the sum of the total of the two arguments is greater than the individual addition of the constituent parts*, we can with some greater confidence affirm the accuracy of the reading of the *Textus Receptus* here.

The origins of the variants are conjectural. Though one can never be sure that some Greek or Latin scribe might not alter such a reading on the erroneous basis of it being a "stylistic improvement," nevertheless, it seems to me more likely in these instances that the mischief arose due to paper fades / losses. I.e., if due to a paper fade / loss, the TR's "*sullexomen* (we may gather up)," looked something like, "*sullex::men*," it may have been "reconstructed" by a scribe as the *Variant 1's*, "*sullexomen* (we should gather up)," or from something like, "*sulle::::men*" it might have been "reconstructed" as the *Variant 2's*, "*sullegomen* (we gather up)." *Variant 1*'s origins were also possibly influenced by a scribe considering the nearby "*sullexousin* ('they shall gather,' indicative active future, 3rd person plural verb, from *sullego*)," at Matt. 13:41. It is also possible that *Variant 2* arose inside the Latin textual tradition, i.e., if the Latin, "*colligamus* (we may gather up)," looked something like "*collig::mus*," it may have been "reconstructed" by a Latin scribe as the *Variant 2's*, Latin, "*colligimus* (we gather up)."

On the one hand, the Received Text's reading is strongly favoured by textual analysis, and it is a minority Byzantine reading which enjoys further ancient support from both an ancient old Latin Version (k) and Chrysostom. But on the other hand, *Variant 1* is the representative Byzantine reading, and this reading is also cited by Chrysostom. Moreover, *Variant 2* has the support of the Vulgate and most of the old Latin Versions. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:28b a high level "C" (in the range of 63% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

Now to the question, "Where was this reading over time, and through time?" I reply

that it was in the Byzantine textual tradition as a minority Greek reading, the Latin textual tradition as a minority Latin reading, and the writings of the ancient church father and doctor, St. Chrysostom (who refers to both this and the *Variant 1* reading). Thus over time and through time, a good textual analyst guided by the Spirit of God could from these accessible sources compose the Received Text here at Matt. 13:28b. Certainly before the 16th century this process was done more on a verse by verse *needs basis as required*, but it was nevertheless still capable of being done over time and through time. Then in the 16th and 17th centuries, His Divine Majesty, the Lord Jehovah, so providentially ordered matters that a most notable class of textual analysts were prepared and equipped for this special task by his Holy Spirit, and these men then set about to more formally compose the entire *Textus Receptus*. And we find among this learned group engaged in this noble task, such as, e.g., Erasmus of Rotterdam, Stephanus of Geneva, Beza of Geneva, or the Elzevirs of Leiden, that there was a general agreement and concurrence on this matter, namely, that the minority Byzantine reading and minority Latin reading found in the Greek writings of the church father and doctor, St. Chrysostom, "*sullexomen* (we may gather up)," was indeed the correct reading here at Matt. 13:28b. And having revisited the matter, *supra*, we cannot doubt that they could not have reasonably arrived at any other conclusion.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 13:28b, "we may gather up (*sullexomen*, subjunctive)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century).

Variant 1, "we should gather up (*sullexomen*, future)," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 157 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text,) and 13 (13th century, independent).

Variant 2, is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), being rendered in Ciasca's 19th century Latin as, "*seligimus* ('we weed out,' indicative active present, 1st person plural verb, from *seligo*)." Assuming that Ciasca's Latin has accurately captured the relevant Arabic tense, did this underpinning Arabic reading arise independently from the Latin *Variant 2*, *supra*, or did it come from the same original Greek variant, "*sullegomen* ('we gather up,' present)?

Its support in the Alexandrian text meant that for the wrong reasons, the correct reading was accepted into the neo-Alexandrian texts such as the NU Text *et al*. Hence the correct reading at Matt. 13:28b is found in the ASV, (which here reads the same as the AV), "Wilt thou then that *we* go and *gather* them *up*?" (ASV). The correct reading is also found

in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Variant 1 is found at Matt. 13:28b in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005). However, Robinson & Pierpont consider their majority text reading, "we should gather up (*sullexomen*, future)," is here "significantly divided" with the TR's reading, "we may gather up (*sullexomen*, subjunctive)." Pierpont earlier said in Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) that *Variant 1* was followed by "61-79 of all manuscripts." Von Soden (1913) says that within the K group, *Variant 1*, "*sullexomen*" is followed by the Kx and Kr groups, whereas the TR's reading is followed by less than 10 manuscripts. Combined the Kx and Kr groups constitute *c.* 68-72% of K group (see commentary Vol. 2, at Matt. 20:15c). Therefore Pierpont's broad calculation in Green's Textual Apparatus is correct, and on this occasion he evidently considers this is sufficient to say that the Byzantine text is "significantly divided" here at Matt. 13:28b.

Prima facie, the correct reading is also in the New King James Version (NKJV). But in fact this conclusion is misleading. That is because those who accept the premises upon which this version is based, will ultimately consult the Burgonites' Majority Text when looking at the Greek, and upon doing so, they will be badly misled and think that the Greek reading is that of *Variant 1*. As to Burgon's claim, "the *'Textus Receptus'* …, calls for … revision," "upon the" basis of the "majority of authorities" (*Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15); and Burgon's associated proud boast, "Again and again we shall have occasion to point out … that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction" (*Revision Revised*, p. 21); I note that this is premised on the replication of majority errors, and to some extent seems to reflect the late 19th century political values of a universal electoral franchise i.e., "all members of an electorate are of equal voting value" and "the majority is always right," rather than an intellectually and spiritually defensible Biblically sound position.

The Majority Text Burgonites place a premium on ignorance. But what saith the God of the Universe? As a most caring and loving Father he has given different "gifts" to the church, one of which is "teachers" (I Cor. 12:28-31; Eph. 4:11,12). And he further says, "if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out" (Luke 19:40); so that by his common grace to Jews and Gentiles he also sometimes called unsaved Jews to preserve the Old Testament oracles (Rom. 3:2; 11:29), and unsaved Gentiles to preserve the New Testament oracles, e.g., the Roman Catholic Complutensians. For Divine Preservation depends not on the power of man, but of God; and he is in need of no-one, is indebted to no-one, and requires no-one. He is an absolute sovereign king who does his pleasure, and who graciously condescends to give life and gifts to men. Yet he sometimes calls those who are first saved by his special grace to this important work. So one of the types of "teachers" the Lord provides, (for he provides different types of "teachers,") are the textual analysts who when needed may compose or defend the *Received Text*, e.g., Stephanus or Beza. Thus saith the Word of the Lord, "Study to shew thyself approved unto God" (II Tim. 2:15).

Matt. 13:33 "spake he unto them" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*elalesen* (spake he) *autois* (unto them)," in the words, "Another parable spake he unto them," is supported by the majority Byzantine text, e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), E 07 (8th century), F 09 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); and Minuscule 2 (12th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*locutus est* (spake

he) *eis* (unto them)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), Pi (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). They are further supported as Latin, "*dixit* (spake he) *illis* (unto those [people])," in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century).

However, another reading (*Variant 1*), while containing these same key words, adds after them, Greek "*legon* (saying)," thus reading, "*elalesen* (spake he) *autois* (unto them) "*legon* (saying)." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codices M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), and X 033 (10th century); as well as Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 126 (11th century), and 243 (14th century). It is further found as Latin, "*locutus est* (spake he) *eis* (unto them) *dicens* (saying)," in old Latin Versions h (5th century) and q (6th / 7th century).

In another reading (*Variant 2*), "*elalesen* (spake he) *autois* (unto them)," is omitted. This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 76 (12th century). It is also found in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries) and d (5th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. The presence of these key words in *Variant 1* is further testimony to their authenticity, in contrast with their omission in *Variant 2*. The origins of these two variants are speculative. The addition of "*legon* (saying)" in *Variant 1* was possibly an intentional "stylistic improvement;" although it may have been an accidental addition if there was a stylistic paper space / loss e.g., near the end of a line ending with "*elalesen autois*," and a scribe wrongly concluded that "something had been lost," and so he "reconstructed" "*legon*." Either way, it was probably influenced by the common usage of "*legon*" both in St. Matthew's Gospel (e.g., Matt. 1:20; 2:13; 13:3; 14:27; 15:4, *et al*) and elsewhere in the NT. *Variant 2* was probably an accidental loss due to a paper fade.

The reading of the *Textus Receptus* has good support in both the Greek and Latin, with no good textual argument against it. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:33 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 13:33, "spake he unto them," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), being rendered in

Ciasca's Latin translation, as "*proposuit* (related he) *eis* (unto them)."

Variant 1, "spake he unto them, saying," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscule 157 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in an independent manuscript of the Coptic Sahidic Version, as well as the Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century), and the Armenian Version (5th century).

Variant 2, which omits the words, "spake he unto them," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); as well as the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions.

Neo-Alexandrians have been in disagreement as to what to do with these readings at Matt. 13:33, though most have favoured the reading of the TR, followed by Rome Vaticanus, which is the reading found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952), Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). However, the footnote in Nestle's 21st edition refers only to *Variant 2*, and the footnote in Nestle-Aland's 27th edition refers to both variants.

Most notably, Westcott-Hort (1881) place the words of the TR in square brackets, thus making them optional, and so even more strongly than Nestle's 21st edition, allow for *Variant 2*. This type of methodology in which the reading of the Western Greek Text and / or Syriac is determinative, especially if the two main Alexandrian texts are in agreement, is more commonly the type of thing generally associated with that semi neo-Alexandrian, Moffatt, who on this occasion does not adopt *Variant 2*, but reads at Matt. 13:33, "He told them another parable" (Moffatt Bible). It is instructive to note, that even though Moffatt was a semi neo-Alexandrian past master of this type of technique, i.e., having an Alexandrian text pincer arm generally used, and a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm occasionally used, and even though neo-Alexandrians Proper avoid it far more than Moffatt did; nevertheless, as here seen by the Westcott-Hort text, neo-Alexandrians Proper may be prepared to dabble in the usage of a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, albeit not at a much lower level of frequency than the semi neo-Alexandrian, Moffatt.

Notwithstanding the back'n'forth to-ings and fro-ings of the neo-Alexandrian texts, the neo-Alexandrian versions we generally consider have followed the TR's reading, which is here followed by the neo-Alexandrian's beloved Codex Vaticanus, and which though generally favoured by the Puseyites Westcott & Hort, at least on this occasion was not. Thus at Matt. 13:33, the American Standard Version adopts the correct reading for the wrong reasons, and so reads, "another parable spake he unto them" (ASV). So too, the correct reading is also followed in the NASB, RSV, NRS, ESV, NIV, and Moffatt Bible.

Matt. 13:34 "not" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, *prima facie* the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century) supports the TR's reading, and follows the Latin Vulgate's reading at Matt. 13:34; and outside the closed class of sources, *prima facie* Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), also follows this reading. But because both are Diatessaron Gospel "harmonies," it is not possible to tell with confidence if the reading found in both the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron and Ciasca's Latin as, "*non* (not) *loquebatur* (he was speaking) *eis* (unto them)," is from Matt. 13:34 or Mark 3:34. Hence no reference is made to either Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 13:34, the TR's Greek, "*ouk* ('not,' adverb, *ou*)," in the words, "and without a parable spake he not (*ouk*) unto them," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices E 07 (8th century, *ups<u>o</u>th<u>e</u>sa*), F 09 (9th century), G 011 (9th century), K 017 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), V 031 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century), S 028 (10th century), X 033 (10th century), Gamma 036 (10th century); and Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*non* ('not,' adverb)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), Pi (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Eusebius (d. 339).

However, a variant reads, Greek, "*ouden* ('nothing,' accusative singular neuter adjective, from *oudeis*)," is a slim minority Byzantine reading, making the reading, "and without a parable spake he nothing (*ouden*) unto them." It is found in e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and M 021 (9th century). It is also found as Latin, "*nihil* ('nothing,' an indeclinable noun)," in old Latin Version f (6th century). It is further followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Clement of Rome (*c.* 150), Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215), Origen (d. 254), and Chrysostom (d. 407).

On the basis of reasonable projections from von Soden's K group of about 1,000 manuscripts, more than 90% of which are Byzantine text, we can say that the representative Byzantine text here has the overall support of all the Gospel Byzantine manuscripts. There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text's hundreds upon hundreds of Gospel manuscripts that contain this correct reading. The variant's origins are necessarily conjectural. Was this a deliberate "stylistic improvement;" or a "reconstruction" after a paper fade / loss, either at the end of a line, or with a stylistic paper space after *ouk*? Though *ou* (before a consonant e.g., Matt. 13:11; 14:16; 24:21), or *ouch* (before a vowel with a rough breathing i.e., ' e.g., Matt. 7:29; 12:43; 13:55), or *ouk* (before a vowel with a smooth breathing i.e., ' e.g., Matt. 12:2; 13:5; 14:4), is far more common and expected in Matthean Greek than *ouden* (Matt. 5:13; 10:26; 13:34; 17:20; 21:19; 23:16; 26:62; 27:12), possibly one or more of these references to *ouden* influenced the scribe into making this change. Since Origen was aware of both readings, this was clearly an early change to the text.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at

Matt. 13:34 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 13:34, "not," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further found in Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century) and Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century).

The incorrect reading, "nothing," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; and Armenian Version (5th century).

The incorrect reading at Matt. 13:34 entered the NU Text *et al*; although footnote readings showing the correct reading are found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) (although this is normative for Tischendorf's very useful textual apparatus which generally shows variants), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993). The ASV follows the erroneous reading, "and without a parable spake he nothing (*ouden*) unto them." So too, this incorrect reading is found in the RSV, NRSV, and ESV. The looseness of the NIV's "dynamic equivalent" makes for an imprecise translation, but on the basis that the NIV's "not" + "anything" = *nothing* (Variant), it is followed in the reading, "he did *not* say *anything* to them without using a parable" (NIV, emphasis mine).

Seemingly influenced by a combination of the Western Text and Syriac Curetonian Version *et al*, for the wrong type of reasons, the correct reading also appears in the NASB. Though the neo-Alexandrian Proper NASB translators use this technique of a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm with far less frequency than the semi neo-Alexandrian Moffatt, it is notable that on this occasion they appear to have agreed with that great advocate of this technique, for the Moffatt Bible also adopted the right reading for the wrong reasons, "he never (*ouk*) spoke to them except in a parable."

Matt. 13:35a "by the prophet" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*dia* (by) *tou* (the) *prophetou* (prophet)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); as well as Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation), 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels); 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts);

1010 (12th century, Byzantine); 597 (13th century, Byzantine), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles); and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). This is further supported by Latin, "*per* (by) *prophetam* (the prophet)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported in an alternative spelling, as Latin, "*per* (by) *profetam* (the prophet)," in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), ff2 (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), and Pi (7th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Eusebius (d. 339), Chrysostom (d. 407), Hesychius (d. after 450); and ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

However, the addition of Greek, "*Hsaiou* (Esaias)," thus making the reading, "*dia* (by) *Hsaiou* (Esaias / Isaiah) *tou* (the) *prophetou* (prophet)," may be reconstructed in the Greek from the Latin. It is also found in an independent manuscript of the Latin Vulgate. It is further followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Porphyry (d. 301/4), in a Latin manuscript according to Jerome (d. 420), as Latin, "*per* (by) *Isaiam* (Isaiah) *prophetam* (the prophet);" and ancient Greek writer, Pseudo-Clementine (4th century), also in a Latin manuscript according to Jerome (d. 420).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text, which is therefore correct. The origins of this variant are by definition speculative. But it looks to me as though a scribe probably looked back to similar words at the nearby Matt. 13:13,14, "Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand. And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias (*Hsaiou*), which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive" etc. . And seeing some similar concepts in the quote from Ps. 78:2 at Matt. 13:35, "I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world," this scribe *then assumed* that Matt. 13:35 was a continuation of the Isaiah quote at Matt. 13:14,15, and so transposed the "*Hsaiou* (Isaiah)" from Matt. 13:14 down to Matt. 13:35. Was this a deliberate "stylistic improvement," or was there a stylistic paper space after the word, "*dia* (by)," which possibly came at the end of a line, and the scribe wrongly thought that "there must have been a paper fade of the ink"?

The TR's reading is well supported in the Greek and Latin, and has no good textual argument against it. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:35a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 13:35a, "by the prophet," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); and by the hand of a later corrector of one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus; as well as in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the independent text type) 0242 (4th century, Matt. 8:25-9:2; 13:32-38,40-46); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), and (the

independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500), and Slavic Version (9th century). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading, "by Esaias the prophet," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in an Ethiopic manuscript (Paris, 13th to 14th centuries), and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous reading of Tischendorf's London Sinaiticus, which adds, "*Hsaiou* (Esaias)", was followed in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). Though not found in their main text, "*Hsaiou*" was given as a footnote alternative by Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd edition (1975) and UBS 3rd corrected edition (1983), and also the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). Significantly, the NU Text Committee of the 3rd and 3rd corrected UBS editions claimed, "that there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text or the apparatus contains the superior reading;" and the NU Text Committee of the UBS's 4th revised edition said, "the Committee had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text."

Commenting on this, Metzger (who was on both NU Text Committees; Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 33; 1994, pp. 27-8), said the erroneous reading being followed "by codex Sinaiticus (first hand), [and what he regarded as] several important minuscule mansucripts, one Ethiopic manuscript [two if Dillmann is included], and copies of the Gospel known to Eusebius and Jerome" acted to commend it. This at once shows his neo-Alexandrian presuppositions about what are good mansucripts, since for we neo-Byzantines, the idea that mansucripts outside the closed class of sources, such as the Arabian *Codex Sinaiticus*, the Family 1 and 13 minuscules, or the African Ethiopic manuscripts, would be given any serious weight, is quite preposterous. Where were these manuscripts over time and through time? We cannot be sure. We only know that manuscripts such as *Codex Sinaiticus* and the Ethiopic manuscripts emerged from some dark corners of the dark continent, like black bats flying out of hell (Deut. 14:18; Rev. 18:2), to come and try to plague us with their nasty little bites in historically modern times.

In the second place, Metzger then refers to the fact that Jerome "states that Porphyry

cited it as showing the ignorance of Matthew" i.e., claiming that St. Matthew thought Isaiah wrote this rather than the Psalmist. Once again, this shows a neo-Alexandrian inability to weigh ancient church writer sources, since Porphyry (*c.* 234-301/4) was a neo-Platonist pagan Greek philosopher, who exhibited suicidal tendencies that his philosophy teacher at Rome, Plotinus, sought to eradicate from him. A ferocious God-hater, Porphyry heathen's book, *Against the Christians*, was rightly condemned in 448 A.D. . We ought not to be surprised that this virulently anti-Christian writer would claim that the reading "*Hsaiou* (Isaiah)," acted to show that, as recorded by St. Jerome in Latin, "… *Mt* (Matthew) *tam* (so) *imperitus* (ignorant) *fuit* (he was)…," the sense of which is, "Matthew was so ignorant." Porphyry was looking for this type of thing in order to attack the truthfulness of Christianity, and so he was anxious to accept so improbable a reading as coming from St. Matthew rather than a later scribe. That the rusty-brained neo-Alexandrians find themselves attracted like metal to a magnet by what for them are the magnetic writings of Porphyry, merely acts to show that the religiously liberal presuppositions of neo-Alexandrians are in tune with the same ungodly spirit that anti-Christian pagan Roman writers exhibited. By contrast, the great Christian church father and doctor, St. Jerome, felt no such magnetic attraction to Porphyry, (and nor I must confess, do I,) and so he discarded these absurd claims by him, with his Latin Vulgate here rightly following the Greek of the *Textus Receptus*.

In the third place, Metzger then says, "Transcriptional probabilities … favor this as … it is easy to suppose that so obvious an error would have been corrected by copyists (compare 27:9; Mk 1:2)." Firstly, I note that this shows the religiously liberal neo-Alexandrian presupposition that, "so obvious an error" could have been made by a Bible writer, i.e., a generally contemptuous attitude of stupidity on the part of some "ignorant" person like St. Matthew, whose gospel is seen as the labour of human endeavours by an "ignorant" Bible writer, rather than the God-inspired oracles of the living God (Rom. 3:2; II Tim. 3:16). *How similar this is to the contemptuous attitude of the pagan Porphyry, supra*! *How similar this is to the arrogant attitude of the heretical Syriac "translators" of Zech. 11:13*, (followed in the RSV, NRSV, & Moffatt Bible), *infra* (see next footnote)!

Nor is Metzger's reference to Matt. 27:9 and Mark 1:2 the crushing argument he thinks it is; but rather is an example of the same basic *anti-Divine inspiration of the Bible presupposition* as Porphyry, which twists the Scripture to falsely claim there is "a Bible blunder." Unlike the AV, adding the words, "*about 'fields'*" in italics as forming no part of the text; unlike the AV, placing parentheses before "And they" and after "did value;" and unlike the AV, putting into quotation marks the key words from Jeremiah, namely, "field" (Jer. 32:7,8,9), "the Lord" (Jer. 32:6,8), and "me" (Jer. 32:6), helps us better understand what St. Matthew here meant. Thus Matt. 27:8-10 reads, "Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood, unto this day. Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet "*about 'fields'*," saying, (And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel value,) And gave them for the potter's 'field,' as 'the Lord' appointed 'me'[65]." So too, Mark 1:2 makes perfect sense as "in the

[65] Re: "[about fields]" and "Jeremy." The prophecy of Jeremiah is focused on the word "field," which is thrice mentioned in Jer. 32:7-10. I.e., in Jer. 32:43,44, the Lord foretold of a time after the Babylonian Captivity, when men would again "buy fields for money" (AV) or literally, "silver" (Hebrew *keceph*) around Jerusalem and elsewhere in ancient Israel; of which the Lord directing "me," Jeremy, to buy a "field" in Jer. 32:6-9 was a prophetic type. Therefore this prophecy that "Men shall buy fields for money" (AV) or

prophets" (TR, representative Byzantine text, & AV), and it is in fact the corrupted Alexandrian and Western texts that render it, "in the prophet Isaiah" (Moffatt Bible *et al*). (See commentary at Mark 1:2).

Metzger then considers that the other side to the coin is that, "if no prophet were originally named, more than one scribe might have been prompted to insert the name … ." Such dogmatism as to this being a deliberate insertion is too strident, since this is only one possibility, i.e., as discussed *supra*, this might have been an accidental "reconstruction." This type of comment shows how the neo-Alexandrians look for simplistic and uncomplimentary solutions to textual matters, and lack a comprehensive overview of different possibilities.

Metzger then concludes, "in the face of such conflicting transcriptional probabilities, the Committee preferred to follow the preponderance of external evidence" i.e., the reading of the TR in the main text. This reminds me of the type of thing Burgonite Majority Text advocates fall back on in order to resolve textual problems. It is a poor substitute for genuine textual analysis. Notably, these same neo-Alexandrians are far less inclined to argue this way when their two leading Alexandrian texts are in agreement, and so it is really a capricious technique, for those who do not have the skills of textual analysis and so do not really know where to go if their Alexandrian textual normativity is upset. The reality is, and the reality remains, that there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading.

The endorsement of the erroneous reading, "*Hsaiou* (Esaias)," by Tischendorf at Matt. 13:35a, and this clear uncertainty about whether or not to adopt it by the NU Text Committee, is reflected in the variation found among the neo-Alexandrian translations that we are considering. Thus the correct reading is found in the ASV as, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through the prophet." So too, the correct reading is found in the NASB

"silver" (Jer. 32:44), as typed by Jeremiah in Jer. 32:6-9, was repetitively fulfilled every time that a post exilic Jew bought a "field" in Israel, such as happened here in Matt. 27:8-10. That this is the chief prophetic focus here is not only evident in St. Matthew's quadruple reference to "field," but also in his specific statement that he is concerned with the fulfillment of the prophecy of "Jeremy." Nevertheless, he makes a parenthetical reference to another prophecy in between his references to Jeremiah's "fields" (cf. Matt. 21:5), of relevance because the sum of "silver" was "thirty pieces." In Zech 11:12,13, Zechariah was said to be only worth "thirty pieces of silver," and this is contextually the price that a potter's services were valued at. That Zechariah is here a messianic type pointing forward to the Messiah is evident in the fact that Zechariah throws the money *to the potter* who is in the Lord's house. I.e., the Messiah was (1) to be somehow priced at thirty pieces of silver; and (2) this money was to somehow be associated with a "potter," (3) through the conduit of the Lord's house. If this is not recognized as a Messianic prophecy, then it makes no sense, since a man did not pay for a potter at the temple. Hence the ancient Syriac "translators" of the OT, lacking the Holy Spirit of God (II Peter 1:20,21), performed an act of violence on God's holy word by pummeling it so that Hebrew, "to the potter," in "cast them to the potter," became "into the treasury" (Moffatt Bible *et al*), but by this dreadful deed, perversely acting to demonstrate the basic point that if Zech. 11:12,13 is not recognized as a Messianic prophecy, it makes no sense.

and NIV. On the one hand, the correct reading is also found in the main texts of the RSV, NRSV, and ESV; but on the other hand, the RSV and its two brats, the NRSV and ESV, all give the erroneous reading as an alternative in their footnotes. E.g., the NRSV footnote at Matt. 13:35a says at "the prophet" in the main text (NRSV), "Other ancient authorities read 'the prophet Isaiah'" (NRSV ftn).

Matt. 13:35b "of the world" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*kosmou* (of the world)," in the words, "from the foundation of the world," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); E 07 (8th century), F 09 (9th century), G 011 (9th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), V 031 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); X 033 (10th century), and Gamma 036 (10th century); and Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation), 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels); 2 (12th century, Byzantine); 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts); 1010 (12th century, Byzantine); 597 (13th century, Byzantine), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles); and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). It is further supported as Latin, "*mundi* (of the world)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), Pi (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found as Latin, "*saeculi* ('of the age' or 'of the world')," in old Latin Versions d (5th century) and h (5th century). It is further found in the ancient church Greek writers, Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215), Pseudo-Clementine (d. 4th century), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Hesychius (d. after 450); and the ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Jerome (d. 420).

However, a variant which omits, "of the world," is found in the African old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century) and k (4th / 5th centuries). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Eusebius (d. 339).

The first line, "I will open my mouth in parables," is from Ps. 78:2a (LXX); and the second line, "I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world," is from Ps. 78:2b. But there is some clear similarity between "from the foundation of the world," in Matt. 13:35b, and Ps. 78:2b (LXX) which reads, "from (*ap'*) the beginning (*arches*)." This is more precise than the Hebrew, "from (*minniy- /* מני) of old (*qedem /* קדם[66])." Notably, Ps. 78:4b makes a generic reference to all the Lord's works, "and his wonderful works that he hath done," and so this necessarily includes the Lord's works of *the creation* (cf., Asaph's other Psalms, Pss. 50:1,4,6; 74:16,17), so that the "dark sayings of old" (Ps. 78:2b), may be fairly said to mean things which have been "from the beginning" of the world (Ps. 78:2b, LXX). Therefore the type of clarification that the Holy Ghost directed St. Matthew to pen in Matt. 13:35b i.e., "from the foundation of the world," is within translation

[66] Hebrew *QeDeM* is a singular masculine noun, and can carry the meaning of "from the beginning" such as in Prov. 8:22 ("before," AV), Brown, Driver, & Briggs, p. 869 (קדם / QeDeM).

style normativity evident in the Septuagint's rendering, "from the beginning" (Ps. 78:2b, LXX)[67], though it is more precise and succinct than the LXX.

Asaph's statements in Ps. 78:2,4 that he would reveal the *things kept secret* or the *dark sayings* that were *from of old* or *from the foundation of the world*, is of course, a claim that was clearly only partially met in his following verses which represent a selection of the Lord's works from earlier parts of the OT. Thus the prophet Asaph shows himself to be a messianic type pointing forward to the Messiah who would give a more fulsome dissertation on what constituted the relevant *things kept secret* or the *dark sayings* that were *from of old* or *from the foundation of the world.* This was to include matters connected with the "salvation" of "God" (Ps. 78:22) and "the redeemer" (Ps. 78:35). Hence St. Matthew's citation of Ps. 78:2 in Matt. 13:35 is the citation of a Messianic prophecy. It is thus appropriately introduced with the words, "That is might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet," Asaph.

The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was this a deliberate "stylistic improvement"? If so, a scribe looking at the fact that Matt. 13:35 cites Ps. 78:2a from the Septuagint may have wished to make the second part more like Ps. 78:2b from the Septuagint. If so, to make "from (*apo*) the foundation (*katabol<u>es</u>*) of the world (*kosmou*)" (Matt. 13:35) more like "from (*ap'*) the beginning (*arch<u>es</u>*)" (Ps. 78:2, LXX), the words, "of the world (*kosmou*)," may have been pruned away. Alternatively, if "*kosmou* (of the world)" was lost due to a paper fade, then particularly, though not exclusively, if it was at the end of a line, a scribe may have taken this to be a stylistic paper space, and may have been consoled in his erroneous thinking by stylistic comparison with Ps. 78:2, LXX.

Either way, the absence of, "of the world (*kosmou*)," creates a stylistic jarring effect. This is confirmed by the presence of the complete terminology, "from (*apo*) the foundation (*katabol<u>es</u>*) of the world (*kosmou*)," elsewhere both in St. Matthew's Gospel (Matt. 25:30), and other parts of the NT (Luke 11:50; John 17:24; Eph. 1:4; Heb. 4:3; 9:26; Rev. 13:8; 17:8); or the terminology, "before (*pro*) the foundation (*katabol<u>es</u>*) of the world (*kosmou*)" (I Peter 1:20). Thus whether a scribe deliberately pruned "*kosmou* (of the world)," or whether it was lost due to a paper fade and he thought nothing of it, either way, he clearly failed to diligently consider this terminology which is quite abrupt without "*kosmou* (of the world)." Was the originating culprit once again Origen? We cannot be sure. We only know for sure that the omission forms no part of the original text.

With good support from the Greek and Latin, and textual factors clearly in its favour, we cannot reasonably doubt the accuracy of the TR's reading. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:35b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

---

[67] Bearing in mind the maxim, *A little knowledge is a dangerous thing*, I say to those who use this type of information to try and justify the type of dynamic equivalents found in e.g., the REB or NIV, "Do you have the inspiration of the Holy Ghost?" *It is one thing for God to make such clarifications, it is quite another thing for we poor frail uninspired men to try and do so.* Therefore let us keep to a literal translation, such as the Authorized Version.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 13:35b, "of the world," is found in the original reading of one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus, and after it was removed by a first "corrector," it is then written back in by a second corrector. It is further found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It further appears in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; as well as the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), Bohairic (3rd century), and Fayyumic (3rd century) Versions. It is further found in the Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Slavic Version (9th century). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading which omits "of the world," is found in of one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); and by the hand of a first "corrector" of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus. It is also followed in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further followed in the Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500). A similar, though not identical reading is found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions.

Commenting on Matt. 13:35, Metzger says, "It can be argued that the shorter reading, attested to by representative witness of the Alexandrian [Rome Vaticanus], Western [African old Latin Versions e & k], and Eastern [similar Syriac] types of text, was original, and that *kosmou* was added by scribes from [Matt.] 25:34, where the text is firm. On the other hand, … the preponderance of the external evidence was taken to support the inclusion of *kosmou* …" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1994, p. 28). Let the reader note, that there is nothing said here about the stylistic jarring effect of omitting "of the world (*kosmou*)," or the corollary absence of such terminology in NT Greek without these words, *supra*, i.e., no genuine textual analysis to resolve what the NU text Committee regarded as a textual problem on the basis of a split in their two major Alexandrian texts. Rather, there is first a stated principle favouring "the shorter reading," a ridiculous presupposition for which there is no warrant, and then a check to what type of support this error has in certain text types; with a final uncertainty due to "the preponderance of the external evidence." There is internal contradictions in their methodology also, since all would accept that e.g., Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215), predates their Alexandrian texts, and so on this occasion we do not find them specifically saying, "the oldest known manuscripts are the best," even though

this is their operating presupposition in consulting their Alexandrian texts.

The back'n'forth tussle over London Sinaiticus, which first had the correct reading, then was changed by a first "corrector" to omit, "*kosmou* (of the world)," then was changed back by a second corrector to the correct reading, shows a back'n'forth tussle in the Alexandrian School, that makes their slim number of manuscripts very unreliable. It also means that in the Alexandrian School there were clearly deliberate "stylistic improvements" made to the text. Von Soden's approximately 40 research assistants laboured for about 15 years. This (in rounded numbers) gives his textual apparatus access to over 2,000 Byzantine text manuscripts (*c.* 83.5% of his total of 2440 manuscripts), of which *c.* 79% (or *c.* 1920 manuscripts are completely Byzantine) and a further *c.* 4.6% (or *c.* 110 manuscripts) are Byzantine text in specific parts. Though no-one claims the Byzantine manuscripts are perfect, nevertheless, if one has thousands of manuscripts, such as in the Byzantine School, then the presence of an odd-bod "corrector" generally becomes more quickly apparent. But when one is relying primarily on two leading Alexandrian manuscripts (together with some other Alexandrian fragments), then this type of thing is far more significant. It can only be assumed that the "rub it out" group succeeded at Matt. 13:35b with both *Codex Sinaiticus* and *Codex Vaticanus*, but that the "put it back in" group managed to get back to the former manuscript's, but not the latter manuscript's antecedent manuscript line.

It seems that this Alexandrian back'n'forth tussle has a modern sequel, as neo-Alexandrians confused about what to do when their two leading Alexandrian texts are in disagreement, have themselves fiddled'n'faddled'n'fudged the text of Scripture, as they push'n'pull'n'fall over one another in a bid to get to be the first to get to the "next edition" of a neo-Alexandrian text, and so argue for one or the other readings ahead of their neo-Alexandrian intra-school rivals. Tischendorf forged his way to the front of the neo-Alexandrian pack, by endorsing the variant's omission in his 8th edition (1869-72), and both Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952) followed hard on his heels (although both Tischendorf and Nestle have a footnote referring to the correct reading). But in the push-pull world of neo-Alexandrians, those lovers of *Codex Sinaiticus* and the second corrector of *Codex Sinaiticus*, wanted to replicate the second corrector, and put it back in *the main text*. The frustration and confusion mounted as the two neo-Alexandrian groups stood face to face in a Mexican stand-off.

Then to the composers of the NU Text the solution was easy enough. *Let the neo-Alexandrian text reflect the confusion of the two Alexandrian texts, and the frustration of the two neo-Alexandrians groups!* This was done by the usage of square brackets, so that the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) makes it equally optional to either include or omit "*kosmou* (of the world)." To be sure, these two modern groups of neo-Alexandrians (neither of whom have an even rudimentary grip on sound principles of textual analysis,) are "a chip off the old block" of their beloved ancient Alexandrian School.

Amidst the neo-Alexandrian confusion and hubbub, the ASV adopted the correct reading in its main text at Matt. 13:35b, "from the foundation of the world" (ASV), but a footnote says, "Many ancient authorities omit 'of the world'" (ASV ftn). This same stylistic dichotomy of the correct reading in the main text, with a footnote stating the omission of these words in other manuscripts, was also followed by the NRSV, JB, and NJB. By contrast, for the wrong reasons, the correct reading, is found in the NASB, RSV, ESV, and

NIV.

Matt. 13:36 "Jesus" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek, "*o Iesous* (Jesus)," in the words, "Then Jesus sent the multitude away," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*Iesus* (Jesus)," by old Latin Versions h (5th century), f (6th century), and q (6th / 7th century). The basis meaning of the clause is further supported as a minority Byzantine reading (*Variant 1a*), making no difference to the English translation, in which "*o Iesous* (Jesus)," is put in the Greek before, "*elthen* (he went) *eis* (into) *ten* (the) *oikian* (house)," not after these words as in the TR, by Gamma 036 (10th century).

However another variant (*Variant 2*), which omits, "Jesus (Greek, *o Iesous*; Latin, *Iesus*)," is found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), Pi (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is certainly no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is thus correct. The origins of the variants are speculative. *Variant 1a* appears to have been a deliberate "stylistic improvement," which moved the subject, "*o Iesous* ('Jesus,' nominative, Greek transliteration from Aramaic into quasi 2nd declension)," to before the verb "*elthen* (he went)," for what a scribe presumably considered was "greater immediate clarification" of the clause, i.e., by locating the subject in the clause earlier to the reader or listener.

Concerning *Variant 2*. Was this a deliberate "stylistic improvement" on the basis of "redundancy"? Its likely origins with Origen makes this a distinct possibility, though not a definite certainty, since Origen's standard vacillates wildly between very good, very bad, and everything in between. Or was this an accidental loss due to a paper fade. In Codex W 032, we find "*O IHCOYC*" abbreviated to "*O IC*" (with a bar over the top of the "*IC*"), and if the paper fade was from a manuscript using such an abbreviation, it could even more easily go undetected as a "stylistic paper space."

On the one hand, the reading of the TR has solid support from the Greek, some significant minority support from some ancient Latin Versions, and no good textual argument against it. But on the other hand, the variant has strong support from the Latin tradition, and is followed by a couple of ancient church writers, although to this must be made the qualification that the variant may well have originated with Origen, an ancient writer of a very uneven standard. Balancing out these competing considerations, and bearing in mind the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:36 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 13:36, "Jesus," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further followed in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

Variant 1a which has the same meaning as the TR, is followed in Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent). *Variant 1b* places Greek, "*o Iesous* (Jesus)," even earlier in the text, again without affecting meaning or English translation, after "*apheis* ('sent,' literally, 'sending away')," and is followed by Minuscule 157 (independent, 12th century). This also appears to have been a deliberate "stylistic improvement" placing the subject even earlier in the general grammatical structure (more like it is in the English rendering). *Variant 1c* is found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), where the Latin, "*Iesus* (Jesus)," being a translation of the Arabic, is found at the beginning of the Latin clause in the reading of Ciasca's Latin, "*Tunc* (Then) *Iesus* (Jesus) *dimisit* (sent away) *turbas* (the multitudes)" (although this may or may not reflect its position in the underpinning Arabic). All these *Variants 1a-c* basically follow the TR's meaning.

The erroneous *Variant 2*, which omits "Jesus," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries);

The erroneous *Variant 2* was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Hence at Matt. 13:36 the ASV reads, "Then he left the multitudes, and went into the house" etc. . So too, the erroneous reading which omits "*o Iesous* (Jesus)," is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Matt. 13:37 "unto them" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek, "*autois* (unto them)," in the words, "He answered and said unto them, He …" etc., is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*eis* (unto them)," in old Latin Versions h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th century); and as Latin, "*illis* ('unto those [people],' i.e., 'unto them')," in old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this latter reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant which omits "unto them," is found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), Pi (7th century), 1 (7th /

8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). This omission is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which therefore is correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was this a deliberate "stylistic improvement," designed to create "a more succinct text"? Its probable origins with Origen mean such a possibility cannot be ruled out. Or was this an accidental omission in which following a paper fade, a scribe, probably Origen, wrongly took this to be a stylistic paper space, and so failed to detect its loss? If so, other later scribes influenced by Origen's reference, then took any manuscripts they came across with it in to be "faulty manuscripts containing an addition," and so deliberately omitted it in the copies they made. We cannot be sure which of these two possibilities best accounts for it, but in either instance, it looks like the variant originated with the Alexandrian born, Origen.

On the one hand, the reading of the TR has solid support from the Greek, some significant minority support from some ancient Latin Versions, the church father and doctor, St. Chrysostom, and no good textual argument against it. But on the other hand, the variant has strong support from the Latin tradition, and the early support of Origen, a heretic whose quality of textual transmission and understanding of Scripture fluctuates greatly. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:37 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 13:37, "unto them," is found in the independent text type) 0242 (4th century, Matt. 8:25-9:2; 13:32-38,40-46), (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the independent) Codex 0250 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in all extant Syriac versions e.g., the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); as well as some independent manuscripts of the Coptic Sahidic Version; an independent manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and the Armenian Version (5th century). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), where it appears in Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic as "*illis* ('unto those [people]' = 'unto them')."

However, the incorrect reading which omits "unto them," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). This

omission is also found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere); as well as the Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions, together with some independent manuscripts of the Coptic Sahidic Version; and also the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al*. Hence at Matt. 13:37 the ASV reads, "he answered and said, He …" etc. . So too, this omission is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Matt. 13:40 "this" (TR & AV) {B}

The Received Text's Greek, "*toutou* (this)," in the words, "the end of this (*toutou*) world (*tou aiōnos*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), P 024 (*Codex Guelferbytanus*, 6th century); and Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). It is also supported as Latin, "*huius* (this)," in old Latin Versions h (5th century), f (6th / 7th century), and q (6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, "this (Greek, *toutou*; Latin, *huius*)" is omitted as a minority Byzantine reading in Gamma 036 (10th century). It is further omitted in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). This omission is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (*c.* 395), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must therefore stand. The origins of the variant's omission are speculative. Was this a deliberate "stylistic improvement" assimilating "*tou* (-) *aiōnos* (world) *toutou* (this)" in Matt. 13:40 (and Matt. 13:22, *supra*), to the NT terminology, "*tou* (the) *aiōnos* (world)" in St. Matthew's Gospel (Matt. 28:20), perhaps with some further reference to one or more other usages in the NT of "*tou* (the) *aiōnos* (world)" (John 9:32) or "*aiōnos* ([the] world)" (Luke 1:70; Acts 3:21; 15:18; Heb. 6:5)? Alternatively, was this an accidental loss due to a paper fade that went undetected because it was regarded as a stylistic paper space, possibly, though not necessarily, at the end of a line? A deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be certain. We can only be certain that the omission occurred.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:40 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 13:40, "this," is found

in (the independent text type) Codex 0242 (4th century, Matt. 8:25-9:2; 13:32-38,40-46), (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0119 (7th century, Matt. 13-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex 0250 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) and Fayyumic (3rd century) Versions, and an independent manuscript of the Coptic Sahidic Version; as well as the Georgian Version (5th century). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading which omits "this" is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), and Codex 892 (9th century, mixed text type). This omission is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (*c*. 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

From such sources, the incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al*. Thus the ASV reads, "the end of the (*tou*) world (*aionos*)." So too, this omission is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Matt. 13:43 "to hear" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek, "*akouein* (to hear)," in the words, "Who hath ears to hear (*akouein*), let him hear" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century); as well as Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 1010 (12th century), 597 (13th century), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). It is also supported as Latin, "*audiendi* (of hearing)," in old Latin Versions d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th century / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century) From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and ancient church Latin writers, Chromatius (d. 407) and Pelagius (d. after 418).

However, a variant which omits "to hear," is found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), and b (5th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is further omitted by the

ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was this a deliberate "stylistic improvement" to create "a more succinct text" in a Greek manuscript copied into the Latin? Was this an accidental loss due to ellipsis (see Matt. 11:15 comments)? Was this an accidental loss due to a paper fade that went undetected as a stylistic paper space? We cannot be sure. We can only be sure that the omission is no part of the original.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:43 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 13:43, "to hear," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the independent) Codex 0250 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), Bohairic (3rd century), and Fayyumic (3rd century) Versions. It is further found in the Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500), and Slavic Version (9th century). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect reading which omits "to hear" is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Codex Vaticanus (4th century) and Codex Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0242 (4th century, Matt. 8:25-9:2; 13:32-38,40-46), and Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent).

The incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al*. Hence Matt. 13:43 of the ASV reads, "He that hath ears, let him hear," although an ASV footnote refers the reader to "ver. 9," and a footnote at 13:9 says, "Some ancient authorities add here, and in ver. 43, 'to hear' … ." The omission, with a similar footnote, is also found in the RSV, NRSV, and ESV. The omission, without such a footnote, is found in the NASB, NIV, and Moffatt Bible. The ASV (or RV) is generally the most literal of the neo-Alexandrian versions, after which comes the NASB. But on this occasion, the NASB and NIV join the religiously liberal Moffatt Bible, in omitting all reference to this reading; so that bad as the RSV, NRSV, and ESV are, on this occasion they are better than the NASB and NIV since they at least refer to the correct reading in a footnote.

Matt. 13:44a "Again" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*Palin* (Again)," in the words, "Again (*Palin*), the kingdom of heaven is like" etc., is supported by the majority Byzantine text, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), and P 024 (6th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*Iterum* (Again)," in old Latin Versions h (5th century), f (6th century), and q (6th century / 7th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

However, this word is omitted in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is also omitted by the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which is thus correct. The origins of the variant are speculative. Was this a deliberate "stylistic improvement" by an antecedent Greek scribe, seeking to make "a more succinct text"?

Or was this an accidental loss due to a paper fade, that was wrongly taken by a scribe to be a "stylistic break"? While verse numbering in the NT is rightly attributed to Stephanus (1551), Manuscript Washington (W 032) here reminds us that stylistic break-ups into many of the traditional verses are in fact much older, and that Stephanus was evidently often recognizing a more ancient tradition with his verse divisions when for the first time he added the verse numbers we now have in our Authorized (King James) Versions. Hence at Matt. 13:41, the "*PALIN* (Again)" of W 032 is after a stylistic space of a third of a line length at the end of Matt. 13:40, then starts on a new line, and the letter "*P*" (Greek, pi) of "*PALIN*," is made to protrude to the left of the page by about one letter. So likewise with Matt. 13:42, there is a stylistic space of about half a line length left at the end of Matt. 13:41, and then the letter "*P*" of "*PALIN*," is made to protrude to the left of the page by about one letter space. Then when we come to the beginning of Matt. 13:47, a stylistic paper space of about 5 letter spaces is left, and then we read "*PALIN* (Again)." Now if a paper fade occurred for the "*PALIN* (Again)" at Matt. 13:41 in a manuscript using a paper space like W 032 does for Matt. 13:47, it could simply be regarded by a scribe copying it out, as a 10 letter stylistic paper space rather than a 5 letter paper space.

A deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be sure. We can only be sure that it is not part of the original text Providentially preserved for us in the representative Byzantine Greek Text, from which we do not move away unless there is a good textual reason to do so, resolvable within the closed class of Greek and Latin sources. For there was a reasonable access to the Greek and Latin over time and through time. "The Word of the Lord endureth for ever" (I Peter 1:25).

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:44a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of

certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 13:44a, "Again," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the independent) Codex 0250 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 700 (11th century, independent), and 1071 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The incorrect reading which omits "Again" is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); (the independent text type) 0242 (4th century, Matt. 8:25-9:2; 13:32-38,40-46); and Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels). It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; all extant Egyptian Coptic Versions e.g., the Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

From such sources, the incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 13:44a. Hence the ASV reads "The kingdom of heaven is like" etc. . This omission of "Again," is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Matt. 13:44b "all" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*panta* (all)," in the words, "*panta* ('all,' word 1) *osa* ('whatsoever' = 'that,' AV, word 2) *echei* ('he hath' word 3), *polei* ('he selleth,' word 4)" i.e., "selleth all that he hath" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), P 024 (6th century); and Lectionaries 185 (11th century), 333 (13th century), and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*universa* (all)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th century / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin, "*omnia* (all)," in old Latin Versions d (5th century) and f (6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and

the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, in *Variant 2*, Greek, "*panta* (all)," is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading, found in Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) in word order 2,3,4 (*Variant 2a*); and likewise omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in word order 4,2,3 (*Variant 2b*).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. The origins of *Variant 2* are speculative. But there is good reason to look for its origins in Origen. On one occasion, Origen includes "selleth all that he hath" as found in the Received Text's word order 1,2,3,4; but on a second occasion, with no difference to English translation, Origen includes it in word order 4,1,2,3 (*Variant 1b*); and on a third occasion, Origen omits "*panta* ('all,' word 1), and renders it as word order 4,2,3 (*Variant 2b*). (I do not distinguish between word orders 1,2,3,4 & 4,1,2,3, when referring to TR support, *supra*.)

The origins of the variants are conjectural. But the word order of the *Textus Receptus* best explains origins of other variants. Due to ellipsis on the "*ei* (he)" endings of "*echei polei*" the "*polei*" may have been lost; but the scribe then realizing his mistake after he had written further, then inserted "*polei*" with a side-marker or footnote marker in the correct place. We find this type of thing in *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) at e.g., Matt. 24:24 (where "*megala*" / "great," was first omitted due to ellipsis loss on the preceding *meia*, being at the start of a line in continuous script, in which "*meia*" is part of "*semeia*" / "signs," but the "*se*" is on the previous line; and then *megala* was written in the side-margin with a footnote-like indicator as to where it should be placed). But perhaps a scribe reading such a manuscript realized that the meaning is the same if "*polei* (word 4)" is placed before "*panta* (word 1)," and such a placement would act to avoid future possible loss by ellipsis, and thus the word order 4,1,2,3, arose (*Variant 1b*). It is further possible, though by no means certain, that some sort of "confirmation" in the scribe's mind that this was "a valid stylistic improvement," was found by reference to Luke 18:22, "*panta* (all) *osa* ('whatsoever' = 'that,' AV) *echeis* (thou hast) *poleson* (thou sell)," i.e., "sell all that thou hast" (AV).

The origins of the variant in question i.e., omitting "*panta* (all)" (*Variant 2*) came from Origen in a manuscript line that had first been modified to this word order 4,1,2,3 (*Variant 1b*). Was this omission deliberate? Did a scribe, quite possibly Origen, conclude that "*panta* (all)" was "redundant, since "sell that he hath" (Variant) was considered to "mean the same thing" as "sell all that he hath"? Particularly if Origen was also the originator of the changed word order on another occasion, he may have become emboldened to think that he "was very smart" with these "stylistic improvements," and so more inclined to make such a change to the text. Alternatively, was the omission of "*panta* (all)" accidental, stemming from a paper fade in which the loss was regarded as a stylistic paper space, especially, although not exclusively, if it came at the end of a line? If so, the scribe, quite possibly Origen, may simply have not remembered that he also knew of this verse with the "*panta* (all)" in it. These same questions of a deliberate "stylistic improvement" for redundancy or accidental omission due to paper fade come in the word order 2,3,4 of Minuscule 28 (*Variant 2a*), though the generally much greater care with the text that marked the Byzantine School, makes accidental omission in this instance more likely, though not certain. These were clearly independent omissions as seen in the different word orders between Origen and Minuscule 28. The origins may have been quite different. I.e., perhaps Origen's was a

deliberate change and Minuscule 28's was an accidental change. Deliberate or accidental changes? The matter is as clear as mud. We only know for sure they were changed from the original reading preserved in the Received Text.

The reading of the TR has strong support from both the Greek and Latin, including the Greek doctor, St. Chrysostom, and the Latin doctor, St. Gregory; and has no good textual argument against it. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:44b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading in word order 1,2,3,4, at Matt 13:44a is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the independent text type) Codex 0119 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0250 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (12th century, independent); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.*

The reading, in word order 4,1,2,3 (*Variant 1b*), is further found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), and (the independent text type) Codex 0242 (4th century, Matt. 8:25-9:2; 13:32-38,40-46). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*

Though we cannot be sure of the word orders used in the manuscripts these translations were made from, it is also found (on UBS & Tischendorf's 8th ed. in TR's word order 1,2,3,4) in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; some manuscripts of the Armenian Version (per Tischendorf); and Ethiopic Versions (6th century, Rome, & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). It is further (on UBS & Tischendorf's 8th ed. in *Variant 1b's* word order 4,1,2,3) in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Bohairic (3rd century), and Fayyumic (3rd century) Versions; some manuscripts of the Armenian Version (5th century) (per UBS); an Ethiopic Version manuscript (Pell Platt & Praetorius); and Georgian Version (5th century). It is also found as Latin, "*universa* (all)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century)[68].

---

[68] For word orders 1,2,3,4 (TR) and 4,1,2,3 (*Variant 1b*) as well as 4,2,3 (*Variant 2b*) in this section, I refer to UBS and Tischendorf's editions, and on their logic, also add Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron under the latter of these on the basis of its Latin word order, which is possibly different to the Arabic word order, which in turn is possibly different to its antecedent pre-Arabic manuscripts. But it should be understood that I do not necessarily accept these classifications, since I consider that in translation from one language

The variant which omits "all" at Matt. 13:44b, is found in Origen's word order 4,2,3 (*Variant 2b*) in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century), as well as (on UBS word order) the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Version.

The split between the two leading Alexandrian texts has caused some degree of consternation and uncertainty among neo-Alexandrians, who despite their pretensions to consider a larger range of texts, generally remain very closely allied to these two. Both Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952) followed the variant which omits "*panta* (all)," on the word order 4,2,3 (*Variant 2b*), presumably preferring *Codex Vaticanus* on the basis that "the shorter reading is to be preferred," although beyond this, Westcott & Hort in general favour *Codex Vaticanus* over *Codex Sinaiticus*, and both Westcott & Hort and Nestle's 21st edition include footnotes showing the "*panta* (all)" of *Codex Sinaiticus*. But opposite to Westcott & Hort, Tischendorf generally favoured *Codex Sinaiticus* over *Codex Vaticanus*, a general difference that is here manifested. For Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), like the UBS 3rd (1975), 3rd corrected (1983), and 4th revised (1993) editions, and Nestle-Aland 27th edition (1993), all follow the word order 4,1,2,3 (*Variant 1b*), of *Codex Sinaiticus*, and with the exception of UBS 4th revised edition provide a footnote giving the alternative reading of *Codex Vaticanus.*

The confidence of NU Text Committee in the UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) that this reading of *Codex Sinaiticus* is so strong as not to even require a footnote alternative, contrasts with the uncertainty of the NU Text Committee's 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) UBS editions, which says that the NU Text Committee considered "there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text" i.e., *Codex Sinaiticus*, "or the apparatus" i.e., presumably here meaning either the TR or *Codex Vaticanus*, "contains the superior reading." Metzger was on both NU Text Committees, but his thought seems to have moved with these UBS editions, since in 1971 he said that, "the absence of *panta* may be the result of the Alexandrian penchant for pruning unnecessary words" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 34); whereas in 1994 he made no comment (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 2nd ed., 1994, p. 28). Of course, another neo-Alexandrian Committee in the future may swing the other way, and this back'n'forth process may go on *ad infinitum* until Doomsday. Such are the vagaries and uncertainties of the Neo-Alexandrian School and their texts.

On the one hand, though following the incorrect Greek word order, 4,1,2,3 (*Variant 1b*) which makes no difference to English translation), the correct reading at Matt. 13:44b, "selleth all that he hath" (ASV), is followed with the "all" in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. But on the other hand, given the constantly shifting views of neo-Alexandrian texts as to whether or not "*panta* (all)" should be either included or omitted, it follows that future revisions of these neo-Alexandrian versions, or future neo-Alexandrians

---

to another, word order may change for reasons of style in the second or later language(s), and so it is hazardous and unsafe to be dogmatic on such an issue. E.g., UBS consider the Latin word order follows 4,1,2,3, (*Variant 1b*) but there is absolutely no certainty that this was not simply done for reasons of Latin literary style, rather than a rigid maintenance of the Greek word order. Or the English word order in the AV is 4,1,2,3, (*Variant 1b's* Greek word order) but we know it came from the Greek TR with word order 1,2,3,4 (TR). Possibly reflecting these difficulties, UBS and Tischendorf disagree on the word order support in the Armenian Version, although possibly they consulted rival Armenian versions.

versions, may well omit the "all" from Matt. 13:44b. We cannot be sure what future neo-Alexandrian texts or versions will do with this word, but we can be sure that the *Textus Receptus* (TR) will retain "*panta*" and our Authorized (King James) Versions will continue to uphold the correct reading, "selleth all that he hath" (AV). The neo-Alexandrian texts are as solid as quick-sand; whereas the Received Text is as solid as rock. Let us not settle for the fleeting fancies of this or that group of neo-Alexandrian textual critics on this or than neo-Alexandrian Committee, but rather, let us settle for the Word of God as manifested in the neo-Byzantine Received Text and AV. *We have the best, let us not accept that which is less!*

Matt. 13:45 "man" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*anthropo* (man)," of "*anthropo* (man) *emporo* ('merchant,' a noun)," i.e., "a merchant man," in the words, "the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant man," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., abbreviating it as "*ano*" with a line over the last two letters). It is also supported as the Latin, "*homini* (man)," of "*homini* (man) *negotiatori* ('trader' / 'merchant,' a noun)," i.e., "a merchant man," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century, reading "*negotiatori*" is unclear and uncertain), 1 (7th / 8th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported as the Latin, "*homini* (man)," of "*homini* (man) *negotianti* ('doing trade,' a verb participle)," i.e., "a merchant man," in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th century / 7th century), aur (7th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). The Latin, "*homini* (man)," without "*negotiatori* (merchant)," i.e., simply "man," is found in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is also supported as the Latin, "*homie* (man)," of "*homini* (man) *negotianti* (merchant)," i.e., "a merchant man," in old Latin Version g1 (8th / 9th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a variant which omits Greek, "*anthropo* (man)," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex Gamma 036 (10th century) and Minuscule 50 (11th century). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Athanasius of Alexandria (d. 373), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and ancient church Latin writer, Ambrose (d. 397).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. The origins of the variant are speculative. Was the omission accidental? In W 032, "*anthropo* (man)," is abbreviated to "*ANO*" (with a bar over the top of these letters) in a continuous script manuscript. This would make a loss due to a paper fade, especially, though not necessarily, at the end of a line, difficult to detect. Was the omission deliberate? The fact that its earliest following comes from Athanasius of Alexandria in a line later followed by Cyril of Alexandria, raises the sceptre of the ugly possibility that this might have been a typical Alexandrian School pruning of "unnecessary wordage," which was then inadvertently picked up and quoted by Athanasius and Cyril. An accidental or deliberate omission? We cannot be sure. Moreover, we cannot be sure of the relationship between writers' sources e.g., Athanasius and Cyril may have been following a

manuscript line where the word had been deliberately omitted; whereas Chrysostom and Ambrose may have been following a different manuscript line where the word have been accidentally omitted. Thus the correlation between these writers might be either a common manuscript line or simply a quaint coincidence. With so much we do not know about textual transmission history; we only know for sure that this omission is not part of the original text.

The reading of the TR is sure. It has no good textual argument against it, and it has the strong support of both the Greek and Latin texts, together with a number of ancient church writers and an early mediaeval church writer. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:45 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 13:45, "man," is found in such Codices as (the independent text type) 0242 (4th century, Matt. 8:25-9:2; 13:32-38,40-46), the leading representative of the Western text, D 05 (5th century), (the mixed text type) C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) 0233 (8th century), (the independent) 0250 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found as Latin, "*homini* (man)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), rendered in Ciasca's Latin as, "*homini negotianti*," i.e., "a merchant man."

However, the incorrect reading which omits "man" is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as Minuscule 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere).

Confusion prevails among the neo-Alexandrians as to what to do with this reading. On the one hand, the correct reading is found in the main text of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), and the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993); although footnotes refer to the omission in Tischendorf and Nestle-Aland. But on the other hand, the incorrect reading is found in Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952), although footnotes refer to the correct reading. It seems that while some neo-Alexandrians are in support of the omission since it is followed by both *Codex Vaticanus* and *Codex Sinaiticus*, others are worried about the overall low level for it of what neo-Alexandrians call "external support" i.e., support for it beyond these Alexandrian texts.

The neo-Alexandrian versions reflect this confusion at Matt. 13:45, although generally favour *the shorter*, and so what on flawed neo-Alexandrian principles is usually "the better," reading. The correct reading is found in the ASV, "Again, the kingdom of

heaven is like unto a man (*anthropo*) that is a merchant" etc. (ASV). However, the incorrect reading which omits "man" is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. E.g., unlike so many fine white Protestant Scotsman who uphold the Received Text and King James Bible, "the mad Scotsman," James Moffatt (d. 1944), reads, "Again, the realm of heaven is like a trader" etc. (Moffatt Bible).

Matt. 13:46 "who" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek, "*os* (who)," of "*os* (who) *euron* (finding)," in the words, "Who, when he had found one pearl of great price" etc. (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), P 024 (6th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as the Latin, "*qui* (who)," of "*Qui* (who) *inveniens* (finding)," in old Latin Version f (6th century); and as the Latin, "*qui* (who)," of "*Qui* (who) *inventa* (finding)," in old Latin Version q (6th century / 7th century)[69]. It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Chrysostom (d. 407) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

However, an alternative reading omits "who," and adds a conjunction either after or before "finding," thus making the reading, "But (or And) having found one pearl of great price" etc. . This is found as Latin, "*Inventa* (finding) *autem* (but)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found as Latin, "*Inveniens* (finding) *autem* (but)," in old Latin Version h (5th century); and as "*Et* (And) *inveniens* (finding)," in old Latin Version d (5th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Both readings were known to Cyril of Alexandria[70]. Alexandria had both better quality scribes of the Byzantine School, and lower quality scribes of the Alexandrian School. This diversity of citation by Cyril therefore raises the issue of whether or not the variant originated in the Alexandrian School? If so, this may well have been a deliberate "stylistic improvement."

Alternatively, the variant's origins may have been accidental. If the "*os* (who)," of "*os* (who) *euron* (finding)," was first lost due to an undetected paper fade, and copied as

---

[69] Julicher shows old Latin q as reading, "*inveta*," which I take to have been a Latin scribe's slip for "*inventa*;" but either way, the "*qui*" clearly supports the TR's "who" reading.

[70] St. Cyril of Alexandria in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1864 edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 69, p. 192 (Received Text reading) (*Glaphyrorum in Genesim*, Libri 4, s. 117A); Vol. 68 (1864 edition), p. 297 (Variant reading) (*De adoratione in Spiritu et veritate*, Libri 3, s.102C); Vol. 76 (1863 edition), p. 61 (Variant reading) (*Adversus Nestorium*, Libri 2, s. 32D) (Greek).

simply "*euron* (finding);" a later scribe detecting that something had gone wrong in the text, may then have "reconstructed" the conjunctive Greek "*de*," from a line of manuscripts found in Cyril's reading, "*euron* (finding) *de* (and / but)." It is further possible, though by no means certain, that some sort of "confirmation" in the scribe's mind that this was "the type of thing a gospel writer would say," was possibly found by reference to John 12:14, "*euron* (finding) *de* (and) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," i.e., "And (*de*) Jesus, when he had found (*euron*)" etc. (AV); coupled with the fact that "*de*" is a common conjunctive (e.g., Matt. 13:5,29,39,57; 14:6) "which being only two letters," the scribe may have thought, "could have been easily lost in a paper fade." Deliberate or accidental? We simply do not know.

On the one hand, the *Textus Receptus* reading has strong support from the Greek, a couple of old Latin Versions, and the unequivocal support of Chrysostom. But on the other hand, the variant has strong support from the Latin. Balancing out these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual subservience of the lesser maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, to the perpetual dominance of the greater maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*; and taking into account the fact that there is no warrant at Matt. 13:46 to look for any remedy to any Greek textual problem, the overriding authority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, must in this instance be decisive. But it is nevertheless tempered by the equivocal support of Cyril of Alexandria, who makes reference in the Greek to both readings, and thus on one reading follows the reading of the majority Latin text. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:46 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 13:46, "Who (*os*), when he had found," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the independent) Codex 0250 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

However the incorrect reading, "But (*de*) having found," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is the most probable reading of (the independent text type) 0242 (4th century, Matt. 8:25-9:2; 13:32-38,40-46), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th

century, mixed text type), 788 (11th century, independent); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) Version; most extant Egyptian Coptic Versions, e.g., some manuscripts of the Bohairic Version (3rd century)[71]; Armenian Version (5th century); Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

This incorrect variant entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 13:46. Hence it is found in the ASV which reads, "and (*de*) having found one pearl of great price" etc. (ASV). The erroneous reading is also found in the NASB. The incorrect reading is further found in both the NIV and Moffatt Bible, both of which omit the "and" (*de*), evidently regarding it as "redundant," e.g., Moffatt reads, "when he finds a single pearl of high price" (Moffatt Bible). However, the correct reading is found in both the RSV and ESV. The NRSV rejects both the Received Text and variant readings, either regarding one of them as "redundant" in English translation; or undertaking a religiously liberal textual analysis that "reconstructs the original Greek" and omits some words, i.e., without any textual support considering the words of both the Received Text and variant are "scribal additions." Hence in the next clause, the NRSV then finds it necessary to specifically translate the "he" of "he sold" (*peprake*, indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *piprasko*), thus making the reading, "on finding one pearl of great value, he went and sold all that he had" etc. (NRSV).

Matt. 13:48a "and" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Both Tischendorf (1869-72) and von Soden (1913) show old Latin a (4th century) following the variant, whereas Julicher (1938) shows old Latin a following the TR with Latin, "*et* (and)." Therefore I make no reference to old Latin a, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 13:48a the TR's Greek, "*kai* (and)," in the words, "and (*kai*) sat down," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), P 024 (6th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*et* (and)," in e.g., Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604). It is also manifested in the Greek New Testament editions of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550).

But it is omitted in a minority Byzantine similar reading in Minuscule 1572 (14th century).

---

[71] Nestle-Aland (27th ed.) says, "All" of the extant Egyptian Coptic Versions support the variant; but Tischendorf's 8th edition says the Coptic Bohairic supports the TR's reading (cf. Matt. 13:51).

There is no good argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct. Was this an accidental omission lost in an undetected paper fade? Was it a deliberate omission on the basis of "redundancy"? We cannot be sure. But either way we are here reminded of a wider plethora of textual corruptions that God has preserved the *Textus Receptus* against.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:48a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Matt. 13:51a "Jesus saith unto them" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Lectionary 1968 here reads, "*autes* (unto her)" not "*autois* (unto them)" (TR). Lectionary 1968 thus reads, "*Legei* (he saith) *autes* (unto her) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," i.e., "Jesus saith unto her". That this is not an intentional change is evident in the following verse 52, where in harmony with the TR, Lectionary 1968 continues with "*autois* (unto them)" in, "Then said he *unto them* (*autois*)" (AV). The error thus appears to have been an accidental oversight by the Lectionary scribe, who must have been following the TR's reading.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 13:51a, the TR's Greek, "*Legei* (he saith) *autois* (unto them) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," i.e., "Jesus saith unto them" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). A similar reading is found in Lectionary 1968 where due to a scribal error, "*autois* (unto them)" is changed to "*autes* (unto her)," *supra*. It is further supported as Latin, "*Dicit* (he saith) *eis* (unto them) *Iesus* (Jesus)," in old Latin Version q (6th century / 7th century); and as Latin, "*Ait* (he saith) *illis* ('unto those [ones],' i.e., 'unto them') *Iesus* (Jesus)," in old Latin Version f (6th century). With the gratuitous addition of the conjunctive, Latin "*et* (and)," it is also supported as Latin, "*Et* (And) *ait* (he saith) *illis* ('unto those [ones],') *Iesus* (Jesus)," in old Latin Version h (5th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, these words are omitted in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). They are also omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text, which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was a manuscript damaged in this area, and if so, did a scribe conclude "from context" that no words were omitted? If so, did a scribal note alert a later scribe, who thus aware of this, and who then speculated that something like, "*Kai* (and) *legei* (he saith)" was originally there? Is this the origins of the reading found in old Latin a (4th century), "*Et* (and) *dixit* (he saith)"? If so, is the Latin "*et*

(and)," of the old Latin h Version a conflation with this reading? Alternatively, was this variant the result of pruning the text as a deliberate "stylistic improvement" to remove "unnecessary wordage" and create "a more succinct text"? The likely origins of this variant with Origen makes this a distinct possibility. Accidental loss or deliberate change? We cannot be certain. We know so little of the unrecorded textual transmission history, that we cannot be sure about how this or any variant arose. We only know for certain that this variant is not original.

On the one hand, with no good textual argument against it, the representative Byzantine text has strong support from the Greek, several old Latin Versions, and the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom. But on the other hand, the variant has the support of the Latin Vulgate and most old Latin Versions, together with an ancient Greek writer. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:51a, a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 13:51a, "Jesus saith unto them," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 788 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; the Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), where it reads in Ciasca's Latin, "*Ait* (saith) *illis* ('unto those [ones],') *Iesus* (Jesus)."

The incorrect reading which omits the words, "Jesus saith unto them," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, D 05 (5th century). It is further found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Version; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous reading entered the NU Text *et al*. Hence the words, "Jesus saith unto them," are omitted at Matt. 13:51a in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV. The NIV's rendering appears to be an amalgam of the shorter, old Latin a Version reading, "*Et* (and) *dixit* (he saith)" which omits "unto them," together with the TR's reading which includes "Jesus;" so that what, on this curious conflation, would literally be, "Jesus saith," becomes at

Matt. 13:51a, "Jesus asked" (NIV). If so, this is a religiously liberal "reconstruction" of "the original Greek text," for which there is no specific manuscript support. But the frustrating difficulties of trying to unravel the NIV's so called, "dynamic equivalents" here surfaces, since it is also possible that the NIV translators agreed with the NU Text *et al*, and simply added these words as what for them would be a "permissible" addition under their overly free and easy concept of dynamic equivalence. The NIV thus presents a puzzle here as elsewhere, and again reminds us that for the serious Bible student, the NIV is an untenable and unacceptable version to use. Whether fiddling and fudging with the underpinning Greek in an NIV "reconstruction," or fiddling and fudging with the text of Scripture in their English "translation," or both, it is clear that the NIV is a highly unreliable and untrustworthy version.

Matt. 13:51b "Lord" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek, "*Kurie* (Lord)," in the sentence, "They say unto him, Yea, Lord" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., abbreviated as "κε" with a line on top). It is also supported as Latin, "*Domine* (Lord)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th century / 7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, this word is omitted in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, this omission is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Athanasius (d. 373); and ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

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

In Manuscript Washington (W 032), Greek "*KYRIE*" is abbreviated to the letters, "*KE*" (with a bar over the top) in a continuous script manuscript. A paper fade of these letters could easily account for its omission, which coming at the end of verse 51 could then be easily taken as a stylistic paper space separating it from verse 51. Indeed, in W 032 there is already such a stylistic paper space dividing verse 51 from 52 of about two letters spaces; but other verses have larger paper spaces. E.g., on the same page of W 032, Matt. 13:58 and Matt. 14:1 is separated by a paper space of seven letters. (Many of these verse divisions first formally numbered by Stephanus in his 1551 edition, predate Stephanus by more than a thousand years as accepted points of unnumbered verse divisions, a fact clearly evident in W 032. Although divisions inside Stephanus' verses also sometimes occur e.g., verse 56b, "Whence then" etc. is divided by a paper space of eight letters on this same page of W 032). Thus if a scribe was working from a manuscript that looked something like W 032, instead of thinking of the paper space between verses 51 and 52 as e.g., two letter spaces, its omission would make it appear as four paper spaces, which is still less than some paper spaces. And if a scribe was working with a non-continuous script manuscript, this could likewise be taken as a larger pre-numbered era verse division between verses 51 and 52.

Alternatively, this might have been a deliberate "stylistic improvement." Entering the head of an ancient scribe is admittedly impossible. We can only guess, and we might guess wrongly. E.g., did a scribe influenced by a misinterpretation of the statement, "Let you communication be Yea (*nai*), yea (*nai*); Nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil" (Matt. 5:37), prune away "Lord" from "*Nai* (Yea) *Kurie* (Lord)" at Matt. 13:51? But if so, why did the scribe leave "*Nai* (Yea) *Kurie* (Lord)" at Matt. 9:28? Was it perhaps a different scribe? Both readings were known to Origen, who may well have been the originator of this variant. If so, did he make this pruning on e.g., the basis of a misreading of Matt. 5:37, or simply because he thought the "*Kurie* (Lord)" was redundant, without realizing that a similar terminology also existed at Matt. 9:28? If so, is this why later scribes, aware of Origen's usage of Matt. 13:51, then pruned away "*Kurie* (Lord)" at Matt. 13:51, but not at Matt. 9:28?

Of course, it is also possible that these omissions are unrelated e.g., a deliberate omission by Origen and an accidental omission by paper fade on another manuscript line. Thus as is usually the case, we are left uncertain as to whether this variant arose due to accident or design. But in either instance, we can be sure it is not original.

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:51b a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 13:51b, "Lord," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as most extant Egyptian Coptic Versions e.g., some mansucripts of the Bohairic Version (3rd century); and the Armenian Version (5th century). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However the incorrect reading which omits "Lord" is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); together with Minuscule 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. The omission is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; some mansucripts of

the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century)[72]; as well as the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The Alexandrian scribes, in all likelihood influenced by Origen's quotation which pandered to their disposition for a shorter text, pruned away "*Kurie* (Lord)" at Matt. 13:51 in their Alexandrian School texts. The neo-Alexandrians, *being their devoted slaves*, likewise followed this inaccurate reading. Thus the erroneous variant is found in the NU Text *et al*. Hence the ASV reads, "They say unto him, Yea" (ASV); and this omission is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, TEV, TCNT, and Moffatt.

But these are not the only enslavers. The Church of Rome till the very end will keep both the "bodies" of their "slaves, and" the "souls of men" in captivity (Rev. 18:13)[73]. E.g., she has control of Roman Catholic "bodies" through her "doctrines" of "forbidding to marry" (I Tim. 4:1,3) with regard to her requirements of a celibate priesthood, or her prohibition on the remarriage of divorcees who have Biblically sound divorces (Deut. 24:1-4; Judg. 19:2; Mal. 2:14-16; Matt. 5:31,32; 19:9; I Cor. 7:15). Rome also has control of Roman Catholic "bodies" through her "doctrines" to "abstain from meats" (I Tim. 4:1,3), whereby she teaches that by certain fastings a man may merit favour with God, and "reduce his time in purgatory," wherein she greatly misuses the Biblical teaching of the fast, and also attacks justification by faith (Gal. 3:11), "for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified" (Gal. 2:16). And so by this Romish teaching of the fast she also enslaves the "souls of men" (Rev. 18:13), so that by this means they "be in bondage" (Gal. 4:9) of both body and soul (Rev. 18:13).

We Protestant liberators, who by the grace of God declare the free gospel of justification by faith (John 8:36; Rev. 14:6; 22:17), have previously dealt with these Papists here at Matt. 13:51b. For with respect to the Lord's teaching of judgement "at the end of the world," in which he shall "sever the wicked among the just" (Matt. 13:49); we received not from the old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II Council (1962-5) times, an answer to the Lord's question, "Have ye understood all these things?," the robust and full words of Scripture, "Yea, Lord" (Matt. 13:51) in which "by the Holy Ghost" a "man can say that Jesus is Lord" (I Cor. 12:3). Rather, we received from the Latin Papists of the Douay-Rheims, a whimpering trimmed down, "Yes." And so too, we find the same weak trimmed down reply comes from the post Vatican II Council new neo-Alexandrian Papists in their Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles. Has Rome really changed? After all, she still attacks the Received Text and Authorized Version, and she still makes "slaves" of men's bodies and "souls" (Rev. 18:13). By contrast, as in the olden times, so too in modern times, we proclaim the great truths of the Reformation Motto: "*sola fide*, *sola gratia*, *sola Scriptura*" (Latin, "faith alone, grace alone, Scripture alone"). And we who believe in the Divine Inspiration of Scripture (II Tim. 3:16), also believe in the Divine Preservation of Scripture (I Peter 1:25); wherefore our response here at Matt. 13:51b is clear, unequivocal, and *the full Word of God*; it is this, "Yea,

---

[72] Nestle-Aland (27th ed.) says, "All" of the extant Egyptian Coptic Versions support the TR's reading; but Tischendorf's 8th edition says the Coptic Bohairic supports both the TR's reading and the variant reading (cf. Matt. 13:46).

[73] The AV's "slaves" at Rev. 18:13 is Greek, "*somaton* (neuter plural genitive noun, from *soma*)," and might also be translated, "bodies." Thus contextually the idea is that Rome has control of both the "bodies" and "souls of men" in some kind of slavery.

Lord"!

Matt. 13:55 "Joses" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek, "*Ioses* (Joses)," in reference to Jesus' "brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), K 017 (*Codex Cyprius*, 9th century), Y 034 (*Codex Macedoniensis*, 9th century), and Pi 041 (*Codex Petropolitanus*, 9th century); Minuscules 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts), 597 (13th century), 1242 (13th century), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); as well as Lectionaries 69 (12th century), 211 (12th century), 303 (12th century), 850 (12th century), 12 (13th century), 333 (13th century), 1642 (13th century), 1084 (1292 A.D.), 1579 (14th century), and 1761 (15th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*Ioses* (Joses)," in old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, an alternative reading (*Variant 1*), Greek, "*Iose* (Jose)," is a minority Byzantine reading. It is found as a margin reading in Codex S 028 (10th century); in Minuscules 1006 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Revelation), 1010 (12th century), and 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles); as well as in Lectionary 70 (12th century).

Another reading (*Variant 2*), is Greek, "*Ioseph* (Joseph)." This is a minority Byzantine reading, found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and N 022 (6th century); as well as Lectionaries 387 (11th century), 997 (12th century), and 184 (1319 A.D.). It is further followed as Latin, "*Ioseph* (Joseph)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th century / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), and Basil the Great (d. 379); ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

Yet another reading (*Variant 3*), is Greek, "*Ioannes* (John)." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., Codices E 07 (8th century), F 09 (9th century), and S 028 (10th century); as well as Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels), and 2 (12th century). It is further followed as Latin, "*Iohannes* (John)," in old Latin Version d (5th century), and Latin Vulgate Codices D (8th / early 9th centuries, Dublin) and R (8th century, Vatican Rome; 8th / 9th centuries Oxford; 10th century, Paris). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

A further reading, (*Variant 4*), is found is some Latin Vulgate manuscripts as Latin, "*Iohannes* (John) *et* (and) *Ioseph* (Joseph)."

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must therefore stand as correct. The origins of the four variants are conjectural.

Before considering them, let us consider an associated relevant matter.

OT prophecy foretold that "a virgin shall conceive, and a bear a son, and call his name Immanuel" (Isa. 7:14), which amazing event was fulfilled in Christ's virgin birth from Mary (Matt. 1:1-23). And OT prophecy further foretold that it would be said of the Messiah of Ps. 69:4 (John 15:25), Ps. 69:9 (John 2:17), and Ps. 69:21 (Matt. 27:34), that he would later have half-brothers and half-sisters from the same mother who had been a "virgin" when he was born (Isa. 7:14), for we read in Ps. 69:8, "I am become a stranger unto my brethren, and an alien unto my mother's children." (Although we know that in the longer term, "James the Lord's brother" later did believe, Gal. 1:19.) Since "my brethren" and "my mother's children" are in Hebraic poetical parallelism, this requires that they must have been the children of Mary, and so Mary did not remain a virgin after she bore Christ (Matt. 1:24, 25). Hence Christ was Mary's "firstborn" (Matt. 1:25; Luke 2:7), but she had later half-brothers and half-sister's of Christ by normal means with Joseph.

It seems the reason for this OT prophetic focus is so that the emphasis of Mary's virgin birth is put on Christ. I.e., as in Protestantism, to emphasis the Christological truth that Mary was "the <u>*God*</u>-bearer (Greek, *Theotokos*)[74];" for Christ was the "child" "born" who is "the Mighty God" (Isa. 9:6), and "the Lord" (AV) or "Jehovah" (ASV), whose "path" or "way" was to be made "straight" by John the Baptist (Isa. 40:3; Matt. 3:3). *Theotokos* is from Greek *Theos* ('God,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *Theos*) and *tokos* ('bearer,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *tokos* which is from the base of *tikt<u>o</u>*)[75], and means that in harmony with Matt. 1:23 that Christ was "God" (Greek *Theos*) "with us," and the virgin Mary did "bear" (NKJV) (Greek *texetai*, from *tikto*) him. This is also stated in the Greek Septuagint rendering of Isa. 7:14, where we read, "a virgin shall conceive," "and shall *bear* (*texetai*, root *tikto*, from *teko* meaning 'to bear') a son," and his name "Emmanuel" (Isa. 7:14, LXX) is explained in Isa. 8:8 (LXX) as "God" (*Theos*) with us." I.e., "God-bearer (*Theotokos*)" refers to a Trinitarian Christological issue, in which contrary to the Nestorian heresy, it is affirmed that Christ was always God while in Mary's womb, for Matt. 1:23 says, "*texetai* ('she will bear,' indicative middle future, 3rd person singular verb, from *tikto*) ... *Theos* (God)."

Thus the Scriptures make the emphasis "the <u>*God*</u>-bearer and so act to safeguard us from the Romish teaching that wrongly puts the emphasis on Mary as "the God-<u>*bearer*</u>," or as they like to say, "*the Mother* of God." For by the misleading terminology, "Mother of God," they ensure that their minions in Popery think of Mary as a mother-goddess figure; but if challenged on the matter, their hierarchy retort in the true spirit of tricky Jesuitry, "'Mother of God' is just our rendering of '*Theotokos*,' and means the same thing as your Protestant rendering of it as 'God-bearer'."

But what saith Scripture? Mary is "blessed" (Luke 1:48); but those who put the

---

[74] This Greek term "*Theotokos* (God-bearer)" is found in the Third General Council of Ephesus (431) and the Fourth General Council of Chalcedon (451). Bettenson's *Documents*, pp. 46-47 (Ephesus) & 51-2 (Chalcedon).

[75] *Tokos* (which is from the base of *tikto*) is used in Hosea 9:11, LXX, "Ephraim has flown away as a bird, their glories from the birth (*tikon*, masculine singular accusative noun, from *tokos*), and travail, and the conception."

focus on Mary, saying "Blessed is the womb that bare" Christ, "and the paps which" Christ "hast sucked," would do better, to say "rather, blessed are they that hear the Word of God, and keep it" (Luke 11:27,28). For Mary is no more blessed, and no less blessed, than any other believer. She gives us a godly example to follow, but so do other saints of God. While she was privileged that God chose her to accomplish the incarnation through, God could have, if he had wanted to, chosen another godly woman, and so all glory should go to God, and not Mary.

Also consistent with this Biblical emphasis, neither OT prophecy, nor very many NT passages, ever refer to the names of Christ's brethren, or give us much detail about them. These background facts, may therefore be relevant in helping us to understand how the variants might possibly have come about

It is notable that in the continuous script *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), there is a stylistic paper space of two letter spaces between "*IOCHC*" (Joses) and the next two words which have no such paper space between them, "*KAICIMON*" i.e., "*kai* (and) *Cimon* (Simon)." The reason for this appears to be that the scribe wanted to right hand justify the page, and since "*KAICIMON*" are the two last words on the line, he left a paper space after "*IOCHC*" to achieve this result. (Such right-hand page justification was not a stylistic policy that he consistently adopted.)

If due a paper fade, the original "*Ioses* (Joses)," lost the final sigma (s / c), it would have looked something like "*Iose* (Jose)." Is this the origin of *Variant 1*?

And if due to a paper fade, the original "*Ioses* (Joses)," lost the final sigma (s / c), and looked something like "*Iose* (Jose)," then a scribe, detecting a paper space, which as in Manuscript Washington (W 032) may have been a stylistic feature in addition to the lost letter, i.e., a paper space of two letter spaces; or alternatively, if possibly the "*Iose* (Jose)" came at the end of a line; then the scribe may have "reconstructed" this as "*Ioseph* (Joseph)" on the basis that "'Joseph' was a common name," perhaps with reference to "Joseph (*Ioseph*)" of Arimathaea in Matt. 27:57,59; and / or "probably passed down as the father's name," with reference to "Joseph (*Ioseph*)" in Matt. 1:16,18 *et al*. Is this the origin of *Variant 2*?

And if due to a paper fade, the original "*Ioses* (Joses)," looked something like "*Io::: ,*" then a scribe, detecting a paper space, which as in W 032 may have been a stylistic feature in addition to the lost letters, *supra*, or possibly the "*Io::: "* came at the end of a line, *supra*, then the scribe may have "reconstructed" this as "*Ioannes* (John)" on the basis that "'John' was a common name, perhaps with reference to "*Ioannes* (John)" in Matt. 10:2; 14:4 *et al*. Is this the origin of *Variant 3*?

It is also possible, that these were deliberate "stylistic improvements" by e.g., scribes who thought "*Ioses* (Joses)" was some kind of "local Galilean derived form" of "*Iose* (Jose)," or "*Ioseph* (Joseph)" or "*Ioannes* (John)," and thought "the more common form" was for some reason "preferable." Given that both *Variants 2 & 3* were known to Origen, we cannot rule out the possibility that they both originated with Origen, who may have deliberately altered the text in different ways on different occasions, in order "to bring out" what he thought to be "more common forms" of "Joses;" i.e., with his view of what the preferred "more common form" was, varying on different occasions in accordance with his unstable

mind that first sought to make such a change. Another much later scribe, with Origen-like proclivities, possibly did the same thing to produce "*Iose* (Jose)" in *Variant 1*; and if so, he was probably influenced by "*Iose* (Jose)" in Luke 3:29.

Were *Variants 1, 2, & 3* accidental or deliberate alterations? Either way, it seems likely to me that with *Variants 2 & 3* first in existence, another scribe then sort to "harmonize" these two readings by conflating them. This probably explains the origins of *Variant 4*.

On the one hand, the TR's reading has strong support in the Greek, is followed by an ancient old Latin Version, has no good textual argument against it, and is supported by the learned church fathers and doctors, St. Basil the Great and St. John Chrysostom. But on the other hand, *Variant 2* is followed in the Vulgate, and is the representative Latin text's reading. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 13:55 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 13:55, "Joses," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 1241 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*[76]. It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Fayyumic (3rd century) Versions, together with some manuscripts of the Bohairic Version; some manuscripts of the Armenian Version; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 1, "Jose," is found in Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Ethiopic Takla Haymanot Version (*c.* 500); and some manuscripts of the Slavic Version. It is also found translated from the Arabic as Latin, "*Iose*," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

---

[76] The UBS's 3rd (1975), 3rd corrected (1983), and 4th revised (1993) editions, as well as Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) all show Family 13 following "Joses" (TR); and so too does Swanson, whose *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text,) and 13 (13th century, independent). But the UBS's 4th revised edition alone, shows Minuscule 13 supporting "Joseph" (*Variant 2*), which therefore is presumably a misprint.

Variant 2, "Joseph," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century), as well as (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 892 (9th century, mixed text type); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and margin of the Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Georgian Version (5th century); together with some manuscripts of the Bohairic Version; some manuscripts of the Armenian Version; and some manuscripts of the Slavic Version.

Variant 3, "John," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century).

The erroneous *Variant 2*, was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Thus the ASV reads at Matt. 13:55, "Joseph." This inaccurate reading was also followed by the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

With the two leading Alexandrian texts split, it might be reasonably asked why the neo-Alexandrians are so united in their preference for Variant 2? The answer appears to lie in the fact that in Mark 6:3, the same names appear with "*Iose* (Jose)," rendered in the AV "Joses" (since though shown as Variant 1, supra, this is in fact the same name). To the neo-Alexandrian mind, the idea of an alleged "contradiction" between two gospels, is much more appealing than the idea that the two writers might agree with one another. In this religiously liberal presupposition, they are like Moffatt, who also renders Matt. 13:55 as "Joseph" (Moffatt Bible). Thus it has happened with these neo-Alexandrian versions, in accordance with the prophecy, "the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables" (II Tim. 4:3,4).

In *The Book of the Battles between the Protestant Neo-Byzantines of the Textus Receptus and the post Council of Trent Latin Papists of the Clementine Vulgate*, it is recorded that the Papists here drew a line in the sand at Matt. 13:55, and upon charging over it to attack the Protestants who held up the shield of the Received Text and sword of the King James Bible, the Papists were pushed back with so mighty a thrust that the Protestants advanced over that line and held their ground with the mighty Sword of the Lord. For the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version both here read, "Joseph," whereas the Received Text and Authorized Version both here read "Joses." We now find that in *The Book of the Battles between the Protestant Neo-Byzantines of the Textus Receptus and the post Vatican II Council neo-Alexandrian Papists*, it is recorded that the Papists here drew a line in the sand at Matt. 13:55, and upon charging over it to attack the Protestants who held up the shield of the Received Text and sword of the King James Bible, the Papists were pushed back with so mighty a thrust that the Protestants advanced over the line and held their ground with the mighty Sword of the Lord. For the Popish Jerusalem and New Jerusalem

Bibles here follow the same reading as the Douay-Rheims Version, whereas the Received Text and Authorized Version both here read "Joses." *Meditation:* In its opposition to the pure Word of God as found in the *Textus Receptus*, has Popery fundamentally changed since the Vatican II Council?

Matt. 14:3a "Herod had laid hold on" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Latin Vulgate uses "*tenuit* (he laid hold on)" with regard to St. John the Baptist at both Matt. 14:3a and Mark 6:17. Given that the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century) is a Latin Vulgate Codex in Diatessaron format, the fact that it too reads *"tenuit*," means one cannot say for certain if this reading is based on Matt. 14:3a, Mark 6:17, or both of these verses. Therefore I make no reference to the Sangallensis Diatessaron inside the closed class of sources, *infra*. This same problem exists with the Arabic Diatessaron, and so while Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic also reads, *"tenuit*," I once again make no reference to the Latin-Arabic Diatessaron outside the closed class of sources, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:3a, the TR's Greek, "*Hrodes* (Herod) *kratesas* ('laying hold on,' nominative singular masculine, active aorist participle, from *krateo*)," i.e., "Herod had laid hold on" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionary 1761 (15th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*tenuit* ('he laid hold on,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *teneo*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), q (6th century / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin, "*tenens* ('laying hold on,' nominative singular masculine, active present participle, from *teneo*)," in old Latin Versions d (5th century), f (6th century); and as Latin, "*adpraehensum* ('to take hold of,' prefix *ad* = 'to' + *praehensum* = 'take hold of,' nominative singular, perfect passive participle, from verb *praehendo*)," in old Latin Versions h (5th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

However, a minority Byzantine reading adds Greek, "*tote* ('then,' or 'at that time')," thus making the reading, "Herod had then (*tote*) laid hold on John." This is found in Minuscule 1010 (12th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must therefore stand. The origins of the variant are speculative. The Greek "*tote* (then)" is used elsewhere in St. Matthew's Gospel (e.g., Matt. 12:13; 13:26), and on this occasion I would agree with the neo-Alexandrian, Metzger, that it appears to have been added by a scribe, "in order to make it clear" that the events of Matt. 14:3ff predate those of Matt. 14:1,2 (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, pp. 34-5). To which I, a neo-Byzantine, would also add that the gratuitous and unwarranted addition of "*tote*" to form the terminology of the variant at Matt. 14:3a, "*Hrodes* (Herod) *tote* (then)," was possibly also made with some more

specific reference to the terminology at Matt. 2:7,16, "*Tote* (then) *Hrodes* (Herod)."

The reading of the representative Byzantine text has no good textual argument against it, and is well supported in both the Greek and Latin textual traditions, both of which had reasonable accessibility over the ages and are inside the closed class of sources. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:3a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:3a, "Herod had laid hold on," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) and Fayyumic (3rd century) Versions. It is further found in the Armenian Version (5th century); the Georgian "A" Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500).

However, the incorrect reading adding "then," i.e., "Herod had then laid hold on John," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions; as well as the Georgian "1" (5th century) and Georgian "B" (5th century) Versions.

On the one hand, the correct reading entered the NU Text *et al*, with the variant shown in footnotes for Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions. But on the other hand, it must be noted that with the two major Alexandrian texts in disagreement, and some support for both readings in such unreliable translations as the Egyptian Coptic Versions and Georgian Versions, the neo-Alexandrians of the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions regarded the matter as *line-ball*. Both said "that there is a considerable degree of doubt whether" the reading they placed in "the text," i.e., the correct reading of the TR, "or the apparatus" reading, i.e., the variant, "contains the superior reading."

The correct reading at Matt. 14:3a, is found in the ASV, which replicates the AV and

so reads, "For Herod had laid hold on John" (ASV). The correct reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. However, given the neo-Alexandrian stated uncertainty, *supra*, we cannot be sure as to whether or not a future neo-Alexandrian version may adopt the erroneous variant reading.

Matt. 14:3b "him" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Latin Vulgate uses "*eum* (him)" with respect to the imprisonment of St. John Baptist at both Matt. 14:3b and Mark 6:17. Inside the closed class of sources the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex in Diatessaron format. Given that it too reads "*eum* (him)" means one cannot say for certain if this reading is based on Matt. 14:3a, Mark 6:17, or both of these verses. Hence I make no reference to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*. Outside the closed class of sources, this same problem exists with the Arabic Diatessaron, and so while Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic once again reads, "*eum* (him)," I also make no reference to the Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), *infra*.

With regard to old Latin q, the "*eum* (him)" occurs in the connected words, i.e., Latin, "*et* (and) *alligavit* (he bound) *et* (and) *misit* (he threw) *eum* (him) *in* (into) *carcere* (prison)" etc. . This contrasts with the Latin Vulgate *et al*, which reads, "*et* (and) *alligavit* (he bound) *eum* (him), *et* (and) *posuit* (he put) *in* (into) *carcerem* (prison)" etc. . For this reason, the textual apparatus of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), with the qualification that the Latin "*eum* (him)" is found after "put (Greek, *etheto*; Latin, *misit*)," and the textual apparatus of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), without any qualification, both show old Latin q as supporting the variant by omitting "him." But I disagree with both. It is necessary to supply the second "him" in English translation. Hence we find it added in italics in the Protestant Authorized Version (1611) translation from the Greek, "and bound him, and put *him* in prison." And likewise, we find it though not in italics (as it should be), in the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582) translation from the Latin, "and bound him, and put him into prison." I consider that similar categories of thought were operating in the mind of a Latin scribe, as were in the minds of these English translators.

Thus it seems to me that a Latin scribe, considering the Latin, "*eum* (him)," was working double-time, in all likelihood shifted it. I.e., so that the "*et*" in "*alligavit* (he bound) *et* (and) *misit* (he threw)" would be understood conjunctively, not disjunctively, so that the sense would be, "and bound and threw him (*eum*) into prison." How else can one reasonably explain the fact that old Latin q both omits "*eum*" after "*alligavit*," and then adds it after "*misit*"? It would then seem that the later Latin scribe of old Latin g1 (8th / 9th century), aware of both the general presence of "*eum*" after "*alligavit*" (Vulgate *et al*), as well as its inclusion after "*misit*" in old Latin q (6th century / 7th century), conflated these two readings and thus has both. Therefore, I consider old Latin q can be shown in support of the TR's reading, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:3b, the TR's Greek, "*auton* ('him,' accusative singular masculine, pronoun from *autos-e-o*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032

(5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1- 28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*eum* ('him,' accusative singular masculine, pronoun from *is-ea-id*)," by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th century / 7th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin, "*illum* ('that [one],' singular masculine accusative, demonstrative pronoun from *ille* i.e., 'him')," in old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

However, a variant omits, Greek, "*auton* (him)." It is found in old Latin Versions h (5th century) and ff1 (8th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was this an accidental loss following a paper fade? If so, was the paper space, possibly at the end of a line, taken by a scribe to be a stylistic space in which instance the absence of "*auton* (him)" after "*edesen* (he bound)" was considered by him to be "stylistically consistent" with the absence of "*auton* (him)" after "*etheto* (he put)"? Alternatively, its probable origins with Origen who refers to both readings, means that we cannot rule out the possibility that this was a deliberate pruning away of "*auton* (him)." If so, was it pruned away on the basis of "redundancy," i.e., with Origen regarding "*auton* (him)" as "unnecessary wordage" in his desire to produce "a more succinct text"? A deliberate or accidental change? We cannot be certain. But we can be sure that it is not original.

The representative Byzantine reading is well supported in the Greek and Latin, and has no good textual argument against it. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:3b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:3b, "him," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828

(12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

However the incorrect reading which omits "him" is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent). It is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

With the two leading Alexandrian texts in agreement, the incorrect reading omitting Greek, "*auton* (him)," was adopted by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). But the slimness of what the neo-Alexandrians call "external support" outside of these two leading Alexandrian texts, evidently worried the NU Text compilers who in the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) enclose "*auton*" in square brackets i.e., making its inclusion or omission entirely optional.

Nevertheless, the correct reading was adopted in the ASV, whose translators evidently considered the "*auton*" was working double-time, for without any italics for the second "him" as in the AV, they translated Matt. 14:3b as, "and bound him (Greek, *auton*), and put him (Greek, -) in prison" (ASV). The NASB revisers followed their father ASV translators' views. *Prima facie*, so did the translators of the RSV, NRSV, and ESV; and *prima facie* the NIV translators also took the same view. However, the fact that italics are not used in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV, means that we cannot be sure as to exactly what these "translators" (I use the term loosely,) thought about the underpinning Greek, and nor can any of their readers. Such are the hazards and pitfalls of non-literal translations that do not like the AV, ASV, and NASB, use italics for added words.

Matt. 14:3d "Philip's" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Greek, word order is "*ten* (the) *gunaika* (wife) *Philippou* (of Philip) *tou* (the) *adelphou* (brother) *autou* (of him)," i.e., "his brother Philip's wife" (AV). This basic word order is followed in old Latin Versions h, f, aur, & q which read, "*uxorem* (the wife) *Philippi* ('of Philip,' in f, q, & aur, or Latin 'Filippi' = 'of Philip' in h) *fratris* (the brother) *sui* (of him)," i.e., "his brother Philip's wife." A different word order is found in old Latin versions b and ff2 as, "*uxorem* (the wife) *fratris* (of the brother) *sui* (of him) *Filippi* ('Philip,' in b, or 'Pilippi' in ff2) i.e., "the wife of his brother, Philip."

Since "his brother Philip's wife" is synonymous with "the wife of his brother, Philip," I show all these old Latin Versions supporting the *Textus Receptus*. I do not consider that these minor differences affect the support of these Latin Versions for the TR because in translation from Greek to Latin, as in translation from Greek to English or Latin to English, word order may change as part of the act of translation. Thus the different positions of "Philip" in these Latin sentences, like the different Latin spellings of "Philip" in these versions, simply reflect different Latin translators' discretions and preferences.

The Latin Vulgate uses "*Philippi* (Philip)" at Mark 6:17. Given that the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century) is a Latin Vulgate Codex in Diatessaron format, the fact that

it too reads "*Philippi* (Philip)" means one cannot say for certain if this reading is based on Matt. 14:3d or Mark 6:17, or both of these verses. Hence I make no reference to the Sangallensis Diatessaron inside the closed class of sources, *infra*. Outside the closed class of sources, this same problem exists with the Arabic Diatessaron, and so while Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic once again reads, "*Philippi* (Philip)," I also make no reference to the Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:3d, the TR's Greek, "*Philippou* (Philip's)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels); 1010 (12th century); 597 (13th century); and Lectionary 1761 (15th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*Philippi*," in old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th century / 7th century), and aur (7th century); as Latin, "*Filippi*," in old Latin Versions b (5th century) and h (5th century); and as Latin, "*Pilippi*," in old Latin version ff2 (5th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, "Philip's" (Greek, *Philippou*; Latin, *Philippi*, *et al*)," is omitted by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), d (5th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also omitted by the ancient Latin church writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430). From the Latin support for this omission, this reading is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must therefore stand. The origins of the variant are speculative. Was this an accidental loss due to a paper fade? In Codex W 032 this name comes at the end of a line. *Prima facie* the long length of the name, *PHILIPPOY*, makes it improbable, though not impossible, that such a paper fade would go undetected by a scribe copying out a manuscript. That is because for such a gap to go undetected would require a fairly incompetent scribe. But to this must be added a qualification that reduces such an improbability, namely, some scribes were fairly incompetent. Therefore, this possibility cannot be ruled out.

Was this a deliberate omission? Of relevance, Herod the Great begat three sons, Aristobulus, Herod Philip (known as "Philip" in Luke 3:1), and Herod Antipas (known as "Herod" in Matt. 14:3, Luke 3:1, *et al*). Aristobulus's daughter was Herodias. Since in marriage the man and woman become "one flesh," each are prohibited from marrying in-laws in the same degree as if they were blood relatives e.g., if a man's wife dies, he cannot marry his sister-in-law because he cannot marry a blood related sister[77]. The incest laws prohibit

[77] In later OT polygamous times (Exod. 21:10; Deut. 21:15), applications of the incest laws were different at this point i.e., the Levirate marriage rule (Deut. 25:5-10), than are applications of these incest laws when applied in the context of Christian monogamy (Matt. 19:9). Christian monogamy returns to the earlier OT practice of monogamy, and necessarily abolishes the Levirate marriage rule and hence this former dispensation for such unions.

marriages in the degrees of uncles and nieces or aunts and nephews, whether by blood or affinity (Lev. 18:14; 20:20). Thus when Herodias married Herod Philip, she was marrying her father's brother i.e., her uncle, and the marriage was incestuous. But the matter was compounded when Herodias then left Herod Philip, and married Herod Antipas. At this point, Herod Antipas had married the wife of his brother, Herod Philip. This is also prohibited under the incest laws (Lev. 18:16; 20:21). In his dealings with Herod Antipas, St. John the Baptist declared plainly, "It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife" (Mark 6:18), and in response to this moral condemnation of a corrupt ruler, "Herod" Antipas "Had laid hold on John, and bound him, and put him in prison for Herodias' sake, his brother" Herod "Philip's wife" (Matt. 14:3).

With all these "Herods" there at that time, some confusion may have arisen. I.e., two Latin and Greek speaking citizens of the ancient Roman Empire, Iapetus (the Latin form of "Japheth," derived from Noah's son,) and Anubis (the Latin form of a name derived from a pagan dog-headed god from the Land of Ham), might have had a conversation something like this. Iapetus might ask Anubis, "When you say 'Herod,' do you mean Herod the father, that is, Herod the Great; or Herod the son, I mean Philip, the one who used his second name, Herod Philip; or Herod the son, I mean Herod, the other one who uses his first name, Herod Antipas?" And Anubis may reply, "I mean the Herod who married Herodias; you know, the Herodias whose sordid tale is all about incest and then murder of St. John the Baptist." To which Iapetus might reply, "Now when you say the 'Herod' who committed 'incest' with 'Heriodias,' do you mean Herod Philip, the one who used to use his second name, Philip, and who incestuously married his niece, Herodias; or do you mean Herod Antipas, you know, the one who used to call himself by his first name, 'Herod,' and who incestuously married the wife of his brother, Philip?" "O come on," might say Anubis, "Don't you ever read the classics? The Greek writer, Josephus says Herodias's first husband, was Herod, the son of Herod the Great in *Antiquities* (18:5:4), so that's who I mean when I say 'Herod who married Herodias'." "Well thanks for the clarification," might reply Iapetus, "And yes, I do read the classics. But don't you ever read the Bible? For example, St. Mark says St. John Baptist told Herod, 'It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife' (Mark 6:18); St. Matthew says 'Herod … laid hold on John, and bound him, and put him in prison for Herodias's sake, his brother Philip's wife' (Matt. 14:3); as does St. Luke, who says 'Herod' was 'reproved' by St. John Baptist 'for Herodias his brother Philip's wife' (Luke 3:19). So naturally I thought first and foremost about what the Bible says, when you started to talk about 'Herod' committing 'incest' with 'Herodias.'"

"Well to be perfectly frank with you," might continue Anubis, "I think it's those verses you referred to in Matthew's and Luke's Gospels, that's causing all the trouble. I really think Philip's name should be pruned away from Matthew's and Luke's Gospels in those passages. I reckon we should make the Bible more compatible with the classics. Really Matthew's and Mark's Gospels should not say, 'Herodias' 'his brother Philip's wife,' but 'Herodias,' 'his brother Herod's wife.' But I suppose we could leave the reference to 'Philip's' in Mark's Gospel (Mark 6:17), as a record of the whole thing, although there's a weaker argument for pruning away 'Philip' from there too, namely, just to standardize the whole thing. I know some scribes from Alexandria in Egypt, who reckon its okay to prune away unnecessary wordage, as long as it makes the text of Scripture more succinct. And I

think this is a good example of where we should do something like that, so when people read these Gospels they can more quickly relate it to what Josephus says." To which Iapetus might reply, "Not a chance, Anubis. I've heard about those heretical Alexandrian scribes, and I reckon their very, very, bad people. We've got no business tampering with the Word of God! I happen to know there's another school of orthodox scribes down in Alexandria, and they follow the mainline scribes in the rest of the Eastern Roman Empire, and say we should never tamper with the Word of God. They're the ones I follow." "Well," might conclude Anubis, "You keep to your received text if you want, but in the versions I and my mates will be circulating through the Western Roman Empire, there's no way we're gonna' leave something as confusing as Philip's name in those passages of Matthew's and Luke's Gospels. And I think we might send a copy of it down to Africa, just for good measure."

This conjectural and fictional conversation between Anubis and Iapetus might not have transpired exactly as set out above, and almost certainly did not. The exact details of what actually happened is something we simply do not know. Nevertheless, the basic ideas in this fictionalized form of the above conversation between Iapetus and Anubis, means that there may have been what some scribes regarded as "a good reason" to prune the text of Matt. 14:3 (and Luke 3:19; see commentary at Luke 3:19) of "Philip's." Was the omission of "Philip's" in Matt. 14:3 (and Luke 3:19) deliberate or accidental? We cannot be sure. We can only be sure that the original text of Scripture contained "Philip's."

The representative Byzantine reading at Matt. 14:3 has no good textual argument against it. It has the strong support of the Greek text, and a broad spread of support in a number of old Latin versions dating from ancient times, as well as two ancient church Greek writers. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:3d an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:3d, "Philip's," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; and is the most probable reading of the Syriac

Palestinian Version (*c.* 6th century) although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain; as well as the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), Bohairic (3rd century), and Fayyumic (3rd century) Versions. It is further found in the Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500 & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However the incorrect reading which omits "Philip's" is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).

With strong support in the Alexandrian text at Matt. 14:3 the correct reading entered the NU Text *et al*. Hence the correct reading is found in the American Standard Version as, "his brother Philip's wife" (ASV). The correct reading is also found in the NASB and NIV. Though the correct reading is found in the RSV, NRSV, and ESV, all three contain a footnote giving the variant's reading. E.g., the NRSV footnote reads, "Other ancient authorities read 'his brother's wife'" (NRSV ftn). The reference to this obviously erroneous variant in the footnotes of the RSV, NRSV, and ESV, is a cause for some concern.

Moreover, it is notable that the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582), translating from faulty Latin texts, such as those adopted in the Clementine Vulgate (1592), translates Matt. 14:3 as, "his brother's wife." Thus we here see that the superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, was perversely made subject to the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*. We Protestants can have none of this! For centuries we have upheld our Greek Received Text against this type of perversion of God's Word as found in the Romish Douay-Rheims, based as it is on an inferior Latin text. And we will continue to do so!

As seen by the footnote readings in the Alexandrian text based RSV, NRSV, and ESV, even though most Alexandrians support the TR's reading here for the wrong reasons, there is nevertheless some Alexandrian support for the variant. In this they show some sympathy for the bad old Greek scribes of the Western Text. Thus there is some continuation among some neo-Alexandrians of our old battle with the Western Greek scribes and Romanists of the Latin Text following the Douay-Rheims Version here at Matt. 14:3. Our answer to apostate Protestants following the neo-Alexandrian footnote readings of the RSV, NRSV, and ESV, is the same as that to Papists following the Latin text reading of the variant. We stand unflinching in our conviction that the Received Text is the best Text! We want no other! We will have no other! We will have the full Word of God and nothing less! Give it to us, and nothing else!

Matt. 14:6 "birthday was kept" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

There is nothing new about differences in the minds of men that one finds between more literal modern translations of the Bible, such as e.g., the *American Standard Version* (1901) or *New King James Version* (1982), and less literal modern translations of the Bible such as e.g., the *New International Version* (1984) with its many dynamic equivalents, or even looser translations such as the *Moffatt Bible* (1935). These types of variations were found in ancient times as seen by comparable variations among different translators who

undertook different portions of the Greek Septuagint translation of the Hebrew OT Scriptures. This included everything from ancient literal translators more like those of the NKJV, through to ancient translators using dynamic equivalents more like those of the NIV, through to ancient liberal translators prepared to rearrange sections throughout the Book of Jeremiah much like Moffatt rearranges sections of Scripture. Contemplating such things, I am reminded of the Latin motto of an old *Alma Mater* of mine (not that she always deserved this kindly Latin designation[78]), Sydney University, "*Sidere Mens Eadum Mutato*" i.e., "The stars (*sidere*) change (*eadum*) [but] the mind (*mens*) [remains] the same (*mutato*)."

This issue becomes relevant in considering what Greek text might be underpinning the Latin Versions of Matt. 14:6. The Latin Vulgate's reading, "*Die autem natalis Herodis*," is rendered in the *Douay-Rheims Version* (further discussed, *infra*,) as, "But (*autem*) on Herod's (*Herodis*) birthday (*die* = day; *natalis* = birth-time)." This and some other Latin readings, are regarded by the textual apparatus of Tischendorf's 8th edition as similar to, with minor variations, *Variant 1a* and *Variant 1b*, *infra*. By contrast, the textual apparatus of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) avoids all reference to the Latin on these readings.

On the one hand, I think a case can be made out for Tischendorf's view, and this is e.g., a stronger case for old Latin Version's ff1's "*cum advenisset*" / "when … was come," than for the Vulgate, *supra*, and so I have included ff1, *infra*. But on the other hand, I think the type of reading found in the Vulgate is too difficult to classify, because a Latin scribe reading the Greek, "when Herod's birthday was kept," might choose to render this in Latin as, "on Herod's birthday," even though this is certainly not the most literal rendering. Such a Latin scribe may not e.g., be fully cognisant with the relevant subtleties of the Greek, or due to his theory of translation, may not care about them.

It is notable that e.g., no Latin version ever used italics for added words, and while the Latin is generally a fairly literal translation, and thus a very useful textual tradition inside the closed class of sources, nevertheless it can and does at times err. I hesitate to use it in this instance because I can envisage how Latin scribes without the commitment to the level of literalness that I uphold, might have used a Vulgate type rendering for either the TR or variant, even though in doing so it must be admitted in fairness to Tischendorf, that they thereby produced a reading more like the variant than the Received Text.

The matter is one of fine debate. The bottom line is that we cannot enter the head of a Latin scribe and know for sure what he was thinking. So if, good Christian reader, you disagree with me, and consider the entire Latin tradition in fact supports the variant reading, then that is a difference of opinion we can live with. Perhaps you are right and I am wrong. I do not claim infallibility. But even if, *as I do not*, I were for the sake of argument to

---

[78] Latin, "*Alma* (nourishing) *Mater* (mother)," is a term applied by convention to a tertiary college or university where one was educated. But the secularists at Sydney University were not always "nourishing" or "kind" (Latin, *alma*); nor "mother" (Latin, *mater*) like, except to be like "a wicked step-mother;" for they were in general, though not in all instances, rather cruel, anti-intellectual, and anti-Christian propagandists. They remind us that those secularists who like to complain about the idea of a Protestant Christian State "inhibiting" them, care nothing for the inhibition and persecution of the righteous and godly when the power is in their evil hands to accomplish suchlike.

stipulate that you were right and I was wrong, this would not change the fundamental fact that the reading of the Greek *Textus Receptus* stands sure. (Cf. my comments in the preliminary textual discussion at Matt. 14:9, *infra*).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:6, the Received Text's Greek, "*genesion* ('birthday,' neuter plural genitive, 2nd declension noun, from *genesia*[79]) … *agomenon* ('being kept,' present middle, masculine plural genitive participle, from *ago*)," i.e., "birthday was kept" in the words, "But when Herod's birthday was kept," is the majority Byzantine reading, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), E 07 (8th century), G 011 (9th century), Gamma 036 (10th century); and Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century).

A variant, Greek, "*genesion* ('birthday,' neuter plural genitive, 2nd declension noun, from *genesia*) … *genomenon* ('being come,' present middle, masculine plural genitive participle *genomenos*, from *ginomai*)," i.e., "birthday came" in the words, "But when Herod's birthday came," is a minority Byzantine reading (*Variant 1b*), found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), and K 017 (9th century). *Variant 1b* is further followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407)[80].

Variant 1a+ b (*Variant 1*) is also followed as Latin, "*cum advenisset* (when was come)," by old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century). Some may consider the entire Latin tradition supports this reading (see *Preliminary Textual Discussion*, *supra*).

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

---

[79] "Birthday" is a plural form, i.e., *genesia-on*, not *genesion-ou*. This is a genitive of time *during which something happens*; whereas the variant is a dative of time *during which something happens* cf. *genesiois* in Mark 6:21 (Moulton's *Grammar of NT Greek*, Vol. 3, pp. 235,243; Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 122-4,155-7; Young's *Greek*, pp. 33-4, 49). It is in the plural form because the plural may be used of festivals. (Cf. *sabbaton-ou*, which unlike *genesia-on* has a singular Greek form; but likewise is a genitive plural neuter noun, *sabbaton* in Col. 2:16; or a neuter plural dative noun, *sabbasi(n)* in Matt. 12:10,12; Mark 3:4; Luke 4:31; 6:2 [6:9 TR only]. In such instances, the plural Greek might be rendered either with reference to a plurality of "sabbath days" as in the AV; or as a *genitive of time* or *dative of time* respectively, i.e., with reference to the time during which something is happening on a singular "sabbath day" as in the ASV.)

[80] Like Variant 1b, the TR and Variant 2, *infra*, are present participles, and such participles usually indicate that the action is contemporaneous in time with the action of the main verb, "*orchesato* ('she danced,' indicative middle aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *orcheomai*)." Variant 1a is an aorist participle, and while in general an aorist participle will be antecedent in time to the main verb's action, this is not so when an aorist participle is, as here, related to an aorist main verb, in which instance the aorist participle will also be contemporaneous with the main verb's action. (Wallace's *Greek Grammar*, pp. 624-5). Thus (notwithstanding some differences in Greek, for the purposes of English translation,) the meaning of Variants 1a & 1b is basically the same.

which is thus correct. The origins of the variants are conjectural. Were these variants deliberate "stylistic improvements"? If so, did the scribes consider that the "more simple terminology" of the variants "was to be preferred"?

Was this an accidental alternation? Was there a paper fade / loss of the TR's "*agomenon*," so that it looked something like, "*::omenon*," could, particularly if there was a slight space between the original "*de*" and "*agomenon*," as part of the scribe's writing be "reconstructed" as the *Variant 1b's* "*genomenon*." (Such things are common in handwritten manuscripts, as evident on this very page in W 032, where e.g. at Matt. 14:9 between the *kai* / 'and' and *elupethe* / 'was sorry,' a slightly larger gap than normal is left.) Or was this a deliberate alteration regarded as some kind of "stylistic improvement"?

On the one hand, the representative Byzantine Text has strong support from the Greek, and no textual problem with it. Its antiquity is testified to by *Codex Freerianus* (W 032). But on the other hand, the minority Byzantine variant (in multiple similar forms) is followed by an ancient church writer, has some old Latin Version support, and *possibly* is the Greek reading underpinning the entire Latin textual tradition. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:6 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:6, "birthday was kept," is found in (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is additionally the most probable reading of Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain; and it is further found in Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found as a marginal reading in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

Another reading (*Variant 2*) is, "*genesiois* ('birthday,' neuter plural dative, 2nd declension noun, from *genesia*) … *agomenois* ('being kept,' present middle, masculine plural dative participle, from *ago*)." This (for English translation purposes,) basically follows the correct meaning of the TR. The origins of this variant are speculative. If due to a paper fade / loss, "*genesion … agomenon*" came to look something like "*genesi:: … agomen::*", then the "*genesiois*" was probably "reconstructed" with reference to the "*genesiois*" of Mark 6:21, and then "*agomenois*" declined as a matching dative. Was this a deliberate change? If so, a scribe probably first assimilated the "*genesiois*" of Matt. 12:6 to the "*genesiois*" Mark 6:21, and then made a matching dative of "*agomenois*" by changing it to "*agomenois*."

However, the incorrect reading, "birthday came," is found as *Variant 1a* in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the independent text

type) Codex Z 035 (6th century). As *Variant 1b* it is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), and 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels). *Variant 1* (*Variant 1a+ b*) is also followed in Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Was this an accidental alteration? If the original, "*genesion* (birthday) *de* (but) *agomenon* (was kept)," due to a paper fade / loss was changed from something like "*genesiondeagomenon*" to something like, "*genesi:::de:gomen:::*," bearing in mind that the Greek omega in e.g., Codex W 032, looks something like our English "w," and so the loss of these two letters could accommodate the three letters *ois*, at the end of both main words, then the gap between the "*de*" and "*gomen:::*" may have been taken to be a stylistic paper space, not being very large, and the whole thing "reconstructed" by a scribe to *Variant 1a's* "*genesioisdegenomenois*" (*genesiois de genomenois*). If so, the "*genesiois*" was probably "reconstructed" with reference to the "*genesiois*" of Mark 6:21. Or was this a deliberate alteration regarded as some kind of "stylistic improvement"?

The erroneous *Variant 1a* entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 14:6. The erroneous reading is rendered in the ASV as "birthday came." The incorrect *Variant 1* is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, and Moffatt Bible. Both the NIV and Moffatt render this in a manner more compatible with the Latin. E.g., Moffatt translates it as, "However, on Herod's birthday" (Moffatt Bible). Moffatt is not as literal as the ASV's, "But when Herod's birthday came" (ASV), but it is, depending on one's theory of translation, a possible rendering. Those whose minds think like Moffatt and the NIV translators, must surely have no doubt that that Tischendorf is correct in the preliminary textual discussion, *supra*, as indeed he may well be.

Historically, the neo-Byzantine defenders of the Authorized King James Version upheld the correct reading of the Greek *Textus Receptus*, "But when Herod's birthday was kept" (Matt. 14:6, AV), against the incorrect reading of the Latin text's Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version, "But on Herod's birthday" (see Latin Vulgate at preliminary textual discussion, *supra*). Now we neo-Byzantines find ourselves defending the AV against such neo-Alexandrian renderings as the Moffatt Bible's "However, on Herod's birthday." As King Solomon says, "The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun" (Eccl. 1:9).

Matt. 14:9 "was sorry: nevertheless" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Greek, "*elupethe* ('he was sorry,' word 1a)," or the variant, "*lupetheis* ('being sorry,' word 1b), may be rendered in the Latin as "*contristatus*." Thus the Vulgate, and all old Latin Versions other than a & d which both omit "*est*," *infra*, read, "*Et* (And) *contristatus est* ('having been made sad,' = *contristatus*, nominative singular masculine, passive perfect participle, from *contristo*; + *est*, indicative active present, 3rd person singular, from *sum-*

esse[81]) *rex* (the king)" etc. . I.e., "And the king was made sad."

Because Latin, "*contristatus*," is a nominative singular masculine, passive perfect participle, some might argue that it is translating the variant's Greek, "*lupetheis*," which is a nominative singular masculine, passive aorist participle, rather than the TR's Greek, "*elupethe*," which is an indicative passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb. But such a view would surely be claiming a higher standard of precision literalness in translation by the Latin scribes than the evidence will support (cf. my comments in the preliminary textual discussion at Matt. 14:6, *supra*). Neither the textual apparatuses of Tischendorf's 8th edition, Nestle-Aland's 27th edition, nor UBS's 3rd, 3rd corrected, 4th revised editions seek to make such an argument, and I think they or anyone else would be unwise to do so.

Thus I agree with these textual apparatuses that the issue for determination as to which Greek text the Latin version is following, should be determined through reference to the issue of whether or not they translate the Greek, "*de*," with a Latin equivalent.

Due to the absence of Latin "*autem*" in the Vulgate at Mark 6:26; I think it reasonable to conclude that the Sangallensis Diatessaron is here following the Latin Vulgate at Matt. 14:9, inside the closed class of sources. The matter is probably too fine to discern the Arabic from the Latin. On the one hand, an error in the section outside the closed class of sources is of no consequence to the text, since those manuscripts referred to here are not used to determine the NT text, i.e., they are relevant only as an interesting, albeit unnecessary, history of textual transmission. But on the other hand, for the sake of accuracy, I make no reference to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron outside the closed class of sources.

In the section considering "Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses," I say, the variant "*may* be also followed by the Ethiopic Version." The UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions indicate uncertainty as to whether or not the Ethiopic follows this reading, whereas UBS 4th revised edition (1993) is confident that it does. *What* has changed in the Ethiopic Version between 1983 and 1993? Nothing! But *who* has changed on the NU Text Committee between 1983 and 1993? Two committee members left and two new committee members arrived on the NU Text Committee of five. Only the overt "bright lights" of Metzger and Aland, and one other more covert figure, quietly and craftily camouflaged by lurking in black robes in the black shadow of these "bright lights," remained constant over NU Text Committee changes. (I say, good Christian reader, "*Take a deep breath. … I think I smell a Jesuit rat!*") For those neo-Alexandrians who around the world robotically believe what ever these five neo-religiously liberal Alexandrian committee members tell them, their views on the Ethiopic Version changed. But of course, if other NU Text Committee members tell them something different in the future, they will change on that too. The only thing we can be sure about on such neo-Alexandrian text matters is that the neo-Alexandrian text and its associated "justifications" are unstable.

Principal Textual Discussion.

---

[81] Latin, *est* may be used, as here, with a nominative perfect participle, in order to form a verb perfect passive voice. Its omission in old Latin a & d is not fatal to the meaning.

At Matt. 14:9, the TR's Greek, "*elupethe* ('he was sorry,' word 1a, indicative passive aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *lupeo*) *o* ('the,' word 2) *basileus* ('king,' word 3) *dia* ('for,' word 4) *de* ('nevertheless,' word 5)," i.e., "the king was sorry: nevertheless for," in the wider words (with "it" and "her" in italics as added), "And the king was sorry: nevertheless for the oaths' sake, and them which sat with him at meat, he commanded *it* to be given *her*" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is further supported with the presence of word 5 as Latin, "*autem* ('but,' or 'yet')," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th century / 7th century), aur (7th century), and 1 (7th / 8th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin, "*set* ('but,' or 'yet')," in old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries); and as Latin, "*sed* ('but,' or 'yet')," in old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

However, a variant changes word 1, and omits word 5, thus upon reconstruction of the Greek from the Latin reading, Greek, "*lupetheis* ('being sorry,' word 1b, nominative singular masculine, passive aorist participle, from *lupeo*) *o* ('the,' word 2) *basileus* ('king,' word 3) *dia* ('for,' word 4)," i.e., "being sorry, the king for," in the wider words (with "it" and "her" in italics as added), "And being sorry, the king for the oath's sake, and them which sat with him at meat, commanded *it* to be given *her*." This is found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was this an accidental alteration? If the original "*elupethe obasileusdiade*" was written over two lines, with either the "*elupethe*" at the end of one line, or with a scribe's stylistic paper space after it, then due to a paper fade / loss it may have looked (in continuous script) something like "*:lupeth:::obasileusdia::*". Thus a scribe may have "reconstructed" this as the variant, (in continuous script,) "*lupetheisobasileusdia*".

Was this a deliberate "stylistic improvement"? In the representative Byzantine text, the "*de* ('nevertheless,' word 5)," acts to create more distinctive clauses i.e., 1) "And the king was sorry," 2) "nevertheless (*de*) for the oaths' sake" etc. . It is possible that a scribe considered that he could "improve the flow" of the sentence by removing the connecting word, "*de* (nevertheless)," and changing the declension of *lupeo* from "*elupethe*" to "*lupetheis*," thus making the reading, 1) "And being sorry, the king for the oath's sake" etc. . If so, such a "stylistic change" came from a scribe who erroneously had too negative a view of connecting words such as *de* and *kai*. If so, this is a grammatical peculiarity that also infects modern English translators who think themselves "improving the flow" of the sentence by the gratuitous removal of "and," especially at the beginning of sentences. They do so from the "And" of Gen. 1:2 (Hebrew, *vav* / ו; Greek LXX, *de* / δε; Latin Vulgate, *autem*), thereby from my creationist Gap School perspective perverting the meaning of Scripture (Gen. 2:4; Heb. 1:2; 11:3) since in Scripture the Hebrew "*tohuw* ('without form,' Gen. 1:2)" and "*bohuw* ('void,' Gen. 1:2)" carry the connotation of a destruction event (cf. "*tohuw*" and "*bohuw*" in the later destruction events of Isa. 34:2,11 and Jer. 4:20,23); through to the "And" of Rev. 22:17 (Greek, *kai* / και; Latin, *et*). I think the only "flow" that these

ancient or modern "stylistic improvers" increase, is the flow of the Spirit of God out of what is called "Scripture," since recognition of the verbal inspiration of Scripture (Isa. 51:16; Jer. 1:7; II Tim. 3:16) means that no man has any business undertaking such "stylistic improvements."

If this was a deliberate "stylistic improvement," the scribe responsible fell flat on his face. That is because in addition to the problem created, *supra*, he created a further grammatical problem. Specifically, on the reading of the variant it is unclear if the remaining "*dia* ('for,' word 4)," is meant to qualify the earlier "*lupetheis* ('being sorry,' word 1b)," or the later "*ekeleusen* (he commanded)." This stylistic difficulty is so great, that even Metzger acknowledges it (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 2nd ed., 1994, p. 29). So much for the value of this so called, "stylistic improvement"! For if this was a wilful change to "improve the flow" of the text, it actually became a wilful change causing confusion, and so inhibiting the reader's flow of understanding when considering this text!

The representative Byzantine reading has strong support in both the Greek and Latin, no good textual argument against it, and the further support of the ancient church father and doctor, St. Jerome. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:9 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:9, "was sorry: nevertheless," in the words, "the king was sorry: nevertheless for," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type); 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), Bohairic (3rd century), and Fayyumic (3rd century) Versions; as well as the Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the incorrect reading, "being sorry, the king for," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century), and Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere) and 700 (11th century, independent); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It may be also followed by the Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500), *supra*.

At Matt. 14:9, the erroneous reading found in the variant entered the main text of the NU Text *et al*. But with a major split in the two main Alexandrian texts, the NU Text Committee of the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions considered there was "some degree of doubt" about which of the two readings was correct, whereas the NU Text Committee of the UBS 4th revised edition (1993) considered that their preferred reading in "the text is almost certain." Such are the fluctuations in thinking among these religiously liberal neo-Alexandrians, who do not believe in the Divine authority of the Word, much less in its Divine preservation.

This uncertainty also appears to be reflected in neo-Alexandrian versions. Though the matter is complicated by the general lack of literalness in most neo-Alexandrian versions, most of them nevertheless appear to disagree with the preferences of the neo-Alexandrian texts for *Codex Vaticanus*, *supra*, and follow instead *Codex Sinaiticus*, whose reading is referred to in footnotes of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS editions, *supra*, and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993). Such diversity of opinion is certainly inside the limits of neo-Alexandrian normativity and allows neo-Alexandrians to show what they think of as "independence of thought."

Thus in harmony with the correct reading which is found in London Sinaiticus, the American Standard Version reads at Matt. 14:9, "the (*o*, word 2) king (*basileus*, word 3) was grieved (*elupethe*, 'he was grieved,' word 1a); but (*de*, word 5) for (*dia*, word 4)," in the wider words (not showing "it" in italics as added), "And the king was grieved; but for the sake of his oaths, and of them that sat at meat with him, he commanded it to be given" (ASV). So too, this reading appears to be followed in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. But is this simply because they are following the correct reading of London Sinaiticus, or is this because they are following the incorrect reading of Rome Vaticanus but they are not sufficiently literal for the reader to detect the difference?

Either way, we have a clear instance of the variant being followed in the more literal translation of the NASB at Matt. 14:9. Though the NASB's 3rd edition gratuitously removes the "And (*kai*)," of its 1st & 2nd editions; the NASB nevertheless more literally follows the variant's reading found in the main text of the NU Text *et al*. The NASB (3rd ed.) reads, "Although he was grieved (*lupetheis*, word 1b), the (*o*, word 2) king (*basileus*, word 3) … because of (*dia*, word 4, made to work double-time in the NASB's rendering)," in the wider words (with "it" in italics as added), "Although he was grieved, the king commanded *it* to be given because of his oaths, and because of his dinner guests" (NASB).

Matt. 14:12a "the body" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources the reading of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century), "*corpus* (body) *eius* (of him)," could be, and probably is, a Diatessaron format conflation of Matt. 14:12 and Mark 6:29, since while the Vulgate reads "*corpus* (body)" at Matt. 14:12, it reads "*corpus* (body) *eius* (his)" at Mark 6:29. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources the same reading rendered from the Arabic in Ciasca's Latin as, "*corpus* (body) *eius* (his)," presents the same problem. Therefore no

reference is made to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), *infra*.

With regard to two old Latin Versions from Africa, I take the "*cataver*" of k and "*cadaber*" of e, to be forms of the Latin, "*cadaver* (corpse)," from which we get our English word, "cadaver," a term used especially in medical science with regard to a dead body used for dissection. I base this conclusion on the general context of these old Latin Versions, and their clear similarity to "*cadaver* (corpse)."

In doing so, I also note that in Hebrew there is fluidity between the second letter of the alphabet (ב), beth (pointed) and veth (unpointed), like the Latin form "*cadaver*" becoming old Latin e's "*cadaber*;" and either this or similar dynamics in some other language, may account for a local dialect's change of this letter in the Latin of old Latin version e from North Africa. Such diversity is also reflected in the fact that the sixth letter of the Hebrew alphabet, the *vav* (*vau* / ו) of Hebrew "David," is transliterated into English as a "v," whereas *one* form of transliteration into Greek is with a "b" (beta / β), i.e., *Dabid*[82].

Likewise, the Greek, *Petros* (Peter) might be rendered as Latin, *Petros* or *Pedros* (Peter), seen also in the *Pedro* of the Latin language of Spanish, derived from the Latin, *Petrus*. Thus some similar type of dynamics for "t" and "d" might be operating in some language known by the African scribe, or possibly regarded by him as an internal variation allowed in the Latin. This may account for the difference between the Latin form "*cadaver*" with "*cataver*" in old Latin version k from North Africa.

Alternatively, "*cataver*" (old Latin k) and "*cadaber*" (old Latin e), may have been scribal misspellings; or possibly copyist's errors from an unusual looking "d (δ)" that was confused with a "t (τ)" e.g., one that had a partial paper fade on the left-hand side of the bottom loop of the "δ." But these seem less likely possibilities both due to the historical transliterations, *supra*, which reflect a slightly different nuance in different men's ears that can account for these changes in other languages or dialects besides the one's isolated, *supra*. A spelling mistake also seems unlikely since more generally old Latin versions e and k do not contain such spelling mistakes.

Were these scribal misspellings? Or in the case of old Latin k, scribal miscopying of an unusual looking "d" that became a "t"? Or were these the vocalized pronunciations of a local dialect, and if so, are these local Africanized Latin spellings, or are they some other regionalized spellings used more widely than Africa? I am not dogmatic on the matter, and admit that I simply do not know. Whatever the origins, I consider they clearly seem to be forms of "*cadaver*." (Cf. old Latin k in preliminary textual discussion at Matt. 14:12b, *infra*.)

I also take the opportunities provided by this reading and its variants to itemize some

---

[82] Others refer to this Hebrew letter as "waw," and *one* form of transliteration into Greek is with a "u" (upsilon), i.e., *Dauid*. (See Vol. 1 Appendices, "Primary & Secondary Rules of Neo-Byzantine Textual Analysis," & Appendix 2, on Matt. 1:1,6).

of the Latin Vulgate jewels in the Latin textual tradition, not generally so itemized in this commentary. The Latin Vulgate Codices, *infra*, are drawn from Merk's *Novum Testamentum*, Greek & Latin (9th ed., 1964).

Both Tischendorf's 8th edition and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition are confident one can state that certain Syriac and Egyptian Versions support either Greek, "*soma* ('body' / 'corpse')" or "*ptoma* ('body' / 'corpse')." Though I am not familiar with the Syriac and Egyptian (outside the closed class of sources), I am familiar with the Greek (inside the closed class of sources). I would not be confident that two such similar Greek words could be safely distinguished in a second language, and so I make no reference to these versions in the section dealing with transmission history outside the closed class of sources. This same factor also affects my treatment of the Latin inside the closed class of sources.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:12a, the TR's Greek, "*to* (the) *soma* ('body' or 'corpse')," i.e., "the body," in the words, "and took up the body" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), E 07 (8th century), F 09 (9th century), S 028 (10th century), and Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). The TR's construction (like *Variant 2's* construction, *infra*), is further supported by the Latin, "*corpus* ('the body' or 'the corpse')," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century); and as Latin, "*cadaver* ('corpse' or 'dead body')," in old Latin Versions k (Latin, '*cataver*,' 4th / 5th centuries) and e (Latin, '*cadaber*,' 4th / 5th century). It is also supported by Vulgate Codices P (Perusinus L, Perugia, 6th century), M (Mediolanensis, Gospels, Milan, 6th century), Z (Harleianus, Gospels, London, 6th / 7th century), I (Ingolstadiensis, Gospels, Munich, 7th century), O (Oxoniensis Gospels, Oxford, 7th century), X (Cantabrigiensis, Gospels, Cambridge, 7th century), A (Amiatinus, Firenze, 7th / 8th century), L (Lichfildensis Mt-L3, Lichfield, 7th / 8th century), Be (Beneventanus Gospels, London, 8th century), Y (Lindisfarnensis, Gospels, London, 8th century), B (Bigotianus, Gospels, Paris, 8th / 9th century), Gat (Gatianus, Gospels, Paris, 8th / 9th century), C (Cavensis, La Cava, 9th century), V (Vallicellanus, Italian Rome, 9th century), and H (Herbertianus, London, 9th / 10th century).

However, an alternative reading (*Variant 1*), "*ptoma* ('corpse' or 'body') *autou* (of him)," i.e., "his body," is a minority Byzantine reading. It is followed by Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). *Variant 1's* construction (like *Variant 3's* construction, *infra*), is also followed as Latin, "*corpus* (body) *eius* (of him)," in old Latin Versions d (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th century / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is further found in Vulgate Codices J (Foroiuliensis, Gospels, Cividale, 6th / 7th century), Q (Kenanensis, Gospels, Dublin, 7th / 8th century), D (Dublinensis, Dublin, 8th / 9th century), E (Egertonensis, Gospels, London, 8th / 9th century), Ep (Epternacensis, Paris, 9th century), Ma (Martini-Turonensis, Gospels, Tours, 8th century), T (Toletanus, Madrid, 8th century), R (Rushworthianus, Gospels, Oxford, 8th / 9th century), K (Karolinus, London, 9th century), Th (Theodulfianus, Paris, 9th century), and W (Willelmi, London, 1245 A.D.). From the Latin support for *Variant 1* (and / or *Variant 3*, *infra*), this reading is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Greek

reading, which is thus correct. The origins of the variant are speculative. Was this an accidental alteration? If due to a paper fade, the original "*to soma*" with a stylistic paper space between the "*o*" (omicron) of "*to*" and "*s*" (sigma) of "*soma*," coming at the end of a line looked something like, "*to*:::*oma*:::", it may have been "reconstructed" by a scribe as "*ptoma* ('corpse' or 'body') *autou* (of him)," from the presence of these words at Mark 6:29. Alternatively, it may have been a deliberate assimilation to Mark 6:29 for "the sake of" what a scribe wrongly considered to be "clarity" or "consistency." An accidental or deliberate change? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that it is not original.

The representative Byzantine stands as a natural rendering of the Greek, has the overwhelming support of the Byzantine Greek textual tradition, and its basic construction (like that of *Variant 2*, *infra*), is supported by a strong Latin textual tradition dating from ancient times. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:12a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:12a, Greek, "*to* (the) *soma* ('body' or 'corpse')," is found in (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 1071 (independent, 12th century) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, is "*ptoma* ('corpse' or 'body')." This same construction is supported in the same Latin mentioned for the TR, *supra*. I.e., one cannot distinguish between the TR and *Variant 2* in the Latin. *Variant 2* is found in this Greek form in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 788 (11th century, independent), 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent).

Variant 1, "*ptoma* ('corpse' or 'body') *autou* (his)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (independent text) Minuscule 565 (9th century).

Another reading, *Variant 3*, is "*to* (the) *soma* ('body' or 'corpse') *autou* (his)." This same construction is supported in the same Latin mentioned for *Variant 1*, *supra*. I.e., one cannot distinguish between *Variant 1* and *Variant 3* in the Latin. *Variant 3* is found in this Greek form in Minuscule 157 (independent, 12th century).

At Matt. 14:12a, the incorrect *Variant 2* entered the NU Text *et al*. Both Variant 2's "*ptoma* ('corpse' or 'body')" and the TR's "*to* (the) *soma* ('body' or 'corpse')," may be rendered the same. Hence the rendering of e.g., "the corpse" (ASV), like the renderings of the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV, are not discernibly different in the English, even though

the underpinning Greek is surely the erroneous *Variant 2* rather than the *Textus Receptus*. One cannot discern any difference in the English between *Variants 1 & 3*, which both translate as "his body" or "his corpse." Nevertheless, it is surely *Variant 1*, with the support of Rome Vaticanus *et al*, that is being followed by the NIV.

Matt. 14:12b "it" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

As per the preliminary textual discussion on old Latin k at Matt. 14:12a, *supra*, old Latin version k once again appears to be using "t" for "d," and so I take its "illut" to equate "illud (it)."

Inside the closed class of sources the reading of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century), "*illud* ('that [thing],' could be, though in this instance probably is not, a Diatessaron format conflation of Matt. 14:12 and Mark 6:29, both of which use "*illud*." But due to this uncertainty, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*. Outside the closed class of sources the same reading translated from the Arabic in Ciasca's Latin as, "*illud*," presents the same problem. Thus likewise no reference is made to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:12b, the TR's Greek, "*auto* ('it,' accusative singular neuter, 3rd person pronoun, from *autos*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine Text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*illud* ('that [thing],' accusative singular neuter, demonstrative pronoun from *ille-illa-illud* i.e., 'it') in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), k (Latin, "*illut*," 4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th century / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However an alternative reading, which on reconstruction of the Greek from the Latin would be Greek, "*auton* ('him,' accusative singular masculine, 3rd person pronoun, from *autos*)," is a minority Latin reading. The variant reading, Latin, "*illum* ('that [one],' accusative singular masculine, demonstrative pronoun from *ille-illa-illud* i.e., 'him')," is found in old Latin Version a (4th century); and Latin, "*eum* ('him,' accusative singular masculine, demonstrative pronoun from *is-ea-id*)," is found in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which here must stand, and manifest the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was it accidental? If its origins are from a Greek manuscript, then due to a paper loss the original "*auto*" may have looked something like, "*auto:*", and a scribe may have wrongly concluded that a letter was lost when it was not, and so "reconstructed" this as "*auton*." If so, the scribe was possibly influenced by the nearby "*auton*" of Matt. 14:5. If its origins are from a Latin manuscript, then due to a paper fade the Latin, "*illud*" may have looked something like "*illu:*", and been "reconstructed" by a Latin

scribe in the tradition of old Latin version a, as "*illum*." If so, the scribe was possibly influenced by the nearby "*illum*" of Matt. 14:5. Possibly another paper fade of "*illum*" as "*:::um*", or either "*illum*" or "*illud*" as "*:::u:*", led a scribe in the old Latin ff1 tradition to "reconstruct" this as "*eum*." If so, the scribe was possibly influenced by the nearby usage of "*eum*" in Matt. 14:3,5,13,15,22,26 *et al*. Alternatively, this might have been a deliberate "stylistic improvement" changing the neuter "it" to the masculine "him." Possibly this was influenced by a belief that referring to St. John Baptist's dead body as "him" was "more respectful" than referring to it as "it."

Moreover, Greek, "*to* ('the,' neuter singular accusative, definite article from *o*) *s<u>o</u>ma* ('body' or 'corpse,' neuter singular accusative, noun from *s<u>o</u>ma*)," in Matt. 14:12b is in the neuter gender, and thus it conforms with the neuter gender of the TR's personal pronoun, "*auto* ('it')[83]. Such stylistic harmony seems more probable, with later inferior quality scribes thinking nothing of breaking such grammatical symmetry, and changing the personal pronoun to the masculine gender. *Those who alter the Word of God always debase it.*

The representative Byzantine reading has no good textual argument against it, and indeed it has a reasonable textual argument in its favour in terms of the grammatical concord in the neuter gender of the noun, "body (*s<u>o</u>ma*)," and the matching neuter gender of the personal pronoun, "it (*auto*)." With strong support in both the Greek and Latin textual traditions inside the closed class of sources, the reading of the *Textus Receptus* stands sure. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:12b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:12b, "it," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century); 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*; as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century).

However, the incorrect reading, "him," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15). It is also found in some manuscripts of the Bohairic Version.

---

[83] This same argument applies even if one is following the Matt. 14:12a's Variant 1, *supra*, "*pt<u>o</u>ma* ('corpse' or 'body,' neuter singular accusative, noun from *pt<u>o</u>ma*)."

The incorrect reading with footnotes showing the TR's reading, entered the main text of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and without any footnote showing the TR's reading, it entered the Westcott-Hort text (1881). But the neo-Alexandrian texts are like a rubber bouncing ball, and we cannot be sure which way they will spin and bounce over time. The lack of much manuscript support outside the two leading Alexandrian texts, posed no concerns for Westcott and Hort, raised some secondary concerns for Tischendorf and Nestle's 21st edition, and some primary concerns for the contemporary NU Text. And so it was, that in time the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) made their main text reading, "*auto[n]*," indicating by these square brackets that the inclusion or omission of the final "n" (Greek letter, nu) is optional. I.e., one can read it as either "it (*auto*)" or "him (*auton*)," depending on one's fancy.

This neo-Alexandrian text uncertainty is also reflected in diverse readings in the neo-Alexandrian versions. On the one hand, the incorrect reading entered the American Standard Version, which at Matt. 14:12 reads, "And his disciples came, and took up the corpse, and buried him (*auton*)" (ASV). The erroneous reading is likewise followed by Moffatt, whose erratic mind was not on this occasion influenced by the presence of the correct reading in the Western Text's D 05. He thus reads, "His disciples came and removed the corpse and buried him (*auton*)" (Moffatt Bible). But on the other hand, the correct reading is found in the NASB (although the NASB's 2nd ed. has a footnote giving the erroneous reading as an alternative), RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. We cannot be certain as to which way neo-Alexandrian critical texts and versions will twist and spin on Matt. 12:14b in the future, but we can be sure that the Received Text and our Authorized Versions will continue to have the correct reading.

Matt. 14:14a "Jesus" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Received Text reads Greek, "*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," i.e., "Jesus" in "*kai* ('And,' word 1) *exelthon* ('going forth,' word 2) *o* ('the,' untranslated in English, word 3) *Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 4) *eide* ('saw,' word 5) *polun* ('great,' word 6) *ochlon* ('a multitude, word 7)," i.e., "And Jesus went forth, and saw a great multitude" etc. (AV). But in both Lectionaries 2378 and 1968 the reading of Matt. 14:14-22 commences at "and saw a great multitude," so that "*o* ('-'word 3) *Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 4) is moved to after "*polun* ('great,' word 6)," and "*Iesous*" is abbreviated to "ıc" with a bar on top. I.e., "And Jesus saw a great multitude" etc. .

Given that the rearranged word order of 5,2,3,6,7 reflects Lectionary formatting, I show both Lectionaries supporting the Received Text's reading, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:14a, the Received Text's Greek, "*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," i.e., "Jesus," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*Iesus*," in old Latin Versions h (5th century), f (6th century), and q (6th century / 7th century). It is further supported by the

ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

However, these Greek words are omitted in a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 219 (13th century). They are also omitted in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), k (4th / 5th centuries), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this omission, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct. The origins of the variant are speculative. "*O IHCOYC* (Jesus)" may well have been written in continuous script and in an abbreviated form as in Manuscript Washington (W 032), as "*OIC*" (with a bar over the "*IC*"). In the one-way slide of loss from manuscripts due to paper fades that could not be detected, the loss of these three letters by this means may have given rise to its accidental omission. Alternatively, a scribe may have considered that the presence of "*O IHCOYC* (or *o Iesous*, 'Jesus')" in Matt. 13:13, made the repetition of "*O IHCOYC*" in Matt. 13:14 "superfluous," "unnecessary," "and redundant," and so may have deliberately removed it as a "stylistic improvement" creating "a more succinct" text. A deliberate or accidental omission? We do not know. We only know for sure that this change was made.

The reading of the representative Byzantine text has solid support from the Greek, and some ancient support from an old Latin version and an ancient Greek writer. Notwithstanding its omission in the representative Latin text, these factors act to give a reading such as this which has no good textual argument against it, a very high degree of probability. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:14a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:14a, "Jesus," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 067 (6th century, Matt. 14; 24-26), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century[84]), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions.

However the incorrect reading which omits, "Jesus," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). The omission is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent); as well as

[84] Though found in L 019 after, not before "*eiden* (he saw)" as in the TR, this may be due to an initial accidental omission, followed by an immediate correction, or a deliberate scribal "stylistic improvement" of the word order.

the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in all extant Egyptian Coptic Versions e.g., the Bohairic Version (3rd century); Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Version; the Armenian Version (5th century); and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al.* Hence the erroneous reading is found at Matt. 14:14a in the ASV as, "And he came forth." It is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV; all of which refuse to give a literal rendering of the Greek "went forth" (AV), or "came forth" (ASV), or more literally, "going forth." This is Greek *exelthon*, a participle from *exerchomai* which is given a non-literal and unwarranted rendering in e.g., the NASB's 2nd & 3rd editions as the dynamic equivalent, "went ashore" (NASB 3rd ed.), altering a more literal rendering in the NASB's 1st edition. In this they follow the bad example of Moffatt who rendered this as, "So when he disembarked" (Moffatt Bible). By contrast, perhaps influenced by the Syriac Pesitto and Harclean Versions, the correct reading is found in the NIV.

Matt. 14:15a "his disciples" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Outside the closed class of sources, *prima facie* Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron follows the TR's reading, rendered in Ciasca's Latin translation, as "*discipuli* (the disciples) *eius* (his)." But it is also possible that due to its Diatessaron format, the underpinning Arabic brought the "his" over from Mark 6:35. Therefore no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:15a the TR's Greek, "*oi* (-) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (of him)," i.e., "his disciples," in the words, "his disciples came to him" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*discipuli* (the disciples) *eius* (of him)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th century / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, in a variant reading, Greek, "*autou* (of him)," is omitted, i.e., thus reading, "*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples)," i.e., "the disciples." This is omitted in old Latin Versions k (4th / 5th centuries) and b (5th century). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are speculative. Was this an accidental omission due to an undetected paper fade? Or was this a deliberate "stylistic improvement," if so, probably originating with Origen who refers to both readings? Did Origen regard "*autou* (his)" in Matt. 14:15a as "redundant" on the basis that reference is made shortly before in Matt. 14:12 to "*oi* (-) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (of him)," and so the reader "is already aware" that these are "his" disciples? (Cf. commentary on Origen at Matt. 14:15b, *infra*.) An accidental or deliberate omission? We cannot be sure. We can only be sure that it constituted a change to the Received Text.

The representative Byzantine reading is well supported in both of the main Biblical languages relevant to New Testament textual studies, Greek and Latin. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:15a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:15a, "his" in the words, "his disciples," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is additionally the most probable reading of (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in all extant Syriac versions; the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the incorrect reading which omits "his," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also the most probable reading of (the independent text type) Z 035 (6th century), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and 346 (12th century, independent). It is also found in the Armenian Version (5th century).

From such sources, the incorrect reading entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 14:15a. So poorly attested to a reading finds sympathy with the benighted neo-Alexandrians in part because it is the shorter reader, and in part because it can be found in Mark 6:35, from which it is assumed without evidence that it was "conflated." How sad that so many of the tertiary institutions of learning put so high a premium on ignorance, that they suffer such fools gladly, and generally keep the wise man out of their teaching precincts. Sadder still, so

many in the churches also suffer these fools gladly, using and promoting their neo-Alexandrian Bible versions. Hence the ASV reads, "the disciples came to him." The erroneous reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, and Moffatt Bible.

Matt. 14:15b "send" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. I do not doubt that in St. Matthew's Gospel most Latin scribes would agree with the great St. Jerome and usually render the Greek conjunction, "*oun* (therefore)" with the Latin adverb, "*ergo* (therefore)" (Matt. 1:17; 3:8; 5:19; 6:2; 7:11; 9:38; 10:16; 13:18; 17:10; 18:4; 19:6; 22:9; 23:3; 24:15; 26:54; 27:17; 28:19), even if occasionally something else was used e.g., "*itaque* (therefore)" (Matt. 25:13). Certainly most old Latin Versions follow St. Jerome on most of these instances in St. Matthew's Gospel (Matt. 1:17; 7:11; 9:38; 10:16; 13:18; 17:10; 18:4; 22:9; 23:3; 26:54). However, most old Latin versions occasionally prefer the adverb "*itaque* (therefore)" (Matt. 19:6) or conjunction "*autem* (but / moreover)" (Matt. 27:17); sometimes the old Latin versions divide fairly evenly between Jerome's rendering of Greek *oun* as Latin *ergo* and another such as the adverb "*nunc* (now)" (Matt. 28:19); and the odd old Latin Version may occasionally prefer elsewhere "*itaque* (therefore)" (Matt. 9:38 in a; Matt. 9:38; 23:9 in k), or "*autem* (but)" (Matt. 1:17;3:8; in old Latin k; Matt. 24:15 in old Latin l; Matt. 13:18 in old Latin e) or the conjunction "*igitur* (therefore)" (Matt. 6:2 in k)

It is notable that in this analytical survey, the African scribe(s) of old Latin k shows the greatest departure from Jerome's usage. While the Latin, "*et*," more closely equates the Greek, "*kai*" than the Greek, "*oun*," and *et* (Latin) or *kai* (Greek) is stereotypically rendered, "and," "even," "also;" depending on the writer, there are varying degrees of elasticity in these words (the Greek *kai* being very elastic). Therefore, since the Latin, "*et demitte*," *infra*, of old Latin k seemingly uses the "*et*" with this same type of wider meaning as found in the variant's Greek, "*oun*," on this particular occasion (though not necessarily on another,) it appears to reflect the Latin rendering of a scribe taking a more elastic view of the Latin, "*et*." Therefore I show old Latin k in support of the variant.

No doubt many would criticize this Latin scribe of old Latin k, as having made a poor choice in his usage of *et*, exhibiting an over-looseness and lack of requisite precision in his rendering of the Greek *oun* as Latin *et*. I would agree with such persons. Nevertheless, the primary issue is not what *should* this Latin scribe have done, but what *did* this Latin scribe do? Though it is also possible to argue that he may have had another aberrant Greek text that used the Greek *kai* here, what little evidence we have for a Greek variant at this place points exclusively to *oun* which I think is therefore the more probable reconstruction of what happened. But if, good Christian reader, you find yourself disagreeing with me, and think that this indicates the existence of a third variant, whether coming from the Greek as a *kai* or *de*, or possibly just as a Latin variant, then we can surely live with such scholastic differences of opinion. If in fact old Latin k does not support this variant, it merely acts to further reduce the already very weak support for this aberrant reading.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century), reads Latin, "*dimitte* (send)." But this is a Vulgate Codex, and due to its Diatessaron format this may be derived from the Vulgate's

reading at Matt. 14:15b or Mark 6:36 or Luke 9:12, or some combination thereof. Therefore no reference is made to it, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) presents the same issue with respect to the Arabic underpinning its rendering in Ciasca's Latin as, "*dimitte* (send)." Thus once again, no reference is made to it, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:15b the TR's Greek, "*apoluson* ('sendest thou,' imperative active first aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *apoluo*)," i.e., "send" in the words, "send the multitude away" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*dimitte* ('sendest thou,' imperative active present, 2nd person singular verb, from *dimitto*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th century / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin, "*demitte* ('sendest thou,' imperative active present, 2nd person singular verb, from *demitto*)," in old Latin Version f (6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

However, a variant adds Greek, "*oun* ('therefore,' 'so,' etc.)" after "*apoluson* (send)" i.e., "Therefore send the multitude away." Though the matter is open to debate, I think this reading is probably supported by the Latin "*et*" of a sometimes imprecise, vague and woolly Latin scribe of north Africa in old Latin Version k (4th / 5th centuries) (see Preliminary Textual Discussion, *supra*). It is certainly supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text, which is thus correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was it accidental? It is possible that a scribe looking at the "*on*" ending of "*apoluson* (send)," and the "*ous*" ending of the next word, "*tous* ('the,' of 'the multitude')," became befuddled in his mind, and jumbling up these letters in his head, inserted, "*oun*." If so, the scribe would have had to be suffering from great fatigue, and probably working by a flickering candle-light at night. Alternatively, this may have been a deliberate "stylistic improvement," if so, probably by Origen, who refers to both readings. (Cf. commentary on Origen at Matt. 14:15a, *supra*.) If so, Origen possibly thought that the imperative, "send the multitude away," was "just too abrupt," and "needed to be more smoothly linked with the preceding clause," and hence the addition of "*oun*." If so, I disagree, and think the lack of such a conjunction with the imperative "send" here makes for a more stylistically pointed and preferable reading. Was this an accidental or deliberate change in the text? Probably the latter, but possibly the former.

Despite some unsustainable possible objections from Origen, *supra*, there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is well supported by the Greek and Latin. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:15b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high

level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:15b, "send," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (*Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*, 5th century, Cambridge University, UK). It is further found in (the independent text type) Codex 067 (6th century, Matt. 14; 24-26), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the main text of all extant Syriac versions e.g., the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and the Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century).

However, the incorrect reading adding "Therefore," i.e., "Therefore send," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); and (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century). It is further found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found as a marginal reading in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century).

With the two major Alexandrian texts split down the middle at Matt. 14:15b, and both showing external support in the Syriac and Egyptian Coptic versions, neo-Alexandrians have a splitting headache over which reading to follow. The discover of *Codex Sinaiticus*, Tischendorf, generally preferred it over *Codex Vaticanus* in such instances, and he here normatively chose to follow his prized text, and so included the variant's Greek, "*oun*" in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), albeit showing the TR's reading in his comprehensive footnotes. But in general Westcott & Hort preferred *Codex Vaticanus* over *Codex Sinaiticus* in such instances, and they here normatively chose to put this reading of their so called "neutral" text of Rome Vaticanus in their main text, and hence on this occasion, for the wrong reason, they fluked what is the right reading, though they also gave a footnote (really a sidenote) showing the variant in Westcott-Hort (1881). But then Erwin Nestle (the son of Eberhard Nestle, originator of Nestle's 1st ed., 1898,) decided to jump back the other way, and follow Tischendorf over Westcott-Hort so that the "*oun*" reappears in the main text of Nestle's 21st edition (1952), albeit with a footnote showing the TR's reading. But then the NU Text Committee decided to jump back the other way again, and follow Westcott-Hort over Tischendorf and Erwin Nestle, so that the correct reading is found in Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) with a footnote showing the variant and in UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) with no footnote showing the variant. *With all this jumping about, it looks as though*

the neo-Alexandrians have gotten ants in their pants!

What were the neo-Alexandrian versions to make of such constant vacillations? Most would slip and slide towards neo-Alexandrian flawed first principles, and so go for *the shorter reading*. Thus by a fluke, on this occasion the correct reading is found at Matt. 14:15b, "send the multitudes away" (ASV), in the ASV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. No doubt influenced by its presence in the Western Text, for the wrong reasons, Moffatt also adopted the right reading, "send off the crowds" (Moffatt Bible). But that splitting neo-Alexandrian headache would not go away. The NASB translators, together with the Roman Catholic translators of the JB and NJB would slip and slide in the other direction, thinking that Tischendorf and Nestle were right, *supra*. After all, does not Origen, albeit not consistently, and the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version also follow the same variant reading as London Sinaiticus? And so it was that the incorrect reading entered e.g., the *New American Standard Bible* as, "so (*oun*) send" (NASB).

Matt. 14:16 "Jesus" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Outside the closed class of sources, *prima facie* Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron follows the variant's reading, rendered in Ciasca's Latin translation, as "*At* (But) *ille* ('that [one]' = 'he') *dixit* (he said) *eis* (unto them)" i.e., "But he said unto them." But it is also possible that due to its Diatessaron format, the underpinning Arabic pruned away the "Jesus" of Matt. 14:16 as part of the assimilation of the reading with Mark 6:37 and Luke 9:13. Therefore no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:16 the TR's Greek, "*Iesous* (Jesus)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and P 024 (6th century); and Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and (abbreviated as "ις" with a line over the last letter,) Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*Iesus* (Jesus)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th century / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); or as Latin, "*Ihesus* (Jesus)" in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested as, "*Iesus*," in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, it is omitted in the Latin reading, "*Ille* ('that [one],' masculine singular nominative pronoun, from *ille*)" i.e., "he," found in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century) and k (4th / 5th centuries); and also in the Latin reading, "*Qui* ('who,' masculine singular nominative pronoun, from *qui*)," found in old Latin Version d (5th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. The origins of the variant are speculative. Was this an accidental omission due to an undetected paper fade? In the upper case letters (unicals) of Codex W 032, "*IHCOYC* (*Iesous*)," is abbreviated as "*IC*" (with a line over the top of these letters

signifying abbreviation). Thus a paper fade may have occurred of these two letters. Was this a deliberate omission? Did a scribe consider that "a smoother transition" into Matt. 14:16 from Matt. 14:15 required that "the unnecessary repetition" of Jesus' name from Matt. 14:14 be pruned away as a "stylistic improvement"?

With no good textual argument against it, and the inclusion of "Jesus" strongly attested to in both the Greek and Latin, we cannot doubt the accuracy of this reading. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:16 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:16, "Jesus," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 067 (6th century, Matt. 14; 24-26), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent); together with the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; the Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); and Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

However, the incorrect reading which omits "Jesus," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also the most probable reading of (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is further found in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The split in the two major Alexandrian texts, both of which are followed by some Syriac and Egyptian versions, has acted to put a painful split among the neo-Alexandrians at Matt. 14:16. First, Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) confidently declared that the Alexandrian text he generally preferred, *Codex Sinaiticus*, was the correct one, and so he supported the omission. Then Westcott-Hort (1881) gave an unqualified rejection of Tischendorf by declaring that the "neutral" Alexandrian text they generally preferred, *Codex Vaticanus* was the correct one, and so they gave no footnote alternative. Then Erwin Nestle agreed with Westcott-Hort in following *Codex Vaticanus*, but gave a footnote alternative

showing the TR's reading as here followed by *Codex Sinaiticus* in Nestle's 21st edition (1952). The NU Text Committee looked at the matter, and were baffled by the disagreement, and so in Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) they included "*Iesous* (Jesus)," in square brackets, i.e., making its inclusion or omission entirely optional.

With the matter up in the air, most neo-Alexandrian versions have adopted the correct reading. Thus at Matt. 14:16, the ASV correctly reads, "But Jesus said unto them." The correct reading is also followed by the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. However the omission of "Jesus" found in the incorrect reading was adopted by the *New English Bible* (1961-1970). Given such textual uncertainties in the neo-Alexandrian texts, we cannot be sure if at some point in the future another of the neo-Alexandrian versions will agree with the NEB, and so follow Tischendorf and the NU Text option of adopting the incorrect reading. The precedent of omission has already been set by Tischendorf and the NEB. In future neo-Alexandrian texts or versions, *Watch this space!*

Matt. 14:19c "and" (TR & AV) {C}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Pierpont in the von Soden (1913) based Green's Majority Text Apparatus (1986) says 95-100% of all manuscripts follow the majority Byzantine reading i.e., the variant which omits "*kai*" / "and," *infra*. Thus less than 5% of all Greek manuscripts here support the minority Byzantine reading of the *Textus Receptus* (TR). As part of a wider a feature of this Revised Volume 1, I have gone through von Soden for a number of minority Byzantine readings of the TR. While von Soden's generalist approach means he may have left a relatively small number of manuscripts supporting this reading out of his textual apparatus, e.g., he does not here include reference to W 032, having on this occasion here at Matt. 14:19c looked at von Soden directly, I would concur with Pierpont's calculation.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, due to Diatessaron formatting the reading of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron at Matt. 14:19c is so conflated with Luke 9:16 that it cannot be used for the relevant textual purposes of Matt. 14:19c. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Unfortunately I have not been able to inspect X 033 or a facsimile of it, and so my understanding of this manuscript's possible, though uncertain support for the TR's reading, must rest on the assessment of Tischendorf (Tischendorf's 8th edition, 1869-72).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:19c, the TR's Greek, "*kai* (and) *labon* (taking)," i.e., "and took" in the words, "and took the five loaves," is a minority Byzantine reading found in *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53, Washington, D.C., USA); and Minuscules 2 (12th century, Basel, Switzerland), 245 (12th century, Moscow, Russia), 485 (12th century, British Library, London, UK), and 1010 (12th century, Athos, Greece). It is a possible reading of *Codex Monacensis* (X 033, 10th century, Munich, Germany), although the manuscript's lack of clarity makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is further supported as Latin, "*et* (and)," in *Codex Bobiensis* (old Latin Version

k, 4th / 5th centuries, Turin, Italy), *Codex Claromontanus* (old Latin Version h, 5th century, Vatican City State, Rome), *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff1, 10th / 11th century, St. Matthew, St. Petersburg, Russia). It is also manifested in the Greek *Novum Testamentum* (New Testament) editions of e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

The Greek, "*kai* (and)," is omitted before the "*labon* (taking)," in the majority Byzantine reading e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). As the Latin, "*et* (and)," it is further omitted in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

However, there is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading. When the participle "*labon* (taking)," is used in a clause without an immediate qualification within one or two words so as to indicate that a new clause has commenced, then it may in some instances, of which this is one, easily be confused with the preceding clause. Thus the reader or listener first misunderstands the application of "*labon* (taking)," and if reading it then has to go back and correct himself as to its meaning. Matthean Greek always includes stylistic measures to prevent this problem from occurring when "*labon* (taking)" is used.

Let us first consider this matter with regard to two types of Matthean Greek clause constructions using "*labon* ('taking,' masculine singular nominative, active second aorist participle, from *lambano*)."

Type 1, is where the absence of qualification before the "*labon* (taking)" acts to make a smooth application of "*labon* (taking)" to that which precedes it, but then this is immediately followed by a stylistic breaker that prevents "*labon* (taking)" being applied to that which comes after it. This type is found in Matt. 25:16. Here we read, "*de* (then) *o* ('the [one],' masculine, i.e., 'he') *ta* (the) *pente* (five) *talanta* (talents) *labon* (receiving) *eirgasato* ('he worked,' or 'he traded') *en* (with) *autois* (them)." Here the 3rd person singular form of "*eirgasato* ('he traded,' indicative middle aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *ergazomai*, using the aorist form of *eirgasamen*)" i.e., "*he* traded" acts as a stylistic break to prevent application of "*labon* (receiving)" any further. By contrast, the absence of any such qualification before "*labon* (receiving)" means that this participle flows freely from the previous words. Hence its natural meaning in Greek sounding English is, "Then he the five talents receiving, he traded with them," or in better English, "Then he that had received the five talents went and traded with the same" etc. (AV).

Type 2 is where a grammatical stylistic breaker near "*labon* (taking)," prevents the reader from accidentally applying this participle to that which preceded it. This takes three forms.

Type 2a). The clause is most likely finished before the "*labon* (taking)," and to prevent any possible confusion, it is followed by a qualification shortly after "*labon* (taking)" making it clear that this is applying to a subsequent clause. This type is found at Matt. 27:24. This reads, "*Idon* (seeing) *de* (-) *Pilatos* (Pilate) *oti* (that) *ouden* (nothing) *ophelei* ('it

prevails,' or 'prevail,' AV, indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *ophelеo*), *alla* (but) *mallon* (rather) *thorubos* (a tumult) *ginetai* ('it be made,' or 'was made,' AV, indicative middle present, 3rd person singular verb, from *ginomai*), *labon* (taking) *udor* (water) *apenipsato* ('he washed,' indicative middle aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *aponiptо*) *tas* (the) *cheiras* (hands)" etc. . Here the established use of a 3rd person singular to end the clause, "Pilate seeing that he could nothing *prevail* (*ophelei*)," then followed by a similar use of a 3rd person singular to end the clause, "but rather a tumult *was made* (*ginetai*)," creates a *prima facie* expectation that the second clause ends with "was made (*ginetai*)." This is then quickly confirmed by the fact that two words later following the "*labon* (taking)," there is a 3rd person singular verb, "*he* washed" clearly referring back to the "*labon* (taking)," so it is quickly apparent that this is a third clause, "he took the water" etc. .

Type 2b). There is first a clearly finished grammatical clause before the "*labon* (taking)," so that the following "*labon* (taking)" must apply to a subsequent clause. This type is found in Matt. 26:26. This reads in English, "He said unto him, Thou hast said. And as they were eating, Jesus took (*labon*) bread" etc. (AV). This reads in the Greek from the end of Matt. 26:25, "*Legei* ('He says' or 'He said,' AV, i.e., Judas said,) *auto* (unto him), *Su* (Thou) *eipas* ('hast said,' indicative active aorist, 2nd person singular verb, from *lego*). *Esthionton* ('eating,' masculine plural genitive, active present participle, from *esthio*) *de* (and) *auton* (of them) [i.e., last 3 words = 'And as they were eating,' AV], *labon* (taking) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus) *ton* (the) *arton* (bread)," etc. . It is clear that the first clause ends with a second person *singular*, "thou (*eipas*)," and the next clause starts with a *plural* participle, "eating (*'Esthionton*)," and so there is a grammatical stylistic break. The next clause is then a complete statement, ending with a *plural*, "*auton* (of them)" with "And as they were eating (*'Esthionton de auton*)." The immediately following *singular*, "*labon* (taking)," thus clearly refers to another clause, and this is immediately confirmed by the (masculine singular nominative) definite article "*o* (the)" and proper noun, "*Iesous* (Jesus)," so that it is quickly clear that "*labon* (taking)" is referring to the third clause.

Type 2c). There is the introduction of a grammatical stylistic breaker with e.g., a preceding pronoun such as "*on* (which)" (Matt. 13:31) or "*ekeinon* (that)" (Matt. 17:27), which ensures "*labon* (taking)" is not applied to the clause before the grammatical break. In English, Matt. 13:31 reads, "which a man took" etc. (AV); and in Greek, Matt. 13:31 reads, "*on* (which) *labon* (taking) *anthropos* (a man)" etc. . Or in English, Matt. 17:27 reads, "that take" etc. (AV); and in Greek Matt. 17:27 reads, "*ekeinon* (that) *labon* (taking)" etc. .

Against this backdrop of Matthean Greek, let us now consider the representative Byzantine text reading of Matt. 14:19c. In English this reads, "And he commanded the multitude to sit down on the grass taking the five loaves and the two fishes and looking up into heaven he blessed" them etc. . In Greek this reads, "*Kai* (and) *keleusas* ('commanding,' masculine singular nominative, active first aorist participle, from *keleuo*) *tous* (the) *ochlous* ('multitude,' masculine plural accusative noun, from *ochlos*) *anaklithenai* ('to recline' i.e., 'to sit,' AV) *epi* (on) *tous* (the) *chortous* (grass)[85] *labon* ('taking,' singular) *tous* (the) *pente*

[85] Matt. 14:19a, "*epi* (on) *tous* (the) *chortous* (grass)," is discussed in Appendix 3 of this volume.

(five) *artous* (loaves) *kai* (and) *tous* (the) *duo* (two) *ichthuas* (fish) *anablepsas* ('looking up,' masculine singular nominative, active first aorist participle, from *anablepo*) *eis* (to) *ton* (-) *ouranon* (heaven) *eulognse* ('he blessed,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *eulogeo*)" them etc. .

The textual problem with this representative Byzantine reading is obvious enough. The transition from the plural "*ochlous* (multitude)" to the singular "*labon* (taking)" alerts the reader to the fact that this "taking" is referring back to the singular one who was "*keleusas* (commanding)," i.e., Christ. But the length of this clause, which first adds in "*tous* (the) *pente* (five) *artous* (loaves) *kai* (and) *tous* (the) *duo* (two) *ichthuas* (fish)," before finally coming to the masculine singular participle which must refer to Christ "*anablepsas* (looking up)," and which qualifies the "*tous* (the) *pente* (five) *artous* (loaves) *kai* (and) *tous* (the) *duo* (two) *ichthuas* (fish)" as referring to Christ who has taken them, leads to a long possible misinterpretation first. I.e., the reader or listener may first think that *Christ having already taken* "*tous* (the) *pente* (five) *artous* (loaves) *kai* (and) *tous* (the) *duo* (two) *ichthuas* (fish)," was "*keleusas* (commanding) *tous* (the) *ochlous* (multitude) *anaklithenai* (to sit) *epi* (on) *tous* (the) *chortous* (grass)," but then when he hears the masculine singular participle, "*anablepsas* (looking up)" followed by "*eis* (to) *ton* (-) *ouranon* (heaven)," with the 3rd person singular verb "*eulognse* (he blessed)" them etc., he realizes that in fact this means that after the multitude had sat down, Christ took the fish and loaves, and looking up to heaven, blessed them etc. .

This type of elongated qualification leading to confusion in understanding when "*labon* (taking)" is used, is definitely not Matthean Greek! Though permissible Greek from some writers, it clangs on the ears as sounding like something other than the sort of thing that St. Matthew would say. In the context of St. Matthew's Gospel, it simply cannot be correct. The only way to remedy this evident textual difficulty in the representative Byzantine text is to adopt the minority Greek Byzantine and minority old Latin reading, which reads, "*kai* (and) *labon* (taking)." This immediately brings Matt. 14:19c into Matthean Greek stylistic harmony with the type of grammatical stylistic breaker that St. Matthew uses at Matt. 13:31; 17:27 discussed as *Type 2c)*, *supra*. Moreover, in the immediate context of Matt. 14:19c, the conjunction *kai* is repeatedly used with, "*Kai* (and) *keleusas* (commanding)," or "*Kai* (and) *klasas* ('breaking,' or 'brake,' AV)," so that the usage of this common Matthean conjunction with "*kai* (and) *labon* (taking)" is harmonious with Matthean Greek both generally and in the immediate context of Matt. 14:19c.

The origins of the variant in the representative Byzantine text are conjectural. *Prima facie*, it may seem hard to believe that anyone would deliberately omit so necessary a "*kai* (and)" on the basis that it was "redundant." However, the fact that this variant appears to have originated with Origen brings this possibility into the realm of the possible, since Origen's standard fluctuates greatly between very good, very bad, and everything in between. Origen also reminds us that not all copyists were high quality scribes, a fact we must never remove from our minds when considering variants. Alternatively, this may have been an accidental loss due to an undetected paper fade. In the continuous script of *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), there is a stylistic paper space of about one letter before this "*KAI*." If it was lost by a paper fade in the variant line of manuscripts, the absence of such a "*kai*" may simply have been thought of as a similar stylistic paper space to that which one finds in *Codex Freerianus* designed to help right-hand justify the page.

On the one hand, the reading of the *Textus Receptus* is strongly supported by textual analysis. It has impressive support as an ancient Greek Byzantine reading (W 032) and ancient Latin reading (old Latin k & h), followed by subsequent support in later Greek Byzantine and old Latin texts. But on the other hand, it is both a fairly slim minority Greek reading and a minority Latin reading which has the support of no more than about a dozen Greek and Latin Codices and Minuscules (even if one includes X 033 which is *in dubio*). For we neo-Byzantines, one Greek or Latin manuscript or citation inside the closed class of sources is enough to warrant a reading entering the Received Text, *providing* it remedies a clear and obvious textual problem in the representative Byzantine Greek text, so in fact we here have many times more manuscripts than we need to warrant the adoption of this reading. Nevertheless, the issue of manuscript numbers, citations from church writers, and their dates, does affect the rating that such a reading is ultimately given *after* it is adopted. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading in Matt. 14:19c, a high level "C" (in the range of 63% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:19c, "and," in the words, "and took," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Aleph 01, London Sinaiticus (*Codex Sinaiticus*, 4th century, British Library, London, UK). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (*Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus*, 5th century, Paris, France); and inside the *Petropolitanus Bibliothecae Caesareae* collection, (the independent text type) Codex 067 (6th century, St. Petersburg, Russia, Matt. 14; 24-26). It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Armenian Version (5th century).

The incorrect reading which omits "and" is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, B 03, Rome Vaticanus (*Codex Vaticanus*, 4th century, Vatican City, Rome); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)*, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

The split in the two major Alexandrian texts causes a major dilemma for the neo-Alexandrians whose curious rules of "critical textual analysis," are from the neo-Byzantine perspective, lacking in any form of serious textual analytical capacity or skill. The neo-Alexandrians solved the problem by resort to one of their perverse circular rules, adopting *the shorter reading* simply because it was *the shorter reading*, on the basis that *the shorter reading* is always more likely to be correct because scribes "like to add" but "not subtract" from the text. *A bizarre claim!* On an extended form of this type of supercilious logic, are we to accept the claims of the NT Samaritans that the OT Books of Joshua to Malachi were

"unwarranted scribal additions" to the shorter Pentateuch of just Genesis to Deuteronomy? Especially is this neo-Alexandrian claim quite ridiculous when one considers the historical one-way track of undetected paper fades that claim entire short words. But the curious neo-Alexandrians love to greatly prattle and prance over this rule.

The incorrect reading is also found in the majority texts of Burgon & Miller (1899), Hodges & Farstad (1985), and Robinson & Pierpont (2005), so that both Burgon & Miller and Hodges & Farstad are bold to say that their majority text reading should here replace the "Textus Receptus[86]." *We here end our treatment of Burgon & Miller (1899) since they only produced a majority text of one volume (Matt. 1-14). Having considered its readings in this revised Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14) of these textual commentaries, it is clear that they have in broad terms continued the methodology of Burgon, even though they are Burgonites Revisionists. Thus notwithstanding methodological differences between them, most notably, that Burgon & Miller lacked a Greek manuscripts priority in their limited count of less than 200 manuscripts, whereas both Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont have a Greek manuscripts priority in their von Soden based majority texts, which in practice are both Byzantine majority texts (by consequence of their non-Byzantine Text priority in the case of Hodges & Farstad since over 85% of their Greek manuscripts are Byzantine text from von Soden's I and K groups of c. 1500 manuscripts; and by Byzantine text design in the case of Robinson & Pierpont since over 90% of their Greek manuscripts are Byzantine text from von Soden's K group of c. 1000 manuscripts); it is clear that Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont will in c. 95% of instances in the NT produce the same result that Burgon advocated. Thus they are the successors of Burgon & Miller, so that their majority texts may more generally be fairly used to represent the Burgonite view (notwithstanding some differences among Burgonites on less than c. 5% of NT readings).*

And so it is, that on this occasion the neo-Alexandrians are joined by the deranged Burgonites whose argument is just as crazy as their own, namely, the *majority of manuscripts* are always correct because *the majority is always right*. On an extended form of this type of supercilious logic, are we to accept the OT Apocrypha as canonical since there are more OT Septuagint manuscripts with it than OT Hebrew Text manuscripts without it? *Either way, making these type of neo-Alexandrian or Burgonite rules as a substitute for serious textual analysis will ultimately lead to serious error.* Both neo-Alexandrians and Majority Text Burgonites are further joined here at Matt. 14:19c by the Roman Catholic Latins as represented by those of the Clementine Vulgate, who reverse the proper order of NT textual analysis, by wrongly maintaining that the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, should be made subject to the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*.

Having selected *the shorter* reading of Rome Vaticanus, the neo-Alexandrians generally then soothed their troubled consciences over leaving out the reading of London Sinaiticus by including it in a footnote. In fairness to them, when one has no real skills of textual analysis, and just two major Alexandrian texts that one pins everything on, (albeit at least in theory looking for further "external" manuscript support for these texts, although in practice this is usually just neo-Alexandrian "padding,") it is very hard to know what to do in this type of situation. We neo-Byzantines can understand their frustration, although we cannot identify with it, nor sympathize with it.

---

[86] Burgon & Miller (1899), pp. vii & 114; Hodges & Farstad (1985), pp. xviii & 47.

Not surprisingly then, that great darling of, and indeed the founding father of, the Neo-Alexandrian School, Constantine von Tischendorf, could not so much as see the evident textual problem in the reading omitting the *kai*, and so he adopted the erroneous reading of Rome Vaticanus in the main text of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) (although as always, showing in his very useful footnotes support for the TR's reading). The erroneous *shorter* reading was also followed by Westcott-Hort (1881) (with a footnote showing the alternative reading), Nestle's 21st edition (1952) (with a footnote showing the alternative reading), Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) (with a footnote showing the alternative reading), and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) (who thought no footnote was necessary for showing the alternative reading).

Nevertheless, it transpires that in English translation of the Greek, one must sometimes add an "and" to convey the meaning. E.g., in this verse in question, Matt. 14:19c, the AV fairly adds "and" twice, once before "looking up to heaven," *although I think they should have put this "and" in italics*; as well as adding "and" before "gave the loaves to his disciples, *although once again, I think they should have put this "and" in italics.* Thus on this same principle, though the "and (*kai*)" before "took the five loaves" is absent from the neo-Alexandrian texts, it does not therefore necessarily follow that it is absent from neo-Alexandrian versions, who may add it in on the basis that it is a required word of translation. This creates the problem that we cannot be sure if given neo-Alexandrian versions are including this "and" because of its textual support, in their instance, Rome Vaticanus, or because they think it is needed as part of English translation; which is also possibly why the Burgonite NKJV includes it *without a footnote* saying it is omitted in the NU Text and Majority Text (although to this it must be added that the NKJV sometimes seems to lack footnote references to what it regards as "less important" differences between the TR and either the NU Text or Majority Text, and so possibly this is also one such instance).

Thus we read at Matt. 14:19c in the ASV, without any italics, "and he took the five loaves." We likewise find this type of reading in the RSV, ESV, and Moffatt Bible. Though the usage of italics in the ASV and presence of the alternative in Westcott-Hort means the ASV may have followed Rome Vaticanus, we cannot be entirely certain of this since for short words like "and," even translations that use italics do not always put such a conjunction in italics, *although in my opinion they should.* In the case of the RSV, ESV, and Moffatt Bible, we cannot be sure which reading they are following. However, while the Greek *kai* or *de* is not always translated, on this occasion, I think we can confidently say that in the case of the NASB, NRSV, and NIV, it is clear that at Matt. 14:19c they are following the erroneous reading of the NU Text *et al*. E.g., "Bruce Metzger's baby," the *New Revised Standard Version*, reads, "Then he ordered the crowds to sit down on the grass. Taking the five loaves and the two fish," etc. (NRSV). In the case of the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582), it is also clear that the majority Latin text which omits "and (*et*)," was followed in their reading, "And when he had commanded the multitude to sit down upon the grass, he took the five loaves and the two fishes," etc. (Douay-Rheims).

We thus find at Matt. 14:19c, that there has been a three-pronged pitch-fork forged in the flames of anti neo-Byzantine principles, as neo-Alexandrians, Majority Text Burgonites, and Latin Papists unite as one to thrust their pitch-fork into the neo-Byzantine *Textus Receptus*. But this three-pronged pitch-fork thrust is ultimately to no avail. The mighty shield of the Received Text is not penetrated by this triple pointed devilish instrument of

violence. Indeed, the three forks bend backwards when they hit the shield of the *Textus Receptus*, and as the neo-Alexandrians, Burgonites, and Latin Papists keep advancing they run directly into their own prongs which are now pointing backwards, and wounded, they fall down onto the ground. By contrast, the *Textus Receptus* still stands sure. Hast thou not heard? Or has it not been told unto thee? *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!* [87] "The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever!"

Matt. 14:22a "straightway" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The relevant reading from Lectionary 2378 is Matt. 14:14-22, whereas the relevant reading from Lectionary 1968 is Matt. 14:14-21.

Lectionary 1968 ends with a characteristic brown ink "+" at the end of Matt. 14:21 i.e., ending, "*kai* (and) *paidion* (children) +". On the next line, the scribes first wrote in normative brown ink the four words, "*Kai* (And) *apolusas* (having sent) *tous* (the) *ochlous* (multitudes);" and these are then followed by the characteristic red ink circular dot, ending a reading. The scribe then crossed these four words out, putting a brown ink line through them. He then commenced the next reading (Rom. 14:6-9).

Matt. 14:22 starts with the word, "*Kai* (And)", and ends with the three words, "*apolusas* (having sent) *tous* (the) *ochlous* (multitudes)." The first four words of Matt. 14:23 are, "*Kai* (And) *apolusas* (having sent) *tous* (the) *ochlous* (multitudes)."

Are these four crossed out words, the first four words of Matt. 14:23? If so, this means that the Cypriot scribe of Lectionary 1968 was not copying from another Lectionary, but from a Greek manuscripts, if so, probably a minuscule (which became normative from the 9th century, replacing the earlier codices). If so, did he have a set of instructions that said something like, "Last sentence, first word, '*Kai* [And];' last 3 words, '*apolusas* [having sent] *tous* [the] *ochlous* [multitudes]'"? Did he then use these instructions to jump from the end of verse 21 to the beginning of verse 23? Having done so, did he then conclude that since it was ridiculous to end a reading with, "And when he had sent the multitudes away" (Matt. 14:23), this note must mean, "End before 'Last sentence, first word, < *Kai* [And]>'," etc., and so he then crossed these words out? I.e., without going back to check the earlier verse 22?

Are these four crossed out words, the first word and last three words of Matt.14:22? If so, this means that the Cypriot scribe of Lectionary 1968 may have been copying out from another Lectionary. If so, did he have a set of instructions that said something like, "Last sentence, first word, '*Kai* [And];' last 3 words, '*apolusas* [having sent] *tous* [the] *ochlous* [multitudes]'"? There is some variation between Lectionaries, and if so, did he then wrongly interpret this to mean that the last sentence was to be reduced in size to these four words? Having done so, did he then conclude that since it was ridiculous to end a reading with, "And when he had sent the multitudes away" (Matt. 14:23), this note must mean he was to end before verse 22, i.e., "End before 'Last sentence, first word, < *Kai* [And]>'," etc., and so he then crossed these words out?

---

[87] Latin Motto of the Lutheran Reformation, quoting I Peter 1:25.

We cannot be sure as to what happened here in Lectionary 1968. But it seems highly likely that the scribe had some sort of instructions that he was to end the reading at Matt. 14:23, which is where Lectionary 2378 ends this reading. These instructions included key words in the first word, and last three words, of the final sentence i.e., Matt. 14:22. But somehow, the scribe "botched" the reading by misunderstanding the instructions which were evidently of a sufficiently unclear nature as to allow this. Thus Matt. 14:22 appears to have been unintentionally lost from Lectionary 1968.

Among other things, we are reminded that in his Providential care, God had many Greek and Latin copies made of New Testament manuscripts, as well as of Greek and Latin church writers. This meant that he was able to simultaneously allow for some level of human error, whether deliberate or accidental, while ensuring that that the records did not stray so far as to lose the truth of God. Under the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture, God ensured an overall accessibility of the Greek and Latin manuscripts from which the Received Text could be accurately composed, but not the completely accurate preservation of this or that manuscript.

And so it was that in the double procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, God then gifted by his Spirit men as textual analyst teachers, e.g., Beza in the 16th century, Elzevir in the 17th century, or myself in the 21st century, so as to thereby manifest his Divine Preservation of the *Textus Receptus*, notwithstanding such scribal errors as we here find in Lectionary 1968 at Matt. 14:22. And with such "gifts" (Eph. 4:8) he called into this work such "teachers" as myself and others, "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ" (Eph. 4:11,12). Now this "body" (Eph. 4:12; 5:30) is contextually the one "church" monogamously married to "Christ" (Eph. 5:32) i.e., the mystical church, or what Article 10 of the *Apostles' Creed* calls, "the holy catholic (universal) church." Now "catholic" comes from the Greek, meaning "throughout (*kath'*) all (*ol<u>es</u>*)" (Acts 9:31), i.e., "universal," (being derived via the French form, "*catholique*," from the Greek form, "*katholikos*,") and refers to the racial universality (Matt. 28:18-20) of the church among the "nations" (Matt. 28:19) in "all the world" (Mark 16:15).

Wherefore, let us ensure that any denominational loyalties we hold are always subject to the recognition that it is this "holy catholic church" which is Christ's "wife" (Eph. 5:31), and "the woman" whom "the Devil" sets out "to make war with" (Rev. 12:9,16,17), and it is to this "holy catholic church" that is our first loyalty under God, and not any denominational or sectarian church. Of course, in saying this, we ought not to deny the concomitant reality that when we engage in what this same Article 10 of the *Apostles' Creed* calls, "the communion of saints" i.e., *the fellowship of believers* (I John 1:7), then this must necessarily always occur at some local level "where" at least "two or three are gathered together" (Matt. 18:20) in a local "church" (e.g., Rom. 16:1). Thus Scripture recognizes that there are many more localized "churches" (Rom. 16:4) inside that universal "church" (Eph. 5:29,32; Heb. 2:12) which the *Nicene Creed* calls, the "one catholick and apostolick church."

The Second Matter. Inside the closed class of sources, due to Diatessaron formatting the reading of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century) at Matt. 14:22 is so conflated with Mark 6:45 that it cannot be used for relevant textual purposes at Matt. 14:22. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*. Outside the closed class of sources the same issue of Diatessaron formatting also acts to exclude Ciasca's Latin-Arabic

Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), *infra*.

According to my old Latin Dictionary, that I used mainly for Latin legal maxims in my old Sydney University days[88], namely, Woodhouse's *Englishman's Pocket Latin-English & English-Latin Dictionary* (1913)[89]; the Latin adverb, "*tunc*," found in ff1, can mean, "then," "at the very time," "at that time," or "immediately." If the latter of these meanings, "immediately," is adopted, then this is a synonym for "straightway," and so *tunc* becomes a synonym for the adverbs *statim* or *continuo*, *infra* i.e., it follows the *Received* Text.

Certainly the more usually meaning of *tunc* does not include, "immediately," a fact reflected in e.g., the concise Latin-English dictionary found at the back of Wheelock's *Latin Grammar* (2005), or Stelten's short Latin-English *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin* (1995)[90]. Thus the textual apparatuses of both Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and the UBS 3rd edition (1975), show ff1 as supporting the variant which omits Greek, "*euthe<u>os</u>* (straightway)." Although this is slightly modified in the textual apparatus of the UBS 3rd corrected edition (1983), which takes the view that ff1 "supports the reading" of the variant, "but with minor differences."

Having considered the reference to *tunc* in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968-82), it seems to me that on this occasion Tischendorf's 8th edition and the UBS 3rd edition are correct. While the Latin, *tunc*, can indicate a response or reaction, and so e.g., be rendered, "thereupon," which is presumably the sense that the Oxonian, Woodhouse, means with his rendering, "immediately," the context here at Matt. 14:22a does not *require* this meaning. Thus I think it possible, though improbable, that this is the plenary meaning of old Latin ff1. If this was the intended meaning of the scribe of ff1, it seems far more likely that he would have followed the other old Latin versions in using "*statim* (straightway)" or "*continuo* (straightway)," *infra*. Therefore I shall show ff1 as following the variant, *infra*.

---

[88] Some persons like to greatly criticize such Latin maxims. Personally, I found their study an interesting and informative way to better understand Latin. In the famous Latin words of Sir Francis Bacon (1561-1626), "*Ipsa* (itself) *scientia* (knowledge) *potestas* (power) *est* (it is)" i.e., "Knowledge itself is power."

[89] Woodhouse, S.C., (Late Scholar of Christ Church, Oxford University, England,) *The Englishman's Pocket Latin-English & English-Latin Dictionary*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, UK, 1913; reprint 1983.

[90] Though not the only Latin grammar I have ever used, I have found Frederick Wheelock's to be a useful one. Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, also known as Wheelock's *Latin*, has been through numerous reprints and revisions since 1956 (1st ed., Barnes & Noble, New York, USA), gaining in popularity over the years, and is now in its 6th revised edition (Revised by Richard LaFleur, Harper-Collins, New York, USA, 2005). Whereas many Greek grammars and concise dictionaries are Biblically focused, the Latin grammars and concise dictionaries generally are not. Thus of some supplementary value, though frequently lacking in details, a dictionary that is of some use is a Roman Catholic work, Stelten, L.F., *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin*, Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody, Massachusetts, USA, 1995. (Whatever the wider meaning of *tunc* may or may not be, Stelten's handy but short dictionary would be unlikely to show it.)

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:22a the Greek TR's, "*euthe<u>o</u>s* (straightway)," in the words, "And straightway Jesus constrained" etc., is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), P 024 (6th century), E 07 (8th century), Y 034 (9th century), Omega 045 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 2 (12th century), 1010 (12th century), 1242 (13th century); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*statim* (straightway)," by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported as Latin, "*continuo* (straightway)," in old Latin versions e (4th / 5th century) and d (5th century). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

However, "straightway (Greek, *euthe<u>o</u>s*; Latin, *statim* or *continuo*)," is omitted in old Latin version ff1 (10th / 11th century), which replaces the Vulgate's "*Et* (and) *statim* (straightway)," simply with "*Tunc* (Then)." It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct. The origins of the variant are speculative. Could this be an accidental omission? If in a given manuscript line a scribe first accidentally omitted the "*kai* (and)" before "*euthe<u>o</u>s* (straightway)," and then realizing his mistake, added it back in, so that the word order became, "*euthe<u>o</u>s* (straightway) *kai* (and)," then omission becomes quickly explainable. In Codex W 032, there are frequently stylistic spaces between what under Stephanus (1551) became our traditional verse numbers. E.g., at this very page, we find a paper space at the end of Matt. 14:26 and the beginning of Matt. 14:27 i.e., between the "*ekraxan* (they cried out)" and the "*euthe<u>o</u>s* (straightway)," which is about four letters in space. On this type of precedent, a paper fade of "*euthe<u>o</u>s* (straightway)," especially if the word order had been altered to "*euthe<u>o</u>s* (straightway) *kai* (and)," could easily go undetected. (Though a paper fade of this size could go undetected if the original word order was in place, this would seem less likely to me, though certainly not impossible.) Alternatively, a scribe may have omitted this as a deliberate "stylistic improvement" on the basis that "context shows this was 'straightway (*euthe<u>o</u>s*)'," and so this word is "contextually redundant."

On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:22a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 14:22a, "straightway," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), the margin of

892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac: Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Bohairic (3rd century), and Fayyumic (3rd century) Versions; the Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500).

However, the incorrect reading which omits "straightway" is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century), (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), and the main text of Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions.

With the two major Alexandrian texts split down the middle, the neo-Alexandrians have exhibited a split personality over what is "the best" reading. Probably looking more to what they would regard as "*the wider external support*" in e.g., the Western Text's D 05, the Syriac Harclean Version and Coptic Bohairic Version, the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), confidently declared that Rome Vaticanus was correct, and so by a fluke got the correct reading. But for other neo-Alexandrians, probably the pull of "*the shorter text*" and their largely unbridled phobia of "*assimilation to other gospel readings*," (in this instance, to the *euthe<u>o</u>s* of Mark 6:45,) has led to a different view. Thus Tischendorf, to some extent influenced by "the external support" of e.g., the Syriac Curetonian Version, just as confidently declared that the incorrect reading of London Sinaiticus was correct in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). With such divisions among neo-Alexandrians, and no easy way out of the dilemma on neo-Alexandrian principles, others have resorted to fence-sitting. Therefore *euthe<u>o</u>s* is enclosed in square brackets, thus making its inclusion or omission entirely optional, in Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). *Oh the pains of being a neo-Alexandrian!*

Reflecting such painful neo-Alexandrian choices, the neo-Alexandrian versions have jumped in different directions. The correct reading is found at Matt. 14:22a in the American Standard Version as, "And (*kai*) straightway (*euthe<u>o</u>s*)" etc. (ASV). The correct reading is also found in the NASB, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. However, the incorrect reading which omits "straightway," is found in the RSV and Moffatt Bible, e.g., the latter of these simply reads, "Then (*kai*)" etc. (Moffatt).

Matt. 14:22b "Jesus" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Lectionary 2378 contains one reading from Matt. 14:14-22 and another reading from Matt. 14:22-34. There is thus some overlap here at verse 22 with the Lectionary 2378

readings. However, its second reading starts between Matt. 14:22a, *supra*, and Matt. 14:22b, *infra*. One ought not to assume that two Lectionary readings are necessarily the same, as seen by Lectionary 2378's readings at Matt. 14:22c, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:22b the TR's Greek, "*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," in the words, "And straightway Jesus constrained" etc., is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices E 07 (8th century), G 011 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 2 (12th century); and (in all three instances abbreviated as "οιc" with a bar over the "c,") Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, twice in two different readings) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*Iesus* (Jesus)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However a variant which omits "Jesus" (Greek, *o Iesous*; Latin, *Iesus*), is a minority Byzantine reading found in e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and P 024 (6th century). The omission is further found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must therefore stand. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was it accidentally lost due to an undetected paper fade? Or was it a deliberate "stylistic improvement"? Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, create "a more succinct text"? We cannot be sure. We only know for sure that it constitutes a change to the original text.

On the one hand, the representative Byzantine reading has solid support from the Greek, together with ancient and later support from a number of old Latin Versions. But on the other hand, the variant has support from a relatively slim number of Byzantine texts, the Vulgate, some old Latin Versions, and a couple of ancient church writers. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:22b a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 14:22b, "Jesus," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere),157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent).

However, the incorrect reading which omits "Jesus," is found in the two leading

Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 067 (6th century, Matt. 14; 24-26), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 788 (11th century, independent), 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)*, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous reading entered the NU Text *et al*. Hence at Matt. 14:22b, we read in the ASV, "And straightway he constrained" etc. . So likewise, the incorrect reading that omits "Jesus" is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV. However on this occasion, the correct reading is found in the NIV.

The natural textual argument in favour of the reading, "Jesus," is that in the surrounding passages of Matt. 14, each new sub-section clearly indicates the name "Jesus (*Iesous*)," so as to avoid any possible confusion. I.e., at Matt. 14:1 for Matt. 14:1-12; at Matt. 14:13 for Matt. 14:13,14; at Matt. 14:16 for Matt. 14:15-21; and the usage of "Jesus" at Matt. 14:31 and "Son of God" at Matt. 14:33, acts to likewise make it clear who the "knowledge of him" is in Matt. 14:34-36. Thus in the section of Matt. 14:22-33, immediate contextual factors of Matthean Greek style would led us to naturally expect the usage of "Jesus (*Iesous*)" at Matt. 14:22. This remains so even if due to a faulty neo-Alexandrian text one were to wrongly omit "Jesus" at Matt. 14:14a,16,25, which is not what the NIV actually does here. Therefore on this occasion at Matt. 14:22b, the NIV translators appear to have grasped the textual argument, and so adopted the correct reading. Though for neo-Alexandrians to show this type of textual analytical skill is admittedly very rare, I think we neo-Byzantines should encourage such bursts of better textual analysis when we see it, and so on this particular occasion I think the NIV translators should be commended for having made the effort to undertake some serious textual analysis at Matt. 14:22b.

Matt. 14:22c "his" (TR & AV) {C}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Green's von Soden based Majority Text Apparatus (1986) says the TR's reading is followed by between 6%-20% of all manuscripts. Therefore (even allowing a 10% error bar for the generalist nature of von Soden's groups upon which is based Green's Textual Apparatus,) the Received Text's reading must still be a sizeable minority Byzantine reading. In broad-brush terms this is a valuable guide, and I am grateful for the work of Pierpont in this textual apparatus which I generally use without checking. However, having considered von Soden's textual apparatus (1913) first hand for the Revised Volume 1 with respect to a number of minority Byzantine readings of the TR, in more precise terms this Kr group is *c*. 22.5-25% of the Gospel manuscripts in K group, more than 90% are Byzantine text, *infra*, to which von Soden only mentions two other K group manuscripts supporting the

reading, the other Byzantine codices and minuscules referred to below being from von Soden's I group. (And von Soden here mentions no Lectionaries, although in his wider work he considers less than a dozen Lectionaries.) Thus the precise count for support of this minority Byzantine reading is slightly higher than in Pierpont's generalist calculations, which nevertheless remain a useful generalist guide. (See Matt. 12:29.)

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century) is a Vulgate Codex. The reading at Matt. 14:22c which omits "his" appears to reflect the variant's reading, since while the Vulgate's reading at Matt. 14:22 reads, "*discipulos* (disciples)," the Vulgate's reading at Mark 6:45 is "*discipulos* (disciples) *suos* (his)." Thus the omission of Matt. 14:22c is not due to a conflation with Mark 6:45, (although the omission of "his" from Mark 6:45 is due to Diatessaron formatting with Matt. 14:22). Hence it is shown in support of the variant, *infra*.

By contrast, outside the closed class of sources Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron reads in Ciasca's Latin, "*discipulos* (disciples) *suos* (his)." However, since it is possible that the "his" is here being brought over from Mark 6:45 due to Diatessaron formatting, no reference is made to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:22c, the TR's Greek, "*autou* (of him)," in the words, "*tous* (the) *mathetas* (disciples) *autou* (of him)," i.e., "his disciples," is a sizeable minority Byzantine reading. It is supported by the purple parchment, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century, Rossano, Italy), *Codex Guelferbytanus* (P 024, 6th century, Wolfenbuttel, Germany[91]), *Codex Basilensis* (E 07, 8th century, Basel, Switzerland), *Codex Boreelianus* (F 09, 9th century, Utrich, Holland), *Codex Cyprius* (K 017, 9th century, Paris, France), *Codex Petropolitanus* (Pi 041, 9th century, St. Petersburg, Russia), and *Codex Monacensis* (X 033, 10th century, Munich, Germany). It is also supported in Minuscules 262 (10th century, Paris, France), 28 (11th century, Paris, France, Byzantine other than in Mark), 1187 (Sinai, Arabia, 11th century), 1188 (11th / 12th century, vacant in Matt. 5:42-8:33; John 9:14-18:22, Sinai, Arabia), 1207 (11th century, Sinai, Arabia), 2 (12th century, Basel, Switzerland), 73 (12th century, Cambridge University, England), 245 (12th century, Moscow Russia), 267 (12th century, Paris, France), 270 (12th century, Paris, France), 280 (12th century, Paris, France), 1200 (12th century, Sinai, Arabia), 1375 (12th century, Moscow, Russia), 248 (13th century, Moscow, Russia), 473 (13th century, Lambeth Palace, London, UK), 477 (13th century, Trinity College, Cambridge University, England), 482 (13th century, British Library, London, UK), and 1354 (14th century, Jerusalem, Israel). It is further supported by von Soden's Kr group, which on his generalist group counts means at least 90% of the Kr group, which on a generalist count is *c.* 18-20% of von Soden's 914 exclusively Byzantine text K group manuscripts (which correlates with the figure of Green's Textual Apparatus, *supra*); or on a more precise Gospel manuscripts count of the K group, the Kr group represents *c.* 22.5-25% of K group Gospel manuscripts, more than 90% of which are Byzantine text.

---

[91] Wolfenbuttel is in Lower Saxony, on the Oker River, about 13 kilometres or 8 miles south of Brunswick. Wolfenbuttel is the seat of the Protestant Bishop of the Lutheran Church of Brunswick.

The TR's reading is also supported by Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, Fisher Library, Sydney University, Australia, abbreviating the "*ou*" suffix and placing it over the "t" in its Matt. 14:14-22 reading), and 1968 (1544 A.D., Fisher Library, Sydney University, Australia). It is further supported as Latin, "*suos* (his)," in old Latin versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), q (6th / 7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and as Latin, "*suis* (his)," in old Latin versions a (4th century), h (5th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century).

However, a variant which omits "*autou* (of him)," thus making the reading, "*tous* (the) *mathetas* (disciples)," is followed by the majority Byzantine reading, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionary 2378 (11th century, in its Matt. 14:22-34 reading). The omission is further followed by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), f (6th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, the omission is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

As more fully discussed in this commentary at Matt. 8:25a, in Matthean Greek, "his disciples," is far more common terminology than "the disciples," so that *prima facie*, "his disciples" is always the more expected term. It is the terminology in more normative circumstances; and indicates the spiritual or physical closeness that Christ had to those who were specifically "his disciples." By contrast, in Matthean Greek, the term, "the disciples," as opposed to "his disciples," is used when putting some distance between Jesus and the disciples, either for mental, emotional, or spiritual reasons, or physical proximity.

The absence of any such factors here at Matt. 14:22c, means that the reading of the representative Byzantine text, "*tous* (the) *mathetas* (disciples)," clangs on the ears as bad Matthean Greek. This is simply not the way St. Matthew uses the term, "the disciples." The "disciples" of Matt. 14:22c are not physically remote from Jesus, since they "get into a ship" with him (Matt. 14:22). They are not remote from Christ in their spiritual or emotional thinking, for they had just participated in a marvellous miracle in which Christ supernaturally fed the "five thousand" (Matt. 14:21). Therefore the representative Byzantine reading at Matt. 14:22c raises a textual problem, one that can only be remedied by adopting the minority Byzantine reading, "*tous* (the) *mathetas* (disciples) *autou* (his)," which must thus be the correct reading.

The origins of the variant are speculative. Was this an accidental loss due to an undetected paper fade? Or was this a deliberate stylistic improvement, if so, probably by Origen, who lacking an understanding of the more subtle nuances of Matthean Greek, may have pruned away the "*autou* (of him)" as "unnecessary wordage"? If so, Origen was perhaps also influenced by the usage of the terminology, "*tois* (the) *mathetais* (disciples)," immediately above at Matt. 14:19, without realizing that it here denoted *physical proximity*, for we read that after Christ "blessed" "the five loaves, and the two fishes," "the disciples" (in the AV "his" is added in italics), moved geographically further and further away from Christ as they gave these loaves "to the multitudes."

On the one hand, textual factors clearly favour the reading of the *Textus Receptus* as the only one that does justice to the nuances of Matthean Greek. This reading has impressive

support from both ancient Latin texts (old Latin b & ff2), as well as Greek Byzantine texts dating from the late 5th or 6th century with *Codex Rossanensis*, and thereafter followed in a sizeable minority Byzantine reading. But on the other hand, the reading of the Received Text is both a minority Greek reading and a minority Latin reading. Balancing out these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:22c a high level "C" (in the range of 63% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading, but has a lower level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 14:22a, "his," i.e., "his disciples," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in all extant Syriac versions; the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the incorrect reading which omits "his" i.e., "the disciples," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 067 (6th century, Matt. 14; 24-26), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is also found in the Armenian Version (5th century).

On the one hand, the two main Alexandrian texts are split here. But on the other hand, applying faulty neo-Alexandrian principles, the fact that there is stronger "*external support*" for the erroneous reading, together with the neo-Alexandrian penchant for *the shorter reading*, and also a parallel gospel account in Mark 6:45 from which it could be claimed that the reading "*autou* (of him)" had been "assimilated from;" acted to embolden neo-Alexandrians to adopt this reading. Thus the erroneous reading is found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) (with a footnote showing the TR's reading), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952) (with a footnote showing the TR's reading), and the NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) (with a footnote showing the TR's reading), and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). The neo-Alexandrians make their silly little rules, and then hide behind them. They then replicate their power structures in tertiary educational institutions with those as silly as themselves. But this type of nonsense is a poor substitute for serious textual analysis, which thing is generally a stranger to them. With one of their two major Alexandrian texts showing the correct reading, they could not so much as tell that

on stylistic grounds Rome Vaticanus is here correct!

These neo-Alexandrians love to criticize readings of the Authorized Version, such as the one here at Matt. 14:22a, which reads, "his disciples" (AV). But in fact these neo-Alexandrians touch and tamper with they know not what. The incorrect reading at Matt. 14:22a is found in the ASV as, "the disciples" (ASV). The erroneous reading is likewise found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, and Moffatt Bible.

Matt. 14:24 "was … in the midst of the sea" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century) reads, "*in* (in) *medio* (the midst) *mari* (of the sea)." But due to its Diatessaron format, the reading of this Latin Vulgate Codex may be derived from either the Vulgate's Matt. 14:24 or Mark 6:47 or both. Hence no reference is made to this Diatessaron, *infra*.

The textual apparatus of the UBS 3rd (1975), 3rd corrected (1983), and 4th revised (1993) editions, show old Latin versions d, e, & ff1, as supporting not the TR, but the Western Text's D 05, which in a typical Western text addition, adds Greek, "*eis* (in)," before "*meson* (midst)" and after *en* (was), the latter of which it transfers from after "*thalasses* (sea)" to before its added "*eis* (in);" and further omits) "*ede* (now)." I.e., the TR's Greek, "*to* (the) *de* (but) *ploion* (ship) *ede* (now) *meson* (in the midst) *tes* (of the) *thalasses* (sea) *en* (was)," meaning, "But the ship was now in the midst of the sea" (AV); becomes in D 05, "*to* (the) *de* (but) *ploion* (ship) *en* (was) *eis* (in) *meson* (the midst) *tes* (of the) *thalasses* (sea)" i.e., "But the ship was in the midst of the sea." I shall not now discuss the vanities of the Western Greek Text. Suffice to say that Bezae saw no value in it for the purposes of determining the NT text, and neither do I nor any other neo-Byzantine. The UBS appears to assume that the Greek (D 05) and Latin (d) of this Greek-Latin diglot, known as *Codex Bezae Cantabrigiesis* (5th century), are necessarily parallel readings (which is not the case). Thus they claim old Latin d follows Greek D 05, as do other old Latin readings which as the same or similar to d.

I for one do not consider that the Latin reading of old Latin d at Matt. 14:24, which is inside the closed class of sources, is to be equated with the Greek reading of D 05, which is outside the closed class of sources. If I am wrong, then the poisoned tentacles of Greek D 05 must indeed *have been very great*, stretching out their poisonous octopus like arms as far a field as to be a scribal influence on old Latin e, which comes from Africa! (But I fear that by saying this, the neo-Alexandrians will now start claiming that a mysterious and hitherto unknown copy of Greek D 05 must have been circulating in Africa! If so, perhaps they should start looking for it in Cheops' Pyramid!)

Certainly it is true that for the Vulgate *et al*, there is an absence of old Latin e's, "*iam* (now) *erat* (was)," or old Latin d & ff1's "*erat* (was)," before "*in* (in) *medio* (the midst) *mari* (of the sea)." Thus the Vulgate *et al* reads simply, "*Navicula* (the little ship) *autem* (but) *in* (in) *medio* (the midst) *mari* (of the sea)," i.e., "But the little ship in the midst of the sea." However, textual analysis here is not concerned with the "now" (Greek, *ede*; Latin, *iam*), since the presence of "now" (Greek, *ede*) is not in any serious dispute. Bearing in mind that the Latin is necessarily a translation of the original Greek, I still think that the variations we find between the Vulgate *et al* and old Latin d, e, & ff1 *on the matters being considered* here

at Matt. 14:24, are therefore best ascribed to Latin scribal diversity of translation. Certainly no-one would attribute them to a support of the variant, *infra*.

In this context, it is also worth observing that the textual apparatuses of the UBS 3rd & 4th revised editions show the Vulgate *et al* as supporting the TR's reading, although the UBS 3rd corrected edition shows the Vulgate *et al* as supporting the TR's reading *with minor differences*. This alteration between UBS editions highlights the difficulties of assessing exactly where a Latin translation is coming from in terms of the original underpinning Greek. In a sense, both views are right i.e., there are minor differences between the Latin Vulgate *et al* and the TR (UBS 3rd corrected ed.), but the most natural conclusion to draw is that the Latin scribes who are rendering the Greek TR, in doing so are exhibiting some level of imprecision in translation (UBS 3rd & 4th revised editions).

If the NU Text Committee applied the same common sense they used for concluding the Vulgate *et al* was supporting the TR's reading, to their analysis of old Latin d, e, & ff1; then they would surely have to agree with me that in fact the more natural conclusion to draw is that all of these Latin readings are supporting the *Textus Receptus* on those matters being considered, *infra*. But the NU Text Committee does not act in such a consistent manner. Nevertheless, I shall. Therefore unlike the UBS textual apparatus, inside the closed class of sources I shall show all these Latin versions as supporting the Received Text. And outside the closed class of sources, I shall show Western Greek D 05 as following the Received Text *with minor differences* (since with the Greek we can make a more exacting comparison).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:24, the TR's Greek, "*meson* ('amidst' or 'in the midst' word 1) *tes* ('of the,' word 2) *thalasses* ('sea,' word 3) *en* ('was,' literally, 'it was' word 4, i.e., referring to 'the ship')," i.e., "was … in the midst of the sea" in the words, "But the ship *was* now *in the midst of the sea*" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), P 024 (6th century), Lectionary 2378 (11th century); and in a similar reading, following words 1, 2, & 3, but omitting word 4, in Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*in* (in) *medio* (the midst) *mari* (of the sea)," by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin, "*in* (in) *medio* (the midst) *mare* (of the sea)," in old Latin version g1 (8th / 9th century); and as Latin, "*erat* ('was,' literally, 'it was' i.e., referring to 'the ship') *in* (in) *medio* (the midst) *mari* (of the sea)," in old Latin versions e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407); ancient church Latin writers, Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:24 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 14:24, "was … in the midst of the sea," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and with minor differences in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex 084 (6th century, Matt. 14:19-15:8), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century). It is further found in Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type), referred to by neo-Alexandrians as "the queen of Minuscules," and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), in word order 4,1,2,3 in 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; and Ethiopic Versions (Roman ed., 1548-9; Pell Platt ed. based on the Roman ed.; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, an alternative reading, "*stadious* ('stades' approximates 'furlongs') *pollous* (many) *apo* (from) *tes* (the) *ges* (land) *apeichen* (it was distant)," i.e., "was many furlongs distant from the land," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is further found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Palestinian (*c.* 6th century) Versions; as well as the Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Slavic Version (9th century).

The origins of the variant are conjectural. The reading is clearly in some form derived from John 6:19, "So when they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs (*stadious*)" etc. . Beyond that, it appears to be an attempt to create terminology "that sounds like something a gospel writer might say." The scribe undertaking this construction clearly thought in terms of a "gospel" Greek language, rather than Matthean Greek, Marcan Greek, etc. . The scribe seems to have made a link between Matt. 14:24 and Mark 6:47, thereafter making some reference to the terminology of Mark 6:47 where we read that, "when even was come, the ship was in the midst of the sea, and" Christ was "alone on the (*tes*) land (*ges*)." He also made some further reference to the terminology of Luke 24:13, where we read that the two men went to the village of Emmaus, "*apechousan* (being distant) *stadious* (furlongs) *exekonta* (sixty) *apo* (from) *Ierousalem* (Jerusalem);" and some reference to general "gospel terminology."

Thus the construction of the variant seems to be conceptually derived from John 6:19, but linguistically derived in broad terms from Luke 24:13. But in specific terms it was then derived from the "*stadious*" of Luke 24:13 & John 6:19; the "*pollous* (many)" of e.g., Matt. 15:30 & Mark 6:13, *et al*; the "*apo* (from)" from Luke 24:13; the "*tes* (the) *ges* (land)" of

Mark 6:47; and finally the "*apechousan* ('being distant,' feminine singular accusative, active present participle, from *apecho*)" of Luke 24:13, which was transformed into "*apeichen* ('it was distant,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *apecho*)."

It is possibly that this was undertaken as some kind of "stylistic improvement," seeking to bring "enhanced accuracy" by "reference to furlongs." But I think it far more probable that this was a "reconstruction" by a scribe, following a serious paper loss or fade of the words, "*meson* (in the midst) *tes* (of the) *thalasses* (sea) *en* (was)." The scribe evidently consulted Mark 6:47 and John 6:19, but broadly aware of differences in terminology between the gospels, then set about to construct something that conveyed the general idea of these passages in "gospel language" Greek. The scribe did so in 31 letters (or 30 if he left off the optional "*n*" from "*apeichen*"), in the space of the original 18 letters. If there had been a stylistic paper space of 2 or 3 spaces in the original, which went over two lines, so the scribe could use some of the right hand margin, such a reconstruction would have been possible. Though it would still have created a right hand protrusion on the original page, for a scribe who thought in terms of a monolithic "gospel language" Greek, such a peculiarity was probably not thought of "as something that really mattered."

The representative Byzantine reading is well attested to in the Greek and Latin, and cannot be seriously challenged on the basis of any textual problem in the Greek. The variant is evidently a "gospel language reconstruction," principally derived from Mark 6:47; Luke 24:13; John 6:19, and has little manuscript support.

With the two main Alexandrian texts split down the middle, neo-Alexandrians were thrown into confusion at Matt. 14:24. Tischendorf followed the correct reading in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72); though as one who has studied Tischendorf's selections, I do not doubt that he did so for the wrong reasons, namely, he had a strong, (though not absolute,) tendency, for following the reading found in the *Codex Sinaiticus* manuscript that he discovered, and to which he was greatly attached. However, the opposite strong, (though not absolute,) tendency, for following the reading found in the *Codex Vaticanus* manuscript is exhibited by Westcott & Hort who thought of it as a more "neutral" text. Thus in stereotypically normative fashion, Tischendorf here follows *Codex Sinaiticus* whereas Westcott & Hort here follow *Codex Vaticanus*. The erroneous reading of Rome Vaticanus, albeit with footnote readings in every instance, giving the correct reading which on this occasion is found in London Sinaiticus, appears in the main texts of Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, as well as the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

Metzger asks if Matt. 14:24 was harmonized to Mark 6:47 or John 6:19? He concludes that such assimilation was more common among the synoptic gospels, and so supports the variant (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 37; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 30). This is typical of the type of superficial "textual analysis" that is so much the hallmark of a neo-Alexandrian "textual analyst." It finds an immediate similarity between Matt. 14:24 and Mark 6:47, and so assumes an assimilation. It acts in a circular manner to confirm its own erroneous opinions with regard to alleged "assimilations." It fails to consider wider textual issues of where the variant is coming from on the basis of stylistic factors such as those discussed above with regard to the evident usage of some kind of "gospel Greek" rather than

Matthean Greek in this variant. These types of supercilious and superficial neo-Alexandrian rules of "textual analysis" find no sympathetic cord with we neo-Byzantine textual analysts.

The neo-Alexandrian split in the texts is reflected in the neo-Alexandrian versions. The correct reading at Matt. 14:24 is followed by Moffatt without qualification. On this occasion, probably being influenced by the correct reading of London Sinaiticus in both the Western text and Syriac Harclean Version, for the wrong reasons, the correct reading with no footnote alternative reading, is followed by Moffatt as, "was … in the middle of the sea," in the words, "but the boat *was* now *in the middle of the sea*" (Moffatt Bible). The correct reading is also found in the main text of the American Standard Version as, "was … in the midst of the sea" in the words, "But the boat *was* now *in the midst of the sea*" (ASV); however a footnote gives the erroneous reading, saying, "some ancient authorities read 'was many furlongs distant from the land'" (ASV ftn).

Reversing the ASV's order, the RSV revisers of the ASV placed the incorrect reading in the main text of the RSV, with a footnote giving the TR's reading. The erroneous reading is further found in the NASB, conveyed more literally in the NASB's 1st & 2nd editions; but with a footnote giving the more literal translation of the variant, it is rendered as a dynamic equivalent in the NASB's 3rd edition, "was … a long distance from the land" (NASB). This type of dynamic equivalence and usage of a footnote giving a more literal rendering of the incorrect main text variant which characterizes the NASB, is also found in NRSV and NIV. The ESV also follows the NASB, NRSV, and NIV in this technique, but additionally like its RSV parent, has a footnote giving the TR's correct reading.

On the one hand, we here see at Matt. 14:24 the bumbling ideas of Tischendorf and Moffatt, *supra*, whose neo-Alexandrian "textual analysis" achieved the correct reading by a fluke when they followed London Sinaiticus as they pondered which of the two main Alexandrian texts to follow. And on the other hand, we here see the stumbling ideas of Metzger *et al*, *supra*, who jumped the other way and followed Rome Vaticanus as their neo-Alexandrian "textual analysis" led them into crazy circular reasoning ideas about "assimilation" being more common among the synoptic gospels. Either way, these bumbling and stumbling neo-Alexandrians are misdirected in their concept of "textual analysis."

Like any Christian who is not a textual analyst, a Christian who has the gift of teaching (I Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11) in the specific form of a textual analyst, (there are many others who have the gift of teaching in a different form,) must "serve the Lord with gladness" (Ps. 100:2). He must acknowledge "that the Lord he is God: it is he that hath made us and not we ourselves" (Ps. 100:3). He must be saved through the everlasting covenant of grace, under which "the Lord is good; his mercy is everlasting" (Ps. 100:5). He must recognize that he is handling "the Word of truth" (II Cor. 6:7; Eph. 1:13; Jas 1:18); and that "his truth endureth to all generations" (Ps. 100:5). If he does not in the first place recognize that "his truth endureth to all generations" (Ps. 100:5), then a man does not truly acknowledge "that the Lord he is God" (Ps. 100:3). Therefore, he is under "the wrath of God" (Rom. 1:18), and the result must be that such men become "vain in their imaginations." Thus "professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (Rom. 1:21,22). The Word of God says, "In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths" (Prov. 3:6). But contrary to this clear word of the Lord, we live in a "secular" age in which secularists wrongly assert that men who do not acknowledge God as they should, but have an anti-supernaturalist

understanding of the textual transmission history of Scripture, can accurately construct this or that neo-Alexandrian text or version. What saith the Word of God? "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (Rom. 1:21,22).

Matt. 14:25a "went" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

In the Latin Vulgate, both Matt. 14:25a and Mark 6:48 read, "*venit* (he came / went) *ad* (unto) *eos* (them)." Inside the closed class of sources, bearing in mind that the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century) is a Vulgate Codex, it seems to me that on this occasion it is reasonable to conclude that it here supports the variant (even though one could argue that the reading is an assimilation from Mark 6:48).

Outside the closed class of sources the Latin translation in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) also reads, "*venit* (he came / went) *ad* (unto) *eos* (them)." However, it seems to me that the grammatical matters here are so finely balanced between the two readings, that one would need to consult the underpinning Arabic in this instance. Therefore no reference in made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*. This is of no great consequence, since textual transmission history outside the closed class of sources has no impact whatsoever on determination of the text, and is purely a matter of general historical interest.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:25a the TR's Greek, "*apelthe* (indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *aperchomai* = *apo* / away + *erchomai* / come or go)," i.e., "he went" or "went" in the words "Jesus went (*apelthe*) unto (*pros*) them (*autous*)" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and P 024 (6th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and (in both instances adding the optional "n" at the end,) Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*abit* ('he goes away,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *abeo*)," i.e., "he went," in old Latin version d (5th century, omitting Latin, "*ad* [unto] *eos* [them]").

However, a variant reads, "*elthen* (indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *erchomai*)," i.e., either "he came," in the words, "he came (*elthen*) unto them," or "he went" in the words, "he went (*elthen*) unto them. This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is further found as Latin, "*venit* ('he comes' or 'he goes,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *venio*)," i.e., "he came (*venit*) unto them" or "he went (*venit*) unto them," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Eusebius (d. 339), and Chrysostom (d. 407).

In English, the past tense of "go" is "went;" and the past tense of "come" is "came."

Because the Received Text's root word, Greek, *aperchomai*, is made up of "*apo*" meaning "away" and "*erchomai*" meaning "come" or "go," the contextual sense must be "go" i.e., "going away" or "went" in Matt. 14:25a. If one wanted to render the *erchomai* element of *aperchoma* as "coming," or "came," then one would have to add "away" i.e., "Jesus came away unto them," which is not contextually the natural reading. But if one wants to render the *aperchoma* as "going," then the sense of "going away" may be contained in the word "went," and so in terms of a one word literal translation equivalent, the rendering, "Jesus went unto them" (AV) is accurate, although as in other matters of NT translation, one would need to consult the underpinning Greek to better understand that the specific sense here is *aperchomai*, i.e., *going away*.

By contrast, the absence of the "*apo*" from *aperchomai* in the variant's root word, *erchomai*, means that it could be taken to mean either, "he going" i.e., "he went," or "he coming" i.e., "he came." Thus if one wants to render the *erchoma* as "going," then the sense of "going" may be contained in the word "went," and so in terms of a one word literal translation equivalent, the rendering, "Jesus went unto them" would be accurate, although as in other matters of NT translation, one would need to consult the underpinning Greek to better understand that the specific sense here is *erchomai*, i.e., *going*.

Thus there is not necessarily a difference of translation between the TR and the variant, both of which may be here translated as, "went;" although there is a shade of different meaning in the underpinning Greek between these two renderings which may be both rendered into the English as "went." By contrast, if one wanted to unambiguously endorse the variant, then one could render this as "came."

Whereas the TR's reading requires that Jesus was *going away* i.e., *going away* from Point A to the disciples at Point B i.e., "*he went* (*apelthe*) unto them," the variant will allow the sense that Jesus was *coming* from Point A to Point B i.e., "he came ("*elthen*) unto them." The difference between so *going away* (TR) and so *going* or *coming* (variant) is a fine line, that is more important in some contexts than others. *In this particular context*, on the one hand, it is possible to argue that it does not seem to be of great consequence to the sense, since there is no contextual stress on Jesus *leaving something or someone behind* in order to *go away* from it unto the disciples. But on the other hand, one may argue that the stress is in the word itself i.e., Jesus *went away* from what impliedly was a *more secluded part of the vessel* unto his disciples who impliedly were *in the more peopled and so less secluded part of the vessel*.

Whether or not one thinks the distinction in this particular instance is or is not a matter of consequence, is a matter of private judgement that I leave to the reader to ponder. Either way, the reality is that when the Holy Ghost took the words from St. Matthew's vocabulary and had St. Matthew pen these verbally inspired words of Scripture, he here selected a word that unambiguously meant Christ was *going away* from one point to another, conveyed in the AV's "went" (although one must go beyond the English and consult the underpinning Greek to properly appreciate this matter). If that is what God wrote, then that is what we must uphold. There is certainly no good textual argument against the variant, which must therefore stand as the reading of the *Textus Receptus*.

The origins of the variant are speculative. If the alteration was accidental it is possible that due to an undetected paper fade of the "*ap*" of "*apelthe*" / "*apelthen*" (whether

or not it had the optional "n" I do not know, since von Soden's work generally lacks this information), this became the variant's "*elthen*." If the alteration was deliberate, then it probably originated with Origen as a "stylistic improvement." His thinking may have revolved around the view that the "*ap*" here was "redundant," and was also quite possibly influenced by a desire of "harmonization" with the reading at Mark 6:48, where the Holy Ghost took the words from St. Mark's vocabulary and had St. Mark pen these verbally inspired words of Scripture, "*erchetai* ('he comes' / 'cometh' or 'he goes' / 'goeth,' indicative middle present, 3rd person singular verb, from *erchomai*) *pros* (unto) *autous* (them)" i.e., "he cometh unto them" (Mark 6:48, AV). Whether this change was deliberate or accidental is uncertain. But either way, because the Holy Ghost allows an ambiguity in the words of Mark 6:48, it does not mean that he must therefore make a comparable ambiguity in the words of Matt. 14:25a. For "none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?" (Dan. 4:35).

On the one hand, the reading of the representative Byzantine text, has strong support from the Greek which dates from ancient times. Though it has some support from old Latin d, the fact that this old Latin version lacks the words, "unto them," means that the support is not as strong as it could be. More generally the reading lacks support in the Latin text, and so we here see the paramount supremacy of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, standing in its properly dominant position over the general Latin text. But on the other hand, the variant has some support in the Greek as a minority Byzantine reading and among three ancient church writers, and also has the support of the representative Latin text. Taking these competing factors into account, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:25a a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 14:25a, "went," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also the most probable reading of (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is also found in (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and main text of the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version.

However, the incorrect reading, "came," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), and 700 (11th century, independent); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)*, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Version,

and margin reading of the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; as well as Bohairic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous reading, "*elthen* ('he came' or 'he went') at Matt. 14:25a, entered the NU Text *et al*. Hence we find the incorrect reading in the ASV as, "he came (*elthen*) unto them." The erroneous reading is also clearly found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV.

However, it is unclear as to which reading is followed in both the NIV and Moffatt Bible e.g., Moffatt reads, "he went to them." Are Moffatt and the NIV here following the variant, Greek, *elthen*, and rendering it "he went" (Moffatt Bible)? Or are Moffatt and the NIV here following the TR's reading, Greek, *apelthe*, on the basis that it has support from the Western Text, Egyptian Sahidic, and Syriac Harclean Versions, and rendering it "he went" (Moffatt Bible)? Certainly both Moffatt and the NIV use the same rendering at Mark 6:48 where the Greek is "*erchetai* ('he cometh' / 'goeth')" in both the TR and NU Text *et al*, e.g., Moffatt translates this as "he went (*erchetai*) to them" (Moffatt Bible). Nevertheless, both Moffatt and the NIV used eclectic NT Greek texts, and so here at Matt. 14:25a we cannot be sure as to what the textual basis is for the Moffatt Bible or NIV, although in both instances we can say that their renderings into English are the same as if they were based on the correct reading of the Received Text.

Matt. 14:25b "Jesus" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, the reading of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century) at Matt. 14:25b appears to support the variant. Contrary to the TR, the Vulgate omits "Jesus" at Matt. 14:25b, lacks it in harmony with the TR at Mark 6:48, and has it in harmony with the TR at John 6:19 (Greek, *Iesoun*; Latin, "*Iesum*"). Bearing in mind that the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex, it nevertheless shows some minor differences inside the range of normative Vulgate differences among Codices, and so one cannot with confidence say exactly which reading it here supports, although it *probably* supports the variant. Nevertheless, due to the ambiguities and uncertainties resulting from its Diatessaron format, on this occasion I shall make no reference to it, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, similar problems exist with Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century). While Ciasca's Latin translation, "*Iesus* (Jesus)," *prima facie* means the underpinning Arabic supports the Received Text's reading at Matt. 14:25b, one cannot rule out the possibility that as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting, "Jesus" here was introduced from John 6:19. Hence once again, no reference will be made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:25b, the *Textus Receptus* reads in the Greek, "*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," in the words, "And in the fourth watch of the night Jesus went unto them" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., *Codex Basilensis* (E 07, 8th century), *Codex Nanianus* (U 030, 9th century), *Codex Monacensis* (X 033, 10th century); Minuscules 28 (Paris, France, 11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark; *o Iesous* placed slightly earlier in the sentence); 2

(Basel, Switzerland, 12th century); *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 2378 (11th century, abbreviated to "ιc" with a bar over the "ιc"), and *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D., abbreviated to "ιc" with a bar over the "c"). It is also supported as Latin, "*Iesus* (Jesus)," in *Codex Vercellensis* (old Latin Version a, 4th century), *Codex Palatinus* (old Latin Version e, 4th / 5th century), *Codex Veronensis* (old Latin Version b, 5th century), *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff2, 5th century), *Codex Claromontanus* (old Latin Version h, 5th century), *Codex Brixianus* (old Latin Version f, 6th century), *Codex Colbertinus* (old Latin Version c, 12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339).

However, "Jesus (Greek, *o Iesous*; Latin, *Iesus*)," is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and P 024 (6th century). It is also omitted in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions d (5th century), aur (7th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is further omitted in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which is therefore indubitably correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was it accidental? Did the omission arise from an undetected paper fade, possibly from a manuscript abbreviating "*OIECOYC*" to "*OIC*"? Was it deliberate? Did the omission come about as a "stylistic improvement" at the hand of Origen who is notorious for setting about to "corrupt the Word of God" (II Cor. 2:17)? Did Origen regard it as "redundant" since "Jesus" is mentioned in Matt. 14:22? In this context was Origen further influenced by the absence of "Jesus" at Mark 6:48 to which he then in some measure assimilated this reading? Though we cannot be certain as to whether this omission was deliberate or accidental, we can be certain that it is not the true reading of the text.

On the one hand, the representative Byzantine reading has solid support in the Greek, impressive support in the Latin from ancient times and later, and notable support from the church historian and Bishop of Caesarea, Eusebius. But on the other hand, the variant is an ancient minority Byzantine reading, followed in the Vulgate and a number of old Latin versions, and also by a couple of ancient church writers. Taking into account these competing factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:25b a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:25b, "Jesus," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac

Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Version; and the Armenian Version (5th century).

However, the incorrect reading which omits, "Jesus," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous reading which omits "*o* (-) *Ie<u>s</u>ous* (Jesus)" at Matt. 14:25b, is found in the NU Text *et al*. Thus the ASV reads at Matt. 14:25b, "And in the fourth watch of the night he came unto them." So too, this omission is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV. But perhaps influenced by the wider support for the TR's reading in general, and the support of the Syriac Curetonian and Armenian Versions in particular, the NIV adopted the correct reading.

Matt. 14:26b "the disciples" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources the Latin Vulgate lacks the TR's reading, "the disciples (Latin, *discipuli*)" at Matt. 14:26b; Mark 6:49; John 6:19. As the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex, it is shown as following the variant, *infra*, since it was evidently found at none of these three verses.

Outside the closed class of sources Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron reads in Ciasca's Latin translation, "*discipuli* (the disciples)." Since this is not found at either Mark 6:49 or John 6:19, the Diatessaron formatting must have gotten it from Matt. 14:26b. Therefore the Arabic Diatessaron is shown as following the TR's reading, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:26b the TR's Greek, "*oi* (the) *math<u>e</u>tai* (disciples)," in the words, "And when the disciples saw him walking on the sea" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), P 024 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*discipuli* (the disciples)," in old Latin versions d (5th century) and f (6th century).

However, "the disciples" (Greek, *oi math<u>e</u>tai*; Latin, *discipuli*), are omitted in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), aur (7th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is also omitted in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339); and ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which thus must stand. The origins of the variant are speculative. Was it accidentally lost due to an undetected paper fade? Was it deliberately omitted as a "stylistic improvement" on the basis of "redundancy" when compared with Mark 6:50 and / or "harmonization" with Mark 6:50? Either way, if deliberate the variant of Matt. 14:26b may well reflect a semi-assimilation with Mark 6:50 which reads in the Greek, "*pantes* (all) *gar* (for) *autou* (him) *eidon* ('they saw,' indicative active aorist, 3rd person plural verb, used as an aorist of *orao*)," i.e., "For they all saw him" (Mark 6:50, AV); and in the Latin Vulgate, "*Omnes* (all) *enim* (for) *eum* (him) *viderunt* ('they saw,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *video*)," i.e., "For they all saw him." For without the Greek noun, "*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples)," or the Latin noun, "*discipuli* (the disciples)," at Matt. 14:26b; the Greek reads, "*Kai* (And) *idontes* ('seeing' in the plural i.e., here rendered 'they seeing,' masculine plural nominative, active aorist participle, from *eidos*) *auton* (him)," i.e., "And they seeing him;" and the Latin Vulgate reads, "*Et* (And) *videntes* ('seeing,' in the plural i.e., here rendered 'they seeing,' masculine[92] plural nominative, active present participle, from *video*) *eum* (him)," i.e., "And they seeing him." Though the participle forms at Matt. 14:26b (Greek, *idontes*; Latin, *videntes*), are not identical with the verbal forms at Mark 6:50 (Greek, *eidon*; Latin, *viderunt*), they are clearly very similar in that they modify a non-expressed noun. (Cf. John 6:19.)

On the one hand, the representative Byzantine text has strong and ancient support from the Greek text, and also minority Latin support from ancient times (5th century) and later (6th century). But on the other hand, the representative Latin text omits, "the disciples," as do a couple of ancient church writers. Balancing out these competing considerations, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:26b a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the *Textus Receptus* is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:26b, "the disciples," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); and the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 788 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further followed by some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

---

[92] Though this Latin participle is in a common masculine or feminine gender form, its gender must agree with that of the noun. But (like adjectives,) the participle sometimes modifies a non-expressed noun, and so functions as a noun. We cannot doubt that the unexpressed noun here is contextually Christ's "disciples (Matt. 14:22, Latin, *discipulos*)," which is a masculine plural, and so the gender here at Matt. 14:26b is masculine.

However, the incorrect reading which omits, "the disciples," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex 084 (6th century, Matt. 14:19-15:8), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), and 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*. The omission is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century).

With the two leading Alexandrian texts split at Matt. 14:26b, the neo-Alexandrians are also split. Tischendorf who generally favoured *Codex Sinaiticus* over *Codex Vaticanus* here stayed true to his general form and confidently followed the variant of London Sinaiticus and so omits, "*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples)," in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) (although his comprehensive textual apparatus shows the TR's reading). By contrast, Westcott & Hort who generally favoured *Codex Vaticanus* over *Codex Sinaiticus* here stayed true to their general form and just as confidently followed Rome Vaticanus. So too, Rome Vaticanus was followed by Nestle's 21st edition (1952) (with a footnote showing the variant), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) (with a footnote showing the variant) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

The correct reading is found at Matt. 14:26b in the ASV as, "the disciples." The correct reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. However, the incorrect reading which omits "the disciples," is found in the *Twentieth Century New Testament* (1904) and *Today's English Version* (1976). With neo-Alexandrians split as seen in the fact that Tischendorf and these two neo-Alexandrian versions follow the erroneous reading, we cannot be certain as to whether or not more neo-Alexandrian versions will omit this reading in the future. Furthermore, following the representative Latin text, the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims Version (NT 1582) also omits these words in its translation from the Latin, "And they seeing him walking upon the sea" etc. (Douay-Rheims).

In older times, Protestant defenders of the Greek Received Text, upheld this reading at Matt. 14:26b against the Roman Catholic Latin text based Douay-Rheims Version; whereas in more modern times we must defend this reading against *some* neo-Alexandrians such as e.g., Tischendorf and Bratcher's ratty TEV. Whether against Papist or apostate Protestant or any other, the Lord being our helper, we stand firm in our defence of the *Textus Receptus.*

Matt. 14:27 "Jesus" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex. Whereas both the Received Text and Vulgate readings at Mark 6:50 and John 6:20 lack "Jesus," I consider the presence of "*Ihesus*" in the Sangallensis Diatessaron indicates that it is drawing it from Matt.14:27.

Hence I show the Sangallensis Diatessaron supporting the reading of the TR, *infra.*

Outside the closed class of sources, similar considerations lead me to conclude that the presence of "*Iesus*" in Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic Diatessaron, requires the conclusion that Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron is also following the TR's reading, *infra*.

The Second Matter. Whereas the Greek word order of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) is, "*autois* ('unto them,' word 1, masculine plural dative, 3rd person personal pronoun, from *autos*) *o* ('the,' word 2, nominative singular masculine, definite article, from *o*) *Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 3, nominative singular masculine, noun from *Iesous*)," and the Latin word order of the Vulgate *et al* is, "*Iesus* ('Jesus,' nominative singular masculine, noun from *Iesus*) …*eis* ('unto them,' masculine plural dative, 3rd person personal pronoun, from *is*)," the textual apparatus of the UBS 3rd & 3rd corrected editions, consider the Latin does not support the Greek TR. Rather they consider these Latin sources support the word order reading of *Variant 3*, *infra*, i.e., word order 2,3,1. This however is qualified by the fact that these UBS apparatuses consider this Latin reading "supports the reading" of *Variant 3* "but deviates from it in minor details;" whereas Nestle-Aland's 27th edition makes no reference to the Latin on this *Variant 3*.

By contrast, Nestle-Aland's 27th edition and both UBS editions consider the readings of old Latin f, "*eis* ('unto them,' masculine plural dative, 3rd person personal pronoun, from *is*) *Iesus* ('unto them,' masculine plural dative, 3rd person personal pronoun, from *is*)," and old Latin q, "*illis* ('unto those [ones]' = 'unto them,' masculine plural dative, 3rd person demonstrative pronoun, from *ille*) *Iesus* ('Jesus,' nominative singular masculine, noun from *Iesus*)," both support the Greek TR, being in the same word order.

I find these UBS claims to be absurd. In the first place, I do not consider that one can reasonably make such a claim about word order since in translating from the Greek to the Latin, a Latin scribe may well change the word order. We see this also in the translation from Greek to English, for the Authorized Version does not read with the Greek word order, "unto them Jesus" etc., but rather, "Jesus … unto them." But who on this basis would seriously seek to suggest that the English is not translating the Greek of the TR which is in a different word order?

Furthermore, taking into account the fact that Latin lacks the more common usage of the definite article found in the Greek (word 2), (and on this occasion is once again like the English, for we do not say, "the Jesus" but simply, "Jesus,") it is clear that the grammatical syntax of the Greek TR and Latin are in fact the same, *supra*. Thus I think it is indefensible for the UBS to claim that the Latin which like the Greek uses a *nominative singular masculine noun*, "Jesus (Greek, *Iesous*; Latin, *Iesus*)" with a *masculine plural dative, 3rd person personal pronoun*, "unto them (Greek, *autois*; Latin, *eis* or *illis*)," in fact "deviates from" the Greek reading in question "in minor details" (for we are only interested in these key words for the purpose of textual analysis); while UBS simultaneously makes no such qualification for old Latin f & q, in which old Latin f is like these other Latin versions in that both the Latin and Greek use a *nominative singular masculine noun*, "Jesus," with a *masculine plural dative, 3rd person personal pronoun*, "unto them." Indeed, it might be remarked that old Latin q is more dissimilar in that while in both old Latin f and q the Latin is, like the Greek, a *nominative singular masculine noun*, "Jesus (Greek, *Iesous*; Latin, *Iesus*);" that whereas the Latin of old Latin f follows the Greek in being a *masculine plural*

dative, 3rd person personal pronoun, "unto them (Greek, *autois*; Latin, *eis*)," by contrast, the Latin of old Latin q is a *masculine plural dative, 3rd person demonstrative pronoun*, "unto those [ones] (Latin, *illis*)." Perhaps the NU Text Committee might respond that they are considering some wider issues of sentence structure, but I would maintain *that for the purposes of textual analysis this is what matters here*.

Therefore, I maintain that the Latin of both these Latin forms could be reasonably said to be translating either the Greek Received Text inside the closed class of sources; or *Variant 3* outside the closed class of sources (with slight variation found inside the closed class of sources in one Greek Lectionary); and that no real "minor differences" exist between the Greek TR and Latin here, since any *prima facie* such "minor differences" are simply reasonable elements in the process of translation from Greek to Latin. However, I do consider the differences between the Greek *Textus Receptus* and the Greek *Variant 3* to be *minor differences*, of the type and kind that I would at best more commonly place in an Appendix of this commentary, or possibly make no reference to at all. Because I consider *Variant 3* is a minor variant of the TR, I do not make as much of it as the UBS textual commentary does. Thus I show the Latin Vulgate *et al* in support of the Greek Received Text, *infra*.

The Third Matter. The UBS 3rd & 3rd corrected editions also show the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions following *Variant 3*; although Nestle-Aland's 27th edition does not. On the one hand, I am not directly familiar with the Syriac (because the Syriac is outside the closed class of sources it does not really matter, as it has no impact on the text); but on the other hand, similar considerations of translation mean that I would not trust the judgment of the NU Text Committee on such a matter. Therefore I make no reference to these at *Variant 3* outside the closed class of sources, *infra*.

The Fourth Matter. In the following verse, Matt. 14:28, the scribe of Lectionary 1968 first omitted, "*auto* (him)," in the introductory words, "And Peter answered him (*auto*)." Then realizing his error, the scribe added some dote makers above the line where the word should be, and placing the same dot markers on the left in the side-margin, gave the accidentally omitted reading, "*auto* (him)." We are thus reminded by this, that especially short words, could sometimes be accidentally omitted by a scribe. And what of the one's not so picked up by a copyist? By the grace of God, we neo-Byzantines recognize that *this was a one-way track to a shorter text!* But alas, the neo-Alexandrians, lacking such benefits of God's "gifts" as "teachers" (Eph. 4:8,11), wrongly tend to support such losses, falsely claiming the TR's text "added" in this or that word.

Of course, it must be said that leading neo-Alexandrians, such as e.g., Aland (d. 1994) and Metzger (d. 2007), were not selected for their positions on successive NU Text Committees because they were orthodox and could credibly testify to being gifted and called by God to such a teaching ministry. Rather, they are selected by Colleges / Universities, publishers, etc., on secularist criteria, which is not subject to the directive will of God as set forth in his Infallible Book. It is anti-supernaturalist, anti-Christian, and anti-religiously conservative Protestant. It is very different to what *should* happen. On the one hand, much of the data they collect and collate may be profitably used in a critical manner. But on the other hand, as to the interpretations these neo-Alexandrians place on such data, it is more often than not, a case of, "And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch" (Matt.

15:14).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:27, the TR's Greek, "*autois* ('unto them,' word 1) *o* ('the,' not rendered in Latin or English translation, word 2) *Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 3)," i.e., "Jesus … unto them" in the words, "And straightway Jesus spake unto them" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), P 024 (6th century); and (in both instances abbreviating word 3, "ιηcουc," to "ιc" with a line on top,) Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*Iesus* ('Jesus,' words 2 & 3) …*eis* ('unto them,' word 1)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also supported as Latin, "*Iesus* ('Jesus,' words 2 & 3) …*illis* ('unto those [ones]' = 'unto them,' word 1)," in old Latin Version b (5th century); as Latin, "*eis* ('unto them,' word 1) *Iesus* ('Jesus,' words 2 & 3)" in old Latin version f; and as Latin, "*illis* ('unto those [ones]' = 'unto them,' word 1) *Iesus* ('Jesus,' words 2 & 3)," in old Latin version q.

However another reading (*Variant 1*), omits words 2 and 3, and reads simply, "unto them" (word 1). This is a minority Byzantine reading found as Greek, "*autois* (unto them)," in Minuscules 231 (12th century) and 1010 (12th century). It is further found as Latin, "*illis* ('unto those [ones]' = 'unto them')," in old Latin version d (5th century); and as Latin, "*ad* (unto) *eos* (them)," in old Latin version ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339).

Another reading (*Variant 2*), omits word 1, and reads simply, "*o* (-, word 2) *Iesous* ('Jesus,' word 3)." This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 47 (10th century).

Yet another reading is in its final form outside the closed class of sources and so discussed in the next section, *infra*, (*Variant 3*).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct. The origins of the variants are conjectural. Manuscript Washington (W 032) helps us better understand how *Variants 1 & 2* might have been accidental omissions. In the continuous script and capital letters of *Codex Freerianus*, "*autois* (unto them) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," is written as, "*AYTOICOIC*" (with a bar over the top of the last, "*IC*," indicating it is abbreviated from *IHCOYC*). As a consequence of ellipsis, in *Variant* 1, did a copyist's eye jump from the first "*OIC*" ending of "*AYTOIC*" to the second "*OIC*" (either not noticing the bar over the top of it, or possibly the bar had been lost in a paper fade)? Was the second "*OIC*" meaning "*O IHCOYC*" (or *o Iesous*) thus accidentally omitted? With respect to *Variant 2*, did a copyist remembering he was "up to the word with the *OIC* ending" i.e., "*AYTOIC*," scan forward with his eye? Then perhaps being distracted, or suffering from fatigue, as his eye scanned back and saw the second "*OIC*," did he quickly think "the *OIC* ending," and so write this down? Did *Variant 2* thus arise by accident?

Alternatively, was *Variant 1* a deliberate "stylistic improvement" by a scribe, seeking to "harmonize" Matt. 14:27 with the readings in Mark 6:50 and John 6:20 that lack "*o* (-) *Ie̲sous* (Jesus)"? Was *Variant 1* a deliberate or accidental change? We cannot be certain. We can only be certain that it is a change from the original Greek reading.

Was *Variant 2* an accidental loss from an undetected paper fade? Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change which when a scribe considered it was a "stylistic improvement" to remove a "redundant" reference to "*autois* (unto them)" (cf. *elale̲sen* / "he spoke" in Matt. 9:33,14:27; Luke 11:14; Acts 7:6)? Most Byzantine School scribes were more honourable than the Alexandrian School scribes in that generally speaking they did not seek to deliberately alter the text of Scripture. But here at Matt. 14:27, might there have been "a rotten scribal apple at the bottom of the Byzantine scribal barrel"? ("The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked," Jer. 17:9.)

The reading of the representative Byzantine text has rock solid support in both the Greek and Latin. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:27 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:27, "Jesus (words 2 & 3) … unto them (word 1)," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 1, "unto them (word 1)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex 084 (6th century, Matt. 14:19-15:8) and Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions, as well as the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century).

Yet another reading, *Variant 3*, uses word order 2,3,1 i.e., "*o* (-, word 2) *Ie̲sous* ('Jesus,' word 3) *autois* ('unto them,' word 1)," meaning, "Jesus … unto them." This reading is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is also found at the hand of a first "corrector" of London Sinaiticus, who altered London

Sinaiticus from *Variant 1* to *Variant 3*.

The origins of *Variant 3* are speculative. Was it accidental? Did it arise due to an Alexandrian scribe first fumbling over "*autois* (unto them) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," written as, "*AYTOICOIC*," and by ellipsis loosing the "*AYTOIC*" as his eye went forward and then back to the "*OIC*"? If so, did he then realize his mistake and write "*AYTOIC*" back in after "*OIC*"? Alternatively, was this a deliberate "stylistic improvement" by the *Codex Vaticanus* scribe, motivated by a desire to create a text that avoided the type of ellipsis made by his less adroit fellow Alexandrian scribe of *Codex Sinaiticus* with *Variant 1*? Did such thinking inside the Alexandrian School of scribes, then act as the justification for a scribe to change *Codex Sinaiticus* from *Variant 1* to *Variant 3*?

With the two major Alexandrian texts split down the middle, the neo-Alexandrians have also been split as to what to do. *Variant 1* was followed by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). But being divided between *Variants 1 & 3*, in *Variant 3* word order, words 1 & 2, "*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)," were made entirely optional and placed in square brackets, by Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

Thus for the wrong reasons, by following *Variant 3* the correct reading was adopted at Matt. 14:27 by the ASV which (replicates the AV and) reads, "But straightway Jesus spake unto them" (ASV). So likewise, for the wrong reasons, by following *Variant 3* the correct reading is also found in the NASB, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. Probably influenced in his decision by what from the benighted neo-Alexandrian would be the "wider external support" beyond the Alexandrian texts (in this instance, *Codex Vaticanus* and the first "corrector" of *Codex Sinaiticus*,) in e.g., the Western text and Syriac, *Variant 3* was also followed by the semi neo-Alexandrian Moffatt as, "Then Jesus spoke to them at once" (Moffatt Bible). By contrast, the incorrect reading which follows *Variant 1* and omits "Jesus" is found in the RSV and NEB.

Matt. 14:29 "to go" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*elthein* ('to go,' active second aorist infinitive, from *erchomai*)," i.e., "to go" in the words, "to go to Jesus" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), P 024 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*ut* ('to,' conjunction, conveying *purpose*[93]) *veniret* ('he might go' or 'he might come,' subjunctive active imperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *venio*)," i.e., "to go" (or "to come"), is also supported by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), q (6th / 7th

[93] The Latin *ut* with a subjunctive, here conveys: *purpose* i.e., "*in order that*" or "*to*" etc. . (Depending on context, *ut* with a subjunctive may also convey: *result* i.e., "so that" or "that;" *jussive* noun clauses - a sort of indirect command, i.e., "to" or "that" rather than a direct command; or *fear clauses* i.e., "that … not.") Wheelock's *Latin*, p. 190 (& pp. 196,253-4,285,489).

century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Basil the Great (d. 379); and ancient church Latin writers, Gaudentius (d. after 406) and Chromatius (d. 407).

However, a variant (*Variant 1*) reads, "*kai* (and) *elthen* ('he came,' indicative active second aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *erchomai*)," i.e., "and came" making the words, "and came to Jesus." This is a minority Byzantine reading followed in Lectionary 253 (1020 A.D.) and Minuscule 1010 (12th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

In English the past tense of "go" is "went," and the past tense of "come" is "came." The Greek *erchomai* (like the Latin, *venio*,) can be translated either "come" or "go." Thus the TR could be rendered, "to come to Jesus," and *Variant 1* could be rendered, "and came to Jesus." This contrast thus highlights the fact that the TR is an infinitive (cf. *elthein* in Matt. 13:32; 14:28; 16:24; 17:10 *et al*). There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine's infinitive reading, which must thus stand.

The origins of *Variant 1* are conjectural. Was this an accidental change? If due to a paper, the original *elthein* looked something like, *:lth::n*, and (possibly to help right hand justify the page) there was a small stylistic paper space of about two letters spaces (since the iota / "i" of *kai* does not take up much space, a fact also relevant to the ending i.e., a missing *ei* at the end of the word might look like just one missing letter, epsilon / "e" rather than two), was this "reconstructed" as "*kai elthen*" from "context"?

Was this a deliberate change? Either directly in conjunction with, or indirectly by way of example and influence, was the change at Matt. 14:25a from "*apelthe* ('he went' or 'went' AV)" to "*elthen*," *supra*, accompanied by or influenced by, a similar "harmonizing stylistic" change at Matt. 14:29 by *one* or *some*, but *not all* scribes in the circle connected with a deliberate change at Matt. 14:25a, if indeed Matt. 14:25a was such a deliberate change? If so, was this "stylistic improvement" "justified" in an immediate sense by reference to the *elthen* at Matt. 14:25 in the Matt. 14:22-33 discourse, and possibly also the presence of *elthen* at John 6:23 just after the John 6:15-21 discourse? Was "justified" in a broader sense through reference to "*kai* (and) *elthen* (he came)" from one or more Matthean passages (Matt. 9:1; 13:4; 19:1)?

We simply do not know enough of the unrecorded history of textual transmission, to safely know if such a change was accidental or deliberate, and if the latter, exactly why the change was made. If such a circle of scribes making a deliberate change here did exist, we are very much, "outside the loop." Nevertheless, we can with confidence say that a change was made from the original reading, preserved for us in the representative Byzantine Text and Received Text.

The reading of the representative Byzantine text has strong support in both the Greek and Latin texts. It has support from both the Greek church father and doctor, St. Basil the Great, and (in his Vulgate) the Latin church father and doctor, St. Jerome. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:29 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:29, "to go," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also the most probable reading of (the mixed text type) Codex 073 (6th century, Matt. 14:28-31; from the same manuscript as 084, 6th century, Matt. 14:19-15:8), whose state of preservation means complete verification is not possible. It is further found in (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century).

The correct reading is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac: Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500); and some manuscripts of the Slavic Version. It is also found as Latin, "*ut* (to) *veniret* (go)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However *Variant 1*, "and came," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is also the most probable reading of (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is further found in Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent); as well as the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and some manuscripts of the Slavic Version.

Another reading, *Variant 2*, reads Greek, "*elthein* (to go), *kai* (and) *elthen* (came) *oun* (therefore)," i.e., making the reading, "he walked on the water *to go, and therefore came* to Jesus." This reading is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). The origins of this variant are speculative. But in this instance, I think we can in all probability rule out accidental change. This looks very much like a deliberate "stylistic improvement" by an Alexandrian School scribe.

Elsewhere, St. Matthew certainly uses the conjunction, *oun* (e.g., Matt. 12:12; 13:18; 17:10 *et al*); although he does not do so here. As already discussed, *supra*, at Matt. 14:15b a variant followed by London Sinaiticus adds *oun*. This and *Variant 2* here at Matt. 14:29, shows a proclivity and preparedness by the scribe of *Codex Sinaiticus* to so add this

conjunction if and when it took his curious fancy to do so, which mercifully was not very often. It seems that the double usage of the technique here and at Matt. 14:15b and 14:29 was an unusual outburst. I.e., this appears to have been largely a fleeting fancy to which he only occasionally returned, such as at Heb. 8:4; I Peter 5:1. The remaining elements of *Variant 2* are an obvious conflation of the Received Text's "*elthein* (to go)" with *Variant 1*'s "*kai* (and) *elthen* (came)." The combined effect of which produced, "*elthein* (to go), *kai* (and) *elthen* (came) *oun* (therefore)."

Though making no specific reference to the addition of the *oun*, the neo-Alexandrian, Metzger, says of *Variant 2*, "Although the reading … has the appearance of being a conflation, it may be merely an exegetical expansion introduced by the scribe" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 37; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 30). To anyone other than a doting minion of Metzger, this is most unconvincing. The neo-Alexandrian, Metzger, here fails to understand the Alexandrian School very well. If we were talking about a reading from the Western Text, then this may well be a more potentially expected explanation. But even though the Alexandrian School did sometimes simply expand a text (see commentary at Matt. 7:22); and indeed this is done here at Matt. 14:29 with the "*oun* (therefore)," this is not really the sort of thing that the Alexandrian School in general, nor the scribe of London Sinaiticus in particular, are more commonly characterized by. If, as is occasionally the case, one was to run this argument for an Alexandrian text, because in general it is so relatively uncommon, one would need a very good reason for it, which Metzger does not provide; and one would need to have the absence of a more naturally expected interpretation. Contrary to Metzger's claims, the natural interpretation is a conflation of two readings, and the addition of the *oun* is only an occasional device used by the Alexandrian School.

At Matt. 14:29, the erroneous *Variant 1* was adopted by the NU Text *et al*, although footnotes showing the alternative reading are provided by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

Hence we read at Matt. 14:29 in the main text of the American Standard Version, the correct reading, "to come" (ASV), but a footnote gives the erroneous reading of *Variant 1*, saying, "Some ancient authorities read 'and came'" (ASV ftn). The incorrect *Variant 1* is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV's 2nd edition (1984).

No variant omits these words altogether and so reads simply, "and walked upon the waters … to Jesus" (ASV). Nevertheless, the NIV's 1st edition (1978 & 1979) does just this, *but without dots or a footnote showing that an omission is being made*. Thus the NIV (1st ed.) tries to dodge the issue of which reading to follow, by in effect creating another variant, and leaving this section out altogether.

Such a peculiarity of reading was also made by Moffatt. Moffatt's conflation added the words, "on his way," which also renders no known variant in his "translation" of Matt. 14:29 as, "walked over the water on his way to Jesus" (Moffatt Bible).

The ancient Alexandrian School scribes such as those of *Rome Vaticanus* with *Variant 1* or those of *London Sinaiticus* with *Variant 2* would not accept the Word of God as found in the Received Text, and instead tampered with it. Their successors in the modern

neo-Alexandrians will not accept the Word of God as found in the Received Text, but either follow *Variant 1*, or like the ancient Alexandrian School scribe of *London Sinaiticus*, simply create a new reading of their own fancy (Moffatt & NIV 1st ed.). *Why is there so much fretting and fuming over these simple words*, "to go (*elthein*)," in the words, "to go to Jesus" (AV)? Could it be that this extraordinary miracle of walking on water, which thing the religious liberals try to "allegorize away," has in it a deeper message much hated by them?

That message can only be that we are meant to have "faith" and so "go to Jesus" (Matt. 14:29,31) by a supernatural means. We are to "Repent" (Matt. 3:3:2; 4:17), "confessing" our "sins" (Matt. 3:6), such as, those on the second tablet (commandments 6 to 10) e.g., "Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness," and those on the first tablet (commandments 1-5), e.g., "Honour thy father and thy mother" (Matt. 19:18,19) and "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" (cf. Matt. 5:21-30; 6:24; Exod. 20:1-17; 34:28,29).

We are to be baptized by Christ, for "he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire" (Matt. 3:11). This spiritual baptism or regenerating work of the Spirit gives us a "pure" "heart" (Matt. 5:8 cf. Titus 3:5). It gives us what the Apostle Peter lacked in Matt. 14:30a, it gives us "faith" "to go to Jesus" (Matt. 14:29,31 cf. Luke 22:31,32). For Christ came "to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28). Hence in the symbols of the Lord's Supper, Christ says of the bread, "This is my body" (Matt. 26:26); and of the red wine, "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. 26:28). Thus Christ's body was given and his blood was shed "for the remission of sins" (Matt. 26:28) and "a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28), as he hung on the cross and died (Matt. 27:27-66). But this "testament" or "covenant" of which he spoke (Matt. 26:28) is effective, and he was "raised again" on "the third day" (Matt. 16:21; 17:23), coming forth from the grave (Matt. 28); and indeed is coming again a second time in power and great glory (Matt. 26:64, *et al*). Thus like the Gentile Roman "centurion" who was "watching Jesus" die, we are to proclaim, "Truly this was the Son of God" (Matt. 27:54); for "whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God" (I John 4:15).

The example of the Apostle Peter is also one that warns us that if we are "to go to Jesus" (Matt. 14:29) we must not waver in our "faith" (Matt. 14:31). "But without faith it is impossible to please him: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him" (Heb. 11:6). For this reason, God who worked primarily with the Jewish race from Gen. 12 on in OT times, and the odd person of Gentile race, generically speaking, "spared not" the Jewish race (Rom. 11:21), "casting" them "away" (Rom. 11:15), even though he continues to work with the odd person of Jewish race, such as the Apostle Paul (Rom. 9:3; 16:7,11,21). Thus we of Gentile race should "be not highminded, but fear." For, like any saved Jewish Christian kinsmen of St. Paul, my fellow saved Gentile Christian kinsmen and I, stand only "by faith" (Rom. 11:20).

The message that we are "to go to Jesus" (Matt. 15:29), that we must not waver in "faith," that we must in "faith" cry out, "Lord, save me" (Matt. 14:29-31), means that when looked at in the wider context of St. Matthew's Gospel in the first instance, and the rest of Scripture in the second instance, important truths of "the gospel of the kingdom" (Matt. 4:23) are explained to us in this story. And so, good reader, if thou hast not done so before, I say unto thee, that thou art "to go to Jesus" crying, in "faith," "Lord, save me" (Matt. 14:29-31),

if thou wouldst "enter into the kingdom of God" (Matt. 19:24). For "spiritual things" "are spiritually discerned" (I Cor. 2:13,14).

Matt. 14:30 "boisterous" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Diatessaron uses the Vulgate's words at Matt. 14:30, "*ventum* (the wind) *validum* (boisterous)[94]" i.e., "the wind boisterous." Reference is made in the Vulgate's John 6:18 to "*vento* (a wind) *magno* ('great,' adjective from *magnus*) *flante* (blowing)," i.e., "a great wind that blew." However, it seems to me that if this were the source of a conflation due to Diatessaron formatting, then given that the Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex, one would expect some usage of *magnus*, rather than *validus*. Therefore I show the Sangallensis Diatessaron supporting the TR's reading, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron also uses the Latin words, "*ventum* (the wind) *validum* (boisterous)." But in this instance, we do not know enough about the underpinning Arabic to know if this is coming from Matt. 14:30 or John 6:18. Therefore I make no reference to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:30, the TR's Greek, "*ischuron* (boisterous)," in the words, "But when he [Peter] saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), P 024 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*validum* (boisterous)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Basil the Great (d. 379), and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Gaudentius (d. after 406), Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430).

However, a variant (*Variant 1*), adds the Greek adverb (in this instance to modify an adjective, *ischuron*), "*sphodra* (very)," thus making the reading, "the wind very boisterous." This is a minority Byzantine reading, found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53).

Another variant (*Variant 2*), omits the adjective "boisterous" (Greek, *ischuron*; Latin, *validum*). This is a minority Latin reading found in a Vulgate Codex.

---

[94] The Vulgate's words, "*ventum* ('the wind,' noun from *ventus*) *validum* ('boisterous' or 'sturdy' or 'strong,' adjective from *validus*)," is of some further passing interest, since from Latin *ventus* comes our English word, "vent" i.e., an air-hole; and from Latin *validus* comes our English word, "valid."

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. The origins of the variants are conjectural. *Variant 1* must in all probability be a deliberate "stylistic change." It may be a gratuitous "stylistic improvement" to "make it sound more dramatic;" or it may be a semi-conflation of the Greek, "*ton* (the) *anemon* (wind) *ischuron* (boisterous)," at Matt. 14:30, with the Greek, "*anemon* (wind) *megalou* (great)," at John 6:18. Either way, the scribe had some sensitivity to Matthean Greek which it must be said uses the adjective "*megalou* (great)" at Matt. 5:35 ("the great king"). The adverb, "*sphodra* (very)," though found elsewhere in the NT (Mark 16:4; Luke 18:23; Acts 6:7; Rev. 16:21), is a favourite word of Matthean Greek (Matt. 2:10; 17:6; 18:31; 19:25; 26:22; 27:54). Thus whether or not this is a semi-conflation with John 6:18; as a second step, the scribe stylized his idea of this addition into "Matthean Greek."

This was no clumsy conflation of the type found at *Variant 2* of Matt. 14:29 (outside the closed class of sources), *supra*. This was a much more careful and clever conflation or simple addition, by a more gifted scribe who had some sort of sensitivity to Matthean Greek. It is very disappointing to see this type of thing from a Byzantine scribe from whom we neo-Byzantine's naturally expect and hope for better things. Though God has introduced a broad safety mechanism into the *Textus Receptus* by ensuring that where there is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine text, we may through textual analysis adopt the correct reading from a minority Byzantine source, or the Latin text, or a Greek or Latin church writer, nevertheless, this is only done in relatively rare instances. Thus overall we hold the representative Byzantine text in high regard, it being our starting point from which we only depart when compelled to do so for textual reasons. In considering this *Variant 1* at Matt. 14:30, we are reminded that through reference to the representative Byzantine text, God here both shows his preservation of the text under his directive will; and through such changes as here found in W 032, his permissive will in allowing the scribe freedom. Thus the mystery of God's perfect sovereignty and simultaneous maintenance of our free will is expressed in this paradigm. O the "wisdom of God" (Eph. 3:10; Rom. 11:33), which he sometimes graciously makes "known" unto us (Eph. 3:10), and sometimes does not (Rom. 11:33).

Was the *Variant 2* omission at Matt. 14:30 of "boisterous" (Greek, *ischuron*; Latin, *validum*) accidental? Was lost in ellipsis, when looking at Greek, "*anemon* (wind) *ischuron* (boisterous)," a Greek scribe's eye jumped from the "*on*" (omicron nu) ending of "*anemon*" to the "*on*" (omicron nu) ending of "*ischuron*," perhaps after being distracted, or suffering from fatigue? Did a similar loss from ellipsis occur from a Latin scribe looking at Latin, "*ventum* (the wind) *validum* (boisterous)," in which his eye jumped from the "*v*" beginning" and "*um*" ending of "*ventum*" to the "*v*" beginning" and "*um*" ending of "*validum*"? Alternatively, was this a deliberate "semi-harmonization" by a Greek scribe with Greek, "*o* (the) *anemos* (wind)," or by a Latin scribe with Latin, "*ventus* (the wind)," at Mark 6:48? A deliberate or accidental change? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that it is not the original reading of Matt. 14:30.

The reading of the representative Byzantine text has rock solid support in both the Greek and Latin texts. It is further supported by the learned Greek church fathers and doctors, St. Basil the Great and St. John Chrysostom, together with the learned Latin church fathers and doctors, St. Jerome and St. Augustine. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:30 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:30, "the wind boisterous," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in all extant Syriac Versions; the Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (*c.* 500), and Slavic (Slavonic) Version (9th century).

Variant 1, "the wind very boisterous." With minor differences this is found in the Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century).

Variant 2, omitting "boisterous," and reading, "the wind." This is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex 073 (6th century, Matt. 14:28-31; from the same manuscript as Codex 084, 6th century, Matt. 14:19-15:8) and Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Bohairic (3rd century), and Fayyumic (3rd century) Versions.

Both major Alexandrian texts support *Variant 2*. For the older Westcott & Hort type neo-Alexandrians this was conclusive. E.g., Westcott & Hort would say they had attained their "neutral text." Thus after coming out of a Puseyite church service filled with idolatrous religious apostasy, Westcott might look smilingly at Hort and say, "There might be one bad scribe in the Alexandrian School …," and then Hort might look back smilingly at Westcott as both then said in unison, "… but not two!"

Variant 2 is found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). However, the "external support" for *Variant 2* beyond this is fairly limited, and in ancient terms, only Egyptian. For the later post Westcott-Hort neo-Alexandrians this is a relevant consideration. Thus the NU Text Committee of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) placed *ischuron* in square brackets, making its acceptance or denial optional. In reaching this conclusion, Metzger says that while "it can be argued that *ischuron* was added by scribes in order to heighten the dramatic effect, … a majority [of the Committee] was inclined to regard its presence as

intrinsically required in order to explain Peter's increasing fear" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 38; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 30). The NU Text Committee's argument that "its presence" is "required" "to explain Peter's increasing fear," is a choice bit of logic, that gave them a better understanding of this reading than their predecessor neo-Alexandrians who omitted it without question. It is pleasing to see that in resolving what from one type of neo-Alexandrian paradigm is "a textual problem" (i.e., "lack of diverse external support" for the Alexandrian text,) at last some neo-Alexandrians are taking some serious textual arguments into consideration. Nevertheless, they were still bogged down with invalid neo-Alexandrian presuppositions about the desirability and reliability of the Alexandrian textual tradition, or the shorter reading being the better one; and so they only went so far as to put *ischuron* in brackets.

The neo-Alexandrian versions are "all over the shop" on this reading at Matt. 14:30. Probably influenced by its presence in the Western Text and Syriac Versions, for the wrong reasons, the correct reading was adopted by Moffatt whose loose mind adopted the rendering, "the strength of the wind" (Moffatt Bible). The incorrect *Variant 2* is found in the main text of the American Standard Version as "the wind" (ASV), although a footnote says, "Many ancient authorities add 'strong'" (ASV ftn). The ASV's dichotomy of *Variant 2* as the main reading and a footnote giving the TR's reading, was also followed in the RSV and ESV. This dichotomy is reversed with the correct reading of the TR in the main text, and a footnote giving the *Variant 2* reading, in the NRSV. The erroneous *Variant 2* which omits "boisterous" is also found without footnote alternatives in the NASB and NIV.

Matt. 14:32 "when … were come into" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek reads, "*embanton* ('coming into,' or "going into,' masculine plural genitive, active aorist participle, from *embaino*)," i.e., "when … were come into" (although the "into" is reinforced by a subsequent *eis*), in the words, "And *when* they (*auton*) *were come into* the ship" (AV). This is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (*Codex Freerianus*, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century), P 024 (*Codex Guelferbytanus*, 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*).

However, another reading, *Variant 1*, reads Greek, "*epibanton* ('coming on [board],' or 'going on [board],' or 'going into,' masculine plural genitive, active aorist participle, from *epibaino*)." It *might* be rendered the same as the TR (but this is not the only possibility). This reading is followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, reads Greek, "*anabanton* ('going up' or 'coming up,' masculine plural genitive, active aorist participle, from *anabaino*)," i.e., "when … were gone up" (or "when … were come up") in the words, "And *when* they *were gone up* into the ship" (or "And *when* they *were come up* into the ship"). This is found as Latin, "*cum* (when) *ascendissent* ('they had ascended,' or 'they had gone up,'[95] subjunctive active pluperfect, 3rd

[95] The idea of the pluperfect is something that was completed before a past time. E.g., "Yesterday I caught the train (past time), and five minutes before the train arrived *I bought the train ticket* (pluperfect)." The subjunctive pluperfect is sometimes rendered as "may" or "might," i.e., "they might have ascended" or "they might have gone up;" but it is

person plural verb, from *ascendo*)," i.e., "when they were gone up" (or "when they were come up"), in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Version a (4th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). With the same meaning, but showing some minimalist internal variation within Vulgate Codices, it is also found as Latin, "*cum* (when) *adscendissent* ('they had ascended,' or 'they had gone up,' subjunctive active pluperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *adscendo*)," in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

Another variant (*Variant 3*), reads Latin, "*cum* (when) *ascendisset* ('he had gone up,' subjunctive active pluperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *ascendo*)," i.e., "when he had gone up." This is the Latin reading in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also a found in Latin Vulgate Codices X (7th century, Cambridge), E (8th / 9th century, London), R (8th / 9th century, London & 10th century, Paris), and Th (9th century, Paris). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Sixtinam Vulgate (1590).

The Received Text's Greek, *embaino* is from *en* (and highlighting this is the spelling variant in W 032 where the spelling is with a nu / "n" / "ν" rather than a mu / "m" / "μ" i.e., *ENBANTON* not *EMBANTON*,) meaning "in," "into," *et al*, and *baino* meaning "to walk," the combination of the two here carrying the idea of *coming into* or *going into*. However, the idea of "into" is reinforced because of the presence of Greek, *eis* in the clause, "*kai* (and) *embanton* (coming into) *auton* (them / they) *eis* (into) *to* (the) *ploion* (ship)" i.e., "And *when* they *were come into* the ship" (AV). *Variant 1's* Greek, *epibaino* is from *epi* meaning "on," "in," *et al*, and *baino* meaning "to walk," the combination of the two here carrying the idea of *coming on [board]*, or *going on [board]*, or *going into*. Its meaning is thus not necessarily synonymous with the TR, but its meaning *might* be synonymous with the TR's reading. *Variant 2's* Greek, *anabaino* is from *ana* meaning "up," and *baino* meaning "to walk," the combination of the two here carrying the idea of to *come up* or *go up*. However, the idea of "into" is still preserved because of the presence of Greek, *eis* i.e., "And *when* they *were gone up* into (*eis*) the ship."

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text at Matt. 14:32, which is therefore correct. The origins of these variants are speculative.

If Chrysostom's citation of *Variant 1* reflects a more ancient textual error, then it is possible that a scribe deliberately changed "*embanton*" (TR) to "*epibanton*" (*Variant 1*), intending that the meaning, "going into" attach to *Variant 1*, so that the two had a synonymous meaning of "when … were gone into" (or "when … were come into"). If so, e.g., he may for some curious reason have thought this a "stylistic improvement" somehow linking the "*epi*" of Matt. 14:28,29, "on (*epi*) the water" (twice). I.e., first the Apostle Peter went "on (*epi*) the water" (Matt. 14:28,29), and then in "a stylistic balance," with Christ, they "were come into (*epibanton*) the ship" (Matt. 14:32). If so, then due to a paper fade of the

---

also sometimes rendered into English as an indicative as I have done here, and so reads in English the same as an indicative pluperfect may be rendered (Wheelock's *Latin*, pp. 78,203).

epi on "*epibanton*" (*Variant 1*), this may have been "reconstructed" as "*anabanton*" (*Variant 2*). Alternatively, it is also possible that there was a simple paper fade of the "*em*" of "*embanton*" (TR), and due to the presence of a stylistic space before these two letters, a later scribe then "reconstructed" this as "*anabanton*" (*Variant 2*). If so, *Variant 1* may have come later in time, as a "reconstruction" after a paper fade of the "*ana*" of "*anabanton*" (*Variant 2*); or a "reconstruction" following a simple paper fade of the "*em*" of "*embanton*" (TR) where there was a stylistic paper space before "*embanton*," possibly done to help right hand justify the page.

Alternatively again, *Variant 2* may have been a deliberate "stylistic improvement" by a scribe who considered that his "great brain" had "deduced that they must have gone *up* from the sea," and so "the better Greek would be, *anabanton*" meaning, "when … were gone *up*." If so, what the scribe arrogantly and impiously thought of as, "the great brain of man," was possibly also influenced by other more general Matthean usage of, *ana*, for instance, in Matt. 13:29 (*ana meson* = "among") or Matt. 20:9 (*ana* = "every [man]").

Variant 3 may have come about accidentally, following a paper fade of the Latin, "*nt*" ending of "*ascendissent* (they had ascended)," which was then "reconstructed" as "*ascendisset* (he had gone up)." Alternatively, this might have been a deliberate "stylistic improvement" by a Latin scribe who considered that his "great brain" had "deduced that the focus was meant to be on Peter, not Christ and Peter, since only Peter 'ascended,' whereas Christ stayed on an even keel." If so, the scribe's defective view of, "the great brain of man," failed to realize that Christ still had to "ascend" to get into the ship, otherwise the deck would have to be level with the water, and the ship would surely have sunk! (If as is by no means certain, this was a Latin translation of the Greek, perhaps it was an altered form of the slightly different *Variant 4*, discussed outside the closed class of sources, *infra*.)

On the one hand, the reading of the Received Text has rock solid support as the reading of the representative Byzantine Greek text, and is attested to from ancient times. Depending on how one translates *Variant 1*, its basic meaning may also be further followed by an ancient church Greek writer. But on the other hand, the meaning of *Variant 1* is open to interpretation. *Variant 2* is followed by the Vulgate and a couple of ancient church Greek writers; and *Variant 3* is followed by most of the old Latin Versions and some Vulgate Codices. Balancing out these different considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:32 a "B" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:32, "when … were come into (Greek, *embanton*)," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.

Variant 2, "when … were gone up" (or "when … were come up;" Greek, *anabanton*),

is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex 073 (6th century, Matt. 14:28-31; from the same manuscript as 084, 6th century, Matt. 14:19-15:8), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), and 700 (11th century, independent). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*.

Variant 3, "when he had gone up (Latin, *cum ascendisset*)," may be followed in the Arabic Diatessaron; although I cannot be sure of this as I am not familiar with the tongue of the Arabic reading. This is of no consequence for we neo-Byzantines consult only the Latin and Greek tongues inside the closed class of sources to compose the NT Received Text. At least *prima facie*, it may be reflected as Latin, "*ascendit* ('he ascends,' or 'he goes up,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *ascendo*)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

Another variant, *Variant 4*, reads Greek, "*embanti* ('coming into' or 'going into,' masculine singular dative, active aorist participle, from *embaino*) *auto* ('him,' masculine singular dative, demonstrative from *autos*)," i.e., "when … he was come into" (although the "into" is reinforced by a subsequent *eis*), in the words, "And *when* he (*auto*) *was come into* the ship." This is found in Minuscule 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); an Egyptian Coptic Sahidic manuscript; the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions. Was this an accidental "reconstruction" of the TR's "*embanton auton*" which due to a paper fade / loss looked like "*embant:: auto:*"? Was this a deliberate "stylistic improvement" of the possible type mentioned at *Variant 3*, *supra*?

At Matt. 14:32, the incorrect *Variant 2* was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. It is thus found as "when … were gone up" in the American Standard Version's rendering, "And *when* they *were gone up* into the boat" (ASV).

Prima facie, the correct reading is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and Moffatt. E.g., Moffatt reads, "When they got into the boat" (Moffatt Bible); and the NKJV likewise reads, "when they got into the boat" (NKJV). But in fact, the underpinning Greek of the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and Moffatt is *Variant 2's anabaino*, whereas the underpinning Greek of the NKJV is *embanton*. The reason why e.g., Moffatt can use "got" (Moffatt Bible) or the NKJV can follow its rendering, *supra*, is that neither has a commitment to the sort of literalness of translation that one finds in the AV or ASV.

An attempt to more literally following the neo-Alexandrian Greek at Matt. 14:32 is found in the New International Version's, "when they climbed into the boat" (NIV), since *to climb* has the sense of going *up*. However I think that this NIV rendering could give an erroneous impression of Christ and Peter tensing their arm muscles and pulling themselves up by their arms, as they struggled and strained and tried to *climb* and clamber *into* a high boat, (perhaps with the wet Peter slipping a few times due to his wet hands?), which is certainly not

the intended meaning. Now if good reader, you find this image a little bit ridiculous, then let me say, I for one find the NIV to be a little bit ridiculous here.

Matt. 14:33 "came and" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The writings of the Origenist heretic, Didymus the Blind of Alexandria (d. 398), who was rightly condemned by the 6th general council of 680-1 (itself a mix of orthodox Christological clarifications and other erroneous non-Trinitarian matters), turned up in Egypt, North Africa, only as recently as 1941. But these writings can be used inside the closed class of sources providing they introduce nothing new, since they merely show an earlier date for what we already knew. (See Commentary Volume 2 at Matt. 18:6, "The Second Matter.") Hence I so refer to them, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:33 the Received Text's Greek, "*elthontes* ('coming,' masculine plural nominative, active second aorist participle, from *erchomai*)," i.e., "came and" in the words, "Then they that were in the ship *came and* worshipped him" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), P 024 (6th century), K 017 (9th century), Gamma 036 (10th century); Minuscule 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, abbreviated as "ελθον" with a "τ" on top between the "θ" and "ο," and a "/" over the "ν,") and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*venientes* ('coming,' masculine plural nominative, active present participle, from *venio*)," i.e., "came and," in old Latin Version d (5th century); and as Latin, "*venerunt* ('they came,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *venio*) *et* (and)," i.e., "came and," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However a variant omits "came and" (Greek, *elthontes*; Latin, *venientes* or *venerunt et*). This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and N 022 (6th century). It is also a minority Latin reading found in old Latin version ff1 (10th / 11th century). This omission is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Didymus of Alexandria (d. 398).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. The origin of the variant is conjectural. Was this an accidental loss brought about by an undetected paper fade / loss? Such losses due to a damaging mishap could sometimes be quite great. E.g., here in the Latin textual tradition, old Latin h (5th century) ends with the "*vene*" of what is surely, "*venerunt*," and is then missing the text up to Matt. 18:12. Of course, such a major loss due to damage is more easily detected. But where the loss is smaller, only a word or two, and the sentence can still make sense, a scribe may not detect the loss. Was this a deliberate loss brought about as a "stylistic improvement?" The early presence of the reading with Didymus of Alexandria, surely heightens the possibility that this was a pruning away "of unnecessary wordage" in order to

"create a more succinct text," at the hands of the notorious Alexandrian School scribes. A deliberate or accidental omission? We cannot be sure. We can only be sure that this omission occurred.

The reading of the *Textus Receptus* has strong support in both the Greek and Latin. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:33 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:33, "came and," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0106 (7th century, Matt. 12-15), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as the Armenian Version (5th century). It is also translated from the Arabic as Latin, "*venerunt* (came), *et* (and)," in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However the incorrect reading which omits, "came and," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It is further found in Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent), 579 (mixed text, 13th century); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*.

My primary interest is in the Aryan or Japhetic linguistic family's Greek, Latin, and English (and beyond that, for the OT, inside the Hamito-Semitic linguistic family, also the Semitic tongues of Hebrew and Aramaic). My references to these other tongues outside the closed class of sources are very much a secondary matter, and at best an optional extra i.e., those matters dealing with textual transmission outside the closed class of sources are of *optional historical interest only*, and have *no impact on the task of composing the Received Text of the NT (or OT).* Certainly one does not need to consult any languages outside the closed class of sources i.e., Greek and Latin for the NT (and for the OT, also Hebrew and Aramaic), just as one does not need to consult any textual traditions outside the closed class of sources in order to determine the text of Scripture, and then from that make a translation into English (or any other tongue). Though I am unfamiliar with the Allophylian tongues of Coptic and Ethiopic; I note that there is a disagreement among those studying the Hamito-Semitic tongue of the Coptic language, found in the Land of Ham (Ps. 105:27), as to whether or not the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century) does (Tischendorf's 8th ed.), or simply may (Nestle-Aland's 27th ed.), follow this variant. But among those studying the Hamito-Semitic tongue of Ethiopic, from the Biblical Cush (Gen. 10:6), it is said that this variant is followed in the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect reading at Matt. 14:33 was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Thus "came and," is omitted before "worshipped him" in the ASV's, "And they that were in the boat

worshipped him." This same omission is made in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. The omission is also found in Moffatt's, "and the men in the boat worshipped him" (Moffatt Bible), since on this occasion, as on most occasions, Moffatt preferred the two leading Alexandrian texts over the Western Text and Syriac, even though he less frequently did not.

Matt. 14:34 "into the land of" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Sizeable parts of the Byzantine Text vary between the minor spelling variants, Greek, "*Gennesaret*" (W 032 & Origen; Latin "*Gennesar*" in Vulgate, old Latin a, e, b, ff2, aur, 1, g1, ff1, c, & Merk's revised Clementine; Latin, "*Gennasar*" in old Latin d), "*Genesaret*" (N 022 & Sigma 042; Latin, "*Genesaret*" in old Latin f; Latin, "*Genesar*" in Wordsworth & White's Sixtinam and Colunga & Turrado's Clementine Vulgate), and "*Gennesareth*" (P 024; Latin, "*Gennezareth*" in old Latin q). The basic meaning is the same. (Depending on pointing, the Hebrew "t" / "ת" / tau / tav may be translated into English as "t" or "th," just like "s" / "ש" / schin / shin / sin can be rendered "s" or "sh" e.g., "Sabbath" is the normal English form, but modern Jewry sometime says, "Shabbat.") I here follow Scrivener's text with "*Gennesaret*" at Matt. 14:34 because it is the majority Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument. (Cf. *Nazareth / Nazaret*, Matt. 2:23 & 4:13, Appendix 1.)

The Greek, *e Gennesaret*, is indeclinable, and seemingly is a Hellenized semi-transliteration in some way derived from the Hebrew, *Kinneret* (*Kinnereth*) found in the OT as e.g., "the sea of Chinnereth" (Josh. 13:27), or "the sea of Chinneroth" (Josh. 12:3), or as "Cinneroth" (I Kgs 15:20). Gennesaret was a small area north-west of "the sea of Galilee," also known as "the sea of Tiberius" (John 6:1), and also known as "the lake of Gennesaret" (Luke 5:1). In the TR's reading, I have thus here regarded, Greek, "*Gennesaret*," as a feminine singular genitive noun, as at Luke 5:1, where we read, "*ten* (the) *limnen* (lake) *Gennesaret* (of Gennesaret)." (Thus I include the "of" from this genitive, "of Genessaret," in the English translation as part of the TR, *supra*.) By contrast, in translating the variant, the same indeclinable proper noun is to be regarded as a feminine singular accusative noun. Similar issues exist with the indeclinable Latin nouns for Gennesaret of "*Gennesar*" *et al*.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century) reads, "*in* (into) *terram* (the land)." But since these words are found in the Vulgate at both Matt. 14:34 and Mark 6:53, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*, since it is possible that they came from Mark 6:53 due to Diatessaron formatting.

The Third Matter. Outside the closed class of sources a confusing picture emerges of further conflations. Since these further changes outside the closed sources are at best side-issues since they have no impact on the composition of the Received Text, involve interpretations of translations into tongues outside the closed class of sources (Syriac, Egyptian Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopic), and are only of a peripheral interest anyway, I make no reference to a number of them, *infra.* Though I would not normally refer to such a matter, I do so on this occasion in part due to their higher than normal numbers; and in part to

remind the reader that there are a host of incidental variants I do not consider, since my primary concern is the debate between neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus* such as myself on the one hand, and on the other hand, our contemporary adversaries in the neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites, although I also make some reference to our old textual adversaries, the Latin Papists whom we historically defended the AV & TR with against their Douay-Rheims Version & Clementine Latin Vulgate.

Those wishing to see a different analytical approach may prefer the methodology of Tischendorf's 8th edition or Nestle-Aland's 27th edition, both of which split this reading into three separate variants. Technically, there is a sense in which these neo-Alexandrians are correct to do this; but because my interests here at Matt. 14:34 are different to theirs, I do not do so in my discussion outside the closed class of sources (although I do some of this inside the closed class of sources at the first matter, *supra*).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:34 the TR's Greek, "*eis* ('into,' preposition with an accusative) *ten* ('the,' feminine singular accusative, definite article from *e*) *gen* ('land,' singular feminine accusative, noun from *ge*)," in the words, "they came into (*eis*) the (*ten*) land (*gen*) of Gennesaret ('*Gennesaret*,' indeclinable, operating as a genitive noun)" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices P 024 (6th century), E 07 (8th century), M 021 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); Minuscule 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, abbreviating "*ten*" / "την" as "τ" with "^" on top followed by "'",) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, "*in* ('into,' preposition with an accusative) *terram* ('the land,' singular feminine accusative, noun from *terra*)," in the words, "into the land of Gennesaret," by Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and the earlier part of the words, Greek, "*eis*," is also supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant (*Variant 1*), reads Greek, "*epi* ('to,' preposition with an accusative) *ten* ('the,' an accusative) *gen* ('land,' an accusative, *supra*)," i.e., making the words, "they came to the land of Genessaret," is a minority Byzantine reading. It is found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and N 022 (6th century). It is also found as Latin, "*ad* ('to,' preposition with an accusative) *terram* ('the land,' an accusative, *supra*)," in old Latin version e (4th / 5th century). The earlier part of the words, Greek, "*epi*," is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

Yet another variant (*Variant 2*), reads Greek, "*epi* (to) *ten* (the) *gen* (land) *eis* ('in,' preposition with an accusative) *Gennesaret'* ('Gennesaret,' indeclinable, operating as an accusative noun)," i.e., making the words, "they came to the land in Gennesaret," is a minority Byzantine reading. It is found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. The origins of the variants are speculative. Was *Variant 1* an

accidental change? Due to a paper fade / loss of "*eis* (into)," was this "reconstructed" as "*epi* (to)" on the basis of Mark 6:53 (TR) which has this same reading? Alternatively, was *Variant 1* a deliberate "harmonization" of Matt. 14:34 with Mark 6:53? It seems unlikely that *Variant 2* arose accidentally, although it is *just possible* that if a manuscript with *Variant 1* had a paper loss on a blank space at the end of a line after the word "*gen* (land)," that a scribe wrongly thought that a word "was missing," and then "reconstructed" this as "*eis* (into)." If so, he might have been influenced by a copy of the TR he saw which had the earlier "*eis* (into)" at Matt. 14:34; or he might have been influenced by the grammatical syntax of John 6:21 which has the form, "*epi tes ges eis*," in its reading, "*to* (the) *ploion* (ship) *epi* (at) *tes* (the) *ges* (land) *eis* (to) *en* (which) *upegon* (they were going)," i.e., "the ship was at the land whither (*eis* + *en*) they went" (AV). Alternatively, he might have so inserted the "*eis* (into)" as a "stylistic harmonization" with John 6:21. (Cf. commentary at Mark 6:53 and John 6:21). Did *Variant 1* and / or *Variant 2* come about by accident or design? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that they are not original.

The reading of the Received Text at Matt. 14:34 has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, and strong support in the Latin as the representative Latin reading found in St. Jerome's Vulgate *et al*. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:34 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:34, "into (*eis*) the land of," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent) and 1071 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)*, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude).

The incorrect *Variant 1*, "to (*epi*) the land of," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century). It is also found in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent).

The incorrect *Variant 2*, "to (*epi*) the land in (*eis*)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century).

At Matt. 14:34, the erroneous *Variant 2* was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* It is thus found in the American Standard Version as, "to (*epi*) the (*ten*) land (*gen*), unto (*eis*)," in the words, "they came to the land, unto Genessaret" (ASV); or in the Moffatt Bible as "to (*epi*) land (*ten gen*) at (*eis*)," in the words, "they came to land at Gennesaret" (Moffatt). The incorrect *Variant 2* is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV (although elements of the NIV's underpinning text are obscured by a gratuitous dynamic equivalent).

Matt. 14:36 "him" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, since Latin, "*eum* (him)," is found in the Vulgate at both Matt. 14:36 and Mark 6:56, it is possible that it is found in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron due to Diatessaron formatting. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources similar issues with what Ciasca also translates from the Arabic as Latin, "*eum* (him)," apply to the Arabic Diatessaron. Hence likewise no reference is made to Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 14:36, the TR's Greek, "*auton* (him)," in the words, "*Kai* (And) *parekaloun* ('they besought,' indicative active imperfect, 3rd person plural verb, from *parakaleo*) *auton* ('him,' masculine singular accusative, 3rd person pronoun, from *autos-e-o*)," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*eum* ('him,' masculine singular accusative, 3rd person pronoun, from *is-ea-id*)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592).

However, a variant omits "him (Greek, *auton*; Latin, *eum*)." This omission is found in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is thus correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural. Was this an accidental omission? If so, it may have come about due to an undetected paper fade. Was this a deliberate omission? If so, its probable origins with Origen may reflect what he thought to be a "stylistic improvement," accomplished by a pruning away from the text of "unnecessary wordage" in order to create "a more succinct text."

The reading of the TR has strong support in both the Greek and Latin. The probable origins of the variant with Origen reminds us that Origen's standard as a scribe was very uneven. *When Origen was good, he was very good; but when Origen was bad, he was very bad.* Thus we cannot simply apply a man made rule such as, "the oldest witness is the best," for we know that dating from New Testament times onwards, there have been "many which corrupt the Word of God" (II Cor. 2:17). What if, from NT times itself the manuscript of such a corrupter were to turn up, even as the manuscripts of such corrupters have already turned up in the two major Alexandrian texts from the 4th century? The anti-supernaturalist Alexandrians would tend to hail it as "a great discovery of the best text," whereas we neo-Byzantines would test it by the standard of the NT Received Text; even as we even now test

the OT Dead Sea Scrolls by the standard of the OT Received Text. For we know that in NT times itself, there were not "a few," but "many which" did set about to "corrupt the Word of God" (II Cor. 2:17). Therefore we must consider such matters critically and with all due circumspection, remembering that some witnesses are more reliable than others. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 14:36 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt 14:36, "him," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and that which the neo-Alexandrians call their "Queen of the Minuscules," Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in Minuscule 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere); and the *Family 1 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)*, Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude); together with the *Family 13 Manuscripts (Swanson)*, which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee)* Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent).

However, the incorrect reading which omits "him," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type).

At Matt. 14:36, the Greek, "*auton* (him)," is placed in square brackets in Westcott-Hort (1881), indicating that its inclusion or omission is regarded as optional. By contrast, it is included in the main text of Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

The correct reading is found at Matt. 14:36 in the ASV, which reads, "and they besought him (*auton*)." The correct reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

The 3rd person masculine singular <u>nominative</u> pronoun from "*autos*" is "*autos* (he);" whereas the 3rd person masculine singular <u>accusative</u> pronoun from "*autos*" is "*auton* (him)," *supra*. If the variant were followed, one might add in italics an English rendering which theoretically supplied the equivalent of the nominative singular 3rd person pronoun "*autos* (he)," together with the imperfect indicative 3rd person singular form of the verb, "*eimi* (to be)" i.e., "<u>*en*</u> (he was)," before "besought." *Prima facie*, the New English Bible does this, and so it *might* be following the variant. But the NEB is such a loose translation, how can one be sure that in fact this is not an NEB dynamic equivalent, in which the 3rd person singular accusative pronoun is simply rendered as the 3rd person nominative singular pronoun, and the verb *to be* is then gratuitously added in as part of the dynamic equivalent? We cannot be sure. We cannot know. And nor can the users of the NEB.