

Matt. 18:2 “Jesus” (TR & AV) {A}*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

The First Matter. Tischendorf considers that without qualification the variant is followed by F 09 (9th century). By contrast, Swanson considers that the original Byzantine manuscript F 09 was blank at this verse, and that a later “corrector” added in its present verse 2 (I assume sometime before the end of the 16th century). I am unable to inspect this manuscript myself. But either way, the variant is a minority Byzantine reading, since it was either originally part of F 09, or was subsequently written out as the variant by a Byzantine scribe. Moreover nothing much hangs on this, since one can show the reading inside the closed class of sources from elsewhere.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Vulgate reads Latin, “*Iesus* (Jesus),” at both Matt. 18:2 and Luke 9:47. As a consequence of Diatessaron formatting, it is not possible to tell if the *prima facie* reading of Matt. 18:2 in the Latin Vulgate Codex of the Sangallensis Diatessaron, got its Latin, “*Ihesus* (Jesus),” from one or both of these sources. Thus no reference is made to this Diatessaron, *infra*.

Likewise, outside the closed class of sources, due to Diatessaron formatting, it is not possible to tell where the *prima facie* reading of Luke 9:47 in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron got the Latin, “*Iesus*,” from. Thus once again, no reference is made to this Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 18:2, the TR’s Greek, “*o* (-) *Iēsous* (Jesus),” in the words, “And Jesus called” etc. (AV), are supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.) (in both instances the Lectionaries abbreviate *o Iēsous / O IHCOYC* to *O IC* with a line on top of *IC*). Though the precise place at the beginning of the sentence varies, it is also found as Latin, “*Iesus* (Jesus),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (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). Though place after, rather than before, “*paidion* (a little child),” as in the TR, the reading is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) (*Variant 1*).

However, the Greek, “*o* (-) *Iēsous* (Jesus),” is omitted in a variant (*Variant 2*). This is a minority Byzantine reading found in F 09 (9th century) and V 031 (9th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental change? In Manuscript Washington (W 032) at e.g., Matt. 24:24, “*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. In such scribal practice, words might drop out due to scribal error, and be reinserted a little bit later, providing the basic meaning was still the same. (Cf. my comments at Matt. 17:3b; 17:4; 17:5, 17:17b, discussed simultaneously in App 3.)

In the continuous script W 032, the “*O* (-) *IHCOYC* (Jesus),” is abbreviated (with a line on top where I have a line underneath,) as “*OIC*.” But whether or not this abbreviation was used, we know that short words were sometimes lost. E.g., were these two words lost due to an ellipsis with the final “*C*” (sigma) of the previous word, “*proskalesamenos* (‘calling’ = ‘called,’ AV),” and then added back in after? I.e., in looking at “*ΠΡΟΣΚΑΛΕCAMENOCOIC*,” did Origen’s mind become befuddled with the “*OCOIC*” ending, so that his eye jumped from one “*C*” (sigma) to the next, at which point he wrote, “*ΠΑΙΔΙΟΝ* (a little child),” and then, suddenly realizing his mistake, did he then add back in, “*OIC* (Jesus)”?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? Did Origen regard it as some kind of “stylistic improvement” to put “*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus),” after, rather than before, “*paidion* (a little child)”?

Importantly, the meaning of *Variant 1* is not different to that of the TR’s reading, which it thus supports.

Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration? E.g., due to ellipsis per *Variant 1*, *supra*, was the “*OIC* (Jesus)” lost, but not detected? Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change? Due to the presence of “*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus),” in Matt. 18:1, did a scribe regard its presence here at Matt. 18:2 as “superfluous wordage,” and so remove it on the basis of “redundancy”?

Deliberate or accidental changes? We do not know. But we do know that they were changes to the original Received Text.

The TR’s reading has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument. It also has the monolithic support of the Latin text, being found in both St. Jerome’s Vulgate and all old Latin versions. By contrast, the variant has slim support and does not remedy a clear and obvious textual problem in the representative Byzantine text. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 18:2 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 18:2, “Jesus,” is found in 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). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); together with the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in all extant Syriac versions e.g., the Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions; and Armenian Version (5th century).

However *Variant 2*, which omits, “Jesus,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), and (the independent, but Byzantine influenced,) Codex 078 (Matt. 17-18, 19; Luke 18:14-25; John 4:52-5:8; 20:17-26; 6th century). It is further found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 18:2, the erroneous *Variant 2* was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Thus the ASV reads, “And he called” etc. . The incorrect reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

But perhaps influenced by the correct reading in the Western Text, Syriac Versions, and most Egyptian versions, for the wrong reasons, the right reading was adopted by the TCNT and TEV.

Matt. 18:6 “about his neck” (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The translation of the King James Version at Matt. 18:6, “about,” in, “were hanged about his neck,” might have been based on either *Reading 1a* or *Reading 1b, infra.* On the one hand, *Reading 1b*, “*epi* (about),” as adopted by Scrivener, and is *prima facie* the more likely possibility given that it was used in various 16th century printed Greek texts e.g., Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550).

But on the other hand, the relatively wide usage of *Reading 1a*, “*peri* (about), in ancient times by e.g., Origen, St. Cyril - twice, and St. Basil - thrice¹, means that the King James translators may well have preferred it. Thus we cannot be sure which of these two readings was preferred (and perhaps some translators preferred *Reading 1a* and others *Reading 1b*). But in either instance, the meaning and translation into English as “about,” is the same.

The Second Matter. When earlier Byzantine manuscripts, such as *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century, Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) or *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century), are rediscovered, they are included inside the closed class of sources, since they represent a text type known though time and over time². On the same principle, reference may be made to, for instance, Didymus (d. 398), where his reading can be found elsewhere inside the closed class of sources³.

The Origenist, Didymus (c. 313-398), is also known as Didymus of Alexandria, or Didymus the Blind. Blind from the age of four, Didymus followed such Origenist heresies as the pre-existence of souls, transmigration of souls, and universalist salvation. Reminding us that none of us is perfect, and we all make mistakes, St. Jerome (d. 420) at first spoke favorably about Didymus. But upon later learning about his heretical views, St. Jerome then understandably moved to put a clear distance between himself and Didymus.

On the one hand, Didymus held some orthodox beliefs for which he may be fairly commended e.g., he opposed the Arian heresy. But on the other hand, he held some unorthodox beliefs for which he may be fairly condemned. In the final analysis, of heretics like Didymus the Blind, it may be fairly said, “They went out from us,” “for” “they were not of us” (I John 2:19). Didymus was rightly condemned by the *Third Council of Constantinople* (680-1), and his works disappeared altogether, lacking any

¹ Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72); for Origen: Mignius *Patrol. Gr.* Vol. 11-17, 3, at 593 [Origen in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1862 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 13, p. 1140 (Commentary on Matthew, 13:593) (Greek)]; for St. Cyril, *de adoratione et cultu in spiritu et veritate libri septendecim*, Vol. 1, pp. 1-632, at 250; 2) *Habacuc (Abacuc), commentarius in duodecim prophetas; post pontanum et Aubertum*, 3 vols, edidit Philippus E. Pusey, Oxonii, a. 1862, 2 Voll, at 155; and for St. Basil 1) *Moralia*, Vol. 2, pp. 230-323 at 259; 2) *Operum eius editionem Benedictinum curavit Iulianus Garnerius*, Parissii annis 1721-1730, 3 voll, fol, huius editionem volumina ad titulas singulos adposui, reg br 64; 3) Basiliius metropolita Seleucensis, Mignium, *Patrol. Gr.* vol. 85, coll. 9-618, at 155 [St. Basil the Great in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1864 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 85, p. 325 (Oration 29:155) (Greek)].

² See Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, section 5) “Greek and Latin Texts.”

³ See Commentary, Vol. 1, at Matt. 1:25; 5:11a; 5:11b; 7:14a; 11:17b; 12:35; 14:33.

general accessibility over the ages. But then in 1941, papyrus containing his works was rediscovered at Toura, south of Cairo, in Egypt, north Africa.

Providing the reading of Didymus accords with that which we already have inside the closed class of sources, I therefore cite it on the same type of basis that I cite rediscovered Byzantine texts. By contrast, if a reading of Didymus were to lack such pre-existent support inside the closed class of sources, I would not so cite it inside the closed class of sources. If any of my fellow neo-Byzantines so dislike Didymus of Alexandria that they do not want him cited at all, (such was the normative practice from medieval times till the twentieth century,) then let them just ignore the references I make to him, and they will find that this does not affect the final outcome at all.

The Third Matter. The third matter subdivides into subsections 3a, 3b, and 3c.

3a) The Latin at Matt. 18:6, “*in* (‘on’ preposition *in* + ablative) *collo* (‘the neck,’ masculine singular ablative noun, from *collus*) *eius* (of him),” i.e., “on the neck,” is found 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), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further found in the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

Tischendorf considers the Latin, “*in collo*” supports the reading of *Variant 1*, i.e., the representative Byzantine text. But it does not necessarily follow that the Latin, “*in collo*,” is rendering the same meaning of “upon / on the neck.” This is evident from Dan. 5:7,16. In the Aramaic, both passages refer to a golden chain being “*al* (around)” a neck. The first Aramaic, “*al* (around)” of Dan. 5:7 is rendered in both the Vulgate and Clementine as, “*in* (on) *collo* (the neck);” and the second Aramaic, “*al* (around)” of Dan. 5:16 is rendered in both the Vulgate and Clementine as, “*circa* (around) *collum* (the neck).” (Cf. Hebrew, *al* rendered by Latin, “*in*,” with Latin, “*in collo*” of both the Vulgate and Clementine at Jer. 27:2.)

Given this clear precedent of Dan. 5:7, in which the Aramaic, “*al* (around)” is rendered in both the Vulgate and Clementine as, “*in* (on) *collo* (the neck);” it is clearly the case that at Matt. 18:6, St. Jerome *et al* may have likewise rendered the Greek, “about / around (*epi* / *peri*)” the neck (*Readings 1a & 1b*) as Latin, “*in collo*.” This means that we cannot be sure whether, on the one hand, the Latin “*in collo*,” is a translation from *Readings 1a & 1b*; or on the other hand, if the Latin “*in collo*,” is a translation of *Variant 1*, “on (*eis*) the neck” (majority Byzantine text). Under the circumstances, Tischendorf’s dogmatism is unwise, and so no reference will be made to those Latin texts following this reading, *infra*.

3b) Furthermore, Tischendorf also considers that at Matt. 18:6, old Latin e supports the reading of the representative Byzantine text, Greek, “*eis* (upon).” Old Latin

e, is the preposition “*in*” with an accusative, and here means “on” or “upon⁴.” Thus we read, “*in* (‘upon,’ preposition *in* + accusative) *collum* (‘the neck,’ masculine singular accusative noun, from *collus*) *eius* (of him),” in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century).

But once again we find that Hebrew, “*al* (around / upon)” (the same as the Aramaic, *supra*), might be so translated into the Latin. The usage of Latin, “*in* (‘about’ or ‘upon’ preposition *in* + accusative) *collum* (the neck),” is found at Gen. 45:14. Here there is a Hebraic poetical parallelism in a man putting his arms around his brother’s neck to embrace him. The key words in, “fell *upon* his brother Benjamin’s neck,” in both the Vulgate and Clementine are Latin, “*in* (upon) *collum* (the neck);” and the Vulgate and Clementine then both say that likewise Benjamin, “wept *upon* his neck,” and here the parallel key words are Latin, “*super* (about / upon) *collum* (the neck).” There is an ambiguity with the parallel, “*super* (‘about’ or ‘upon’) *collum* (the neck),” which could mean “about / around the neck” or “upon the neck.” But either way, it is clear that the Latin terminology found in old Latin e, “*in* (upon) *collum* (the neck);” is being used to render what in the Hebrew has the likely connotation of “upon” in the sense of “around.”

Thus once again, because old Latin e could conceivably have been made from a scribe using either *Readings 1a* or *1b*, or *Variant 1*, no reference is made to old Latin e, *infra*.

3c) Finally with respect to the Latin at Matt. 18:6, there is the matter of old Latin Version d (5th century) (which is not referred to by Tischendorf here, even though he refers to it on some other occasions). This reads, “*super* (‘about’ or ‘upon,’ preposition *super* + accusative) *collum* (‘the neck,’ masculine singular accusative noun, from *collus*) *eius* (of him).” The fact that Latin “*super*” can here mean either “about” as in *Readings 1a* or *1b*, or “upon / on” as in *Variant 1*, once again means that we cannot with confidence cite it as supporting either reading. Thus no reference is made to old Latin d, *infra*.

Therefore the textual issues involved at Matt. 18:6 must be resolved with exclusive reference to the Greek texts.

The Fourth Matter. Both Swanson and Nestle-Aland (27th ed.) say that N 022 reads “*peri*” (*Reading 1a*). But the copy of N 022 I use (H.S. Cronin’s *Texts & Studies*, under the editor, J.A. Robinson, Cambridge University, UK, 1899), clearly reads, “*epi*” (*Reading 1b*). The error by both Swanson and Nestle-Aland reminds us that the mind of a copyist can sometimes become befuddled, and the letters “*e* (‘epsilon,’ ε),” “*p* (‘pi,’ π),” and “*i* (‘iota,’ ι),” of “*epi* (επι),” muddled and rearranged in the mind’s eye of a copyist, to become, “*peri* (περι).” This is an instance from modern times, of an old problem that we find in the manuscripts. Fallen human nature and fallen human frailties do not change.

⁴ See the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* at “*in*,” pp. 855-7.

“O thou Adam, what hast thou done? For though it was thou that sinned, thou art not fallen alone, but we that come of thee.” “O thou Adam, what hast thou done? (II Esdras 7:47, Apocrypha).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 18:6, *Reading 1a*, Greek, “*peri* (‘about,’ preposition *peri* + accusative) *ton* (‘the,’ masculine singular accusative definite article, from *o*) *trachelon* (‘neck,’ masculine singular accusative noun, from *trachelos*) *autou* (of him),” i.e., “about his neck” (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading. This is supported in the purple parchment, Codex Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark, Paris, France), and Lectionary 184 (1319 A.D., Burney 22, British Library, London, UK). It is also supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Basil the Great (d. 379), Didymus (d. 398), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

With the same meaning as *Reading 1a*, *Reading 1b* is found in Scrivener’s Text which follows, for instance, the Greek texts of Erasmus (1516), Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633). *Reading 1b*, Greek, “*epi* (‘about,’ preposition *epi* + accusative) *ton* (‘the,’ accusative definite article) *trachelon* (‘neck,’ accusative noun) *autou* (of him),” i.e., “about his neck” (AV), is also a minority Byzantine reading. It is supported by the purple parchment, Codex N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century, London, UK, Athens, Greece, New York, USA, *et al*), Codex U 030 (*Codex Nanianus*, 9th century, Venice, Italy), and Minuscule 2 (12th century, Basel, Switzerland).

Variant 1 reads Greek, “*eis* (‘upon,’ preposition *eis* + accusative) (‘the,’ accusative definite article) *trachelon* (‘neck,’ accusative noun) *autou* (of him),” i.e., “upon his neck.” This is the majority Byzantine reading⁵, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, there is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading (*Variant 1*). On the one hand, in OT Septuagint and NT Koine Greek, one may put certain things “on (*epi* + genitive) the (*tou*, singular genitive) neck (*trachelou*, singular genitive),” Gen. 27:16, LXX.

But on the other hand, one does not *hang something* “upon (*eis*) the neck.” Rather one *hangs something* “about / around (*epi* / *peri*)” the neck. Hence we find the

⁵ The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden’s K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green’s Majority Text Apparatus says 95-100% of all manuscripts follow the majority Byzantine reading (i.e., the variant, *eis*). Thus 5% or less of all manuscripts follow the minority Byzantine readings of *Reading 1a* (*peri*) or *Reading 1b* (*epi*).

formulae of words, “*peri* (‘about,’ preposition *peri* + accusative) *ton* (‘the,’ accusative) *trachelon* (‘neck,’ accusative),” at Gen. 41:42, LXX; Jer. 27:2 (34:2), LXX; Ezek. 16:11, LXX; Dan. 5:29, LXX; Mark 9:42; Luke 17:2. Or the formulae of words, “*peri* (‘about,’ preposition *peri* + dative) *trachelo* (‘neck,’ dative singular),” at Prov. 1:9, LXX; Prov. 6:21, LXX. Or the formulae of words, “*epi* (‘about,’ preposition *epi* + accusative) *ton* (‘the,’ accusative definite article) *trachelon* (‘neck,’ accusative noun)” at Gen. 33:4, LXX; Gen. 45:14, LXX; Deut. 28:48, LXX; Dan. 5:7, LXX; Luke 15:20; Acts 15:10; 20:32. Or the formulae of words, “*epi* (‘about,’ preposition *epi* + dative) *trachelo* (‘neck,’ singular dative)” at Gen. 45:14, LXX; Prov. 3:3, LXX; Dan. 5:16, LXX. Though relatively rare, the Greek “*en*” + dative, can have the sense of “about” e.g., “about (*en* + dative) the (*tois*, a plural dative definite article) [business]” (Luke 2:49). This is also its meaning in, “about (*en* + dative) the (*tois*, plural dative) necks (*trachelois*, plural dative),” at Judg. 8:21,26, LXX.

Therefore, the reading of the representative Byzantine text at Matt. 18:6, that “a millstone were hanged *upon* (*eis*) his neck,” clangs upon the ears as bad Greek. To remedy this textual problem, it follows that we must adopt one of the two minority Byzantine readings, namely, “*peri* (about)” (*Reading 1a*) or “*epi* (about)” (*Reading 1b*). But which one? Both are clearly permissible on the basis of general textual analysis.

Given the relatively wider usage of *Reading 1a*, “*peri* (about), in ancient times by Origen - once, St. Cyril - twice, and St. Basil - thrice, (and if Sigma 042 is late 5th century, rather 6th century, then also this manuscript), I regard this as the preferred reading over *Reading 1b*, Greek, “*epi* (about).”

In reaching this conclusion in favour of *Reading 1a* over *Reading 1b*, I also note that similar teaching by our Lord was sometimes given multiple times on the same general occasion, or on quite separate occasions. Hence while I believe there are clearly some Gospel parallelisms, e.g., there was only one death and resurrection of our Lord, nevertheless, I do not agree with a large number of attempts to claim a “gospel parallelism.” E.g., repetition is a device used by a teacher, so that even on the same occasion the same message, or elements of it, can be repeated, perhaps with some slight differences. Our Lord taught the same things, multiple times, in multiple places over a period of three and a half years, sometimes slightly changing details in the changed situation. But for all that, it is clear that in the same type of context as Matt. 18:6, he used the terminology “*peri* (‘about,’ preposition *peri* + accusative) *ton* (‘the,’ accusative) *trachelon* (‘neck,’ accusative),” in Mark 9:42 and Luke 17:2. This therefore acts to further confirm the propriety of preferring *Reading 1a*.

But given the fact that Stephanus *et al* would have been aware of the better ancient attestation of *Reading 1a* by the old and holy doctors St. Basil the Great and St. Cyril, or its earlier usage by Origen, as well as the usage of “*peri* (about),” at Mark 9:42 and Luke 17:2, necessarily raises the question as to why, having rightly recognized a clear and obvious textual problem in the representative Byzantine reading at Matt. 18:6 finding resolution in either *Reading 1a* or *Reading 1b*, they would then opt for *Reading 1b* over *Reading 1a*. Given that the two are synonymous in meaning, and translation

from either is the same, leads me to ask, Was *Reading 1b* preferred over *Reading 1a* as a textual trademark which persisted over time?⁶

The origins of *Reading 1b* and *Variant 1* are conjectural.

Was *Reading 1b* an accidental alteration? Did the original “*peri* (about)” (*Reading 1a*) go over two lines, with the “*p*” at the end of one line, and the “*eri*” at the start of the second line? If so, due to paper fades, did the “*p*” (pi) of line 1 fade totally, and line 2 look something like, “*e:~*”? If so, did a scribe then “reconstruct” this “from context” as “*epi*” (*Reading 1b*)?

Was *Reading 1b* a deliberate change? Did a scribe, correctly understanding the synonymous nature of “*peri* (about)” (*Reading 1a*) and “*epi*” (*Reading 1b*) here at Matt. 18:6, decide to change the reading as a paper space saving device? Would this likelihood be greater if he was coming to the end of the line on a page, and he wanted to “squeeze it in” rather than go over two lines with it?

Was *Variant 1* an accidental alteration? Did the original “*peri* (about)” (*Reading 1a*) go over two lines, with the “*p*” at the end of one line, and the “*eri*” at the start of the second line? If so, due to paper fades, did the “*p*” (pi) of line 1 fade totally, and line 2 look something like, “*e:~*”? If so, did a scribe then “reconstruct” this “from context” as “*eis*” (*Variant 1*)? If so, the scribe, who appears to have been Origen, evidently used a Latinized conceptualization of the Greek without consciously realizing what he was doing. I.e., the Latin idea of something, “*in* (on) *collo* (the neck),” *supra*, put in Greek form as, “*eis* (on) *ton* (the) *trachelon* (neck).”

Was the *Variant 1* a deliberate change? The change appears to have originated with Origen, who refers to both “*peri* (about)” (*Reading 1a*) and “*eis* (on)” (*Variant 1*). Is this another instance in which we have caught Origen “with his finger in the pie”? Did Origen deliberately seek to make some kind of “cultural adaptation,” in which he consciously transposed the Latin idea of something, “*in* (on) *collo* (the neck),” *supra*, into a Greek form as, “*eis* (on) *ton* (the) *trachelon* (neck)”?

Deliberate or accidental changes? We may suspect this or that, but we simply do not know. We only know that some changes were made.

On the one hand, either *Reading 1a* or *Reading 1b* are strongly favoured by textual analysis. Within these parameters, *Reading 1a* has some broad support over time and through time in the Greek as a minority Byzantine reading in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), together with some later 11th and early 14th Byzantine manuscripts. It also has some impressive diversified ancient support in the combination of references from

⁶ See Commentary Volume 1 (Matt. 1-14), “Primary & Secondary Rules of Neo-Byzantine Textual Analysis” in the “Introduction” to the Appendices; and also the first Appendix.

Origen – once, St. Cyril – twice, and St. Basil the Great – thrice. But on the other hand, this is a minority Byzantine Greek reading, supported in approximately 5% or less of manuscripts in von Soden’s K group.

Weighing up these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 18:6 a low level “B” (in the range of 66% +/- 1%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 18:6, *Reading 1a*, Greek, “*peri* (about),” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century); and Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century).

Reading 1b, Greek, “*epi* (about),” is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent) and 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere).

Variant 1, Greek, “*eis* (upon),” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscule 1071 (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*; 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*.

Variant 1 is referred to in Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) as favoured by a 3:1 ratio over *Reading 1b* in his selection of manuscripts. He says that “*eis*” appears instead of “*epi*” (*Reading 1b*), in Gospel manuscripts: i (Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17), v (Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9), and w (Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16); but *not* so in z (Evangelistarium, Christ’s College, Cambridge, F. i. 8). (Elzevir adopted the minority *Reading 1b*, *supra*.)

Variant 2, “*en* (about),” is found in Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent).

The presence of *Reading 1a* in the two major Alexandrian texts, meant that for the wrong reasons, the right reading was adopted by the neo-Alexandrian’s NU Text *et al*. Thus in harmony with the TR, at Matt. 16:8, the ASV correctly reads, “about his neck.”

So too, by the same neo-Alexandrian textual fluke, the correct reading is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

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 thus Burgon’s proud boast was this, “Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction” (*Revision Revised*, p. 21). Responding to their master’s call, the Burgonite minions of John Burgon (d. 1888), have supported *Variant 1* in such Majority Texts as Hodges and Farstad (1985), Green’s Textual Apparatus (1986), and Robinson and Pierpont (1991).

However, the Burgonite New King James Version (NKJV), which is highly selective as to which majority text readings it refers to, makes no reference to their “Majority Text” reading here at Matt. 18:6. The effect of this, and other such omissions, is to give the reader of the NKJV the erroneous impression that the Burgonite Text is closer to the Received Text than what it actually is. To some extent, this understating of the differences between the Majority Text and Received Text may be pleasing to the ears of the USA based Dean Burgon Society, who lack a fundamental understanding of Burgon’s textual theoretics, and wrongly think that the Majority Text equates the Received Text. What then of Burgon’s claim, “the ‘*Textus Receptus*’ ..., calls for ... revision,” “upon the” basis of the “majority of authorities;” and his concomitant brag, “Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction”? To accept it here at Matt. 18:6 is unthinkable, for to do so, we must first be prepared to set aside the natural construction of the Greek. If so, we must choose to put a premium on ignorance. We cannot do so, for we believe in godly natural law (reason); although maintain that such natural law must always be subject to, and never in violation of, the Divine revelation (a factor making our form of natural law different to that of the ungodly). We know that in ancient times God was prepared to judge and destroy those who set aside godly natural law, and so though they had no Divine revelation, they were judged and perished for such sins as incest, sex with a menstruating woman, adultery, murder, idolatry, and sodomy (Lev. 18); and that this same Creator God will do so again on the Day of Final Judgement (Rom. 1 & 2).

We do even as we are commanded in Holy Scripture, “ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee; and the fowls of the air, and they shall tell thee: or speak to the earth, and it shall teach thee: and the fishes of the sea shall declare unto thee” (Job 12:7,8). “Go to the ant, thou sluggard; consider her ways, and be wise” (Prov. 6:6). We have gone to beasts. We have gone to the fowls. We have considered the earth’s geological layers. We have listened to the fish. We have gone to the ant. We have considered man, and concluded that he is *ad imaginem Dei*⁷. We have learnt that our God expects a high standard of his people, and that we are to use godly reason in a way harmonious with, but never contrary to, that which we find in the Divine revelation of Holy Writ. We are to give our best to God. We bow down low before His Divine

⁷ Latin, “*ad* (according to) *imaginem* (the image) *Dei* (of God)” (Gen. 1:27, Vulgate).

Majesty, the Lord Jehovah; for our “God” “reigneth” (Rev. 19:6), “he sitteth between the cherubims” (Ps. 99:1), “Alleluia” (= “Praise Jah,” “Jah” is an abbreviated form of “Jehovah,” Rev. 19:1,3,4,6). And so, we neo-Byzantines respond to the Burgonites, that humbly relying upon the blessing of Almighty God, *Again and again we have occasion to point out, that the Textus Receptus needs no correction.*

Matt. 18:7a “it ... be” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek, “*estin* (‘it is’ or ‘it ... be,’ AV, indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *eimi*),” in the words, “for *it* must needs *be* that offences come” (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), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), as well as Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). It is also supported as Latin, “*est* (it is / be),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, Greek, “*estin* (it is / be),” is omitted in a minority Byzantine reading e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), and Minuscule 2 (12th century). It is also omitted in the ancient church Greek writers, Chrysostom (d. 407) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text’s, “*gar* (for) *estin* (it is / be)” here at Matt. 18:7a (cf. “*gar esti{n}*” at Matt. 9:4; 12:8; 20:1), which is therefore the correct reading. The origins of the variant are speculative.

Was this an accidental change? E.g., did the eye of a copyist, who was perhaps suffering from fatigue, jump from the “*e*” (epsilon) of “*estin* (it is / be),” to the “*e*” of the next word, “*elthein* (‘to come’ = ‘come,’ AV)”?

Was this a deliberate change? Did a prunist scribe regard “*estin* (it is / be)” as “unnecessarily excessive wordage”? If so, did he then prune it away in order to make “a more succinct” and “less flowery” text?

The reading of the TR has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument. It has such support from ancient times in W 032. It also has the monolithic support of the Latin textual tradition, once again, from ancient times in e.g., St. Jerome’s Vulgate. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 18:7a 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. 18:7a, “it is / be,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century); together with the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.*

However, “it is / be,” is omitted in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is also omitted in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further omitted 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 omitted in the Syriac Version (1708, Schaafius); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

With a major split in the two leading Alexandrian texts at Matt. 18:7a, the neo-Alexandrians were painfully bamboozled and flabbergasted as to just what they should do. With general, though not absolute predictability, Tischendorf, who was known to sometimes put his hand down dirty places and pull things out of a bin, embraced his much beloved “discovery” of the booby-prize, London Sinaiticus. Thus for the wrong reasons, he adopted the correct reading in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72). After all, did it not have the additional support of the Western Text’s D 05?

Now the old “whore” of Rome (Rev. 17:1), might sometimes say to a young man, “come on up to my chamber, I used to service your daddy!” Now personally, as a Reformed (Evangelical) Anglican Protestant, I find the old ugly harlot of Rome quite repulsive, but it seems that not all agree with me, and “beauty is in the eye of the beholder.” Certainly “the pull of Rome” proved stronger for the semi-Romanist Puseyite Anglicans, Westcott and Hort (1881), who in slap-stick humour type manner, evidently fell over each other in order to see who could be first to get to the old whore of Babylon, and follow the variant of Rome Vaticanus that came from the Pope’s library. After all, did it not have the additional support of some Syriac, Egyptian Sahidic, and Ethiopic texts? This logic was evidently quite compelling, for the variant of Rome Vaticanus was further followed by 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).

What were the neo-Alexandrian translators meant to make of all this fiddling and faddling by their neo-Alexandrian masters? Some of them agreed with Tischendorf. Thus at Matt. 18:7a, for the wrong reasons, the right reading was fluked by the American Standard Version, which in following London Sinaiticus, correctly reads, “it ... be” (ASV). So too, the correct reading is found in the NASB, RSV, and ESV.

But others agreed with Westcott-Hort *et al.* Thus the wrong reading is found in the Roman Catholic’s Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles, even though the correct reading was earlier found in the Roman Catholic’s Douay-Rheims Version. It seems that on this occasion, the old Latin Papists’ Latin was more reliable than the new neo-Alexandrian Papists’ Greek. This reminds me of a joke that one sometimes hears, “Since Vatican II the Roman Catholics have decided that the Protestants were right about how to compose the Biblical text, and so they have gone over from the Latin to the Greek for the New Testament in their Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles.” I say, “joke,” because while said in a serious kind of way by deluded persons, one could scarce call a neo-Alexandrian text “Protestant” in the true sense of the word; and the reality is, that both before and after Vatican II, Rome still attacks the Received Text. The variant is likewise found in the NEB, REB, NIV, and Moffatt Bible. E.g., “Such things must come” (NIV); or “hindrances have to come” (Moffatt Bible).

Others, finding themselves caught between the Devil and the deep blue sea, took the verb “to be” element from London Sinaiticus, but omitted the “it,” thus producing a kind of half-way house English translation between London Sinaiticus and Rome Vaticanus. Such was the rendering of the New Revised Standard Version, “Occasions for stumbling are bound to come” (NRSV); or the Twentieth Century New Testament, “There cannot but be snares” (TCNT). This same type of “solution” is found in the TEV. Are the TCNT, TEV, and NRSV following London Sinaiticus and omitting the “it” of *estin*, or following Rome Vaticanus and gratuitously adding in the verb, *to be*, with no italics? We do not know. And nor do their readers. Perhaps the translators of the TCNT, TEV, and NRSV, themselves did not know?

Now “in all the churches of the saints,” “God is not the author of confusion” (I Cor. 14:33). So to whom then must the spiritual life-line of these very confused neo-Alexandrians be connected? The answer to that question may be found in I Peter 5:8.

Matt. 18:7b “that” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), places Origen’s name in brackets after the variant. The UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, consider that Origen “supports the” variant “reading for which he is cited, but deviates from it in minor details.” On this occasion, I have had the opportunity to examine the Origen quote in his Commentary on Matthew’s Gospel, as found in Migne.

On the one hand, I think the fact that Origen clearly makes some changes to the

verse before the key section, is important for showing that Origen was prepared to make “stylistic changes” that suited his fancy. It is these changes of Origen that the UBS apparatus refers to as “minor details,” *supra*. But on the other hand, while Origen’s quote of the earlier part of the verse is slightly different, at the key section of relevance for the purposes of textual analysis, it is the same as the variant, reading Greek, “*τὸ* (the) *ἄνθρωπος* (man) *δι’* (by) *οὗ* (whom) *τοῦ* (the) *σκάνδαλον* (offence) *ἐρχεται* (cometh)” (Variant). Therefore without qualification, I make reference to Origen supporting the variant, *infra*.

A later Latin translation of Origen placed in the adjoining column of Migne reads, Latin, “*homini* (man) *illi* (that)⁸.” This indicates that the later Latin scribe translating Origen, detected Origen’s error at Matt. 18:7b, and corrected it in the Latin. But I could not accept that this later Latin translation accurately reflects Origen, even though, it must be said, that it does correctly reflect the TR’s reading.

The matter is of some interest in showing how scribes sometimes made amendments to the text that they were simply meant to be copying out. The Latin scribe was no doubt well intentioned, and certainly correct in his understanding of the better reading. But even if one takes a pig, and cleans it up, and puts a ribbon around its neck; it is still a pig. Thus I cannot agree with the actions of the Latin scribe who tried to “clean Origen up” and “doll Origen up” here. We cannot be certain that the change to the text, probably by Origen, was deliberate, although it may well have been, and the likelihood of this is heightened by his earlier changes to parts of Matt. 18:7b. If it was deliberate, then we ought not to try and conceal the actions of heretics like Origen. “For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you” (I Cor. 11:19).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At. Matt. 18:7b, the TR’s Greek, “*εκεῖνο* (that),” in “*τὸ* (-) *ἄνθρωπος* (man) *εκεῖνο* (that),” i.e., “*that* 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, in a different word order, *infra*), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is also supported as Latin, “*homini* (man) *illi* (that),” in Latin Vulgate Codices L (*Codex Lichfeldensis*, 7th / 8th century, Lichfield) and H (*Codex Hubertianus*, 9th / 10th century, London); together with old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century, in reverse word order), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century, in reverse word order), 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, Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215), Adamantius (d. 4th century), Basil the Great of Caesarea (d. 379), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); the ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258),

⁸ Origen in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1862 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 13, p. 1158 (Commentary on Matthew, 13:602) (Greek & Latin).

Hilary of Poitiers (d. 367), Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370), and Augustine of Hippo (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a variant omits, Greek, “*ekeino* (that),” and so reads, Greek, “*tō* (the *anthropō* (man),” i.e., “the man.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in F 09 (9th century) and Lectionary 184 (1319 A.D.). This omission is also found in the reading of Latin, “*homini* (the man),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions d (5th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Didymus (d. 398).

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

Was the variant an accidental change? The reading of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) at Matt. 18:7b is, “*plen* (‘but,’ word 1) *ouai* (‘woe,’ word 2) *tō* (‘to the,’ word 3) *anthropō* (‘man,’ word 4) *ekeino* (‘that,’ word 5).” Yet in W 032, this is put in word order 1,5,2,3,4. Why was “*ekeino*” moved forward to be placed between words 1 and 2? Notably W 032 also uses a normative abbreviation for “*anthropō*” (with a line on top where I have one underneath the “an”,) as “*ano*.” Looking at this in a continuous script manuscript in capital letters, would thus look something like, “*IIAHNOYAITΩANΩEKEINΩ*”. Could it be that the scribe of W 032, knew from experience, that the “*NΩ*” (*nō*) ending of “*ANΩ*” (*ano* = *anthropō*) and the “*NΩ*” (*nō*) ending of “*EKEINΩ*” (*ekeino*), were known to sometimes produce an omission of “*ekeino* (that)” from ellipsis? Does the decision of the scribe of W 032 to move word 5 forward, constitute evidence of a problem seen also in the accidental omission of “*ekeino* (that)” from ellipsis in the variant readings?

In this context, does the fact that old Latin *e* and *ffl* are in the reverse word order of “*illi* (that) *homini* (man),” reflect the fact that they came from Greek manuscripts which had done the same thing as W 032? Or is the reverse word order of old Latin *e* and *ffl* simply a stylistic decision by later Latin scribes?

Was the variant a deliberate change? The probable origins of the basic variant form are seemingly with Oregenes Adamantius, commonly called, Origen. He was born in c. 185 A.D. at Alexandria, Egypt, in North Africa, and he appears to have kept up some kind of two-way cultural contact with the Alexandrian School of scribes in the city of his birth, even though he moved to the West Asian location of Tyre in Phoenicia (modern day Sur, Lebanon). The heretical Alexandrian School is notorious for a low view of Scripture resulting in them pruning the text, although some of their changes may have been accidental and simply reflect a generally poor quality of scribe that was connected with this school. Did Origen here make a deliberate pruning away of “unnecessary wordage,” in order to create what to his darkened mind was “a more succinct and less flowery text”?

Was this a deliberate or accidental change? We do not know. But we do know that this was a change to the original reading of the Received Text.

The reading of the TR has strong support in the Greek, and though absent in most Vulgate codices, it still has strong support in the Latin textual tradition, being followed by most old Latin versions. It also has impressive support among ancient church writers, including, for instance, the church fathers, St. Cyprian, St. Basil the Great, St. Hilary, St. Augustine, and St. Cyril; and in early mediaeval times from St. Gregory the Great. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 18:7b 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. 18:7b, "that man," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is further found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); together with 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 also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant that omits "that" and so reads simply, "the man," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, 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 L 019 (8th century); and Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Palestinian (c. 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Version, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version.

With the two major Alexandrian texts split down the middle, neo-Alexandrian translators started to feel a splitting headache coming on, as they reached for the headache tablets. On the one hand, the neo-Alexandrians were attracted to the variant because context tends to call for the presence of "*ekeinq* (that)," which in the perverted minds of neo-Alexandrians is actually regarded as an argument against it i.e., their low view of Scripture tends to assume the Bible will be written in a second rate manner by

stumbling, bumbling, Bible writers, who fumble from one word to the next. To this, their darkened neo-Alexandrian minds coupled the concomitant idea that they did not think therefore, that any post NT times scribe would be silly enough to deliberately remove “*ekeino* (that),” i.e., they have a high view of the non-inspired scribes who they attribute a higher level of understating the Greek to, than they do the Bible writers. They also failed to see how it could have been accidentally lost. (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 44). To this, no doubt a third factor for these neo-Alexandrians would be the strong support for the variant in the Syriac and Egyptian Bohairic, which appears to have been the final “clincher argument” for neo-Alexandrian text compilers. Thus the variant was adopted in the NU Text *et al.*

But on the other hand, some neo-Alexandrians appeared to have been concerned that Rome Vaticanus would not be likely to “add in” a reading like “*ekeino* (that).” Moreover, is there not “diversified support” for the reading in the Coptic Sahidic and Armenian Versions? And what about the Georgian and Ethiopic? This resulted in the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions Committee saying that, “there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text” i.e., the variant *tō* (the) *anthropō* (man), “or the apparatus” i.e., the TR’s *tō* (-) *anthropō* (man) *ekeino* (that), “contains the superior reading.”

With confusion reigning, as is usually the case for neo-Alexandrians when their two leading Alexandrian texts are in disagreement, neo-Alexandrian Bible translators were thrown into consternation as to which way they should jump. Whatever they did, they would have one of the two major Alexandrian text’s on their side, and one against them. *O the pains of being a simple-minded pea brain neo-Alexandrian! Just as well for them they have control of the universities and colleges, so that like the other moral, spiritual, and intellectual scum that generally controls the colleges of “the secular state,” they can create and sustain “academic reputations” which give them the appearance of being “experts,” as they pat one another on the back in their “celebrated” post-graduate theses and “academic” journals. “Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools” (Rom. 1:22)*⁹.

⁹ The old secularists, whose modern historical rise was connected with the sad destruction of the Protestant Christian state, remained till about the end of World War II, although a smaller tail-end group of them survived another 20 or so years. They were generally characterized by higher intelligence and morals, evident in the fact that they believed in God (often Nature’s God rather than the Christian God; but knowing the Christian God is a spiritual matter), were racists (they recognized e.g., the self-evident truths of the higher creative genius of the Caucasian race, or the lower general intelligence of the Negroids, and so opposed miscegenation; and they also recognized the value of race-based nationalism), were sexists opposed to e.g., adultery or sodomy (they understood the issues of e.g., a family as the base unit of society, that matters of wider sociological structures relevant to both this and other matters, e.g., suitability of males for combatant military service and the creation of a stronger moral male required by this). Because they had a belief in God, and promoted the Christian Church as an “ally” whose function they saw as that of a “moral policeman,” a large number of Christians were

Thus for the wrong reasons, the correct reading found in Rome Vaticanus, “that man,” was adopted at Matt. 18:7b by the American Standard Version which reads, “but woe to that man through whom the occasion cometh!” (ASV). The correct reading is also found in the NASB. However, the incorrect reading found in the variant of London Sinaiticus, which omits “that,” is found in the RSV, NRSV (artificially injecting painful feminist language into the text), ESV (artificially injecting painful feminist language into the text), NIV, and Moffatt Bible. E.g., Moffatt reads, “but – woe to the man by whom the hindrance does come!” (Moffatt Bible).

Among Popish persons, we find that the old Latin Papists’ pre-Vatican II Council Douay-Rheims Version, correctly reads at Matt.18:7b from the best Latin text, “woe to that man” etc. . But when we go to the new neo-Alexandrian Papists’ post-Vatican II Council Jerusalem Bible and New Jerusalem Bible, we find “that” is removed. We are in sad days indeed, when an old Popish version based on the Latin, rather than the Greek, is more accurate than new Popish versions based on a greatly corrupted Greek text that comes from the ancient Alexandrian School on the Dark Continent. Though I

persuaded by them as to the desirability of the secular state. The old secularists generally fell where Lucifer had fallen, in pride; stereotypically priding themselves that they had the intelligence to perceive the hand of Nature’s God (some were old earth creationists, others were Darwinists), racial traits and diversity and hence racism, sexual traits and diversity and hence sexism, etc. . The new secularists of the post World War II era are very much their intellectual and moral inferiors. Stereotypically, they are agnostics or atheists, although some believe in a Deistic or vaguely defined Theistic God (others worship the creature of scientific laws, and when they say “god guided” etc., they really mean in an atheistic way, that some, as yet undiscovered scientific law, which naturally exists is “god” i.e., this is atheism in theistic language). They are generally Darwinists. Like the old secularists, some are religiously liberal “Christians.” Their intellectually inferior minds do not perceive that e.g., miscegenation destroyed the Caucasian creative genius in southern Europe, and arrested the technological development of those now permanently retarded regions. Generally lacking the intellectual perception or moral stamina to be racists, etc., they are indeed virulent anti-racists, always placing this at the forefront of their French Revolution derived “human rights” beliefs, followed by anti-sexism etc. . They are libertines on sexual morals, lacking the perception to understand Biblical Christian morals. *Whereas the old secularists generally prided themselves on the fact that they were “more intelligent” than the Christians who “needed the Bible to tell them to keep good Christian morals,” the new secularists generally pride themselves on the basis that they are “more intelligent” than the Christians who “just keep outdated morals because they are in the Bible.”* Both old and new secularists opposed the *Textus Receptus* and are neo-Alexandrians; however the old secularists generally supported some basic level of Biblical knowledge among people, which was from the AV on the grounds of its literary beauty and cultural importance to a white Christian English speaking society. Whereas I have *some* intellectual respect for the old secularists, I have virtually none for the new secularists. There are more spins on these issues than this footnote will allow. (Cf. I Cor. 1:18-31.)

disapprove of the Roman Church both before and after the Vatican II Council, there is a sense in which more so than before the council, the Roman Church “wrecked itself up” at the Vatican II Council. That Popish council saw the Roman Church’s embrace of the new post World War Two secular state, characterized by crazy anti-racism and loony anti-sexism, and whose anti-supernaturalists values included e.g., the neo-Alexandrian text. This point of degeneracy in the Roman Church (which, of course, was already degenerate,) was noted both at the time, and later, by a most eminent council “father” of the Vatican II Council, one whom Pope John XXIII nominated to be a member of the Central Preparatory Commission for the *Vatican II Council*, to wit, the Frenchman, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre (1905-1991).

It was bad that before the Vatican II Council, the Roman Church denied God’s providential protection of the Byzantine Greek text; and it was bad that they elevated the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, to an unnatural position over its master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. But to the extent that they upheld God’s providential protection of the Latin text, they held some element of important truth in the great doctrine of the Divine Preservation of Holy Writ. But after the Vatican II Council, the Roman Church denied God’s providential protection of both the Byzantine Greek text and the Latin text, adopting in its place neo-Alexandrian textual principles and a neo-Alexandrian text. Thus the situation of the Roman Church from before Vatican II to after Vatican II on this issue of the Divine Preservation of Scripture, might be best described as *having gone from bad to worse*.

Matt. 18:8 “them” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek, “*auta* (‘them,’ neuter accusative, 3rd person plural pronoun, from *autos*),” in, “Wherefore, if thy right hand (*cheir*, feminine singular nominative noun, from *cheir*) or (*e*) thy foot (*pous*, masculine singular nominative noun, from *pous*) offend thee, cut *them* (*auta*) off,” etc., is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), E 07 (8th century), V 031 (9th century), X 033 (10th century), and Minuscule 2 (12th century).

However, a variant (*Variant 1*, unless otherwise stated, at Matt. 18:8 “variant” refers to this *Variant 1*) reads, Greek, “*auton* (‘it,’ masculine accusative, 3rd person singular pronoun, from *autos*),” i.e., if thy right hand (*cheir*, feminine singular nominative noun, from *cheir*) or thy foot (*pous*, masculine singular nominative noun, from *pous*) offend thee, cut *it* (*autos*) off,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscules 245 (1199 A.D.), and 243 (14th century). It is also found as Latin, “*eum* (‘him’ = ‘it,’ masculine accusative, singular pronoun, from *is*),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further found as Latin, “*illum* (‘that one’ = ‘it,’ masculine accusative, singular pronoun, from *ille*),” in old Latin Version ff1

(10th / 11th century). It is also found in the 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 is thus correct. The origins of the variant are speculative.

Was this an accidental change? Did “*auta* (them)” come either at the end of a line, or with a stylistic paper space after it in a manuscript, and following a paper fade / loss, was it then “reconstructed” by a scribe as “*auton* (it)”? Or was this a deliberate change intended as a “stylistic improvement”? Either way, was the thinking of the scribe influenced by the following considerations?

At Mark 9:43 we read “*auten* (‘her’ = ‘it,’ feminine singular accusative, 3rd person singular pronoun, from *aute*),” with reference to the “hand (*cheir*, a feminine singular noun)” alone i.e., “And if thy hand offend thee, cut it (*auten*) off.” (That some scribes were so influenced appears evident from the existence of *Variant 2* at Matt. 18:8, Greek, “*auten*” in U 030, 9th century; Minuscule 28, 11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark; = Latin, “*eam*,” feminine accusative, singular pronoun, from *ea*, in old Latin Version, aur, 7th century.) Was it thus a semi “stylistic harmonization” with Mark 9:43?

Was its form as “*auton* (it)” influenced by the presence of this pronoun at Matt. 18:9, “and if thine eye offend thee, pluck it (*auton*) out”? I.e., was the usage of “*auton* (it)” in both Matt. 18:8 and Matt. 18:9 misconstrued as some kind of “matching stylistic couplet”?

At Matt. 18:8, the Greek, “or (*e*),” may be read conjunctively in the TR’s reading (cf. Matt. 5:17; 25:37,38,39,44), i.e., both “hand” and “foot,” in which instance, the pronoun makes sense in the plural form, “*auta* (them)” (TR). Or at Matt. 18:8, the Greek, “or (*e*),” may be read disjunctively (cf. Matt 5:18; 10:11; 17:25), i.e., either “hand” or “foot,” in which instance, the pronoun makes sense in the singular form, “it (*autos*)” (Variant). The usage of “*e* (or),” in a disjunctive sense, is far more common than its usage in a conjunctive sense. Therefore, did a scribe reading at Matt. 18:8, “if thy right hand or (*e*) thy foot offend thee,” wrongly take this in the more common disjunctive way, and so think the singular “*auton* (it)” of the variant was either the “correct” reading to “reconstruct” (accidental change, *supra*), or deliberately alter the reading to as a “stylistic improvement” (deliberate change, *supra*)?

Was the variant an accidental or deliberate change? We simply do not know. But we do know that it was a change to the original text preserved for us in the *Textus Receptus*.

On the one hand, the TR’s reading has solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument. Its support is also from ancient times (W 032), so that it can be shown to have existed over time, and through time, from ancient times. But on the other hand, though the variant’s support in the Greek textual tradition is weak, it has had strong support in the Latin

textual tradition. Weighing up these competing considerations, and bearing in mind the perpetual 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. 18:8 a high level "B" (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 18:8, "them (*auta*)," is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), and 700 (11th century, independent). It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; and Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century).

However, the incorrect reading, "it (*auton*)," 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 L 019 (8th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 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), 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 Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic 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).

At Matt. 18:8, the erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al*. Thus the ASV reads, "cut it (Greek, *auton*) off, and cast it (Greek, -) from thee." This second "it" should be in italics as an added word, (in the same way as the second "them" in the AV is in italics as an added word,) but it is not. Thus the ASV reader is unaware of this editorial insertion which wrongly appears to "confirm" the first erroneous reading of "it" (ASV). The erroneous reading, like the ASV not putting the following added word of what they would see as its "confirmation" in italics, i.e., "it," is likewise found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, and Moffatt Bible. Thus e.g., Moffatt reads, with no italics, "cut it (Greek, *auton*) off and throw it (Greek, -) away."

Spiritual Application. The allegorical language of Matt. 18:7-9 teaches us that "if" anything e.g., "thy hand or thy foot offend thee," we should "cut them off," so as to remove "offences," from us, "rather than ... be cast into hell fire." Thus e.g., if a man is

living in violation of the Holy Decalogue, then he should, by the grace of God, repent from his wicked ways, and under God, seek to keep the Ten Commandments; even though we can never do so perfectly this side of our glorification (Exod. 20:1-17; Matt. 19:17-19; Rom. 7:7; 13:9). We cannot doubt that the neo-Alexandrian Versions are also one example of such “offences” that are causing people to err. If any good Christian reader is still using such a version, when he reads this section, let me challenge him to make a decision. Let him go to the throne of grace, and in prayer to God the Father, resolve that with God the Holy Ghost empowering him through the blood of God the Son, he will “cut them off” (Matt. 18:8), and start using the Authorized (King James) Version. And for those of us who have already made this decision in the past, let us thank God for bringing us to this truth at a time in our life that enables us to better understand his precious Word. “I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight” (Matt. 11:25,26).

Matt. 18:11 “For the Son of man is come to save
that which was lost” (entire verse) (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Those texts outside the closed class of sources, not being generally accessible over time and through time, have a zero impact on determination of the text. They include e.g., all non-Greek and all non-Latin New Testament texts. If a neo-Byzantine textual analyst wanted to ignore them completely, that would be a perfectly valid choice for him to make, and it would in no way, shape, or form, affect his fundamental work on the *Textus Receptus*. Nevertheless, if for whatever reason, a neo-Byzantine textual analyst such as myself, carefully segregating them into a different section, and looking at them for some purposes of interest, *but not for the purposes of determining the text*, wanted to refer to some or all of them, then that also is a perfectly valid choice for him to make.

With such important qualifications ever present, whether I specifically state them at the time or not, I now turn to a document outside the closed class of sources. Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century) makes a citation of both Matt. 18:11, following Matt. 18:10 in Diatessaron chapter 27; and then a citation of Luke 19:10, following Luke 19:9 in Diatessaron chapter 31. Taking into account the differences between these two passages (see *Variant 1, infra*), here preserved in Ciasca’s Latin readings of the Arabic Diatessaron, and the wider context both occur in, it seems to me that on this occasion, one can fairly safely conclude that the Arabic Diatessaron knew of the Matt. 18:11, and did not assimilate it from Luke 19:10, and thus I refer to it, *infra*.

But what if I am wrong? I do not think I am, but it does not really much matter. That is because at the end of the day, documents outside the closed class of sources, some

of which interest me more than others, are like the OT Apocrypha which certainly does interest me. I.e., they have no authority, even as the OT Apocrypha has no authority. And to be perfectly frank about the matter, were it not for the rise of the Neo-Alexandrian School, which uses these type of unreliable texts, I would not be spending *as much space and time* as I do on matters relating to them. But even if the Neo-Alexandrian School had never arisen, as a textual analyst of the Neo-Byzantine School, I might still from time to time have considered some of them in such a section, e.g., in some instances as historical examples of the “many which corrupt the word of God” (II Cor. 2:17).

Yet to this I make the following qualification. If professedly Christian people think so much about e.g., the Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries) or the Slavic Version (9th century), that in insular enclaves in e.g., the Arab world (the Arabic Diatessaron) or the Balkans (the Slavic Version), they were prepared to look after them over lengthy periods of time under conditions of varying difficulties, and then e.g., in the 19th century Ciasca in Rome was prepared to undertake a Latin translation of the Arabic Diatessaron (Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron), then I am prepared to give some positive recognition to these peoples’ labours and efforts. But in doing so, it should be clearly understood that I consider such preservation of these texts outside the closed class of sources rests purely on the exercise of a human free will, or matters of chance, rather than any supervening Divine preservation of these texts (beyond, that is, God’s common grace to all men¹⁰).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 18:11, the TR’s Greek, “*elthe* (‘he came’ or ‘he is come’¹¹) *gar* (for) *o* (the) *Yios* (Son) *tou* (of) *anthropou* (man) *sosai* (to save) *to* (the [one]) *apololos* (having been lost¹²),” i.e., “For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost” (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), E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century), M 021 (*Codex Campianus*, 9th century), Gamma 036 (*Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus*, 10th century); Lectionary 185 (11th century, Christ’s College, Cambridge, which also contains *Variant 1b, infra*) and Lectionary 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*); and Minuscules 2 (12th century) and 597 (13th century).

¹⁰ Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, pp. 432-446.

¹¹ Indicative active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *erchomai*.

¹² The Greek, “*to* (the [one]),” is a neuter singular accusative, definite article, from *to*. While looked at in limited isolation this could *prima facie* mean, “the [thing],” looked at in the wider immediate context, the meaning is, “the [one].” The Greek, “*apololos*,” is a neuter singular accusative, active perfect participle, from *apollumi*. Translation is sometimes a difficult art, but the combination of this definite article and participle, “the [one] having been lost,” may be fairly rendered, “that which was lost” (AV).

It is also found as Latin, “*Venit* (he is come) *enim* (for) *Filius* (the Son) *hominis* (of man) *salvare* (to save) *quod* (‘what’ or ‘that which’) *perierat* (was lost¹³),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further found as Latin, “*Venit* (is come) *enim* (for) *Filius* (the Son) *hominis* (of man) *salvare* (to save) *id* (that) *quod* (which) *perit* (is lost¹⁴),” in old Latin Version d (5th century). It is found in similar readings in old Latin Versions a (4th century), n (5th / 6th century), l (7th / 8th century), which follow the Vulgate’s reading other than reading “*autem* (indeed),” rather than, “*enim* (for);” and old Latin Version b (5th century), which follows the Vulgate’s reading other than omitting, “*enim* (for).” It is further found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Chromatius (d. 407).

However, another reading, *Variant 1*, adds in Greek, “*zetesai* (to seek) *kai* (and),” thus making the reading, “For the Son of man is come *to seek and* to save that which was lost” (*Variant 1a*). This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionaries 950 (1289 / 1290 A.D.) and 1968 (1544 A.D.); and Minuscules 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels), 1010 (12th century), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark). *Variant 1a* is also found in old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century), which adds in Latin, “*et* (and) *quaerere* (to seek).” A similar reading, which follows *Variant 1a* other than reading “*kai* (and),” for “*gar* (for),” i.e., “*And (kai)* the Son of man is come *to seek and* to save that which was lost” (*Variant 1b*), is also a minority Byzantine reading. *Variant 1b* is found in Lectionaries 185 (11th century, which also contains the TR’s reading, *supra*), 374 (1193 A.D.), 69 (12th century), 70 (12th century), 80 (12th century), 211 (12th century), 303 (12th century), 10 (13th century), 12 (13th century), 299 (13th century), and 1642 (13th century).

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, entirely omits verse 11. This is found in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and the Eusebian Canons (4th century); and the ancient church Latin writers, Juvencus (d. 4th century) and Jerome (d. 420).

¹³ The Latin, “*perierat*,” is a syncopated form of “*periverat*,” in which a syncopated perfect drops the “v” (it also sometimes contracts the vowels). This is an indicative active pluperfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *pereo*. The pluperfect is used for something that was previously completed, looked at from the time-frame of a past time (cf. Matt. 16:5). Therefore the Latin nuance here highlights that what “was lost,” had been lost in an earlier time i.e., before Christ came to save “that which was lost.” Cf. old Latin d (*perit*).

¹⁴ The Latin, “*perit*,” is an indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *pereo*. Cf. the Vulgate *et al* (*perierat*).

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental change? On this same page in Manuscript Washington (W 032), we find that in the next verse at Matt. 18:12, the scribe wrote “*dokei* (‘it seems’ = ‘think,’ AV)” at the end of a line, then inexplicably left about four letter spaces till the end of that line, and on the next line wrote, “*ean* (if).” Why did he not put the “*ean* (if)” on the first line? So likewise, did a less alert scribe leave a larger space at the end of a line after “*anthropou* (man),” and another scribe, wrongly thinking that there must have been a paper fade, then “reconstruct” the words “*zetēsai* (to seek) *kai* (and)” from Luke 19:10? With regard to *Variant 1b*, was a paper fade of “*gar* (for)” to “*:a:*,” “reconstructed” by a scribe “from context” as, “*kai* (and)”?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? Did a scribe seeking a “gospel harmonization” between Matt. 18:11 and Luke 19:10, then conflate the Matt. 18:11 reading through assimilation with Luke 19:10? With regard to *Variant 1b*, did a scribe regard it as some kind of “stylistic improvement” to change “*gar* (for)” to “*kai* (and)”?

Was Latin *Variant 2* originally in the Greek? Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration? Was a scribe working with a manuscript in which the first line ended with the last words of Matt. 18:10, “*EN OYPAÑOIC / en ouranois* (in heaven),” and the second line ended with the last words of Matt. 18:11, “*TO ΑΠΟΛΩΛΟC / to apololos* (that which was lost)”?

Perhaps tired or ill, did he get confused with the “*OIC*” ending of the first line and the “*λOC*” ending of the second line, and by befuddlement and ellipsis, jump from the sigma (*C / s*) of one line to the next, thus omitting Matt. 18:11?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate alteration? This omission appears to have originated with Origen. Origen held to the heretical view of pre-existent souls. The Biblical teaching (e.g., Eccl. 12:7,14; Matt. 10:28; Heb. 12:23; Rev. 6:9) is that a man is made up of body and soul. I maintain a dichotomy in which “soul” and “spirit” refer to the same thing i.e., soul / spirit + body = man¹⁵. E.g., St. Mary says in the stylistic parallelism of the *Magnificat*, “My *soul* doth magnify the Lord, and my *spirit* hath rejoiced in God my Saviour” (Luke 1:46,47). Thus in describing Christ’s humanity, the *Council of Chalcedon* (451) correctly said Christ was “truly man, consisting also of a reasonable soul and body.” This type of language is also found in the *Athanasian Creed*, which says Christ was “man: of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting.”

¹⁵ Berkhof’s *Systematic Theology*, pp. 192-196. Contrary to the claims of those arguing for a trichotomy (soul + spirit + body = man), I follow a dichotomy (soul / spirit + body = man). I think I Thess. 5:23 means “your whole spirit or soul, and body, be preserved” etc. . (Thus I disagree with both the AV’s translation of the Greek, *kai* as “and,” rather than “or,” and the AV’s punctuation here. But I accept the AV’s translation and punctuation is a possible rendering.) I understand Heb. 4:12, “dividing asunder of soul and spirit” to be a linguistic device, meaning, “dividing” the “soul” apart, or “dividing” the “spirit” apart, i.e., reaching into the very deep recesses of the soul or spirit. Thus I think “soul” and “spirit” are referring to the same thing here at Heb. 4:12.

Among orthodox Protestants, there are both *soul creationists* (who consider God makes a new soul for each human being conceived), and *soul traducianists* (who consider that as part of the act of biological procreation, all souls are transmitted by parents to their children i.e., as part of their natural generation from Adam)¹⁶. Thus while some known heretics such as Tertullian or Apollinarius were traducianists, nevertheless, even Protestants who like myself are soul creationists, do not agree with Anastasius II, Bishop of Rome (496-498); who, long before there were any Popes in Rome (First Pope, Boniface III, 607), went so far as to condemn traducianism¹⁷. Rather, we are more tolerant of such diversity, and regard this matter as one of *bona fide* internal orthodox disagreement.

Soul creationists (e.g., St. Jerome, St. Hilary of Poitiers; the majority Protestant view, for instance, Calvin) and soul traducianists (Tertullian, Apollinarius, Luther; a minority Protestant view held mainly by Lutherans, but also others, for instance, the American Puritan, Jonathon Edwards), both agree that God created Adam's soul. At this point of agreement, both are thus soul creationists. The Bible teaches that the first man's "soul" became "living" NOT as a pre-temporal fallen angel, but rather, when "God" added to it a body from "the dust of the ground," and "breathed into" the "nostrils" of "man" "the breath of life" (Gen. 2:7). "And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul" (I Cor. 15:45).

By contrast, Origen's idea of soul transmigration in which pre-temporal fallen angels enter human bodies, fundamentally attacks the definition of a man as consisting of a body and soul, and effectively makes him some kind of half-breed creature that is half-human and half-angelic. The Scriptures teach that, "God made man upright" (Eccl. 7:29, ASV), i.e., with original righteousness. Thus Adam did not, as Origen claims, come with some pre-history of sin from a pre-temporal fall, in which through the transmigration of his soul from a fallen angel he was "in the process of being redeemed."

"I believe in ... God the Father ..., maker of ... all things visible and invisible" (*Nicene Creed*). As a soul creationist, I consider the soul is an *invisible* supernatural element that cannot be visibly seen by man studying human genetic material under a microscope. (By contrast, a traducianist must consider the soul is a visible element in man's genetic material.) I think the "soul" is "wrought" outside of the womb, and then added by God to man's "substance" "in secret" in the "womb" (Ps. 139:13-16). As a soul creationist, I maintain that "the God of the spirits of all flesh" (Num. 16:22) is "the Father of spirits" (Heb. 12:9), who is so named "Father of spirits" (Heb. 12:9) because soul creation is part of the work of "the Father" as "maker of ... all things ... invisible"

¹⁶ Berkhof's *Systematic Theology*, pp. 196-201.

¹⁷ Letter to the Bishops of Gaul (498), in P. Coustant's *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, Paris, 1721, (up to 440 A.D.) as revised by A. Thiele (continued up to 553 A.D.) (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1911,1913, Encyclopedia Press, New York, USA, Vol. 15, p. 15).

(*Nicene Creed*). God refers to “the souls which I have made” (Isa. 57:16); and to the question of when these are made, thus “saith the Lord,” that he “*formeth the spirit of man within him*” (Zech. 12:1). Now if it is “within him” (Zech. 12:1), this must surely require that soul / spirit creation does not occur before conception. Thus I maintain that this rules out Origen’s pre-existent soul heresies.

Origen considered there was a transmigration of souls from angels who had fallen before the world was made (a pre-temporal fall), and that the transmigration of their souls into human bodies was part of a process ultimately leading to their salvation, since he was a universalist. Because he thus blurred the barrier between men and angels, he believed all men and all angels would ultimately be saved. This is also contrary to the orthodox teaching of the *Nicene Creed* that Christ came “for *us men and our salvation*” (Rom. 5:12-19; I Cor. 15:45,49) i.e., the atonement relates to Adam’s race *alone*, not the angel race. As a universalist, Origen denied the orthodox teaching of the *Apostles’ Creed* concerning the Final Judgment found in Article 7, which says Christ “shall come to judge the quick and the dead” (Dan. 12:2; John 5:29,30; Rev. 20:4,5,11-15); and Article 4 of this Creed which recognizes the reality of “hell” (Ps. 16:10; Luke 16:23; Acts 2:27,31).

Therefore, here at Matt. 8:11, did Origen take offence at the idea that “the Son of man” had come “to save that which *was lost*,” because as far as Origen was concerned, it was not “lost,” but at worst, only “temporarily gone”? I.e., in the process of being saved by virtue of the fact that a transmigration of a soul had occurred from a fallen angel to a man in the reference to the one here saved (Matt. 18:11)? Was this heretical idea of Origen’s here brought forcefully to his mind by the preceding words of Christ which refer to “angels” that “do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven” (Matt. 18:10)?

Was Matt. 18:11 an accidental omission by a vacant minded Origen, who stumbled over the final sigmas (“C” / “s”) of Matt. 18:10 and Matt. 18:11 in parallel lines? Or was it a deliberate change by a heretical minded Origen, who altered the text of Scripture to try and make it conform more to his unorthodox views? We do not definitely know. We cannot tell for sure *beyond a reasonable shadow of a doubt* (the higher evidential standard of criminal law). However, on this occasion, I think that *on the balance of probabilities* (the lower evidential standard of civil law), the explanation of a deliberate change by Origen connected with his heretical views is more probable than not.

The TR’s reading at Matt. 18:11 has strong support in both the Greek and the Latin, being found as both the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument, and also the representative Latin reading of St. Jerome’s Vulgate *et al.* It also enjoys further support from both ancient Greek and Latin writers. By contrast, *Variants 1 & 2* are both minority Greek and minority Latin readings, with no good textual arguments to commend them. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 18:11 an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Here at Matt. 18:11 we find an instance of the Messianic title, “the Son of man.” Now “the things of the Spirit of God ... are spiritually discerned” (I Cor. 2:14). Hence before Christ “opened ... their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures” (Luke 24:45), they did not understand various OT prophecies. These use a more proximate prophetic type (which the spiritually blind may wrongly think is the focus of the prophesy, which they then wrongly think has “failed”). E.g., while it is true that David went down to *the grave*, for he was “both dead and buried” (Acts 2:29), it would be too much to say that his “soul” went down into “hell” (Ps.16:10). Thus he was a prophetic type of the Messiah who whose body would not “see corruption,” but whose soul would be detached from his body as his “soul” would go down into “hell” (Ps. 16:11) for a duration in time short enough for his body not to decay (Acts 2:24-36¹⁸). How long was that short time to be? Jonah was “three days” “in the belly of the fish” (Jonah 1:17), and says he was in “the belly of hell” (Jonah 2:2). Jonah might have thought that he was in his *grave*, but he certainly was not in *hell*. Therefore Jonah must be a prophetic type of the Messiah, who was to rise again after three days, during which time he would descend into hell (Matt. 12:38-41; 16:4).

To make the basic point, let us just consider only one of the OT passages where we find the Messianic title, “the Son of man.” In Ps. 8 we read of what at first appears to be man. “What is man, that though art mindful of him? And the son of man, that thou visitest him?” “Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands: thou

¹⁸ The Greek word here correctly rendered “hell” at Acts 2:27,31 in the AV is Greek, *hades*. In the context of Luke-Acts, St. Luke uses this same word in Luke 10:15; 16:23. See Article 4 of the *Apostles’ Creed*, “he descended into hell.” With all due respect to my Puritan Presbyterian brethren in Christ, contrary to the *Church of Scotland Psalter* which reads, “Because my soul in grave to dwell shall not be left by thee,” there is no way that Greek, *hades*, here means, “the grave;” rather, it means “hell.” E.g., in Luke 16:23,24, we read, “in hell (*hades*) he lift up his eyes, being in torments ... and he cried out and said, ... I am in torment in this flame.” Clearly the man was not simply in *the grave* which is common to both saints and sinners, but rather, he was in “hell.” Furthermore, the idea in the *Church of Scotland Psalter* is contrary to the Biblical teaching that at death, a man’s soul leaves his body (I Kgs 17:21-23), rather than first waits for the burial of the body, before it leaves the body. For Christ saith, “Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit” (Luke 23:46), and he added not, “once my body is buried.” That Christ’s spirit / soul went straight to God upon his death is evident, for then, not later, “he gave up the ghost” / spirit (Luke 23:46), and his entrance into the heavenly Most Holy Place was symbolized by the earthly temple veil being torn in twain (Luke 23:45). Then after this time when his soul was in heaven, his soul went down into hell, before coming up from hell to rejoin his body on Easter Sunday. Concerning this time, when he who is both Lord of heaven and Lord of hell (Ps. 139:1,8), marched triumphantly as Lord of hell (Prov. 15:11) through his jail-house called hell (Rev. 1:18), see Eph. 4:9,10; Col. 2:15; I Peter 3:18-20.

hast put all things under his feet” (Ps. 8:4,6). Adam was given “dominion” over the local “earth” (Gen. 1:28) of Eden, created in six literal days (Gen. 1:2b-2:3), following a gap in time before which God had created the universe and globe with a succession of different “worlds” (Gen.1:1,2a; 2:4; Heb.1:2; 11:3). Adam’s wider world of Eden also included an inner sanctum known as the Garden of Eden (Gen. 2:8-25), from which he was expelled after the Fall (Gen. 3). Following Noah’s Flood, which was anthropologically universal but geographically local to this general area of Eden (in an area now under the waters of the Persian Gulf), God gave a dominion mandate to Noah and his three sons which was as geographically universal as the rainbow (Gen. 9) i.e., the globe, as seen by the movement of Japheth into Europe and West Asia, Shem into Asia, and Ham into Africa and West Asia (Gen.10), and thereafter the rest of the globe.

Thus when Ps. 8:6 was writ, man had “dominion” over the globe. Yet it would be too much to say that “man” had such “dominion,” that God had “put all things under his feet” (Ps. 8:4,6). E.g., man did not have sin and death “under his feet,” quite to the contrary, sin and death had man under their feet. Therefore, Ps. 8 must be a Messianic psalm, teaching that the Messiah would be a “man,” known as, “the Son of man” (Ps. 8:4), who would ultimately put “all things” (Ps. 8:6), sin and death included, “under his feet” (Ps. 8:6; Heb. 2:6,8).

Thus “the Son of man” is a Messianic title (Ps. 8:4), that among other things, includes reference to Christ’s redemptive work (Ps. 8:6). Hence when Matt. 18:11 which both uses this title, and refers to Christ’s redemptive work, is removed as occurs in *Variant 2*, there is actually a wider attack on Biblical doctrine occurring than just the removal of a verse i.e., Matt. 18:11 (even though that is bad enough!). There is also a downplaying of the wonderful teaching of Ps. 8:4,6, which is manifested here in Matt. 18:11.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 18:11, “For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost” (entire verse), is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

Variant 1, which adds, “to seek and,” thus reading, “For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost,” is found in Minuscules 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; some

manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Slavic Version (9th century); and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). *Variant 1* is also referred to as a minority reading in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624).

Variant 2, which omits the entire verse of Matt. 18:11, is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 892 (9th century, mixed text type). The omission 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 Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Palestinian (c. 6th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions (3rd century), and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; as well as some codices of the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous *Variant 2*, entered the NU Text *et al*. Hence at Matt. 18:11 the omission is found, with a footnote referring to the missing verse, in the ASV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NEB, REB, TEV, and NIV. Likewise, the verse is found in square brackets, by which the translators claim, "the words" are "probably not in the original writings," in the NASB. And in his Moffatt Bible, the foolhardy Moffatt, like the TCNT translators before him, removes the verse, without so much as a footnote referring to its absence!

On the one hand, the old Latin Papists' Douay-Rheims, following the Vulgate and Clementine, correctly reads at Matt. 18:11, "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost." But on the other hand, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists' Jerusalem Bible and New Jerusalem Bible, both omit Matt. 18:11 with a footnote referring to the missing verse. Whatever undoubted defects the Latin text based Douay-Rheims Bible possesses, it is certainly more accurate at this verse than the neo-Alexandrian text based Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles. In connection with the Vatican II Council, Popish standards, which it must be said were always lower than those of godly Protestants anyway, have clearly dropped still further.

Thus we find that here at Matt. 18:11, apostate Protestant and Papist alike, has fallen prey to the heresy and trickery of Origen's antics.

Looking at the matter in overview, here at Matt. 18:11 we see instances of the Word of God being *added to* (*Variant 1*) and *subtracted from* (*Variant 2*). There is nothing new about this, for St. Paul refers to "*many, which corrupt the word of God*" (II Cor. 2:17). Thus God said through Holy Moses, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I

command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it” (Deut. 4:2). Or speaking through St. John the Divine (Theologian), God said not to “add” or “take away from” his “words” (Rev. 22:18,19).

Let us imagine that we were turn up an example *from New Testament times* of what St. Paul calls, “many, which corrupt the word of God” (II Cor. 2:17). What fool would think it preferable over the pure Word of God that we have in the *Textus Receptus* on the basis that, “the older texts are the better ones”? Yet foolish men do similar things in their neo-Alexandrian versions, thinking that because “the older” readings of Origen and the Alexandrian Texts follow the omission, so should they. Are we to disbelieve the teaching of Scripture that the rise of heretics who “corrupt the word of God” (II Cor. 2:17 cf. I Cor. 11:19; II Cor. 4:2) was occurring even in NT times, and thus long before e.g., Origen, joined this bandwagon? If so silly a proposition were correct, then we would need to also throw out much of our Old Testament, for the Old Testament *Textus Receptus* is not the same as, nor are its apographs as old as, a number of Greek Septuagint or Latin Vulgate readings.

Good Christian brethren, let us be careful not to be “tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive” (Eph. 4:14). In the Received Text we have the Divinely preserved apographs (I Peter 1:25) of the Divinely inspired autographs of God’s Word (II Tim. 3:16). *We have no other. We need no other. We want no other. Give us the full Word of God! Nothing more, and nothing less! We thank God for the OT Textus Receptus and NT Textus Receptus. For “these are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks, standing before the God of the earth” (Rev. 11:4). Their light is sufficient for us, and their oil is good for our soul’s health. And we thank God we have them translated for us in a tongue we can understand in our Authorized King James Versions of 1611!*

Matt. 18:14 “your” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek, “*umon* (your),” in the words, “your Father,” is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, “*vestrum* (your),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (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 as Latin, “*vestro* (your),” in old Latin Version d (5th century); and as Latin, “*vestri* (your),” in old Latin Version f (6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420), Augustine (d. 430), and Speculum (d. 5th century).

However, another reading, *Variant 1*, reads Greek, “*emon* (our),” making the

reading, “our Father.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 890 (1420 A.D.). It is also found in old Latin z 65 (Harleianus, 8th century); as well as the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, reads Greek, “*mou* (my),” making the reading, “my Father.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), O 023 (6th century); Lectionaries 185 (11th century), 855 (1175 A.D.), 997 (11th century), 1627 (11th century), 1084 (1292 A.D.), and 184 (1319 A.D.). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Macarius / Symeon (d. 4th / 5th century).

There is good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which is therefore correct. The origins of these variants are speculative.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental change? Due to a paper fade, did the original “*u*mon (your),” come to look something like, “:mon””? If so, did a scribe “reconstruct” this “from context” as “*e*mon (our),” possibly with some reference to the “*e*mon (our)” of the well known, *Lord’s Prayer* (Matt. 6:9)?¹⁹

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? Did a scribe, wishing to contextually stress that God the Father was *both* the Father of God the Son and the Father of the disciples, deliberately change this to “our,” in what he regarded to be “a stylistic improvement” which “better captures the sense of God’s generic Fatherhood”?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental change? Possibly with the “*u*” of “*u*mon (your)” at the end of one line, and the “*mon*” on the next line, due to a paper fade, did the original “*u*mon (your),” come to look something like, “:m:””? If so, did a scribe, probably Origen, “reconstruct” this “from context” as “*mou* (my),” possibly with some regard to the “*mou* (my)” of the nearby Matt. 18:10,19 and / or elsewhere (e.g., Matt. 7:21; 10:32,33; 11:27; 12:50; 16:17, *et al*)?

“O Oh! Did somebody just say that this *Variant 2* originated with the heretic ORIGEN?” *Was Variant 2 a deliberate change by Origen?*

Certainly there is nothing intrinsically wrong with, and on a number of occasions, Christ referred to God the Father as, “my Father” (Matt. 20:23; 24:36; 25:34; 26:39,42,53, *et al*). But heresy can sometimes consist in over-emphasizing one truth, in such a way as to deny another truth. E.g., sex-role perverted feminists stress the universality of access to God irrespective of a person’s sex, “neither male nor female” (Gal. 3:28), and then misuse this to generate a more general anti-sexist sentiment which is opposed to the natural order of patriarchy (Gen. 2 & 3; I Cor. 11:3; 14:34-37; I Tim. 2:8-3:12). So likewise, is it possible that Origen here wanted to detract the emphasis on God

¹⁹ A scribe may not have given the matter any great thought, cf. (with reference to a generally unreliable text outside the closed class of sources,) Matt. 20:33 in Appendix 3.

being “your” i.e., “the disciples” (Matt. 18:1), “Father,” in order to here over-stress the fact that he was “my” i.e., Christ’s “Father,” for some reason?

Notably, Origen denied the equality of the Divine Persons in the Trinity, e.g., the fact that the Son “thought it not robbery to be equal with God” “the Father” and God the Holy “Spirit” (Philp. 2:1,6,11). Instead, Origen considered the Son was unequal with, and less than, the Father, and in turn the Holy Ghost was unequal with, and less than, the Son. But Origen considered part of the role of this lesser Divine Person of the Son, was to determine if pre-existent souls who were fallen angels, should go through a process of universal salvation by first becoming “devils” here on earth, or first becoming men here on earth.

In the context of this crazy theology of Origen’s, did he think that by changing “your Father” to “my Father” here at Matt. 18:14, and so making the reading, “it is not the will of *my* Father which is in heaven, *that one of these little ones should perish*,” he was thereby helping to create “a proof text” that he could use as a stepping stone for the later development of his beliefs e.g., in a sermon or “Bible study”? Did the idea behind Origen’s “great brain wave” go something like this? First he would change the “your Father” to “my Father” at Matt. 18:14, and then use this to say, “the Son here says, ‘my Father,’ because the Son is subordinate to the Father, being unequal to, and less than the Father, as touching upon his Divinity”? Then did Origen intend to further say, “The Son’s relationship to the Father is here emphasized because it is the Son who determines which pre-existent souls of fallen angels become the ‘sheep’ of this passage, that is, men, rather than devils here on earth”? And then having laid this groundwork, did Origen intend to conclude by saying “the words of this verse, ‘it is not the will of’ the ‘Father’ ‘that one of these’ ‘should perish,’ points to universalist salvation of all”? Was this convoluted type of heretical theological loading part of Origen’s thinking behind a deliberate change of Matt. 18:14?

Did these variants spring from deliberate or accidental changes? We do not know. We cannot now know. We can only now know for sure that they were changes to the original text which read, “your Father.”

The TR’s reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument. The Received Text’s reading has strong support in the Latin as the representative Latin reading of St. Jerome’s Vulgate *et al.* The *Textus Receptus* reading has notable support amongst the learned church fathers and doctors, St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome, and St. Austin. By contrast, the two variants have fairly weak support in the Greek (and Latin in the case of *Variant 1*), and no good textual argument to commend them. Taking these factors into account, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 18:14 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. 18:14, “your,” i.e.,

“your Father,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); Minuscule 1071 (independent, 12th century); and is the most probable reading of Minuscule 565 (9th century, independent), although the manuscript’s state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscles 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: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and margin of the Harclean h (616) Versions; Slavic Version (9th century); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

Variant 1, “our,” i.e., “our Father,” is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century).

Variant 2, “my,” i.e., “my Father,” 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); as well as Minuscles 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is further found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscles 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Despite the claims of the more modern neo-Alexandrians to look to a wider textual base of sources than the two leading Alexandrian texts, a claim that is partly correct, though *in most instances* misleadingly so, the reality is that the two leading Alexandrian texts, both of which are badly corrupted, are and remain the neo-Alexandrian’s great guides for determining the NT Text. Though some neo-Alexandrians may wish to dodge and fudge this fact, when their two main Alexandrian texts are in disagreement, they are *generally* thrown into perplexity and bewilderment, becoming uncertain and unsure what to do. *How strange that they like to criticize Erasmus for having only a small number of manuscripts, when in fact his small number was certainly greater than these two blind-guides of the neo-Alexandrians!*

Thus here at Matt. 18:14, with the two major Alexandrian texts in disagreement, we find the neo-Alexandrians looking like jumping jack-rabbits, as one jumps this way, and the other jumps that way. Springing into the air to follow his beloved London

Sinaiticus which he had “discovered,” for the wrong reasons, Tischendorf jumped the right way and in the main text followed the TR’s reading in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), as did Nestle’s 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993). But jumping into the air the other way, *Variant 2* as found in Rome Vaticanus was preferred in the main text by Westcott-Hort (1881). “After all,” probably thought Westcott & Hort, “it is *the older reading* of Origen.”

What were the neo-Alexandrian Bible translators to make of this puzzling problem at Matt. 18:14? They decided to “join the club” and started “jumping around” like jack-rabbits themselves. The ASV jumped one way, and decided to put the correct reading, “your Father” in the main text, but supply a footnote saying that other “ancient authorities read ‘my’” (ASV fn). This type of “solution” i.e., the TR’s reading in the main text with a footnote referring to *Variant 2*, was also followed by the NRSV. But perhaps buoyed up by its “external” support in *both* the Syriac Curetonian and Pesitto Versions, the NASB was more certain, and simply followed the TR’s reading with no footnote alternative. This type of “solution” was also followed by the NIV.

By contrast, the RSV jumped the other way, and put *Variant 2* in the main text, and supplied a footnote referring to the TR’s reading. This type of “solution” i.e., *Variant 2’s* reading in the main text with a footnote referring to the TR, was also followed by the ESV. But perhaps buoyed up by its “external” support in *both* the Syriac Sinaitic and Harclean Versions; together with Dillmann’s Ethiopic Version which in the shifting sands of neo-Alexandrian opinions was then in greater favour with neo-Alexandrians, the TCNT was more certain, and simply followed *Variant 2* with no footnote alternative.

“Jumping jack-rabbits!!!” Such are the unsettling problems of being a neo-Alexandrian!

Matt. 18:15a “shall trespass against thee” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Some confusion appears to exist at Matt. 18:15a in different textual apparatuses as to Origen’s support or otherwise of *Variant 1* inside the closed class of sources. He is shown as following *Variant 1* by Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72). But then he is said to support *Variants 2 & 3* with no reference to *Variant 1* in the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions. Then in the UBS 4th revised edition (1993), Origen is said to support *Variant 1*. But both Nestle’s 21st edition (1952) and Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993), say that in fact Origen follows *Variant 3*.

I have examined the relevant Origen quote in Migne²⁰, and on this occasion

²⁰ Origen in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1862 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 13, p. 1174 (Commentary on Matthew, 13:610) (Greek & Latin).

consider that Tischendorf is correct. Origen says, Greek, “*ean* (if) *amartē* (shall trespass) *o* (the) *adelphos* (brother) *sou* (of thee), *upage* (go), *elegxon* (tell) *auton* (him) *metaxu* (between) *sou* (thee) *kai* (and) *autou* (him) *monou* (alone).” This clearly follows *Variant 1* at Matt. 18:15a (*amartē*), and the variant at Matt. 18:15b omitting the TR’s “*kai* (and),” after “*upage* (thou go).” (Of some interest to the Third Matter, *infra*, the accompanying Latin translation of Origen’s Greek, “*amartē*,” in the parallel column is Latin, “*peccaverit*.”)

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex. It shows a conflation of Matt. 18:15a and Luke 17:3 due to Diatessaron formatting. However, whilst “*peccaverit* (‘he shall trespass’ = ‘shall trespass’) is present in both Vulgate passages, the key words, “*peccaverit* (shall trespass) *in* (against) *te* (thee),” are only present in this form in the Vulgate at Matt. 18:15a. On this basis, on this particular occasion, I think it reasonable to conclude that the Sangallensis Diatessaron must be drawing from the Vulgate form of Matt. 18:15. Thus I show the Sangallensis Diatessaron supporting the TR’s reading, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, the Latin of Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, chapter 27, first renders the Arabic of Luke 17:3 identically with that of Luke 17:3 in the Vulgate, and then (after one more verse,) renders the Latin of Matt. 27:15 identically with that of Matt. 18:15 in the Vulgate other than one word, which word comes later and is not part of the verse being here considered in the textual commentary. The effect of this is that it would seem to me that the Arabic Diatessaron formatters, included Matt. 18:15 in its own right. Thus I show it in support of the readings in the *Textus Receptus* and *Variant 2, infra*.

The Third Matter. Outside the closed class of sources, while the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions are uncertain if the Armenian Version (5th century) and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500) are best characterized as supporting the TR’s reading or *Variant 3*, by contrast the UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993) is confident that they both follow the TR’s reading. Though I am familiar with neither the Aryan tongue of Armenian, nor the Allophylian tongue of Ethiopian, it is clearly regarded by some as doubtful that one could make such a distinction between these two readings. Certainly in English both are rendered the same. Yet all three of these UBS editions are confident that the Syriac, Georgian, and some Bohairic manuscripts follow the TR’s reading, but not *Variant 3*. Once again, I lack any familiarity with the Semitic tongue of Syrian, or the Allophylian tongues of Georgian and Egyptian.

Under the circumstances, I can only hope, perhaps wrongly, that the UBS linguistics are sufficiently professional not to mislead their readers on this matter, and that they are able to make such a distinction between the Greek first aorist (or “weak aorist”) and second aorist (or “strong” aorist) in the Syriac, Georgian, and Egyptian Bohairic tongues, which if UBS is correct presumably have some kind of close correlating equivalent distinctions. I just do not know enough about these tongues to know how they reach such a conclusion. In this context, I further note that Nestle-

Aland's 27th edition (1993) also shows all extant Syriac Versions and some Bohairic versions following the TR's reading. Therefore I shall show the Syriac, Georgian, and Bohairic, following the TR, *infra*. But in view of the evident confusion over the Armenian and Georgian Versions, I shall make no reference to them, *infra*.

What if I am wrong, and in fact that UBS neo-Alexandrian linguistics are not able to make such a distinction between the Greek first and second aorists in the Syriac, Georgian, and Egyptian Bohairic tongues, but simply put this in because it suited their preferences? That they might have done so is evident in the fact that they all claim the Latin supports the TR, without making the qualification that it might also be said to support *Variant 2*. Thus I am understandably suspicious. But it does not ultimately matter. That is because for we neo-Byzantines, all texts outside the closed class of sources have precisely no impact on determining the NT Greek text. We merely look at them as a matter of interest. *Stress less! We have the Greek and Latin from inside the closed class of sources! Strength in the things that remain!!*

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 18:15a, the TR's Greek, "*amartese* ('he shall trespass' = 'shall trespass,' subjunctive active first aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *amartano*) *eis* (against) *se* (thee)," i.e., "shall trespass against thee," is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century, Rossano, Italy), N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century, Patmos & Athens, Greece, *at al*), O 023 (*Codex Sinopensis*, 6th century, Paris, France), E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century, Utrecht, Holland), H 013 (9th century, Hamburg, Germany); and Lectionaries 1231 (10th century, Princeton, USA), 150 (995 A.D., London, UK), 32 (11th century, Gotha, Germany), 76 (12th century, Paris, France), 211 (12th century, Oxford, UK), 1564 (12th century, Chicago, USA), 950 (1289 / 1290 A.D., Uppsala, Sweden) 1642 (13th century, Chicago, USA), 184 (1319 A.D., London, UK), 1663 (14th century, Chicago, USA), and 1968 (1544 A.D., Sydney University, Australia). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

The Latin does not distinguish in its translation between an underpinning Greek first or second aorist, so that the Latin equally supports either the TR's reading or *Variant 2*. With this qualification, the TR's reading is also supported as Latin, "*peccaverit* ('shall trespass,' subjunctive active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *pecco*) *in* (against) *te* (thee)," 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), n (5th / 6th 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 Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367), Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370), Pacian (d. before 392), Chromatius (d. 407), Jerome (d. 420), and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

Variant 1, reads Greek, “*amarte* (‘he shall trespass,’ subjunctive active second aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *amartano*)” i.e., “shall trespass.” This reading is followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Basil the Great (d. 379).

Variant 2, reads Greek, “*amarte* (he shall trespass) *eis* (against) *se* (thee),” i.e., “shall trespass against thee.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); Lectionary 2378 (11th century); and Minuscules 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels), 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts), 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), and by the hand of a later Byzantine “corrector” of 1242 (13th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379), Didymus (d. 398), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Theodoret of Cyrus (d. 460).

As observed, *supra*, the Latin shown at the TR’s reading, equally supports either the readings of the Received Text or *Variant 2*.

Variant 3, reads Greek, “*amartese* (he shall trespass),” i.e., “shall trespass.” This reading is followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); and ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

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

Something like, though not exactly the same as in English, there is one “mouse” i.e., singular ending, “ouse,” but two or more “mice,” i.e., plural ending, “ice,” so in Greek, there are different endings (suffixes) or beginnings (prefixes) for plural and singular words, and other declensions. In this context, it should be clearly understood that while the first aorist declension of *amartano* is found in the readings of the Received Text and *Variant 3*; whereas the second aorist declension of *amartano* is found in the readings of *Variants 2 & 3*, that there is absolutely no difference in meaning. An aorist is an aorist whether its declension is as a first or second aorist (and more commonly than not, I just refer to an “aorist” rather than a “first aorist” or “second aorist” in this commentary). The fact that Matt. 18:15a uses the first aorist, whereas Luke 17:3 uses the second aorist, simply manifests the synonymous meaning of these two possible aorist options for *amartano*.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental change? Due to a paper fade, did “*amartese eis se*,” if so, probably coming at the end of a line, come to look something like, “*amarte:::~::~:*”? If so, was it then adopted as an undetected paper fade, probably by Origen?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, decide to “reduce unnecessary wordage” and make “a more succinct text,” by pruning away “*eis* (against) *se* (thee)”? Did Origen then change *amartano* from a first aorist (*amartese* / he shall trespass) to a second aorist (*amarte* / he shall trespass), for other “stylistic reasons,”

e.g., it was “shorter,” or perhaps “more commonly” a second aorist in his area of the Greek speaking Greco-Roman Greek and Latin speaking world?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental change? Due to a paper fade, did “*amartese eis se*,” if so, with “*amartese*” quite possibly coming at the end of one line, and the next line starting with “*eis se*,” come to look something like, “*amarte::*” (line 1) “*eis se*” (line 2)? If so, was this then adopted as an undetected paper fade by a later scribe?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change? Did a scribe, seeking a “gospel harmonization” with Luke 17:3 which also reads, “*amarte* (he shall trespass) *eis* (against) *se* (thee),” deliberately change the TR’s reading to that of *Variant 2* as a “stylistic improvement”? If so, was the scribe also influenced by Origen’s *Variant 1* usage of “*amarte*”?

Was *Variant 3* an accidental change? Due to a paper fade, did “*amartese eis se*,” if so, probably coming at the end of a line, come to look something like, “*amartese:::~::~:*”? If so, was it then adopted as an undetected paper fade by a later scribe?

Was *Variant 3* a deliberate change? Did a scribe decide to “reduce unnecessary wordage” and make “a more succinct text,” by pruning away “*eis* (against) *se* (thee)”? If so, was the scribe’s final reading of simply, “*amartese* (he shall trespass),” further influenced by Origen’s *Variant 1* usage of “*amarte* (he shall trespass)”?

Were these deliberate or accidental changes? We do not know. But we do know that they were changes to the text.

The TR’s reading has rock solid support as the representative Greek reading of the Byzantine Text against which there is no good textual argument. Though the Latin might have been rendered from either the Greek of the Received Text or *Variant 2*, with this qualification, the TR’s reading is also supported by the representative Latin reading of St. Jerome’s Vulgate and the old Latin Versions; as well as a number of Latin church writers, including the Western Church Doctors, St. Jerome, St. Austin, and St. Gregory. By contrast, all the variants, have relatively minor support in the Greek, and the latter *Variants 2 & 3* may well have been influenced in different ways by the earlier *Variant 1* of Origen. Bearing in mind the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, and considering all these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 18:15a 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. 18:15a, “shall trespass (*amartese*) against thee,” is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th 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), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (c. 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century), and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Georgian Version (5th century); and some manuscripts of the Slavic Version.

In consulting Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), I generally look at the 19th century Latin translation (although very occasionally I have consulted an English translation of it). I do not know Arabic, nor know how the Arabic reads. But on the basis of Ciasca's Latin translation, the rendering in the relevant part of Matt. 18:15a is the same as the Vulgate, *supra*. As also previously noted, this Latin reading, equally supports either the readings of the Received Text or *Variant 2*.

Variant 2, "shall trespass (*amarte*) against thee," is found in Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type). As stated before, the Latin translation in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), equally supports either the readings of the Received Text or *Variant 2*.

Variant 3, "shall trespass (*amartese*)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in Minuscule 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 also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century), and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and also some manuscripts of the Slavic Version.

Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) makes reference to the readings of both the TR (Gospel manuscripts: H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum) and *Variant 2* (Gospel manuscripts: z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

The erroneous *Variant 3* was adopted by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952) (with footnote references in Tischendorf & Nestle's to the TR's reading). But with the TR's reading having the support of the Western Text, the Coptic Middle Egyptian Version, and all extant Syriac Versions, some neo-Alexandrians were worried. The solution to their dilemma, first pioneered in the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and then adopted into

the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993), was to put the reading of the TR in the main text, but place square brackets around words 2 & 3. Thus the reading of the NU Text, "*amartese* [*eis se*]," makes the inclusion of "*eis* ('against,' word 2) *se* ('thee,' word 3)" after "*amartese* ('shall trespass,' word 1)," purely optional. Thus NU Text minions are given a free choice to follow either the TR's reading or *Variant 3*.

Now "if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" (I Cor. 14:8). Confused neo-Alexandrian translators were uncertain what to do.

The first result was a ping-pong match among family descendants of the American Standard Version (ASV). At Matt. 18:15a, the correct reading is found in the main text of the ASV as, "sin against thee," but an ASV footnote then says, "Some ancient authorities omit 'against thee'." First the RSV revisers of the ASV followed the main text reading of the TR in the ASV, and jettisoned the ASV's footnote referring to *Variant 3*. But then the NASB rival revisers of the ASV reversed the ASV's order, putting *Variant 3* in their main text as "sins" (NASB), with a footnote claiming, "Late mss [manuscripts] add 'against you'" (NASB 3rd ed. ftn). Then in this back'n'forth "ping-pong match," the NRSV revisers of the RSV, kept the RSV's following of the TR in their main text, but reintroduced a footnote referring to *Variant 3*, like the earlier ASV's footnote which the RSV had removed. Then the ESV revisers of the RSV, came in for "a grand slam" against the NRSV rival revisers of the RSV, by following the RSV's view of putting the TR's reading in their main text, while removing the ASV and NRSV idea of a footnote referring to *Variant 3*.

Other neo-Alexandrian versions outside the ASV's feuding family descendants of the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV, showed similar confusion and disagreement amongst themselves. In a rival battle, the NIV and TEV put the TR's reading in the main text, with a footnote referring to *Variant 3*. But Moffatt followed the TR's reading without any footnote; after all, does not both the Western Text and all extant Syriac versions have this reading? But the NEB disagreed. The NEB and its later revision of the REB, both put *Variant 3* in the main text, with a footnote reference to the TR's reading. However, the TCNT wanted none of this, and simply followed *Variant 3* with no footnote alternative, reading in unqualified agreement with Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus, "If your brother does wrong."

Among the Papists, another fight also broke out. The old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II times, following the Vulgate *et al*, translated Matt. 18:15a as, "if thy brother shall offend against thee" (Douay-Rheims). But the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II times thought too much of the Alexandrian text's Rome Vaticanus and London Sinaiticus, to allow the Douay-Rheims reading to remain. Thus both the Jerusalem Bible and New Jerusalem Bible, put *Variant 3* in the main text, with a footnote reference to the TR's reading which they falsely claimed is unlikely to be correct.

Matt. 18:15b "and" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden's K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and both Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) and Robinson and Pierpont (1991), show the majority text reading as including "kai," without making any reference to the minority Byzantine reading omitting it. Swanson shows the majority text reading with Byzantine support from W 032 (5th century), N 022 (6th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century), and Minuscule 2 (12th century); and the variant with Byzantine support from Minuscule 28 (11th century).

But while Hodges and Farstad (1985) place the TR's reading in their main text, and in their footnote place it first, indicating majority support; they also indicate substantial support for the variant. However, how much of this support for the variant is Byzantine is not clear, since what is meant by substantial support is not clear. No reference to the textual support for the reading or variant is made in Nestle's 21st edition (1952), Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), or the UBS 3rd (1975), 3rd corrected (1983), or 4th revised (1993) editions. On the basis of the data available to me from Tischendorf and Swanson, what Greek manuscript support it seems to have is generally non-Byzantine, and so outside the closed class of sources.

Thus on this occasion I must go directly to the common source of Green's Textual Apparatus, Robinson & Pierpont, and Hodges & Farstad i.e., von Soden. Von Soden says the "kai" is supported by the K group, other than one manuscript in his K1 group, (Minuscule 661, 11th century, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system), and his Kr group. Von Soden's Kr subgroup has c. 190 completely Byzantine manuscripts out of c. 914 completely Byzantine manuscripts in the K group i.e., c. 21% +/- c. 2.1% of the K group, follow the variant. Thus the majority Byzantine text here has c. 80% or 4/5ths Byzantine manuscript support; and the variant omitting it has c. 20% or 1/5th Byzantine manuscript support²¹. Hence Robinson & Pierpont are clearly correct to classify it as the representative Byzantine reading. (See Origen's usage of this variant in the preliminary textual discussion of Matt. 18:15a, Matter 1, *supra*.)

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 18:15b, the TR's Greek, "kai (and)," after "upage (thou go)," i.e., "go and" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is also supported as Latin, "et (and)," after "vade (thou go)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the

²¹ On the Kr group, see commentary at Matt. 16:20c & Matt. 20:15c.

ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, “and (Greek, *kai*; Latin, *et*),” is omitted in the Greek as a minority Byzantine reading, found in Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further omitted in the Latin in old Latin Versions d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Basil the Great (d. 379), Chrysostom (d. 407), and 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 is thus correct. The origins of this variant are speculative.

Was this an accidental change? Was the original “*kai*” lost in the one-way paper slide of an undetected paper fade? Whether or not it came at the end of a line this could have happened, though it would be more likely to have happened if it came at then end of a line.

Was this an deliberate change? Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, seeking to create “a more succinct” and “less wordy” passage, deliberately prune away the “*kai* (and)”? In its trimmed down form, Matt. 18:15 reads, “if thy brother” etc., “go, tell him his fault” etc. (variant), rather than, “go *and* tell him his fault” (TR) etc. . If a deliberate alteration, was Origen influenced by a semi-assimilationist desire to make Matt. 18:15b more like the similar, but different, Luke 17:3, which lacks a “*kai* (and)” after the “*sou* (thee),” so that the passage reads simply, “If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him” etc. (Luke 17:3)?

Was this a deliberate or accidental change? We do not know. We only know for sure that a change was made to the text of Matt. 18:15b, probably by Origen. Both readings then retained some usage, for both are referred to by Bishop Gregory.

The TR’s reading has strong support in both the Greek and Latin. By contrast, the variant is both a minority Greek and minority Latin reading, and has no good textual argument to commend it. Moreover, Origen’s fluctuations in his standard of textual transmission are well known, and this variant looks suspiciously like it came from the notoriously erratic, and so notoriously unreliable, hand of Origen. Therefore, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 18:15b 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. 18:15b, “and (*kai*),” is found in (the independent, but Byzantine influenced,) Codex 078 (6th 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

(independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th 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); and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

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

The variant which omits "*kai* (and)," was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* At the point of translation into English a difficulty arises. Even when the "*kai* (and)" is absent, it is possible to argue that as part of the act of translation, it should be supplied. This factor has thus led to a division between neo-Alexandrian versions. On the one hand, wanting to show its absence in the neo-Alexandrian text it is following, it is omitted in the American Standard Version, which reads at Matt. 18:15, "And if thy brother sin against thee, go, show him his fault" etc. (ASV). But on the other hand, supplying it as a part of translation into English, it is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Though only the ASV has thus sought to highlight the difference in the neo-Alexandrian text, it has nevertheless set an important precedent that we cannot ignore. Moreover, even though these other neo-Alexandrian versions *prima facie* look like they follow the same reading as is in the TR because they add "and" here in their English translations, it is clear from the underpinning neo-Alexandrian texts that in fact they are adding it in as part of English translation, rather than regarding it as part of the underpinning Greek text. Though discussion of this variant might have been placed in Appendix 3, I consider the Westcott-Hort based reading of the American Standard Version here, "go, show him" (ASV), which is a mild spelling revision of the earlier Westcott-Hort based reading of the (English) Revised Version (RV), "go, shew him" (RV), is simply too important to ignore.

Westcott and Hort both looked to a source of authority that was external to God, who providentially preserved the Received Text. They were both Puseyites involved in Mariolatry, which thing is prohibited in Articles 22 & 35 of the Anglican *39 Articles*. Thus Westcott said of a statue of Mary, "I could have knelt there for hours;" which is a clear violation of the Second Commandment, "Thou shalt not make," "bow down" "to," "nor serve," "any graven image" (Exod. 20:4-6). And Hort say, "Mary-worship and Jesus worship have very much in common in their causes *and their results*²²" i.e., the

²² *Life of Westcott*, Vol. 1, p. 51 / 81, & *Life of Hort*, Vol. 2, p. 50; cited in Ray, J.J., *God Wrote Only One Bible*, The Eye Opener Publishers, Oregon, USA, 1955,

blasphemous teaching of Mary “co-mediator,” which violates the clear teaching of Scripture that “there is ... one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus” (I Tim. 2:5). Their attack on the *Textus Receptus* here at Matt. 18:15b, as highlighted in the RV and ASV, manifested their wider theological beliefs, which instead of focusing on the power of the Holy Spirit of God to preserve the New Testament text, instead focused on the power of Mariolatry. Now Marian devotion is one element in the great apostasy of Christianity under Papal Rome (Dan. 11:37-39; II Thess. 2:3)²³, and such Mariolatry is ultimately backed by the spiritual power of “seducing spirits, and ... devils” (I Tim. 4:1). Since these semi-Romanists were evidently given over to such spiritual forces, ought we to be surprised that their Westcott & Hort text is so bad?

Matt. 18:19a “Again I say unto you” (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

A divide exists here at Matt. 18:19a between the readings of the TR, *Variant 1*, and *Variant 2* on the one hand, and two other readings which both omit “*palin* (‘again,’ word 1).” *Variant 3*, omits the “*palin* (‘again,’ word 1) of *Variant 1*, and may be reconstructed in the Greek from the Latin as, “*lego* (‘I say,’ word 2) *de* (‘and,’ word A) *umin* (‘unto you,’ word 3)” (ancient Latin writer, Cyprian, d. 258). *Variant 4*, omits the “*palin* (‘again,’ word 1) of *Variant 2*, and may be reconstructed in the Greek from the Latin as, “*amen* (‘verily,’ word B) *lego* (‘I say,’ word 2) *umin* (‘unto you,’ word 3),” (old Latin ff1, 10th / 11th century)²⁴.

However, there is no good textual argument against *this element* of the representative Byzantine text’s reading, and so its usage of word 1, “*palin* (again),” must stand. The origins of these two variants are conjectural. Was the “*palin* (again)” accidentally lost in undetected paper fades? Or was it deliberately changed as “stylistic improvements” in order to make Matt. 18:19 “more readily flow” from Matt. 18:18 (see

revised edition 1983, pp. 29,70.

²³ See a classic Protestant historicist application of Dan. 11:38 to saint mediator “forces” with reference to Popish saints and idols of saints, in Article 35 of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles* (Homily 2, Book 2), discussed in Commentary Vol. 2 (Matt. 15-20), “Preface,” section, “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” sub-section “(3) The Antichrist visits my hometown of Sydney, Australia (2008).”

²⁴ Outside the closed class of sources, *Variant 4*, “Verily, I say,” is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere); and 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.*

discussion of *palin, infra*)? Or was *Variant 4* a “stylistic improvement” to form “a matching couplet with the “Verily I say unto you” of Matt. 18:18?

Thus in order not to confuse the reader by detracting from the primary textual discussion here at Matt. 18:19a between the readings of the TR, *Variant 1*, and *Variant 2*, I shall make no further reference to these clearly aberrant *Variants 4 & 5, infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 18:19a, the TR’s Greek, “*palin* (‘again,’ word 1) *legō* (‘I say,’ word 2) *umin* (‘unto you,’ word 3),” in the introduction to verse 19, “*Again I say unto you*,” is a minority Byzantine reading²⁵. It is supported in Codices Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century, Rossano, Italy) and Gamma 036 (*Oxoniensis Bodleianus*, 10th century, Oxford, England, UK); as well as Lectionary 524 (12th century, Messina, Italy). It is also supported as Latin, “*Iterum* (‘Again,’ word 1) *dico* (‘I say,’ word 2) *vobis* (‘unto you,’ word 3),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions d (5th century), ff2 (5th 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 further supported by the ancient church Greek writer Origen (d. 254); and ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

Another reading, *Variant 1*, broadly supports the TR’s reading, but adds in “*de* (‘and,’ word A) i.e., “*And again I say unto you*.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in word order 1,A,3,2, as Greek, “*palin* (‘again,’ word 1) *de* (‘and,’ word A) *umin* (‘unto you,’ word 3) *legō* (‘I say,’ word 2),” in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and in word order 1,A,2,3, in N 022 (6th century), O 023 (6th century), and M 021 (9th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, is Greek, “*palin* (‘again,’ word 1) *amen* (‘verily,’ word B) *legō* (‘I say,’ word 2) *umin* (‘unto you,’ word 3).” This is the majority Byzantine reading found in e.g., Codices K 017 (9th century) and U 030 (9th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels), 2 (12th century), 180 (12th century, Byzantine other than in Acts), 1010 (12th century); 597 (13th century), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further found as Latin, “*Iterum* (‘Again,’ word 1) *amen* (‘verily,’ word B) *dico* (‘I say,’ word 2) *vobis* (‘unto you,’ word 3),” in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), f (6th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation, and

²⁵ The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden’s K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green’s Majority Text Apparatus says 0%-5% of all (Greek) manuscripts follow this reading.

Basil the Great (d. 379).

There is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading at Matt. 18:19a. In the first place there is a broad general concern, namely, that in Matthean Greek or other Gospel Greek, in Christ's words, "*amen* (verily)," is generally used with "*lego* (I say)," in the context of a specific conclusion *immediately* flowing on from what is said or written before it, or in the case of an exception, shortly later after a small number of intervening verses. There is then also a second specific concern, namely, that "*palin* (again)," is used as a stylistic break, and never by Christ with "*amen* (verily)," in Matthean Greek or other Gospel Greek.

Concerning the first broad general concern, in which the representative Byzantine reading of Matt. 18:19b goes against a general stylistic feature of Jesus' words in both Matthean Greek and other Gospel Greek. When in St. Matthew's Gospel, or indeed the Synoptic Gospels more generally, we hear Jesus saying, "*amen* (verily) *lego* (I say)," this is generally connected with either an immediate consequence in what he is saying (Matt. 5:18,26; 6:2,5,16; 10:15,23,42; 13:17; 16:28; 17:20; 18:13,18; 23:36; 24:2,34,47; 25:12,40,45; 26:13,34; Mark 3:28; 6:11; 8:12; 9:1,41; 10:15; 11:23; 13:30; 14:9,25; Luke 4:24; 12:37; 13:35; 18:17; 21:32; cf. *nai* / verily in Luke 11:51), or as an immediate consequence of something that has contextually happened (Matt. 8:10; 18:3; 19:23,28; 21:21; Mark 10:29; 12:43; 14:30; Luke 18:29; 23:43).

The Gospel of St. John is different in much of its focus, and is the only Gospel written by one of the three inner disciples of our Lord, namely, Peter, James, and John (e.g., Matt. 17:1). Without considering the matter in detail, St. John's Gospel contains a number of instances where Jesus uses the terminology, "*Amen* (Verily), *amen* (verily), *lego* (I say)" followed by "unto you / thee." When he does so, the emphasis of repeating, "*amen* (verily)," is used as part of a *sterner* terminology. It is used by Christ in public address (e.g., John 8:58), address of outer disciples (e.g., John 1:51), address of a religious leader who should know better (e.g., John 3:11); address of the disciples in some more sombre contexts (e.g., John 13:21), or address of an inner disciples in a more stern tone (e.g., John 13:38; 21:18). Yet notwithstanding this, it is notable that the same basic dichotomy exists as in the Synoptic Gospels. I.e., "*amen* (verily) *lego* (I say)," is connected with either an immediate consequence in what Christ is saying (John 1:51; 3:11; 5:24,25; 6:47; 8:58; 10:7; 12:24; 13:16,21,38; 12:12; 16:20,23; 21:18), or as an immediate consequence of something that has contextually happened (John 3:3,5; 5:19; 6:26,32,53; 8:34,51; 10:1; 13:20).

Thus e.g., in Matt. 5:17 we first read Jesus say, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets, I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." We then read the connected conclusion in Matt. 5:18, "For *verily I say unto you*, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law" etc. . Or in Matt. 8:10, we first read that something happened, "When *Jesus heard it, he marvelled*, and said to them that followed," with Christ's words of consequential conclusion, "*Verily I say unto you*, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel."

To this normative stylistic pattern in Christ's usage of "*amen* (verily) *lego* (I say)," there are two notable "exceptions" in the Synoptic Gospels, although even these must be qualified. The first qualification is that this is the same event in both Gospels (Matt. 26:21; Mark 14:18). Here we read in Matt. 26:21, "and as they did eat, he [Jesus] said, *Verily I say unto you*, that one of you shall betray me." The second qualification is, that this is more typical of the kind of thing we find in St. John's Gospel, i.e., a sombre or stern usage of "verily I say," and so it is not out of character with the wider Biblical Jesus, as found in St. John's Gospel. The third qualification, is that in the wider context, Matt. 26:14-16 (and Mark 14:10,11), refers to the betrayal of Christ by Judas Iscariot. Thus these words are said *as a consequence of something that has happened*, although not immediately after since there are the intervening verses of Matt. 26:17-20 (or Mark 14:12-17).

By contrast, when we consider Matt. 18:19, we find that in the immediately preceding verse, following immediately on as a conclusion, Jesus says in Matt. 18:18, "*Verily I say unto you*, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." But then when we read in the majority Byzantine text, "Again, *verily I say* unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven" etc., it is clear that this does not follow on as a consequence of what has just been said, or something that has just happened. Nor can we find the type of exceptions here applicable to Matt. 26:21; Mark 14:18. I.e., this does not conform to wider Christological terminology in another synoptic Gospel or St. John's Gospel. Nor is this a consequence of something said or that has happened a small number of verses before, with some intervening content. Therefore, this type of usage of "*amen* (verily) *lego* (I say)" here at Matt. 18:19a in the representative Byzantine text is essentially unique to not only St. Matthew's Gospel, but all four Gospels.

Since in the first place the representative Byzantine reading of Matt. 18:19a goes against a general stylistic feature of Jesus' words in both Matthean Greek and other Gospel Greek, namely, the usage of these words *as an immediate consequence of something that is said or has happened*; and since it then differs from the broad maintenance of such ideas in even the exception of Matt. 26:21; Mark 14:18; it follows that the usage of "*amen* (verily) *lego* (I say)," here at Matt. 18:19, clangs on the ears. It does not sound right. It is not the type of thing Christ would say.

This then leads us to make a further investigation of the matter with reference to a second more narrowly defined concern. The concern here has to do with the usage of "*palin* (again)" with "*amen* (verily)." When Greek, "*palin*" is used by our Lord, it acts as a stylistic breaker (Matt. 5:33; 13:44,45,47; 19:24). E.g., "Again (*palin*), ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time" etc. (Matt. 5:33); or "and again (*palin*) I say (*lego*) unto you" etc. (Matt. 19:24). Given the nexus between Christ's usage of *amen* (verily) with an immediately flowing consequence, or in the exception case, a slightly later flowing consequence, it follows that the usage of a stylistic breaker such as "again (*palin*)," constitutes an absolute stylistic bar on his usage with it of "*amen* (verily)." *Thus on the lips of Jesus, we nowhere else find "palin amen."*

Hence when we read in the representative Byzantine reading of Matt. 18:19a, “*palin* (again) *amen* (verily) *lego* (I say),” we are confronted with an impossible union of “*palin* (again)” and “*amen* (verily).” *This is simply not the stylistic way that Christ spoke. This simply cannot be correct.* Therefore the only way to remedy this textual problem with the representative Byzantine Greek reading, is to adopt either the minority Byzantine reading, “*palin* (again) *lego* (I say) *umin* (unto you)” (TR), or “*palin* (again) *de* (and) *lego* (I say) *umin* (unto you)” (*Variant 1*).

But which of these two readings at Matt. 18:19a is correct? The key to this matter is found in the issue of how Jesus uses “*palin* (again)” as a stylistic breaker. On the one hand, his normative usage is to use it as a *strong* stylistic breaker, with no accompanying “*de*.” E.g., he uses it to divide one commandment from another at the beginning of Matt. 5:33. So likewise he uses it to divide different metaphors at Matt. 13:44,45,47. But on the other hand, his exceptional usage of it is as a *weak* stylistic breaker, here with an accompanying “*de*.” Thus at Matt. 19:23,24, he first says at Matt. 19:23, “Verily I say unto you, That a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven.” Then, linking this with what is a *weak* stylistic breaker, that then continues this idea in what follows, but with a metaphor, he says in Matt. 19:24, “And (*de*) again (*palin*) I say (*lego*) unto you (*umin*), It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.” The words of Matt. 19:24 are identical with those of the variant at Matt. 18:19a, i.e., Greek, “*palin* (again) *de* (and) *lego* (I say) *umin* (unto you).”

Now it is clear that the usage of “*palin* (again)” as a stylistic breaker here at Matt. 18:19, is as a *strong* stylistic breaker, comparable to the way our Lord uses it to divide different metaphors at Matt. 13:44,45,47. The context of Matt. 18:19 does not flow on from Matt. 18:18 in the same way as it does with the *weak* stylistic breaker at Matt. 19:24. Therefore the correct reading here at Matt. 18:19a must be “*palin* (again) *lego* (I say) *umin* (unto you)” (TR).

The origins of the variants are speculative.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental change? In the continuous script manuscript of *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), we find that at Matt. 18:19, there are stylistic paper spaces of one letter between the “*d*” and “*e*” of Word A (*de*), and of another letter space after “*lego* (I say)” and before “*oti* (that),” in order to (in broad terms) right-hand justify the page. Did a similar set of paper spaces, but with the two paper spaces both coming after “*palin* (‘again,’ word 1)” occur in a manuscript? If so, did a subsequent scribe then wrongly conclude that “there must have been a paper fade,” and so “reconstruct” the “missing two letter spaces” as “*de* (‘and,’ word A)”)? The Greek, “*de*,” is a common conjunctive and found in e.g., Matt. 18:15 (“Moreover,” AV), Matt. 18:16 (“But,” AV), and Matt. 18:17 (first “And,” AV). Was the scribe influenced in his selection of “*de*” at Matt. 18:19a by such proximate usage?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? Did a scribe, misinterpret the *strong* break

created by “*palin* (again)” at Matt. 18:19a, as “an abrupt break”? If so, did he then set about to undertake “a stylistic improvement” in which he made Matt. 18:19 “more readily flow” from Matt. 18:18, without realizing that he was thereby creating a *weak* break and so distorting Christ’s words? Was this lower quality scribe influenced in his decision by the superficial similarity of Matt. 18:19a with Matt. 19:24?

The changed word order of W 032 from word order 1,A,2,3, to word order 1,A,3,2, i.e., to “*palin* (‘again,’ word 1) *de* (‘and,’ word A) *umin* (‘unto you,’ word 3) *lego* (‘I say,’ word 2)” (W 032), was probably accidental. I.e., we know that short words were sometimes missed by a scribe, and if they were more adroit, then added back in, such as occurs in W032 elsewhere (e.g., Matt. 7:17) (or if they were less adroit, then lost in that manuscript line). Probably he missed “*lego* (‘I say,’ word 2)” and wrote “*umin* (‘unto you,’ word 3),” then suddenly realizing his mistake, wrote it back after word 3, on the basis that “the meaning was still the same with this different word order.”

Was *Variant 2* an accidental change? Probably with “*palin* (again)” as the last word on a line, followed by a paper space, did a subsequent scribe wrongly conclude that “there had been a paper fade”? If so, did he then “reconstruct” the “*amen* (‘verily,’ word B)” at Matt. 18:19a, with reference to the immediately preceding “*amen* (verily)” of Matt. 18:18?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change? Did a scribe, superficially regard the repetition of the “*amen* (verily)” of Matt. 18:18 with the “*amen* (‘verily,’ word B)” of Matt. 18:19a, as a desirable “stylistic couplet”? If so, without realizing the inappropriateness and stylistic incongruity of inserting “*amen* (‘verily,’ word B)” here both because Matt. 18:19a is not a conclusion immediately (or near immediately) flowing on from what is said or written before it, and because “*palin* (again)” as a stylistic break is never used by Christ with “*amen* (verily);” did this lower quality scribe then insert this “couplet” as a “stylistic improvement”?

Were these deliberate or accidental changes? We simply do not know. But we do know that they were changes to the original reading of the Received Text.

Three broad factors are relevant to the rating of the TR’s reading here at Matt. 18:19a. Firstly, the reading is strongly supported by textual analysis. Secondly, though the TR’s reading is a minority Byzantine reading, one can show its presence in the Greek from early times in the 3rd century (Origen), through to the late 5th / 6th century (Sigma 042), then to the 10th century (Gamma 036), and on to the 12th century (Lectionary 524). It has thus clearly existed in the Greek through time, and over time.

Thirdly, since neo-Byzantine textual analysis recognizes the superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, because the textual analysis is focused on the Greek, this means when we draw on a Latin reading to resolve a textual problem in the representative Byzantine Greek, we rightly use the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*. In this context, the fact that the *Textus Receptus* reading is found in St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate from the 4th / 5th centuries, together with a number of old

Latin versions, both ancient from the 5th century (d & ff2) and later (aur & l), is a significant witness to the TR's reading. It has thus clearly existed as a preferred reading in the Latin through time, and over time, as most clearly seen in the endorsement of it by the church father and doctor, St. Jerome, and his associated usage of it in St. Jerome's Vulgate.

Weighing up these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 18:19a, 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. 18:19a, "Again I say unto you," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with 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); Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) 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 (first half 5th century) Version, and a manuscript of the Syriac Palestinian Version; Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Georgian "2" Version (5th century). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron; being translated from the 12th-14th centuries Arabic in Ciasca's 19th century Latin as, "*Iterum (Again) dico (I say) vobis (unto you).*"

Variant 1, "And (*de*) again I say unto you," is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 2, "Again, verily (*amen*), I say unto you," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions, some manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version; and Georgian "1" (5th century) Version.

Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) shows *Variant 2* as the majority reading among his selected texts (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; L, Codex Leicestrensis; H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8); although he shows the TR's reading with minority support (Gospel manuscript: P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18). The TR's reading was followed

by Erasmus's Greek NT (1516 & 1522), Stephanus's Greek NT (1550) *et al.* We cannot doubt that on this occasion, Desiderius Erasmus and Robertus Stephanus had a first class grip on the Greek. We thank God that the King James Version translators also had this appreciation, and so followed the Received Text's reading here at Matt. 18:19a.

The neo-Alexandrians dotting adoration of figures like Tischendorf, Nestle I & II, or Metzger, reminds me of some of the more bizarre elements in the mediaeval *feast of fools*. They would get almost as much reliable advice on the principles of how to compose the NT text if they simply called for "the village idiot." "Oh no," as it were, said one neo-Alexandrian to another, "the village idiot is not in town today! ... He's out in the countryside asking people, 'How long does it take to boil 2 minute noodles?' ... What are we gonna' do?" And so they fumbled and fiddled and diddled, and looked blankly at each other, and the roof, wondering what they should do. With the two major Alexandrian texts in disagreement, the neo-Alexandrians who make up for their lack of textual analytical skills by maintaining bigoted control of the tertiary colleges and universities, thus giving them the semblance of competence to the unlearned, were thrown into consternation and confusion.

The "great discoverer" of *Codex Sinaiticus* (London), Tischendorf, as is usually the case in such instances, supported the reading of that manuscript, and so by a fumbling fluke, on this occasion adopted the correct reading in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). But lacking this same level of vested interested in London Sinaiticus, Westcott-Hort *et al* were not so sure. Westcott-Hort thus came up with "the obvious" solution to their neo-Alexandrian dilemma. The "*amen* ('verily,' word B)" of *Variant 2* (Rome Vaticanus), was placed in square brackets between the "*palin* ('again,' word 1)" and "*lego* ('I say,' word 2)" of the TR's reading (followed by London Sinaiticus). The whole matter of whether or not to follow the "*amen* (verily)" was thus thrown back on the reader in Westcott-Hort (1881). "A brilliant dodge," perhaps exclaimed Nestle, as he followed the same idea in Nestle's 21st edition (1952). "A masterly fiddle," perhaps proclaimed the UBS Committees as they too followed this "solution" in the UBS 3rd (1975), 3rd corrected (1983), and 4th revised (1993) editions. "I love the beautiful diddle," Aland possibly thought as he drew back hard on his cigar, and so this "great solution" was also adopted in Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993)²⁶.

Everything was now as clear to the neo-Alexandrian translators as a smoke-screen coming from Aland's cigar. Thus at Matt. 18:19a, *Option 1*, to follow London Sinaiticus and thus by accident, to follow the TR, was adopted by the ASV, NASB, RSV, ESV, and NIV. But *Option 2*, to follow Rome Vaticanus and thus *Variant 2*, was adopted by "Metzger's baby" of the NRSV. So too, the post Vatican II (1962-5) new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the *New Jerusalem Bible* adopted *Variant 2*, and thereby put a

²⁶ A Wikipedia article on Kurt Aland (d. 1994) shows him about four years before his death, reclining in an armchair and smoking a cigar. The photo is dated to c. 1990, and may be clicked on to gain a higher half-page picture size resolution. ("Kurt Aland," *Wikipedia*, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kurt_Aland).

distance between themselves and the pre-Vatican II old Latin Papists of the Douay-Rheims Version whose translation from the Latin correctly follows that of the TR, and so reads, “Again I say to you” (Douay-Rheims). Reminding us that though most of them use it less than Moffatt, the neo-Alexandrians also have a non-Alexandrian pincer arm; with different variants there were numerous possibilities for the baffled neo-Alexandrians. The REB translators evidently decided to follow *Option 3*, and so exercising their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, on this occasion they decided to “ditch the disagreeing Alexandrian Texts,” and “go with the Syriac and Ethiopic” of *Variant 1*, which they then adopted.

Not to be left out, the Burgonite translators of the NKJV put a footnote at Matt. 18:19a saying that both the NU Text and their Majority Text follow *Variant 2*. This is actually a so called, “half-truth,” since the NU Text makes it entirely optional as to whether or not one does or does not follow the erroneous “verily (*amen*)” of Rome Vaticanus over the reading of London Sinaiticus which rightly does not have this addition. But perhaps they thought “it sounds better” to say that their Burgonite Majority Text has the unequivocal support of the neo-Alexandrian NU Text here in a joint neo-Alexandrian and Burgonite attack on the *Textus Receptus*.

The confusion among neo-Alexandrians at Matt. 18:19a, stems from the fact that the two major Alexandrian texts are in disagreement with each other, and they use these faulty texts as a poor substitute for textual analysis of the representative Byzantine text. The error of the slothful Burgonites at Matt. 18:19a, stems from the fact that they use the majority text as an inferior substitute for textual analysis of the representative Byzantine text. What a contrast there is then, between these neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites on the one hand; and on the other hand, the great neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the 16th and 17th centuries whose work culminated with the Authorized (King James) Version of 1611! Humbly relying upon the blessing of Almighty God, the great neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the *Textus Receptus*, discharged their laborious responsibilities with great diligence and care. We thank God for their wonderful and godly labours.

Thus on the one hand, I find much that is useful and good by way of textual information in the textual apparatuses of the neo-Alexandrians and Burgonites. But on the other hand, when such as here, at Matt. 18:19a, it goes beyond this, and they give a neo-Alexandrian or Burgonite Majority Text view on what the better reading is, then I say to both alike, *Ne sutor ultra crepidam!* (Latin, *Cobbler, not further than the sandal!*)²⁷

²⁷ *Cobbler, not further than the sandal!* I.e., *Don't offer your opinion on matters outside of your competence.* The ancient Greek painter, Apelles (4th century B.C.), was an artist of the royal court, and painted famous portraits of Philip II (382-336 B.C.) and Philip II's son, Alexander the Great (365-323 B.C.). When undertaking work on a particular painting, Apelles is said to have consulted a cobbler with respect to the details on sandals, so as to paint them more accurately. But when the cobbler started to give him advice on how he thought the rest of the artwork should be done, Apelles rebuked him in the Greek tongue, and his words, rendered in the Latin tongue, “*Ne* (not)

Matt. 18:21 “Peter to him, and said” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) and the UBS 3rd edition (1975), both take the view that the Latin Vulgate and old Latin e support the TR’s reading; whereas the UBS 3rd corrected edition (1983) considers that the Vulgate and old Latin e supports the TR’s reading “with minor differences.” Though Tischendorf makes no reference to old Latin l, the UBS 3rd edition likewise considers it supports the TR’s reading, but once again, the UBS 3rd corrected edition considers that old Latin l supports the TR’s reading “with minor differences.”

At this passage, the Latin of the Vulgate, *infra*, is most naturally rendered into English as, “Then came Peter to him, and said,” i.e., the same meaning as the TR. Hence I show this reading of the Vulgate *et al* as supporting the TR. Moreover, at the key words, 1,2,3,4, *infra*, old Latin e is identical with old Latin a *et al*, although it adds “*et* (and),” and so I also show it with them, *infra*.

On the one hand, I disagree with the UBS 3rd edition, and so agree with the UBS 3rd corrected edition, that there are minor difference with old Latin e (referred to by Tischendorf). But on the other hand, I disagree with the UBS 3rd corrected edition, and so agree with the UBS 3rd edition, that one can say that the Vulgate and old Latin l support the TR’s reading. With these two UBS Committees at sixes and sevens with each other, the UBS 4th revised edition (1993) Committee decided to side-step the issue, and make no reference to this variant in that edition.

The Second Matter. Outside the closed class of sources, Tischendorf’s 8th edition shows the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic and Bohairic Versions following the TR’s reading. By contrast, the UBS 3rd and 3rd corrected editions, show these Egyptian Versions following *Variant 2*. As to which reading these Allophylian Versions from the Land of Ham actually follow, I do not know, nor much care. In the final analysis, it matters not since they are outside the closed class of sources used to discover the NT Text. But in view of these differing interpretations made on their meaning, I make no reference to them, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 18:21, the TR’s Greek, “*autō* (‘to him,’ word 1) *o* (- / literally, ‘the,’ word 2) *Petros* (‘Peter,’ word 3) *eipe* (‘[and] he said,’ word 4),” i.e., “Peter to him, and said,” in the words, “Then came *Peter to him, and said*,” etc. (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-

sutor (cobbler) *ultra* (further than) *crepidam* (the sandal)!”, became a popular Latin maxim in the ancient Greco-Roman world.

28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), E 07 (8th century), K 017 (9th century), X 033 (10th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century); and Lectionaries 76 (12th century, Paris, France), 850 (12th century, St. Catherine's Greek Orthodox Monastery, Sinai, Arabia), and 333 (13th century, London, UK). It is further found in the Latin, "*ad eum* ('to him,' two Latin words, *ad* / to + *eum* / him = Greek word 1) *Petrus* ('Peter,' one Latin word = two Greek words, words 2 & 3) *dixit* ('[and] he said,' word 4)," i.e., "Peter to him, and said," in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century, adding in *et* / and, before word 4), q (6th / 7th century), and aur (7th century). It is also found as Latin, "*Petrus* ('Peter,' = Greek words 2 & 3) *ad eum* ('to him,' = Greek word 1), *dixit* ('[and] he said,' word 4)," i.e., "Peter to him, and said," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Version 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 further found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writer, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370).

However, another reading, *Variant 1*, reads, Greek, "*o* (-, word 2) *Petros* ('Peter,' word 3) *eipen* ('[and] he said,' word 4) *auto* ('to him,' word 1)," i.e., "Peter, and said to him," in the words, "Then came *Peter*, and said to him," etc. . This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscules 300 (11th century) and 49 (12th century). It is further found as Latin, "*Petrus* ('Peter,' one Latin word = two Greek words, words 2 & 3) *dixit* ('[and] he said,' word 4) *ei* ('unto him' Greek word 1 as in *Variant 1*)," in old Latin Version d (5th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254).

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, may be reconstructed as Greek, "*auto* ('to him,' word 1, as in the TR) *o* (-, word 2) *Petros* ('Peter,' word 3) *eipe* ('[and] he said,' word 4) *auto* ('unto him,' word 1, as in *Variant 1*)" i.e., "Peter to him, and said unto him," in the words, "Then came *Peter* to him, and said to him," etc. . This is found as Latin, "*ad eum* ('to him,' two Latin words, *ad* / to + *eum* / him = Greek word 1 as in TR) *Petrus* ('Peter,' one Latin word = two Greek words, words 2 & 3) *dixit* ('[and] he said,' word 4) *ei* ('unto him' Greek word 1 as in *Variant 1*)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century, adding in *et* / and, before word 4), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century).

Still another reading, *Variant 3* omits "*auto* ('to him,' word 1)," and reads, Greek, "*o* (-, word 2) *Petros* ('Peter,' word 3) *eipen* ('[and] he said,' word 4)" i.e., "Peter, and said," in the words, "Then came *Peter*, and said," etc. . This is found in the early mediaeval church Greek writer, John of Damascus (d. before 754).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading, which must thus stand. The origins of the variants are conjectural. *Variant 3* is further discussed in the section outside the closed class of sources, *infra*.

It must be admitted that there is quite a *subtle difference* of emphasis in the statement, "Then came Peter to him, and said" (AV & TR), in which the emphasis

connected with “*eipe* (he said),” is put on the fact that Peter *first came*, and *then later he spake*; and the reading of *Variant 1*, “Then came Peter, and he said to him,” in which the emphasis connected with “*eipe* (he said),” is put on the fact that Peter *said* something to Christ. This subtlety of difference may well have been lost on a lesser quality scribe, and this in turn may become relevant to the possibilities of *Variant 1* being either an accidental or deliberate change, *infra*.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental change? We know from Manuscript Washington (W 032), that a scribe sometimes omitted a shorter word, and then realizing his error, wrote it back in afterwards where it made no difference to the basic meaning (e.g., Matt. 7:17). Did a similar thing occur here, with a scribe, perhaps suffering from fatigue, or perhaps the distraction of some external stimulus, first omit “*auto* (‘to him,’ word 1),” and then realizing his error, add it back in after word 4 because “it meant the same thing”? If so, this less adroit scribe missed the *fine shade of difference* between these two readings.

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? In *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), the shorter form of “*eipen* (he said)” without the optional “*n*” has a line on top, indicating abbreviation (by contrast in e.g., N 022 this is written as “*eipen*”); and the next word, “*Kurie* (Lord),” is abbreviated (with a line on top where I have one underneath,) to “KE”. The reading of “*eipe* (he said), *Kurie* (Lord),” when written as, “*EIIIEKE*” might have been interpreted by a scribe as something that could “too easily” give rise to the loss of the “KE” by accidental ellipsis on the two epsilon (“*E*”) words. Certainly “*Kurie* (Lord)” was here lost in G 011 (9th century) and Minuscule 474 (11th century), and its loss was possibly due to this factor. Therefore, did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, decide to make “a stylistic improvement” to “safeguard” against this type of possibility, and hence deliberately reposition the “*auto* (‘to him,’ word 1)” so it would be after the “*eipe* (he said)” and before the “*Kurie* (Lord)””? If so, Origen did not seem to detect that he was in fact changing the emphasis of a fine nuance in the Greek.

Variant 2 looks very much like a conflation of the TR’s reading and *Variant 1*. A scribe, evidently aware of both readings, appears to have concluded that due to loss in transmission, an “*auto* (‘to him,’ word 1)” had been lost in both the TR’s and *Variant 1*’s manuscript lines, and also an “*auto* (‘to him,’ word 1)” preserved in each of these two manuscript lines. If the action of conflation was deliberate, but stemmed from this accidental means of misinterpretation of the data by a lower quality scribe, should one classify this as a deliberate or accidental alteration?

Were these variants accidental or deliberate alterations, or some combination thereof? God knows. We do not. But we do know that they were changes to the original text.

The TR’s reading has solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument, and also in the Latin with St. Jerome’s Vulgate. It is also attested to from ancient times in both the Greek and Latin writers e.g., the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of

Constantinople.

By contrast, *Variant 1* has weak support in the Greek and Latin, and looks like the work of Origen. Though *Variant 2* is absent from the Greek, it has some stronger support in the old Latin versions. But bearing in mind the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*; and the fact that because *Variant 2* is a conflation of the readings in the TR and *Variant 1*, it too can ultimately be traced to Origen's fiddling with the text in *Variant 1*, means that as a package deal, *Variant 2's* support is not that impressive. Though the presence of *Variant 3* in early mediaeval Greek writings is enough to put it inside the closed class of sources, it not only lacks both ancient support and wider later attestation (which though not in itself a conclusive argument against a reading, would always affect its rating even if it could be justified by textual analysis), but more importantly, has nothing to commend itself textually, being clearly an aberrant reading.

Therefore, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 18:21 an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 18:21, "Peter to him, and said," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the independent) 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), 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 also found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); the Georgian "1" (5th century) and "A" (5th century) Versions; and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 1, "Peter, and said to him," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); and with minor differences in the leading representative of the Western Text, Codex D 05 (5th century, omits word 2, "o" / "the," which is redundant in English translation). It is also found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere).

Variant 2, "Peter to him, and said unto him," is found in Ciasca's Arabic Diatessaron (12th-14th centuries). It is rendered in the 19th century Latin translation of

Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, as “*ad eum* (‘to him’ = word 1) *Cephas* (‘Cephas’ = ‘Peter’ = words 2 & 3) *dixit* (‘[and] he said,’ word 4) *ei* (‘unto him,’ word 1 repeated).”

Variant 3 omits “*autō* (‘to him,’ word 1),” and reads, Greek, “*o* (-, word 2) *Petros* (‘Peter,’ word 3) *eipen* (‘[and] he said,’ word 4)” i.e., “Peter, and said,” in the words, “Then came *Peter, and said,*” etc. . This is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century).

I have left speculation of the possible origins of this variant till here. That is because it is a typical example of the Alexandrian School's pruning practices, and on this occasion I wish to particularly highlight that fact.

Was this an accidental change? As discussed with regard to *Variant 1, supra*, did a scribe, accidentally omit this shorter word, perhaps when distracted by an external stimulus, such as a donkey braying or a camel snorting in the streets of Alexandria? If so, lacking the adroitness of the scribe discussed at *Variant 1, supra*, did this Alexandrian School scribe then fail to detect his error, and so fail to add it back in? Certainly it must be candidly admitted, that good quality scribes were often hard to find in the ancient north African city of Alexandria.

Was this a deliberate change? Did an Alexandrian School scribe consider that the presence of the “*autō* (‘to him,’ word 1),” was “excessive wordage”? Did he then make an instantaneous decision to prune away this word? Or did he perhaps first give it some thought; possibly thinking it over as he rode back on his camel from some Alexandrian night-club with a name something like, “the Shangri-La,” in which he watched dancing girls *shake their silver bangles*, thus giving him “the bright idea” that he too would, “give that Matthean text *a bit of a shake-up*”? Certainly no competent scribe would adopt this kind of “shake about” lifestyle or approach, but it must be frankly admitted, that the evidence indicates that in ancient Alexandria, one was frequently hard pressed to locate a decent quality scribe.

The split in the two major Alexandrian texts between *Variant 1* (Rome Vaticanus) and *Variant 3* (London Sinaiticus), was generally resolved by the neo-Alexandrians in favour of *Variant 1*. After all, from the neo-Alexandrian perspective, does not this *Variant 1* have much better “external support” with the added weight of the Western Text's D 05?

Thus *Variant 1* is found in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). But to this must be added the qualification that the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions made the statement, “there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text of the apparatus contains the superior reading” i.e., they were not strongly committed to, nor opposed to, either the TR's reading or any of the three variants. Moreover, Westcott and Hort (1881) were baffled by the matter, and so placed word 1 in square brackets, i.e., “*o* (-) *Petros* (Peter) *eipen* ([and] he said) [*autō* (to him)],”

thus making the inclusion of “*auto* (to him)” (*Variant 1*, Rome Vaticanus) or its exclusion (*Variant 3*, London Sinaiticus), entirely optional.

At Matt. 18:21, the erroneous *Variant 1* was adopted by the American Standard Version, which reads, “Then came *Peter*, and said to him” (ASV). *Variant 1* was also followed by the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV. Moffatt also adopted *Variant 1* in his reading, “Then Peter came up and said to him” (Moffatt Bible). “After all,” Moffatt probably thought, “does not this reading” of *Variant 1* have the “external support of the Western Text?” But reflecting neo-Alexandrian uncertainties and confusion, *supra*, the incorrect *Variant 3* was followed by the NIV and TEV. After all, from the neo-Alexandrian perspective, does not *Variant 3* have the “external support” of the Sinaitic Syriac?

But other neo-Alexandrians were evidently worried about just how slim the “external support” really was for both *Variants 1* and *3*; a fact reflected in the vague non-committal comments of the UBS 3rd and 3rd corrected editions with respect to their placement of *Variant 1* in their main text. Against this backdrop, it is therefore notable that the Revised English Bible, and also the Roman Catholic’s Jerusalem Bible and New Jerusalem Bible, all adopted the correct TR’s reading. Of course, their reasoning for doing so would have been wrong. Nevertheless, it is an interesting example of three neo-Alexandrian versions occasionally using a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm, in conjunction with their more normatively used Alexandrian text based neo-Alexandrian pincer arm, to determine the reading here at Matt. 18:21. After all, from this type of perspective, what is the slim “external support” of either *Variant 1* or *Variant 3*, compared with “the diverse support” for the TR’s reading in e.g., the Byzantine Text, the Syriac Versions, the Armenian Version, and the Georgian Versions, together with, for instance, the *Family 1* and *Family 13* manuscripts?

It seems one of the things we can be certain about with the neo-Alexandrians, is that when their two major Alexandrian texts are split, they are thrown into turmoil and confusion. They might like to rant and rave, and splutter and mutter with claims about looking to “external support” and “diversified support” beyond these texts, and in some limited way they really do. But the reality is, that in the vast overwhelmingly majority of instances, this type of thing is just “window dressing.” It’s “the apple” that they “put in the pig’s mouth” of their neo-Alexandrian swine texts. Instead of publishing them in Germany at Stuttgart, perhaps they should publish them at Swinefurt? The general, although not absolute rule, is that they follow two Alexandrian texts that were effectively secreted in dark corners for about one and a half millennia, and they just look for “further support” from this or that papyrus, or other source, in order to bolster up their shaky base.

Good Christian reader, do you want to hear a good joke? I will tell you. These same neo-Alexandrians love to criticize Received Text readings such as I John 5:7,8 - on the basis of - WAIT FOR IT - “slim manuscript support”!!! I for one, would rather have the Textus Receptus, which even when it has slim manuscript support, also has a good textual argument in its favour for departing from an evident textual problem in the representative Byzantine Text, than have the neo-Alexandrian texts, which are almost

always based on variants with slim textual support, but with no good textual argument in their favour! The saying is true, *There are none so blind, as those who WILL NOT see.*

Matt. 18:26a “The servant” (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

This variant is followed by only one neo-Alexandrian text (Tischendorf), and no neo-Alexandrian versions. Indeed, the normal discussion of neo-Alexandrian versions will be severely curtailed, *infra*.

However, I have included reference to it here because it is instructive for three reasons. Firstly, inside the closed class of sources, it is an old battle-ground duelling point between Protestants of the Greek Received Text and King James Version, and Latin Papists of the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version.

Secondly, outside the closed class of sources, it is a typical example of how the Western Greek Text adds material to the Word of God. For whereas the Alexandrian text generally takes away from the Scriptures, the Western text generally adds to the Scriptures. Thirdly, outside the closed class of sources, it is a good example of how neo-Alexandrians Proper sometimes compliment their general usage of a neo-Alexandrian pincer arm with a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm (albeit with a much lower frequency than the semi neo-Alexandrian, Moffatt). In this instance, with regard to Tischendorf.

With respect to these first two factors, we are thus reminded that defending the Received Text against a rival text type is nothing new. For whereas in more recent times we neo-Byzantines have been primarily defending the *Textus Receptus* against neo-Alexandrian texts; in former times, we neo-Byzantines were defending it against both the Western Greek Text and Latin text of the Clementine Vulgate.

And if the Lord tarries (Matt. 25:5), (I hope he does not tarry long, but His Divine Majesty, the Lord Jehovah, is an absolute sovereign monarch, and I humbly bow to whatever is his good pleasure,) then who knows if perhaps one or more further rival texts might not turn up to plague us? Some may argue such a further rival text already exists with “the Caesarean Text.” Such a “Caesarean” Text type, in which one finds a mixture of the readings in the Western and Alexandrian texts, connected with e.g., Origen and Eusebius, and found in the Armenian and Georgian Versions, was confidently said *to exist* in Metzger’s *UBS Textual Commentary* of 1971 (pp. xxviii-xx), and just as confidently said *not to exist* in Metzger’s *UBS Textual Commentary* of 1994 (2nd ed., pp. 6-7,14-16).

In the shifting sands of neo-Alexandrian opinion, the existence or non-existence of the “Caesarean” Text is uncertain. But whether or not any more text types turn up, (I hope they do not, but we must be ready for any contingency,) the principles of neo-Byzantine textual analysis, used in the 16th and 17th centuries with crushing force against the Western Greek Text (D 05), Alexandrian Text (Rome Vaticanus), and Papist’s

Latin text; and still used with equally devastating force against the Alexandrian Text and Burgonite Text in modern times; are the principles that will, by the grace of God, utterly undo any other rival text that comes onto the scene. *The good Christian should remember that nothing can happen to him unless God directs it* (God's directive will,) *or permits it* (God's permissive will). "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven" (Matt. 6:10, *Lord's Prayer*). "For there must also be heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you" (I Cor. 11:19). Dost thou resist this truth? Then go thy way! "Wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east," "run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord," and thou shalt "not find it" (Amos 8:12).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 18:26a, the TR's Greek, "*o* (the) *doulos* (servant)," in the introductory words of this verse, "The servant therefore fell 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); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further found as Latin, "*servus* (the servant)," in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century). It is also found in the medieval church Greek writer, John of Damascus (d. before 754).

However, a variant reading, Greek, "*o* (-) *doulos* (servant) *ekeinos* (that)," i.e., "that servant," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). It is further found as Latin, "*servus* (servant) *ille* (that)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century, in reverse word order), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Latin writer, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370).

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

Was this an accidental alteration? The word following "*doulos* (servant)" is "*prosekunei* ([and] he did worship)." Did a less adroit scribe first accidentally write this word twice, with the first "*prosekunei*" at the end of a line; and then later realizing his mistake, (or another scribe realizing the earlier scribe's mistake later), cross out the first "*prosekune*," perhaps by rubbing against the parchment? If so, was a later scribe again then able to make out the letters, "*:::ek:n:*"? If so, did the last of these scribes then wrongly conclude that there had been some kind of "damage" to the parchment, and then "reconstruct this from context" as "*ekeinos* (that)"?

Was this a deliberate alteration? The same terminology, "*o* (-) *doulos* (servant) *ekeinos* (that)," is also found at Matt. 24:46 and Luke 12:43. Possibly with reference to one or both of these verses, did a scribe consider that it would here be "desirable" to use the demonstrative pronoun, "*ekeinos* (that)"? Did he think that to "more strongly focus on the servant," by making it "that servant," was some kind of "stylistic improvement"?

A deliberate or an accidental change? We do not know. We only know that a change to the text was made, and thereafter generally followed in the Latin, but not in the Greek.

Though the TR's reading has some minority support in the Latin, it has strong support in the Greek. By contrast, though the variant has some minority support in the Greek, it has strong support on the Latin. The adoption of the representative Byzantine reading here at Matt. 18:26a, thus manifests the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, over the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*. On the one hand, the TR's reading has solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument. It clearly has ancient support in *Codex Freerianus* (W 032). It also has some notable minority Latin support in a 6th / 7th century old Latin Version. But on the other hand, the variant has the support of the representative Latin text, dating from ancient times. Weighing up these factors, 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. 18:26a, 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. 18:26a, "The servant," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in the *Family I 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 Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the variant, "That servant," 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 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), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in all extant Syriac Versions, e.g., the Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Its uniform support in both major Alexandrian texts, together with "wide external support" in the Byzantine Text, Egyptian Sahidic, and what some call the "Caesarean"

Text (Armenian Version), meant that most neo-Alexandrians adopted the correct reading of the TR for the wrong reasons. Thus it is found in Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

By contrast, we find that the variant was adopted by Tischendorf, both before and after he "discovered" *Codex Sinaiticus* on the Arabian Peninsula. With respect to neo-Alexandrian textual principles, we here see the father of the Neo-Alexandrian School, Constantine Tischendorf (d. 1874), prepared to compliment his general usage of a neo-Alexandrian pincer arm with a non-Alexandrian text pincer arm²⁸. This is a feature of the neo-Alexandrians Proper (whose usage of it is much lower than Moffatt, whom I accordingly regard as a semi neo-Alexandrian, rather than a neo-Alexandrian Proper). Indeed, Tischendorf's support was so strong for the reading of the Western Text here at Matt. 18:26a, that he not only criticized the Received Text reading of Stephanus (1550) for not including it in his 2nd edition (1842), but even after his "discovery" of *Codex Sinaiticus* he retained this addition in his 8th edition (1869-72).

Tischendorf here looked to what the neo-Alexandrians regard as "wide external support" with e.g., the Latin (Tischendorf refers to the Vulgate and some old Latin Versions), the Western Text (Tischendorf refers to D 05), Syriac (Tischendorf refers to the Syriac Curetonian), Ethiopic (Tischendorf refers to Dillmann), some independent support (Tischendorf refers to Delta 037), and the neo-Alexandrian's "queen of minuscules," Minuscule 33 (also referred to by Tischendorf). The reason why Tischendorf wrongly considered "*ekeinos* (that)" had been "omitted" in the Byzantine Text is speculative. Did he think a Byzantine scribe simply regarded it as "superfluous"? Or did he think that a Byzantine scribe set out to make "a more elegant" linguistic expression? We do not know. We only know that Tischendorf was very wrong to reach this type of conclusion, and that in doing so, he helped to refine and define the rules of Neo-Alexandrian School textual criticism that have plagued us ever since.

Moreover, we here see a common feature of the Neo-Alexandrian School's usage of their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm; which they only rarely use, employing it in conjunction with their general usage of a neo-Alexandrian pincer arm based on the two major Alexandrian texts. This feature is present on every instance where we have considered its usage to date (Matt. 9:22; 11:10, Moffatt Bible; Matt. 10:25, Tischendorf's & NU texts; Matt. 13:33, Westcott-Hort's text; Matt. 13:34, NASB; 15:6c, NASB; Matt. 16:5, NIV; Matt. 16:8a, NEB & TEV; Matt. 18:19a, REB; Matt. 18:21, REB, JB & NJB). The feature is that when this non-Alexandrian text pincer arm is used by one or more

²⁸ I sometimes refer to Tischendorf as "the father of the Neo-Alexandrian School;" because it was only after he discovered *Codex Sinaiticus* on the Arabian Peninsula in 1859, that the recognizable principles of the Neo-Alexandrian School reached their broadly present form (although diversity among neo-Alexandrians may emerge on their application, most especially where the two leading Alexandrian texts are in disagreement). But I do not wish to thereby deny that Tischendorf developed pre-existing unsound ideas found in e.g., Griesbach and Lachmann.

textual critics of the Neo-Alexandrian School, most of the other textual critics of the Neo-Alexandrian School do not agree with its usage on that particular occasion, even though they may use the technique at some other passage. Tischendorf's usage of the non-Alexandrian text pincer arm here at Matt. 18:26a is no exception. It is clear that both other neo-Alexandrian texts and also neo-Alexandrian versions, have not followed his thinking here at this verse.

Yet Tischendorf is not entirely alone here at Matt. 18:26a. By adopting the variant reading here, he effectively entered an alliance with the old Latin Papists against the *Textus Receptus* reading at Matt. 18:26a. It should be remembered that Tischendorf's Greek Text of 1869-72 was published about a century before the Roman Catholic Church's *Vatican II Council* of 1962-65. Thus the old Latin Papists were still very active at this time. At that time, and in those days, the Latin Papists stood as a spiritual army with hard-wood shields marked, "the Clementine Vulgate" in their left hand, and in their right hands, blunted metallic swords, marked "the Douay-Rheims Version." They stood in spiritual battle formation against the Protestants, holding metallic shields marked "Textus Receptus" in their left hands; and in their right hands, sharp metallic swords, marked "the Authorized Version." Thus Tischendorf's claims here at Matt. 18:26a, would have been welcomed with glee by the old Latin Papists, when word was brought to them of a fifth columnist apostate Protestant, who was joining their battle ranks in order to attack Matt. 18:26a.

Of course, the old Latin Papists support of the variant at Matt. 18:26a, was based on a different methodology to that of Tischendorf's Neo-Alexandrian School. The old Latin Papists had taken the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, and greatly perverted it, by placing it *over*, rather than *under*, the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. Thus whereas it is proper and right to employ the Latin, *providing one does so to resolve a textual problem in the Greek, so that the focus is on Greek text textual analysis as the starting and finishing point*; by contrast, it is improper and wrong to employ the Latin texts *as the means for determining the NT text, so that the focus is on Latin text textual analysis as the starting and finishing point*. And so it was, that the old Latin Papists, having walked a crooked mile by unnaturally elevating the servant above his master, i.e., wickedly and mischievously elevating the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, usurping it into the place of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*; then came to render Matt. 18:26a in the Douay-Rheims as, "that servant," and in support of this, the Clementine read, Latin, "*servus (servant) ille (that)*." *Oh forbidden lust of the servant seeking to elevate himself about his master!* Oh how shocking that Ham should rule over Japheth (Gen. 9:27)! Oh how horrible that a woman should rule over a man! Oh how insolent, that a child should rule over an adult (Isa. 3:12)! *Oh forbidden lust of the servant seeking to elevate himself about his master!*

Good Christian reader, we are standing on holy ground. We are standing where the saints have trod. We are standing where Christian soldiers of Protestantism have stood, in gleaming battle array with shining metallic shields of the Received Text and AV swords, against their Latin Papist enemies raising up their wooden shields of the Clementine Vulgate, thinking in vain that by this means, they might with the blunted

blades of the Douay-Rheims inflict some damage on the hard metallic shields of the Protestants, and then halt the powerful metallic blades of the Protestant's King James Version. But the Papist wooden shields were smashed and dashed in pieces by the sharp blade of the Protestants, who stood in glorious triumph, declaring that by the grace of God, the Papists were "brought down and fallen: but we are risen, and stand upright. Save, Lord: let the king hear us when we call" (Ps. 20:8,9).

The ring of the Protestant triumph here at this old battle-ground and sword fighting point of Matt. 18:26a was great indeed. Not only did it route the Papists, who beat a hasty retreat; but it routed Tischendorf, as his neo-Alexandrian minions broke ranks, and fled from the face of the Protestant sword. In time, even the neo-Alexandrians came to bow down low to the Received Text here at Matt. 18:26a, with e.g., the American Standard Version reading, "The servant" (ASV). And so likewise, the Papists too came to admit that the Greek *Textus Receptus* Protestant swordsmen were the superiors of the old Latin Papist swordsmen, here at Matt. 18:26a. Thus the Papists also came to bow down to the Protestants, as the correct reading came to be adopted in the Roman Catholic's Jerusalem Bible and New Jerusalem Bible. On this occasion, the Protestant triumph of the Received Text and Authorized Version was very sweet indeed. For it is as a prophetic type pointing to the greater fulfilment on that day of which we read in Rev. 3:9, "Behold, ... I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee²⁹."

Matt. 18:26b "Lord" (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek, "*Kurie* (Lord)," in the words, "*Kurie* ('Lord,' word 1) *makrothumeson* ('thou have patience,' word 2) *ep'* ('with,' *epi* + dative, word 3) *emoi* ('me,' dative, word 4)," i.e., "Lord, have patience with me" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), O 023 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*Domine* (Lord)," in the words, "*Domine* ('Lord,' word 1) *patientiam* ('patience,' word 2) *habe* ('thou have,' word 2) *me* ('with me,' ablative, words 3 & 4)," in old Latin Version ff2 (5th century); and in the words, "*patientiam* ('patience,' word 2) *habe* ('thou have,' word 2) *in* ('with,' ablative preposition, word 3) *me* ('me,' ablative pronoun, word 4), *Domine*

²⁹ In the Bible, to bow down, or worship, is an act of respect from the lower to the higher one, or an act of humility (e.g., Matt. 15:27). Contrary to the claims of 17th century Puritans, the fact of some religious context when kneeling does not *necessarily* denote Divinity. E.g., to bow before an earthly king who was *Supreme Governor of the Church of England*, for instance, Charles I, *did not mean* that Anglicans considered he was Divine (e.g., Gen. 37:10; 41:42,43; 49:8; Rev. 3:9). However, in some contexts it certainly does carry this connotation (e.g., Ps. 95:6), for which reason Anglicans traditionally kneel *to God* for various prayers in church. As a matter of church order (I Cor. 14:40), and an act of humility in grateful acknowledgement of the benefits Christ gives to all those who worthily receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Protestant Reformed (Evangelical) Anglicans also kneel to receive Communion.

(‘Lord,’ word 1),” in old Latin Version h (5th century). It is also supported in the words, “*Domine* (‘Lord,’ word 1) *patientiam* (‘patience,’ word 2) *habe* (‘thou have,’ word 2),” in old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century); and in the words, “*patientiam* (‘patience,’ word 2) *habe* (‘thou have,’ word 2), *Domine* (‘Lord,’ word 1),” in old Latin Version b (5th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation, and Asterius (d. after 341); and ancient church Latin writer, Chromatius (d. 407).

However, “Lord (Greek, *Kurie*; Latin, *Domine*),” is omitted in a variant reading. It is omitted as a minority Byzantine reading in Minuscule 15 (12th century); and Lectionaries 47 (10th century), 76 (12th century), and 184 (1319 A.D.). It is further omitted in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), d (5th 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 omission, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also omitted in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writer, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370).

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

Was this an accidental loss? In both W 032 and Lectionary 2378, “*Kurie*” is abbreviated to “*KE*” with a line on top of the “*E*” (epsilon). In Manuscript Washington (W 032) after, “*ΑΕΓΩΝ* (*legon*, saying)” and before “*KE* (*Kurie*, Lord),” there is a stylistic space of about 3 letter spaces, so as to indicate a quote is following. Did a scribe, working from a manuscript where there might have been just one such letter space, not detect a paper fade of the “*KE* (Lord),” thinking it was simply part of a stylistic paper space before a quote?

Was this a deliberate change? Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, consider that because reference is made to his “lord (*kurios*),” in the preceding verse (Matt. 18:25), and also “the (*o*) lord (*kurios*)” in the following verse (Matt. 18:27), that therefore the further inclusion of “Lord (*Kurie*, vocative from *kurios*),” here at Matt. 18:26b was “unnecessary” and “redundant wordage”? Did he then, in the interests of “a more succinct text,” simply prune away this “*Kurie* (Lord)””? Either in conjunction with such thinking, or autonomously from such thinking, did a scribe consider that it was a “stylistic improvement” to create a “matching parallelism” between Matt. 18:26b and Matt. 18:29 which simply reads, “*legon* (saying), *Makrothumeson* (Have patience) *ep*’ (with) *emoi* (me)””?

A deliberate or accidental change? We do not know. But we do know that it was a change to the original text.

Notably, “*Kurie*” here at Matt. 18:26b is in the vocative case (masculine singular vocative noun, from *kurios*), which is used for directly addressing someone. Thus the Greek, “*Kurie* (‘Lord,’ vocative) *eleeson* (thou have mercy),” in the Latinized form of the

Greek as, “*Kyrie eleison*,” is the form found in the hymn addressing the Trinitarian God, sometimes sung in Anglican churches e.g., after the *Third Collect, for Grace*, at Matins. An English form of it, “Lord, have mercy upon us (addressing God the Father), Christ, have mercy upon us (addressing God the Son), Lord, have mercy upon us (addressing God the Holy Ghost),” is also found in the Anglican 1662 (*Church of England*) and 1666 (*Church of Ireland*) Caroline prayer books at e.g., Matins (Morning Prayer).

On the one hand, the TR’s reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative reading against which there is no good textual argument. This dates from ancient times. It also has solid support in the Latin with more than half a dozen old Latin versions, also dating from ancient times. It has further support from both Greek and Latin ancient writers. But on the other hand, the variant has the support of the Vulgate, about the same number of old Latin versions dating from ancient times, and also the support of both Greek and Latin ancient writers. Weighing up these considerations, and taking into account 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. 18:26b 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. 18:26b, “Lord,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac: Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; some Armenian Versions; Slavic Version (9th century); and Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). It is also found in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century); where Ciasca’s Latin translation reads, “*patientiam* (‘patience,’ word 2) *habe* (‘thou have,’ word 2) *in* (‘with,’ word 3) *me* (‘me,’ word 4), *domine* (‘Lord,’ word 1);” although to what extent this reflects the underpinning Arabic word order, I do not know.

However, the variant which omits, “Lord,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; some Armenian Versions; and Georgian Version (5th century).

Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) refers to the variant (Gospel manuscript v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9).

Neo-Alexandrians here saw their “wide external support” beyond Rome Vaticanus for the variant in e.g., the Western Text (D 05), Latin Text (Vulgate), Syriac (Curetonian & Sinaitic), and “Caesarean” Text (Armenian) (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 46; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 37); although even on their faulty methodology, they might have just as easily found such “wide external support” in the TR’s reading beyond London Sinaiticus in e.g., the Byzantine Text (majority reading), Latin Text (old Latin versions), Syriac (Pesitto, Palestinian, & Harclean), and Egyptian Coptic (Sahidic, Middle, & Bohairic). The neo-Alexandrian preference for the shorter reading, premised on the circular reasoning that texts are more likely to be added to, than subtracted from by pruning, meant that the variant reading of Rome Vaticanus was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* The UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions said of the variant, that there “is some degree of doubt” about it. But time made them more cocky. The UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993) said of the same variant, “the text is certain.” We are thus reminded that when men do wrong, if not restrained, then over time they become emboldened in their iniquity.

Notwithstanding the cockiness of the UBS 4th revised edition’s claims, *supra*, the split in the two major Alexandrian texts, and the capacity to argue either way with respect to “external support,” appears to have led the translators of the American Standard Version to adopt the correct reading, albeit for the wrong reasons. Hence at Matt. 18:26b, the ASV reads, “Lord, have patience with me.” The correct reading is also found in the RSV. However, the incorrect reading, omitting, “Lord,” is found in the NASB, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. The combination of one Alexandrian Text *and the Western Text*, coupled with the Syriac, appears to have been “the clincher” for Moffatt, who likewise follows the variant and says, “Have patience with me” (Moffatt Bible).

Matt. 18:28a “me” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek, “*moi* (unto me),” i.e., “me” in the statement, “Pay *me* that thou owest” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported by the Latin, “*mihi* (unto me),” in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century) and f (6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant omitting “*moi* (unto me),” and thus making the statement reading simply, “Pay what (that) thou owest,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Pi 041 (9th century), Y 034 (9th century); and Lectionary 184 (1319 A.D.). The omission is further found 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 / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (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). The omission is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and ancient church Latin writer, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370).

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

Was this an accidental loss? Especially, although not exclusively, if the “*moi* (unto me),” came at the end of a line, was it lost in an undetected paper fade? Was this a deliberate removal? Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, regard it as a “stylistic improvement” to prune the text of “unnecessary and cumbersome wordage”?

A deliberate or accidental alteration? We do not know. We only know that it is a change to the text.

On the one hand, the TR’s reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument. It also has good ancient support both in the Latin (old Latin e), and in the Greek with the church father and doctor, St. Chrysostom. But on the other hand, the variant has the majority support of the Latin textual tradition (Vulgate, *et al*), as well as the support of a couple of ancient church writers. Weighing up these considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 18:28a 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. 18:28a, “me,” 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 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 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; a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the variant omitting, “me,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* At Matt. 18:28a, the erroneous reading is found in the American Standard Version as, “Pay what thou owest” (ASV). The incorrect reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV.

But reflecting the “wide external support” for the TR’s reading in e.g., the Byzantine Text (majority Byzantine reading), “Caesarean” Text (Armenian Version), Egyptian (Bohairic Version), and Syriac (all extant versions), some neo-Alexandrian translators decided to here exercise their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm. Hence for the wrong reasons, the correct reading at Matt. 18:28a is, by a fluke, found in the TCNT, TEV, NEB, REB, NIV, and Roman Catholic’s JB and NJB. Given that the Roman Catholic Latin based Douay-Rheims here omitted “me,” reading, “Pay what thou owest” (Douay-Rheims), the readings in the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bible are, on this occasion, more accurate.

Matt. 18:29a “at the feet” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek, “*eis* (at) *tous* (the) *podas* (feet) *autou* (of him),” in the words, “And his fellowservant fell down *at his feet*, and besought him,” etc. (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 found as Latin, “*ad* (at) *pedes* (the feet) *eius* (of him),” in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century).

However, a variant omitting these words is a minority Byzantine reading found in G 011 (9th century). It is further omitted 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), aur (7th century), l (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, the omission is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also omitted by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and ancient church Latin writer, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text reading here at Matt. 18:29a, which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are conjectural.

Was this an accidental alteration? When reading, “*Pesōn* (falling down) *oun* (therefore) *o* (the) *sundoulous* (fellowservant) *autou* (his) *eis* (at) *tous* (the) *podas* (feet) *autou* (of him) *parekalei* ([and] besought) *auton* (him), (saying)” (Matt. 18:29a); after writing, “*o* (the) *sundoulous* (fellowservant) *autou* (his),” did the copyist look forward over some lines, and then back, and seeing the “*autou* (his)” at the end of “*eis* (at) *tous* (the) *podas* (feet) *autou* (of him),” think that this is where he was up to, and so start to write, “*parekalei* ([and] besought) *auton* (him)” etc.?

Was this a deliberate change? Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, consider that the words, “at his feet” were “unnecessary wordage” at Matt. 18:29a, on the basis that we first read, “*Pesōn* (‘falling down,’ masculine singular nominative, active second aorist participle, from *pipto*),” and *pipto* carries with it the idea of prostration? Was Origen “confirmed” in this conclusion by the parallel usage of “*Pesōn*” in Matt. 18:26a where we do not read, “worshipped *at his feet*”?

If so, on one level, Origen was, *in a qualified sense*, “right.” I.e., he correctly recognized that Matt. 18:26 and Matt. 18:29 are not identical, and while there are certain irreducible features of the two which must be the same in order to maintain a broad stylistic parallelism showing the generality of the response, whether or not one does or does not have “at his feet” in both is not one of these irreducibly necessary features. That is because the idea of prostration remains the same in both instances, whether or not “at his feet” is present in one or both. Nevertheless, if this was his thinking, Origen was in fact still *very wrong*. That is because even if a stylistic feature such as “at his feet” is not absolutely necessary to understand the meaning of a passage, an uninspired man (and Bible prophets existed only in Bible times, Dan. 9:24; Luke 11:49-51; Eph. 2:20,) has *absolutely no business whatsoever* in setting about to either “add unto” or “diminish ... from,” “the word ... of the Lord” (Deut. 4:2). Therefore, if this was a deliberate decision by Origen to prune away the “unnecessary words” of “*eis* (at) *tous* (the) *podas* (feet) *autou* (of him)” at Matt. 18:26a, then *what wilful unrepentant arrogance and impiety* Origen here shows!

On the one hand, the TR’s reading here has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument, and this includes Greek manuscript support from ancient times. The reading also has minority Latin support in a couple of old Latin versions. But on the other hand, the variant has the support of the representative Latin text, and includes the support of a couple of ancient writers. Weighing up these considerations, and bearing in mind the perpetual 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. 18:29a 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. 18:29a, “at his feet,” is found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as Minuscules

33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 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 Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the variant which omits "at his feet," 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 mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* But the ambiguity and uncertainty of Neo-Alexandrian School rules here became apparent in the neo-Alexandrian versions.

On neo-Alexandrian principles, is not the shorter reading to be preferred? After all, in addition to the support of both major Alexandrian Texts, does not the variant have "wide external support" in the Latin text (Vulgate *et al.*), Western Text (D 05), Syriac (Sinaitic & Curetonian), Egyptian (Coptic & Bohairic)? Hence at Matt. 18:29a, the incorrect reading is found in the ASV as, "So his fellow-servant fell down and besought him," etc. . The erroneous reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, TEV, TCNT, and Moffatt.

Nevertheless, some neo-Alexandrian translators were not so sure. Might not the words have been lost in ellipsis with the repetition of "*autou* (of him)," *supra*? After all, does not the TR's reading have "wide external support" in the Byzantine Text (majority Byzantine reading), "Caesarean" Text (Armenian), Syriac (Pesitto & Harclean), and Egyptian (Middle)? Thus reflecting an interesting usage of their non-Alexandrian pincer arm, at Matt. 18:29a, for the wrong reasons, the correct reading was adopted by the NEB, REB, and Roman Catholic's JB and NJB. Given that the Roman Catholic Latin based Douay-Rheims (Douai-Rheims) here omitted "at his feet," reading, "And his fellow-servant falling down, besought him, saying," etc. (Douay-Rheims), by a fluke, the readings in the JB and NJB are here more accurate than the old Douay-Rheims.

*Oh the frustrations and pains of being a neo-Alexandrian! Don't they wish they had the answer? Well, by the grace of God, the neo-Byzantines have the answer! You who walk in the darkness of the Neo-Alexandrian School, come to the light of the Neo-Byzantine School! You who walk in the darkness, come to the light!! Hast thou not heard? Or has it not been told unto thee? Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!!!*³⁰

Matt. 18:29b “all” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR's Greek, “*panta* (all),” in the words, “and I will pay thee all” (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading. It is found before, “*soi* (unto thee) *apodoso* (I will pay)” in *Codex Freerianus* (Washington, D.C., USA; W 032, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); *Codex Macedoniensis* (Cambridge University, UK; Y 034, 9th century), and *Codex Petropolitanus* (St. Petersburg, Russia; Pi 041, 9th century)³¹. It is also found after “*soi* (unto thee) *apodoso* (I will pay)” in *Codex Cyprius* (Paris, France; K 017, 9th century) and *Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus* (Oxford University, UK; Gamma 036, 10th century); as well as Minuscules 1223 (Jerusalem, Israel, 10th century), 660 (Berlin, Germany, 11th century), 1207 (Sinai, Arabia, 11th century), 270 (Paris, France, 12th century), 280 (Paris, France, 12th century), 443 (Cambridge University, England, 12th century), 1200 (Sinai, Arabia, 12th century), 1355 (Jerusalem, Israel, 12th century), 1375 (Moscow, Russia, 12th century), 291 (Paris, France, 13th century), 248 (Moscow, Russia, 13th century), 473 (Lambeth Palace, London, UK, 13th century), 482 (British Library, London, UK, 13th century), and 1604 (Athos, Greece, 13th century). It is further found as Latin, “*omnia* (all),” in *Versio Vulgata Hieronymi* (Jerome's Vulgate Version, 4th / 5th centuries), and *Codex Brixianus* (old Latin Version f, 6th century), *Codex Monacensis* (old Latin Version q, 6th / 7th century), *Codex Aureus* (old Latin Version aur, 7th century), *Codex Rehdigeranus* (old Latin Version 1, 7th / 8th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the *Vulgata Clementina* (Clementine Vulgate, 1592). It is further found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, a variant omits, “*panta* (all),” thus making the reading, “and I will pay thee.” This is the majority Byzantine reading e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). This omission is further found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century). It is also found in the ancient church Latin writer, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370).

³⁰ “The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever!” (I Peter 1:25). Latin Motto of the Lutheran Reformation.

³¹ Swanson puts Pi 041 here, whereas von Soden places it in his Ika group after the “*soi* (unto thee).” Who is correct? The matter is only of secondary importance.

There is a textual problem with the representative Byzantine reading here at Matt. 18:29b. Stylistically, it is clear that there is a contrast being made between the two men who owed money, and this is reinforced by the similarity of words in Matt. 18:26 and Matt. 18:29. We thus find the following parallelism. In Matt. 18:26a and Matt. 18:29a, “*Peson* (falling down) *oun* (therefore) *o* (the) *doulos* (servant) *prosekunei* (worshipped) *auto* (him), *legon* (saying)” (Matt. 18:26a) // “*Peson* (falling down) *oun* (therefore) *o* (the) *sundoulos* (‘fellovservant’ = *sun* / fellow + *doulos* / servant) *autou* (his) *eis* (at) *tous* (the) *podas* (feet) *autou* (of him) *parekalei* ([and] besought) *auton* (him), (saying)” (Matt. 18:29a). Then in Matt. 18:26b and Matt. 18:29b, placing the words of the minority Byzantine reading in square brackets, “*Kurie* (Lord), *makouthumeson* (have patience) *ep’* (with) *emoi* (me), *kai* (and) *panta* (all) *soi* (unto thee) *apodoso* (I will pay)” (Matt. 18:26b) // “*Makouthumeson* (have patience) *ep’* (with) *emoi* (me), *kai* (and) [*panta* (all)] *apodoso* (I will pay) *soi* (unto thee)” (Matt. 18:29b).

While Matt. 18:26 and Matt. 18:29 are not identical, there are certain irreducible features of the two which must be the same in order to maintain a broad stylistic parallelism. One of those features is the generality of the response. Thus Matt. 18:26a reads, “The servant therefore *fell down*, and *worshipped him*” (AV); and Matt. 18:29a reads, “and his fellovservant *fell down at his feet*, and *besought him*” (AV). Another is the fact that both make the same response, i.e., “*makouthumeson* (have patience) *ep’* (with) *emoi* (me), *kai* (and) *panta* (all) *soi* (unto thee) *apodoso* (I will pay).”

On the one hand, in this reading, we here see some non-fundamental features in the parallelism, namely, that in verse 26, the master is addressed as, “*Kurie* (Lord),” and the word order is “*soi* (unto thee) *apodoso* (I will pay);” whereas in verse 29 the man is not addressed as “*Kurie* (Lord),” and the word order is reversed with “*apodoso* (I will pay) *soi* (unto thee).” These differences do not pose any textual problems, since the broad meaning of *relevance to the parable* i.e., the forgiveness of debt, is still comparably the same.

But on the other hand, we also see a fundamental feature absent in the representative Byzantine reading, but present in the minority Byzantine reading. That is because if there is no “*panta* (all)” at verse 29, such as occurs in the representative Byzantine reading, the parallelism, which though never identical is nevertheless broadly comparable, would clearly be demolished at a fundamental level. I.e., of *relevance to the parable* the forgiveness of debt is not *necessarily* the same. It is only because the fundamental response is the same, that the stylistic parallelism holds up. If the second man merely promises, “I will pay thee” (Matt. 18:29), perhaps as in the parable of the unjust steward (Luke 16:1-13), he is promising to pay (what in modern decimal currency would be,) 80 cents on the dollar or 80 pence on the pound (Luke 16:7), or 50 cents on the dollar or 50 pence on the pound (Luke 16:6). Furthermore, the importance of the “*pas* / all (*panta*, neuter plural accusative adjective, from *pas*)” at both Matt. 18:26 and Matt. 18:29, is also contextually further stressed in the words, “all (*pasan*, feminine singular accusative adjective, from *pas*) that debt” (Matt. 18:32) and “should pay all (*pan*, neuter singular accusative adjective, from *pas*)” (Matt. 18:34).

Therefore, the ambiguity created in the response of Matt. 18:29b in the representative Byzantine text, when compared and contrasted as contextually it must be with the response in Matt. 18:26b, means that stylistically, there is a textual problem crying out for remedy in the reading of Matt. 18:29b. The only way to relieve this painful textual problem in the majority Byzantine text, is by adopting the soothing ointment of the minority Byzantine reading, so that Matt. 18:29b reads, “have patience with me, and I will pay thee all (*panta*).” With the soothing balm of this minority Byzantine reading in place, we again have a fundamental stylistic comparability in the parallelism between the responses of Matt. 18:26b and Matt. 18:29b, and thus the propriety of the master’s response to the first man. Hence the minority Byzantine reading is clearly the correct reading.

A further point of note that I drew to the good Christian reader’s attention, is the fact that Christ’s parables teach some specific point or message, and so their fictional features cannot be used beyond these basic points. The basic point of this parable is clearly stated by our Lord in Matt. 18:35, “So likewise shall my heavenly Father do unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.” This is the same type of message that one finds at Matt. 6:12 in the *Lord’s Prayer*, “And forgive us our debts, *as we forgive our debtors*” (Authorized Version, 1611, emphasis mine), or “And forgive us our trespasses, *as we forgive them that trespass against us*” (Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662, emphasis mine).

Thus e.g., one cannot properly use this parable of the two debtors (Matt. 18:23-35), as some cult heretics have done, to claim that God’s forgiveness is conditional, and having forgiven us our sins, God might then withdraw that forgiveness³². For St. Peter said, “Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out” (Acts 3:19). And, “as far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us” (Ps. 103:12); for the Lord says, “I have blotted out, as a thick cloud, thy transgressions, and, as a cloud, thy sins” (Isa. 44:22). Thus we must be careful to uphold all the elements in the Biblical teaching of what Article 11 of the *Apostles’ Creed* calls, “the forgiveness of sins.”

The origins of the variant are speculative.

Was this an accidental change? In *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), we find at this page, that there are stylistic spaces marking out every verse from Matt. 18:22 (the page starts with this verse), down to Matt. 18:31 (the last verse on the page). In the case of Matt. 18:23,26,27,28,30, the verse specifically starts on a new line. This reminds us that the verse divisions of Stephanus formally numbered by him in 1551, here manifest more ancient unnumbered Byzantine Text verse divisions. Yet when we come to Matt. 18:29, we find that in W 032, the final “*soi* (thee),” juts out to the right of the page by three letter spaces, as the scribe sought to “squeeze it in” in order to start verse 30 on a new line. (Cf. Matt. 13:10, in W 032) Moreover, in another Byzantine jewel, *Codex*

³² Anthony Hoekema’s *The Four Major Cults*, Eerdmans, Michigan, 1963, pp. 144-160 (Appendix B on Seventh-day Adventism), at pp. 151-155.

Alexandrinus (A 02) we find that on a number of occasions in the Gospels, that the last letters of words are made smaller near the end of the line to help right hand justify the column of a two column page. E.g., at column 2 of Codex A 02's page 27b containing Matt. 26:46-26:73, one finds there is no correlation with ends of verses, as above; but rather, simply an attempt to maximize manuscript space led to words being written shorter to "squeeze them in" at the end of a line. Was the "*panta* (all)" so "squeezed in" at the end of a line, and then accidentally lost in a paper fade?

Alternatively, we know from *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), that sometimes a scribe missed a short word, and then realizing his error, added it back in (Matt. 7:17). That this could happen with the "*panta* (all)" of Matt. 18:29b, seems amply attested to by its position in K 017, where it occurs after "*soi* (unto thee) *apodoso* (I will pay)," instead of before "*soi* (unto thee) *apodoso* (I will pay)" as in W 032, Y 034, Pi 041, and Gamma 036. The scribe of K 017 was evidently sufficiently adroit to realize his mistake, and then add the "*panta* (all)" back in two words later. Did a similar mistake occur with a less adroit scribe, who failed to realize his error, and so fail to add the "*panta* (all)" back in at Matt. 18:29b?

Was this a deliberate change? Did a heretical scribe, consider that it was "desirable" to "redesign" Matt. 18:29b in such a way, so as to provide a "poof text" for those who made something less than a full confession and repentance from sin?

E.g., the Roman Catholic Church distinguishes between what it calls, "*perfect contrition*," in which the person has sorrow of sin from a motive of loving God e.g., they sincerely regret having committed fornication (I Cor. 6:9; Gal. 5:19); and "*imperfect contrition*," in which the person is only sorry about the consequences of their sin e.g., the woman got pregnant and the man is now worried that God will visit their iniquities upon both himself, the woman he got pregnant, and the child born of fornication (Exod. 20:5). The Roman Church maintains, that if either "*perfect contrition*" or "*imperfect contrition*" is present, then at his auricular confession to a Roman priest, the Popish priest can then "absolve" a man of his sins³³. Thus in this case scenario, if the man had his time over, he would still commit fornication, but he would make sure that he used a condom so as to avoid *the unwanted consequence* of pregnancy. Nevertheless, on the basis of *imperfect contrition*, a Popish priest will still "absolve him" for the sin of fornication.

There are many different spins on this type of thing. E.g., a man may get drunk (I Cor. 6:10; Gal. 5:21), and then get behind the steering-wheel of a car. He may then smash the car, killing e.g., three innocent people. Going to the Popish priest for "confession," he may be sincerely sorrow about the fact that he killed three people in his drunken state, and believe that he has thereby violated God's law, "Thou shalt not kill" (Exod. 20:13). But he may have absolutely no remorse whatsoever about the fact that he

³³ Broderick, R.C., *The Catholic Concise Encyclopedia*, Simon & Schuster, New York, USA, 1957. Imprimatur: Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, USA, 1956, p. 110 (Contrition).

had gotten drunk. If the man had his time over, he would still have gotten drunk, but he would have taken a taxi home. Before going to the Romish “confessional,” this man might stand outside a Roman Church next to a Roman priest, and say to some of his mates, “First I’ve gotta’ go to confession with Father Micky here, about that car crash I was in, but afterwards we’ll meet down at the Irish pub and get as drunk as skunks.” Nevertheless, on the basis of *imperfect contrition*, this same Popish priest, knowing that the man has no remorse for his sin of drunkenness, and intends as soon as he has done some Romish “penances,” to straight away go out and get drunk again, will still “absolve him” for the sin of his former drunkenness and associated car crash, including his vehicular manslaughter of three people.

There are many errors in this Romish teaching of *imperfect contrition*, not the least is the very idea of auricular confession to a priest, for we are to confess our sins to none but God alone³⁴. Hence e.g., at Matt. 6:9,12, Christ teaches us to pray in the *Lord’s Prayer*, “Our Father which art in heaven, ... forgive us our debts” (AV), or “forgive us our trespasses” (*Anglican Book of Common Prayer*, 1662). Nevertheless, for our present purposes, the issue of so called, “imperfect contrition,” is itself a serious Papistical error. It is contrary to the plain words of numerous Scriptures, e.g., “God shall wound the head of his enemies,” namely, “the hairy scalp of such an one as *goeth on still in his trespasses*” (Ps. 68:21).

No doubt Judas Iscariot was *sorry about the consequences* of his actions in betraying Christ (Matt. 27:3-5), but he was still a “son of perdition” (John 17:12). Since he committed self-murder, his last intent being that of murder, on the basis that “no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him” (I John 3:15), we can be sure he went to hell. Thus the *Burial Service* in the *Anglican Book of Common Prayer* (1662), says “the Office ensuing is not to be used for any that ... have laid violent hands upon themselves,” for those who commit suicide are rightly denied a Christian burial or a grave on consecrated ground. (In this sense, traditional Anglican ecclesiastical law rightly resembles elements of Jewish law, Acts 1:16-19.)

Did not “Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright,” “afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing,” i.e., was *sorry about the consequences* of his actions, “rejected: for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears” (Heb. 12:17). Hence concerning those who like Esau are simply concerned with *the consequence of their sins*, Article 17 of the *Anglican 39 Articles* says, they are “curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ.” For genuine repentance from sin is part of the “gift of God,” for “by grace are ye saved through faith” (Eph. 2:8).

And so Homily 14, Book 2, Article 35 of the *Anglican 39 Articles* says, “Ye must

³⁴ See Textual Commentary, Vol. 1 (Matt. 1-14), Preface, “Dedication: The Anglican Calendar,” section “b) William Laud,” subsection, “Some instances of ‘Laud’s Popery’ as fairly being characterized as Laud’s Innovations,” under, “An eighth innovation of Laud’s was the reintroduction of auricular confession.”

consider that ye be therefore cleansed and renewed, that ye should from henceforth *serve God in holiness and righteousness all the days of your lives* (Luke 1:74,75) If ye refuse so great grace, whereto ye be called, what other thing do ye than heap up your damnation more and more, and so provoke God to cast his displeasure unto you Apply yourselves, good friends, to live in Christ, ... thankful in your lives: determine with yourselves to refuse and avoid all such things ... as should offend his eyes of mercy (Col. 3:5,6) It is not enough to *forsake evil*, except ye ... *do good* (Ps. 37:27)."

And to be perfectly frank about the matter, good Christian reader, we cannot doubt that the Devil himself would have some level of what the Romanist's call, "imperfect contrition." Can we seriously doubt that the Devil would not have some regret at *the consequence of his sins* in terms of fear about God's future punishment? For Satan knows right well, that God has said of "the devil," the papal "beast" that the Devil has possessed since Boniface III in 607 A.D., "and the false prophet" of those "council fathers" in the "ecumenical councils" the Devil has used to promote his errors, that God shall "cast" them all "into the lake of fire and brimstone," and they "shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever" (Rev. 20:10).

Thus, good Christian reader, we are left to pose this question here at Matt. 18:29b. Did a scribe, holding to some earlier form of the heresy of "imperfect contrition" that was later more fully developed by the Roman Church, deliberately set about to alter Matt. 18:29b? Did such a heretical scribe consider it "desirable" to remove the "all (*panta*)" at Matt. 18:29b, so as to create a "poof text" for those who made something less than a full confession and repentance from their sins? Thus they could say, "As long as I go *some of the way*, not *all of the way*, in repenting, my repentance is valid." For those of us who uphold the Biblical teaching of what Article 11 of the *Apostles' Creed* calls, "the forgiveness of sins," the notion of "imperfect contrition" is thoroughly repugnant. Nevertheless, as seen by the Roman Catholic teaching of *imperfect contrition*, we cannot doubt that such a heresy exists.

Was this removal of "all (*panta*)" at Matt. 18:29b a deliberate change by a scribe who held to some form of the heresy of imperfect contrition? Or was this removal of "all (*panta*)" at Matt. 18:29b an accidental change, either from an undetected paper fade or the loss of a short word? A deliberate or accidental change? We simply do not know. We only know that an omission was here made.

On the one hand, the TR's reading here at Matt. 18:29b, is found in the Greek over time and through time with e.g., W 032 (5th century), Y 034 (9th century), and Gamma 036 (10th century). It is strongly supported by textual analysis, and further attested to in the Greek in ancient times by the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom. Moreover, it is well attested to in the Latin, being most notably found in the Latin Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome, and also present in half a dozen old Latin versions. But on the other hand, the variant is the representative Byzantine reading, is followed in half a dozen old Latin versions, and also an ancient church writer. Weighing up these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 18:29b 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.

Praise God! The reading of the *Textus Receptus* here at Matt. 18:29b was known through reference to e.g., St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate. "*Verbum ... Domini manet in aeternum*" (I Peter 1:25, Latin Vulgate) ("The Word of the Lord endureth forever").

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 18:29b, "all," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is 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). With the same basic meaning, "*panta* ('all,' from *pas*)" at Matt. 18:29, has an "a" (alpha) added in front of it to become, "*apanta* ('all,' from *apas*)," in Minuscule 788 (11th century, independent). The reading "all," is further found in the margin of the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which omits, "all," 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 independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent) and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The erroneous variant was adopted by both the neo-Alexandrian NU Text *et al*, and the Burgonite Majority Texts of Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (1991). The incorrect variant, which omits "all," is thus found at Matt. 18:29b in the American Standard Version which reads, "and I will pay thee" (ASV). This inaccurate variant is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, NEB, REB, TEV, and TCNT. Like the other neo-Alexandrian texts and versions, the fact that somewhat predictably, Moffatt also reads here, "and I will pay you" (Moffatt Bible), reminds us that the neo-Alexandrians lack any real or serious grip on the principles of textual analysis. Thus the old Papists' Douay-Rheims, based on what in this instance is the more accurate Latin, correctly reads, "and I will pay thee all" (Douay-Rheims); whereas the new Papists' neo-Alexandrian versions of the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bible, both omit "all" here. The Neo-Alexandrian School is not alone in its deplorable ignorance of textual analytical skills, for the Burgonite School likewise follows the variant, and hence

at Matt. 18:29b a New King James Version footnote says that both the NU Text and Majority Text here omit “all.” *Let us thank God for our King James Versions, which here give us the full Word of God, without any additions or SUBTRACTIONS!*

Matt. 18:34b “unto him” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek, “*auto* (unto him),” in the words, “till he should pay all that was due *unto him*,” 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), K 017 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 2 (12th century), 1010 (12th century); 1242 (13th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also found in the early mediaeval church Greek writer, John of Damascus (d. before 754).

However, a variant omitting “*auto* (unto him),” is a minority Byzantine reading, found in Lectionary 805 (9th century). The omission is also found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), 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 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 conjectural.

Was this an accidental alteration? As a scribe read the “*auto* (unto him)” of Matt. 18:34b followed by the “*outo* (so)” of Matt. 18:35, did his eye pass by ellipsis on the last three letters, and so omit the “*auto* (unto him)”³⁵? Or if the second word in his manuscript was not “*outo* (so)” but “*outos* (so)”³⁵, might the “*auto* (unto him)” have been lost in an

³⁵ The vast majority of manuscripts used in the Majority Texts are Byzantine, but whereas Hodges & Farstad’s Majority Text (1985) show the reading without the optional “s” (sigma) as “*outo* (so)” (this is also the reading of Scrivener’s Text); by contrast, Robinson & Pierpont’s Majority Text (1991) and Swanson’s Byzantine witnesses (1995) (other than Y 034, 9th century, which reads “*outo*”), both show the reading with the optional “s” (sigma) as “*outos* (so).” In fact, von Soden (1913) upon whom both Hodges & Farstad’s and Robinson & Pierpont’s Majority Texts are based, cannot be used for such information, and so these two majority texts are simply stating their own preferences. The next word is “*kai* (‘also’ / ‘likewise’),” and since this starts with a “k” (kappa), i.e., a consonant, the exclusion of the optional “s” (sigma) in Hodges & Farstad and Scrivener, simply reflects the fact that the following word does not start with a vowel. But even if e.g., the majority Byzantine text reads “*outos* (so),” the fact that a minority Byzantine reading is “*outo* (so),” still means that such a manuscript (whether by a paper fade of the “s” or a stylistic scribal choice to omit the “s,”) may have been the origins of the deletion by ellipsis, with yet later scribes again, then adding back in the

undetected paper fade?

Was this a deliberate alteration? Matt. 18:30 ends with the words, “*eos* (until) *ou* (he) *apodō* (should pay) *to ophelomenon* (‘the [thing] owing’ = ‘the debt’);” and Matt. 18:34b ends with the words, “*eos* (until) *ou* (he) *apodō* (should pay) *pan* (all) *to* (the) *ophelomenon* (debt) *auto* (unto him).” Did a scribe, seeking to create “a greater stylistic harmony” between the endings of Matt. 18:30 and Matt. 18:34b, while simultaneously seeking to remove “unnecessary wordage,” deliberately prune away the “*auto* (unto him)” at Matt. 18:34b?

A deliberate or accidental change? We do not know. This side of glorification we cannot know. But we can know that a change was made to the text by the variant.

On the one hand, the TR’s reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading. It has manuscript support through time and over time, since ancient times. But on the other hand, the variant has weak minority support in the Greek, and strong support in the Latin as the monolithic reading in the Latin textual tradition. Considering these factors, and recognizing 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. 18:34b 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. 18:34b, “unto him,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the 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), 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 Syriac: Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (c. 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which omits, “unto him,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 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 Syriac

optional “s” of earlier manuscripts at the end of “*outō* (so).” Alas, so much is speculation, the finer details being lost in the unrecorded history of textual transmission.

Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The split between the two leading Alexandrian texts at Matt. 18:34b, split the neo-Alexandrians. For the wrong reasons of following Codex Sinaiticus, the right reading of the TR was adopted by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). After all, from the flawed neo-Alexandrian paradigm, is there not "external support" for the reading in the Byzantine text, the Syriac, and the Egyptian? By contrast, following Codex Vaticanus, the wrong reading of the variant was adopted by Westcott-Hort (1881), 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). After all, from the flawed neo-Alexandrian paradigm, is there not "external support" for the reading in the Latin text, Syriac, and Egyptian, *together with* the "Caesarean" Text (Armenian Version)?

Of these two neo-Alexandrian views, the pull of "the shorter text" proved *too strong* for most of the neo-Alexandrian Versions. Hence whilst on the one hand, at Matt. 18:34b the correct reading which includes, "unto him," was followed by the NASB; on the other hand, the incorrect reading which omits, "unto him," was followed by the ASV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, Moffatt Bible, NEB, REB, TEV, JB, and NJB. E.g., the American Standard Version reads, "till he should pay all that was due" (ASV).

Matt. 18:35b "their trespasses" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The usage of a singular plural of "*adelphos* ('brother,' masculine singular nominative noun, from *adelphos*)," is evident in the Greek Septuagint's reading of I Chronicles 8:14. This reads at I Chron. 8:14-27, "*Kai* (And) *adelphos* ('the brother,' singular) *autou* (of him [was]) *Sosek* (Sosec) *kai* (and) *Arimoth* (Arimoth) *kai* (and) *Zabadia* (Zabadia) *kai* (and) *Ored* (Ored) *kai* (and) *Eder* (Eder) *kai* (and) *Michael* (Michael) *kai* (and) *Iespha* (Jespha) *kai* (and) *Ioda* (Joda) *kai* (and) *Beria* (Beria) *kai* (and) *Zabadia* (Zabadia) *kai* (and) *Mosollam* (Mosollam) *kai* (and) *Azaki* (Azaki) *kai* (and) *Abar* (Abar) *kai* (and) *Isamari* (Isamari) *kai* (and) *Iexlias* (Jexlias) *kai* (and) *Iobab* (Jobab) *kai* (and) *Elphaal* (Elphaal) *kai* (and) *Iakim* (Jakim) *kai* (and) *Zachri* (Zachri) *kai* (and) *Zabdi* (Zabdi) *kai* (and) *Elionai* (Elionai) *kai* (and) *Salathi* (Salathi) *kai* (and) *Elieli* (Elieli) *kai* (and) *Adaia* (Adaia) *kai* (and) *Baraia* (Baraia) *kai* (and) *Samarath* (Samarath) *kai* (and) *Samaith* (Samaith) *kai* (and) *Iesphan* (Jesphan) *kai* (and) *Obed* (Obed) *kai* (and) *Eleel* (Eliel) *kai* (and) *Abdon* (Abdon) *kai* (and) *Zechri* (Zechri) *kai* (and) *Anan* (Anan) *kai* (and) *Anania* (Anania) *kai* (and) *Ambri* (Ambri) *kai* (and) *Ailam* (AElam) *kai* (and) *Anathoth* (Anathoth) *kai* (and) *Iathin* (Jathin) *kai* (and) *Iephadias* (Jephadias) *kai* (and) *Phanouel* (Phanuel) *uioi* (the sons) *Sosek* (of Sosec) *kai* (and) *Samsari* (Samsari) *kai* (and) *Saarias* (Saarias) *kai* (and) *Gotholia* (Gotholia) *kai* (and) *Iarasia* (Jarasia) *kai* (and) *Eria* (Eria) *kai* (and) *Zechri* (Zechri) *uioi* (the son) *Iroam* (of Iroam)."

In this chronology of I Chron. 8:14-27 (LXX), we thus find that four dozen brothers are itemized under the singular, “brother (*adelphos*).” Thus in the nuance of the Greek, one could e.g., say of three or more brothers, (pointing to Bill), “This is *my brother* (singular) Bill, and (then pointing to Tom,) Tom, and (then pointing to John,) John” etc.; rather than, (pointing to Bill), “These are *my brothers* (plural) Bill, and (then pointing to Tom,) Tom, and (then pointing to John,) John” etc. . Therefore at I Chron. 8:14, Brenton’s Greek-English Septuagint (1851, Hendrickson 1986) renders the Greek singular, “*adelphos*,” into the English as the plural “brethren,” thus reading, “And his brethren were Sosec, and Arimoth” etc. .

But this Greek nuance caused some inferior quality scribes to be tripped up. Reminding us that the good co-existed with the bad in ancient Alexandria, *Codex Alexandrinus* (5th century) is a codex stitched together after work had been done in the New Testament by a mix of both better quality Byzantine School scribes (the Gospels) and bad quality Alexandrian School scribes (the rest of NT). Also stitched into the same codex was an Old Testament Septuagint. Here we find that at I Chron. 8:14 the bad group of scribes triumphed, for the textual apparatus of Rahlfs’ Greek Septuagint refers to the fact that “*adelphos* (‘brother,’ singular)” was changed in this codex to “*oi* (the *adelphoi* (‘brothers,’ plural)³⁶.”

The lessons we here learn from I Chron. 8:14 (LXX) and the changed OT Septuagint text of *Codex Alexandrinus* are important for some matters raised in discussion of Matt. 18:35b, *infra*. Specifically, in the first instance, the Greek “*adelphos*” may, depending on context, serve as a singular plural i.e., referring to many brethren. And in the second instance, this nuance was potentially lost on some inferior quality Greek scribes, of which the Alexandrian School was notoriously well endowed, who might well consider, “It should read the plural, ‘*adelphoi* (brothers / brethren)’ not the singular, ‘*adelphos* (brother),’” and who might then go about to “correct” the text on this inaccurate basis.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 18:35b the TR’s Greek, “*ta* (the) *paraptomata* (trespasses) *auton* (‘of them,’ masculine plural genitive, 3rd person personal pronoun, from *autos*),” i.e., “their trespasses” in the words, “if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother *their trespasses*” (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, “*peccata* (the trespasses) *eorum* (of them),” in old Latin Version f (6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

³⁶ Rahlfs, A., *Septuaginta*, Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart, Germany, 1935, Two Volumes, Vol. 1 (Paralipomenon 1, 8:14).

However, another reading, *Variant 1*, reads Greek, “*ta* (the) *paraptomata* (trespasses) *autou* (‘of him,’ masculine singular genitive, 3rd person personal pronoun, from *autos*),” i.e., “his trespasses.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscules 1223 (10th century) and 945 (11th century, Byzantine outside of independent text in Acts & General Epistles).

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, omits these words, making the reading, “if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother.” This variant is found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (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, the omission is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and ancient church Latin writers, Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 370) and Augustine (d. 430).

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

Before considering *Variants 1 & 2*, I make the following observations. These are relevant both to the possibility of accidental or deliberate alteration of the text with *Variant 1*, and also the possibility of deliberate alteration of the text with respect to *Variant 2*. The wider relevant passage at Matt. 18:35b reads, “*to* (the) *adelpho* (‘brother,’ singular) *autou* (of him) ... *ta* (the) *paraptomata* (trespasses) *auton* (‘of them’ = ‘their,’ plural),” i.e., “his brother their trespasses,” in the yet wider words, “if ye forgive not every one his brother (singular) their (plural) trespasses” (AV). It must be admitted that on this particular occasion the TR’s reading, “*ta* (the) *paraptomata* (trespasses) *auton* (‘of them,’ plural),” is a harder reading to understand what is happening in the Greek on, and so this may well have led to deliberate changes, whether by alteration (*Variant 1*) or excision (*Variant 2*).

A very clear example of the singular plural usage of the Greek “*adelphos*” is found at I Chron. 8:14 (LXX), *supra* (“Preliminary Textual Discussion”). One also finds a number of places in the NT where there is plural usage of the singular “brother” i.e., where the singular “brother” has a contextual application to many “brothers” (plural), e.g. Matt. 5:22-24; 7:4,5; 10:21; 18:21. It is certainly within the parameters of Greek grammar to go from such a plural usage of the singular “brother,” to a follow through application in the plural. Thus at Rom. 14:10-12 St. Paul says, “But why dost thou judge thy brother (*adelphon*, masculine singular accusative noun, from *adelphos*)? Or why dost thou set at nought thy brother (*adelphon*, singular)? For we shall all (*pantes*, masculine plural nominative adjective, from *pas*) stand (*parastesometha*, indicative middle future, first person plural verb, from *paristemi*) before the judgement seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us (*emon*, genitive plural, first person personal pronoun, from plural *emeis*) shall give account of himself to God.” It is contextually clear that both the singular “brother” and plural “all” and “us” of Rom.

14:10-12 include in their orbit large numbers of brothers (plural).

On the one hand, the usage of Greek, *laos*, in St. Matthew's Gospel is not a precise equivalent since *laos* meaning "people" is always a plural singular; whereas *adelphos* meaning "brother" may, depending on context, be either a singular or a plural singular. It is thus something like our English word, "man," e.g., the statement, "Man (plural) is descended from one man (singular), Adam." But on the other hand, we see something of these principles at work in Matt. 1:21 where we read, "*ton* ('the,' masculine singular accusative, definite article from *o*) *laon* ('people,' masculine singular accusative noun, from *laos*) *autou* ('of him' = 'his') *apo* (from) *ton* (the) *amartion* (sins) *auton* ('of them,' = 'their,' masculine plural genitive, 3rd person personal pronoun, from *autos*)," i.e., "his people from their sins." (Cf. Matt. 15:8.)

Was *Variant 1* an accidental change? Due to a paper fade, did the original "*auton* ('of them,' plural)," come to look something like, "*aut:.*"? If so, did a scribe, not realizing that *adelphos* as a singular plural could take a plural pronoun, then "reconstruct" this "from context" as "*autou* ('of him,' singular)"?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? Did a scribe, not realizing that *adelphos* as a singular plural could take a plural pronoun, then "correct" this to "*autou* ('of him,' singular)"?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental change? Did a scribe first write down "*ton* (the) *kardion* (hearts) *umon* (of you)," and then stop at the following "*ta* (the) *paraptomata* (trespasses) *auton* (of them)," and remember in his mind he was up to "*umon ta*," as he either looked forward down the page, or turned the page on his manuscript, or was distracted by an external stimulus e.g., a bird landing on his window. Looking back at his page, and possibly suffering from fatigue, did the scribe then become befuddled in his mind about being up to "*umon ta*," so that when his eye returned to the approximate part of the page he was up to, and he saw, "*auton* (of you)," then got confused in his head about the "*t*" (tau) and "*u*" (upsilon) and "*on*" (omega nu); and possibly on the next page, then just started to write the next words of Matt. 19:1, "*Kai* (And) *egeneto* (it came to pass)" etc.? Alas, the work of scribal copyists were not always of the very highest standard.

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change? Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, stumble and fall over at the Greek of this verse because he did not realize that *adelphos* as a singular plural could take a plural pronoun? If so, did he then wrongly conclude that it "must have been added in," and so did he then deliberately omit it?

Alternatively, the same words found here at Matt. 18:35b, "*ta* (the) *paraptomata* (trespasses) *auton* (of them)," also occur at Matt. 6:14 where we read, "For if ye forgive men *their trespasses*, your heavenly Father will also forgive you." Contextually, this is an elucidation on that part of *The Lord's Prayer* which reads, "And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors" (AV), or "And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us" (BCP, 1662) (Matt. 6:12). We cannot doubt that Origen's

allegorizations which subverted the historical fall of Adam (original sin and original guilt), and his universalism, both acted to downplay the seriousness of sin with respect to original sin (man's fall in Adam) and actual sins (committed by men). Under the circumstances, did a heretic, probably Origen, having a diminished view of the nature of sin, consider that sin was being "over stressed" generally in the church and specifically here in this passage? If so, reflecting this disposition to downplay sin, did Origen decide to prune away what he considered was "unnecessary wordage," and make "a more succinct" reading, more in keeping with a *lower emphasis* on sin?

Variant 1 is a slim minority Greek reading, and while the TR's reading is a harder reading to understand what is happening in the Greek on, there is ultimately no good textual argument to commend the variant, so *Variant 1* may be safely dismissed. What of *Variant 2*? On the one hand, the TR's reading has solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument. It also has minority support in the Latin textual tradition; and further enjoys the support of the ancient church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople. But on the other hand, the TR's reading is a harder reading to understand what is happening in the Greek on (or in the Latin which follows it as the singular, "brother" / "*fratri*" + plural, "their" / "*eorum*" in old Latin h), the variant is the representative Latin text reading, and has the support of a few ancient church writers. Balancing out these considerations, and bearing in mind the perpetual 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. 18:35b 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. 18:35b, "their trespasses," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th 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 in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; and Armenian Version (5th century). It is also found with minor differences in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), rendered in Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic as, "*errata* (the errors) *illius* (of that [one])."

Variant 1, reading "his trespasses," is found in the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century).

Variant 2 which omits, "their trespasses," 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 L 019 (8th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Was the erroneous *Variant 1* adopted by the New King James Version? This reads at Matt. 18:35b, “does not forgive his brother his trespasses” (NKJV). A footnote says, “NU-Text omits ‘his trespasses’” (NKJV ftn.), though no reference is here made to the Majority Text which as is generally the case, here reads the same as the majority Byzantine Text. The Majority Text of Hodges & Farstad (1982 & 1985), represents the basic principles upon which the NKJV’s NT is based in its incomplete footnotes which favour the Majority Text over the Received Text.

Von Soden says *Variant 1* is found in two Byzantine text Minuscules (1223 & 945), one minuscule otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system (990, 12th century), together with the Syriac Pesitto. But given the generalist nature of von Soden’s categories, he may well have omitted a relatively small number of readings following this variant, which could be as high as about 10% of the texts, although could also be well below this upper figure. E.g., von Soden’s makes no reference to Minuscule 124 (12th century, von Soden’s ε 1211 in his I tb group, otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden’s system), though Swanson says this minuscule also reads, “*autou* (‘of him,’ singular).” Given that the NKJV translators do not believe in textual analysis to remedy a defect in the Greek text, it seems inconceivable that they would here set aside what is the Majority Text (and also majority Byzantine text) reading of the Received Text, in favour of four minuscules, the Syriac Pesitto, and possibly a relatively smaller number of other manuscripts that von Soden did not itemize under this variant.

This leads to two possibilities. The English “their” may be singular or plural. Did the NKJV translators simply look at the English of the KJV, and thinking it was “their” singular, slackly change it to “his” without consulting the Greek? Alternatively, did they see this as a “brilliant dynamic equivalent”?

We do not know. But either way, we can safely conclude that the NKJV translators were here guilty of sloppy and inaccurate translation of the reading, “their (plural)” as “his (singular).” This slackness on the part of the NKJV translators is reflective of their more general lack of due care and consideration for such matters, seen in their removal of the distinction between “you” singular and plural. E.g., at John 3:7, the King James Version is very clear, “Marvel not that I said unto thee [singular], Ye [plural] must be born again.” I.e., Christ here makes it clear that the solution to the spiritual problem with Nicodemus is applicable not just to him (“thee”), but others as well (“Ye”). There is a need to be regenerated by the Holy Ghost. By contrast, the New

King James Version is as clear as mud, “Do not marvel that I said unto you [singular?], You [singular?] must be born again.” Now what fool would prefer the obscurity of the New King James Version over the perspicuity of the King James Version at e.g., Matt. 18:35 and John 3:7?

Good Christian brethren, let us by God’s grace seek to raise the standards, not let them fall, or like the NKJV positively help in dropping them! In an age when at one extreme, secular anti-supernaturalists teach the Darwinian theory that men “evolved” from monkeys or monkey-like creatures; and at the other extreme, self-conceited brethren with simplistic minds cause merry hell in the churches for old earth creationists by first denying the age of the earth’s geological layers, then claiming that this planet is but 6,000 to 10,000 years old, and then seeking to engender intolerance towards old earth creationists; I am conscious of the fact that there are many “thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand” (Jonah 4:11). *Let us by God’s grace seek to RAISE THE STANDARDS, and not keep lowering them! Joining in the deceptive tactics of the Young Earth Creationist Institutes, the NKJV e.g., omits “And” in Gen. 1:2 so as to deny that there is a gap of “worlds” (Heb. 1:2; 11:3) between the first two verses of Genesis; also denying the associated presence of multiple “generations of the heavens and of the earth” (Gen. 2:4) in between the first two verses of Genesis 1 in the NKJV rendering of Gen. 2:4 as “This is the history of the heavens and earth” (NKJV), rather than “These are the generations of the heavens and the earth” (KJV). And then to complete their young earth deception which places Adam inside their time-frame, they further pervert Ps. 105:8,10 so as to make Ps. 105:8 read, “The word he commanded, for a thousand generations” (NKJV), rather than “the word which he commanded to a thousand generations” (KJV); so as to deny that the “everlasting covenant” of grace was given “to a thousand generations” between Abraham’s time and Adam’s day (before renewing it as a covenant inside a covenant to Abraham, Ps. 105:11; Gal. 3:16,17). Let us RAISE THE STANDARDS! We can start by getting rid of these bad New King James Versions and in their place bringing back in the good old King James Versions!!!³⁷*

³⁷ On the one hand, my emphasis is on *creation not macroevolution and the authority of the Bible*, and so I regard the issue of what creationist model of Gen. 1 & 2 one adopts is a matter of private interpretation. But on the other hand, the young earth creationist institutes have sought to turn this third issue into a fundamental of the faith, and incited intolerance towards old earth creationists. I am thus intolerant towards this intolerance; for while I can accept that one should not “judge thy brother,” or “set at nought thy brother” (Rom. 14:10) on this type of issue i.e., old earth or young earth; nor should one “let” these weaker young earth brethren set about to impose their views and “judge” (Col. 2:16) stronger old earth brethren on such matters. Hence I distinguish between these dishonest shepherds and the precious sheep of Christ’s flock they have led astray. Thus while I regard the young earth model as incorrect, I would nevertheless embrace as brethren in Christ those adhering to this model, and regard the issue as one of private judgment. However, the NKJV’s perversion of passages such as Gen. 1:2; 2:4; Ps. 105:8; here reflects the type of self-conceited arrogance of a certain type of young earth creationist that I am so strongly opposed to.

The erroneous *Variant 2* was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence at Matt. 18:35b the incorrect reading is found in the ASV as, “if ye forgive not every one his brother from your hearts.” *Variant 2* is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

The NRSV here uses feminist language, adding the words “or sister” after “brother.” Its “translators” under Metzger, thereby encourage arrogant sex role perverts in their dirty anti-patriarchal lusts, forbidden by the 10th commandment, “Thou shalt not covet” (Exod. 20:17). The Bible’s patriarchal language reminds us of the natural order, which is God, man, woman, children (Gen. 1:26-28; I Cor. 11:3). This was perverted in e.g., New Testament times, by the concept of female pagan priests i.e., pagan priestesses. For instance, when I visited Rome in August 2001, I stood in the Roman Forum of ancient Imperial Rome, and among other things, beheld, the column remains of “*Aedes* (Latin, ‘The Temple’) *Vestae* (of Vesta),” which had the so called, “Vestal virgins.”

But while the ancient Greco-Roman pagan world knew of both pagan priests and priestesses, contrary to their pagan society’s “ignorant practices” of having female priests, the Ante-Nicene church did not “ordain women priests,” as this would “abrogate the order of creation” and “the constitutions of Christ” (*Constitutions of the Holy Apostles* 3:1). On the one hand, “the commandments of the Lord” (Cor. 14:37) declare, “Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law” (I Cor. 14:34); “Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence” (I Tim. 2:11,12). But on the other hand, the spirit of worldliness denies “that the things” the holy apostle, St. Paul, did “write unto you are the commandments of the Lord” (I Cor. 14:37), so that “children are their oppressors, and women rule over them. O my people,” says the Lord, “they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths” (Isa. 3:12).

The painful feminist language of the NRSV at Matt. 18:35b, is an example of those who “add unto the word” of God, while the NRSV’s removal of “their trespasses” is an example of those who “diminish” the Word of God (Deut. 4:2). In this sense we find that these modern neo-Alexandrians are very much like the ancient heretics of the Alexandrian School, who also liked to chop and change the Word of God to make it better suit their fleeting fancies. Hear what the holy Apostle, St. John, saith about such things? “Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever” (I John 1:15-17). Hear also what the holy Apostle, St. Paul saith about such things. “Know ye not that the unrighteous,” e.g., the “covetous,” “shall not inherit the kingdom of God?” “And such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God” (I Cor. 6:9-11) Wherefore, “denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly” (Titus 2:12).

Matt. 19:3a “The Pharisees” (TR & AV) {A}*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

In Latin, there is no specific definite article (“the”), although there are some rarely used indefinite articles (“a” / “an”), such as the adjective *unus*, so that we read at Matt. 5:18 in the Vulgate, than not “a” / “one” jot or “a” / “one” tittle shall pass away; or in Matt. 8:19 of “*unus* (a certain) *scriba* (scribe).” Or the pronoun, *quidam* at Matt. 21:28 in the Clementine, reads, “*Homo* (man) *quidam* (a / certain one)” i.e., “A man” or “A certain man.” Thus Woodhouse refers to *unus* as both an adjective and an indefinite article, and to *quidam* as both a pronoun and an indefinite article³⁸.

But as a general rule, in translating the Latin into English, whether or not one uses a definite article or indefinite article is left to a translator’s discretion. Therefore the Latin reading of the Vulgate *et al* at Matt. 19:3a, “*Pharisaei*” (or “*Farisaei*” in old versions e, h, q, & ff1), might be rendered, “the Pharisees” (Douay-Rheims), but might also be rendered simply as “Pharisees.” Therefore, no reference is made to the Latin, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:3a, the TR’s Greek, “*oi* (the),” before, “*Pharisaioi* (Pharisees),” i.e., “The Pharisees,” in the words, “The Pharisees also came unto him” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codices E 07 (8th century), K 017 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); Lectionary 2378 (11th century); and Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), 2 (12th century), and 1242 (13th century). It is further found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Gregory of Nazianzus (d. c. 390).

However, a variant omits the Greek, “*oi* (the),” thus making the reading either, “the Pharisees,” or simply, “Pharisees,” depending on the translator’s discretion. This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), Pi 041 (9th century); Minuscule 1010 (12th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. (Cf. e.g., Matt. 18:18.) The origins of the variant are

³⁸ Woodhouse, S.C., (M.A. [Master of Arts], Late Scholar of Christ Church, Oxford University,) *The Englishman’s Pocket Latin-English & English-Latin Dictionary*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, UK, 1913; reprint 1983, pp. 143,195,251. (The learned author had a Master of Arts degree from Oxford University. But in the tradition that he graduated in, a person with a Bachelor of Arts degree automatically qualified to get a Master of Arts degree after a set time from his B.A. graduation, once he payed a particular fee. Thus the equivalent degree from e.g., Sydney University, is a B.A. .)

conjectural. It should be noted that there is no definite article in the Greek before the AV's "Pharisees" (*Pharisaioi*)" at Matt. 15:1 and Luke 5:17; nor is there a definite article in the Greek before the AV's "the Pharisees" (*Pharisaioi*)" at Luke 13:31 and Acts 23:9.

Was this an accidental change? Was the definite article, "oi (the)," lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was this a deliberate change? Did a scribe here consider that the "oi (the)," was "unnecessary wordage" and so "redundant," on the basis that whether or not it is present, the meaning is "the same"? If so, the scribe was "too smart by half," since in fact one can here give the passage a different emphasis if the definite article is omitted, even though one does not have to do so.

Alternatively, did a scribe realize that the absence of the definite article meant one could here give the passage a different emphasis and that this was in fact some kind of "stylistic improvement"? If so, was he influenced by some torturous analogy with the "*Pharisaioi* (Pharisees)" of the earlier Matt. 15:1? E.g., in both instances Pharisees come to tempt Christ, and so in some sense did the "smart boy" scribe think that "these were meant to be "equivalent" types of incidents? Certainly no competent scribe would justify the deliberate omission of "oi (the)" at Matt. 19:3a on this type of flimsy and supercilious basis of "stylistic equivalence" between Matt. 15:1 and Matt. 19:3a. But it must be remembered, that the type of scribe who would set about to so deliberately alter the text of Scripture, by definition, was *something less* than fully competent.

The reading of the *Textus Receptus* here has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument. It clearly has ancient Greek support from the ancient church father and doctor, St. Gregory Nazianzus, also known as St. Gregory the Theologian, for his writings and work in defence of the Trinity.

St. Gregory Nazianzus (c. 330 - c. 390) is one of the four great ancient doctors of the Eastern Church, and was the son of Bishop Gregory, Sr. . He was consecrated Bishop of Nazianzus from 325 by bishops on the way to the *General Council of Nicea* (325). St. Gregory, who became an ordained Minister in 362, was consecrated as a bishop in 372, and then became *locum tenens* Bishop in his home city of Nazianzus upon his father's death in 374. A friend of St. Basil the Great, who is another of the four great ancient doctors of the Eastern Church, when St. Basil died in 379, St. Gregory became the leading spokesman in Asia Minor on Trinitarian orthodoxy against the Arian heretics; and in recognition of this he became Bishop of Constantinople, albeit for a relatively short time, before returning to the area around Nazianzus, where he again served briefly as a church administrator during a vacancy. His orthodox support for the teaching of three equal Divine Persons in the Trinity, together with the earlier *General Council of Nicea*, were both acknowledged as correct by the *General Council of Constantinople* in 381. St. Gregory was also favourably known to St. Jerome (d. 420) who is one of the four great ancient and early mediaeval doctors of the Western Church. St. Gregory defended the teaching that Christ was fully Divine against Arian heretics; and also

defended the teaching that Christ was fully man against Apollinarian heretics (who denied that Christ had a human soul). St. Gregory of Nazianzus's orthodox defence of the Holy Trinity, resulted in him being awarded the title, "the Theologian."

Are we to set aside the reading of the representative Byzantine Greek text, which has no good textual argument against it, and ancient support from so fine a church figure as St. Gregory Nazianzus, and in its place adopt a minority Byzantine reading found in a handful of manuscripts, that has no good textual argument to commend it? (I say the word "God" reverently, when I say,) God forbid! On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 19:3a 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. 19:3a, "The Pharisees," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in Minuscules 157 (independent, 12th century) and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century) and Armenian Version (5th century).

However, the incorrect reading which omits, "the," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th 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 (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); together with Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version, as well as the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

Reference to the variant is made as occurring in two of the eight manuscript selections found in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) (Gospel manuscripts: w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; & H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum).

The division between the two leading Alexandrian texts, caused a corresponding division between neo-Alexandrian texts at Matt. 19:3a. With such "wide external support" as the Byzantine Text, Western Text, "Caesarean" Text (Armenian Version), and Egyptian Bohairic behind his beloved Alexandrian text, London Sinaiticus, for the wrong types of reasons, Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) adopted the correct reading.

But the pull of “the shorter text” as “the better reading,” proved too strong for most neo-Alexandrians, and so the reading of the Alexandrian’s Rome Vaticanus, was adopted 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).

It is possible to translate the variant exactly the same as the TR’s reading, on the basis that the absence of the Greek definite puts the Greek in the same type of position as the Latin, i.e., it is up to the discretion of the translator whether or not to use the definite article. But most of the neo-Alexandrians have made much of this difference, and followed the variant. Metzger says, “The [UBS] Committee was impressed by the diversity and quality of the witnesses that support the anarthrous expression,” i.e., the reading without the definite article (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 47).

Hence at Matt. 19:3a the American Standard Version reads, “And there came unto him Pharisees” (ASV), although a footnote says, with a false claim of TR *insertion*, “Many authorities, some ancient, insert ‘the’” (ASV ftn). The erroneous reading, without any footnote reference to the Received Text’s reading, is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Though the Latin tongue has no definite article, *supra*, the old Latin Papists of the pre-Vatican II Council era, having a good feel for the sense of the Latin tongue, rendered Matt. 19:3 as, “And there came to him the Pharisees” (Douay-Rheims Version). By contrast, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the post-Vatican II Council era, finding no definite article in their neo-Alexandrian text, and having a poor feel for the sense of the Greek tongue, omitted “the” in their Jerusalem Bible and New Jerusalem Bible.

On the back-cover jacket of my copy of the Moffatt Bible³⁹, is a quote by the neo-Alexandrian, J.B. Phillips, who “translated” the ill-fated Phillip’s Bible (NT 1947-1958, Four Prophets 1963, revised NT 1973), which I am pleased to say, like the Moffatt Bible, has undergone a massive decline in popularity. Phillip’s motive for his own “translation,” was to replace the Authorized Version, and he was encouraged in this sad endeavour by the apostate, C.S. Lewis, whose religious novels, among other things, promote Devilish concepts of magic. Phillip’s set about to produce his Phillip’s Bible on the basis that younger people “couldn’t make head or tail” of the King James Version⁴⁰.

When I hear this kind of nonsense, I am grateful to God that back in the 1980s and 1990s, when I was a young man in my 20s and then 30s, there were still a number of Anglican Churches in the Evangelical *Diocese of Sydney* that used the 1662 prayer book and AV. I generally attended such churches; even though more widely in the Diocese, an inferior “modern” prayer book was replacing the 1662 prayer book, and various

³⁹ *The Moffatt Translation of the Bible*, 1935, Hodder & Stoughton, London, UK, 1987 (ISBN 0-340-00113-5). Moffatt died in 1944.

⁴⁰ Kubo & Specht, *So Many Versions? op. cit.*, pp. 61-78 at p. 61.

inferior “modern” versions were replacing the AV. I well remember how the Rector of an Anglican Church I was attending, the Reverend Mr. Harry Edwards, used to sometimes talk to me about various “Anglican” things⁴¹. I recall Mr. Edwards saying to me that older people in the church had said to him something like, “When younger people say they do not understand the words of the 1662 prayer book,” *which always included readings from the AV*, “we say, ‘How do you think we understand? We had to learn the language when we were young, just as you do’.”

The reality, of course, is that the language of the AV and 1662 prayer book was always archaic, since when these came out in 1611 and 1662 respectively, “thee,” “thou,” and “thy” were no longer used in normal conversation as a singular “you.” But just as Hebrew speaking Old Testament readers and listeners had to learn certain poetical devices, e.g., in order to understand the acrostic poetry of Psalm 119, or had to learn the similar though different Aramaic tongue in order to understand certain portions of the OT e.g., Dan. 2:4-7:28; so likewise it was necessary for Anglophones using the prayer book or Bible to understand such archaisms, since accuracy of translation was paramount. The Protestant teaching was not that the Word of God had to be in *the language of the people*, but rather, *in a language the people could understand*, and this is a statement made with the same type of qualifications that one finds in the OT passages, *supra*.

But in contrast to the wise words of the Anglican Rector, Reverend Edwards, *supra*, are the foolish claims of Phillips that his translation was justified because younger people “couldn’t make head or tail” of the AV. Oozing out the worldly superficiality so much the hallmark of both the Moffatt Bible (produced by an apostate Puritan Protestant clergyman,) and Phillip’s Bible (produced by an apostate Anglican Protestant clergyman), J.B. Phillips says on the back-jacket of the Moffatt Bible, “I regard ... Moffatt’s translation with the greatest respect Moffatt transmits the urgency and the passion of the message in a way that cannot fail to stimulate the modern reader.” On the one hand, I have no sympathy for Phillip’s promotion of Moffatt, and unlike him, I do not have any great respect for Moffatt’s Bible, because I respect the truth of God. But on the other hand, I find something I can empathize with when Phillip’s says that “Moffatt’s translation ... cannot fail to stimulate the modern reader.” That is because it stimulates me to a holy and righteous anger, for it is a work containing many heresies and errors, and like Phillip’s Bible, the Moffatt Bible is a very poor substitute indeed for *the real thing*, namely, the Authorized King James Version of 1611.

On this occasion here at Matt. 19:3a, swayed more by *the shorter reading* (Rome Vaticanus) than *the reading of the Western Text as the decider* (London Sinaiticus), the unstable mind of Moffatt, *in this instance*, followed the variant and reads, “Then up came some Pharisees” (Moffatt Bible).

Matt. 19:3b “saying unto him” (TR & AV) {B}

⁴¹ “Rector” is a Latin word, meaning e.g., “leader” / “director” / “ruler” / “governor.” Cf. the Late Latin, “director (governor).” In accordance with Anglican custom, Mr. Edwards was sometimes addressed in conversation as, “Rector.”

The TR's Greek, "*auto* (unto him)," in the words, "tempting him, and saying unto him" (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), U 030 (9th century); Lectionary 2378 (11th century); and Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark) and 2 (12th century). It is further supported as Latin, "*ei* (unto him)," in old Latin Versions h (5th century) and q (6th / 7th century); and as Latin, "*illi* (unto that [one])," in old Latin Versions d (5th century) and c (12th / 13th century).

However, a variant which omits Greek, "*auto* (unto him)," making the reading, "tempting him, and saying," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), Y 034 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century); and Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). The omission is further found 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), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th 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). The omission is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Gregory of Nazianzus (d. c. 390); and 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 an accidental change? Was the "*auto* (unto him)" first squeezed in at the end of a line, and then lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was this a deliberate change? Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, make a "stylistic improvement" in which he omitted "unnecessary and redundant wordage"? If so, was "the great brain" of Origen influenced in this "brilliant deduction," by reference to other Matthean passages where the Greek, "*lego*" (*legontes* = 'saying,' masculine plural nominative, aorist passive participle, from *lego*)," is not so followed by the Greek pronoun, "*autos* (*auto* = 'unto him,' at Matt. 19:3b, masculine singular dative, 3rd person pronoun, from *autos*)" (e.g., Matt. 2:2; 9:14; 12:10; 13:36; 14:15)? If so, what about e.g., the "*lego* (*legousin* = 'they said,' indicative active present, 3rd person verb, from *lego*)" and "*autos* (*auto* = 'unto him,')" of Matt. 9:28? Or the "*lego* (*legei* = 'he said,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *lego*)" and "*autos* (*auto* = 'unto them,' masculine plural dative, 3rd person pronoun, from *autos*)" of Matt. 9:24? (Cf. Matt. 14:4,31; 18:32; 22:1; 26:25,52; 27:13; 28:10). If deliberate, this type of capricious pruning of the text by Origen or anyone else is entirely unacceptable and totally outrageous. *Men must learn by the grace of God to humbly put themselves under the Word of God, not over it. Where there is no clear and obvious textual problem with the representative Byzantine text, then it must stand as the Received Text and infallible apographs of the infallible autographs. It's that simple!*⁴²

⁴² I regard "infallible" and "inerrant" as synonymous, and repudiate religiously

On the one hand, the TR's reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading; and ancient support in both the Greek (W 032) and Latin (h). But on the other hand, the variant is the representative Latin text reading, and also has support from a few ancient writers. Taking these factors into account, and recognizing 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. 19:3b 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. 19:3b, "unto him," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; and Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century).

However the variant, which omits "unto him," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 700 (11th century, independent), 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence at Matt. 19:3b the ASV reads, "and saying, "Is it lawful" etc. . The incorrect reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

This is not *de ja vu*. We neo-Byzantine defenders of the *Textus Receptus* have stood on this battle-front, and under God fought to defend Matt. 19:3b afore. In the olden times, we fought against the old Latin Papists whose highly unreliable Douay-Rheims reads, in accordance with the Latin of the Clementine Vulgate reads, "saying: Is it lawful" etc. (Douay-Rheims). In our own day, since the old "false prophet" (Rev. 13:11-18; 16:13; 19:20; 20:10) of Romish "ecumenical councils," opened his mouth at

liberal "neo-Evangelical" attempts to claim one can have a so called "infallible" Bible (i.e., "infallible for the purpose for which it was written") which is not "inerrant" (i.e., "containing various errors or 'Bible blunders' e.g., 'Cainan' in Luke 3:36"). This type of linguistic chicanery curries no favour with me. When I say the Book is infallible, I include in this word, "infallible," the fact that it is entirely inerrant, i.e., it contains no errors of *any kind*. However, I do think the infallible Bible is sometimes made the subject of *erroneous interpretations by fallible men*, but that is another issue (e.g., the Jehovah's Witnesses cult falsely claims that the Bible does not teach the Trinity).

the Vatican II Council (1962-5), we fight against the new neo-Alexandrian Papists whose highly unreliable Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles also make this omission.

The old Latin Papists came at us with the blunted blades of the Clementine and Douay-Rheims, whereas the new neo-Alexandrian Papists now come at us with the blunted blades of a neo-Alexandrian text and Jerusalem or New Jerusalem Bible. The battle is joined. But as in olden times, so in modern times, the sharp blade of the Received Text and King James Bible prevails. By the grace of God, those sharp blades triumph. Those sharp blades win the day. For the King James Version remains *by far* the most accurate English translation, and the *Textus Receptus* from which it is translated is nothing less than the infallible “Word of God.” It is “quick, and powerful,” “piercing even to diving asunder of soul and spirit, and of joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart” (Heb. 4:12). *Dost thou seek to stand over this book? “Thou fool” (Luke 12:20)! Submit thou unto it!*

Matt. 19:3c “for a man” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:3c, the Greek reads, “*anthropo* (‘for a man,’ masculine singular dative, noun from *anthropos*),” whereas at Mark 10:2 the Greek reads, “*andri* (masculine singular dative, noun from *aner*).” Matching this type of synonymous usage of terms, the Latin of the Vulgate reads, “*homini* (‘for a man,’ masculine singular dative, noun from *homo*),” at Matt. 19:3c, and “*viro* (‘for a man,’ masculine singular dative, noun from *vir*),” at Mark 10:2. Bearing in mind that the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex put into Diatessaron format, I think it reasonable to conclude that its usage of “*homini*” is drawn from Matt. 19:3, rather than Mark 10:2, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:3c, the TR’s Greek, “*anthropo* (for a man),” in the words, “Is it lawful *for a man* to put away his wife for every cause?” (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 found as Latin, “*homini* (for a man),” 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), q (6th / 7th century), aur (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). It is further found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Gregory of Nazianzus (d. c. 390); and ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

But a variant omitting Greek, “*anthropo* (for a man),” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codex Gamma 036 (10th century), and Minuscules 125 (11th century)

and 301 (11th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Clement of Rome (c. 150); and the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

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

Was this an accidental loss? In Manuscript Washington (W 032) the “*anthropo* (for a man),” is not written out in full as “ANΘΡΩΠΩ” but rather, abbreviated, with a line on top for half of the first and third letters, and all of the middle letter, as “ANΩ” (*anō*). It is abbreviated in Lectionary 2378 as *anō* with a line over the top of part of the “n” and “ω;” and in Lectionary 1968 as *anō* with a line over the top of the “n.” Was this lost in an undetected paper fade of just 3 letters? Alternatively, the next word is “*apolusai* (to put away).” Did the eye of a scribe, looking at “ANΩΑΠΙΟΛΥCΑΙ”, jump from the first to second “A,” possibly also getting confused with the “Π (p)” of “ΑΠΙΟΛΥCΑΙ” as he thought in his mind of “ANΘΡΩΠΩ”, thereby omitting “ANΩ”?

Was this a deliberate change? Did a scribe decide to prune away “*anthropo* (for a man),” in order to create a “more succinct” and “less wordy literary style”? If so, was he also seeking to create “a more perfect literary parallel” with Matt. 19:7, which reads, “Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away,” not, “Why did Moses then command to give A MAN a writing of divorcement, and to put her away”?

A deliberate or accidental change? As is generally the case, we cannot be sure as we lack sufficient information. Nevertheless, we can be sure that a change was made.

The *Textus Receptus* (TR) reading has strong support in both the Greek and Latin. It also has the support of the Greek writing church father and bishop, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Latin writing church father and bishop, St. Hilary of Poitiers. By contrast, the variant has weak support in both the Greek and Latin, and no good textual argument to commend it since it remedies no clear and obvious problem in the representative Byzantine Greek text. Therefore on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 19:3c 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. 19:3c, “for a man,” is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) 087 (6th century, Matt. 1:23-2:2; 19:3-8; 21:19-24; John 18:29-35), (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), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 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: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; and Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

However, the variant which omits, “for a man,” 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 L 019 (8th century) and Minuscule 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the Ethiopic Version (6th century, Rome).

A split occurred among neo-Alexandrians, as it usually does, when one group of neo-Alexandrians decide to compliment their general usage of their Alexandrian text pincer arm, with the relatively rare usage of their non-Alexandrian text pincer arm. Their *raison d’etre* for doing so in this instance here at Matt. 19:3c, to some extent also reflects a trend increasingly seen with later neo-Alexandrians to look for “external support” beyond the Alexandrian texts, which was not a view regarded as *so* important by earlier neo-Alexandrians (especially, though not exclusively so in the case of Westcott & Hort who regarded the Alexandrian text who regarded the Alexandrian text in general, and *Codex Vaticanus* in particular, as “neutral”). Reflecting these type of internal Neo-Alexandrian School debacles, the variant, with support of both leading Alexandrian texts, was adopted by Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle’s 21st edition (1952). By contrast, for the wrong reasons, the TR’s reading was adopted by the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993). But reflecting their unease at disagreeing with both major Alexandrian texts, the UBS Committees of the 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, said that they considered, “there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text or the apparatus contains the superior reading.”

Notwithstanding these intra Neo-Alexandrian School tussles, the incorrect variant was adopted at Matt. 19:3c by the ASV, which puts the words, “for a man” in italics, i.e., indicating that the translators considered that they were adding that which was not there in their Greek text of Westcott-Hort. This same methodology was also adopted by the NASB which used Nestle’s 23rd edition (NASB 1st ed., 1960-71, & 2nd ed. 1977) and Nestle’s 26th edition (NASB 3rd edition, 1995). But the variant was followed without such a purported “addition” of “for a man,” by the RSV, ESV, and Moffatt e.g., the latter of these reads, “Is it right to divorce one’s wife for any reason?” (Moffatt Bible). However, for incorrect reasons, the correct reading is *prima facie* found in the TCNT, TEV, NEB, REB, NRSV, NIV, and Papists’ JB and NJB. E.g., the Twentieth Century New Testament reads, “Has a man the right to divorce his wife for every cause” (TCNT). However, because neither the TCNT nor these other versions use italics for added words, we cannot be entirely certain if they are not following the form of the ASV and NASB,

i.e., “adding” the words in themselves. Such are the confusions and vagaries created by versions that do not use italics for words not found in their underpinning Greek texts!

Matt. 19:4a “unto them” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, at both Matt. 19:4a and Mark 10:3, the Latin Vulgate reads, “*eis* (unto them).” Hence the presence of “*eis* (unto them),” in the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron might have come from either or both sources in the Vulgate as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron also exhibits similar problems, although Ciasca’s Latin translation of the Arabic as “*illis* (‘unto those [ones]),” contextually looks more clearly and obviously to have been taken from Mark 10:3 in conjunction with Matt. 19:4a. Therefore no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:4a, the TR’s Greek, “*autois* (unto them),” in the words, “And he answered and said unto them,” etc. (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, “*eis* (unto them),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions q (6th / 7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported as Latin, “*illis* (‘unto those [ones]),” in old Latin Versions b (5th century), f (6th century), and aur (7th century).

However, a variant omits, “unto them (Greek, *autois*; Latin, *eis* / *illis*).” This omission is found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th 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 speculative.

Was this an accidental change? Was “*autois* (unto them),” squeezed in at the end of a line, like e.g., so many words in Codex Alexandrinus (A 02, 5th century, Byzantine in the incomplete Gospels), such as those at Matt. 26:73-27:28 (codex page 28)? Was it then lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was this a deliberate change? Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, deliberately prune away the “*autois* (‘unto them,’ masculine dative, 3rd person plural, from *autos*)”

after the “*eipen* (he said),” in order to create a text with “a more concise literary style”? If so, was the “great brain” of Origen influenced in this decision by passages such as e.g., Matt. 2:8, where “*eipe* (he said)⁴³” is not followed by some form of *autos*? If so, what about passages such as e.g., Matt. 3:7, where we also read, “*eipen* (he said) *autois* (unto them)”? Is this an instance of pruning the text by an arrogant Origen up to his old tricks?

A deliberate of accidental change? We cannot with confidence be sure. But we can be sure that this was a change to the Received Text of Holy Scripture.

On the one hand, the TR’s reading has rock solid support in the Greek, and strong support in the Latin with St. Jerome’s Vulgate and half a dozen old Latin versions. It is found in both the Greek and Latin from ancient times. The origins of the variant appear to have been with Origen, whose standard vacillates greatly, and whose writings must therefore always be approached with great caution. But on the other hand, in addition to Origen, the variant has the support of about half a dozen old Latin versions. Taking these factors into account, and recognizing the perpetual 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. 19:4a 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. 19:4a, “unto them,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in all extant Syriac versions; and Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century).

However, the variant which omits, “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, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); as well as Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 19:4a, the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the omission is found in the ASV which reads, “and said, Have ye not read ...?” etc. . The incorrect reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

On this occasion, the old Latin Papists, following the correct reading of the

⁴³ The “*n*” at the end of *eipe* is an optional letter.

Vulgate *et al*, rightly read, “said to them, Have ye not read ...?” etc. in the Douay-Rheims Version. By contrast, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists, following the incorrect reading of the neo-Alexandrian texts, got the wrong reading by omitting “unto them” in their Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles.

Matt. 19:5b “father and mother” (TR & AV) {D}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:5b, both the reading lacking, “*autou* (of him),” i.e., “father and mother” (Scrivener’s Text), and the reading including “*autou* (of him),” i.e., “his father and mother,” have substantial support in the Byzantine Text. The vast majority of manuscripts used in the Majority Text are Byzantine, and both readings are said by Hodges & Farstad’s Majority Text (1985) to have the part support of the Majority Text, though the fact that they do not include the reading in their main text indicates their count favours the shorter reading.

The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden’s K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green’s Textual Apparatus (1986) regards the two readings as “alternatives.” I.e., “the evidence is about evenly divided (40-60% support),” and so on Green’s Textual Apparatus Majority Text principles, Pierpont (who was also a co-editor of the Robinson & Pierpont Majority Text,) “cannot be certain which reading represents the original – but it must be one of the two.” Reflecting the same conclusion, “*autou* (of him),” is placed in square brackets in the Robinson & Pierpont Majority Text (1991), which thus considers its usage or non-usage entirely optional.

Like Scrivener’s Text, the reading is absent in Stephanus’s Greek NT (1550) as it was earlier in Erasmus’s Greek NT (1516 & 1522). But Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) notes the unqualified inclusion of “*autou* (of him)” in two of his selected eight manuscripts (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; & H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum); and further says it is included by “an old hand” in another two of his selected eight manuscripts (Gospel manuscripts: P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ’s College, Cambridge, F. i. 8). Elzevir thus also considered the texts were divided over these two readings.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:5b, the representative Byzantine text is fairly evenly divided between two readings. The first reading (*Reading 1*), found in Scrivener’s Text reads, “*ton* (-) *patera* (father) *kai* (and) *ten* (-) *metera* (mother),” i.e., “father and mother” (AV), is supported by about half of the Byzantine texts e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), F 09 (9th century), G 012 (9th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), U 030 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century), Omega 045 (9th century), S 028 (10th century); and Minuscule 2 (12th century). It is further supported as Latin, “*patrem* (father) *et* (and) *matrem* (mother),” 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), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th 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). The Greek “*kai*” can mean “and,” “or,” etc., and so it is also supported in Latin, “*patrem* (father) *aut* (or) *matrem*,” in old Latin versions ff2 (5th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Athanasius (d. 373).

The second reading (*Reading 2*), “*ton* (the) *patera* (father) *autou* (of him) *kai* (and) *ten* (the) *metera* (mother),” i.e., “his father and mother,” is also supported by about half of the Byzantine texts e.g., E 07 (8th century), Y 034 (9th century); Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). This reading is also supported by a minor variant, placing the “*autou* (of him)” after “*ten* (the) *metera* (mother),” i.e., “his father and mother,” in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Apostolic Constitutions (3rd / 4th century), Titus of Bostra (d. before 378), and Chrysostom (d. 407).

Under neo-Byzantine textual theoretics, one must be able to compose the representative Byzantine text from a reasonable sample of manuscripts, even if that is a relatively small number of manuscripts, such as were available to Elzevir, or a larger number, such as the much larger number that is available to us today through von Soden’s *Neuen Testaments* (1913). When this is done, it is clear from Robinson & Pierpont’s work on von Soden’s K group that the text is fairly evenly divided. Hence, it would be pointless and prove nothing, if a person were to do an absolutely precise manuscript count and declare which of these two readings was the literal Byzantine “majority” text. When the manuscripts are this close, from the neo-Byzantine paradigm there is deemed to be a dead-heat or tie, irrespective of which reading might technically have a literal majority behind it.

And to be perfectly frank about the matter, *we do not care* which one in precise mathematical terms is the majority reading, as determined by a careful count of all Byzantine text manuscripts up to the 16th century; not that such a precise count would even be presently possible in such terms, since von Soden’s groups are generalist, and one must therefore allow an error factor of up to plus or minus (+/-) 10% of one’s von Soden based figures. Where the numbers are fairly close (as Robinson & Pierpont indicate they here are), even if one could calculate it, the technical “majority” means nothing to us, since we operate on timeless rules that are just as effective in the 16th and 17th centuries when one could access only a fairly small fraction of the Byzantine manuscripts, as they are in the 20th and 21st centuries when one can access far more of them. So long as a reasonable sample shows a fairly evenly divided Byzantine text, which on the basis of Robinson & Pierpont’s work on von Soden’s K group is clearly the case here, the matter must then be determined on the basis of textual analysis, not a precise mathematical count. We do not split hairs on this type of thing. A neo-Byzantine textual analyst of the 21st century has no ultimate edge over a neo-Byzantine

textual analyst of the 16th or 17th centuries, or any other centuries, and nor do any who come after us have any ultimate edge over us who have gone afore⁴⁴.

There is no clear and obvious textual problem with either *Reading 1* or *Reading 2*. The fact that both forms of Matt. 19:5b are found in Origen probably indicates that he originated the variant reading. But which one did he alter?

On the one hand, *Reading 1*, is consistent with the type of Matthean terminology found in Matt. 10:37, “He that loveth father (*patera*) or (*e*) mother (*meta*) more than me is not worthy of me;” or at Matt. 19:29, “And every one that hath forsaken ... father (*patera*) or (*e*) mother (*meta*) ... for my name’s sake, shall ... inherit everlasting life.” But on the other hand, *Reading 2*, is consistent with the type of “*tou* (the) *patros* (father) *autou* (of him)” Matthean terminology found in Matt. 10:35, “For I am come to set a man at variance against his (*autou*) father (*tou patros*);” or the “*ton* (the) *patera* (father) *autou* (of him) *e* (or) *ten* (the) *meta* (mother) *autou* (of him)” at Matt. 15:6, i.e., “And honour not his (*autou*) father (*ton patera*) or (*e*) his (*autou*) mother (*meta*).”

On the one hand, the words of *Reading 2*, “*ton* (the) *patera* (father) *autou* (of him) *kai* (and) *ten* (the) *meta* (mother),” are the same as those of the Greek Septuagint at Gen. 2:24 (LXX). But on the other hand, other parts of the quote at Matt. 19:5,6 are quite different to the Septuagint. Therefore, if one were to argue that the “*autou* (of him)” were assimilated from the Septuagint, this would result in the concomitant question, “Why then was the rest of the quote not assimilated to the Septuagint?” While one might argue that the “*autou* (of him)” was added from the Greek Septuagint or Hebrew, one might also argue that it had been pruned away. Likewise, one might argue for assimilation from Mark 10:7; but one might also argue for an Origen pruning of the text at Matt. 19:5b.

On the one hand, it is possible that “*autou* (of him)” was accidentally lost by either a paper fade or due to the fact that it is a short word, possibly squeezed in at the end of a line. But on the other hand, it is possible that it was added in as assimilation with Gen. 2:24 and / or Mark 10:7. This is to some extent seen with reference to the minor variant of W 032. Did the scribe, at first accidentally omit “*autou* (of him)” because it was a short word, and then realizing his mistake, add it back in? Or did he deliberately move it from after the “*ton* (the) *patera* (father)” to after the “*ten* (the) *meta* (mother),” as a “stylistic improvement”? Or did he add it in after the “*ten* (the) *meta* (mother)” as assimilation with Gen. 2:24 and / or Mark 10:7, choosing a different location to place it as some kind of “stylistic improvement”?

Thus both *Reading 1* and *Reading 2* have about half the Byzantine manuscripts behind them; neither reading presents any clear and obvious textual problem; both readings are stylistically consistent with Matthean Greek; and textual arguments might be reasonably adduced for either an addition to the text by Origen, or a subtraction from the

⁴⁴ See Commentary Vol. 2, Preface, “Determining the representative Byzantine Text.”

text by Origen.

Under the circumstances, weighing up these competing considerations, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading of the AV at Matt. 19:5b a "D" i.e., the evidence for the two readings is about equally divided, so that we cannot be entirely certain as to which is the better reading (50% certainty). Thus the TR's reading as found in the King James Version can be neither definitely affirmed as correct, nor definitely rejected as wrong. Therefore the reading (*Reading 1*) is "passable," but so is the alternative reading (*Reading 2*). This means *Reading 1* may as well stay in the text since it has a 50:50 chance of being correct; but this could have happened *vice versa* to what it did i.e., *Reading 2* may have been in the text. Hence I think that in printed editions of the Received Text, the word "*autou* (of him)," should be placed in square brackets after "*ton* (the) *patera* (father)," signifying this uncertainty, and thus making its usage or non-usage entirely optional. Nevertheless, it must be clearly understood, that to the extent that the AV translators chose one of two legitimate options, their translation is certainly valid.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources, *Reading 1*, "father and mother," is found at Matt. 19:5b 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 (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 579 (mixed text, 13th century), 565 (9th century, independent), and 700 (11th century, independent). It is further found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

Reading 2, "his father and mother," is found at Matt. 19:5b in (the mixed text type) Manuscript Codex C 04 (5th century), the (independent text type the independent, but Byzantine influenced,) Codex 078 (Matt. 17-18, 19; Luke 18:14-25; John 4:52-5:8; 20:17-26; 6th century), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (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); 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 further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Its attestation in both Alexandrian texts was enough to ensure that *Reading 1* was adopted by the neo-Alexandrians. The Neo-Alexandrian School has no difficulty in

seeing how e.g., Origen might have conflated the text by adding in “his” from e.g., Mark 10:7. But their one-eyed blinkered methodology, cannot see that Origen might just as easily have pruned away the “his.” Thus *Reading 1* was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence it is clearly found at Matt. 19:5b in the Papists’ NJB.

But a strange phenomenon now occurs among neo-Alexandrian versions at Matt. 19:5b. *Prima facie*, we find that *Reading 2* is found in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, Moffatt, TCNT, NEB, REB, TEV, and JB. E.g., with “his” in normal print rather than italics indicating it is added, the American Standard Version reads, “For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother” (ASV). So too, the Twentieth Century New Testament reads, “For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother” (TCNT); or Moffatt reads, “Hence a man shall leave his father and mother” (Moffatt Bible).

Yet with the neo-Alexandrian texts monolithically supporting *Reading 1*, we cannot doubt that this is the underpinning Greek text of these versions. E.g., the ASV and TCNT are both based on Westcott-Hort which lacks “his,” and yet they both have “his” in their translations. Thus the most natural construction to place upon this, is that they all considered that the masculine gendering found in the “*anthropos* (a man),” before the words of *Reading 1*, entitles them to add in the “his” *as part of English translation*. Even so, versions such as the ASV and NASB should have used italics here for “his,” and their failure to do so is inconsistent with their stated principles of translation.

But the proper interpretation is not as clear in the case of the New King James Version. This also reads at Matt. 19:5b, without any italics. “For this reason shall a man leave his father and mother” etc. (NKJV). The NKJV translators are *probably* here following *Reading 1* as found in Scrivener’s Text, and like e.g., the ASV, adding in “his” (ASV) without italics on the basis that it is justified *as part of English translation*. But once again, the absence of italics here makes this inconsistent with their theoretics of translation.

Given the NKJV’s commitment to the Majority Text principles of Hodges & Farstad, not for reasons of textual analysis, but simply due to the divide in that Majority Text, it is *just possible* that they here followed *Reading 2*. If so, they were inconsistent with their stated principles of following the Received Text, which given their lack of appreciation of textual analysis would necessarily be an uncritical acceptance of Scrivener’s Text. We are thus left with a question, *Did the NKJV translators follow Reading 1 and inconsistently not use italics for “the added” word (the more probable scenario)? Or did the NKJV translators follow Reading 2 and so inconsistently not follow their definition of the Received Text in the main text of their version (the less probable scenario)?* Even though I think that on the balance of probabilities the NKJV translators were following *Reading 1* and inconsistently not using italics for “the added” word, we cannot be entirely confident of this. And nor can their readers.

But in the final analysis, the matter does not really matter. That is because, if we accept that printed editions of the *Textus Receptus* should read here at Matt. 19:5b, “*ton patera [autou] kai ten metera*,” then it follows that the inclusion or non-inclusion of the

“*autou* (of him),” is entirely optional, and so one may equally render it, “father and mother” or “his father and mother.” The matter is ultimately one of a translator’s discretion, and if the King James Version translators went one way and followed *Reading 1*, and some other translators went the other way and followed *Reading 2*, then that would be within the boundaries of permissible neo-Byzantine variation here at Matt. 19:5b.

Given the fact that there is a 50:50 chance of either reading being correct; I think that in any “Study Bible” of the King James Version, that a footnote should be provided giving the alternative reading. However, this is not necessary in a normal edition of the Authorized Version, since the evidence being fairly evenly divided between *Reading 1* and *Reading 2*, means that the reading of the AV i.e., *Reading 1*, achieves a “basic pass” at 50% (as would *Reading 2* if it were in the text), and the AV translators’ policy was not to use footnotes. Thus while I think a footnote reading is highly desirable in a “Study Bible,” it is not absolutely essential in a normal edition of the KJV. *Thus once again, the AV comes through!*

Matt. 19:7 “to put her away” (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron reads, “*et* (and) *dimittere* (to put away)?” The Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex, and this same reading is found in the Vulgate at both Matt. 19:7 and Mark 10:4. Hence it is theoretically possible, though improbable (given the absence of the longer reading at Matt. 19:7 in Vulgate Codices generally), that the reading was shortened as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting, i.e., in order to conform with Mark 10:4. Therefore, on this occasion, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, similar issues arise with Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron. Thus no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:7, the *Textus Receptus*’s Greek, “*autēn* (her),” in the words, “and to put her away?” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); the magnificently illuminated purple parchment, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century); the purple parchment, *Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus* (N 022, 6th century); the purple parchment with silver writing and gold illumination, *Codex Sinopensis* (O 023, 6th century); and the two Sydney University Lectionaries written in brown ink with colourful red illumination of key letters and section markers, to wit, *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 2378 (11th century) and *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D). It is further found as Latin, “*eam* (her),” in *Codex Brixianus* (old Latin Version f, 6th century) and *Codex Monacensis* (old Latin Version q, 6th / 7th century).

However, instead of reading, “*autēn* (her),” *Variant 1* reads, “*tēn* (the) *gunaika* (wife)” i.e., “and to put away the wife?” This is a minority Byzantine reading, found in the margin of Lectionary 5 (10th century). It is further found as Latin, “*uxorem* (the wife),” in old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation; and ancient church Latin writers, Ambrose (d. 397) and *Speculum* (d. 5th century).

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, omits Greek, “*autēn* (her),” i.e., “and to put away?” This omission is found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). This omission is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and the ancient church Latin writers, Jerome (d. 420) and Augustine (d. 430).

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental alteration? If “*autēn* (her),” came at the end of a line, following a paper fade / loss, was it “reconstructed” as “*tēn* (the) *gunaika* (wife)” from “context”? Did these words thus come from the “*tēn* (the) *gunaika* (wife)” of Matt. 19:9? Such a procedure of “reconstruction” may strike us as gratuitous i.e., why not simply check with another manuscript? But it must be remembered that relatively speedy transport and good communications which allow us to access manuscripts, were not always available to those of ancient (or medieval) times. Thus “reconstructions from context,” may have “seemed like a good idea at the time” to some scribes in this kind of situation.

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? Did a scribe consider the usage of “*autēn* (her),” was in some way “too vague”? Did he then set about to create a deliberate “stylistic improvement” by “more specifically” referring to “*tēn* (the) *gunaika* (wife)”?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration? If “*autēn* (her),” came at the end of a line, was it lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change? Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, conclude that “*autēn* (her)” was “redundant and unnecessary wordage”? If so, was he emboldened in this decision by a further desire to seek “a Gospel harmony” with Mark 10:4, which like the Matt. 19:7 *Variant 2*, reads simply, “*kai* (and) *apolusai* (to put away)”?

On the one hand, the TR’s reading has the rock solid support of the representative Byzantine text, and attestation in that Greek text from ancient times. It has the further support of a couple of old Latin versions. But on the other hand, *Variant 1* has the support of a few old Latin versions and a few of ancient church writers; and *Variant 2* has

strong support in the Latin, and among a few ancient church writers. Weighing up these 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. 19:7 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. 19:7, "her," 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) 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), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and Ethiopic Versions (the Takla Haymanot, c. 500; and a manuscript of Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9).

Variant 1, which instead of "her" (TR), reads "the wife," is found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions.

Variant 2, which omits "her" (TR), is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Palestinian Version (c. 6th century); Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (Roman edition, 1548-9; Paris, Ethiopic Manuscript no 32; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The split between the two major Alexandrian texts, as per usual, had the effect of splitting the neo-Alexandrians, whose false paradigm places so much focus and emphasis on these two manuscripts connected with the African School of Alexandria. They were secreted in dark corners for centuries and centuries and centuries, before one of them, Codex Vaticanus, was considered by Erasmus just long enough for him to see it was a corrupt text not worthy of any further attention; and then secreted again for centuries in

the Vatican Library, before both its and Codex Sinaiticus's effective "rediscovery" in the nineteenth century by religiously liberal Bible critics. With his beloved Codex Sinaiticus following *Variant 2*, which is of course, *the shorter reading*, and so from the neo-Alexandrian perspective, generally "the better reading," Tischendorf readily embraced *Variant 2* in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). He was followed in this by Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952), who both tripped over each other in order to be seen to be following the father of the Neo-Alexandrian School, Constantine Tischendorf; although they both had footnotes referring to the TR's reading also. But "so what," they may have thought, "after all, does not Tischendorf himself also have a footnote here?" And what about the "external support" for London Sinaiticus in e.g., the Syriac and Ethiopic Versions?

But the United Bibles Societies' Committee of the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions were not so sure. After all, did the reading not look suspiciously like an assimilation with Mark 10:4? (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 47; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 38.) And what about the "external support" for Rome Vaticanus in e.g., the Syriac and Ethiopic Versions? *Surely the TR's reading must be put in the main text.* But then again, How could they be sure? After all, *Variant 2 is the shorter reading*, and so "the better reading"? And what about the "external support" for London Sinaiticus in e.g., the Syriac and Ethiopic Versions? "Why can't those blasted Syriac and Ethiopic Versions all agree with each other!" *Oh the pains and strains of being a neo-Alexandrian!*

How was this problem going to be resolved? The solution pioneered in the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, was to place the TR's reading of "*auten* (her)" in the main text, but to encompass it with square brackets, thus making its inclusion or exclusion entirely optional. But in doing so, the UBS 3rd & 3rd corrected editions Committees, said, "that there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text or the apparatus contains the superior reading." This type of solution appealed to the NU Text Committee of the contemporary NU Text. Thus the reading, "[*auten*]" is also found in the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

At Matt. 19:7, *Variant 2* was followed by the ASV. However, as a part of English translation, it placed "her" in italics, indicating it was "added" by the ASV translators. Using the same technique of italics as the ASV parent, the incorrect reading of *Variant 2* was also followed by NASB (2nd ed. & 3rd ed.); thus departing from the correct reading, followed for the wrong reasons, by the earlier NASB (1st ed.). Though *prima facie* the, TCNT, RSV, NRSV, ESV, TEV, and NIV follow the TR's reading, since these versions do not use italics for added words, who is to say that in fact they are not following *Variant 2*, and simply adding in "her" as part of English translation, like e.g., the ASV does with italics? Do the TCNT, RSV, NRSV, ESV, TEV, and NIV follow the TR's reading or *Variant 2*? We do not know. We cannot know. And nor can their benighted followers who use these highly unreliable versions.

An alternative solution, more clearly designed to endorse *Variant 2* against the

TR's reading, is found in the TEV, NEB, REB, Moffatt Bible, and Romish JB and NJB. This was to omit the words, "and (*kai*) to put away (*apolusai*)" altogether. Think of it, *by omitting two Greek words (kai + apolusai), these neo-Alexandrians wanted to make the point that they did not think Codex Sinaiticus had omitted one Greek word (auten)*. If these neo-Alexandrians have such a low view of Scripture, that they think nothing of omitting two Greek words to suit their fancy, why do they maintain that one of their Alexandrian forbears would not omit one Greek word to suit his fancy? Thus amidst such inconsistencies, e.g., the Moffatt Bible reads, "Then why did Moses lay it down that we were to divorce by giving a separation-notice?"

And here we see both a similarity and a further difference between the old Latin Papists of the pre-Vatican II Council, and the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the post-Vatican II Council. Both old and new Papists supported *Variant 2* at Matt. 19:7 in united opposition against the hated *Textus Receptus*, which when translated in a tongue understandable by the people, had in the words of the King James Version's Preface, "given such a blow unto that man of sin, as will not be healed." But the old Latin Papists had a higher regard for accuracy in translation of their Latin text. Hence their Douay-Rheims Version reads, "and to put away?" By contrast, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists have a lower regard for accuracy in translation of their Greek text. Hence their Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles omit two Greek words, in order to signify that they thought one Greek word, "her" had been added by Rome Vaticanus, and so not omitted by London Sinaiticus.

In the Bible, absolute patriarchal structures are required for the offices of the church's immediate structures (I Tim. 2:8-3:12) e.g., in an Anglican context, bishops, priests, and deacons; or in a Presbyterian context, ruling and teaching elders, and deacons. And whereas patriarchy is based in the creation (Gen. 2:21-23; I Cor. 11:8,9; 14:34-37; I Tim. 2:13) and the fall (Gen. 3:16; I Tim. 2:14), it follows that patriarchal structures transcend any cultural values of the day, so that the natural order of God's law requires the more general structures of patriarchy in a society (Isa. 3:12; Titus 2:4,5). Nevertheless, for the rare and unusual purposes of necessity, *genuinely and not artificially arrived at*, a woman may from time to time be a crowned queen, as was (in approximately equivalent terms,) Deborah who ruled jointly with Barak (Judges 5 & 6; Heb.11:32). And so too we read of "a man of Ethiopia, an eunuch, of great authority under Candace queen of the Ethiopians, who had the charge of all her treasure" (Acts 8:27). Now on the basis that a daughter only becomes a crowned queen if she has no brothers, and that if she has children then her eldest son becomes next king, the requirement of necessity has been made out for the British Crown, which from the 16th century has in relatively rare instances admitted such a crowned queen. But in doing so, in harmony with Holy Scripture, "we give not to our princes the ministering either of God's Word or of the Sacraments" (Article 37, Anglican *39 Articles*).

Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth I (Regnal Years: 1558-1603), Queen of the Kingdoms of England and Ireland, was Supreme Governor of the *Church of England* and *Church of Ireland*. This Protestant monarch is referred to in the King James Version's Preface as, "that bright Occidental Star, Queen Elizabeth, of most happy memory."

When she had inscribed on her royal coat of arms, her personal motto, “*semper eadem*,” meaning, “always the same,” she did so with a basic and fundamental integrity of person, as a good Anglican Protestant Christian. By contrast, when the Roman Church falsely claims, as she loves to do, that she too is, “*semper (always) eadem (the same)*,” we see the fundamentally farcical nature of this claim in e.g., the many variations we find between the old Latin Papists’ Douay-Rheims Version and the new neo-Alexandrian Papists’ Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles.

Matt. 19:9b “except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks.

It is notable that in this context of divorce, our Lord makes reference to original sin (Ps. 51:5; Rom. 5:12-14; 7:17,18,22,23) and original righteousness (Eccl. 7:29). He says, “from the beginning,” i.e., with Adam and Eve (Gen. 2:21-25), “it was not so” that man had “hardness of ... hearts” (Matt. 19:8). Our Lord thus relates divorce to the fact that whereas before the fall man had a sinless human nature, after the fall, man has a sinful human nature (Christ except, Heb. 4:15; I Peter 1:19, who came as the second Adam, Rom. 5:17-19; I Cor. 15:22,45,49, overcoming where the first Adam failed).

While the teaching of the Fall is Biblical, being found in both the OT and NT, the origins of the term, “the fall,” to describe it, comes from the Apocrypha. Though it is a sad and tragic verse, I think of it with e.g., man’s sinfulness and man’s mortality. When e.g., I think of a man no longer being in his younger years (0-39 years), nor middle aged (40-64 years), but in old age (65 years plus); or I think of sickness or death or what sin has done, I tend to think of this verse. “O thou Adam, wast hast thou done? For though it was thou that sinned, thou art not fallen alone, but we all that come from thee.” “*O thou Adam, what hast thou done?*”! (II Esdras 7:48, Apocrypha).

Our Lord draws attention to original sin in the divorce context. On the one hand, it is true that in the Book of Malachi we read of the matrimonial divorce cause of cruelty (Mal. 2:15,16; such “violence” here ends the sexual relationship, and since it so terminates conjugal rights it makes the one guilty of cruelty also guilty of passive adultery i.e., one form of “fornication,” Matt. 5:32; 19:9; I Cor. 7:2-5). But on the other hand, the Book of Malachi also says, “the Lord ... hateth putting away” (Mal.2:16) i.e., *the Lord hates divorce*. Thus whilst it is true that, e.g., a woman who deserts her husband thereby terminates conjugal rights, and so is guilty of passive adultery (i.e., one form of “fornication,” Matt. 5:32; 19:9; I Cor. 7:2-5,15), so that such a woman can be said to have “played the whore against” her husband (Judg. 19:2), the reality is that *the Lord hates divorce*. The Bible permits divorce with remarriage providing it is for such weighty matrimonial causes as adultery, desertion, or cruelty. (Although as further discussed, *infra*, Protestants historically disagree on the full range of divorce causes, e.g., some allowing it only for adultery; others only for adultery or desertion.) Nevertheless, *the Lord hates divorce*. It only comes about due to the “hardness of ... hearts” (Matt. 19:8) resulting from the Fall. “*O thou Adam, what hast thou done?*”!

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Bishop Gregory was a Bishop of Rome (590-604), before there were any Popes of Rome (Boniface III, Bishop of Rome, 607; First Pope, 607). In a partial quote, Gregory uses the words, “*excepta* (excepting) *causa* (on account of) *fornicationis* (fornication),” and Migne attributes this to “Matth. xix” verse “9.” *Prima facie* this could also be citing Matt. 5:32, but contextually Gregory connects this to the words of Matt. 19:6, quoting these just before, “*Quae* (What) *Deus* (God) *conjunxit* (hath joined together), *homo* (man) *non* (not) *separet* (let put asunder)” i.e., “What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.” Thus I agree with Migne that this is a partial quote of Matt. 19:9, following on from Bishop Gregory’s citation of Matt. 19:6, and so I cite it, *infra*.

The Second Matter. At Matt. 6:18, Lectionary 2378 reads (at p. 56b) after a normal size “*tō* (the),” in very small writing extending out from its *c.* 5 cm or 2 inch column to the right another *c.* 2 cm or ¾ inch, the words (omitting reference to the bars on top of words indicating abbreviations), “*pri* (= *patri*, ‘Father’) *s* (with an abbreviated *ou* on top = *sou*, ‘of thee’) *ō* (with a ‘t’ on top = *tō*, ‘the [one]’ = ‘he which’ = ‘which’) *en* (in) *kru* (with an abbreviated ‘*pt*^’ on top = *kruptō*, ‘secret’),” then on the next line, still in the same half-size small writing, “*ς* (an abbreviation meaning ‘*kai*,’ ‘and’) *o* (the) *pter* (= *pater*, ‘Father’) *s* (with an abbreviated *ou* on top = *sou*, ‘of thee’) *o* (with a ‘t’ on top = *to*, ‘the [one]’ = ‘he which’ = ‘which’) *ble* (with an abbreviation on top, ‘*p*’ on top of which a half semi-circle arch, “^” = *blepon*, ‘seeing’)” then back to normal size writing, “*en* (in) *tō* (-) *kruptō* (secret)” etc. . It would appear that some words were first omitted, then scratched out, and these words written in half-size letters were made to fit in the space up to where the scribe had already written this “*en* (in) *tō* (-) *kruptō* (secret).”

This type of thing may be important for understanding some larger paper fades, such as those discussed for Matt. 9:19b at, “Was *Variant 2* an accidental change?,” *infra*; or for Matt. 9:19:c, at “Alternatively, was *Variant 2* a paper fade?,” *infra*. I.e., if e.g., words so written to the right of the margin, such as at Matt. 6:18 in Lectionary 2378, “*ō* (with a ‘t’ on top = ‘which’) *en* (in) *kru* (with an abbreviated ‘*pt*^’ on top = ‘secret’),” were lost in a paper fade, and a sentence still made sense without them, then they could easily pass as an undetected paper fade by a subsequent copyist. Or if the sentence did not still make sense, a scribe may then attempt a “reconstruction” of the text.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:9b, the TR’s Greek, “*me* (‘not,’ here meaning, ‘except’) *epi* (for) *porneia* (fornication), *kai* (and) *gamese* (he shall marry) *allen* (another), *moichatai* (he committeth adultery)” i.e., (with “it be” in italics showing it as added by the translators,) “except *it be* for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery” (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, with variant spelling variants, “*pornia*” and “*moichate*⁴⁵,” and omitting “*kai*”), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also found as Latin, “*nisi* (except) *ob* (for) *fornicationem* (fornication), *et* (and) *aliam* (another) *duxerit* (he shall marry), *moechatur* (he committeth adultery),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century) and old Latin Version 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 further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379); and ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420). It is also supported as a partial quote, “*excepta* (excepting) *causa* (on account of) *fornicationis* (fornication),” by the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, *Variant 1* reads Greek, “*parektos* (saving for) *logou* (the cause) *porneias* (of fornication), *poiei* (he causeth) *auten* (her) *moicheuthenai* (to commit adultery)” i.e., “saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 547 (13th century). It is further found as Latin, “*excepta* (except) *causa* (for the cause of) *fornicationis* (of fornication), *facit* (he causeth) *eam* (her) *moechari* (to commit adultery),” in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, reads Greek, “*parektos* (saving for) *logou* (the cause) *porneias* (of fornication), *kai* (and) *game \bar{s} e* (he shall marry) *allen* (another), *moichatai* (he committeth adultery)” i.e., “saving for the cause of fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionaries 1016 (12th century) and 184 (1319 A.D.), together with Minuscule 1016 (13th century). It is further found in a multiplicity of different Latin forms, in 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), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation, and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writer, Speculum (d. 5th century).

Yet another reading, *Variant 3*, reads Greek, “*m \bar{e}* (except) *epi* (for) *porneia* (fornication), *poiei* (he causeth) *auten* (her) *moicheuthenai* (to commit adultery)” i.e., (with “it be” added in for translation purposes,) “except [it be] for fornication, causeth her to commit adultery.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in N 022 (6th century).

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental change? Following a paper fade / loss of the 34 Greek letters of “*m \bar{e}* (‘not,’ here meaning, ‘except’) *epi* (for) *porneia* (fornication), *kai*

⁴⁵ See Commentary Vol. 2, at Matt. 16:8b.

(and) *game \bar{s} e* (he shall marry) *allen* (another), *moichatai* (he committeth adultery)” (TR); did a scribe “reconstruct” the missing words “from context,” by supplying in the 40 Greek letters of Matt. 5:32, which like *Variant 1* also reads, “*parektos* (saving for) *logou* (the cause) *porneias* (of fornication), *poiei* (he causeth) *auten* (her) *moicheuthenai* (to commit adultery)”?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, deliberately set about to create “a gospel harmony” between Matt. 5:32 and Matt. 19:9b, by changing the words of Matt. 19:9b to the same as those of Matt. 5:32, *supra*?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental change? Following a paper fade / loss of the 12 Greek letters of “*me* (except) *epi* (for) *porneia* (fornication),” did a scribe “reconstruct” the missing words “from context,” by supplying in the 21 Greek letters of Matt. 5:32, which like *Variant 2* also reads, “*parektos* (saving for) *logou* (the cause) *porneias* (of fornication)”? If so, did the originally lost words come at the end of a line on the end of a page, so that the scribe thought he had more room left than he actually did? If so this may still require a large paper space till the next page. Nevertheless, one cannot assume a sufficiently high level of scribal competence existed to see that in this particular instance this was improbable. (See “The Second Matter,” in “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” *supra*.)

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change? Did a scribe, deliberately set about to create “a gospel harmony” between Matt. 5:32 and Matt. 19:9b, by changing the words of Matt. 19:9b to the same as those of Matt. 5:32, *supra*?

Was *Variant 3* an accidental change? Following a paper fade / loss of the 22 Greek letters of “*kai* (and) *game \bar{s} e* (he shall marry) *allen* (another), *moichatai* (he committeth adultery)” (TR); did a scribe “reconstruct” the missing words “from context,” by supplying in the 19 Greek letters of Matt. 5:32, which like *Variant 3* also reads, “*poiei* (he causeth) *auten* (her) *moicheuthenai* (to commit adultery)”?

Was *Variant 3* a deliberate change? Did a scribe, deliberately set about to create “a gospel harmony” between Matt. 5:32 and Matt. 19:9b, by changing the words of Matt. 19:9b to the same as those of Matt. 5:32, *supra*?

With respect to the possibility of either accidental or deliberate changes for *Variants 2 & 3*, it is also possible that scribes consulted the faulty Origen reading, rather than Matt. 5:32 directly. If the later *Variant 2* Latin translation of Origen accurately reflects the earlier work of Origen, and this is by no means sure, as it was possibly modified to *Variant 2* by the Latin translator, did Origen in fact generate two variants here? Even assuming Origen did not originate *Variant 2*, it still follows that Origen who created *Variant 1*, may or may not also be responsible for the confusion resulting in the subsequent *Variants 2 & 3* i.e., depending on whether or not the scribes of *Variants 2 & 3* did or did not consult Origen’s *Variant 1* reading.

Were these deliberate or accidental changes? To what extent, if any, was

Origen's *Variant 1* responsible for subsequent scribes coming up with *Variants 2 & 3*? We do not know the answers to these questions. But we do know that *Variants 1, 2, & 3* were changes to the original Received Text, preserved for us at Matt. 19:9b in the representative Byzantine Greek Text.

The TR's reading at Matt. 19:9b has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine text against which there is no good textual argument. It also has impressive support in the Latin with St. Jerome's Vulgate. It has the further support of the ancient church fathers and doctors, St. Basil the Great and St. Jerome. By contrast, none of the three variants has much support in the Greek text, and *Variant 3* is very poorly attested to. But *Variant 1* has the support of a couple of ancient church writers, although one of these is Origen, a writer who must always be used with great caution; and *Variant 2* has the support of both a few ancient writers, although once again one of these is possibly Origen, and also some strong Latin textual support dating from ancient times. Weighing up these considerations, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, strongly tips the rating in favour of the *Textus Receptus's* reading when one further considers its support in not only the Latin Vulgate, but also the citations of both the Eastern Doctor, St. Basil in the Greek, and the Western Doctor, St. Jerome in the Latin. Therefore, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 19:9b 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. 19:9b, "except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (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), 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: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9). It is also found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), in the similar reading of Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic as Latin, "*sine* (without) *fornicatione* (fornication), *et* (and) *aliam* (another) *duxerit* (he shall marry), *exponit* (he exposes) *eam* (her) *adulterio* (to adultery)" i.e., "without fornication, and shall marry another, exposes her to adultery."

Variant 1, "saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is

further found in (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (8th century) and Minuscule 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); Ethiopic Version (Takla Haymanot, c. 500); and Slavic Version (9th century).

Variant 2, “saving for the cause of fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery,” is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in Minuscule 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 also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century).

Though they all contained footnotes referring to *Variant 1* (Rome Vaticanus), partly for the right reasons (recognizing that *Variant 1* was a likely assimilation to Matt. 5:32), and partly for the wrong reasons (following London Sinaiticus), the right reading of the TR was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Thus at Matt. 19:9b, the correct reading is found in the ASV as, “except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery.” However not wanting to entirely dismiss *Variant 1*, an ASV footnote says, “Some ancient authorities read ‘saving for the cause of fornication, maketh her an adulteress,’ as in ch[apter] 5:32.” A similar footnote using this ASV format is found in the NASB (1st ed.), RSV, NRSV, ESV. By contrast, the correct reading at Matt. 19:9b, without any footnote alternative, was adopted by the TCNT, NASB (2nd ed. & 3rd ed.), and NIV. E.g., the TCNT reads, “except on the ground of her unchastity, and marries another women, is guilty of adultery.”

A footnote here at Matt. 19:9b in the Popish *Jerusalem Bible* (1966), tries not to explain Matt. 19:9b, but rather, tries to *explain it away*. I.e., it seeks to uphold the Romish doctrine of marital indissolubility. It refers in negative terms to the Protestant view that Matt. 19:9b means adultery, although seeks to claim that if this were the meaning, a more narrow term would be used than the Greek, *porneia*, namely, the Greek *moicheia*. But all to no avail. For the reason why such a wide word as Greek *porneia* is used, is clearly to include *more than adultery*. E.g., if a man marries a woman, and then finds she is e.g., two or three months pregnant at the time of their marriage, he would in the normal cause of events be entitled to divorce her for *fornication* rather than adultery. This was the type of basis that St. Joseph intended to divorce St. Mary for, until it was supernaturally revealed to him in a vision from God that his wife was in fact still a virgin, “for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost” (Matt. 1:18-25 cf. Deut. 22:13-21; 24:1).

If the Romish view found in the *Jerusalem Bible* of marital indissolubility were correct, then God could never have divorced the Jews (Isa. 50:1) and made the Christian Church his wife (Eph. 5:31,32). Recognition of marital dissolubility with remarriage of

Biblical divorcees is an element of Reformation Protestantism doctrine⁴⁶.

While the Anglican *Ecclesiastical Canons* of 1597 and 1603 indicate divorce was allowed; Archbishop Whitgift (like Hermes) sought to reintroduce marital indissolubility in *Foljambe's case* (1601). By contrast the law followed Bishop Cozens' view (like Basil the Great) that the Matthean divorce provisions (Matt. 19:9) allow divorce only for adultery. In the parliamentary debates over divorce up to the 1857 Divorce Act (before that time each divorce under the law of England required an Act of Parliament), Cozens' view consistently triumphed over Whitgift's view and was incorporated into the 1857 Act. One group within this school understands the NT to mean divorce with remarriage requires both sexual "uncleanness" and "hate" (Deut. 24:1,3). If a woman commits adultery, it is considered both elements are present. If a man commits adultery, it is considered the second element of hate may be absent, so on a wife's petition there must be adultery with aggravated enormity e.g., (depending on interpreter) adultery in the form of polygamy (Gen. 4:19; 7:13; Matt. 19:9; Titus 1:6; I Tim. 3:1,2), adultery in the form of incest (Lev. 18:6; I Cor. 5:1), adultery in the form of miscegenation (Gen. 6:2,4; Dan. 2:43,44; Matt. 24:37-39; Acts 15:20; I Cor. 7:18-20 cf. I Macc. 1:15, *Apocrypha*), adultery in the form of sodomy (Gen. 19:5; Rom. 1:26,27; I Cor. 6:9; I Tim. 1:10), or adultery coupled with cruelty, or adultery coupled with desertion. Another group within this school considers simple adultery should be allowed on either spouse's petition, and this became English law in 1923.

Another school, argued by e.g., the Reformer Beza, was historically the law of Scotland (administered by courts) till 1938. This considers the NT allows divorce for sexual "uncleanness" or "hate" (Deut. 24:1,3) in the form of simple adultery (Matt. 19:9) or desertion (I Cor. 7:15). Beza considered desertion a form of passive adultery (Judg. 19:2), and in Scottish law desertion required a writ for the restitution of conjugal rights from 1573 till 1861.

There are internal revised variations in this school. E.g., one revised variation limits desertion to the desertion of an unbeliever i.e., if two unbelievers are married, and one converts, if the non-converted partner wants to desert and end the marriage, then that is permissible. But *no other desertion* ever results in marital dissolubility.

Another revised variation considers divorce is limited to "cases of unrepentant and continued adultery," rather than adultery *per se*. It further limits desertion in I Cor. 7:15, to "the departure of an unbelieving spouse." But an *unbeliever's desertion* in I Cor. 7:15 is then qualified by Matt. 18:17, so that, "If a person is in chronic sin, and they are disciplined in the church," then "to be treated as a tax collector and an outcast" "in Matt. 18," means that if they desert, the innocent Christian "person would be free to

⁴⁶ Much of what I say here may be found in my letter, "The Myth of the Anglican Indissolutist View," *English Churchman*, 29 Nov. & 6 Dec. 2002, p. 2. Cf. my comments at Matt. 5:32b (Commentary Volume 1).

remarry⁴⁷.” Since Matt. 18:16 can be used for such things as e.g., marital cruelty, habitual drunkenness, or a crime leading to imprisonment, providing the guilty party does not want to remain married, the Christian party can divorce for a variety of weighty causes once the church excommunicates the guilty party.

A third view argued by Thomas Cranmer, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, (like Justinian⁴⁸) considers the NT allows divorce for sexual “uncleanness,” or “hate,” and gives a wider interpretation to a constructive death (Deut. 24:1,2). Thus “fornication” (AV) or “unchastity” TCNT (Matt. 19:9) refers to any weighty cause attacking the sanctity of marriage, e.g., a deserting wife has thus “played the whore” (Judg. 19:2). Thus adultery *manifests* e.g., uncleanness (Jer. 3:8; Matt. 19:9), and desertion *manifests* e.g., hate (Judg. 19:2; I Cor. 7:15). But other weighty causes also *manifest* hate e.g., in marriage the man and woman “shall be one flesh” (Gen. 2:24), “but he that is cruel troubleth his own flesh” (Prov. 11:17), so that cruelty also constitutes a divorce cause (Mal. 2:14-16). Cranmer’s views existed at the beginning of the Reformation in his *Reformed Laws*, but then being replaced by other views, did not re-emerge in English law till 1937 and Scottish law till 1938.

In our sexually immoral age all such Protestant divorce schools have now disappeared from UK and Australian law with the coming of libertine divorce laws clearly condemned by Jesus in Matt. 19. But all these schools allow divorce and remarriage. Dan. 11:37 and I Tim. 4:1,3, remind us that the Roman Church’s teaching of both celibate religious orders and also marital indissolubility with its associated denial of remarriage to Biblical divorcees are teachings that come from the Devil and not God, and are some of the traits exposing the Church of Rome as the Church of Antichrist.

My own views are broadly the same as those of Thomas Cranmer, i.e., divorce for a series of weighty causes. I consider any divorce cause must be for a weighty cause in which marital “hate” (Deut. 24:3) occasions “uncleanness” (Deut. 24:1) in the form of active or passive adultery (Matt. 5:32; 19:9). For in Matt. 5:32, though it is the man who

⁴⁷ The contemporary Baptist Minister and Radio Evangelist, John MacArthur of California, advocates this view. MacArthur, J., *Different By Design*, Chariot Victor Publishing, Colorado, USA, 1994, p. 64; MacArthur, J., *Divorce & Remarriage*, Grace To You, P.O. Box 4000, Panorama City, California, 91412, USA, 2001, pp. 2-4; “John MacArthur Takes the Hot Seat” (cassette), Grace To You, Kent, England, UK, 2003.

⁴⁸ Justinian was an Eastern / Byzantine Roman Emperor (Regnal years: 527-265). In broad-brush terms, Justinian’s Divorce Code exhibits the same type of principles as Cranmer’s *Reformed Laws* i.e., divorce for a series of weighty causes. The historical impact of Justinian’s Divorce Laws on the Eastern Orthodox Churches, has been that in broad-brush terms they support the same type of divorce i.e., for weighty causes, that one finds among Protestants who agree with Cranmer’s *Reformed Laws* or English *Matrimonial Causes Act* of 1937 (repealed in 1973). In this context I further note that the footnote at Matt. 19:9 in the Roman Catholic Jerusalem Bible, is specifically critical of both Protestant *and* Eastern Orthodox belief that adultery is a divorce cause.

“causeth her to commit” passive “adultery” through her denial of conjugal rights, it is clear that it is the man who is guilty of the matrimonial offence that occasions this.

E.g., cruelty (Mal. 2:13-16) has the effect of putting the innocent party in such fear of the other, as to *induce*, and so be responsible for, *passive adultery* i.e., a termination of sexual relations. Since the person engaging in cruelty is responsible for a situation in which the intimacy of sexual relations becomes entirely inappropriate, that person is guilty of *causing passive adultery* and so may be lawfully divorced. For example, the health distress to a man from his wife engaging in lesbian acts may result in a termination of any desire on his part to have conjugal relations with her (of which she may or may not be willing to undertake). Indeed, this type of nexus was to some extent recognized in the case of *Spicer v. Spicer* [1954], which held that lesbianism may constitute cruelty (husband’s petition)⁴⁹.

So likewise, a person who deserts the matrimonial home is guilty of a form of passive adultery (Judg. 19:2) i.e., a denial of conjugal rights. This type of nexus was recognized in Scottish law which from the late 16th to late 19th centuries, required that wilful desertion for four years be followed by a judicial order for the restitution of conjugal rights, which if not restored, then constituted a divorce cause.

Nevertheless, all cases in which it is said the conduct of the guilty party induced passive adultery in the innocent partner (Matt. 5:32), or constituted passive adultery in the guilty party (Judg. 19:2), must be carefully scrutinized. If there is no such clear and obvious matrimonial causes as e.g., cruelty or desertion, and a party wilfully refuses to engage in conjugal relations, then that party is the one guilty of causing passive adultery (I Cor. 7:2-5; Matt. 5:32), and so that party may be lawfully divorced as the guilty party. Of course, conjugal relations may be properly refused during a woman’s monthly sickness cycle (Lev. 20:18), for even pagan peoples should know by natural law that to so discover a woman’s fountain of blood is immoral (Lev. 18:19,24-30).

Amidst this type of diversity of opinions among the orthodox with respect to

⁴⁹ Finding a legal definition of lesbian sodomy for the purposes of characterizing it as some form of active adultery is fraught with difficulties. By contrast, legally showing that the wife has as a consequence of her lesbian relationships engaged in marital cruelty to her husband, (who no longer wishes to engage in marital relations with her and is seeking a divorce,) is a more easily managed matter in legal terms. Cf. the UK *Royal Commissioners’ Report, 1955* which was concerned with “the difficulty of getting a workable definition,” and issues of “proof” for lesbianism. By contrast, they considered a ground of “cruelty” could be made out “where her husband’s health was affected” (*Royal Commission on Marriage & Divorce*, also known as the Morton Report, Report 1951-1955, Presented to the Westminster Parliament 1956, Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, London, England, UK, 1968, p. 31; referring to *Gardiner v. Gardiner*, [1947] 1 *All England Law Reports* 630; *Spicer v. Spicer*, [1954] 1 *Weekly Law Reports* 1051).

matrimonial causes for divorce and remarriage, it is important to *remember our unity as Protestants*. *On the one hand, we Protestants take seriously the teaching that marriage SHOULD be for life. We are agreed that cheap “at pleasure” divorce or “no fault” divorce or lax divorce laws, e.g., the Family Law Act (1975, Australia) which has “no fault” divorce after 12 months separation, is immoral and the very type of thing that our Lord so clearly condemned in Matt. 5:31,32; Matt. 19:9. We repudiate the type of thing found in Mohammedanism, where the man simply has to say to his wife, “I divorce thee” three times, and the marriage is over.*

But on the other hand, we Protestants are agreed that divorce with remarriage is allowed for weighty matrimonial causes. Such is the case of simple adultery by the woman (husband’s petition); and adultery with aggravated enormity by the man (wife’s petition), i.e., where the adultery is coupled with adultery or cruelty, or where the adultery is of a particularly obnoxious kind e.g., incest, sodomy, or a man who commits adultery against his wife by raping another women. E.g., we agree that it is wrong for a man to commit adultery in the form of bigamy (I Cor. 7:2; I Tim. 3:2; Titus 1:6). For instance, the case of a man who covertly marries a second woman under an assumed name, runs two separate households, has children in both, and deceives both wives as to the non-existence of the other, by moving between houses on the pretext of undertaking certain “business trips” from time to time. Upon his discovery and exposure, the second marriage being declared bigamous and void, we Protestants agree that the first wife may lawfully seek a divorce for adultery with aggravated enormity in the form of bigamy.

We Protestant Christians thus agree on the big principles of upholding the ideal of marriage for life by limiting divorce to weighty matrimonial causes, but nevertheless maintaining marital dissolubility with permissible remarriage for Biblically sound divorcees. We Protestants thus further agree that the Roman Catholic doctrine of marital indissolubility is wrong. Therefore, the Papist refusal to remarry e.g., a man who divorces his wife for adultery, or a woman who divorces her husband after he incestuously interferes with their daughter, is an example of “forbidding to marry” that manifests the “doctrines of devils” (I Tim. 4:1,3). Hence the Popish teaching of marital indissolubility is one of the hallmarks of the great apostasy (II Thess. 2:3)⁵⁰.

In addition to the historic Protestant opposition to easy divorce as seen in our repudiation of Mohammedan teaching, and also historic Protestant opposition to marital indissolubility as seen in our repudiation of Popish teaching, there is another important area of agreement that we Christians of the Holy Protestant Faith hold to with respect to

⁵⁰ In saying this, I do not wish to thereby deny that “forbidding to marry” (I Tim. 4:3) also includes the Romanist’s over extended prohibited degrees of “incest,” and the Romanist’s prohibition on marriage to those in religious orders. Indeed, specifically referring to such enforced celibacy, Holy Daniel says the Papal Antichrist will not “regard ... the desire of women” (Dan. 11:37). (Of course, while God calls most Christians to marriage, he gives the gift of continency to a small percentage, and this is a different thing altogether, since even a person with the gift of continency is able to marry, and if he wishes to he can, but he is not compelled to. I Cor. 7; 9:5)

these words of our Lord, “Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery” (Matt. 19:9). Specifically, Christ does not here say, “and shall marry another, *engages in lawful polygamy*,” but rather, and shall marry another, *committeth adultery*.” I.e., Christ here reintroduces the earlier antediluvian ban on polygamy (Gen. 2:24; 4:19; 7:13), and makes monogamy a Christian principle. Thus for the Christian, the seventh and tenth precepts of the Ten Commandments, are understood to uphold monogamy (Exod. 20:14,17)⁵¹. Christ here thus makes a modification to the Holy Decalogue applicable in Christian times, which thing he also did to the Fourth Precept (Exod. 20:8-11) when he rose on “the first of the week (*sabbaton*)” or “the first of the sabbaths (*sabbaton*)” (Matt. 28:1), thereby making the first Easter Sunday the first of many Sunday Sabbaths⁵². This is seen in e.g., our historic Protestant Christian opposition to the polygamy allowed in Mohammedanism.

Therefore, for we Christians of the Holy Protestant Faith who uphold an infallible Bible, the Matthean marriage and divorce teachings of Matt. 5:31,32; 19:9, have been an important Biblical basis for our doctrine and practice with regard to Christian marriage. With them, we have e.g., defended the Biblical teaching of monogamy and marital dissolubility with remarriage for weighty matrimonial causes, against both Papists and Mohammedans, and in more recent historical times, against libertines.

⁵¹ Compare Christ’s reintroduction of the earlier antediluvian ban on polygamy (Matt. 19:9), with his reintroduction of the earlier antediluvian ban on miscegenation (Matt. 24:37-39; cf. Gen. 6:1-4); even though like polygamy (Exod. 21:9-11; Deut. 21:15-17), a small amount of assimilation via inter-racial marriage had been allowed in later OT times (Ruth 1:1; 4:18-22; Matt. 1:5 n.b., the genealogy of Matt. 1:5 spans about 350-400 years from the time of the Conquest to King David, and so it here omits 3 or 4 generations of bastardy for Rahab, see Gen. 24:2-4; 28:1,2; Deut. 5:9; and about 10 generations of bastardy for Ruth, see Deut. 23:3). But a careful reading of Scripture also shows, that when such polygamy and small scale miscegenation was allowed, it always caused problems and was undesirable. (Even in these later OT times, generalized miscegenation threatening the racial integrity of the population group was banned e.g., Ezra 9 & 10, is concerned with both the religious and racial integrity of Israel.)

⁵² Only we Protestants who have proceeded to the second stage of the Reformation on this matter regard Sunday as the Sabbath. Others who remain at the first or Lutheran stage of the Reformation on this matter, regard Sunday as a day of Christian assembly and worship, but not as a Sabbath day. Though Col. 2:16 indicates that Jewish Christians maintained an option of keeping the Jewish liturgical year as part of their cultural heritage, of which St. Paul is an example (Acts 16:13; 20:6,16); the keeping of such Jewish days was prohibited to Gentile Christians (Gal. 4:10,11). But because Gentile Christians kept Sunday (Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2), a Christianized form of remembering the Christian Pentecost Sunday of Acts 2 (as opposed to keeping the Jewish feast of Pentecost, Lev. 23:15-21; Deut. 16:9-12), might be kept (Whit-Sunday, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662), since the events of Pentecost Sunday (Acts 2:1) are an early example of Sunday sacredness among Christians, who e.g., kept the “Lord’s day” (Ps. 118:24; Acts 4:10,11; Rev. 1:10) on the Sunday after the resurrection (John 20:26).

Matt. 19:9c “and whoso marrieth her which is put away
doth commit adultery” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. In Lectionary 1968 from Cyprus, the TR’s “*apolelumenen* ([her] having being put away),” is misspelt with an “*ē* (eta, η),” substituted for the “*u* (upsilon, υ),” i.e., as “*apolelemenēn*.” We cannot doubt that the “*u*” is an irreducible part of the declension here of *apoluo* as a participle⁵³. Given that both the shape and style of the eta is the same as e.g., on the line above for the final eta of “*game^{se}* (he shall marry)” (Matt. 19:9b), it is not reasonably possibly to simply characterize this as “a poorly formed ‘u’.”

The fact that other nearby words do not substitute “*ē*” for “*u*” e.g., “*umin* (‘unto you’)” (Matt. 19:9) or “*legousin* (‘they say’ = ‘say’)” (Matt. 19:10), *prima facie* indicates that this is not a local dialect change to Cypriote pronunciations of Greek. While I am prepared to revise this *prima facie* finding if I receive information to the contrary, on the evidence presently available to me, this is not a local dialect change, and so not a deliberate alteration. It is thus accidental i.e., the eta appears to be a spelling mistake.

How might this have originated? There is small gap both after the “*l*” (lambda) and before the “*m*” (mu) of “*apolelumenēn*.” Was the scribe in some way momentarily distracted at this point? If so, “the sky’s the limit” as to what this might have been. E.g., did he look up from his writing desk, and while thinking about the cool sea breezes on the beaches of sunny Mediterranean Cyprus, vaguely write down the “*n*,” look back down, and with greater concentration then keep going? Or as someone walked in and started talking to him, did he write “*ē*” without thinking as he looked up (e.g., the person’s name, or subject matter, might have started with, or contained a number of eta’s, which subconsciously made him think of this letter), and then as he was still talking to them, did he finish off the word, say “Farwell” to his friend, and keep writing?

Whatever the origins of this spelling mistake, I consider the reading of Lectionary 1968 clearly supports the TR’s reading, *infra*.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting).

Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex. It follows the Vulgate in reading Matt. 5:32 at Diatessaron chapter 29, “*et (and) qui (whoso) dimissam* ([her] having being put away) *duxerit* (he shall marry), *adulterat* (he commits adultery),” i.e., “and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth

⁵³ Mounce’s *Analytical Lexicon to the Greek NT* (1993), pp. 44 (perfect middle / passive participle; declensions same as 2nd declension adjectives, p. 10), 93 (*apoluo*).

commit adultery.” It also follows the Vulgate in reading Matt. 19:9c at Diatessaron chapter 100, “*et (and) qui (whoso) dimissam ([her] having being put away) duxerit (he shall marry), moechatur (he commits adultery),*” i.e., “and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.” In my opinion, both the repetition of these two Vulgate verses in their different respective contexts, and the lack of assimilation to either “*adulterat (he commits adultery)*” (Matt. 5:32, Vulgate) or “*moechatur (he commits adultery)*” (Matt. 19:9c, Vulgate), indicates that these are independently derived from the Vulgate, and not assimilated to each other. Therefore I show the Sangallensis Diatessaron supporting the TR’s reading, *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, a similar set of dynamics in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, shows the Arabic Diatessaron at chapter 8 with Matt. 5:32; and at chapter 15 with Matt. 19:9c. Thus once again, I show the Arabic Diatessaron supporting the TR’s reading, *infra*.

Without consultation of the Arabic, a tongue of which I have no knowledge, it remains possible that the reading might be said to support *Variant 1*. But even if this is so, it still supports the TR in broad terms. Moreover, readings outside the closed class of sources are of no importance or consequence for the purposes of determining the NT text anyway. At most, we look at them only for the purposes of interest, or to better understand the type of sources the neo-Alexandrians consult. E.g., on the one hand, the Arabic Diatessaron is included in the textual apparatuses of Von Soden (1913) (not that his textual theory receives neo-Alexandrian endorsement), and the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions; but on the other hand, no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron in the textual apparatuses of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993). It seems the Arabic Diatessaron interests some neo-Alexandrians, but not others. And so too, it may interest some neo-Byzantines, but not others. But either way, the Arabic Diatessaron is ultimately of no consequence to we neo-Byzantines for the purposes of composing the Received Text.

The Third Matter. My knowledge of various translations outside the closed class of sources, such as the Bohairic Version, comes from various Greek NT textual apparatuses, e.g., UBS. As to how they distinguish between the TR and *Variant 1* in e.g., the Bohairic Version, I do not know. But in the final analysis, whether they are right or wrong on this matter does not really matter. That is because for we neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus*, those manuscripts outside the closed class of sources have no impact on the NT Greek Text. At best, we are somewhat indifferent about such versions, and like the Alexandrian and Western Texts, the primary reason why attention is paid to them in this commentary is so as to better represent the confused and deceived thinking processes of the neo-Alexandrian mind, which places a much higher value on them e.g., as “external support” where they agree with the Alexandrian Text.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:9c, the TR's Greek, “*kai* (and) *o* (‘the [one], masculine gender⁵⁴ = ‘he’) *apolelumenen* (‘[her] having being put away,’ feminine gender⁵⁵) *gamesas* (‘marrieth,’ masculine singular nominative, active aorist participle, from *gameo*) *moichatai* (he commits adultery),” i.e., “and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century), F 09 (*Codex Boreelianus*, 9th century), G 012 (*Codex Boernerianus*, 9th century), H 013 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century); 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), 597 (13th century), 1292 (13th century, Byzantine outside of the General Epistles), and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, *Sidneiensis Universitatis*) and 1968 (1544 A.D., *Sidneiensis Universitatis*; see “The First Matter,” *supra*). It is also found as Latin, “*et* (and) *qui* (whoso) *dimissam* ([her] having being put away,’ feminine gender⁵⁶) *duxerit* (he shall marry)⁵⁷, *moechatur* (he commits adultery),” i.e., “and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery,” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century, with the “*qui*” after, rather than before, “*dimissam*”), aur (7th 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 in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation, Basil the Great (d. 379), and Cyril (d. 444); and ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

However another reading, *Variant 1*, though supporting most of TR’s reading, reads Greek, “*gamon* (‘marrying’ = ‘marrieth,’ masculine singular nominative, active present participle, from *gameo*),” instead of “*gamesas* (marrieth)” The reading, Greek, “*kai* (and) *o* (he) *apolelumenen* ([her] having being put away) *gamon* (‘marrying’ = ‘marries’) *moschate* (he commits adultery),” i.e., “and whoso married her which is put away doth commit adultery,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), and O 023 (6th century). It is also found in Minuscules 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels) and 1010 (12th century); and Lectionaries 547 (13th century) and 184 (1319 A.D.). It is further found in the ancient church Latin writer, Speculum (d. 5th century).

⁵⁴ Masculine singular nominative, definite article, from *o*.

⁵⁵ Feminine singular accusative, perfect passive participle, from *apoluo*.

⁵⁶ *Dimissam* (having been put / sent away) = *dis* (‘away,’ a prefix) + *missam* (‘having been sent,’ here with the contextual meaning, ‘having been put,’ feminine singular accusative, perfect passive participle, from *mitto*).

⁵⁷ Compare Matt. 19:9b, where Greek, “*gamese*” in “*gamese* (‘he shall marry,’ subjunctive active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *gameo*) *allen* (another),” is rendered by Latin, “*duxerit* (‘he shall marry,’ subjunctive active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *duco*),” in the Vulgate.

Another reading, *Variant 2*, omits these words. This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionaries 845 (9th century), 253 (1020 A.D.), 305 (12th century), and 1074 (1290 A.D.); as well as Minuscule 2 (12th century). It is further omitted in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is also omitted by 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 variants are conjectural.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental alteration? Due to a paper fade / loss possibly coming at the end of a line, did the original “*gamesas* (marrieth)” come to look something like, “*gam:::*”? If so, did a scribe “reconstruct” this “from context” as “*gamon* (‘marrying’ = ‘marrieth’)”? In doing so, did the scribe make reference to the “*gamon* (‘marrying’ = ‘marrieth’)” of Luke 16:18?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe deliberately set about to create “greater harmonization” between Matt. 19:9c and Luke 16:18 by assimilating the “*gamon* (‘marrying’ = ‘marrieth’)” of Luke 16:18 in the place of the “*gamesas* (marrieth)” of Matt. 19:9c?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration? In the reading, “*me* (‘not’ = ‘except’) *epi* (for) *porneia* (fornication), *kai* (and) *gamese* (he shall marry) *allen* (another), *moichatai* (he committeth adultery), *kai* (and) *o* (he) *apolelumenen* ([her] having being put away’) *gamesas* (marrieth) *moichatai* (he commits adultery);” we see that there is a repetition of “*moichatai* (he committeth adultery).” In *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), the first “*moichatai*” is on one line, and the second “*moichatai*” is on the second line, with the “m” (mu) of the second “*moichatai*” starting under the “o” (omicron) of the first “*moichatai*.” Thus these omitted words can be clearly written in about one line. Did a scribe looking at a manuscript similar to *Codex Freerianus*, perhaps in which the first and second “*moichatai*” were exactly in parallel on two lines, inadvertently move his eye down a line after writing the first “*moichatai*” to the second “*moichatai*,” thus omitting these words, and then keep writing?

Alternatively, was *Variant 2* a paper fade? (See “The Third Matter,” in “Preliminary Remarks,” Matt. 19:9b.)

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe deliberately omit these words due to a theological objection by e.g., one who claimed it was “pastorally impracticable” or “undesirable” to apply Matt. 19:9c? If, as it seems likely the scribe was Origen, did he add in his “justification” something like, “after all, in the end everybody is saved, so why should be enforcing such harsh strictures on them?”

E.g., “what of the case of unbelievers in such a marriage who convert? Are we to say that because their pre-existing marriage is adulterous that it must be put to an end?”

The type of pressure that this can create is e.g., seen by the fact that some apostate missionaries in polygamous countries, have tried to justify the continuation of polygamous marriages which are adulterous against the man's first wife on these type of so called, "practical" reasons. The truth is there is nothing ever right about immorality and vice. This is seen in the Biblical example of St. John the Baptist, who "had said unto Herod, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife" (Mark 6:18); which godly example was followed by Thomas Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who said unto Henry, It is not lawful for thee to have thy brother's wife.

The Pope had allowed incest between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon by a "papal dispensation." Let the reader imagine a royal court scene, in which the Protestants stand on Henry VIII's right hand, and the Papists on his left hand. Hear the papist advisors saying to King Henry VIII something like, "Great indeed, Your Majesty, is the power of the Pope. For he can set aside the very law of God itself, and grant a papal dispensation to allow, (with a growing smile on their faces,) *a little bit of incest.*" Hear the Protestants responding to the Papists (with a frown on their faces,) something like, "*A little but of incest! Not a chance, fella!*" And then turning (in a dignified fashion) to the King, saying something like, "Your Majesty, no man, no church council, and no Pope, can set aside the law of God as set forth in the Infallible Bible."

King Henry VIII (Regnal Years: King of England 1508-47, Lord of Ireland 1508-1541, King of Ireland 1541-47,) was not a perfect man. But under him, the *Church of England* and *Church of Ireland* was progressively reformed in stages, culminating with his complete embrace of Protestantism at his death-bed. This was the seed-plot for the further reform of the Anglican Church under his son, Edward VI (Regnal Years: King of England and Ireland, 1547-1553), who was a godly reformer, like the Biblical King Josiah (II Kgs 22:1,2). Both kings worked profitably with Thomas Cranmer, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury.

King Henry VIII got orientated in the right direction when he took a stand on the issue of *Biblical authority not Papal authority*, in his decision to terminate the incestuous union he had with his deceased brother's wife, Catherine of Aragon. From that point on, things started to move in the right direction, albeit while hastening slowly to the right goal. So likewise, we need to be orientated in the right direction and stand firm on the Biblical principle, "whoso marrieth he which is put away doth commit adultery" (Matt. 19:9). Unless a person has been divorced for a Biblically sound matrimonial cause, then they are not divorced in God's eyes and God's law. In an age of "at pleasure" divorce or "no fault divorce," we cannot doubt that many divorces that are made under the civil laws, do not meet the necessary criteria of any of the three established Protestant divorce codes (see commentary at Matt. 19:9b, *supra*), i.e., divorce for adultery (e.g., Cozens), divorce for adultery or desertion (e.g., Beza), or divorce for a variety of weighty causes such as adultery, desertion, or cruelty (e.g., Cranmer).

Let us ensure that we stand firm on this issue. Not sanctioning the cheap "no fault" divorces that are now so common, but ensuring that all things be done in accordance with God's Word. For what saith our Lord? "Whoso marrieth her which is

put away doth commit adultery” (Matt. 19:9). And what saith the seventh commandment? “Thou shalt not commit adultery” (Matt. 19:18; citing Exod. 20:14). God’s law as set forth *par excellence* in The Ten Commandments is our moral guide, not man’s corrupt and dirty laws that e.g., sanction adultery. May God give us the grace to stand unreservedly, unapologetically, and unflinchingly for the laws he sets forth in the Holy Decalogue. That includes this protection of the seventh and tenth precepts, with these words, “Whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery” (Matt. 19:9).

Were these variants brought about by deliberate or accidental changes to the text at Matt. 19:9c? We do not know. But we do know that they constitute changes and that is the most important thing to know.

The TR’s reading has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument, and strong support in the Latin with St. Jerome’s Vulgate and several old Latin Versions. It also has the support of e.g., both the Greek church father and doctor, St. Basil the Great, and the Latin church father and doctor, St. Jerome. By contrast, the two variants support is nowhere near as impressive, although *Variant 2* has some strong support in the Latin textual tradition. Weighing up these factors, and with respect to the Latin support for *Variant 2* bearing in mind the superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 19:9c 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. 19:9c, “Whoso marrieth (*game~~s~~as*) her which is put away doth commit adultery,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is also found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 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 Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Versions (c. 500; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

Variant 1, “Whoso marrieth (*gamon*) her which is put away doth commit adultery,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th 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) and 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere); 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* (but not 828, which follows *Variant 2*), which contain

Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (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); and the Slavic (Slavonic) Version (9th century).

Variant 2, which omits reference to the TR's words altogether, is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, 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 L 019 (8th century) and (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century); as well as Minuscules 828 (12th century, independent) and 1241 (12th century, independent in the Gospels). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) and Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century), and a manuscript of the Coptic Bohairic Version.

With the two leading Alexandrian texts split, the neo-Alexandrians textual critics decided to follow their circular rule, "the shorter reading is the better reading," and so *Variant 2* was adopted by the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 19:9c.

But some of the neo-Alexandrian translators were not so sure. Three readings were followed by them at Matt. 19:9c.

After all, does not Rome Vaticanus have some "good external support" in e.g., the "Caesarean" Text (Armenian Version) and Ethiopic? Hence for the wrong reasons, the ASV (*Reading 1*) included the correct reading in their main text at Matt. 19:9c, "and he that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery" (ASV). But an ASV footnote then says of *Variant 2*, that these "words," "are omitted by some ancient authorities" (ASV ftn). Reversing this order, the RSV follows *Variant 2* in the main text, but places the TR's reading in a footnote (*Reading 2*). The *Reading 2* format was also followed in the NRSV, ESV, and NEB. By contrast (*Reading 3*), *Variant 2* is followed with no footnote reference to the TR's reading in the NASB, NIV, REB, TEV, TCNT, and Moffatt Bible.

There is thus confusion among the neo-Alexandrian versions as to what to do here at Matt. 19:9c. This is further confounded by the Roman Catholic switch-around or double-cross it has played on its faithful devotees. For whereas the Douay-Rheims Version, following the correct Latin of the Vulgate reads, "and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery" (Douay-Rheims); by contrast, both the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bible entirely omit these words on the format of *Reading 2, supra*.

From whence cometh all this neo-Alexandrian confusion here at Matt. 19:9c? From whence cometh the shut down and turn around decision of the Papists, as they shut closed their Douay-Rheims Versions and turn around to open up their Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles? It is certainly not from God. "For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints" (I Cor. 14:33). For those seeking this Divine promise of "peace," they will find it here at Matt. 19:9c in the *Textus Receptus* and Authorized (King James) Version reading. *Thanks be to God!*

Matt. 19:10 “His disciples” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek, “*autou* (‘of him’ = ‘his’),” in the words, “*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (of him),” i.e., “His disciples,” are 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 Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, “*eius* (‘of him’ = ‘his’),” 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), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (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 in the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

However, a variant omitting Greek, “*autou* (his),” and so reading simply “*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples),” is found in the medieval church Greek writer, John of Damascus (d. before 754). It is further found in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is also found in the ancient church Latin writers, Juvencus (d. 4th century), Jerome (d. 420), and Speculum (d. 5th century).

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

Was this an accidental change? In Manuscript Washington (W 032), the “*autou* (his)” is followed in continuous script by, “*Ei* (If) *outos* (so),” in which the first line reads, “*autoueiou*” and the second line reads, “*tos*” etc. . Did a scribe, vaguely remembering in his head he was up to “*autou*,” first read forward, and then as his eye came back along the line to the approximate spot that he knew he was up to, perhaps following some distraction, seeing the “*eiou*” become befuddled in his perhaps fatigued mind, remembering he was up to “something *ou*” at this point, and so quickly writing down, “*eiou*” etc., come to accidentally omit “*autou* (his)”? Alas, the quality of scribes sometimes left something to be desired.

Alternatively, was the “*autou* (his)” lost in an undetected paper fade? If so, it probably came at the end of a line, and was possibly “squeezed in” with smaller lettering at the end.

Was this a deliberate change? Looking at the words, “*Legousin* (They say) *auto* (unto him) *oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (of him),” i.e., “His disciples say unto him” (AV), did a scribe consider that because of the word, “*auto* (unto him),” it was “unnecessary” and “redundant” to include “*autou* (of him),” since Christ had already been identified? Did a scribe thus deliberately prune away “*autou* (his)” as “unnecessary wordage” in “a stylistic improvement” of the text?

A deliberate of accidental change? We simply do not know. But we do know

that the variant was a change to the text.

The TR's reading has solid support in the Greek and Latin textual traditions, and the further support of the church father and doctor, St. Austin. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 19:10 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. 19:10, "His disciples," 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 the independent, but Byzantine influenced,) Codex 078 (Matt. 17-18, 19; Luke 18:14-25; John 4:52-5:8; 20:17-26; 6th 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 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 Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (c. 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century), some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Version (c. 500); Slavic Version (9th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the variant that omits "His" and so reads, "The disciples," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century), and a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version.

With the support of the two main Alexandrian texts, the variant was adopted by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). But with what, from the neo-Alexandrian paradigm, is the wide "external

support” for the TR’s reading, the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions and contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993) were not so sure. They all placed “*autou* (his),” in square brackets, making its usage or non-usage entirely optional. To this, the UBS 3rd and 3rd corrected editions Committee said, “there is a considerable degree of doubt” about which is “the superior reading;” and the UBS 4th revised edition Committee i.e., the contemporary NU Text Committee said, “the Committee had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text.”

At Matt. 19:10, the variant was adopted by the ASV which reads, “The disciples.” So too, the erroneous variant was followed by the NASB, RSV, ESV, NIV, NEB, REB, TCNT, and Moffatt Bible. By contrast, for partly the wrong reasons (“external support”), and partly the correct reasons (concern at the likelihood of Alexandrian pruning of the text here), the correct reading of the TR was adopted by the NRSV and TEV.

On the one hand, following the correct Latin of the Vulgate *et al* here at Matt. 19:10, the old Latin Papists correctly rendered this in their Douay-Rheims Version as “His disciples.” By contrast, following the incorrect and corrupted Greek reading of the two main Alexandrian texts, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists incorrectly omitted “his” in their Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles. How do the Papists explain such inconsistencies? Perhaps their Popish priests might say to an enquiring Parishioner something like this, “Well, ... um, ... ah...., it takes up less paper space if you leave out the ‘his,’ and, ... um, ... ah ..., that helps save the number of trees used for paper.”

Matt. 19:11 “this saying” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek, “*ton* (the) *logon* (word) *touton* (this),” i.e., “this saying” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, “*verbum* (word) *istud* (this),” 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), l (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 as Latin, “*verbum* (word) *hoc* (this),” in old Latin Version d (5th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Basilidians – according to Clement (2nd century), Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215), Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation, Basil the Great (d. 379), and Theodoret of Cyrus (d. 460); the ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 407), pseudo-Cyprian (d. 4th century), Ambrose (d. 397), Jerome (d. 420), Augustine (d. 430), and Speculum (d. 5th century); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a variant omitting, Greek, “*touton* (this),” and so reading simply, “*ton*

(the) *logon* (word),” i.e., “the saying,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 184 (1319 A.D.). It is further found in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Apollinaris of Laodicea (d. c. 390), and Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428); and ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 407) and Jerome (d. 420).

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

Was this an accidental alteration? Looking at the words, “*ton* (the) *logon* (word) *touton* (this),” there are three words in a row ending in “*on*,” and this potentially creates a tricky ellipsis net. Did the eye of a scribe, possibly working by night in the flickering light of a candle, jump by ellipsis from the “*on*” ending of “*logon*” to the “*on*” ending of “*touton*”, thereby omitting “*touton*”?

Was this a deliberate alteration? Contextually, “this saying” must refer to Matt. 19:9, since this is the last statement made by our Lord. However, did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, conclude that Jesus here makes a number of statements, i.e., one at Matt. 19:4-6, another at Matt. 19:8, and another at Matt. 19:9, so that there was “some ambiguity” as to what was meant by “this saying”? If so, did Origen then prune away “*touton* (‘this,’ masculine singular accusative pronoun, from *outos*),” as “a stylistic improvement” allowing “greater flexibility” in “the proper understanding of what is really meant here”?

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

The TR’s reading has rock solid support in both the Greek and Latin textual traditions. It enjoys the further support of a number of ancient church writers including e.g., the church doctors, St. Basil, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine; as well as the early mediaeval church doctor, St. Gregory the Great. By contrast, the variant has fairly scant support in the Greek and Latin textual traditions. Interestingly, both the church fathers St. Cyprian and St. Jerome make reference to both the *Textus Receptus* reading and the variant, although the fact that St. Jerome follows the TR’s reading in his Vulgate clearly indicates his preference for it. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 19:11 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. 19:11, “this saying,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); together with 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 the independent, but Byzantine influenced,) Codex 078 (6th century), (the independent text type) Codex 0233 (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) as a margin reading, 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 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Slavic Version (9th century); a manuscript of the Ethiopic Version (Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect reading, which omits "this," and reads, "the saying," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is further found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) as the main text reading, and Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere). It is also found in the Syriac Palestinian Version (c. 6th century); a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and the Ethiopic Version (Roman edition, 1548-9).

The split in the Alexandrian texts baffled and befuddled the neo-Alexandrians.

Following London Sinaiticus, for the wrong reasons, the correct reading was adopted by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952). After all, on neo-Alexandrian principles, is there not good "external support" for Codex Sinaiticus here? And might not, as Metzger suggests, the word have been deleted so as to expand the possible orbit of "the saying" to both the disciples words of Matt. 19:10, or to Matt. 19:4-9 corporately?⁵⁸

Following Rome Vaticanus, the variant was followed by Westcott-Hort (1881). After all, from the neo-Alexandrian paradigm, is there not some good "external support" for Codex Vaticanus here? And is not there a presumption in favour of "the shorter reading" as "the better reading" on the circular logic that scribes are more likely to add

⁵⁸ Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, pp. 48-9; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 39. *Prima facie*, I regard this as an improbable suggestion since I think the fact that Jesus is talking, makes it more likely that one of a number of earlier sayings of Christ in Matt. 19:4-9 are being separated. Nevertheless, we cannot be sure about such matters due to the differences of perception amongst men, and if Metzger here thought of such a dichotomy, it remains possible that so did some prunist scribe.

than subtract from the text?

Caught between the circular merry-go-round logic that on the one hand, the more there are of unreliable texts outside the closed class of sources, (and any inside the closed class of sources,) that support one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, the more likely the reading is (i.e., the TR's reading is to be preferred per Tischendorf); and on the other hand, the circular merry-go-round logic that scribes are more likely to add than subtract from the text (i.e., the variant reading is to be preferred per Westcott-Hort); some neo-Alexandrians started to get a bit dizzy. "Stop the merry-go-round before I get sick," they blurted out, before producing the verbal vomit of the contemporary NU Text with its head-twirling dizzy and giddy justification in Metzger's *Textual Commentary* (1971, pp. 48-9; 2nd ed., 1994, p. 39). Thus the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) places "*touton* (this)," in square brackets, making its inclusion or exclusion entirely optional.

What were the neo-Alexandrian translators to do with all this textual instability? Some neo-Alexandrians thought Codex Sinaiticus was right, and so for the wrong reasons, the right reading was adopted by the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. Others may have thought Codex Vaticanus was right, with the variant arguably then being adopted by the NEB and REB, as well as the Papist's JB and NJB, although the translation vagaries of all four versions' "dynamic equivalents," mean one cannot be entirely certain which reading they preferred. Perhaps such ambiguity by the NEB, REB, JB, and NJB was deliberate, and reflected textual uncertainty in their own minds, as they reeled back'n'forth with dizzy heads from "the merry-go-round" ride, *supra*? Because these are all such loose and liberal translations, we cannot be entirely sure what they meant, and nor can their benighted devotees. Perhaps the NEB, REB, JB, and NJB might rename themselves as, the "Uncertain Bugle Sound" or "UBS" (I Cor. 14:8)?

Matt. 19:14 "But Jesus said" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex, and it *prima facie* follows the variant found in the Vulgate, since it reads, "*Ihesus* (Jesus) *vero* (but) *ait* (said) *eis* (unto them)." However, at Mark 10:14 the Vulgate includes, "*illis* (unto those [ones])." It is therefore possible that as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting, the "*illis* (unto those [ones])" of Mark 10:14 was introduced to Matt. 19:14, and altered to "*eis* (unto them)," something like the way this Codex alters "*Iesus*" to "*Ihesus*." If so, this is a more significant change than simply a spelling variant of Jesus' name; and possibly this is not what happened at all. Nevertheless, amidst such vagaries, at least on this occasion, I have decided to make no reference to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:14, the TR's Greek, "*o* (-) *de* (But) *Iesous* (Jesus) *eipen* (said)," i.e., "But Jesus said" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text, e.g., Sigma 042 (late

5th / 6th century). It is also supported as Latin, “*Iesus (Jesus) vero (but) ait (said)*,” in old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and as Latin, “*Iesus (Jesus) autem (but) ait (said)*,” in old Latin Versions q (6th / 7th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is further found as the most probable reading of the ancient church Greek writer, Clement of Alexandria (d. before 215) where stylistic and contextual factors do not permit complete certainty.

However, a variant adding Greek, “*autois (unto them)*” after “*eipen (he said)*,” i.e., “But Jesus said unto them,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codices W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53) and M 021 (9th century). It is further found as Latin, “*Iesus (Jesus) vero (but) ait (said) eis (unto them)*,” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further found as Latin, “*Iesus (Jesus) vero (but) ait (said) illis (unto those [ones])*,” in old Latin Version g1 (8th / 9th century); as Latin, “*Iesus (Jesus) autem (but) ait (said) illis (unto those [ones])*,” in old Latin Version f (6th century); as Latin, “*Iesus (Jesus) autem (but) dixit (said) eis (unto them)*,” in old Latin Version d (5th century); as Latin, “*Iesus (Jesus) vero (but) dixit (said) eis (unto them)*,” in old Latin Version aur (7th century); and as Latin, “*Iesus (Jesus) vero (but) ait (told) eos (them)*,” in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century) and 1 (7th / 8th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

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 alteration? Did a first scribe, writing out Matt. 19:13,14, “... *epetimesan (rebuked) autois (them), o (-) de (But) Iesous (Jesus) eipen (said)*,” first accidentally omit “*autois (them)*,” and then, after writing out “*o (-) de (But) Iesous (Jesus) eipen (said)*,” suddenly realizing his error, without carefully thinking about what he was doing, then carelessly “add it back in” after “*eipen (said)*”? If so, did then a later second scribe, detecting the error of this manuscript with its omission of “*autois (them)*” after “*epetimesan (rebuked)*,” reinsert the missing “*autois (them)*,” but then wrongly conclude that the absence of the second “*autois (unto them)*” after “*eipen (said)*,” in his other manuscript was the result of some earlier paper fade, with the consequence that he retained this addition from the first scribe’s hand? If so, was this second scribe also influenced in his decision by the further presence of “*autois (unto them)*” at Matt. 19:15?

Was this a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe, seeking a “gospel harmonization” with Mark 10:14, simply assimilate the “*autois (unto them)*” from Mark 10:14?

A deliberate or accidental alteration? We cannot be sure, since the relevant details are lost in a historical dark age in which such details were not kept. Nevertheless, a wise God has ensured that we can be sure that this was a change to the text, since there is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine Greek reading.

On the one hand, the TR’s reading has solid support in the Greek, and both good and ancient support in the Latin, together with the probable further support of an ancient

church writer. But on the other hand, the variant has both good and ancient support in the Latin, together with the further support of an ancient church writer. Balancing out these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual 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. 19:14 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. 19:14, "But Jesus said," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is further found in the (independent text type the independent, but Byzantine influenced,) Codex 078 (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), 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); 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 some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and Armenian Version (5th century).

However, the variant which adds, "unto them," and so reads, "But Jesus said unto them," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, 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 mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in all extant Syriac Versions, e.g., the Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions, a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The split between the two major Alexandrian texts caused some confusion and consternation among the neo-Alexandrians. On the one hand, the variant was followed by Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72). After all, from the flawed neo-Alexandrian perspective, does not Codex Sinaiticus have "good external support"? But on the other hand, for the wrong reasons, the correct reading of the TR was followed by Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993). After all, from a neo-Alexandrian perspective, "Is this not a typical assimilation" (with Mark 10:14); with some "good external support" for Codex Vaticanus?

The pull of “the shorter text as the better text,” acted to ensure that for the wrong reasons, most neo-Alexandrian versions adopted the correct reading here at Matt. 19:14. E.g., the ASV reads, “But Jesus said.” The correct reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. But the pull of such “external support” for Codex Sinaiticus as e.g., all extant Syriac versions, *and* the Bohairic Version, *and* the Latin Vulgate, proved too strong a temptation for some neo-Alexandrians to resist. Thus the variant is adopted by the NEB and Moffatt. E.g., Moffatt reads, “but Jesus said to them” (Moffatt Bible).

“I say,” good Christian reader, the annals of Neo-Byzantine School battles record that we neo-Byzantines have drawn blood here at Matt. 19:14, afore. In former times, before the Vatican II Council, we fought the old Latin Papists of the Douay-Rheims Version, which in following both the Vulgate and Clementine, reads, “But Jesus said to them” (Douay-Rheims). In fairness to the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post Vatican II times, we find that the translators of the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles, now in effect look shamefacedly to the ground, and say, “Our infallible Roman Church which is ‘always the same,’ and which forbade under threats of excommunication that any changes should be made to the Sixtinam Vulgate of 1590, but which two years later then made about 5,000 changes to the Sixtinam Vulgate in the Clementine Vulgate of 1592, also got it wrong here at Matt. 19:14 in the Clementine Vulgate.” In fairness to such Papists, given that the Roman Church has thus shown itself to be constantly duplicitous, there is a sense in which it is, in the Latin, “*semper eadem* (always the same).”

Matt. 19:16b “Good Master” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Latin Vulgate reads at Matt. 19:16b, Mark 10:17, and Luke 18:18, “*Magister* (‘Master,’ singular masculine vocative noun, from *magister*) *bone* (‘Good,’ singular masculine vocative adjective, from *bonus*).” The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex and reads, “*Magister* (Master) *bonoe* (‘Good,’ variant spelling, internally ‘*oe*’ may equate ‘*e*’).” Due to Diatessaron formatting, we cannot be sure from which of these three synoptic gospels, or which combination thereof in the Vulgate, the Sangallensis Diatessaron got, “Good (*bone* / *bonoe*),” from. Therefore, inside the closed class of sources, no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:16b, the TR’s Greek, “*agathe* (Good),” in the words, “*Didaskale* (Master / Teacher⁵⁹) *agathe* (Good),” i.e., “Good Master,” is supported by the majority

⁵⁹ Reflecting this AV English sense of the word, “master,” a school teacher is called a schoolmaster e.g., Cassian of Imola, (Bologna, Italy,) is referred to as, “St. Cassian, a schoolmaster and martyr, whom his own scholars [or students], ... tormented with the pricking or stabbing in of their ... brazen pens ..., and so by a thousand wounds

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, “*Magister* (Master / Teacher) *bone* (Good),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (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, Marcus the Gnostic according to Irenaeus (d. 2nd century), Justin Martyr (d. c. 165), Origen (d. 254), Basil the Great (d. 379), Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386), and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the ancient church Latin writers, Juvencus (d. 4th century) and Jerome (d. 420).

However, a variant omits, “Good (Greek, *Didaskale*; Latin, *bone*),” and so reads only, “Master.” This is a minority Byzantine reading, found in Lectionary 5 (10th century) and Minuscule 1010 (12th century). It is further found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

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

Was this an accidental change? Was this lost in ellipsis as the eye of a scribe jumped from the “*e*” (epsilon) endings of “*Didaskale agathe*”? Or was the “*agathe*” lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was this a deliberate change? We here have evidence of the TR’s reading from two ancient writers before Origen, and then Origen refers to both readings. The probable originator of this variant is Origen. As further discussed at Matt. 19:17a, Origen also appears to be the originator of another alteration, removing reference to “God.” Significantly, this intact passage teaches the Divinity of Christ, since having been addressed as, “Good Master,” our Lord then says, “why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God.” I.e., Christ here is asking why he is called “Good” if he is not “God”? As further discussed at Matt. 19:7, this young man has a serious problem in his disregard of the First Commandment, “I am the Lord thy God.” “Thou shalt have no other gods before me” (Exod. 20:2,3; cf. Matt. 6:24; Col. 3:5).

Thus while there are three Divine Persons in the one Being of God, this passage at

... most cruelly slew ...,” in Book 2, Homily 2 (Part 2), Article 35, Anglican *39 Articles*. Likewise, in the section entitled, “The Persecution under Julian the Apostate,” *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs* says, “Cassian, a schoolmaster, ... for refusing to sacrifice to idols, was taken before a judge; who being ... informed that many of the boys had an aversion to him on account of his strictness,” were given “permission to murder him. He ... [had] his hands tied behind him,” and with “steel pencils, ... then used in writing, ... at length [was] murdered” in “A.D. 362” (Bramley-Moore’s *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, p. 47).

Matt. 19:16,17 focuses on the unity of the Trinity as “one ... God,” that includes the “good” Son of God as the Second Divine Person of the Trinity. Yet the heretical Origen denied that the Father and Son were “equal” (John 5:18; Philp. 2:6), which thing is quite integral to the proper understanding of the three Divine Persons being “one” (John 10:30; I John 5:7). Rather, Origen claimed the three Divine Persons were unequal, so that he blasphemously claimed the Father was greater than the Son, and the Son greater than the Holy Ghost. The Holy Apostle says of those in such “heresies,” “that they shall not inherit the kingdom of God” (Gal. 5:20,21). Manifesting this Biblical teaching, the very beautiful *Athanasian Creed* says, “... And in this Trinity none is afore, or after other: none is greater, or less than another; but the whole three Persons are co-eternal together: and co-equal. ... This is the catholic (universal) faith: which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved ... Amen.”

Therefore, was the hell-bound heretic, Origen, concerned that the stress in Matt. 19:16,17 on the unity of the Trinity as “one” God, in which the Second Person is called “good” without any qualification, could all too naturally produce a belief in the equality of the Divine Persons? If so, did Origen then set about to alter this passage in both Matt. 19:16b and Matt. 19:17a, so as to remove this focus on Christ’s Divinity and the First Commandment, on the basis that if in this unqualified way Christ is said to be the God of the First Commandment, this requires an equality between the Father and the Son?

Was this a deliberate change, or an accidental change? We cannot be certain, although in this particular instance, when the alteration at Matt. 19:17a is considered in conjunction with this alteration at Matt. 19:16b, I think that on the balance of probabilities this is a deliberate change by the Trinitarian heretic, Origen.

The reading of the TR has strong support in both the Greek and Latin texts, as well as enjoying the support of the ancient church father, St. Justin Martyr; and ancient church fathers and doctors, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and St. Jerome. The variant at Matt. 19:16b, in conjunction with the variant at Matt. 19:17a, *infra*, looks like the type of textual wreck-up that the heretic Origen would set out to accomplish. By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, though some good support in the Latin, and the further support of a couple of ancient church writers. Weighing up these factors, and taking into account the natural superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 19:16b 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. 19:16b, “Good Master,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type) as a margin reading, 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 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 Syriac: Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (c. 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; and Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); a manuscript of the Ethiopic Version (Takla Haymanot); Georgian “2” Version (5th century); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the variant which omits “Good,” and so reads simply, “Master,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); and Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) as the main text reading, and 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere). It is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Georgian “1” Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The incorrect variant entered the NU Text *et al.* Hence at Matt. 19:16b, both the ASV and Moffatt read, “Teacher” (ASV & Moffatt Bible). So too, the erroneous variant is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

The strong presence of the correct reading in the Latin, meant that the old Latin Papists of the pre-Vatican II era, got the correct reading in their Douay-Rheims Version, namely, “Good Master” (Douay-Rheims). By contrast, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the post-Vatican II era, fumbling through the pages of their faulty neo-Alexandrian texts, got the wrong reading, as here at Matt. 19:16b they omitted the word, “Good.”

“I say, I say, I say,” good Christian reader, is the rise of this variant in these neo-Alexandrian texts and versions *de ja vu?* Back in the 16th and 17th centuries, the great neo-Byzantine textual analysts, such as Theodore Beza, knew about aberrant texts, and wanted nothing to do with the Western Greek Text, which here at Matt. 19:16b follows the variant in D 05. E.g., in Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624), no reference is made to this variant. Why? Because the aberrant Western Greek Text which includes it was not thought sufficiently important to mention it.

Then in the 19th century, the neo-Alexandrian Tischendorf thought it important to note that the Ethiopic Version of Dillmann (18th / 19th centuries) followed the variant. But in the changing fads and fancies of neo-Alexandrians, the once favoured Ethiopic Version of Dillmann has now been pushed into an embarrassed obscurity. “Don’t

remind us of the way we used to fall down and fawn over Dillmann,” they shriek; as with reddened faces they add, “Actually, we’ve come to think that the man, Dillmann, was a bit of a dill⁶⁰.”

On the one hand, these later neo-Alexandrians say, “the man, Dillmann, was a bit of dill.” But on the other hand, these later neo-Alexandrians still dote over the founding father of the Neo-Alexandrian School, (Wait for it) ... (Can you hear their drum roll?), ... Constantine Tischendorf! ... (Can you hear the neo-Byzantines calling from the audience, “What a let down!; ... What a let down!!”?). These later neo-Alexandrians still think highly of Tischendorf’s poor quality text, which *at least in part*, was originally influenced here at Matt. 19:16b by “the external support” for this variant’s reading in what Tischendorf called, “Aethiopica,” referred to in his textual apparatus by the symbol, “aeth,” i.e., Dillmann’s Ethiopic Version (18th / 19th centuries). Dillmann might be *persona non grata* with neo-Alexandrians now-a-days⁶¹, but back then, to the neo-Alexandrians he was very much, *persona grata*⁶².

And so it was, that the reading of the variant, first crafted by the heretical hand of Origen, found in the aberrant Alexandrian and Western Texts, and knocked on the head by the neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the *Textus Receptus* in the 16th and 17th centuries; popped up again in the 19th century with the “rediscovery” of the Alexandrian text, together with what at the time was regarded as, “such impressive external support, as Dillmann’s Ethiopic Version.” In ancient times, after Origen’s corruption, the church fathers and doctors, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and St. Jerome, all said a categorical, “No,” to the Matt. 19:16b variant of Origen. In Reformation times, the neo-Byzantine Erasmus said “No” to the Alexandrian Text’s *Codex Vaticanus*; and the neo-Byzantine Beza said a categorical, “No,” to the Western Text’s D 05. And in modern times, we neo-Byzantines all say a categorical, “No,” to the Matt. 19:16b variant of the Alexandrian Text and Dillmann’s Ethiopic Version. It’s a case of, “No, No, No, No!”

Matt. 19:17a “Why callest thou me good? There is none good
but one, that is, God” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex, and it here conflates a mix of readings from the Vulgate forms of Matt. 19:17 and Mark 10:18. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

⁶⁰ “Dill” is colloquialism, found in the Australian *Macquarie Dictionary*, meaning an incompetent person or a fool.

⁶¹ Latin, “*persona non grata*,” meaning, “a person not pleasing” i.e., unwelcome.

⁶² Latin, “*persona grata*,” meaning, “a person pleasing” i.e., welcome.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:17a, the TR's Greek, "Ti (Why) *me* (me) *legeis* (callest thou) *agathon* (good) ; (?) *oudeis* ([There is] 'no-one' or 'none') *agathos* (good), *ei me* (but) *eis* (one), *o* (-) *Theos* ([that is,] God)," i.e., "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God" (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, "Quid (Why) *me* (me) *dicis* (callest thou) *bonum* (good)? *Nemo* ([There is] no-one) *bonus* (good) *nisi* (but) *unus* (one,) *Deus* ([that is,] God)," in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, *Variant 1* reads, Greek, "Ti (Why) *me* (me) *erotas* (thou askest) *peri* (about) *tou* ([what is] the) *agathou* (good) ; (?) *eis* ([There is] One) *estin* ([who] is) *o* (the) *agathos* (good)" i.e., "Why askest thou me about what is good? There is one who is good." This is found in the ancient church writer, Origen (d. 254). It is also found as Latin, "Quid (Why) *me* (me) *interrogas* (thou askest) *de* (about) *bono* ([what is] good)? *Unus* ([There is] One) *est* ([who] is) *bonus* (good)," in old Latin Versions a (4th century) and d (5th century).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, may be reconstructed as Greek, "Ti (Why) *me* (me) *erotas* (thou askest) *peri* (about) *tou* ([what is] the) *agathou* (good) ; (?) *eis* ([There is] One) *estin* ([who] is) *o* (the) *agathos* (good), *o* (-) *Theos* ([that is,] God)," i.e., "Why askest thou me about what is good? There is one who is good, God." This is found as Latin, "Quid (Why) *me* (me) *interrogas* (thou askest) *de* (about) *bono* ([what is] good)? *Unus* ([There is] One) *est* ([who] is) *bonus* (good), *Deus* (God)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th 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 found in the ancient church Latin writers, Novatian (d. after 251) and Jerome (d. 420).

Yet another reading, *Variant 3*, reads, "Ti (Why) *me* (me) *erotas* (thou askest) *peri* (about) *tou* ([what is] the) *agathou* (good) ; (?) *oudeis* ([There is] 'no-one' or 'none') *agathos* (good), *ei me* (but) *eis* (one), *o* (-) *Theos* ([that is,] God)," i.e., "Why askest thou me about what is good? There is none good but one, that is, God." This is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Eusebius (d. 339). It is further found as Latin, "Quid (Why) *me* (me) *interrogas* (thou askest) *de* (about) *bono* ([what is] good)? *Nemo* ([There is] no-one) *bonus* (good) *nisi* (but) *unus* (one,) *Deus* ([that is,] God)," in old Latin Versions h (5th century) and g1 (8th / 9th century). It is also found in the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine text, which must thus stand. The origins of the variants are speculative. Nevertheless, on this occasion I shall stipulate that in my opinion, the originating variant of Origen appears

to have been deliberate. (And although it is at least theoretically possible that the conflations of *Variants 2 & 3* came about as “reconstructions” after substantial paper loss / damage, I again think it more likely that they were deliberate scribal conflations.)

Origen appears to have been the originator of *Variant 1*; and related to this, *Variant 2* is a conflation of the TR’s reading and *Variant 1*, adding the TR’s “*o* (-) *Theos* ([that is,] God),” to the end of *Variant 1*. Likewise, *Variant 3* is a conflation of the TR’s reading and *Variant 1*, combining the first part of *Variant 1*, “*Ti* (Why) *me* (me) *erotas* (thou askest) *peri* (about) *tou* ([what is] the) *agathou* (good) ; (?),” with the last part of the TR’s reading, *oudeis* ([There is] ‘no-one’ or ‘none’) *agathos* (good), *ei me* (but) *eis* (one), *o* (-) *Theos* ([that is,] God).” Thus even though *Variants 2* and *3* went through further corrupting scribes, the erroneous elements of both *Variants 2* and *3* can also be traced to Origen. Origen is thus the principle corrupter responsible for all three variants. On this occasion, I shall thus focus attention only on *Variant 1*.

Was this *Variant 1* a deliberate change by Origen? See comments on Matt. 19:17a at Matt. 19:16b, *supra*. The Scriptures set forth two covenants by which a man may be saved. The covenant of works, was reissued from pre-Fall Adamic times (Gen. 2:17) in the Sinai covenant (Lev. 18:5). Thus if a man perfectly keeps the Ten Commandments he will be saved. The other covenant is the covenant of grace. This requires repentance from sin, as defined most especially by the Ten Commandments, and acceptance of the gift of eternal life through the atoning work of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross (Gal. 1:4; 3:13; 4:4,5; 5:11; 6:14). The covenant of grace has operated as a covenant inside of a number of covenants e.g., it was a covenant inside the Abrahamic covenant (Gal. 3:16,17); although since New Testament times it has been a covenant inside the new covenant (Matt. 26:26-29). Hence there has only ever been one eternal covenant of grace, but it has been administered in different covenants in the Old and New Testaments (Heb. 13:20)⁶³.

The Jews of Jesus day were greatly attracted by the covenant of works, and set about to establish a righteousness based on the law (Gal.1:14; Philp. 3:4-6). So too, the system of Roman Catholicism is based on the covenant of works, although even their professed Decalogue keeping leaves something to be desired, since e.g., veneration of relics is said to reduce one’s time in purgatory, or attendance at a Roman mass, in which they idolatrous adore the wafer-bread, is said to be a good work meriting them credit with God. Thus the vice of idolatry is turned into a “virtue.” And so the Homilies of the Anglican 39 Articles refer to the way the Roman Church hides the Second Commandment from her people in her common summary of the Ten Commandments (and then she splits the tenth commandment in two in order to get “ten” commandments).

But even putting aside such inconsistencies in the Popish usage of the Ten Commandments, there is a fundamental problem with the covenant of works, namely, the

⁶³ See McGrath, G.B. (myself), *English Churchman*, 30 Sept. & 7 Oct. 2005, p. 2.

requirement that “The man that doeth them shall live in them” (Gal. 3:12) sets an impossible standard for us fallen men to keep perfectly. Hence the covenant of works is a dead end. Thus at the time of the Reformation, the great Martin Luther found that the Sinai covenant “gendereth to bondage,” whereas the covenant of grace makes us “free” (Gal. 4:21-31). Why then was the Sinai covenant given? It was given as a “schoolmaster” (school teacher) so that when we realized our utter hopelessness in being justified by works, it would thus “bring us unto Christ, that” by the covenant of grace “we might be justified by faith” (Gal. 3:24; see Gal. 3:21-29). “For by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified” (Gal. 2:16).

Here in Matt. 19, the rich young ruler asks, “what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?” (Matt. 19:16). This is a question as to how he might be justified by good deeds under the covenant of works, given at Sinai. Hence our Lord presents him with the Ten Commandments. “If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He said unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness. Honour they father and mother, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself” (Matt. 19:17-19).

Here now is the rich young ruler’s opportunity to say, “Lord, I have tried. But I am so sinful I just cannot keep them perfectly. As David saith, ‘Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me’. Man now has ‘hardness of heart’ because of the fall, ‘but from the beginning it was not so.’ ‘Lord, be merciful to me a sinner’” (cf. Ps. 51:5; Matt. 19:8; Luke 18:13). Then our Lord could have told him of the covenant of grace, in which he needed to “Repent” (Matt. 4:17), looking in “faith” (Matt. 8:10; 9:22) to him who came “to give his life a ransom for many” (Matt. 20:28). Even he who in the “blood of the new testament” was to “shed” his blood “for the remission of sins” (Matt. 26:28). For Christ’s teaching was the covenant of grace, for he said, “I will have mercy” (Matt. 9:13; 12:7).

Alas, this rich young ruler here lost his opportunity. For his staggeringly inaccurate claim was this, “All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet?” (Matt. 19:20). Here this young man shows that he does not understand the true nature of sin. Now “we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully” (I Tim. 1:8); for “the law entered, that the offence might abound” (Rom. 5:20). The Decalogue is sometimes summarized through reference to Lev. 19:18, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself” (Rom. 13:9). E.g., if a man truly loves his neighbour as himself, he will want him to know about the true God revealed in the First Commandment, and so he will certainly pray for missionary work, and he may give money to certain missions, or he may even be called to give a Christian witness.

Therefore, our Lord, who here refers to this summary of the Decalogue after citing some of its precepts in Matt. 19:18,19, could have spoken to him about his violations of these various Decalogue precepts. But the Lord is a sovereign king. He does his will. Thus to highlight this rich young man’s error, our Lord simply isolates one Decalogue precept, namely, the First Commandment, “I am the Lord thy God.” “Thou shalt have not other gods before me” (Exod. 20:2,3).

Christ first isolated this precept in his question, “Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God” (Matt. 19:17). I.e., Christ here requires the conclusion that he is “God,” since he is truly “good.” But Christ also taught that one should not make a god (first commandment) or idol (second commandment) out of money, saying, “Ye cannot serve God and mammon” (Matt. 6:24). Our Lord now ends where he started with this young man, by pointing him to the First Commandment, and saying, “If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me” (Matt. 19:21).

Now the rich young man has another chance to cry out, “Lord, I can never keep the law perfectly. I cannot keep the First Commandment or any of the Ten Commandments perfectly. These laws show me how sinful I am. They are as a schoolmaster (Gal. 3:24), teaching me that I can never meet God’s standards perfectly, and so merit eternal life. What am I to do? Lord, be merciful to me a sinner.” Alas, this rich young ruler, still thinking the impossible covenant of works was possible, failed to realize that “the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope ...; by the which we draw nigh unto God” (Heb. 7:19), namely, “the just shall live by faith” (Heb. 10:38), for “righteousness ... is by faith” (Heb. 11:7). Thus the rich young ruler “went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions” (Matt. 19:22).

At the nub of this discourse is that fact that Christ is a “Good Master” (Matt. 19:16b), and the words, “why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God” (Matt. 19:17), are Christ here asking why he is called “Good” if he is not “God”? As discussed at Matt. 19:16b, *supra*, Origen is the likely originator of alterations to both of these verses. This appears to have related to his heretical Trinitarian views, in which he denied the equality of the three Divine Persons, specifically here, the equality of the Father and the Son (John 5:18; 10:30; Philp. 2:6; I John 5:7). I.e., the words of Christ, “why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God” (Matt. 19:17), establishes an unqualified claim by Christ to be God, showing no lesser Divinity for the Son than for the Father. It is a statement that Christ is the God of the First Commandment, and so equal in his Divinity with God the Father. But Origen’s denial of the equality of the Father and the Son meant he had a graded Trinity in which the Father was more Divine than the Son, who in turn, was more Divine than the Holy Ghost.

Therefore, did Origen here set about to alter this passage in both Matt. 19:16b and Matt. 19:17a, so as to remove this focus on Christ’s Divinity and the First Commandment, on the basis that if in this unqualified way Christ is said to be the God of the First Commandment, this requires an equality between the Father and the Son?

While we cannot be entirely certain, as stated at Matt. 19:16b, *supra*, when the alteration at Matt. 19:17a is considered in conjunction with this alteration at Matt. 19:16b, I think that on the balance of probabilities this is a deliberate change by the Trinitarian heretic, Origen.

The reading of the Received Text has strong and ancient support in the Greek as

the representative Byzantine text, attested to from ancient times in *Codex Freerianus* (W 032). It has the further support of a couple of old Latin versions; and the impressive support of the church fathers and doctors, St. Basil the Great and St. John Chrysostom. Though all three variants have the support of both old Latin versions and ancient church writers, with most notably, *Variant 2*, being followed by the Vulgate, it is nevertheless clear that *Variants 2 & 3* are confections between the TR and *Variant 1*. The focus must therefore be on *Variant 1*. This *Variant 1* has the support of only a couple of ancient old Latin Versions, and its Greek basis is in Origen. When one then takes into account both the fact that this looks like a typical alteration by Origen for reasons related to his heretical views, and the afore mentioned support for the TR's reading; then bearing in mind the superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 19:17a 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. 19:17a, "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century)⁶⁴. It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 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; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century), and a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; a manuscript of the Ethiopic Version (Takla Haymanot); and Slavic Version (9th century).

Variant 1, "Why askest thou me about what is good? There is one who is good," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century, omitting "eis" / "One," although this is added in by a later "corrector") and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century, omitting "tou" / "the" and "o" / "the" "o" / "the"). It is further found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent, lacking "o" / "the"). It is also found in Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian "1" Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9).

⁶⁴ While the UBS 3rd, 3rd corrected, and 4th revised edition shows (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century) supporting this reading; Swanson shows Delta (Δ) as lacking the "*legeis* (callest thou)." Given this uncertainty, I make no reference to Delta.

Variant 2, Greek, “Why askest thou me about what is good? There is one who is good, God,” is found in the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Georgian “2” Version (5th century).

The incorrect *Variant 1* was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence it is found at Matt. 19:17a in the ASV as, “Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good.” The erroneous *Variant 1* is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

The old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II times, following the Vulgate and Clementine in their Douay-Rheims Version, adopted *Variant 2*, and read, “Why askest thou me concerning good? One is good, God” (Douay-Rheims). By contrast, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II times, adopted *Variant 1* in their Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles. The Douay-Rheims and Clementine was an inaccurate translation relative to the Authorized Version and Received Text, but the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles are even more inaccurate, since they further omit “God.” At Matt. 19:17a, the Papists have thus gone from bad to worse.

In following Origen’s reading of *Variant 1* at Matt. 19:17a, Metzger says of the TR’s reading, “If the ... reading were original in Matthew, it is hard to imagine why copyists would have altered it to a more obscure one, whereas scribal assimilation to Synoptic parallels” he thinks “occurs frequently” (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 2nd ed., 1994, p. 40).

Let the reader here note that in the first instance, Metzger shows a low view of Scripture writers and a high view copyists. For St. Matthew to have written something “obscure” is quite acceptable to his neo-Alexandrian way of thinking; but for a copyist to write something obscure – well, PERISH THE THOUGHT! The neo-Alexandrian sentiment is, “As if a copyist would be so stupid or incompetent,” though “of course, Matthew could well have been so stupid or incompetent.” But in the second instance, Metzger here shows how the neo-Alexandrians have a far too uncritical acceptance of Origen’s writings. Origen was a notorious heretic, and he is well known as one of those “which corrupt the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17).

When we neo-Byzantines read statements by neo-Alexandrians like Metzger at Matt. 19:17a, that “If the ... reading” of the TR “were original in Matthew, it is hard to imagine why copyists would have altered it to a more obscure one,” we find his neo-Alexandrian claims reads like a humorous looking jack-in-the-box springing up into the air at us, or a funny looking stand-up comic strip jumping up into our faces. It’s a good joke / gag line, but we neo-Byzantines could never do anything more than laugh at it. I admit that Metzger’s statement might send a roar of laughter around a Dinner table, as neo-Byzantines discussed it over a glass of red wine, but that would be about as far as it could go. It is certainly not a sustainable claim.

Matt. 19:18 “He saith unto him, Which?” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*legei* ('he saith,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *lego*) *auto* (unto him), *Poias* (Which [ones]) ; (?)," i.e., "He saith unto him, Which?," 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, "*Dicit* ('he saith,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *dico*) *illi* (unto that [one]): *Quae* (Which)?," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century)⁶⁵. From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported as Latin, "*Dicit* (he saith) *ei* (unto him): *Quae* (Which)?," in old Latin Version d (5th century); and as Latin, "*Ait* ('he saith,' indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *aio*) *illi* (unto that [one]): *Quae* (Which)?," in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century).

However, another reading, *Variant 1*, may be reconstructed as Greek, "*Poias* (Which): *eireken* ('he said,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *lego*) *auto* (unto him)," i.e., "Which? He said unto him." This is found as Latin, "*Quae* (Which) *dixit* ('he said,' indicative active perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *dico*) *illi* (unto that [one])?," in old Latin version r1 (7th century, Dublin).

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

Was this an accidental change? Did a Greek scribe, perhaps fatigued, first accidentally omit "*legei* ('he saith,' word 1) *auto* ('unto him,' word 2)," and write "*Poias*; ('Which?' word 3);" and then suddenly realizing his error, write it back in as word order 3,1,2 i.e., "*Poias* ('Which,' word 3) *legei* ('he saith,' word 1) *auto* ('unto him,' word 2)"? Then with "*legei* ('he saith,' word 1)" coming at the end of a line, was there a paper fade in this manuscript line, so that "*legei*" was lost? If so, was this then "reconstructed" by a second later Greek scribe, as "*eireken* (he said)," and then translated into Latin by the scribe in the manuscript line of old Latin r1?

Alternatively, did a Latin scribe, perhaps suffering from a head-cold, first accidentally omit, "*Dicit* ('he saith,' word 1) *illi* ('unto that [one],' word 2)," and write down, "*Quae* ('Which,' word 3)?" and then suddenly realizing his error, write it back in as word order 3,1,2 i.e., "*Quae* ('Which,' word 3)?, *dicit* ('he saith,' word 1) *illi* ('unto that [one],' word 2)"? Was there then a paper fade / loss, in which the middle "c" of "*dicit*" was lost? If so, was this then "reconstructed" by a second later Latin scribe as "*dixit* ('he said *dixit* (he said))"?

Was this a deliberate change by a Greek or Latin scribe? For "stylistic" reasons

⁶⁵ Disagreement between Julicher and Tischendorf as to the reading of old Latin c, means I here make no reference to it.

of “a more direct and lively introduction” of the Greek pronoun, “*Poias*; (Which?),” or the Latin pronoun, “*Quae?* (Which?);” followed by “the more pleasing and poignant usage” of the perfect verbal tense rather than the present verbal tense i.e., Greek “*eireken* (he said)” or Latin “*dixit* (he said),” did such a scribe arrogantly set about to deliberately alter the Received Text reading to that of the variant?

A deliberate or accidental change? We do not know. We only know that such a change was made.

The reading of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) has strong support in both the Greek and Latin, in both instances from ancient times. By contrast, *Variant 1* is found only in one old Latin version from the seventh century. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 19:18 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. 19:18, “He saith unto him, Which?,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); together with 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), 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).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, reads in Ciasca’s Latin, “*Dixit* (he said) *illi* (unto that [one]) *adolescens* (the young man)?, “*Quae* (which) *mandata* (commandments)?” i.e., “The young man said unto him, Which commandments?” This is found in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).”

Yet another reading, *Variant 3*, Greek, “*Poias* (Which): *phesin* (‘he saith,’ indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *phemi*)” i.e., “Which? He saith,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and Minuscule 579 (mixed text, 13th century).

The origins of these two variants are speculative. However, *Variant 2* appears to be a conflation of a form of Matt. 19:18 with “the young man” of Matt. 19:20, brought about as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting. On the one hand, in Ciasca’s Latin translation of the Arabic, this follows the word order of the TR; although this Latin word order by no means necessarily reflects the underpinning Arabic word order. But on the other hand, in Ciasca’s Latin translation of the Arabic, the perfect verbal tense, “*dixit* (he said),” is used. Assuming Ciasca has here made an accurate Latin rendering of the

underpinning Arabic Diatessaron, was this alteration achieved independently of *Variant 1*, or might this indicate some earlier influence of *Variant 1*, as an Arabic scribe sought to “harmonize” by conflation the readings of the TR and *Variant 1*?

Was *Variant 3* an accidental change? Did a scribe, perhaps with a top-dizzy Alexandrian head, first accidentally omit “*legei* (‘he saith,’ word 1) *auto* (‘unto him,’ word 2),” and write “*Poias*; (‘Which?’ word 3);” and then suddenly realizing his error, write it back in as word order 3,1,2 i.e., “*Poias* (‘Which,’ word 3) *legei* (‘he saith,’ word 1) *auto* (‘unto him,’ word 2)”? Then with “*legei* (‘he saith,’ word 1) *auto* (‘unto him,’ word 2),” coming at the end of a line, was there a paper fade in this manuscript line, so that “*legei auto*” was lost? If so, was this then “reconstructed” by a second later vague minded Alexandrian scribe, as “*phesin* (he saith)”?

Was *Variant 3* a deliberate change? For “stylistic” reasons of “a more direct and arresting introduction” of the Greek pronoun, “*Poias*; (Which?),” followed by “the more succinct” “*phesin* (he saith),” which he preferred to “the more flowery,” “*legei* (‘he saith,’ word 1) *auto* (‘unto him,’ word 2),” (and for arbitrary Alexandrian School reasons preferring to use a synonymous declension of *phemi*, rather than a declension of *lego*, for “he saith”), did an Alexandrian scribe deliberately alter the TR’s reading to *Variant 3*? If so, what if any influence on this decision, did *Variant 1* have? There is no necessary correlation between *Variant 1* (inside the closed class of sources) and *Variant 3* (outside the closed class of sources). Are they independent examples of a somewhat similar, though not identical, corruption of the text? Or are *Variants 1 & 3* related to each other; and if so, which came first, *Variant 1* or *Variant 3*?

With the two leading Alexandrian texts in disagreement with each other, probably influenced by the “outside support” of the Byzantine, Latin, and Western Texts, for largely the wrong reasons, i.e., neo-Alexandrian School principles, the correct reading of the TR was adopted by Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle’s 21st edition (1952) and contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993). However, Westcott-Hort, Nestle’s 21st edition, and Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition, all give footnote alternatives to *Variant 3*.

By contrast, probably influenced by the idea that the shorter reading is “the better reading,” and the notion that the less likely or harder reading is “more likely to be correct” (a curious neo-Alexandrian rule which assumes imperfections in the text of Scripture are “improved upon” by scribes, thus showing a low view of Bible writers and a high view of copyist scribes), i.e., neo-Alexandrian School principles; and of course, in Tischendorf’s case, the fact that by more general neo-Alexandrian standards, he was overly influenced in such matter by his known favouritism for his “darling” Codex Sinaiticus which he discovered; we find that *Variant 3*, was adopted in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72).

Divisions within the Neo-Alexandrian School thus ran deep on this reading at Matt. 19:18. And as often occurs when the two leading Alexandrian texts are in disagreement, neo-Alexandrian rules are pulled this way and that by different neo-

Alexandrians, so as to achieve different results with regard to “the preferred reading.” This neo-Alexandrian confusion is also found in the neo-Alexandrian versions that now plague us. On the one hand, at Matt. 19:18 the correct reading is found in the American Standard Version as, “He saith unto him, Which?” (ASV). The correct reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV. But on the other hand, though expanding the reading through unnecessary “dynamic equivalents,” the *Variant 3* reading, “Which [ones]?”⁶⁶ He saith,” is found in the New International Version as, “ ‘Which ones? the man inquired’” (NIV). Though lacking italics to show “commandments” or “the man” are added, *Variant 3* is also found in the Twentieth Century New Testament as, “‘What commandments?’ asked the man” (TCNT). It is also found in the NEB, REB, and TEV. *Variant 3* is rendered more literally than it is in the NIV, TCNT, NEB, REB, and TEV, by Moffatt, as “‘Which?’ he said” (Moffatt Bible).

Matt. 19:19 “thy father” (TR & AV) {C}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The TR’s reading is present in some Vulgate codices (Tischendorf’s 8th edition), and absent in other Vulgate Codices (Julicher). Merk refers to about half a dozen Vulgate Codices with the omission (S, 6th century; M, 6th century; J, 6th / 7th century; B, 8th / 9th century; E, 8th / 9th century; Ep, 9th century; & V, 9th century); and says the remainder of his Vulgate Codices include the word (e.g., P, 6th century; O, 7th century; X, 7th century; A, 7th / 8th century; L, 7th / 8th century; Y, 8th century; D, 8th / 9th century; H, 8th / 9th century; *et al*).

In such instances I have formerly stipulated that I will follow Wordsworth and White’s text of Jerome’s Vulgate as the main Vulgate reading. On this occasion, that edition follows the variant, and hence I refer to it at this point, *infra*. Since the textual apparatuses in both Tischendorf’s *Novum Testamentum Graece* (8th edition, 1869-72) and Merk’s *Novum Testamentum* (9th ed., 1964) refer to Latin Vulgate Codices supporting the TR’s reading, reference to this fact is also made, *infra*. Indeed, notwithstanding my stipulated usage of Wordsworth & White, I allow for the possibility that on this occasion, Tischendorf is correct in his assessment that the Vulgate supports the reading, although I consider the matter is not certain.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). In this story of the “rich” (Luke 18:23) “young” (Matt. 19:20) “ruler” (Luke 18:18), the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron *prima facie* supports the *Textus Receptus*’s reading as Latin, “*patrem (father) tuum (thy)*.” However, the Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex, and the Vulgate also reads, “*patrem (father) tuum (thy)*,” at Mark 10:19 and Luke 18:20. Therefore, it is possible that the “*tuum (thy)*” is coming from one or both of these other synoptic gospels

⁶⁶ Greek, “*poias (which [ones])*,” is a plural form (feminine plural accusative pronoun, from *poios*), and so may be rendered, “Which ones,” in order to convey this plural form; although if so, I would prefer that “ones” be placed in italics.

as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting. Hence no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:19, the TR's Greek, "*ton* (the) *patera* (father) *sou* (of thee)," i.e., "thy father," in the words, "Honour thy father" (AV), is a minority Byzantine reading found in *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), *Codex Macedoniensis* (Y 034, 9th century), *Codex Petropolitanus* (Pi 041, 9th century); together with Minuscules 262 (Paris, France, 10th century), 660 (Berlin, Germany, 11th century), 945 (Athos, Greece, 11th century, Byzantine outside of independent text Acts & General Epistles), 245 (Moscow, Russia, 12th century), 270 (Paris, France, 12th century), 280 (Paris, France, 12th century), 443 (Cambridge, England, 12th century), 1010 (Athos, Greece, 12th century), 1200 (Sinai, Arabia, 12th century), 1355 (Jerusalem, Israel, 12th century), 1375 (Moscow, Russia, 12th century), 248 (Moscow, Russia, 13th century), 482 (British Library, London, UK, 13th century), 1604 (Athos, Greece, 13th century), 473 (Lambeth Palace, London, UK, 14th century), and 1354 (Jerusalem, Israel, 14th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*patrem* (father) *tuum* ('of thee' / 'thy')," in some *Versio Vulgata* (Vulgate Version) Codices, *supra*, and *Codex Vercellensis* (old Latin Version a, 4th 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), and *Codex Corbeiensis* (old Latin Version ff1, 10th / 11th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Sixtinam Vulgate (1590) and the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430).

However Greek, "*sou* (thy)," is omitted in the majority Byzantine Text, which reads, Greek, "*ton* (the) *patera* (father)," e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). The omission is further found as Latin, "*patrem* (the father)," in some Latin Vulgate Codices, *supra*, and so found in Wordsworth & White's edition of Jerome's Latin Vulgate; and also in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century), Origen (d. 254); and ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258).

(See commentary at Matt. 15:4). The representative Byzantine text here poses a threefold textual problem. The first is general to the NT; the second is specific to Matt. 19:18,19; and the third is specific to Matt. 19:18,19, and includes some overlap with the second matter, though further entails some consideration of these Decalogue quotes from the Septuagint.

In the first place, as a general proposition, the absence of at least one "*sou* (thy)," made to work double-time for both "father and mother," creates a stylistic tension of vagueness with open-ended ambiguity. Such an abbreviation is too curt and imprecise.

“Honour the father and the mother” of who? Oneself or another’s parents, and if another’s parents, whose? Hence one nowhere finds this as an abbreviation of the fifth commandment in the NT (Matt. 15:4; Mark 7:10; 10:19; Luke 18:20; Eph. 6:2).

In the second place, in the specific context of Matt. 19:18,19, this is contextually one of a number of Decalogue quotes. In the Anglican tradition I am familiar with in various Anglican Churches I have seen e.g., St. Anne’s Top Ryde (Sydney, Australia), or St. John the Baptist’s Lewes (Sussex, England), the first four commandments are put on one stone slab on one side of the Communion Table in full from Exodus 20, and the last six commandments are put on another stone slab on the other side of the Communion Table in full from Exodus 20. By contrast, in the Jewish abbreviated tradition, the first five commandments are written on the first slab, and the last five are written on the second slab. (In both traditions, the writing is only on one side, whereas the original Decalogue was written on both sides, Exod. 32:15). This Jewish tradition receives specific Christian endorsement and usage in a number of NT passages e.g., the 10th commandment (Exod. 20:17) is so abbreviated by the holy Apostle, St. Paul, to simply, “Thou shalt not covet” (Rom. 7:7; 13:9).

This appears to be the reason why Jesus first quotes the sixth (“Thou shalt do no murder”), seventh (“Thou shalt not commit adultery”), eighth (“Thou shalt not steal”), and ninth (“Thou shalt not bear false witness”) commandments; and *then* goes back to quote the fifth commandment (“Honour thy father and mother”), followed by a summary of the Decalogue in the Neighbour Principle (“Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself”). I.e., he first holds up the table of Decalogue containing the 6th to 10th commandments (by quoting the 6th, 7th, 8th, and 9th precepts), then holds up the other table of the Decalogue containing the 1st to 5th commandments (by quoting the 5th commandment), and then holds up both tables at once by quoting the Neighbour Principle summary of the Ten Commandments. E.g., if one loves one’s neighbour, then one will not violate the first, second, and tenth commandments, by idolatrously coveting that which is thy neighbour’s i.e., “covetousness, which is idolatry” (Col. 3:5). One will not offend the ears of the religious by taking the Lord’s name in vain, contrary to the third commandment. One will ensure that not just oneself, but also one’s neighbour, has a sabbath rest, in harmony with the fourth commandment.

Against this backdrop of integrating the 5th commandment with the others, the general precision of clarity in the Decalogue quotes here in Matt. 19:18,19, seems to presuppose that the original quote from the 5th commandment to which it so clearly refers, must have read with comparable clarity, either “*ton* (the) *patera* (father) *sou* (of thee) *kai* (and) *ten* (the) *metera* (mother) *sou* (of thee),” or “*ton* (the) *patera* (father) *sou* (of thee) *kai* (and) *ten* (the) *metera* (mother).” However, given the generally abbreviated forms here used in Matt. 19:18,19, i.e., “Thou shalt not bear false witness,” not “Thou shalt not bear false witness *against thy neighbour*” (Exod. 20:16; Deut. 5:20); and “Honour the father and mother” (majority Byzantine text) or “Honour thy father and mother” (TR) without the further words of Exod. 20:12 or Deut. 5:16; cf. Eph. 6:2,3); seems to make it more probable than not, that simply one “thy (*sou*),” would be used here, as in the TR, rather than two.

A third factor, to some extent overlapping with the second one, is the fact that these are precise Septuagint quotes, and in the second person singular. I.e., “*ou* (no) *phoneuseis* (‘thou shalt do murder,’ indicative active future, 2nd person singular verb, from *phoneuo*; 6th commandment, quoting Exod. 20:15, LXX & Deut. 5:18, LXX), *ou* (not) *moicheuseis* (‘thou shalt commit adultery,’ indicative active future, 2nd person singular verb, from *moicheuo*; 7th commandment, quoting Exod. 20:13, LXX & Deut. 5:17, LXX), *ou* (not) *klepseis* (‘thou shalt steal,’ indicative active future, 2nd person singular verb, from *klepto*; 8th commandment, quoting Exod. 20:14, LXX & Deut. 5:19, LXX), *ou* (not) *pseudomartureseis* (‘thou shalt bear false witness,’ indicative active future, 2nd person singular verb, from *pseudomartureo*; 9th commandment, quoting Exod. 20:16, LXX & Deut. 5:20, LXX), *tima* (‘thou honour,’ imperative active present, person singular verb, from *timaō*) *ton* (-) *patera* (father) *sou* (‘of thee,’ genitive pronoun, 2nd person singular, from *su*) *kai* (and) *ten* (-) *metera* (‘mother,’ 5th commandment, quoting Exod. 20:12, LXX & Deut. 5:16, LXX), *kai* (and) *agapeseis* (‘thou shalt love,’ indicative active future, 2nd person singular verb, from *agapao*) *ton* (the) *plasion* (neighbour) *sou* (‘of thee,’ genitive pronoun, 2nd person singular, from *su*) *os* (as) *seauton* (‘thyself,’ masculine accusative pronoun, 2nd person singular, from *seautou*; quoting Lev. 19:18, LXX).

On the one hand, Christ here follows the Hebraic order of the 6th to 9th commandments, rather than the Septuagint order (Exod. 20, LXX has the order as 7th, 8th, 6th, 9th commandments; Deut. 5, LXX, has the order as 7th, 6th, 8th, 9th commandments), and then the 5th commandment in order to highlight the two tables of the law, *supra*. But on the other hand, these are all precise quotes, albeit in abbreviated form, from the Greek Septuagint. The Greek very clearly uses the 2nd person singular, *supra*, so as to address the individual listener in every precept. However, when one comes to the representative Byzantine text reading of the 5th commandment, with great contextual incongruity, we find the text departing from the clarity of the Septuagint by omitting the 2nd person singular form of *su* i.e., *sou* (‘of thee’ = ‘thy’). This therefore is bad contextual Matthean Greek, being contextually incongruous.

Thus for reasons of both general NT clarity and also particular clarity here at Matt. 19:18,19; and also for reasons of specific clarity at Matt. 19:18,19 through reference to these Septuagint quotes with regard to the usage of the second person singular forms; it follows that the representative Byzantine reading at Matt. 19:19 is strained and contorted, so as to create the turbulence of a serious textual problem. It clangs on the ears as contextually bad Greek. This tension so created, can only be relieved so as to bring peace and tranquillity back into the Greek of this passage, if the minority Byzantine Greek reading, also found in the Latin, is adopted i.e., “*ton* (the) *patera* (father) *sou* (of thee).” Therefore this must be the correct reading.

The origins of the variant are speculative.

Was this an accidental omission? In *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), the Greek, “*patera* (father)” is abbreviated to “*pra*,” and so the “*patera* (father) *sou* (of thee),” in its

capital letters (unicals) and continuous script looks (with a line on the top indicating an abbreviated form where I have a line underneath,) like, “*IIPACOY*”. Due to a paper fade / loss, did this “*prasou*” come to look something like, “*p:::~::~*”? If so, did a scribe, realizing that five letters were missing, “reconstruct” this “from context” as “*patera*”?

Was this a deliberate change? If so, it may well have originated with Irenaeus, and then have come to be more widely accepted because of its further endorsement by Origen. Alexandrian theology is a syncretism between Platonism and the Bible, tends to use symbolic interpretations (to great excess), casts aspersions on the historical and physical universe, and *prides itself on its intellectualism*. Sadly, this is really a semi-intellectualism, (comparable in this sense to the semi-intellectualism of those who generally control the social science and macroevolutionary biological science departments in the colleges and universities today,) and lacks any real intellectual merit.

Origen is one of its greatest proponents; and while it is generally regarded as distinctive from the Alexandrian School of scribes, it seems to me that a common characteristic was *its worldly form of foolish intellectualism*. Thus the numerous changes to the text of Scripture made by Origen, constituted a warped view of the human intellect, that foreshadowed the greater development of this “wisdom of the world” (I Cor. 1:20). One of the characteristics of the later Alexandrian School of scribes, was their preparedness to prune the text of Scripture when it so took their fancy. Therefore, is this variant a deliberate endorsement of pruning of Scripture by Origen who learnt of Irenaeus’s earlier change, in a manner that later became a hallmark of the Alexandrian School of scribes? If so, did Origen start the process of more generally endorsing this change simply because he regarded the “*sou* (of thee)” as “unnecessary wordage,” and so was happy to create “a more concise” text “without such unnecessary flowery additions”?

If so, Origen was sadly mistaken in his endorsement of Irenaeus’s earlier reading. For as discussed above, in pruning the text of Scripture here, there was actually created a most ambiguous text. Indeed, this ambiguity so greatly wounded the text of Scripture by the omission of “*sou* (of thee),” that it *cried out in pain for remedy*. The true reading had been preserved through time and over time as both a minority Byzantine reading, and also a Latin reading. Thus this *crying out for remedy* was given a happy and healthful relief by the great neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the 16th and 17th centuries; which his Divine Majesty, the Lord Jehovah: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one God in a perfect Trinity, most graciously called into existence as teachers whom he suitably gifted for their important work in formally composing the *Textus Receptus*. What? Hast thou not heard? Or has it not been told unto thee? *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!* (Latin, “The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever!”)

A deliberate or an accidental alteration? We cannot be sure. But we can safely conclude that the variant is a change to the original text.

On the one hand, the reading of the Received Text at Matt. 19:19 is clearly supported by textual analysis. It has Greek textual tradition support as a minority Byzantine reading over time and through time spanning from ancient times in the 5th

century (W 032), to the 9th (Y 034) and 14th centuries (1354). It also has impressive support in the Latin textual tradition from ancient times in the 4th (old Latin a) and 5th centuries (old Latin ff2 & h), through into the 6th (old Latin f) and 10th / 11th centuries (old Latin ff1). Significantly, it also has support in the Latin from the ancient church father and doctor, Saint Augustine of Hippo. But on the other hand, the variant is the representative Greek Byzantine reading, has further support in old Latin versions from ancient times, and also has the support of a few 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. 19:19, 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. 19:19, "thy father," is found in the neo-Alexandrian's so called, "queen of minuscules," Minuscule 33. It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), and 1241 (12th century, independent in the Gospels, Alexandrian in the General Epistles, and Byzantine in Acts); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts* (Swanson), which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee*) Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However the variant which omits "thy," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); and Minuscules 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the Armenian Version (5th century).

The incorrect variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* It is also found in the Burgonite Majority Texts of Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont, with Green's Textual Apparatus also supporting its omission on the basis that it is not found in (approximately) 80-94% of all Greek texts in von Soden's K group.

Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) refers to the omission of "*sou* (of thee)" at Matt. 19:19 in half of his selected texts (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8), and refers to its support only in one manuscript (Gospel manuscript: L, Codex Leicestrensis). Certainly its presence in the faulty Western Text (D 05) was also known to the neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the 16th and 17th centuries. There is nothing new or startling about the fact that the TR's reading at Matt. 19:19 is a minority reading.

When the father of the Burgonite (Majority Text) School, John Burgon, says, he would not follow e.g., “the Vulgate”, or “any ancient Father,” contrary to “the whole body of ancient authorities” i.e., contrary to the Majority Text⁶⁷; does he think that his realization that the *Textus Receptus* is not always in agreement with the majority of manuscripts, is some kind of “startling new revelation”? To listen to some of the Burgonites, one might think so. The reality is that this notion that “the majority is always right,” actually reflects universal electoral franchise “democratic” notions from historically modern, and anti-supernaturalist secularist times. If it were true, then we would have to also blasphemously conclude that Christ was wrong to teach, “wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it” (Matt. 7:13,14). Were the majority right to yell and scream and rant and rave, “Crucify him,” “Crucify him,” as they called for “Barabbas” over Jesus (Mark 15:12,13)?

Yet on this bizarre basis, that “the ‘*Textus Receptus*’ ..., calls for ... revision,” “upon the” basis of the “majority of authorities;” Burgon bragged, “Again and again we shall have occasion to point out ... that the *Textus Receptus* needs correction⁶⁸.” Of course, it is true that we neo-Byzantines always consider the representative Byzantine text, and use it as our starting point. It is also true that, humbly relying upon the guidance and blessing of Almighty God, we only move away from it with caution and reluctance if there is a clear and obvious textual problem with it, that can be resolved inside the closed class of sources providentially preserved for us. Such is certainly the case here at Matt. 19:19. But these are not the type of qualifications that the Burgonites make. For them, the majority is always right, no matter how contorted the reading is.

Here at Matt. 19:19, the Burgonite School is joined in their attack against the Received Text by the Neo-Alexandrian School, as the neo-Alexandrians smugly point to the concurring agreement of their two principle Alexandrian texts. And what about the “external support” they have from the Western Text? In this we are reminded that Puseyites like Westcott and Hort saw in the neo-Alexandrian text, a perfect vehicle for attacking the authority of Scripture upheld by the hated Anglican Protestants and other Protestants known to them. So too, the Puseyite Burgon saw in his majority text, a perfect vehicle for attacking the authority of Scripture upheld by the great Protestant Reformers. Neither the founding neo-Alexandrians (such as Tischendorf, followed by Westcott & Hort), nor Burgon, were godly Protestants. They are two different attacks, orchestrated by the sinful heart of man and the Devil, to attack the authority of Scripture by attacking the *Textus Receptus*. The great Protestant Reformation of the 16th and 17th centuries was a manifestation of *the open Word*, and it was not wrought from a

⁶⁷ Burgon’s *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 30-1; 47-50.

⁶⁸ Burgon’s *Revision Revised*, p. 21; & *Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, pp. 13,15.

fundamentally faulty Bible as claimed by the Burgonites and Neo-Alexandrians.

Nevertheless, when we come to the neo-Alexandrian and Burgonite versions, a strange thing occurs. At Matt. 19:19, without italics to show it is “added” relative to the Westcott-Hort text, the ASV on its logic,” “inserts” the pronoun “thy” not once, but twice, and reads, “Honour thy father and thy mother;” as also does the TCNT, TEV, and NJB. One “insertion” relative to the neo-Alexandrian texts, thus producing the same reading as the TR, was enough for the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, NEB, REB, and JB. Indeed, even Moffatt reads, “honour your father and mother” (Moffatt Bible). The Burgonites’ NKJV also follows the ASV *et al* is making two additions of “*sou* (thy),” and has no footnote stating their Majority text does not support the first one, and neither the TR nor their majority text nor the NU Text supports the second one.

How are we to explain such a curious phenomenon? The passage as is, reads no better in the English than in the Greek. It seems that on the one hand, all these neo-Alexandrian and Burgonite translators, are agreed that the passage does not read well as, “Honour the father and the mother;” and in their heads they think, “but of course, a Bible writer like Matthew wouldn’t have realized that;” and so in their own benighted minds, they take it upon themselves “to correct the text” in their English translation of it. But on the other hand, they all have such a low view of the doctrine of the verbal inspiration of Scripture, they think it as nothing not to put in italics what they take to be their “additions.” By their first act, they show themselves to lack any real understanding of textual analysis; and by their second act, they show themselves to lack any proper understanding of the Divine inspiration of Holy Scripture, and a translator’s task to keep as close the underlying Greek (or Hebrew or Aramaic) text as possible.

We can trust the Authorized Version and Received Text, but we certainly cannot trust these modern “versions” and their faulty neo-Alexandrian or Burgonite texts. Let us thank our God: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one God in a perfect Trinity, for our King James Bibles and the *Textus Receptus*! “The truth of the Lord endureth forever. Praise ye the Lord” (Ps. 117:2).

Matt. 19:20 “have I kept from my youth up” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter (Diatessaron formatting).

Inside the closed class of sources, *prima facie* the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron supports the TR’s reading at Matt. 19:20. However, an identical reading is found in the Vulgate at Luke 18:21 (and a similar reading, using “*conservavi*” / “I have kept,” rather than *custodivi* / “I have heeded,” at Mark 10:20). Since the Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, we cannot be sure if in fact it got the reading from Luke 18:21 as a consequence of its Diatessaron formatting. Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron *infra*.

Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron reads in the 19th century Latin translation of the 12th-14th centuries, Latin, "*custodivi* (I have heeded) *a* (from⁶⁹) *pueritia* (boyhood⁷⁰) *mea* (my)." But similar issues with respect to Mark 10:20 and Luke 18:21, mean no reference is made to the Arabic Diatessaron, *infra*.

The Second Matter. The citation of Matt. 19:20 in Gregory is contextually part of a wider citation from Matt. 19:20,21, showing this, rather than Luke 18:21 is his source.

The Third Matter. The UBS (4th revised edition) takes the view that the Vulgate and old Latin *aur*, *g1*, and *ff1*, follows *Variant 2b*. But as discussed below, the Latin might be reconstructed as either *Variant 2a* or *2b*, and so this UBS dogmatism is really wishful thinking by these neo-Alexandrians, who support *Variant 2b* (see discussion outside the closed class of sources, *infra*).

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:20, the TR's Greek, "*ephulaxamen* ('I have kept,' indicative middle aorist, 1st person singular verb, from *phulassō*) *ek* (from) *neotetos* (the youth) *mou* (of me)," i.e., "have I kept from my youth 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), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, "*custodivi* ('I have heeded,' indicative active perfect, 1st person singular verb, from *custodio*) *a* (from⁷¹) *iuventute* (youth⁷²) *mea* (my⁷³)," i.e., "have I heeded from my youth," in old Latin Versions *a* (4th century), *b* (5th century), *ff2* (5th century), *h* (5th century), *f* (6th century), *q* (6th / 7th century), *l* (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, "*observavi* ('I have observed,' indicative active perfect, 1st person singular verb, from *observo*) *a* (from) *iuventute* (youth) *mea* (my)," i.e., "have I observed from my youth," in old Latin Version *e* (4th / 5th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Marcellus (d. 374), and Chrysostom (d. 407); the ancient church Latin

⁶⁹ Preposition with ablative = "from" etc. .

⁷⁰ A singular feminine ablative possessive adjective, from *peur* (a substantive adjective used in the place of a noun, see Wheelock's *Latin Grammar*, pp. 27, 446 noun in 2nd declension, 447).

⁷¹ Preposition with ablative = "from" etc. .

⁷² A singular feminine ablative noun, from *iuventus* / *juventus*.

⁷³ Though the fundamental meaning is the same, a Latin adjective, "*mea* ('my,' singular feminine ablative possessive adjective, from *meus*)," is here used to translate a Greek pronoun, "*mou* ('of me,' 1st person singular, genitive pronoun, from *ego*)." .

writers, Ambrose (d. 397) and Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However another reading, *Variant 1*, may be reconstructed as Greek, “*ephulaxamen* (I have kept) *ek* (from) *neotetos* (youth);” or through reference to *Variant 2b, infra*, as “*ephulaxa* (I have kept) *ek* (from) *neotetos* (youth),” i.e., “I have kept from youth.” This is found as Latin, “*custodivi* (I have heeded) *a* (from) *iuventute* (youth),” in old Latin version d (5th century).

Yet another reading, *Variant 2a*, “*ephulaxamen* (I have kept),” is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Athanasius (d. 373). However, *Variant 2b*, Greek, “*ephulaxa* (‘I have kept,’ indicative active aorist, 1st person singular verb, from *phulasso*),” is also found in Athanasius of Alexandria (d. 373).

A Latin reading, possibly follows *Variant 2a* and possibly follows *Variant 2b*. This is found as Latin, “*custodivi* (I have heeded),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is also found in the ancient church Latin writers, Cyprian (d. 258) and Jerome (d. 420).

There is no good textual argument against the majority Byzantine text i.e., no clear and obvious textual problem with the Greek of the representative Byzantine text, which is therefore correct. The origins of the variants are conjectural.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental change? Did the Greek “*mou* (of me)” or Latin “*mea* (my)” of the TR’s reading come at the end of a line? If so, was it lost in an undetected paper fade? Or was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? If so, was the Greek “*mou* (of me)” or Latin “*mea* (my)” pruned away as “a redundant addition” in the interests of “a more concise text”? When dealing with old Latin d, the latter is possible though improbable. Therefore on the balance of probabilities this was probably an accidental loss. (As to the issue of whether the Latin came from Greek “*ephulaxamen*” / “I have kept” or “*ephulaxa*” / “I have kept,” I leave the matter for the reader to ponder.)

Was *Variant 2a* an accidental change? In Manuscript Washington (W 032), “*ephulaxamen* (I have kept) *ek* (from) *neotetos* (the youth) *mou* (of me) *ti* (what),” takes up an entire line. Was there a similar, though not identical continuous script manuscript, in which the third line started with “*ti* (what)”? If so, was the “*ek* (from) *neotetos* (the youth) *mou* (of me)” first lost in a paper fade; and then did a subsequent scribe wrongly think this was a deliberate stylistic paper space, breaking up the “*ephulaxamen* (I have kept)” from the following clause, “*ti* (what) *eti* (yet) *ustero* (lack I) ; (?)”? If so, I think this was a somewhat silly and improbable conclusion for the scribe to draw; but can we realistically assume that all scribes were as competent as they really should have been?

Was *Variant 2a* a deliberate change? Were the words, “*ek* (from) *neotetos* (the youth) *mou* (of me)” deliberately pruned away to leave just “*ephulaxamen* (I have kept)” as a deliberate “stylistic improvement” to create “a more succinct text”? The fact that

this variant comes to our attention through Athanasius *of Alexandria*, must raise the ugly sceptre of possibility that the pruning of *Variant 2a* came from that notorious Alexandrian School of scribes which were among the “many, which corrupt the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17).

Was *Variant 2b* an accidental change? Did the “*ephulaxamen* (I have kept)” of a *Variant 2a* manuscript line, subsequently lose the “*men*” in an undetected paper fade, and thus become, “*ephulaxa* (I have kept)”?

Was *Variant 2b* a deliberate change? In the middle voice (“*ephulaxamen*,” Received Text), the subject (the rich young ruler), performs the action, “I have kept,” in a way that emphasizes his participation i.e., the emphasis is very much *on the subject’s participation in the action*; whereas in the active voice (“*ephulaxa*,” the variant), the focus is simply on the fact that the subject (the rich young ruler) directly performs the action of the verb, “I have kept.”⁷⁴ On the one hand, the usage of the middle voice was falling into disuse in the Koine Greek of the New Testament, so that the middle voice is often a deponent i.e., a middle grammatical form that has shed its middle meaning and so has the same meaning as the active voice. But on the other hand, the middle voice in a non-deponent form still has some usage in Koine NT Greek⁷⁵. In my opinion, the contextual emphasis on *the rich young ruler’s (the subject’s) participation in the action of the verb in “I have kept”*, means that a non-deponent middle usage is on the balance of probabilities the intended meaning here at Matt. 19:20.

The rich young ruler probably spoke these words in Aramaic. But knowing “the thoughts” of a man’s mind is a Divine Attribute (Matt. 9:4; 12:25), and so we cannot doubt that the Holy Ghost knows best how to render this into the Greek. Interestingly, unlike St. Mark (Mark 10:19,20) and St. Luke (Luke 18:20:21), both of whom also here use the middle form, “*ephulaxamen* (I have kept)” (Matt. 19:20 // Mk 10:20 // Lk 18:21), St. Matthew renders the Decalogue quotes into Greek as precision Septuagint quotes (see commentary at Matt. 19:19). In the Matthean account, this therefore acts to heighten even further the likelihood that a non-deponent form of the middle voice is here intended at Matt. 19:20, since these Septuagint quotes have the effect of indicating a general Septuagint background usage of, and assumed familiarity with, the Greek Septuagint. Thus a Septuagint nuance to the passage therefore means the nuance is one in which the earlier more common Greek usage of the middle voice, such as found in the Septuagint, is most surely the intended meaning here.

But a scribe who missed this contextual Greek nuance of the middle voice, and this additional usage of the Greek Septuagint as a contextual prima to further heighten the non-deponent usage of the middle voice here at Matt. 19:20; may have wrongly thought it “a stylistic improvement” to change this middle voice (TR) to the active voice (variant),

⁷⁴ Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, pp. 410 (active voice) 414-415 (middle voice); Young’s *Greek*, pp. 133-135 (active & middle voice).

⁷⁵ Whittaker’s *New Testament Greek Grammar*, SCM, London, England, UK, 1969, 1975, p. 34.

on the basis that in the Koine Greek form the middle voice is a deponent i.e., a middle voice with an active meaning. Of course, even if one were to conclude that the middle voice here at Matt. 19:20 is such a deponent, one would still have absolutely no right whatsoever to so capriciously alter the text of Scripture. One should, by the grace of God, put oneself *under the Word*, not set oneself *over the Word*.

Did such a deliberate change from “*ephulaxamen* (middle voice, ‘I have kept’)” to “*ephulaxa* (active voice, ‘I have kept’)” first occur? If so, did this same incompetent and arrogant scribe then further go on to “complete” his “stylistic improvement” by pruning away “the unnecessary wordage” of “*ek* (from) *neotetos* (the youth) *mou* (of me),” in order to make “a more succinct text” without such “unnecessary and flowery wordage”? The fact that this variant comes to our attention through Athanasius of Alexandria, thus raises the ugly sceptre of possibility that the change of *Variant 2b* from middle to active voice, and connected pruning of the text, came from that notorious Alexandrian School of scribes which were among the “many, which corrupt the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17).

The TR’s reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument. It has such Greek manuscript support from ancient times. It also has good support in the Latin from ancient times. It further enjoys the support of the church doctors, St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory. *Variant 1* has weak support and can be safely dismissed. Both *Variants 2a & 2b* come to us with weak Greek support. One or possibly both of *Variants 2a & 2b* gave rise to the Latin readings of the Vulgate and a few old Latin versions, together with the citations of a couple of ancient church Latin writers. Weighing up these factors, and with respect to the Latin support for *Variants 2a & 2b*, bearing in mind the superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 19:20 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. 19:20, “have I kept (*ephulaxamen*, word 1) from (*ek*, word 2) my (*mou*, word 4) youth up (*neotetos*, word 3),” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is also found in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac: Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian

Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Slavic Version (9th century); and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 1, (reconstructed from the Latin,) “have I kept (*ephulaxamen*, word 1, or *ephulaxa*, replacing word 1) from (*ek*, word 2) youth (*neotetos*, word 3),” is found as “have I kept (*ephulaxa*, replacing word 1) from (*ek*, word 2) youth (*neotetos*, word 3),” in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century)⁷⁶.

Variant 2b, Greek, “I have kept (*ephulaxa*, replacing word 1),” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); together with Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.*

The erroneous *Variant 2b*, evidently coming from the corrupting hands of Alexandrian School scribes, was adopted by the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 19:20. Because the neo-Alexandrians think that generally “the shorter reading is the better reading,” both major Alexandrian texts are in agreement, and because they could claim an assimilation to other Gospel passages was occurring, the UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993) Committee i.e., the contemporary NU Text Committee (consisting of Kurt Aland, Bruce Metzger, Cardinal Martini, *et al*), went so far as to run into the madness of giving it their highest rating and claiming, “the text is certain.” Such neo-Alexandrian folly reminds us that before we ask, “What are the answers?,” we must first ask, “What are the right questions?”

At Matt. 19:20, the incorrect *Variant 2b* is found in the ASV as, “All these things have I observed, what lack I yet?” This erroneous reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV (with a footnote referring to TR’s reading), ESV, and NIV.

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

We have come to sad days indeed, when we Protestants have to admit that here at Matt. 19:20, the old Latin Papists, basing their translation solely on the Latin, were more

⁷⁶ Though D 05 (Greek, outside the closed class of sources) and d (old Latin, inside the closed class of sources) is a Greek-Latin diglot, in any given instance, the two do not necessarily correlate, although they may do so. As to whether or not the two do or do not correlate here at Matt. 19:20 is anybody’s guess.

accurate than are the new neo-Alexandrian Papists who base their translation, as they say, “on the Greek.” Those who claim “Rome has changed” in that since the Vatican II Council (1962-5) “she now uses the Greek” in her *Revised Standard Version Catholic Edition* (1965), *Jerusalem Bible* (1966), and *New Jerusalem Bible* (1985), are sadly misguided. Since the *Romish Council of Trent* (1545-1563), the fight between Papist and Protestant was always between the Protestant’s Greek *Textus Receptus* which recognizes that God providentially preserved both the Byzantine Greek and Latin, but that the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, must always be subject to the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*; and the Papist’s claim that only the Latin has been providentially preserved, as they unnaturally elevated the servant maxim to the place of the master maxim. *Rome has not fundamentally changed*. She still does not recognize the Received Text of the New Testament. She simply attacks it in a different way in the post Vatican II Council era to how she attacked it in the post Trent Council era until the Vatican II Council.

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

Matt. 19:22 “that saying” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter (Diatessaron formatting). Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron consists of Latin Vulgate readings put into a Diatessaron format. Hence it is a Vulgate Codex. This Vulgate jewel from the Western Latin textual tradition has been selected for usage as a special highlight of this commentary in the four Gospels. It here follows the “*verbum* (‘the word’ = ‘that saying’),” of the TR. The Latin Vulgate reads at Mark 10:22, “*in* (at) *verbo* (the word),” and at Luke 18:23, “*his* (these things).” The differences between Mark 10:22 and Luke 18:23 with this Vulgate Codex’s reading are such, that on this occasion I think the relevant reading must have come from a Vulgate text of Matt. 19:22.

Outside the closed class of sources, Ciasca's 19th century translation of the 12th-14th centuries Arabic, reads, "*hoc* (this) *verbo* (word)." Given the singular form of "*hoc* (this)," rather than the plural form at Luke 18:23, *providing Ciasca has made an accurate translation of the Arabic*, on the balance of probabilities, I do not think this was a conflation of gospel readings; but rather reflects the TR's reading of Matt. 19:22. (If Ciasca has not made an accurate Latin translation of the Arabic, the fact that the thing is outside the closed class of sources means that it does not matter with respect to determining the NT text, that my associated conclusion is therefore wrong.) Hence I show the Arabic Diatessaron following the TR's reading, *infra*.

The Second Matter. Outside the closed class of sources, Nestle-Aland's 27th edition shows Minuscule 579 (mixed text, 13th century) following the TR's reading, whereas Swanson shows it following *Variant 2*. Therefore no reference is made to this minuscule, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:22, the TR's Greek, "*ton* (the) *logon* (word)" i.e., "that saying" (AV)⁷⁷, 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, "*verbum* ('the word' = 'that saying')," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (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, another reading, *Variant 1*, Greek, "*ton* (the) *logon* (word) *touton* (this)" i.e., "this saying," is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionaries 5 (10th century) and 51 (14th century). This reading is found in the Latin as *Variant 1a* which reads, Latin "*hoc* (this) *verbum* (word)," i.e., "this saying," in old Latin Versions a (4th century), n (5th / 6th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and as *Variant 1b* which reads, Latin, "*verbum* (word) *hoc* (this)," i.e., "this saying," in old Latin Versions b (5th century) and ff1 (10th / 11th century).

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, omits Greek, "*ton* (the) *logon* (word)" altogether. This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 950 (1289 / 1290 A.D.). The omission of Latin, "*verbum* (the word)," is further found in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), h (5th century), and f (6th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading

⁷⁷ See also the rendering of "*ton logon*" as "that saying" at Mark 8:32 (AV). Cf. "that saying" (AV) at Mark 9:32 (*to* / the + *rema* / word) and Mark 10:22 (*to* / the + *logo* / word).

which therefore must stand. The origins of the variants are speculative.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental change? Firstly, in a particular manuscript line, was “*ton* (‘the,’ masculine singular accusative definitive article, from *o*) *logon* (‘word,’ masculine singular accusative noun, from *logos*)” written over two lines, with “*ton log*” on the first line, and “*on*” on the second line? Due to a paper fade / loss, did the first line then look something like, “*to:::*”?

Secondly, seeing this, did a scribe then add in a “*t*” as “a reconstruction” to form “*touton* (masculine singular accusative pronoun, from *outos*⁷⁸)” i.e., “But when the young man heard *this [man]*” or “heard *him*,” etc. ? If so, I note that such terminology is more Lucian than Matthean i.e., such a masculine singular accusative usage of *outos* has a more Lucian ring to it (Luke 12:5; 19:14; 20:12; 23:2). However, St. Matthew certainly uses *outos* e.g., at Matt. 5:19 in both the masculine singular nominative form (*outos*) and feminine plural genitive form (*touton*); or at Matt. 19:26 the neuter singular nominative form of (*touto*).

Thirdly, did a later scribe, become aware of both this reading of, “*touton* (‘this [man]’ = ‘him’),” and the TR’s reading, “*ton* (the) *logon* (word)”? Did he then wrongly think that both the TR and this amended text had lost something in transmission? If so, in order “to correct this,” did he then conflate the two readings to form *Variant 1*?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? Did a scribe consider that it was “a stylistic improvement” to here make the text “more explicit,” and so he added in “*touton* (this),” to make the reading, “*ton* (the) *logon* (word) *touton* (this)”? If so, was this bumbling fool influenced in what he thought of as his “brilliant mind,” by the presence of the same terminology, “*ton* (the) *logon* (word) *touton* (this),” slightly earlier at Matt. 19:11?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental change? Was “*ton* (the) *logon* (word)” lost in an undetected paper fade? Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change? Did a scribe consider it was “a stylistic improvement” to prune away “unnecessary wordage” in order to create “a more succinct text”?

Were these deliberate or accidental changes? We do not know. We cannot be sure. We can only be sure that a change to the text has been made, and that the original reading has been preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text, since there is no clear and obvious problem with it.

The TR’s reading has strong support in both the Greek and Latin. Both *Variants 1 & 2* have weak support in the Greek, and some stronger support in the Latin. Bearing in mind these facts, and the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek*

⁷⁸ The demonstrative pronoun *outos* (masculine) – *autē* (feminine) – *touto* (neuter), (demonstratives are used *to point something out*, i.e., this / that / these / those,) may be used without an article and noun, when the noun (here “man”) has to be supplied in the English translation. Hence this is a permissible Greek grammatical construction.

improves the Latin, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 19:22 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. 19:22, "*ton* (the) *logon* (word)" i.e., "that saying," is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). With no difference in English translation, "*ton* (the) *logon* (word)" is further found before, rather than after (TR), "*o* (the) *neaniskos* (young man)," in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere). 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*; 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 Palestinian (*c.* 6th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

Variant 1, "*ton* (the) *logon* (word) *touton* (this)" i.e., "this saying," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); and at the hand of a later "corrector" of Minuscule 892 (original minuscule, 9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); Georgian "1" Version (5th century); and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and Ethiopic Version (in a manuscript of Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9).

Variant 2, which omits "*ton* (the) *logon* (word)," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century); and in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century). It is also found in the Georgian "2" Version (5th century).

With the two leading Alexandrian texts split between *Variants 1 & 2*, confusion reigned in the camp of the neo-Alexandrians as to what they should do.

Neo-Alexandrian View 1 (The TR's reading). The UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition

(1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993) follow the TR's reading. However, in doing so the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions both claim, "that there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text" i.e., the TR's reading, "or the apparatus," i.e., the variants, "contains the superior reading." After all, is not the TR's reading followed by e.g., the Western Text (D 04), "Caesarean" Text (Armenian Version), and Byzantine Text? Is not "the shorter reading the better reading," and so cannot the "touton (this)" of *Variant 1* be thus dismissed? And since the support for *Variant 2* is so slim in different text types and not found in *both* major Alexandrian texts, is it not likely that *Variant 2* was therefore an accidental or deliberate omission? (See Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 49). "What neo-Alexandrian could possibly disagree with this?"

Neo-Alexandrian View 1 which follows the TR's reading is found in the American Standard Version which reads, "But when the young man heard the saying" (ASV).

Neo-Alexandrian View 2 (The TR's reading or Variant 1?). Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle's 21st edition (1952), both read, "ton (the) logon (word) [touton] (this)," thus making an equal option between the TR's reading or *Variant 1*. After all, on neo-Alexandrian principles, do not both readings have "good external support"? I.e., is not the TR's readings followed by e.g., the Western Text (D 04), "Caesarean" Text (Armenian Version), and Byzantine Text? And is not *Variant 1* followed by e.g., Syriac, Egyptian, Georgian, and Ethiopic Versions? "What neo-Alexandrian could possibly disagree with this?"

Neo-Alexandrian View 2 in the form which follows *Variant 1* is found in the NASB, RSV (which omits "saying"), NRSV, ESV (which omits "saying"), NIV (which omits "saying"), NEB (which omits "saying"), REB (which omits "saying"), and TEV (which omits "saying"). E.g., the New Revised Standard Version reads, "When the young man heard this word" (NRSV). Though it is also followed by the TCNT, JB, and NJB, all of these versions gratuitously change the reading from a singular to a plural form. E.g., the Twentieth Century New Testament reads, "On hearing these words" (TCNT).

Neo-Alexandrian View 3 (Variant 2). Tischendorf true to his general form, smiled at his much loved Codex Sinaiticus which he had discovered on the Arabian Peninsula, and in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) he adopted *Variant 2*. After all, on neo-Alexandrian principles, is not the "the shorter reading the better reading"? "What neo-Alexandrian could possibly disagree with this?"

Neo-Alexandrian View 3 which follows *Variant 2* is found in the Moffatt Bible, which reads, "When the young man heard that" (Moffatt).

OH THE PAINS AND STRAINS OF TRYING TO APPLY NEO-ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL PRINCIPLES WHEN THE TWO MAJOR ALEXANDRIAN TEXTS ARE IN DISAGREEMENT! OH THE FRUSTRATIONS OF NEO-ALEXANDRIANS TRYING TO MAKE THEIR PRINCIPLES LOOK "SERIOUS" AND "CREDIBLE," AS THOSE WHO ARE NOT GIFTED AND

CALLED BY GOD TO BE TEXTUAL ANALYST TEACHERS, GROPE ABOUT IN THE DARK TRYING TO “GUESS THE ANSWER.”

Let us humbly thank God that he mercifully supplies all our needs (Philp. 4:19), and through such God-gifted Neo-Byzantine School textual analysts as e.g., Erasmus of Rotterdam (1469-1536) and Beza of Geneva (1519-1605), willed that the *Textus Receptus* of the New Testament should be formally compiled for us in the 16th and 17th centuries. Let us thank God that we have in our Authorized King James Versions this pure Word of God translated from the Received Text! “Forever, O Lord, thy Word is settled in heaven” (Ps. 119:89). “Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven” (Matt. 6:10).

Matt. 19:25 “his disciples” (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Latin Vulgate lacks Matt. 19:25’s “*discipuli* (the disciples),” at Mark 10:26 and Luke 18:26. Hence I think it reasonable to conclude that the reading, “*discipuli* (the disciples),” in the Vulgate Codex of the Sangallensis Diatessaron, has drawn its reading from Matt. 19:25, and so is here unaffected by Diatessaron formatting. Thus the Sangallensis Diatessaron is shown as following the variant, *infra*. (By contrast, outside the closed class of sources, no reference is made to Matt.19:25 in the Arabic Diatessaron translated into Latin by Augustine Ciasca.)

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:25, the TR’s Greek, “*autou* (‘of him’ = ‘his’),” in the words, “*oi* (-) *mathetai* (disciples) *autou* (his),” is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Codex W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, “*eius* (‘of him’ = ‘his’),” in old Latin Version ff1 (10th / 11th century).

However, a variant omitting “his (Greek, *autou*; Latin, *eius*),” and so reading, Greek, “*oi* (the) *mathetai* (disciples),” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Codices Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and K 017 (9th century). The omission is further found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (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). The omission is also found in the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

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

Was this an accidental omission. Did the “*autou* (his)” come at the end of a line?

If so, was it then lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was this a deliberate change? Did a scribe consider that the earlier presence of “*tois (-) mathetais* (disciples) *autou* (of him),” at Matt. 19:23, had the effect of making the presence of “*autou* (of him)” at Matt. 19:25 “redundant”? If so, did this arrogant scribe then prune away the “*autou* (his)” in order to create “a more succinct text”?

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

On the one hand, the reading of the *Textus Receptus* (TR) has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument. This Greek support dates from ancient times. It also has some slim minority support in the Latin textual tradition. But on the other hand, the variant has some minority support in the Greek; is the representative Latin text reading; dates from ancient times; and has the support of an ancient church writer. Weighing up these factors, and bearing in mind the superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 19:25 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. 19:25, “his disciples,” is found in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century); 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 Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); Georgian “1” (5th century) and “A” (5th century) Versions; and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which omits “his,” and so reads, “the disciples,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); 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); (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), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); together with the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (c. 6th

century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Georgian “B” (5th century) Version.

Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) refers to the variant’s omission of “*autou* (his)” in some manuscripts (Gospel manuscripts: w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; L, Codex Leicestrensis).

The erroneous variant is found in the NU Text *et al.* Hence at Matt. 19:25 the reading, “the disciples” is found in the ASV. The incorrect variant is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. Following the representative Latin Text, the old Latin Papists rendered this as, “the disciples” in their Douay-Rheims Version. The new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the post Vatican II Council (1962-5) period have maintained this erroneous reading, adopting the variant in their Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles. In their continued denial of the *Textus Receptus* at Matt.19:25, it is a case of, *Rome does not change*; although she may here smile at the apostate Protestants who now join her in this denial of the Received Text. But for we Protestant Christians of the Received Text, it is a case of, “With salvation’s walls surrounded, Thou may’st smile at all thy foes⁷⁹.”

Matt. 19:29b “or wife” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter (Diatessaron formatting).

Inside the closed class of sources, the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron *prima facie* supports the TR’s reading with Latin, “*aut* (or) *uxorem* (wife).” But the Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Latin Vulgate Codex, and while the Vulgate lacks “*aut* (or) *uxorem* (wife)” at Mark 10:29, it has these words at Luke 18:29. Therefore it is possible that they were brought in from Luke 18:29 as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting. Hence no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

The Second Matter. The differences between the wider quote in Gregory’s writings of Matt. 19:29, when contrasted with Mark 10:29 and Luke 18:29 are sufficient to here show that Gregory is following Matt. 19:29, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:29b, the TR’s Greek, “*ἢ* (or) *gunaika* (wife),” 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 2378 (11th century). It is also supported as Latin, “*aut* (or) *uxorem* (wife),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and

⁷⁹ Anglican clergyman John Newton’s hymn, “Glorious Things of Thee are Spoken, Zion, city of our God” (1779).

(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, Basil the Great (d. 379), Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); the ancient church Latin writers, Ambrose (d. 397) and Jerome (d. 420); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a variant omitting these words is found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (c. 395), and Origen (d. 254).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are speculative. However, the fact that the reference in Irenaeus comes from a later Latin translation, may well indicate that its origins are with Origen, and this corrupted reading was then incorporated into the later Latin “translation” of Irenaeus. Since Origen is the first definite citation of this variant in terms of time, and Origen is a well known representative of the “many which corrupt the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17), I shall here work on the presupposition that he is the originator of this variant at Matt. 19:29b.

Was this an accidental omission? Upon reading, “*e* (or) *patera* (father) *e* (or) *metera* (mother) *e* (or) *gunaika* (wife) *e* (or) *tekna* (children),” did Origen’s eye jump from the alpha (“a”) ending of “*metera* (mother)” to “*gunaika* (wife),” thus accidentally omitting “*e* (or) *gunaika* (wife)””? That such an error could occur, appears to receive some further corroboration in the fact that a similar, though not identical, eye jumping back and forth over this succession of words all starting with “*e* (or)” and ending with “a (alpha),” seems to best explain the absence of “or father (Latin, *aut patrem*)” in old Latin Versions b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century).

Was this a deliberate omission? Origen was a mix of orthodox and unorthodox views. He was certainly correct to defend the lawfulness of marriage against the Encratites, a group of heretics (largely drawn from the Marcionites⁸⁰ and Montanists⁸¹), who forbade marriage (*Against Celsus*, Book 5, chapter 65; I Tim. 4:1,3). Did Origen’s mix of orthodoxy and unorthodoxy, mean that on this occasion, his orthodox belief that marriage was lawful, led him to the unorthodox belief that he should omit “or wife” at Matt. 19:29b, so as “not to encourage the Encratite heresy”? If so, he failed to rightly

⁸⁰ Marcionism denied the Old Testament.

⁸¹ Montanism involved “ecstatic visions in the Spirit” i.e., “prophesying;” as well as “babble in a jargon” when the Montanists “began to rave in a kind of ecstatic trance” (Tertullian, *De amina*, 9, c. 210; Eusebius, HEV 16:7; both in Bettenson’s *Documents*, pp. 77-8). This failure to “be ... sober” (I Peter 4:7), has returned in historically modern times with Montanism reappearing in the Charismatic and Pentecostal movements.

divide the Word of God (II Tim. 2:15), since in this context if a man “hath forsaken” his “wife” (Matt. 19:29b), it would mean “the unbelieving” spouse wanted to “depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage” to the marriage contract “in such cases” (I Cor. 7:15). That is because a desertion of the marriage has occurred (whether a constructive desertion where the two are still under the same roof, or an actual desertion), and so the unbelieving spouse is guilty of passive adultery (Judg. 19:2) i.e., a denial of conjugal rights (I Cor. 7:3-5), and so may be divorced for “fornication” (AV) with allowable remarriage for the innocent Christian spouse (Matt. 5:32; 19:9).

A deliberate or accidental omission by Origen? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that the variant is a corruption of the original text here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text and Received Text.

The *Textus Receptus* (TR) reading at Matt. 19:29b has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading dating from ancient times (W 032); and strong support in the Latin text dating from ancient times in St. Jerome’s Vulgate, as well as further support in a number of old Latin versions. The reading is also supported by two of the traditional four ancient and early mediaeval Western doctors⁸², St. Ambrose and St. Jerome; and two of the traditional four ancient Eastern doctors⁸³, St. Basil the Great and St. Chrysostom. By contrast, the variant’s support in the Greek is limited to Origen, who appears to be its originator. It is thereafter found only in the Latin. Weighing up these considerations, and bearing in mind the perpetual 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. 19:29b 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. 19:29b, “or wife,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) 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 Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions;

⁸² The four ancient and early mediaeval Western doctors are St. Ambrose (d. 397), St. Jerome (d. 420), St. Augustine (d. 430), and St. Gregory the Great (d. 604).

⁸³ The four ancient Eastern doctors are St. Athanasius (d. 373), St. Basil the Great (d. 379), St. Gregory Nazianzus (d. c. 390), and St. John Chrysostom (d. 407).

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).

However, the incorrect reading which omits, “or wife,” 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) (which like the old Latin versions referred to above, also omits “or father,” Greek, “*e patera*”). It is also found in the Syriac Palestinian Version (c. 6th century), and Syriac Sinaitic Version (3rd / 4th century, which like D 05 *et al, supra*, also omits “or father”).

Reflecting the highly circular and erroneous neo-Alexandrian school rule that in general, “the shorter reading is the better reading,” the variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Thus at Matt. 19:29b, “or wife” is omitted in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

But when the two leading Alexandrian texts are split, such as here, different neo-Alexandrians can apply different neo-Alexandrian rules and so prefer different readings. Reflecting this split in the two leading Alexandrian texts, and also the neo-Alexandrian rule of “external support” beyond the Alexandrian text in e.g., the Byzantine text, Latin text, “Caesarean” text (Armenian Version), and Syriac (Pesitto & Harclean), for the wrong reasons, Moffatt correctly includes the words, “or wife” (Moffatt Bible).

Also for the wrong reasons, in their instance the strong Latin support for the reading in the Vulgate *et al*, the old Latin Papists of pre-Vatican II times, included “or wife” in their Douay-Rheims Version. By contrast, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of post-Vatican II times, omitted “or wife” in their Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles.

Matt. 19:29c “an hundredfold” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Remarks.

The First Matter. The rule in English is than “an” is used before a vowel or vowel sound. Thus one would say, “an RAAF plane” because when “R” is pronounced it sounds like “are” i.e., a vowel sound pronounced like, “an Are Double A F plane. By contrast, one would say, “a Royal Australian Air Force plane.” This is relevant where the “h” is silent e.g., “He had to wait half *an hour* for the delayed train.”

While nowadays most people would say, “a hundredfold,” the AV translators evidently had a silent “h” here, and so would have said, “an undredfold.” Likewise while today most people would say, “a unicorn” i.e., pronounced like “a you-nicorn,” it is clear from “an unicorn” at e.g. Ps. 92:10, that the AV translators would have pronounced it like, “an oon-icorn.” Or whereas only the weekly sabbath binds Christians, so that I fully respect the rights of my beloved brethren in Christ who outside of this requirement (Exod. 20:8-11; Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2; Rev. 1:10), exercise their Christian rights under Rom. 14:5,6 to “regardeth not the day,” i.e., they acknowledge no holy days other than

Sunday (e.g., some godly Free Presbyterians known to me); nevertheless, nowadays for most of us who exercise our Christian rights under Rom. 14:5,6 to “esteemeth one day above another,” we would refer to “a holy day,” e.g., Christmas Day (Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662 red letter day, 25 Dec.), or Good Friday (red letter day, Friday before Easter Sunday), or St. Matthew’s Day (red letter day, 21 Sept.), or Eve of All Saints’ Day (either red letter or back letter day, 31 Oct., by Protestant tradition used to remember the start of the Reformation with Luther’s 95 Theses), or St. George’s Day (black letter day, 23 April), or St. Alban’s Day (black letter day, 17 June, martyred in Britain in 303 A.D., he reminds us of the presence of Christianity in the British Isles long before the Roman Church arrived here), or Holy Cross Day (black letter day, 14 Sept.⁸⁴), or Richard Johnson’s Day (black letter day, 3 February, remembering the First Christian service in Australia, conducted by the Reverend Richard Johnson, Sydney, 1788). But the AV translators would have pronounced it like, “an oly day,” for they rendered Col. 2:16, “Let no man ... judge you ... in respect of an holyday”

The Second Matter. This verse of Scripture should be known to every good Protestant in order to counteract one of the Popish heresies put around about Mary, whom

⁸⁴ While Reformed Anglicans use the symbol of the cross, e.g., the sign of the cross on the forehead at baptism is part of the Baptism Service in the 1662 prayer book (this symbolism is consonant with Rom. 6:3,6), most Reformed Anglicans do not like using a cross over the Communion Table. But crosses are more commonly used by Reformed Anglicans on e.g., the bookmarks of a lectern (holding the Bible,) where one has the cross on one bookmark and “I.H.S.” on the other (with the bookmarks in the liturgical colour of the day), or a cross on the outside of the church. While both Lutheran Protestants and Anglican Protestants historically used the symbol of the cross, Puritan Protestants historically were opposed to all usage of it, although in more recent historically times a number of them have dropped their former objections to its modest usage. But some Puritan Protestants remain strongly opposed to it. They consider the words of the Second Commandment, “Thou shalt not make ... any graven image” (Exod. 20:4) prohibit it, whereas the historic Lutheran and Anglican view has been this means with the intent to “bow down” and “serve them” (Exod. 20:5). E.g., a graven image was made of the serpent, and only when idolatry was committed with it was it destroyed (Num. 21:9; II Kgs 18:4); or the Ark of the Covenant containing the Ten Commandments in Old Testament times, had over it the graven images of two angels (Exod. 25:18). As Supreme Governor of the Church of England, by (Anglican) Protestant tradition the monarch’s crown contains a Christian cross on top of it. Nevertheless, Reformed Anglican tradition is opposed to crucifixes and images of saints, not because we believe they are prohibited by the 2nd commandment (as the Puritans historically do), but because it has been the experience of the Church that substantial numbers of weaker brethren are thereby led into idolatry by this means (cf. Rom. 14 & I Cor. 8), a fact evident even in the history of the OT brazen serpent. Hence we must “walk in love” (Eph. 5:2) and ban these things as crucifixes (II Kgs 18:4) and images of saints from our churches (Rom. 15:1-4). By contrast, this has not been the church’s experience with e.g., eagle lecterns or stained glass windows, all of which may be historically found in Reformed Anglican Churches. Cf. Matt. 20:21 ftn. comments.

the prophet Daniel calls “a strange god” (Dan. 11:39), since mother-goddess worship is alien to the Israel of God i.e., the Church. In the same way that the Papists like to pervert the fact that St. Mary is called “blessed” (Luke 1:48), so as to deny by it that all true Christians are also “blessed” (Luke 11:27,28); so likewise, the Romanists, joined by such semi-Romanists as the Puseyites and Eastern Orthodox, seek to pervert the words of our Lord in John 19:27, where “he saith to the disciple,” John, of Mary, “Behold thy mother!” The Romanists try to make this a unique distinction bestowed on Mary, and then universalize it so that their followers refer to “Mother Mary.”

But Scripture here teaches in Matt. 19:29 that the Christian may have many a “mother” in the wider family of Christ. And so St. Paul says to the Romans, “salute Rufus chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine” (Rom. 16:13). And likewise, he saith to Timothy, “entreat” “an elder” “as a father; and the younger men as brethren; the elder women as mothers; the younger as sisters” (I Tim. 5:1,2). Thus Christ was not bestowing on Mary any special privilege in John 19:26,27, over and above that which any Christian mother of any Christian man should have, i.e., a Christian man should, as required, care for his mother.

Yet the Romanists so pervert John 19:27 as to make out of it some so called, “Mother Mary” idol. We cannot doubt the dangers posed by rock’n’roll music to the spiritual and moral fibre of a man and a society, since this music is calculated to beat up the flesh, and thus induce “fleshly lusts, which war against the soul” (I Peter 2:11). Like Elvis Presley⁸⁵, *The Beatles* are historically important to the popular rock’n’roll culture. *We do not need to “keep up” with all the new rock’n’roll “idols” (Col. 3:5) that come’n’go like flies, in order to know that it is wrong. The big picture is that this music is something people “feel” or “pulsate to,” rather than listen to like classical music, and so it is “a brain deadening” music genre used to beat up “fleshly lusts” (I Peter 2:11); and then to this are added lyrics and images that move people away from a Biblical God focus and towards various “worldly lusts” (Titus 2:12)⁸⁶. This type of sentiment is well*

⁸⁵ Known as, “the king of rock’n’roll,” he was also called, “Elvis the Pelvis” to focus on his gyrating pelvis, at which point his guitar was used as a phallic symbol to try and focus people’s attention more on sexual lust. Addicted to various drugs, including the illegal drug of heroin, he understandably died prematurely. See Bob Larson’s *Book of Rock*, *infra*, p. 176; & Bob Jones III’s, *Idols, Rock Music, and Elvis Presley*, (cassette recording 771003), Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina, USA.

⁸⁶ Hence it does not matter that e.g., the following books on this topic are now about 15 to 40 years old. Garlock, F., *The Big Beat: A Rock Blast*, Bob Jones University Press, Greenville, South Carolina, USA, 1971; Peck, R., *Rock*, Bob Jones University, South Carolina, USA, 1985; Ankerberg, J. & Weldon, J., *The Facts on Rock Music*, Harvest, Oregon, USA, 1992; Bob Larson’s *Book of Rock*, Tyndale House, Illinois, USA, 1987. Though there is some very useful information in Larson’s book, his works must be used with caution. E.g., contrary to Rom. 1:17; 16:17; Gal. 1:6-9; 3:11 he embraces the ecumenical compromise with Papists, so that e.g., contrary to Matt. 7:21-23 he thinks Papist exorcists are true Christians. See my comments on Bob Larson in *Textual Commentaries Vol. 4 (Matt. 26-28)*, at “Defence of Evangelical Protestant truth,”

captured in the popular terminology of “sex, drugs, and rock’n’roll,” together with the popular parlance of calling rock’n’roll singers, “idols.” We should by God’s grace “separate” from this “unrighteousness” (II Cor. 6:14,17).

In this context it might be noted that the proposition of a “Mother Mary” was found in the popular song of that most vile and evil group, *The Beatles*, in their song, “Let it Be” (1970). These pied-pipers of the modern world, have like so many pied-piper rock’n’roll “idols,” managed to cast a hypnotic spell over many deluded persons who find their songs as irresistible as the voice of the Sirens in ancient Greek mythology. The Beetle’s lyrics include the words, “When I find myself in times of trouble, Mother Mary comes to me, Speaking words of wisdom, Let it be. And in my hour of darkness, She is standing right in front of me. Speaking words of wisdom, Let it be.” Of course, the Beatles also tried to promote atheism (Ps. 14:1) in their song, “Imagine” (1971), or heathen religions in e.g., “My sweet Lord” (1970, Hinduism, George Harrison) or “Instant Karma” (1970, Hinduism, John Lennon).

We thus see that the Beatles working with the power of the Devil. For they try to tempt men into atheism (in which instance some of them then interpret “Mother Mary” in their song, “Let it Be,” to refer to the justly illegal drug of marijuana)⁸⁷; and if this fails, then they try to siphon off their spiritual interest by tempting them into some kind of

subsection “c) A Case Study on Bob Larson Ministries, USA.”

⁸⁷ The Devil and other devils have a capacity to possess and control animals. While the original reason for this capacity is speculative, it is clear that in general they cannot do so at whim, and thus the devils had to gain Christ’s permission to so possess “the herd of swine” (Matt. 8:31,32). Satan clearly misused this capacity when he devil-possessed the serpent in Eden and spoke through it (Gen. 3-5; Rev. 12:9). More generally, like his minion devils, and usually acting through them, he can cross-apply this capacity to “whisper in the ear” of a person. This should not be confused with, and is NOT the same as devil-possession. Though called, “whispering in the ear,” in fact the devils make no audible sound, but rather exercise a capacity in a person’s mind to suggest an idea which that person is then free to accept or reject (Matt. 16:23). Even those who by years of submission to God’s directive are more skilled in fighting these things, must still always by God’s grace guard against them. But because “unbelieving” (Rev. 21:8) atheists (Ps. 14:1) believe in neither temptation by their sinful natures (Jas. 1:14,15) nor suggestive thoughts by devils (Matt. 16:23), they are easily manipulated by Lucifer through his hosts of devils by “ideas” implanted in their heads which they take to be “their idea” and accept, e.g., “Smart people don’t believe in God,” “Darwin proved we evolved from monkeys,” “There’s nothing wrong with homosexuality,” “I’m not a racist,” “I’m not a sexist,” (there are reverse forms of these last two, used e.g., when the servants of the Most High God have white racist and patriarchal sexist structures in place, and designed to misuse these structures in abusive ways e.g., “niggers are apes” may be used to “justify” murder of negroes), “I’m not a bigot like that Gavin McGrath,” “Let’s get drunk,” etc. . If by God’s grace we “resist the Devil, ... he will flee from you” (Jas. 4:7), but the atheistic “fool” (Ps. 53:1) is “an easy target.”

heathen religion such as Hinduism (or infidel religion e.g., Mohammedanism, Cat Stevens)⁸⁸. But if this fails and they show some preferment for Christianity, then they try to move them Romeward with their “Mother Mary” song⁸⁹. And, *OF COURSE*, the age old desire of the Devil to destroy via mixed marriages the racial groups God has made and segregated (Gen. 6:1-4; Ezra 9 & 10; Dan. 2:43,44; Matt. 24:37-39; Acts 21:25), was writ large in (the Caucasian) John Lennon’s cheap divorce, followed by his Mongoloid-Caucasian mixed marriage with a Japanese women, and subsequent birth of a half-caste child; who like all half-castes bears in his very frame the judgement of God in the second generation, as does the quarter-caste in the “third” “generation” (Deut. 5:9; 23:2-8). Those far gone in the worship of these rock’n’roll idols i.e., worship by lust as the focus or a god of their life (Col. 3:5), love to defend them against men like myself, for they are “blinded” by “the god of this world” (II Cor. 4:4). *Let the reader with spiritual insight note that the technique of the Beatles is the classic technique of Satan. The Devil’s fingerprints are all over them at the moral “crime scene” of their songs and lives.*

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:29c, inside the closed class of sources, *prima facie* the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron supports the TR’s reading with Latin, “*centuplum* (an hundredfold).”

⁸⁸ Because “unbelieving” (Rev. 21:8) infidels (II Cor. 3:14-16) or heathens are “damned” (Mark 16:16), they are fairly easily manipulated by Lucifer through his minions of devils by “ideas” implanted in their heads which they take to be “their ideas,” or possibly that of some “god” they worship. If by God’s grace we “resist the Devil, ... he will flee from you” (Jas. 4:7), but those who by infidelism are “blinded” (II Cor. 3:14), or by heathenism “have fellowship with devils” (I Cor. 10:20), are “an easy target.”

⁸⁹ The Devil is not omnipresent and can only be in one place at once. He has personally devil-possessed every Pope since the first Pope, Boniface III, in 607 (II Thess. 2:9; Rev. 12:3; 13:1; 16:13). This is his master-deception which he runs personally from Rome (Rev. 17:9; 18:2,3). He hog-ties Papists for hell with heresy (Gal. 3:1), so that even their prayers to God are an abomination to the Lord (Prov. 28:9; Isa. 1:15; Mal. 2:13; I Peter 3:7). One such great heresy is Mariolatry, for it blasphemously denies Christ is the only mediator between God and man (I Tim. 2:5; Heb. 12:24); substitutes works’ righteousness for faith (Gal. 2:16; 3:11) on the basis of Mary’s so called “surplus graces;” and involves idolatry (Deut. 5:8-10), so that the devils have a direct channel of communication in which any mircales they perform or “ideas” they implant are regarded as “coming from Mary” and so not resisted. Popery is one the Devil’s fall-back positions, and indeed, his number one fall-back position. But he is replete with a series of fall-back positions, including e.g., Eastern Orthodoxy and Puseyite Anglicanism. If by God’s grace we “resist the Devil, ... he will flee from you” (Jas. 4:7), but those who think they can “drink the cup of the Lord” and also “the cup of devils” (I Cor. 10:21), are “bewitched” (Gal. 3:1), and whereas Mariolatry and all invocation of saints is “giving heed to seducing spirits” (I Tim. 4:1), those so involved prove to be “an easy target.”

The Vulgate also uses “*centies* (a hundred times)” at Mark 10:30, and it is remotely possible that through some additional reference to the Vulgate’s form, “*centuplum*,” at Luke 8:8, that as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting, the Sangallensis Vulgate Codex brought this reading in from Mark 10:30. But taking into account both the improbability of such an indirect route from Mark 10:30 via Luke 8:8, and also the uniform strength of this reading in the Latin textual tradition, on this occasion I think one can safely say that the Sangallensis Diatessaron manifests the TR’s reading, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 19:29c, the TR’s Greek, “*ekatontaplasiona* (an hundredfold),” 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 2378 (11th century). It is further supported as Latin, “*centuplum* (an hundredfold),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (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, “*centuplo* (an hundredfold),” in old Latin Versions a (4th century) and n (5th / 6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Asterius the Sophist (d. after 341), Basil the Great (d. 379), Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394), Chrysostom (d. 407), and ancient church Greek writer, Irenaeus (2nd century) in a Latin translation (c. 395); the ancient church Latin writers, Victorinus-Pettau (d. 304), Hilary (d. 367), Ambrose (d. 397), Paulinus-Nola (d. 431), Jerome (d. 420), and Speculum (d. 5th century); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a variant, Greek, “*pollaplasiona* (manifold),” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 1010 (12th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

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

Was this an accidental change? Did one line of a manuscript end with “*ekatont*” and the next line start with “*aplasiona* (an hundredfold)”? If so, following a paper fade or loss of the “*ekatont*,” did a scribe, probably Origen, then “reconstruct” this as “*poll*,” i.e., “*pollaplasiona* (manifold)”? If so, did Origen draw on the “*pollaplasiona* (manifold)” of Luke 18:30 in forming this “reconstruction”?

Was this a deliberate change? Did a scribe, probably Origen, seek to make “a Gospel harmonization” and so assimilate the “*pollaplasiona* (manifold)” of Luke 18:30 by substituting it for “*ekatontaplasiona* (an hundredfold)” of Matt. 19:29c? If so, he was sadly misguided, for Jesus would have said both in his wider conversation, and each of the Gospel writers merely record a part of what was said by our Lord.

A deliberate or accidental change? We do not know. We only know that a change was made.

The TR's reading has strong support in the Greek and Latin textual traditions, and is further endorsed by e.g., the St. Basil, St. Basil's brother, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Chrysostom, St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Gregory. By contrast, the variant has weak support, and looks like a typical alteration that Origen would make, evidently finding some later favour in the African region around Alexandria. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 19:29c 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. 19:29c, "an hundredfold (*ekatontaplasiona*)," 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, which reads, "*ekatontaplasion*"⁹⁰). 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), 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 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: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), and Harclean h (616 Versions; Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Versions (Takla Haymanot, c. 500; Roman edition 1548-9; & Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9); and Slavic Version (9th century).

⁹⁰ The TR's "*ekatontaplasiona* (an hundredfold)," is a neuter plural accusative adjective, from *ekatontaplasion*. *Prima facie*, D's "*ekatontaplasion*" looks like a neuter singular accusative adjective, from *ekatontaplasion*. Without considering the matter in detail, (the final "a" may have been lost in an undetected paper fade in this manuscript line,) D 05 clearly follows the TR's basic reading rather than the variant.

However, the variant, “manifold,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); and Minuscule 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the Syriac Palestinian Version (c. 6th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions; and a manuscript of the Ethiopic Version.

The divisions between the two main Alexandrian texts, have echoed in painful divisions among Neo-Alexandrians, who lacking *bona fide* rules of textual analysis, have fought’n’tossed’n’tumbled with each other here at Matt. 19:29c. Tischendorf, evidently confident that “the shorter reading is the better reading,” and seemingly impressed by such “external support” as the Coptic Version, together with “that darling” of the Neo-Alexandrians, Origen, followed the variant in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72). Westcott-Hort (1881) seem to have been impressed by this type of “impeccable” Neo-Alexandrian logic, and also followed the variant; as was Eberhard Nestle in Nestle’s 21st edition (1952). “What Neo-Alexandrian could doubt this application of Neo-Alexandrian School rules?”

But then came the problem. “Could the manuscript, *Codex Sinaiticus*, found by Tischendorf in a dark corner of a Greek Orthodox monastery on the Horn of the Dark Continent possibly be wrong here?” After all, on Neo-Alexandrian School principles, does it not have “good external support” in the Western Text (D 05), Byzantine Text, Latin Text, “Caesarean” Text (Armenian Version), and among most Syriac Versions? Given the anti-supernaturalist presuppositions of Neo-Alexandrians, “Did not Matthew largely copy out Mark’s Gospel and then add some things in?” “Does not this make it more likely that he copied out ‘*ekatontaplasiona* (an hundredfold)’ from Mark 10:30, and then some later scribe assimilated it to the ‘*pollaplasiona* (manifold)’ of Luke 18:30?” “What Neo-Alexandrian could doubt this application of Neo-Alexandrian School rules?” Hence for the wrong reasons, the correct reading of the TR was adopted in the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, and contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993). Indeed, inflated with the anti-supernaturalist idea “involving the dependence of Matthew upon Mark” (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 2nd ed., 1994, pp. 40-1), the UBS 4th revised edition Committee concluded that the TR’s reading as found in *Codex Sinaiticus* deserved their rating of “B,” which “indicates that the text is almost certain.”

Confused Neo-Alexandrian Bible translators, who lack a calling from God to undertake the task of Bible translation under his directive will, but who do so under his permissive will; looking to Neo-Alexandrian “textual analysts” who lack a calling from God to undertake the task of textual analysis under his directive will, but who do so under his permissive will; manifested some evident confusion. Now “in all the churches of the saints” (I Cor. 14:33), I do not necessarily say in the world of the ungodly (Gen. 11:1-9), but “in all the churches of the saints,” “God is not the author of confusion, but of peace” (I Cor. 14:33). So where are these Neo-Alexandrians coming from anyway? Clearly not from a pure, orthodox, uncompromising, holy Protestant faith! If they were, they would be Neo-Byzantines!

With the Western Text and a number of Syriac Versions agreeing with *Codex Sinaiticus*, for the wrong reasons, the right reading was followed by Moffatt as, “a hundred times” (Moffatt Bible). So too, the TR’s reading as found in *Codex Sinaiticus* was followed by the NIV and TEV.

Uncertain as to how to deal with the division between the two major Alexandrian texts, the American Standard Version put the correct reading of *Codex Sinaiticus* in their main text as “a hundredfold” (ASV), and the incorrect reading of *Codex Vaticanus* in a footnote, saying, “Some ancient authorities read ‘manifold’” (ASV ftn). The ASV’s format was followed by the RSV, NRSV, and ESV. Reversing the order, and putting the variant in the main text, with the TR’s reading in a footnote, a similar technique was then followed by the NASB’s 1st edition. But time can harden the resolve of those who have resisted God’s truth; and in the NASB’s 2nd and 3rd editions, the variant is followed with no such footnote, and so it simply reads, “many times” (NASB 3rd ed.). Such an unqualified usage of the variant is also found in the TCNT, NEB, and REB e.g., the Twentieth Century New Testament also simply reads, “many times” (TCNT).

Matt. 20:5a “Again” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek, “*Palin* (Again),” in the words, “Again he went out” (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, “*Iterum* (Again),” in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century).

However, a variant reads, Greek, “*palin* (again) *de* (and / but).” It is found as Latin, “*iterum* (again) *autem* (but / and),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions d (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and 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, “*Et* (And) *iterum* (again),” in old Latin Version f (6th century). It is also found in 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 speculative.

Was this an accidental change? In Greek capital letters or unicals, “*de* (and / but),” looks like “ΔΕ,” and earlier manuscripts such as e.g., *Codex Freerianus* (W 032) are in such capital letters in continuous script i.e., without spaces between the words (although W 032 has stylistic paper spaces for its verse divisions). In W 032 the “*Palin* (Again)” of Matt. 20:5a ends one letter space before the letters above it, that is, the “*d*” is completed on the next line with “*s*” i.e., the “*dos* (I will give)” of Matt. 20:4. In this

one letter space gap, coming through the parchment from the other side of the page, is a shape that looks something like, “Λ.” In fact, on the other side of the page this is the “A” in the “ANOIC (men)” (with a line over the “NOI” indicating abbreviation i.e., *anthropois*) of Matt. 19:26. Did a scribe, working with a similar manuscript, mistake the “Λ” at the end of a line for “a paper fade” of the letter, “Δ” (delta), and then “reconstruct” from “this clue” the “missing word” of “ΔΕ (And / But)”?

Was this a deliberate change? The early attestation of Cyril of Alexandria indicates the usage of this variant around ancient Alexandria, known to have a more orthodox (Byzantine School) group of scribes, and a less orthodox (Alexandrian School) group of scribes. Was this a deliberate “stylistic change,” if so, probably by a scribe influenced by the unorthodox Alexandrian School?

On the one hand the TR’s reading has strong support in the Greek from ancient times. It also has good and diverse support from ancient times in the Latin of a number of old Latin versions. But on the other hand, the variant has the support of the Vulgate, and old Latin versions starting from ancient times, together with an ancient church writer. Balancing out these considerations, it seems to me that the excellent Latin support for the TR’s reading more than compensates for its absence in the Vulgate and some other old Latin Versions. When this consideration is added to the extremely weak support of the variant in the Greek, and one takes into account the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*; then on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 20:5a 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. 20:5a, “Again,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32; 22:3-16), (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), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); and Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

However, the variant, “And again,” 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 C 04 (5th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); as well as Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found enclosed by critical signs indicating that it is not the representative text, in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

The hung nature of the two main Alexandrian texts, got the Neo-Alexandrian text compilers all hung up here. They like to pretend they have "textual analytical skills," but really they pretty much rely on their two major Alexandrian Texts, and everything else is largely padding. When those two texts disagree, such as occurs here, they generally have a pretty serious problem on their hands.

*O very foolish ones, what will you leave us this time?
 You can only do the Devil's work for a short time;
 And though your ideas are very popular right now,
 They will perish away though you do not know yet how;
 O very foolish ones, what will you leave us this time?*

In the case of Tischendorf the answer in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) was, "The text in my darling discovery, *Codex Sinaiticus*," i.e., the variant. But a different, though still incorrect, uniform answer was given in the case of 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). It was "a shrug of the shoulders," and a "I dunno" [I don't know]. Hence they all put the "*de*" in square brackets, making its usage entirely optional.

On the one hand, the neo-Alexandrian versions normally considered, appear to have *prima facie* selected the option of omission, though most of them lack the literalness to really be sure as to exactly what they thought of this variant. On this occasion I shall pass over all but two of them, *infra*.

But on the other hand, there is a version of sufficient literalness and importance for us to consider in more detail. That is the Roman Catholic's *Douay-Rheims Version*. Compiled by the pre-Vatican II old Latin Papists, it clearly follows the Vulgate in reading, "And again" from the Latin, "*iterum* (again) *autem* (and)."
 Hence this is an old battle-line between the Protestants of the *Textus Receptus* arguing for the superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin* over the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*; and the Papists arguing for the sole usage, and thus the unnatural superiority of, the maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*. Protestants historically stood with the King James Version in one hand, and the *Textus Receptus* in the other hand, declaring that Matt. 20:5a reads, "Again he went out about the sixth and ninth hour" etc. (AV). They were met and joined in battle here by the Papists, who with the Douay-Rheims Versions in one hand and the Clementine Vulgate in the other hand, claimed that

Matt. 20:5a reads, “And again he went out about the sixth and the ninth hour” etc. (Douay-Rheims).

It is thus of some interest to note that the post Vatican II new neo-Alexandrian Papists appear to have done a summersault at Matt. 20:5a. For either “And” or “But” is entirely omitted from this verse in the Roman Catholic’s Jerusalem Bible and New Jerusalem Bible. Is that because they disagree with the Douay-Rheims Version here, or is that because they are both fairly non-literal translations, and so the omission or inclusion of an “And” or “But” does not mean much too them? We do not know. And nor do their benighted minions in Popery. *Let us thank God for the clarity of the Authorized King James Version, and its faithfulness to the trustworthy Received Text!*

Matt. 20:6a “hour” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Inside the closed class of sources, it would be possible to argue that the Latin Versions cited in the support of the TR’s reading, *infra*, added the Latin, “*horam* (hour)” or “*hora* (hour),” as part of translation. But the fact that other Latin Versions did not do so, shows that this was not a necessary component of Latin translation. Of course, if they did, the rejoinder would surely be, that perhaps those Latin Versions listed as following the variant, *infra*, omitted Greek, “*oran* (hour),” as “redundant in Latin translation.” While the matter could be debated back and forth endlessly, on this occasion, I have taken the Latin diversity to reflect the Greek diversity.

In doing so, on this occasion I find myself in agreement with the textual apparatuses of Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), which e.g., lists old Latin e, f, q, & c, and Hilary for the TR’s reading, and the Vulgate with old Latin a, b, ff2, h, n, l, & g1 for the variant; and Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993), which says the TR’s reading is supported by “the majority of old Latin witnesses,” whereas the variant has “the support of the Vulgate and a part of the Old Latin tradition.” But in this instance at Matt. 20:6a in so agreeing with Tischendorf and Nestle-Aland, the reader should be aware that other interpretations of the data are certainly possible.

Cf. comments in Appendix 1 on Matt. 20:6a at Matt. 20:3.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:6a, the TR’s Greek, “*endekaten* (‘eleventh,’ word 1) *oran* (‘hour,’ word 2),” 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, “*undecimam* (‘eleventh,’ word 1) *horam* (‘hour,’ word 2),” in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), q (6th / 7th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as Latin, “*horam* (‘hour,’ word 2) *undecimam* (‘eleventh,’ word 1)” in old Latin Version f (6th century); and as Latin, “*undecima* (‘eleventh,’ word 1) *hora* (‘hour,’ word 2),” in old Latin Version ff2

(5th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

However, a variant omitting word 2, and so reading simply, Greek, “*endekaten* (‘eleventh,’ word 1),” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 11 (12th century). It is further found as simply, Latin, “*undecimam* (‘eleventh,’ word 1),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th 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 also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and 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 is therefore correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural.

Was this an accidental loss? E.g., having first written “*endekaten* (‘eleventh,’ word 1),” did the eye of a scribe then jump from the last “n” (nu) of “*endekaten* (‘eleventh,’ word 1)” to the final “n” (nu) of “*oran* (‘hour,’ word 2)” on the manuscript he was copying from, and did he then keep writing, thus omitting “*oran* (hour)”?” (See my comments in e.g., Appendix 3 on the trilogy of Matt. 19:16a, Matt. 19:15, & Matt. 19:17b; as well as my Appendix 3 comments at Matt. 19:23)? Or was “*oran* (hour)” perhaps lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was this a deliberate change? The variant appears to have originated with Origen, and so this must increase the likelihood of this possibility. Moreover, at least on this occasion, its later citation by Cyril of Alexandria seems to indicate it thereafter gained a popularity in the area of Alexandria; and since this pruning was a favoured characteristic of the Alexandrian School (although they also less commonly added), it looks like the type of thing that the Alexandrians might adopt from Origen as part of their penchant for pruning the text. Therefore, did Origen here deliberately prune away “*oran* (hour)” as “unnecessary wordage,” in order to make “a more succinct and concise” text?

A deliberate or accidental change? We do not know for sure. But we do know that this was a change to text, in all probability from the hand of Origen.

On the one hand, while the variant has weak support in the Greek, by contrast, the *Textus Receptus* (TR) reading here has rock solid support in the Greek. The TR’s reading also has support in a few old Latin Version, being found in the Latin textual tradition from ancient times. It enjoys the further support of the Bishop of Poitiers and anti-Arian champion of Trinitarian orthodoxy, the church father, St. Hilary. But on the other hand, the variant is found in the Vulgate and has good support in the Latin textual tradition dating from ancient times. It has the further support of two ancient church writers. Taking these factors into account, noting that its support by two ancient church writers on this occasion acts to enhance the likelihood that it was a deliberate change, *supra*; noting its very weak support in the Greek; and giving full credence to the

superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*; on this occasion acts to nullify those positive things that might *prima facie* be said for the variant. Therefore, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 20:6a an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 20:6a, "eleventh hour," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; 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 (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However the variant reading, "eleventh," 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 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32; 22:3-16), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent). It is also found in the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous variant entered the NU Text *et al* at Matt. 20:6a. Therefore the American Standard Version reads with "hour" in italics as added, "the eleventh *hour*" (ASV). This same format of added italics is also found in the NASB. Because the other neo-Alexandrian versions generally considered do not use italics for added words, no clear and obvious adoption of the erroneous variant is evident in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV, even though one can confidently say that their translators would be following the Greek of the NU Text *et al*. Such slackness of translation which results from the non-use of italics, is also evident in the Roman Catholic Douay-Rheims, which in rendering the Latin, "*undecimam* (eleventh)," reads, "the eleventh hour" (Douay-Rheims). This thus parallels a similar slackness of translation of the neo-Alexandrian Greek with such a reading in the Roman Catholic Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles.

However an interesting comparison is found between the Moffatt Bible and Twentieth Century New Testament. Starting the day at 6 a.m., so that "the eleventh

hour” (AV) is 5 p.m.; Moffatt, who does not use italics, is clearly adding in as part of his dynamic equivalent, “o’clock” (rather than “hour” as he alters it to a.m. and p.m. time), in his reading, “at five o’clock” (Moffatt). By contrast, in a more literal dynamic equivalent of Westcott-Hort, the TCNT simply reads, “about five.”

Matt. 20:6b “idle” (TR & AV) {A}

The TR’s Greek, “*argous* (idle),” in the words, “and found others standing (*estotas*) idle (*argous*)” (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, “*otiosos* (idle),” after “*stantes* (standing),” in old Latin Versions h (5th century), f (6th century), and q (6th / 7th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407), and in a partial quote by Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444, omitting “standing” in *Concerning Worship*).

However a variant omits Greek, “*argous* (idle),” and so reads simply, “standing (*estotas*).” This is found as Latin, “*stantes* (standing),” 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), n (5th / 6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444); the ancient church Latin writer, Arnobius (d. after 455); 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 speculative.

Was this an accidental change? Did the eye of a copyist looking at “*estotas argous*,” jump by ellipsis from the final “s” (sigma) of “*estotas* (standing)” to the final “s” (sigma) of “*argous* (idle),” thereby accidentally omitting “*argous* (idle)”? Alternatively, was the “*argous* (idle)” lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was this a deliberate change? Its probable origins with Origen, and evident popular circulation in the region of Alexandria, certainly heighten the likelihood of this possibility. Given that the verse ends with the statement, “and saith unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle (*argoi*, masculine plural nominative adjective, from *argos*)?” did Origen consider the usage of *argos* in the immediately preceding words, “and found others standing idle (*argous*, masculine plural accusative adjective, from *argos*),” was “therefore redundant” and “unnecessary wordage” to be pruned away? If so, was Origen further influenced in this conclusion by the prefatory usage of *argos* in the words of Matt. 20:3, “And he ... saw others standing idle (*argous*) ...”?

A deliberate or accidental change? We cannot be sure, although on the balance

of probabilities, I think that on this occasion it was probably, though not definitely, a deliberate change by Origen.

On the one hand, the TR's reading has rock solid support in the Greek from ancient times; support in the Latin textual tradition from ancient times with a few old Latin versions; and the further support of the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom. But on the other hand, the variant is the majority Latin reading with support from the Vulgate *et al*, and also has the support of a few ancient writers. Weighing up these considerations, bearing in mind that this looks like a typical Origen pruning which thereafter found support in Alexandria, and remembering the perpetual 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. 20:6b 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. 20:6b, "standing idle," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the *Family I 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 Armenian Version (5th century); and Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century).

However, the incorrect reading which omits, "idle," and so reads just, "standing," 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 at the hand of a later "corrector" in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); as well as in (the mixed text type) Codex 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32; 22:3-16), (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), and 700 (11th century, independent). It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Hence at Matt. 20:6b the ASV reads, "and found others standing, and he saith unto them" etc. . The incorrect

reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

The omission is long known to we neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus*. It is found in the Western Greek Text which the great neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries rightly repudiated as an untrustworthy text. It was also adopted by our old pre-Vatican II Council boxing opponents, the Latin Papists of the Douay-Rheims Version, who preferred the Latin of the Vulgate over the Greek of the Byzantine Text. It has likewise been adopted by the post Vatican II Council neo-Alexandrian Papists of the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles, who preferred the faulty Alexandrian Greek and Western Greek texts over the Greek of the Byzantine and Received Texts. The fight we had in olden times with the Western Greek scribes and Latin Papists, is now continued with the modern neo-Alexandrians, who hail this omission as some kind of “new insight.” In fact, it is an old error. “There is no new thing under the sun” (Eccl. 1:9).

Matt. 20:7 “and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

In the TR’s reading, Greek, “*lepesthe* (ye shall receive),” is an indicative middle future, 2nd person plural verb, from *lambano*. The Matthean Greek, “*lepesthe*,” is a syncopated form, losing the “m” (mu). When going from the “*lab*” root of *lambano*, the “a” (alpha / α) is lengthened to an “e” (eta / η), then a “m” (mu / μ) is added in, and when the “b” (beta / β) is added to the “s” (sigma) of “*somai*” it forms “ps” (psi / ψ) i.e., “*lempsomai* (λημψομαι) is the indicative middle future, 1st person singular verb form. In *koine* Greek the middle form is usually regarded as a deponent i.e., a middle form with an active meaning. But to this I make the qualification that I consider the middle form has more non-deponent usage in NT *koine* Greek than the general *koine* Greek as a consequence of Septuagint influence. (See my comments at Matt. 19:20.) This longer form with the “m” (mu) appears as a minority Byzantine reading at the hands of standardizing “corrector” scribes in W 032, Sigma 042, N 022, and X 033 (10th century).

Without changing its meaning, W 032 and Lectionary 2378, both follow a modified suffix which is a local dialect form that changes the “e” (epsilon) ending for “ai” (alpha iota). (See commentary at Matt. 16:8b.) Thus W 032 reads, “*lempsesthai*,” and Lectionary 2378 reads, “*lepesthai*.” Hence I show W 032, Sigma 042, and Lectionary 2378 as following the representative Byzantine text, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:7, the TR’s Greek, “*kai* (and) *o ean* (whatsoever) *e* (‘it is,⁹¹ present tense = ‘is’) *dikaion* (right), *lepesthe* (ye shall receive),” i.e., “and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive” (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 Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544). It

⁹¹ Subjunctive active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *eimi*.

is also supported as Latin, “*et* (and) *quod* (whatsoever) *iustum* (right) *est* (‘it is,’⁹² present tense = ‘is’) *accipietis* (ye shall receive)” in old Latin Version f (6th century); and as Latin, “*et* (and) *quod* (whatsoever) *fuerit* (‘it will be,’⁹³ future tense = ‘will be’) *iustum* (right) *accipietis* (ye shall receive)” in old Latin Versions h (5th century) and q (6th / 7th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Chrysostom in a Latin work (d. 6th century).

However, a variant omitting these words is found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

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

Was this an accidental change? In Manuscript Washington (W 032) these words cover two lines, but in toto are one line in length. Were these words written as one line on the bottom line of a parchment? Were they then lost in a paper fade or paper loss? If the latter, then with the last line of the opposite page ending a line earlier. Did a subsequent scribe, thinking that the passage “made sense” without these words, then not detect the loss, and so did he then copy out the faulty manuscript with this omission?

Was this a deliberate change? Its probable origins with Origen increase the likelihood of this possibility. As at Matt. 6:4b,6 (see commentary at these verses), the omission here at Matt. 20:7 thus appears to have originated with Origen. The proposition that, “whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive,” and that this is the same whether a Christian labours in the Lord’s field after conversion for fifty years, thirty years, ten years, or like the thief on the cross (Luke 23:39-43), less than a day, is a thorough going repudiation of justification by works, and a glorious statement of the doctrine of justification by faith (Rom. 1:17). Our salvation in Christ is complete. By his “one offering” of himself on the cross, our Lord “hath perfected forever them that are sanctified” (Heb. 10:14). There can be no such thing as the Romish, “works of supererogation,” for “voluntary works besides, over and above God’s commandments, which” the Papists “call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety: for by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required,

⁹² Indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *sum-esse-fui-futurum*.

⁹³ Indicative active future perfect, 3rd person singular verb, from *sum-esse-fui-futurum*.

whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, We are unprofitable servants” (Luke 17:10) (Article 14, Anglican *39 Articles*).

Such is the “desperately wicked” and “deceitful” “heart” of man (Jer. 17:9), that this same heresy has crept into some professedly Protestant churches, (though no true Protestant could possibly believe it,) with a new spin or presentation. They claim that while Christ has fully procured our salvation by faith through grace, nevertheless, by various good works e.g., evangelism, one can “earn a reward” on top of salvation e.g., a bigger mansion in the sky that that which one would otherwise have gotten. Some who profess this heresy, such as a Presbyterian I once spoke to who was part of a group of fellow Presbyterians who agreed, talk about earning a multiplicity of “crowns.” In doing so, these Presbyterians set aside their own doctrinal standards, for the Presbyterian *Westminster Catechism* Answer 34 rightly refers to, “full remission of sin.” If it is “full,” how can there be anything left for some kind of “bonus” “reward”?

In fact, our good works e.g., “to” “give” a “drink unto one of these little ones ... in the name of a disciple” (Matt. 10:42), manifests, or is a fruit of, the fact that we are saved. Thus Christ says of such a saved person who clearly exhibits the fruits of Christian charity, “He shall in no wise lose his reward” (Matt. 10:42). Thus the “reward” we Christians receive is that which is procured for us by *Christ alone*. “We love him, because he first loved us” (I John 4:19). We serve him not in order to be saved or get some “extra” / “bonus” “reward,” but rather, because we are saved.

The doctrine of justification by faith, is e.g., found in Gen. 15. He we read of Abraham (when he was still Abram), that “he believed in the Lord: and he counted it to him for righteousness” (Gen. 15:6; see Rom. 4:1-5; Gal. 3:6-11). This verse of Gen. 15:6 is well known. But let the good Christian reader also note well the associated words of Gen. 15:1, “... the word of the Lord came unto Abram ..., saying, Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward.” Thus “the Lord” is the “exceeding great reward” (Gen. 15:1) of the man justified by faith (Gen. 15:6).

For in the Garden of Eden man had full communion with God, but as a consequence of the Fall this was lost (Gen. 2 & 3). But to the man justified by faith, he “hath ... sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts” (II Cor. 1:22). “Now he that hath wrought us for the selfsame thing” of eternal “life” “is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are home in the body, we are absent from the Lord” (II Cor. 5:4-6); “having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better: nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for” us for a season (Philp. 1:23,24). For we “are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, ... and to the spirits of just men made perfect” (Heb. 12:22,23). For “the Lord” is not simply our “reward,” but rather, “the Lord” is our “*exceeding great* reward” (Gen. 15:1, emphasis mine). If God is our “reward,” what a shocking violation of the first commandment (Exod. 20:2,3) it truly is, to think that something else could ever be given to us on top of this “reward” for our so called “good works,” when of course the reality is, that judged by the standards of God’s perfection, “all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags” (Isa. 64:6).

Let us then stand *by faith* where Abraham stood, let us be like him who “believed in the Lord” (Gen. 15:6), knowing and being grateful for the fact, that it is the infinite “Lord” himself who is our “exceeding great reward” (Gen. 15:1).

Articles 2 and 4 of the *Apostles’ Creed* say we believe “in Jesus Christ ... our Lord,” who “suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried;” and Articles 11 and 12 of the Creed tells us that because of this we have “the forgiveness of sins” and “life everlasting.” The words of the *Nicene Creed* clearly isolate this doctrine of vicarious substitutional atonement, saying that it was “for us” that Christ was “crucified,” so as to procure “for us men,” “our salvation.” “I believe ... in one Lord Jesus Christ, ... God ... of one substance with the Father, ... who *for us men, and for our salvation* came down from heaven ... and was *crucified also for us, ... suffered death* and was buried” (*Nicene Creed*, emphasis mine).

The teaching of the *Apostles’ Creed* and *Nicene Creed* is the teaching of the Bible (Matt. 20:1-16; Luke 17:5-10). Let us never depart from it! Referring to the spiritual baptism of the Holy Ghost by Christ (Isa. 52:15; Matt. 3:11; John 3:5), the *Nicene Creed* refers to “one baptism for the remission of sins,” which spiritual baptism of regeneration (Titus 3:4-7; cf. Ezek. 36:25) is the “one baptism” (Eph. 4:5) common to all Christians (irrespective of how they have the symbol of water baptism administered to them). But “even after we have received the Holy Ghost” in spiritual “baptism,” we may still “fall into sin,” though “by the grace of God we may arise again, and amend our lives” (Article 16, Anglican *39 Articles*) (e.g., I John 1: 8,9). What the *Apostles’ Creed* calls, “the forgiveness of sins,” includes both sins of commission (what we have done) and sins of omission (what we ought to have done) (Matt. 23:23). Hence when we say the words of the *Lord’s Prayer*, “forgive us our debts” (AV) or “forgive us our trespasses” (Matt. 6:12) (Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662); let us do so with *full assurance* of the fact that God the “Father” gave his “only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption,” and that he “made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) *a full, perfect, and sufficient* sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for ... sins” (The Communion Service, Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662).

The proposition that, “whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive” (Matt. 20:7) reminds us that under the covenant of grace, God “will have mercy” upon us (Matt. 12:7), so that we may have “faith” and be made spiritually “whole,” of which Christ’s miracles of physically healing were an object lesson (Matt. 9:22). Only when we thus truly acknowledge Christ as “the Son of God” (Matt. 27:54) and our “Lord” (Matt. 8:8), heeding his call to “Repent” (Matt. 4:17) from our sins as most especially found in the Ten Commandments (Matt. 19:18,19), trusting in him whose “blood of the new testament” “is shed for many for the remission of sins” (Matt. 26:28), can we experience regeneration as Christ spiritually baptizes us “with the Holy Ghost, and with fire” (Matt. 3:11) (of which water baptism is but a symbol), and we may have a new and “pure” “heart” (Matt. 5:8). “Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus” (Heb. 10:19), let us stand unflinchingly in the wonderful truths of the Gospel recovered at the time of the Reformation ignited by God at Wittenberg Castle Chapel under Martin Luther on the Eve of All Saints’ Day, 1517.

Let us hold to the *Reformation Motto*, *sola fide* (faith alone), *sola gratia* (grace alone), *sola Scriptura* (Scripture alone). Let us not dilute it with any kind of works righteousness, for as a consequence of original sin occasioned by the Fall, “all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags” (Isa. 64:6), but through him of whom Isaiah speaks in Isaiah chapter 53, we hear the beautiful words, “Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.” That, good Christian reader, is the type of *reasoning* that I like, and I hope it is the type of reasoning you like too, because it is the only type of reasoning acceptable to God. “For by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified” (Gal. 2:16); “for, The just shall live by faith” (Gal. 3:11).

Nevertheless, for the heretic Origen, the words of Matt. 20:7, “whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive,” may have seemed “theologically misleading.” “After all,” may have thought Origen, “this was ‘about the eleventh hour’” (Matt. 20:6) i.e., near the end of the work day. Origen did not, *in such an unqualified way*, believe in one and the same reward of life eternal with God in glory for those who were to be saved. Rather, this universalist considered that in the next life there were purgatorial grades that the souls of people passed through *over time*, i.e., by “*working longer*” one gets a better “*reward*,” and that eventually, the souls of all would pass on into Paradise. Therefore, did Origen deliberately remove what to him were at best, these “misleading words,” or at worst, these “offensive words,” hoping thereby to “encourage people to right-doing in this life,” i.e., by “not focusing on the idea that those who are to be saved receive one and the same reward,” since in his opinion there would be a series of different “rewards” in which not all were to receive the same reward, but “a better reward” in the first instance for those saved who without first going through various “purgatorial grades reached heaven,” and in the second instance, a principle in these “purgatorial grades” that *over time* one can “improve one’s position” and finally obtain entrance to heaven?

A deliberate or accidental change? We cannot be sure. We can only be sure that a change was here made to the Received Text of Holy Scripture.

On the one hand, the *Textus Receptus* (TR) reading here at Matt. 20:7 has the rock solid support of the Greek. It also has support from a few old Latin versions starting in the 6th century; and the notable support of the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople. But on the other hand, the variant is the majority Latin reading. Weighing up these factors, taking into account the probable origins of the variant with Origen, and recognizing the perpetual 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. 20:7 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. 20:7, “and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04

(5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), 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); 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 additionally found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; with slight variation in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries). It is further found in Ciasca's Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), where we read in Ciasca's Latin translation of the Arabic, "*et (and) quod (whatsoever) aequum (just) est (is), accipietis (ye shall receive).*"

However, the incorrect variant which omits these words, is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.* It is also found in Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

The incorrect variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence at Matt. 20:7, the words, "and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive" (AV), are absent from the end of the verse in the ASV. They are also missing in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

Before the Vatican II Council (1962-5), the Pope liked to wear the triple tiara, which when placed on his head, made him look like the "little horn" which "plucked up" "three" "horns" (Dan. 7:8), i.e., the Vandals (c. 533), Ostrogoths (c. 556), and Lombards (c. 752). That is because from 533 to 565, the Bishops of Rome being made by Emperor Justinian the titular "head of the churches," were both a prophetic type of the then future Antichrist that arose from 607, and also important stepping stones to that unrewarding goal; and then the Roman Papacy once established in 607, thereafter gained temporal power with the first of the Papal States in 756. Hence Holy Daniel says, "I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another little horn [the Papacy], before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots" (Dan. 7:8). The Lombards under King Aistulf, being poised to take Rome, were stopped when Pepin's Frankish armies, acting on the Pope's request, subdued them in 754-756 and gave the Papacy its first temporal territory in 756⁹⁴. Both before and after the Vatican II Council,

⁹⁴ The Lombard kingdom lingered till 773 when Aistulf's successor, King

the Pope likes to wear his two-horned papal mitre, reminding us that with his “two horns” (Rev. 13:11) he presides over, and is head of, the Romish “ecumenical councils” i.e., “the false prophet” (Rev. 16:13; 20:10).

Before “the ecumenical” Vatican II Council, the words of Matt. 20:7, “and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive,” were omitted in the old Latin Papists’ Douay-Rheims Version (1582 & 1609/10), which ends with the words, “Go ye also into my vineyard” (Douay-Rheims)⁹⁵. So too, after the Vatican II Council, one finds these words are absent in the new neo-Alexandrian Papists’ *Jerusalem Bible* (1966) and *New Jerusalem Bible* (1985). Whether wearing the Papal triple tiara (Dan. 7:8), or the two-horned Papal mitre (Rev. 13:11), the Pope’s aims in attacking the Received Text of Holy Scripture here at Matt. 20:7 are the same.

In *The Litany* of the 1662 Anglican Prayer Book, there are a number of versicles and responses. These include:

... *Minister*: “O God, we have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us, the noble works that thou didst in their days, and in the old time before them.”

People Answer: “O Lord, arise, help us, and deliver us for thine honour.”

Minister: “Glory be to the Father, and to the Son: and to the Holy Ghost:”

People Answer: “As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.”

Minister: “From our enemies defend us, O Christ”

We cannot doubt that “in the old days,” “the noble works” of God included the way God did “defend” the Protestants with the Received Text and Authorized Version, here at Matt. 20:7 and elsewhere. In those days, the Papists came forlornly clutching to their Clementine Vulgates and Douay-Rheims Versions which omit the words of Matt. 20:7, “and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive;” while these Papists were simultaneously clutching at straws in their hopeless claims about some kind of “second chance” in “purgatory.” To be sure, these Popish persons were very much like Origen in this matter, notwithstanding certain differences between “purgatorial” notions held by Origen as opposed to those taught in Roman Catholicism. But the battle we neo-Byzantines of the *Textus Receptus* and King James Version fought “in the old time” with Papists here at Matt. 20:7, has come back at us again, not this time by the old Latin Papists, but rather from the new neo-Alexandrians, which is an alliance wider than, but including, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles.

Desiderius, lost it to Pepin’s son, Charlemagne, who absorbed the Lombards into the Frank’s Empire, although some of the southern Lombard dukedoms continued longer and were finally conquered by the Normans.

⁹⁵ Unlike the Vulgate (and old Latin q, 1, ff1, & c), the Clementine (manifesting its reading’s presence in old Latin a, e, b, d, ff2, h, n, f, aur, & g1) adds the conflation, “*mean* (my),” i.e., “my vineyard” (Douay-Rheims) rather than “the vineyard” (AV, TR & MBT).

We are fighting where we have fought before, and by the grace of God, we will stand at this waymark and defend the Received Text here at Matt. 20:7 against the neo-Alexandrians, even as we did against the Latin Papists. We will never surrender, nor give up in maintaining and upholding the pure Word of God, the Lord being our helper! Our blade is whet for the battle! That blade has never seen defeat, nor can ever see defeat. It is the Textus Receptus from which was translated the King James Version of 1611. It is the very “sword of” “the Lord” (II Cor. 3:17; Philp. 6:17). To those who now wish to charge at us with their black, dull, blunted, neo-Alexandrian African “sword,” we stand unflinchingly with our white, shining, sharp, neo-Byzantine Received Text “sword;” and declare, “ON GUARD!!”

Matt. 20:15c “Is thine eye evil, because I am good?” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. At Matt. 20:15c the reading of Scrivener’s text has “*ei*” before, “Is thine eye evil, because I am good?” The Greek “*ei*” is an interrogative participle, which introduces direct or indirect questions. The answer to such questions will be a simple, “Yea” or “nay,” as opposed to content questions. Though it may be translated as “if” or “whether” for an indirect question, for direct questions such as here at Matt. 20:15c, it is an untranslatable Greek nuance⁹⁶.

The alternative reading is “ε (or).” The Greek “ε” may be used to introduce either related or opposite alternatives. When the alternatives are opposites, it may be easily rendered as “or;” and if context so allows, it may also be rendered “or” for a related alternative⁹⁷. If used here at Matt. 20:15c, it introduces a related alternative i.e., “Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? *Or* (Greek ε) is thine eye evil, because I am good?”

There is thus a clear difference in English translation on the two Greek readings.

Robinson & Pierpont, Hodges & Farstad, and Green’s Textual Apparatus are all based on von Soden. Robinson & Pierpont’s majority text (2005) reads, “*Ei*,” and shows no alternative reading in its side margin indicating “the Byzantine Textform” is “significantly divided⁹⁸” (though its apparatus says the NU Text reads “ε” here). By contrast, Hodges & Farstad’s majority text (1985) has the *ei* in the main text, indicating it is their preferred reading, but a footnote indicates a significant division, with part of their majority text following *ei*; and part of it following ε, including what they call the Received Text (which like Swanson, they evidently do not here equate with Scrivener’s

⁹⁶ Young’s *Greek*, p. 186.

⁹⁷ Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, p. 672.

⁹⁸ Robinson & Pierpont, pp. xviii-xix, 44.

text which reads, *ei*). Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) makes no reference to this reading (all textual apparatuses are selective, and since, like myself, but unlike Hodges & Farstad, Pierpont understands the TR to read "*ei*," he would not list it if he considered it was supported by the majority Byzantine text, which we know to be his view from Robinson & Pierpont's Majority Text).

Therefore, on this particular occasion I shall consult von Soden (1913) directly, and in doing so, show my thinking so as to help the reader better understand how the Majority Text of Robinson & Pierpont is more specifically a Majority *Byzantine* Text based on von Soden's "K" group, and here at Matt. 20:15c shown to be reliable.

At Matt. 20:15c, von Soden says the reading, "*ei*," has the support of both his Kx and Kr groups. Given the generalist nature of von Soden's system, in practice this means one can say that 90% or more of these two groups support this reading. Von Soden's Kx group comprises just over 52% of von Soden's K group of 983 manuscripts; and just over 51% of the K group's Byzantine texts. The Kx group contains 513 manuscripts of which 502 manuscripts or *c.* 98% (97.89%) are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts, i.e., 482 manuscripts or *c.* 94% of manuscripts are completely Byzantine (i.e., in the Kx parts), 20 Kx manuscripts or *c.* 4% (3.85%) are Byzantine only in specific parts, and 11 Kx manuscripts or *c.* 2% (2.1%) are manuscripts that are outside the closed class of sources⁹⁹.

In von Soden's "Kr" group, there are 87 manuscripts that are otherwise not in a von Soden group¹⁰⁰. There is some doubt as to what grouping a small number of von Soden's manuscripts are meant by him to belong to with regard to the "Kr" group¹⁰¹. But 124 manuscripts that are also classified outside of von Soden's system, are to be found in von Soden's Kr group manuscripts. Of the 124 "Kr" group manuscripts that are classified outside of von Soden's system, 123 manuscripts or *c.* 99% are either Byzantine or Byzantine in specific parts¹⁰², i.e., 111 manuscripts or *c.* 90% (89.5%) of manuscripts

⁹⁹ Commentary Preface (Vol. 2), "Robinson & Pierpont's (1991) new edition Byzantine Textform (2005)."

¹⁰⁰ There are *c.* 210 manuscripts, both codices and minuscules, in the "Kr" group; together with a small number whose place either in or outside of the Kr group is *in dubio*.

¹⁰¹ Aland (*Kurzgefasste, op. cit.*) asks if von Soden includes 1323 (ε 1268), 1658 (ε 1509), & 1990 (ε 1171), in his Kr group?

¹⁰² (Showing von Soden's numbers in brackets after their Gregory numbers): Minuscules: 66 (ε 135), 83 (ε 1218), 90 (Kr in Acts, δ 652), 128 (ε 304), 141 (δ 408), 147 (ε 401), 155 (ε 403), 167 (ε 305), 170 (ε 307), 189 (ε 1401, Kr in the Gospels), 201 (δ 403), 204 (δ 357, Kr in Acts), 214 (ε 430), 246 (ε 460), 285 (ε 527), 290 (ε 512), 361 (ε 316), 386 (δ 401), 387 (ε 205), 394 (δ 460), 402 (ε 428), 415 (ε 421), 479 (δ 359, Kr in Gospels), 480 (δ 462), 498 (δ 402, Kr in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 510 (ε 259), 520 (ε

are completely Byzantine, 12 manuscripts or *c.* 9% (9.7%) are Byzantine only in specific parts, and 1 manuscripts or *c.* 1% (0.8%) are non-Byzantine¹⁰³. Applying these as projections to the 87 manuscripts of the “Kr” group, which are presently unclassified with respect to text-type outside of von Soden’s system¹⁰⁴, means we can add 86 manuscripts to the Byzantine count, of which 8 may be regarded as Byzantine only in specific parts; and add 1 manuscript to the group outside the closed class of sources.

264), 521 (ε 443), 547 (δ 157, Kr in Gospels), 553 (ε 331), 575 (ε 532), 586 (ε 417), 588 (ε 414), 594 (ε 1402), 604 (α 459), 634 (α 462), 645 (ε 434), 656 (δ 463, Kr in General Epistles), 664 (δ 502, Kr in Acts & Pauline Epistles), 673 (ε 1391), 685 (ε 339), 689 (ε 326), 691 (ε 1387), 694 (ε 502), 696 (ε 328), 757 (δ 304), 758 (ε 474), 763 (ε 539), 769 (ε 540), 781 (ε 534), 786 (ε 536), 802 (ε 470), 806 (ε 3036), 845 (ε 412), 867 (ε 400), 897 (ε 361), 928 (δ 478), 936 (ε 2098), 938 (ε 1451), 952 (ε 1453), 953 (ε 556), 955 (ε 557), 958 (ε 558), 959 (δ 461), 960 (ε 1455), 961 (ε 559), 962 (ε 560), 966 (ε 1482), 1003 (ε 1346 & α 484), 1017 (ε 548), 1020 (ε 1408), 1023 (ε 1410), 1025 (ε 1331), 1030 (ε 620), 1046 (ε 1445), 1059 (ε 1447), 1062 (ε 1449), 1072 (δ 406), 1075 (δ 506), 1088 (ε 709), 1100 (α 474), 1119 (ε 1486), 1176 (ε 1235), 1189 (ε 493), 1199 (ε 1197), 1224 (ε 1123), 1234 (ε 498), 1236 (ε 1400), 1248 (δ 409, Kr in Acts, Kx in Gospels), 1249 (α 454), 1250 (ε 571 & α 564), 1251 (δ 269, Byzantine outside General Epistles), 1330 (ε 489), 1331 (ε 490), 1334 (ε 1242), 1339 (ε 1309), 1362 (ε 608), 1367 (δ 554, Kr in Acts), 1400 (δ 378), 1482 (δ 450, Kr in Gospels), 1492 (ε 1464), 1503 (δ 413), 1508 (δ 560), 1543 (ε 1417), 1548 (δ 474), 1572 (ε 1429), 1614 (ε 1467), 1617 (δ 407), 1619 (δ 564), 1628 (δ 562), 1636 (δ 563), 1637 (δ 605, Kr in Gospels), 1649 (δ 561), 1656 (δ 482), 1725 (α 385), 1732 (α 405), 1749 (α 655), 1752 (α 362), 1855 (α 372), 1856 (α 373), 2218 (α 652), & 2221 (δ 557).

¹⁰³ Kr group: Minuscule 1101 (von Soden’s α 751, 17th century, Byzantine text type, but it is too late in time to be inside the closed class of sources).

¹⁰⁴ Kr group unclassified outside of von Soden’s system, (showing von Soden’s numbers in brackets after their Gregory numbers,) Minuscules: 35 (δ 309; Kr in Gospels), 252 (ε 438), 363 (δ 455), 444 (δ 551), 486 (ε 510), 536 (δ 264, Kr in Gospels), 676 (ε 268 & α 273), 940 (ε 1364), 986 (δ 508), 1040 (δ 465), 1092 (ε 4011), 1095 (ε 1475), 1111 (ε 1496), 1117 (ε 1485), 1131 (ε 582), 1132 (ε 583), 1133 (ε 1488), 1140 (α 371), 1145 (ε 616), 1147 (ε 481), 1158 (ε 543), 1165 (ε 484), 1180 (ε 542), 1329 (ε 1241), 1348 (ε 492), 1401 (ε 1469), 1427 (ε 4017), 1461 (ε 561), 1462 (ε 2096), 1465 (ε 562), 1480 (ε 566), 1487 (ε 1382), 1488 (ε 567), 1489 (ε 568), 1490 (δ 393), 1493 (ε 569), 1495 (δ 499, Kr in Acts), 1496 (ε 570), 1501 (δ 479), 1550 (ε 1420), 1551 (ε 3041 & α 1376), 1552 (ε 1421), 1559 (ε 1375), 1560 (ε 1424), 1576 (ε 1430), 1584 (ε 1433), 1591 (ε 643), 1596 (ε 554), 1599 (δ 476), 1600 (ε 1438), 1601 (ε 1439), 1609 (δ 480), 1620 (ε 628), 1621 (ε 609), 1624 (ε 595), 1625 (ε 3008), 1630 (ε 1472), 1633 (ε 581), 1634 (ε 579), 1638 (ε 576), 1650 (ε 632), 1653 (δ 604), 1659 (ε 575), 1667 (ε 1477), 1680 (ε 635), 1686 (ε 1500), 1688 (ε 3049), 1694 (ε 4012), 1698 (ε 1501), 1700 (ε 710), 1705 (ε 645), 1713 (ε 591), 1779 (ε 4016), 1785 (δ 405), 1786 (ε 1503), 1865 (α 380), 2080 (α 406, Kr in Acts), 2122 (ε 2090), 2124 (ε 3035), 2204 (ε 1507), 2213 (ε 572), 2231 (ε 2094), 2235 (ε 459), 2251 (ε 598), 2253 (ε 593), 2255 (δ 651), & 2296 (ε 276).

Tallying these Kr figures together, means that we can say (in broad-brush or approximate terms) terms, that the Kr group in toto, contains 211 manuscripts, and of these, *c.* 209 (123 + 86) are Byzantine, of which *c.* 189 (111 + 78) are completely Byzantine, *c.* 20 (12 + 8) are Byzantine only in parts, and 2 or *c.* 1% are outside the closed class of sources.

When we add these to the Kx group figures, this means that inside the K group, the reading is supported by *c.* 711 (502 Kx + 209 Kr) Byzantine manuscripts, of which 671 (482 Kx + 189 Kr) are completely Byzantine, 40 (20 Kx + 20 Kr) are Byzantine only in parts, with a further 13 (11Kx + 2 Kr) manuscripts that are outside the closed class of sources. Let us now compare these figures to the overall K group of 983 manuscripts, of which 949 are Byzantine *i.e.*, 914 are exclusively Byzantine, 35 manuscripts are Byzantine only in specific parts, and 34 are non-Byzantine. This means that inside von Soden's "K" group, 711 out of the 983 manuscripts, or 72% of the "K" group manuscripts here support the reading, "ei" at Matt. 20:15c. It means 671 completely Byzantine "K" group manuscripts, or 68% (671 out of 983) here support the reading, "ei" at Matt. 20:15c. Therefore on something like the type of system Pierpont used in Green's Textual Apparatus, with 68-72% support, the "ei" here would have a "Level 1" rating *i.e.*, "61-79% of all manuscripts" support this reading¹⁰⁵.

It is therefore not necessary for me to consider the other data in von Soden's apparatus at Matt. 20:15c. This is enough for me to conclude with Robinson & Pierpont that the representative Byzantine text here supports the reading "ei," *i.e.*, the split referred to in Hodges & Farstad is not sufficiently large to alter this conclusion (and hence Robinson & Pierpont do not show the alternative reading in their side margin, since they do not consider "the Byzantine Textform" is "significantly divided" in its *c.* 68% or more support for "ei").

The Second Matter. The reading of the Vulgate and most old Latin Versions, starts this question, "An (-) *oculus* (eye) *tuus* (of thee) ... ?" etc. . In Latin, "an (or)," may act to present a following element as the possible alternative to what is the already stated (or implied) question¹⁰⁶, and its usage at Matt. 20:15c contains this element of

¹⁰⁵ This basic conclusion is not affected by the generalist nature of von Soden's usage of Kx and Kr *i.e.*, 90% or more of these Kx and Kr manuscripts support the reading, since 90% of 68% is 61.2% *i.e.*, still over 61%. Moreover, since von Soden is generalist overall *i.e.*, in both the Kx and Kr subgroups, *as well as the larger K group*, one could (like Pierpont in Green's Textual Apparatus,) ignore this issue for these type of general calculation purposes *i.e.*, to be consistent in these figures, one would also have to calculate them out of 90% of the K group or K group 885 manuscripts rather than 983 K group manuscripts. Thus the figures will be basically the same as the way I have calculated them, notwithstanding the generalist nature of von Soden's counting *i.e.*, *c.* 68% or more support in the K group.

¹⁰⁶ O'Brien, R.J., *A Descriptive Grammar of Ecclesiastical Latin Based on Modern Structural Analysis*, Georgetown University Latin Series, Loyola University

nuance as it follows on from the first question of Matt. 20:15. The Latin “*an* (or),” may also be used for the second part of a disjunctive question, and this grammatical element which acts to urge a “yea” or “nay” answer¹⁰⁷, is thus also clearly part of its nuance here at Matt. 20:15c. On one level the Latin is thus like the Greek “*ei*,” *supra*, which in the context of Matt. 20:15c introduces a question seeking a simple “yea” or “nay” answer; but on another level, the Latin includes some elements of nuance not found in the Greek, and unlike the Greek “*ei*,” the Latin “*an*” here may, at least in *prima facie* theory, be translated into English as “or.”

The issue of whether or not to translate the Latin “*an*” here as “or” must therefore be considered. Bearing in mind that such a translation would here make it indistinguishable in English to a Latin translation based on “*aut* (or),” the Latin translators of the Douay-Rheims Version surely captured the contextual spirit and sense of the Latin here at Matt. 20:15c by wisely not translating it, and so rendering the verse, “Or, is it not lawful for me to do what I will? Is thy eye evil, because I am good?” This Douay-Rheims translation thus best captures the relevant Latin nuances *in the context of this verse*, which as manifested in the Clementine reads from the majority Latin textual tradition “*an*” (Clementine), rather than the minority Latin reading of “*aut* (or).”

Hence notwithstanding some level of difference between the nuance of the Greek, “*ei*,” and Latin “*an*” here at Matt. 20:15c, and bearing in mind that translation is an imprecise art, it seems to me that the most natural construction to place on the Latin “*an*” reading of the Vulgate *et al*, is that it is translating the Greek, “*ei*.” By contrast, I think the most natural construction to place on the Latin “*aut* (or)” reading of a few old Latin versions, *infra*, is that it is translating the Greek, “*e* (or).”

The Anglicans who translated the King James Version would *first seek the Greek, but were strong on the Latin*; whereas the Roman Catholics who translated the Douay-Rheims Version were *weak on the Greek, but strong on the Latin*. Thus the Anglican Protestants were masters of the Latin and the Greek, whereas the Papists were masters of the Latin only. And so it was, that here at Matt. 20:15c, the Roman Catholic translators of the Douay-Rheims Version captured well the sense of the Latin, “*an*,” in precisely the same way that the Protestant translators of the King James Version captured well the sense of the Greek, “*ei*,” in both instances, by not translating it into English, but simply starting the second question of Matt. 20:15 with the word, “Is ...?” i.e., “Is thy eye evil, because I am good?” (Douay-Rheims Version & Latin of the Clementine Vulgate), or “Is thine eye evil, because I am good?” (King James Version & Greek of the Received Text).

The Third Matter. In Lectionary 2378 the same letters sometimes vary. E.g., the epsilon is sometimes like a standard “ε,” at other times like an “E,” at other times

Press, Chicago, Illinois, USA, 1965, p. 159.

¹⁰⁷ Gildersleeve, B.L. & Lodge, G., *Gildersleeve’s Latin Grammar*, 1895, 3rd edition revised & enlarged, reprinted 1953, Macmillan & Co., London, UK, pp. 292-3, s. 457.

(something) like a “G” (e.g., John 1:1), and at other times (something) like a “6” (e.g., Matt. 14:14). So too, a variation occurs in the iota, which may be straight up and down with no curve in the bottom, (something) like “l”, or with a more normative curve at the bottom like the standard, “ι”. Thus e.g., at Matt. 19:3,10, the Lectionary twice reads in a more normative and clear looking script, “ει.”

But in the cursive script, the iota can look something like a “j” without the dot on top of it. Moreover, the handwriting of Lectionary 2378 may sometimes not be as clear as it could be. These factors converge here at Matt. 20:15c, so that the “ei” looks something like, “6j” joined into one by close running writing.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:15c, the TR’s Greek, “ei (-),” prefacing the question, “o (the) *ophthalmos* (eye) *sou* (of thee) *poneros* (evil) *estin* (it is), *oti* (because) *ego* (I) *agathos* (good) *eimi* (I am);” i.e., “Is thine eye evil, because I am good?” is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., H 013 (9th century), S 028 (10th century), Gamma 036 (10th century); Minuscules 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark), and 108 (11th century); and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is also supported as Latin, “An,” in the reading, “An (-) *oculus* (eye) *tuus* (of thee) ... ?” etc., found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (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, Didymus (d. 398) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, in place of “ei (-),” a minority Byzantine reading reads, “ε (or).” This is the reading found in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is further found as Latin, “aut (or),” in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), and h (5th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394).

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 change? The verse divisions of our New Testaments, first formally numbered by Robert (Robertus) Stephanus (Stephens) in 1551, often manifest a more ancient unnumbered Byzantine verse division. Hence in *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), we find a 1 to 2 letter space before the variant reading of “ε (or).” Was the original “ei (-)” lost in a paper fade / loss, and a subsequent scribe, thinking that the space simply manifested such a stylistic paper space, (which it probably did, but as 1 letter space rather than 2 letter spaces,) then “reconstruct” this “from context” as “ε (or)”?

Was this a deliberate change? Working on a manuscript which had not lost the “ε (or)” at the beginning of Matt. 20:15a (see Appendix 3), did a scribe consider it was a “stylistic improvement” to create a “literary balance” between the two questions of Matt. 20:15, i.e., by giving the second one of them the same “ε (or)” start as the first one?

A deliberate or accidental change? We do not know. We cannot know. We can only know that this was a change to the original *Textus Receptus* reading of “*ei (-)*.”

The TR’s reading at Matt. 20:15c has strong support in the Greek as the majority Byzantine reading, and strong support in the Latin as the majority Latin reading. In the Greek it enjoys the support of the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom; and in the Latin it enjoys the support of the Vulgate composed by the church father and doctor, St. Jerome. By contrast, the variant has what is clearly minority support in both the Greek and the Latin. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 20:15c 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. 20:15c, “Is thine eye evil, because I am good?,” is found in Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 209 (independent in Gospels, 14th century in Gospels). It is further found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts* (Swanson), which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 1 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee*), Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere) and 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts* (Swanson), which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee*) Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent).

However, the variant which in its origins substitutes Greek “ε (or)” for “*ei (-)*,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (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); as well as Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). A form of it, with a further conflation, is also found in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron (Arabic 12th-14th centuries; Latin 19th century), which reads in Ciasca’s Latin translation, “*aut* (or) *fortasse* (perhaps) *oculus* (eye) *tuus* (of thee) ... ?” etc. .

The erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence at Matt. 20:15c, the ASV reads, “or (Greek, ε) is thine eye” etc. . So too, this addition is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, & NIV. The RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV all here use a

similar “dynamic equivalent” reading, (in the case of the RSV, NRSV, & ESV, with footnotes giving a literal rendering,) which in the *English Standard Version* is found as, “Or do you begrudge my generosity?” (ESV). Let the reader note the fastidious way in which these neo-Alexandrians feel *they must* add in the added Greek “ε (or)” at the beginning of the verse in *a literal way to “make the point that the Received Text is wrong,”* while simultaneously taking great leniency with their rendering in the latter part of the verse which is supported by the TR.

The reading here at Matt. 20:15c of e.g., the Complutensians (1514), Erasmus (1516, 1519, 1522, 1527, & 1525), Colinaeus (1534), Stephanus (1546, 1549, 1550, & 1551), and Beza (1560) was “*ei* (-).” In Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624), he shows a majority of 6 of his 8 selected texts supporting the “*ei* (-)” reading (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; L, Codex Leicestrensis; H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum; P, Evangelistarium, Parham 18; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ’s College, Cambridge, F. i. 8). As a fraction, 6/8 is 75%, and so this approximates the majority text count support for the reading based on von Soden, *supra*, of c. 68-72%. Nevertheless, Aldus (1518) adopted the minority reading of “ε (or),” as did also Beza’s later editions (1565, 1582, 1589, 1598). Whatever was the logic of Aldus and Beza for adopting this minority Byzantine reading here at Matt. 20:15c, they were certainly wrong to do so, and the King James translators of 1611 rightly followed the majority Byzantine reading of e.g., Erasmus and Stephanus here.

But old errors can sometime reappear, as those who do not learn from the mistakes of the past, then go on to repeat them, and so history repeats itself. Such an example is found in the erroneous claim of Hodges & Farstad (1985) that at Matt. 20:15c the TR follows the “ε (or)” reading, rather than their majority text reading of “*ei* (-).” When I refer to “the Received Text” or “*Textus Receptus* (TR),” it is to the underpinning Greek NT text (or underpinning OT Hebrew and Aramaic text,) of the Authorized King James Version of 1611 that I mean and isolate. With one group of Burgonites then falling over another group of Burgonites in “the rush” to follow a reading that has neither the support of the majority texts of Robinson & Pierpont (2005) nor Hodges & Farstad (1985), nor the Received Text of the AV, the translators of the New King James Version (1982) then lunged at this verse. Evidently misled by Hodges & Farstad’s work (which they endorse in the NKJV Preface), they fell in “a great splat on the floor,” as they rendered Matt. 20:15c, “Or (Greek, ε) is your eye evil because I am good?” (NKJV); and then raising themselves up, “slipt and fell over again” as they provided no footnote stating that they were here following the same minority reading as the NU Text, rather than the Majority Text reading. (The Majority text footnote readings of the NKJV which they say in their Preface “corrects” “the *Textus Receptus*,” are at best highly selective and something less than adequate, so that in practice by having some but not others, they are quite misleading. This is seen by their absence here at Matt. 20:15c and elsewhere.)

We thus find that the same NKJV translators who like to *subtract from the Word of God* at Gen. 1:2 by omitting the Hebrew letter, *vav* (“And,”), so as to pervert the Word of God for the sakes of their anti-gap school friends’ claims; also like to *add to the Word of God* at Matt. 20:15c by adding the Greek, “ε (or),” so as to pummel the Word of God

for the sakes of their Hodges & Farstad friends' claims. Now bearing in mind the NKJV slip'n'fall, *supra*, as to their associated proposition that the New King James Version of 1982 is in some sense superior to, or better than, or to be preferred over, the King James Version of 1611; I can only reply, "That joke fell flat! What's ya' next gag line?"

Matt. 20:16 "for many be called, but few chosen" (TR & AV) {A}

The TR's Greek, "*polloi* (many) *gar* (for) *eisi* ('they are' = 'be') *kletoi* (called), *oligoi* (few) *de* (but) *ekletoi* (chosen)," 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), the three purple parchments: Sigma 042 (*Codex Rossanensis*, late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (*Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus*, 6th century), and O 023 (*Codex Sinopensis*, St. Matthew's Gospel, 6th century); as well as E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century) and H 013 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century); Minuscules 1010 (12th century) and 597 (13th century); and Lectionaries 859 (11th century), 1627 (11th century), 2378 (11th century), 547 (13th century), and 1968 (1544). It is also supported as Latin, "*multi* ('many,' word 1) *sunt* ('they are' = 'be,' word 2) *enim* ('for' word 3) *vocati* ('called' word 4), *pauci* ('few' word 5) *autem* ('but' word 6) *electi* ('chosen' word 7)," in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), b (5th century), and n (5th / 6th century); or in Latin word order 1,3,2,4,5,6,7 in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). It is further found in Latin word order 1,3,2,4,5,6,7 with the Vulgate's word 6 replaced by "*vero* (however)," in old Latin Versions ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as 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 further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

However, a minority Byzantine reading omitting these words is found in Minuscule 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark).

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

Was this an accidental change? It should be remembered that the NT verse divisions we have from Stephanus (1551), in many instances manifest a more ancient unnumbered Byzantine verse division. The end of a line is sometimes used for a division, and the divisions are not always precisely the same as we have from the time of Stephanus on. E.g., in Manuscript Washington (W 032), a paper space of about one letter precedes "*polloi* (many) *gar* (for) *eisi* (be) *kletoi* (called), *oligoi* (few) *de* (but) *ekletoi* (chosen)," which then is given a paper space of between 15 and 20 letters before Matt. 20:17 starts on a new line. When this is done, sometimes there is a slight protrusion to the left of the left hand justified column at the start of the line to indicate a subdivision, e.g., the "*Kai* (And)" of Matt. 20:17 starts on a new line, and the "K" protrudes half a letter space to the left hand justified column. Thus another scribe may

have used the start of a new line for these words.

In continuous script capital letters, these would look something like¹⁰⁸:

ONTAIOIECXATOIIPWTKAIOIIPWTOIECXATOI
ΠΟΛΛΟΙΓΑΡΕΙΚΑΝΚΛΗΤΟΙΟΛΙΓΟΙΔΕΕΚΛΕΚΤΟΙ
ΚΑΙΑΝΑΒΑΙΝΩΝΟΙΕΙCΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΑΠΑΡΕΛΑ

The scribe would have heard an echoing effect of “toi” “toi” in his mind with the last two words of Line 1, i.e., “*prōtoi* (first) *eschatoi* (last). After writing down Line 1, was he then momentarily distracted, perhaps by an external stimulus, or a flickering candle? Did he then look back at the page, with his eye jumping to the “toi” ending of Line 2, i.e., “*eklektōi* (chosen)”? Did he then just continue to write from Line 3, i.e., “*Kai* (and) *anabainōn* (going up)” etc.?

Was this a deliberate change? Was the idea of a free offer of the gospel, i.e., “many are called,” followed by an act of God’s sovereign election determining who would accept and be saved, i.e., “but few are chosen,” displeasing to the ears of an Arminian scribe, who then deliberately set about to expunge these words? For “to the one we are the savour of death unto death; and to the other the savour of life unto life” (II Cor. 2:16). “As the godly consideration of predestination, and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly person, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, . . . : so, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God’s predestination, is a most dangerous downfall” The Arminian fails to recognize that it is not for us to “invent” the God we think we want, or create another gospel in a way that suits our fancy, but to accept Biblical reality and work with it. For “we must received God’s promises in such wise, as they be generally set forth to us in holy Scripture: and, in our doings, that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the Word of God” (Article 17, Anglican 39 Articles).

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission of Matt. 20:16b? We cannot be sure. We can only be sure that these words were omitted.

The TRs reading here has excellent support in the Greek and Latin, and includes e.g., the witness of St. Chrysostom from the ancient Greek speaking east, and St. Jerome

¹⁰⁸ Starting Line 1 with the “*ontai*” of “*esontai*,” i.e., the “*es*” would be the last two letters of the previous line in continuous script (and using “W” for the larger ω or omega, which in some scripts is Ω). Line 1: *esontai* (shall be) *oi* (-) *eschatoi* (last) *prōtoi* (first) *kai* (and) *oi* (the) *prōtoi* (first) *eschatoi* (last); Line 2: *polloi* (many) *gar* (for) *eisi* (be) *kletoi* (called), *oligoi* (few) *de* (but) *eklektōi* (chosen). Line 3: *Kai* (and) *anabainōn* (going up) *o* (-) *Is* (abbreviating ‘*Iēsous*’ = ‘Jesus’) *eis* (to) *Ierosoluma* (Jerusalem) *parela*; Line 4 (not shown above, would start with) *be* i.e., from lines 3 & 4, *parelabe* (he took) etc. .

from the ancient Latin speaking west. By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek, and no support in the Latin. Who but a fool would adopt the variant? On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR's reading at Matt. 20:16b an "A" i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Matt. 20:16b is a verse used by those of the holy Reformed faith i.e., Calvinists, as a Biblical bulwark against both Arminianism on the one hand, *supra*, and hyper-Calvinism on the other hand, *infra*.

Hyper-Calvinists claim the gospel should only be preached to those who first have been convicted of their own sinfulness, and corresponding need of the Saviour. Hence they oppose what is called, "the free offer of the gospel," i.e., preaching the gospel to any who will listen. Evidently e.g., the holy Apostle St. Peter on the Day of Pentecost, did not agree with them, for when he preached to both "Jews" i.e., persons of the Jewish race (like the modern day Sephardim) "and proselytes" i.e., Jewish converts of the Gentile race (like the modern day Ashkenazim) (Acts 2:10), some "were in doubt" (Acts 2:12), "others" were "mocking" (Acts 2:13), and yet others "received his word" and "were baptized" (Acts 2:40). Historically, hyper-Calvinism teaching has e.g., been connected with Strict and Particular Baptists, commonly called, "Strict Baptists." (In England, since the 1970s & 1980s, the Strict Baptists have renamed themselves "Grace Baptists" and repudiated hyper-Calvinism in favour of Calvinism. But in Australia the Strict Baptists have made no such name change, and have retained their hyper-Calvinism.)

On the one hand, I am a Calvinist and consider Calvinism to be Scriptural, i.e., the doctrines of grace; but on the other hand, I consider hyper-Calvinism to be contrary to Scripture (Matt. 22:14; John 7:2,37-44 cf. John 20:31; Acts 13:44-52; 17:14,30,32; I Cor. 1:18,23,24). Among other Scriptures, it is clearly contrary to this one here at Matt. 20:16b. Contextually, Christ here makes it clear that there are grumblers and complainers, who though they have heard something of the gospel, have effectively rejected it. "They murmured against the good man" (Matt. 20:11), thinking that their good works, long performed, would somehow merit them some kind of extra favour with God, so as to increase their heavenly "reward." Such e.g., are the Papists, who rejected the Protestant Reformation, denying among other things justification by faith in their *Council of Trent* (1545-63); Eastern Orthodox, who rejected the Protestant Reformation, denying among other things justification by faith in their *Synod of Jerusalem* (1672); and apostate Protestants who talk about earning some kind of heavenly "reward" by their good works, which they say is on top of salvation by faith. The words of Christ about suchlike are emphatic. These people are not genuinely saved in the first place! "For many be called, but few chosen" (Matt. 20:16).

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct reading at Matt. 20:16b, "for many be called, but few chosen," 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) Codex Delta 037 (9th century), and (the mixed text type)

Codex Theta 038 (9th century, adding “oi” / the before “*kletoi*” / called). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 565 (9th century, independent), as a marginal reading in 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 700 (11th century, independent), 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*; 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: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), Pesitto (first half 5th century), Palestinian (*c.* 6th century), and Harclean h (616 Versions; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century), and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); Ethiopic Versions (*c.* 500; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Slavic Version (9th century). It is also found in Ciasca’s Latin-Arabic Diatessaron, where the 12th-14th centuries Arabic is rendered in Ciasca’s 19th century Latin translation as, “*multi* (many) *sunt* (be) *vocati* (called), *et* (and) *pauci* (few) *electi* (chosen).”

However the erroneous variant which omits Matt. 20:16b, is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32; 22:3-16), and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); as well as Minuscules 892 in the main text (9th century, mixed text type) and 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century), and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version.

Though the neo-Alexandrians were unable to find any “external support” for their reading outside of Egypt, the agreement of the two main Alexandrian texts, coupled with their circular reasoning which favours those who prune texts, namely, “the shorter reading is the better one,” was enough for this most unlikely of variants to be adopted by the NU Text *et al*. Let me remind the reader, that by “NU Text *et al*” is meant, Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle’s 21st edition (1952), the UBS 3rd corrected (1983) edition, and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993). Indeed, so carried away by this madness were the UBS Committee (1993) i.e., the contemporary NU Text Committee, that they went so far as to give this omission their highest rating of “A,” meaning, “the text is certain.”

This craziness was then understandably manifested in the highly unreliable neo-Alexandrian versions. The omission of Matt. 20:16b is found in the ASV, NASB, RSV, NRSV (with a footnote referring to the TR’s reading), ESV, and NIV.

By about halving the Word of God at Matt. 20:16, so as to make it simply read something like Moffatt's, "So shall the last be first and the first last" (Moffatt Bible), the neo-Alexandrians have here joined forces with both Arminians and hyper-Calvinists, in showing a distinct disdain for the words of Holy Scripture at Matt. 20:16b, "for many be called, but few chosen" (TR & AV). But in the words of the great 18th century hymn writer, John Newton, in his hymn, "Glorious Things of thee are spoken, Zion, city of our God;" with "He whose Word cannot be broken," "Thou may'st smile at all thy foes."

Matt. 20:17a "And Jesus going up" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron reads, "*Et (And) his (these) dictis (words having said) abiit (he went) ascendens (going up) Hierosolimam ([to] Jerusalem),*" i.e., "And having said these words, he went, going up to Jerusalem." The Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, and this is clearly a general conflation of the Vulgate's reading at Matt. 20:17a, "*Et (And) ascendens (going up) Iesus (Jesus) Hierosolymam ([to] Jerusalem),*" etc., i.e., "And Jesus going up to Jerusalem," etc., albeit one in which the Diatessaron formatter simultaneously pruned off "*Iesus (Jesus).*"

The Latin scribe appears to have been influenced in the first instance by the Vulgate's Luke 19:28, "*Et (And) his (these) dictis (words having said), praecedebat (he went before), ascendens (going up) Hierosolyma ([to] Jerusalem),*" i.e., "And having said these words, he went before, going up to Jerusalem." In the second instance, he seems to have injected the "*abiit (he went)*" from some general "gospel Latin" terminology, e.g., such passages as the Vulgate's Mark 5:20 ("*Et abiit*" / "And he went"), John 6:1 ("*abiit Iesus*" / "Jesus went"), *et al.*

Yet for all that, it seems to me that the most natural conclusion to draw is that the Latin scribe's source in the Sangallensis Diatessaron for what in Matt. 20:17a are the key words, "*Et (And) ... ascendens (going up),*" must have been the "*Et (And) ascendens (going up)*" of the Vulgate's Matt. 20:17a. Therefore I show the Sangallensis Diatessaron following the Vulgate, *infra.*

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:17a, the TR's Greek, "*Kai (And) anabainon* ('going up,' nominative singular masculine, active present participle, from *anabaino*) *o* ('the' redundant in English translation) *Iesous (Jesus),*" i.e., "And (*Kai*) Jesus (*o Iesous*) going up (*anabainon*) to (*eis*) Jerusalem (*Ierosolyma*)" (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 Lectionaries 76 (12th century), 333 (13th century), 950 (1289 / 90 A.D.), 1579 (14th century), and 1761 (15th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*Et (And) ascendens* ('going up,' nominative singular masculine, active present participle, from *ascendo*)," in

Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), l (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 supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However a variant reading, *Variant 1a*, is Greek, "*Mellon* ('being about,' nominative singular masculine, active present participle, from *mello*) *de* (and) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus) *anabainein* ('to go,' active present infinitive, from *anabaino*) *eis* (to) *Ierosoluma* (Jerusalem)," i.e., "And being about to go to Jerusalem." This is found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254). And a similar reading is found in Minuscule 1062 (14th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. The origins of *Variant 1a* are speculative.

Was this an accidental change? The verse divisions of Stephanus (1551), frequently manifest a more ancient unnumbered Byzantine verse division. Hence in *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), we find that at the end of Matt. 20:16, there is a gap left on the line of about 16 letter spaces, before on the next line Matt. 20:17 starts, with the "*Kai* (And)" protruding slightly to the left of a left hand justified page (containing Matt. 20:12-21). Might a scribe have been working from a similar manuscript, but one in which a much smaller number of letter spaces had been left at the end of the line at Matt. 20:16? Might that manuscript have already suffered in transmission, in that a scribe had rearranged the words of it in the order, "*Kai* (And) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus) *anabainon* (going up)"? Might the "*Kai* (And)" and the "*on*" ending of "*anabainon* (going up)" then have been lost in a paper fade / loss? Did a scribe, probably Origen, then "reconstruct" Matt. 20:17a "from context" as "*Mellon* (being about) *de* (and) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus) *anabainein* (to go) *eis* (to) *Ierosoluma* (Jerusalem)"? If so, was he influenced in this "reconstruction" by the general Matthean Greek usage of the root Greek word, *mello* (e.g., Matt. 17:22; 20:22; *et al*), and a specific usage of *mello* with the infinitive in the Matthean Greek of Matt. 11:14, "*Hlias* (Elias) *o* (which) *mellon* ('was about' or 'was for,' AV) *erchesmai* ('to come,' middle present infinitive, from *erchomai*)"?

Was this a deliberate change? Origen refers to both readings, and the fact that he is probably the originator of this *Variant 1a*, increases this likelihood. St. Matthew refers to "Jesus going up to Jerusalem" (Matt. 20:17,18) in a southward journey from Perea in "the coasts of Judea" east "beyond Jordan" (Matt. 19:1), on a journey that first went via "Jericho" (Matt. 20:29) before coming to "Jerusalem" (Matt. 21:1). Therefore, did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, in the first place add "*Mellon* (being about)" as a "stylistic improvement" to make the point that Jesus was first going through Jericho (Matt. 20:29), and so was *about* to go to Jerusalem; and in the second place, make the general grammatical structure of Matt. 20:17a conform with the general grammatical structure of Matt. 11:14 i.e., by using the infinitive form "*anabainein* (to go)" to create "stylistic comparability" with the "*mellon* ('was about' or 'was for,' AV) *erchesmai* ('to

come, 'infinitive)' of Matt. 11:14?

A deliberate or accidental change? Such matters are lost to us by a historical dark age of unrecorded textual transmission history. We can guess about, but we cannot know for sure about, such matters. But it does not matter. All that really matters is that we can know that there was a change here made to the text of Scripture as found in the Received Text and representative Byzantine text.

The TR's reading here 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. 20:17a 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. 20:17a, "*Kai* (And) *anabainon* (going up) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus) *eis* (to) *Ierosoluma* (Jerusalem)," i.e., "And Jesus going up to Jerusalem" (AV), 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 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32; 22:3-16), (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), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is further found in the Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), and Harclean h (616) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Versions (c. 500; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, *Variant 1a*, which reads, "*Mellon* (being about) *de* (and) *o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus) *anabainein* (to go) *eis* (to) *Ierosoluma* (Jerusalem)," i.e., "And being about to go to Jerusalem," is found in the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al.*

Another reading, *Variant 1b*, reading, "*Mellon* (being about) *de* (and) *anabainein* (to go) *Iesous* (Jesus)," i.e., "And being about to go to Jerusalem," is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). Was this an accidental change of Origen's *Variant 1a*? I.e., if "*o* (-) *Iesous* (Jesus)" was written in abbreviated form as "*OIC*" (with a bar on top where I have one below,) it being fairly small, did an Alexandrian School scribe stumble over it and omit it accidentally, and then realizing his

error, add back in just the “*IC*” on the basis that “the definite article is not necessary,” i.e., “*IHCOYC* (*Iesous,*’ Jesus)?” Was this a deliberate change of *Variant 1a*? I.e., did an Alexandrian School scribe do this as a conflation that preserved the meaning of *Variant 1a* by making it look more like the TR’s reading?

Variants 1a & 1b have the same meaning. This meaning is also found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) Version; and Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

The split between the two main Alexandrian Texts has, as is usually the case, resulted in a corresponding split among the neo-Alexandrians, whose pretensions to look at a number of manuscripts and versions are in general really just a lot of padding out with post-facto justifications. In fact the neo-Alexandrians are very hidebound to these two aberrant Alexandrian texts, so that when they split, they are generally at sixes and sevens as to what to do. *O the agony of being a neo-Alexandrian!*

As he “navel gazed” about “his wonderful discovery of London Sinaiticus¹⁰⁹,” Tischendorf somewhat predictably followed the reading of that Alexandrian text in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), and so by a fluke, got the right reading.

Westcott & Hort (1881) went the other way and followed their “neutral text” of Rome Vaticanus at Matt. 20:17a. After all, it is “the more improbable reading,” and that surely “makes it the more probable one, doesn’t it?” And besides, if one has selective amnesia about the fact that there is “external support” for the London Sinaiticus reading, does not the Rome Vaticanus reading have “external support” in the Syriac and Coptic? Is it not quite similar to one of Origen’s reading? Although working on the logic “‘the shorter reading is the better reading,’ the definite article ‘*o*’ just had to have been added in by Origen, didn’t it?” But as would also be fairly predictable for Westcott-Hort, a sidenote was necessary to show the other reading. “After all, when these two texts from Alexandria disagree, how can one be sure *Codex Vaticanus* really is the ‘neutral’ one?¹¹⁰”

¹⁰⁹ “Navel gazing” is an Australian colloquialism. It relates to the idea that the navel can mean the central point of something e.g., one might say, “New York, USA is the umbilicus of the financial world.” Thus “naval gazing” means “to contemplate one’s navel” i.e., to meditate on a matter. But to the extent that the metaphor is of a man peering at his navel, there is often a connotation, as occurs in its application to Tischendorf here, of an inordinate or excessive admiration of oneself in this process.

¹¹⁰ Even most of the later neo-Alexandrians regard the Westcott-Hort idea of a “neutral” Alexandrian Text, most especially evident in *Codex Vaticanus*, as excessive (e.g., Aland, K., *et unum, The Text of the NT*, 1989, *op. cit.*, p. 14). E.g., at Matt. 20:18, *Codex Sinaiticus* follows the TR’s “*thanato* (to death),” whereas *Codex Vaticanus* omits this. Hence in Westcott-Hort, “*thanato*” is placed in square brackets making its adoption or omission entirely optional. But whilst the neo-Alexandrians generally prefer “the shorter reading,” the “external support” for Vaticanus at Matt. 20:18 is so small (it is followed by Dillmann’s 18th / 19th centuries Ethiopic Version), that the NU Text *et al* here follow Sinaiticus, as indeed does the ASV *et al*. I.e., these other neo-Alexandrians,

That logic seemed pretty good to Erwin Nestle, who followed Westcott-Hort in Nestle's 21st edition (1952).

But then came the NU Text Committee with men like Kurt Aland and Bruce Metzger. Showing the rumblings of some real textual analysis which they occasionally, though quite rarely do, they thought that the "*Mellon* (being about)" of *Variants 1a & 1b* might be "a topographical correction introduced by copyists who observed that from Jericho (... ver. 29) one 'goes up to Jerusalem', before reaching Jericho, therefore Jesus is 'about to go up to Jerusalem'" (Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, 1971, p. 51). But "living up to the academic stereotype ain't easy" for a neo-Alexandrian wanting to uphold these two faulty Alexandrian texts. Therefore, they put the TR's and London Sinaiticus's reading in their main text, but made this qualification in the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, "there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text of the apparatus contains the superior reading." This then is also the reading of the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

Thus spoke these Neo-Alexandrian School "experts," with not one, not two, but three voices, even though their first and third voice agree on the conclusion. Their diverse voices were then echoed in the diversity of neo-Alexandrian versions. "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" (I Cor. 14:8).

Thus at Matt. 20:17a the American Standard Version follows London Sinaiticus which on this occasion has the correct reading of the TR, "And as Jesus was going up to Jerusalem" (ASV). This is also the reading of the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. However, going the other way, the incorrect reading of Rome Vaticanus is found in the NASB, TCNT, and Moffatt Bible. E.g., the Twentieth Century New Testament reads, "When Jesus was on the point of going up to Jerusalem" (TCNT), or Moffatt reads, "As Jesus was about to go up to Jerusalem" (Moffatt Bible).

Matt. 20:17b "the twelve disciples" (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. The UBS 3rd (1975), 3rd corrected (1983), and 4th revised (1993) editions, together with Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993), all show *Variant 2* followed by their *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century,

though likewise generally baffled by splits between these two texts, nevertheless do not hold to the same level of "neutrality" as Westcott-Hort, so that where the "external support" for one is very slim or non-existent, as at Matt. 20:18, they do not follow the concept of "neutrality" with the same rigour. Concerning the many disagreements between *Codex Vaticanus* and *Codex Sinaiticus*, see Herman Hoskier's *Codex B [Rome Vaticanus] & its Allies, A Study & an Indictment, op. cit. .*

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, Swanson (1995) shows *Variant 1* being followed by his *Family 13 Manuscripts* (Swanson), which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee*) Minuscles 788 (11th century, independent text), and 13 (13th century, independent).

The fact that UBS has shown Family 13 following *Variant 2* over three successive editions of about 20 years, means that on the balance of probabilities it looks as though the error on this occasion is with Swanson. Von Soden (1913) says *Variant 2* is followed by Minuscule 788 (von Soden's ϵ 1033 in his IIb group); as indeed, inconsistently, does Swanson. Since 788 is a part of the Family 13 group, this must increase the probability that the error is with Swanson's textual apparatus in this instance. Hence I will show the *Family 13 Manuscripts* following *Variant 2, infra*.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron reads, "Assumens (Taking) *autem* (moreover) *iterum* (again) *duodecim* (the twelve), *ait* (he said) *illis* ('unto those [ones]' = 'unto them')." The Sangallensis Diatessaron is a ninth century Vulgate Codex, and this reading is derived as a consequence of applying the Diatessaron methodology first used by Tatian in the second century. This particular Latin Diatessaron formatting comes from the Vulgate's Matt. 20:17, "*adsumsit* (he took) *duodecim* (the twelve) *discipulos* (disciples) *secreto* (apart), *et* (and) "*ait* (he said) *illis* (unto them);" Mark 10:32, "*et* (and) *adsumens* ('taking,' Clementine reads, *assumens* = 'taking') *iterum* (again) *duodecim* (the twelve);" and Luke 18:31, "*Adsumsit* (he took) *autem* (moreover) *Iesus* (Jesus) *duodecim* (the twelve), *et* (and) *ait* (he said) *illis* (unto them)."

The Latin Diatessaron formatter could have theoretically constructed this without reference to Matt. 20:17. I.e., by taking the Vulgate's Mark 10:32, substituting the "*autem* (moreover)" of Luke 18:31 for the "*et* (and);" and adding from Luke 18:31, "*ait* (he said) *illis* (unto them)." However, on the general principles he used, it seems that he would have also looked at Matt. 20:17. Thus the commonality of "*duodecim* (the twelve)" no doubt derives from all three Synoptic Gospels; as does the "*illis* (unto them)," although the more specific "*ait* (he said) *illis* (unto them)" comes from both Matt. 20:17b and Luke 18:31.

Nevertheless, it is clear that due to this conflation of the Vulgate's Matt. 20:17; Mark 10:32; and Luke 18:31, that one cannot safely say if the Vulgate used by the Diatessaron formatter here followed the Vulgate and so *Textus Receptus* reading (although it probably did), or *Variant 1*, or *Variant 2*. Therefore, no reference will be made to the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:17b the TR's Greek, "*tous* (the) *dodeka* (twelve) *mathetas* (disciples)," 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), O 023 (6th century), E 07 (8th century), G 011 (9th century), X 033 (10th century); Minuscules 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels), 2 (12th century), 597 (13th century), 1242 (13th century); as well as Lectionaries 813 (1069 A.D.), 68 (12th century), 76 (12th century), 673 (12th century), 1223 (13th century), and 1761 (15th century). It is also supported as Latin, “*duodecim* (the twelve) *discipulos* (disciples),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and 1 (7th / 8th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Hilary (d. 367) and Augustine (d. 430).

However, a reading, *Variant 1*, adding “*autou* (‘of him’ = ‘his’)” after “*tous* (-) *dodeka* (twelve) *mathetas* (disciples),” and thus reading, “his twelve disciples,” is a minority Byzantine reading. It is found in Minuscules 1010 (12th century) and 1342 (13th / 14th century, Byzantine other than in Mark); and a similar reading, which places the “*autou* (his)” before “*mathetas* (disciples),” is found in Lectionary 184 (1319 A.D.). It is further found as Latin, “*duodecim* (the twelve) *discipulos* (disciples) *suos* (his),” in old Latin Versions a (4th century), n (5th / 6th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); and a similar reading, which places the “*duodecim* (the twelve)” after the “*discipulos* (disciples) *suos* (his),” is found in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, omitting Greek, “*mathetas* (disciples),” and so reading simply, Greek, “*tous* (the) *dodeka* (twelve),” is found as Latin, “*duodecim* (the twelve),” in old Latin Version d (5th 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 thus correct. The origins of the variants are conjectural.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental addition? We know that words were sometimes “squeezed in” at the end of a line. E.g., in *Codex Alexandrinus* (A 02, 5th century, Byzantine in its incomplete Gospels), the “*AYTOY* (*autou* / his)” is squeezed in at the end of a line for Matt 26:67 (the “his” of “his face”). But this word is also protruding, so that relative to the lines immediately above and below “*autou* (his),” the last letter juts out one space more than the line above, and the last two letters jut out 2 letter spaces more than the line beneath. Therefore, was a scribe working on a manuscript in which, relative to the line above and /or beneath, there was a bit of a gap of 2 or 3 letter spaces at the end of a line after the word “*mathetas* (disciples)”? Did he then think that “*autou* (his)” must have been “squeezed in,” and was now lost due to a paper fade? Did he then set about to “reconstruct the lost ‘*autou* (his)’”?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate addition? The term, “*mathētas* (disciples) *autou* (of him),” is found at e.g., Matt. 10:1; 12:49; 15:32. Did a scribe deliberately assimilate the “*autou* (his)” from one or more of such passages, regarding it as a “stylistic improvement” that “provided greater clarification,” being something “preferred by people in these modern times” (i.e., our ancient times)?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental addition? Was the final “s” (sigma) of “*mathētas* (disciples),” lost in a paper fade, so that “*dōdeka* (twelve) *mathētas* (disciples),” looked like, “*dōdeka mathēta*”? Having first written, “*dōdeka* (twelve),” did the eye of a scribe then jump by ellipsis from the final “a” (alpha) of “*dōdeka*” to the final “a” of “*mathēta*”? Did he then keep writing, thus accidentally omitting “*mathētas* (disciples)”? Alas, it must be candidly admitted that not all scribes were as adroit as they should have been. Was the culprit thus a bleary eyed Origen?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate addition? The probable origins of this variant with Origen acts to increase this likelihood, though by no means makes it certain. Was this “a gospel harmonization” of Matt. 20:17b to the “*tous* (the) *dōdeka* (twelve)” of Mark 10:32 and Luke 18:31. Was the culprit thus a theologically bleary headed Origen?

Were these variants deliberate or accidental changes? We cannot know this lesser matter for sure. But we can know the greater matter for sure i.e., that these two variants were changes to the correct reading preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text and *Textus Receptus*.

The reading has strong support in the Greek and Latin, and a more comprehensive list of Greek manuscripts than normal has been provided, *supra*, to more clearly bring out the point that the Received Text reading has been preserved over time and through time. While St. Jerome quoted *Variant 1* on one occasion, when it came to the composition of St. Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, he followed the reading of the TR. The *Textus Receptus* reading also enjoys the support of the church fathers St. Hilary, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustine. By contrast, one (*Variant 2*) and possibly both (*Variants 1 & 2*) of the variants appear to have come from the hand of the notorious textual corrupter, Origen. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 20:17b 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. 20:17b, “the twelve disciples,” 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 mixed text type) Codex 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32; 22:3-16), 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), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), 579 (mixed text, 13th century), and 205

(independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century). It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version, the Coptic Middle Egyptian Version (3rd century); the Georgian “2” Version (5th century); and Slavic (Slavonic) Version (9th century).

Variant 1, “his twelve disciples,” is found in Minuscule 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere). It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) Version; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and Ethiopic Versions (a manuscript of Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9; & Takla Haymanot, c. 500).

Variant 2, “the twelve,” 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 L 019 (8th century), (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); and is the most probable reading of (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), although the manuscript’s state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is further found in Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type); 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 also found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian “1” Version (5th century); and a manuscript of the Ethiopic Version.

This major split in the two Alexandrian texts led to a corresponding major splitting headache among neo-Alexandrians, who as it were exclaimed, “Oh no! Since we set aside the hundreds and thousands of Byzantine manuscripts from Europe, Asia, and Africa, and really only focus on just these two manuscripts connected with the African School of Alexandria, what are we going to do? ... Quick, pass me the aspirins!”

In the ensuing chaos and confusion, Tischendorf took the view that at Matt. 20:17b the text connected with the African School of Alexandria he found on the Arabian Peninsula “just had” to be given the priority, and so *Variant 2* was adopted in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72). Erwin Nestle also liked that solution, after all, “Is not the shorter reading the better one?”, he probably mused, as he “followed the leader” and adopted *Variant 2* in Nestle’s 21st edition (1952).

But Westcott & Hort were not so sure. After all, do not these two manuscripts connected with the African School of Alexandria constitute “a neutral text” especially when their preferred “neutral text” of Codex Vaticanus was in agreement with Codex

Sinaiticus? If so, they must express this “neutrality.” But how? The answer came in the Westcott-Hort (1881) text’s solution of putting “*mathetas* (disciples)” in square brackets after “*tous* (the) *dodeka* (twelve),” thus making the selection between the Received Text’s reading followed by Codex Vaticanus, or *Variant 2* followed by Codex Sinaiticus, entirely optional. “You can’t get more ‘neutral’ than that,” perhaps Hort exclaimed to Westcott, as they smiled at each other for their “brilliant deduction.”

Bruce Metzger, Kurt Aland, *et al*, on the UBS Committee liked the Westcott & Hort solution. On the one hand, on neo-Alexandrian circular logic, applying the rule of a black cat chasing its tail in the clockwise direction, “Is not the shorter reading the better reading?” “Does not this favour Codex Sinaiticus?” But on the other hand, on neo-Alexandrian circular logic, applying the rule of a tan cat chasing its tail in the anti-clockwise direction, “Are not Gospel variants *virtually always* the result of assimilations, especially within the synoptic gospels, so that if two gospel readings are alike, one is probably assimilated?¹¹¹” “Therefore is not the omission of ‘disciples’ an assimilation to Mark 10:32 and Luke 18:31?” “Does not this favour Codex Vaticanus?” The black’n’tan idea of a “mixed” text in the main text of Matt. 20:17b, in which *both readings* were placed in their main text via the Westcott-Hort solution, thus seemed like an overpoweringly strong solution to these poor benighted neo-Alexandrians.

This Westcott-Hort pioneered solution of square brackets around “*mathetas* (disciples)” after “*tous* (the) *dodeka* (twelve)” is thus found in the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions; and it is also found in the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993). Commenting on the matter here at Matt. 20:17b, the UBS 3rd and 3rd corrected edition’s Committee said, “there is a considerable degree of doubt whether the text or the apparatus” (showing all three readings, though contextually referring to these two readings,) “contains the superior reading.” And the exasperated UBS 4th revised edition Committee i.e., the contemporary NU Text Committee, said, “the Committee had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text.”

What were the neo-Alexandrian translators to make of this neo-Alexandrian text confusion? Similar splits by similar half-wits followed. Confident of a text that the learned Erasmus of Rotterdam had rejected as a bad joke, the Alexandrian *Codex Vaticanus*, for the wrong reasons, on this occasion by a fluke, the right reading of the TR at Matt. 20:17b is found in the ASV as, “the twelve disciples.” It is also found in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV. But equally confident of the text found by Tischendorf on the Arabian Peninsula, *Codex Sinaiticus, Variant 2*, was followed by the NASB (which in italics adds the missing word back in), NEB, REB, & Moffatt Bible. E.g., Moffatt reads, “Jesus ... took the twelve aside” etc. (Moffatt Bible).

Good Christian reader, Hast thou ever heard the Latin motto, “*semper* (always)

¹¹¹ While it is certainly the case that such gospel assimilations can and do occur, the matter must be justified by reason on any given occasion, and not simply assumed *a priori* the way the neo-Alexandrians do.

eadum (the same)”? It was the good personal motto of what the King James Version calls in its Dedicatory Preface to King James I (Regnal Years: 1603-1625), “that bright Occidental Star, Queen Elizabeth” (Regnal Years: 1558-1603) “of most happy memory.” Certainly as Supreme Governor of the *Church of England* and *Church of Ireland*, Elizabeth I helped advance the Anglican Church into further desirable Protestant reform. Yet this same idea as found in her personal motto, is used in a black and sinister way by those seeking to advance Popery, i.e., it is claimed that the *Church of Rome* is “*semper* (always) *eadum* (the same).” Can we take this Romanist claim seriously? In the *Church of Rome’s* Douay-Rheims Version we read at Matt. 20:17b the correct words, “the twelve disciples.” But when we look at this same *Church of Rome’s* Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles, we find that the Douay-Rheims’ “disciples” has been omitted, and *Variant 2* adopted. Therefore, can we really say of the fickle *Church of Rome*, that it is “*semper eadum*,” “Always the same”?

Matt. 20:17c “in the way, and” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Appendix 3 to this volume contains a number of instances where word order varies slightly between the TR and another reading, as well as other readings where the English translation is, or reasonably could be, the same. However, an associated matter is whether or not there is a difference in the meaning of the underpinning Greek, i.e., even where the English rendering may be the same. *Prima facie* some might think this variant is just another example of a difference with the same meaning. However, it contains within it a subtle difference of meaning that could be easily lost on the rapid reader.

In the TR’s reading, “And Jesus going up to Jerusalem took the twelve disciples apart *in the way, and* said unto them” (AV); the action of first going “in the way” is not intrinsically” designed to set the disciples “apart,” but rather, to set the disciples “apart” is something Christ later does when they are “on” / “in the way” (TR & AV). By contrast, in the Variant’s reading, “And as Jesus was going up to Jerusalem, he took the twelve disciples apart, *and on the way* he said unto them” (ASV); the action of first taking them “apart” is then manifested in the fact that they were “on” / “in the way” i.e., the action of going “on” / “in the way” is intrinsically part of Christ’s broader action to set the disciples “apart” (Variant & ASV).

The accounts in the four holy gospels give us a Divinely inspired selection of the events in Christ’s earthly life and ministry. Though Christ’s earthly ministry lasted three and half years (Dan. 9:27), one could easily read all four gospels in just one day. Some parables and sayings were evidently repeated on numerous occasions, with slight differences in application, and so I would imagine that e.g., the parables we have in the Gospels were told on many more occasions in many more contexts, than what we have recorded for us in the Bible. Thus the fundamental claim of various “Gospel harmony” publications is sometimes wrong (e.g., Matt. 6:9-13 and Luke 11:1-4 were said on different occasions and Christ did not use identical words), and sometimes right (e.g.,

there was only one death and resurrection of Christ found in all four gospels). So too, the fundamental claim of religious liberals about “gospel discrepancies” while always incorrect, is specifically incorrect in some instances when it is inaccurately premised on an initial “gospel harmonization” which is not the case; and I include in this the fact that *even when the same event is recorded by different Gospel writers*, Christ may say similar things on multiple occasions *at that one event*, e.g., over a period of half an hour or more in a Gospel story that may take less than 5 minute to read, and so different Gospel writers may record slightly different, but fundamentally similar, sayings.

E.g., While Jesus was *en route* to Jerusalem he engaged in some public ministry. Henry Cooke notes that “Jericho consisted of an old town and new town, as Josephus records¹¹².” (The mound containing the ruins of the old town is visible today.) “And as they departed from” old town “Jericho” (Matt. 20:29) i.e., the ancient uninhabited part, and “they came to” new town “Jericho” (Mark 10:46) i.e., “he was come nigh unto” the newer inhabited part of “Jericho” (Luke 18:35), “two blind men” were “sitting by the way side” (Matt. 20:30).

The issue of why St. Matthew refers to “two blind men” (Matt. 20:30) and both St. Mark and St. Luke refer to just one “blind man” (Mark 10:49; Luke 18:35) is open to some level of interpretation and / or speculation. Is it that “Bartimaeus” (Mark 10:46) had a more dominant personality than the other man (cf. Luke 18:1-8)? Is it that Bartimaeus was some kind of spokesman for the two? If so, while “Bartimaeus” meaning, “son of Timaeus,” could be a first name (cf. “Barnabas” = “son of Nabas,” Acts 15:22), it could also be a surname (cf. “Barsabas” = “son of Sabas,” Acts 15:22). Therefore, if “Bartimaeus” (Mark 10:46) was a spokesman, was “Bartimaeus” a surname and being the father of the other blind man, thus spoke for him (cf. Acts 2:39; 16:15; I Cor. 1:16)? Is it that the Holy Ghost hereby signifieth, that whilst two or more may be saved at a time, yet God is interested at a very personal level with every person saved (cf. Matt. 18:10-14)? Is it that the accounts require the presence of God’s Holy Ghost to properly understand them (I Cor. 2:13), and thus some heretics may here claim “a contradiction” between gospel accounts (cf. Matt. 13:13-16), and so “there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you” (I Cor. 11:19)? Is it some other reason(s)? Is it some combination of these?

One of these two blind men, “Bartimaeus,” “began to cry out, and say, Jesus, thou son of David, have mercy on me” (Mark 10:46,47; Luke 18:38). Indeed, both “blind

¹¹² *Brown’s Study Bible* (1778), Revised edition by the Reverend Dr. Henry Cooke of Ireland (1788-1868) and Reverend Dr. Josiah L. Porter (1823-1899), Gresham Publishers, London in England & Glasgow in Scotland, UK, at Matt. 18:35 (Cooke). Referring to the Jewish historian, Josephus (c. 37- c. 100 A.D.), *The Jewish Wars* (75-79 A.D.), Book 4, Chapter 8, where in describing “Jericho ... the city,” he says, “There is ... a fountain by Jericho, that ... rises near the old city, which Joshua, the General of the Hebrews, took ...” (*The Genuine Works of Flavius Josephus, the Jewish Historian*, translated by William Whiston, A New Edition by Reverend Samuel Burder in two Volumes, J. Robins & Co. Albion Press, London, England, UK, 1825, Vol. 2, p. 322).

men ... cried out, saying, Have mercy on us, O Lord, thou son of David” (Matt. 20:30). “And the multitude rebuked them, because they should hold their peace” (Matt. 20:31), and so in this process, more specifically with respect to Bartimaeus, “many charged him that he should hold his peace: but he” just “cried the more a great deal, Thou son of David, have mercy on me” (Mark 10:48; cf. Luke 18:39). “And Jesus stood still, and called them,” (Matt. 20:32), and fixing his gaze on Bartimaeus specifically “commanded him to be called” (Mark 10:49; cf. Luke 18:40). Jesus addressed both of them, saying, “What will ye that I shall do unto you?” (Matt. 20:32), and looking directly at Bartimaeus, “Jesus ... said unto him, What wilt thou that I should do unto thee?” (Mark 10:51; Luke 18:41). “The blind man said unto him, Lord, that I might receive my sight” (Mark 10:51; cf. Luke 18:41); and indeed, both of the blind men did “say unto him, Lord that our eyes may be opened” (Matt. 20:33). “So Jesus had compassion on them, and touched their eyes, and immediately their eyes received sight, and they followed him” (Matt. 20:34). More specifically, we know that Jesus also said to Bartimaeus, “Receive thy sight” (Luke 18:42) and “Go thy way” (Mark 10:53), “thy faith hath *made* thee *whole* (*sesoke*)” (Mark 10:53) or “*saved* (*sesoke*) thee” (Luke 18:42). I.e., this miracle of the blind receiving physical sight is an object lesson to us, and so ultimately the gospel here teaches us about the receipt of spiritual sight and salvation through the Lord’s “mercy” (Mark 10:47), when we have “faith” (Mark 10:53) in the atoning sacrifice (Mark 10:45) of him who died and rose on the third day (Mark 10:33,34), and so by “faith” we are “made whole” or “saved” (Greek *sesoke* in Mark 10:53; Luke 18:42).

Therefore, unlike those who like a boa constrictor serpent seek to strangle life out of Gospel passages, we must allow space for the Gospels to “breath easy,” without trying to “squeeze out” the wider picture. This principle is relevant to the two readings here in Matt. 20:17c. If we take the TR’s & AV’s reading, then it remains possible that Christ also engaged in some public ministry en route to Jerusalem, as indeed recorded in Matt. 20:20ff e.g., Matt. 20:29-34, supra; whereas if we take the Variant’s & ASV’s reading, this is not possible without creating “a Bible contradiction” since they were travelling in a very private manner. We want the text of Scripture to be allowed to speak for itself, we do not want men to impose their corruptions upon it!

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). See the “The Second Matter” in “Preliminary Textual Discussion” at Matt. 20:17b, *supra*. The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron reads, “Assumens (Taking) autem (moreover) iterum (again) duodecim (the twelve), ait (he said) illis (‘unto those [ones]’ = ‘unto them’).” Therefore no reference is made to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:17c, the TR’s Greek, TR’s “en (‘in,’ word 1) te (‘the,’ word 2) odo (‘way,’ word 3) kai (‘and,’ word 4),” i.e., “And Jesus going up to Jerusalem took the twelve disciples apart *in the way*, and said 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). It is also found as Latin, “in (‘in,’ word 1) via (‘the way,’ words 1 & 2) et (‘and,’ word 4),” in old Latin

Versions d (5th century), h (5th century), and f (6th century); or “*in* (‘on,’ word 1) *itinere* (‘the road,’ words 1 & 2) *et* (‘and,’ word 4),” in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century); or “*in* (‘in,’ word 1) *viam* (‘the way,’ words 1 & 2) *et* (‘and,’ word 4),” in old Latin Version e (4th / 5th century). A similar Latin reading, “*in* (‘on,’ word 1) *via* (‘the way,’ words 1 & 2) *seorsum* (‘apart,’ this word is placed before word 1 in old Latin d, h, & f) *et* (‘and,’ word 4),” i.e., “on the way, apart, and,” in old Latin Versions a (4th century), n (5th / 6th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is further found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

However, *Variant 1*, a reading in word order 4,1,2,3, i.e., Greek, “*kai* (‘and,’ word 4) *en* (‘in,’ word 1) *te* (‘the,’ word 2) *odo* (‘way,’ word 3),” i.e., “And Jesus going up to Jerusalem took the twelve disciples apart *and on the way* said unto them,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 61 (16th century, Byzantine in Gospels & Acts, independent elsewhere). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers Origen (d. 254).

Yet another reading, *Variant 2*, omits words 1,2, & 3, and thus reads, “And Jesus going up to Jerusalem took the twelve disciples apart and said unto them,” etc. . This is a Latin reading, found simply as, “*et* (‘and,’ word 4),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also followed by the ancient church Latin writer, Hilary (d. 367).

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental change? Did a scribe, racing over the passage, first accidentally omit words 1,2,3, and write down word 4, and then suddenly realizing his mistake then add back in words 1,2,3, after word 4? I.e., without carefully thinking through the change in meaning that he had made, did he quickly think in his mind, “It means the same thing both ways, so it doesn’t matter?”

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate change? Its probable origins with Origen, who refers to both the TR’s reading and this variant, increases the likelihood of this possibility. Recognizing that the text of Matt. 20:17c allows, but does not require, that Christ had public ministry contact with others besides the twelve disciples on the way to Jerusalem, did the idea that Christ did not, sufficiently appeal to a scribe, that he decided to alter the text so as to make this one of two possibilities allowed by the text, the only possibility?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental change? We know from Manuscript Washington (W 032) that sometimes words were “squeezed in” at the end, since at Matt. 13:19 we find this occurs with about the last 5 letter spaces protruding to the right of the word, “*sunientos* (understandeth).” Did words 1, 2, and 3 likewise protrude, and then were lost in an undetected paper fade? We certainly know that such a number of letters can be lost in a paper fade, since e.g., in Lectionary 2378 (11th century, *Universitatis Sidneiensis* /

University of Sydney), we find that on the first page there is a fade of all but the “E” (epsilon) of “*Euangeliou* (Gospel),” in the title, “*Ek* (From) *tou* (the) *kata* (according to) *Ioannēn* (John) *Agiou* (Holy) *E[uangeliou]* (Gospel).”

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate change? Did a Latin scribe deliberately omit these words because he failed to understand the subtlety of the Greek, and so thought they were “both the same” and “redundant in Latin translation?” Or did he understand the subtlety of the Greek, and so know about the disagreement between the readings of the Received Text and *Variant 1*, but wrongly concluding that “both were added commentary,” then deliberately exclude both readings from his Latin translation?

Were these two variants deliberate or accidental changes, or was one deliberate and the other accidental? We simply do not know. But we do know that both were changes to the *Textus Receptus* here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

The TR’s reading here has strong support in both the Greek and Latin, and the further support of the ancient church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom. By contrast, *Variant 1* has weak support in the Greek and no support in the Latin, and appears to have originated at the hand of Origen, a well known personage who did “corrupt the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17). *Variant 2* has some good support in the Latin textual tradition, including the Vulgate, but has no support in the Greek. Weighing up these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*; this maxim not only strikes down *Variant 2* (since there is no clear and obvious textual problem here with the Greek that would lead us to consider the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*), but also strikes down *Variant 1* on the basis of its relatively weak support in the Greek (since there is no clear and obvious textual problem that would lead us to look to it to cure that problem). Therefore, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 20:17c 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. 20:17c, “in the way, and,” is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent), 157 (independent, 12th century), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in all extant Syriac Versions; and the Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 1, “and on the way,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32; 22:3-16), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 892 (9th century, mixed text type), and 700 (11th

century, independent); as well as the *Family 1 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 1 (12th century, independent text in the Gospels, Byzantine elsewhere), 1582 (12th century, independent Matt.-Jude), 209 (14th century, independent in the Gospels and Revelation, Byzantine elsewhere), *et al*; 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 Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; and Armenian Version (5th century).

Variant 2, “and,” is found in Minuscule 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere).

At Matt. 20:17c, the erroneous *Variant 1*, was adopted by the NU Text *et al*. It is thus found in the ASV which reads, “and on the way” i.e., “And as Jesus was going up to Jerusalem, he took the twelve disciples apart, *and on the way* he said unto them” (ASV). This incorrect reading is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and Moffatt. E.g., Moffatt reads, “As Jesus was about to go up to Jerusalem, he took the twelve aside by themselves *and* said to them as they were *on the road*” etc. (Moffatt Bible).

Variant 2, was adopted by the NIV, who here exhibit a remarkable “cosiness” with the old Latin Papists in their preparedness to set aside the Greek in favour of the Latin, even though there is no textual problem with the Greek that would warrant the usage of the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*. Or is it just that the NIV is such a vague and woolly translation that they left out these words as part of their “dynamic equivalent”? We do not know, and nor do their sadly misguided supportive readers. Certainly *Variant 2* was earlier adopted by the old Latin Papists in their Douay-Rheims Version which reads, “And Jesus going up to Jerusalem, took the twelve disciples apart and said to them.” Though the words were absent from the old Latin Papists’ Douay-Rheims, they are present in the new neo-Alexandrian Papists’ Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles (albeit in such a loose and imprecise translation as to only further muddy the waters). We thus find the Papists here now running away from their Douay-Rheims Version which before the Vatican II Council they claimed was entirely reliable, or perhaps, as they might now term it while looking shamefacedly to the ground, engaging in “a tactical withdrawal” from it. But in fairness to the Papists, loyalty was never one of their strong points, a fact writ large in their maxim, “faith is not to be kept with heretics.” Indeed, it was on that basis, that even though John Huss (martyred 1415) had been given this assurance of safe-conduct by the Emperor, “Thou shalt permit John Huss [to] pass, stop, stay, and return freely, without any hindrance whatsoever;” nevertheless, the Romish *Council of Constance* (1414-1418) had him burnt at the stake as a “heretic” for his proto-Protestant views and associated support for John Wycliffe (d. 1384), the Morning Star of the Reformation¹¹³.

¹¹³ Bramley-Moore, W., *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, 1563, revised folio edition, 1684, 3rd edition, Cassell, Patter, and Galpin, London, 1867, pp. 152-159, “History of the Life, Sufferings, & Martyrdom of John Huss, who was burnt at Constance, in Germany.”

Matt. 20:19 “he shall rise again” (TR & AV) {A}*Preliminary Textual Discussion.*

The Latin textual tradition here uniformly reads, “*resurget* (‘he will / shall rise [again],’ indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *resurgo*)” (Vulgate & old Latin Versions; manifested in the Clementine). Since this could arguably have been translated from either the Greek reading of the *Textus Receptus* or variant, no reference will be made to the Latin, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:19, the TR’s Greek, “*anastesetai* (‘he will / shall rise [again],’ indicative middle future, 3rd person singular verb, from *anistemi*),” 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). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Basil the Great (d. 379).

However, a variant reading Greek, “*egerthesetai* (‘he will / shall be raised,’ indicative passive future, 3rd person singular verb, from *egeiro*),” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), and Minuscule 50 (11th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Chrysostom (d. 407), and Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444).

In Greek, the Received Text’s middle voice here indicates that the subject, Christ, participates in the result of the relevant action i.e., Christ here is involved in performing his own resurrection. By contrast, the variant’s passive voice indicates that the subject, Christ, is being acted upon¹¹⁴, i.e., Christ here is raised from the dead by God. Providing one is not used to deny the other, both statements are theologically orthodox, for in harmony with the theology of the variant, “God the Father” “raised him from the dead” (Gal. 1:1), and he was “quickenened by the Spirit” (I Peter 3:18); and in harmony with the TR’s reading, Christ said, “I lay down my life, that I might take it again.” “I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again” (John 10:17,18). I.e., the resurrection of Christ involved the action of all three Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity.

Also of relevance to this discussion, *infra*, is a matter dealing with “the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ” (*Athanasian Creed*). The Bible teaches that there is such a thing as a Divine nature (Gal. 4:8; II Peter 1:4), and that Christ was fully Divine (John 1:1-13; 5:18). The Bible also teaches that there is a human nature distinct from e.g., an angel nature, that Christ took upon himself (Heb. 2:16), being fully human with a reasonable soul and body (Ps. 16:10; John 1:14; Acts 2:31). Christ thus had a Divine

¹¹⁴ Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, pp. 414-415 (middle voice), 431 (passive voice); Young’s *Greek*, pp. 134 (middle voice).

nature and a human nature, “For the right faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man; God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds” (i.e., from eternity), “and man, of the substance of his mother, born in the world” (*Athanasian Creed*)¹¹⁵. (Although he had the sinless, unfallen, human nature of Adam before the Fall, rather than sinful human nature of men after the Fall, I Cor. 15:45; Heb. 2:17; 4:15; I Peter 1:19, i.e., he was “perfect man,” *Athanasian Creed*.) The orthodox Trinitarian position is that “as touching upon his Godhead” or Divinity, “the Son” is “equal to the Father” (John 5:18; 10:30; Philp. 2:6), and “as touching upon his manhood” or humanity, “inferior to the Father” (Luke 2:52; John 14:28; Philp. 2:7,8) (*Athanasian Creed*). Contrary to the orthodox Trinitarian teaching that in the “Trinity none is afore, or after other: none is greater, or less than another; but the whole three Persons are co-eternal together and co-equal” (*Athanasian Creed*); Origen was a Trinitarian heretic who denied the equality of the three Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity (John 5:18; 10:30; Philp. 2:6; I John 5:7,8).

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

Was this an accidental alteration? Due to a paper fade / loss, did the original “*anastēsetai* (he shall rise),” come to look something like, “*ēsetai*”? If so, was it “reconstructed” from context by a scribe, probably Origen, as “*egerthesetai* (he shall be raised)”? Did Origen here select the passive voice “*egerthesetai* (he shall be raised)” as a subconscious manifestation of his heretical Trinitarian views, in which he blasphemously denied the Son was “equal with God” the “Father” (John 5:18) i.e., so as to put the focus on the Father to the exclusion of the Son?

Was this a deliberate alteration? A heretic sometimes asserts one truth in such a way as to mischievously deny another truth. Thus while it is perfectly true that God the Father was involved in the resurrection of Christ (Gal. 1:1), if this truth is asserted in such a way as to deny that the Son (John 10:17,18) and Spirit (I Peter 3:18) were also

¹¹⁵ Reformed Anglicanism has historically recognized the Trinitarian and anti-Pelagian teachings of “the first four General Councils, or such others as have only used the words of the Holy Scriptures,” (Blackstone’s *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, Vol. 4, p. 48). The fourth general council, *Chalcedon* (451), upheld the teaching of Christ’s two natures against the monophysitist heretics. The Trinitarian formulas against monophysitism *et al* in the 5th general council of *Constantinople II* (553) and 6th general council of *Constantinople III* (681, against the monothelite heresy, which was a monophysitist heresy derivative), are also sound. However, these 5th and 6th general councils also contained some error, specifically, the claim of Constantinople II of an “ever-virgin Mary;” and the claim of Constantinople III that general councils had the prophetic gift of “inspiration,” i.e., thus giving them the status of a prophet. (See Article 21, Anglican *39 Articles*, entitled, “Of the Authority of General Councils,” e.g., “General Councils ... be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God,” and so “they may err, and sometimes have erred”)

involved, then it becomes one of the “damnable heresies” brought in by “false teachers” (II Peter 2:1). Origen clearly knew of both readings here at Matt. 20:19, and appears to be the originator of this variant. Origen blasphemously claimed the Spirit was an inferior Divine Person to the Son, who in turn was an inferior Divine Person to the Father. Therefore, wishing to put the focus on the Father *to the exclusion of the Son*, did he deliberately alter this verse at Matt. 20:19 from a middle to a passive voice?

Was this a deliberate or accidental change? Either way it appears to have been made by Origen and related to his heretical Trinitarian views which denied the equality of the three Divine Persons of the Holy Trinity. I.e., at Matt. 20:19 Origen was asserting one truth, namely, that God the Father raised the Son; but to the exclusion of another truth, namely, that the Son was involved in performing his own resurrection. We cannot be sure if this was a deliberate or accidental change by Origen at Matt. 20:19, but we can be sure that it was a change to the *Textus Receptus* here preserved for us in the representative Byzantine Greek text.

The TR’s reading has strong support in the Greek text, and enjoys the further impressive support of the church father and doctor, St. Basil the Great, a bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, Asia Minor. By contrast, the variant has weak support in the Greek text, although it is followed by two church fathers (Chrysostom & Cyril). Weighing up these factors, and taking into account the probable origins of the variant with the church writer, Origen, who clearly knew of both readings; on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 20:19 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. 20:19, “he shall rise again (*anastēsetai*)” 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 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32; 22:3-16), (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), and 1071 (independent, 12th 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*; 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*.

However, the incorrect variant, “he shall be raised (*egerthesetai*),” 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 Z 035 (6th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); together with Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century).

Though the two major Alexandrian text's are split, on this occasion there was a general agreement by the neo-Alexandrians that the variant, "*egerthesetai* (he shall be raised)," was the preferred reading. Though the reading of Codex Sinaiticus is found in the NU Text *et al*, due to some level of uncertainty, footnotes show the alternative reading of Codex Vaticanus in Tischendorf's 8th edition (1869-72) (although this is generally the case for Tischendorf due to his very good textual apparatus,) Westcott-Hort (1881), Nestle's 21st edition (1952), and Nestle-Aland's 27th edition (1993). Given that on neo-Alexandrian School principles, the "external support" for Codex Sinaiticus is here lacking to a very great extent, poses the question of "Why?" this preference. The circular and bizarre answer comes in the ideas that the "more difficult" reading is to be preferred, and "assimilation" between the gospels is generally *presumed*. I.e., because in the synoptic gospel accounts of Mark 10:34 and Luke 18:33 the text reads, "*anastesetai* (he shall rise again)," it is *presumed* that the TR's reading here found in Codex Vaticanus "just must" be an assimilation from these accounts. This neo-Alexandrian logic means that if a "loose gun" like Origen comes up with "a wacko" reading, *then precisely because it is "wacko" and improbable, it is to be preferred*. What does this preference for the "wacko" and improbable, tell us about the thought processes in the minds of the type of people that become neo-Alexandrian textual critics?

Hence here at Matt. 20:19, with very little manuscript support, no good textual argument in its favour i.e., based on *stylistic considerations of the Greek* which is what we of the Neo-Byzantine School consider (as opposed to the bizarre circular rules of the Neo-Alexandrian School), the neo-Alexandrian versions followed the corrupted teaching of the Trinitarian heretic, Origen. Origen would no doubt have smiled from ear to ear if he had known that a variant of his reflecting his heretical belief in the inferiority of the Second Divine Person to the First Divine Person had come to be so widely acclaimed.

Thus at Matt. 20:19, the incorrect variant is followed by the American Standard Version which reads, "he shall be raised up" (ASV). The erroneous variant was also followed in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

What of that mad Scotsman, the religiously liberal Puritan, James Moffatt (d. 1944), who in some respects reminds me of another mad Scotsman, the religiously liberal Puritan, Samuel Rutherford (d. 1661). Rutherford's religiously liberal views, stated in *Lex Rex* (a wicked work which the Restoration hangman publicly burnt), were that if certain "natural law" criterion were met, one could set aside Biblical injunctions against "seditions" and "murders" (Gal. 5:20,21). Rutherford went so far as to even support the murder of the king, Charles I (Regnal Years: 1625-1649); whose murder being met with the steadfast Christian faith of the king in the Biblical teaching that men should, "Honour the king" (I Peter 2:17), acts to effectively mark him out as a Christian martyr (remembered on 30 Jan.). *At a conceptual level in which man's mind via "natural law" is said to be able to set aside the clear Word of God, how are Rutherford's religiously*

liberal views on “seditions” and “murders” (Gal. 5:20,21) *fundamentally different to Moffatt’s* “heresies” (Gal. 5:20), which claim that if certain neo-Alexandrian “natural law” criterion are met, he too can set aside the very words of God as stated in the Bible? Of course, I hasten to add that the religious liberalism of Moffatt and Rutherford (the latter of whom received support from the greater part of the English Puritans), were a thorough going disgrace to both Scotland and Puritan Protestantism; and I am relieved to say that the greater part of the Scottish Puritans, who generally were Presbyterians, stood with their Anglican Protestant brethren in unity against this wickedness. Thus united under God, they supported the Restoration of Charles II and the Royal Family in 1660. So what then, of that other mad Scotsman, the religiously liberal Puritan, James Moffatt? It must come as no surprise to us that the Moffatt Bible follows the variant of Codex Sinaiticus here at Matt. 20:19 and so reads, “he will be raised.”

Matt. 20:21 “thy right hand, and the other on the left” (TR & AV):

Component 1 - “thy right hand” {A} &

Component 2 - “the left” {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter.

As discussed in the Preface to this Volume¹¹⁶, I note that there is a *prima facie* possibility, based on the current Greek Gospel Lectionary, that the minority Byzantine reading I here endorse may have some stronger support as a minority Greek reading in the Lectionaries inside the closed class, since Antoniades Lectionary work of 1904 was based on c. 60 lectionaries he used from the 9th to 16th centuries. Of course, not all gospel lectionaries contain this reading, e.g., it is not found in Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, Sydney University) and 1968 (1544 A.D., Sydney University).

But it must be stressed that at this stage the matter is speculative, and unless and until research provides us with specific Lectionaries from the 16th century or earlier that contain this reading, we cannot say that it is manifested in this 20th century Greek Lectionary from outside the closed class of sources, in derivation from any specific Greek Lectionaries that are inside the closed class of sources i.e., 16th century or earlier. Antoniades was known to have used some non-Lectionary sources, and possibly this is an instance of that. However the matter is to be resolved, at this point in time we can nevertheless say with confidence that the current Greek Lectionary manifests a known minority Byzantine reading, i.e., on the basis that it is found in the non-Lectionary Greek manuscripts, *infra*. (Cf. Preliminary Textual Discussion on Matt. 20:22b, *infra*.)

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting).

At Mark 10:37, the Vulgate reads “*sinistram* (left hand) *tuam* (thy),” and at Matt.

¹¹⁶ “Determining the representative Byzantine Text,” under “In the second place,” dealing with “Hembd” (a section which takes about 20 pages).

20:21 it reads, “*sinistram* (left hand).” The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron also reads “*sinistram* (left hand),” and since it is a Vulgate Codex it therefore must have gotten this reading from Matt. 20:21. Hence I show it as supporting the TR’s reading, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:21, in the TR’s, “thy (Greek, *sou*) right hand (Greek, *dexion*), and the other on the left (Greek, *euonumon*);” the first Greek component, “*dexion* (right hand) *sou* (‘of thee’ = ‘thy’),” 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); and the second Greek component, “*euonumon* (the left),” is a minority Byzantine reading, supported by Codices E 07 (*Codex Basilensis*, 8th century, Basel in Switzerland) and Minuscule 1375 (12th century, Moscow in Russia). It is further supported in both of these components with the Latin, “*dexteram* (right hand) *tuam* (thy)” and “*sinistram* (left hand),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions *aur* (7th 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, “*dextram* (right hand) *tuam* (thy)” and “*sinistram* (left hand),” in old Latin Versions *e* (4th / 5th century), *b* (5th century), and *ff2* (5th century); and as Latin, “*dextris* (right hand) *tuis* (thy)” and “*sinistris* (left hand),” in old Latin Version *d* (5th century). It is further supported as, “*dextram* (right hand) *tuam* (thy)” and “*sinistram* (left hand),” by the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258)¹¹⁷.

However, another reading, *Variant 1*, omits Component 1, i.e., the “thy (Greek, *sou*)” of “right hand (Greek, *dexion*),” thus reading, “the right hand.” This reading is followed by the early mediaeval church Greek writer, John of Damascus (also known as John Damascus, or John Damascene,) (d. before 754).

Another reading, *Variant 2*, which adds a second “*sou* (thy)” to Component 2, i.e., “thy (Greek, *sou*) right hand (Greek, *dexion*), and the other on thy (Greek, *sou*) left (Greek, *euonumon*),” is supported in both the “*dexion* (right hand) *sou* (‘of thee’ = ‘thy’),” component and “*euonumon* (left) *sou* (‘of thee’ = ‘thy’),” component, 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)¹¹⁸. It is further found as Latin, “*dexteram* (right hand) *tuam* (thy)” and “*sinistram* (left hand) *tuam* (thy),” in old Latin

¹¹⁷ Hans Freiherr von Soden’s *Das Lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur zeit Cyprians*, in Harnack, A, & Schmidt, C., *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur*, J.C. Hinrich’s sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig, Germany, 1909, pp. 366-588, at p. 409.

¹¹⁸ The vast majority of manuscripts used in von Soden’s K group by Pierpont for his Majority Text are Byzantine Text, and Pierpont in Green’s Textual Apparatus says the variant with “*sou* (thy)” before “*euonumon* (left),” is supported by 95-100% of all Greek texts.

versions h (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), f (6th century), l (7th / 8th century), and g1 (8th / 9th century); and as Latin, “*dextram* (right hand) *tuam* (thy)” and “*sinistram* (left hand) *tuam* (thy),” in old Latin Versions a (4th century) and q (6th / 7th century). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379) and Isidor of Pelusium (d. c. 435).

The second Greek component of *Variant 2*, “*euonumon* (the left),” is also followed by the early mediaeval church Greek writer, John of Damascus (d. before 754). I shall hereafter refer to the combination of this element from *Variant 2* with *Variant 1* as “the John Damascus reading,” i.e., “the right hand, and the other on thy left hand.” Of course, it may well be a much earlier reading.

The first “thy (*sou*)” of the representative Byzantine text i.e., “thy right hand,” omitted in *Variant 1*, has no good textual argument against it, and so is surely correct.

The origins of *Variant 1* are speculative. Was *Variant 1* an accidental omission due to a paper fade? Was *Variant 1* a deliberate omission by a scribe who thought it was “redundant”? Given the *John Damascus reading*, “the right hand, and the other on thy left hand;” may the omission of the “*sou* (thy)” have first arisen as some kind of “stylistic transfer” of the “*sou* (thy)” away from after the “*dexion* (right hand)” to its “better location” after the “*euonumon* (left)”? If so, *Variant 2* may then have been a later conflation of both the TR’s reading and the *John Damascus reading*, *infra*.

The “*sou* (thy)” of the TR’s reading i.e., “thy right hand,” has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument. It also has good support in the Latin with St. Jerome’s Vulgate and all old Latin Versions. By contrast, the omission of the “*sou* (thy)” in “thy right hand,” has weak support in the Greek from the early mediaeval church writer, John of Damascus, and no support in the Latin. Therefore, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s first component at Matt. 20:21, i.e., the “*sou* (thy)” of “thy right hand,” an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

The second “thy (*sou*)” of the representative Byzantine text i.e., “thy left hand” of *Variant 2*, creates a serious textual problem in the context of Matthean Greek.

In Matthean Greek, we find that where there is a couplet and the “*sou* (thy / thine),” repeated, this signifies a contextual emphasis is being placed on the second element of the couplet (or triplet). Thus “if thy (*sou*) right eye offend thee, pluck it out” in order to save “thy (*sou*) whole body” (Matt. 5:29); and so likewise with regard to “thy (*sou*) right hand” contrasted with “thy (*sou*) whole body” (Matt. 5:30); and so also with the contrast between “if therefore thine (*sou*) eye be single, thy (*sou*) whole body shall be full of light” (Matt. 6:22), “But if thine (*sou*) eye be evil, thy (*sou*) whole body shall be full of darkness” (Matt. 6:23); and so likewise in the contrast between “thy (*sou*) hand or thy (*sou*) foot,” compared with “two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire” (Matt. 18:8). Or “Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy (*sou*)

neighbour, and hate thine (*sou*) enemy. But I say unto you,” etc., then focuses on the issue of “your enemies” (Matt. 5:43,44). Or “let not thy (*sou*) left hand know what thy (*sou*) right hand doeth” (Matt. 6:3) i.e., because it is the hand that giveth arms (Matt. 6:4). Or “Behold I send my messenger before thy (*sou*) face, which shall prepare thy (*sou*) way before thee” (Matt. 11:10), has a contextual emphasis on the way of the Messianic Kingdom (Matt. 11:11-15). Or “Behold thy (*sou*) mother and thy (*sou*) brethren stand without” (Matt. 12:47), has a contextual emphasis on all of Christ’s close human relatives, none of whom thereby share any special relationship to God in the kingdom of heaven that elevates them above the rest of Christ’s spiritual family of faith (Matt. 12:48-50). Or in the OT quote, “The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine (*sou*) enemies thy (*sou*) footstool” (Matt. 22:44), there is a contextual emphasis on the enemies becoming the footstool (most clearly brought out in Ps. 110:1,2). Or in the triplet, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy (*sou*) heart, and with all thy (*sou*) soul, and with all thy (*sou*) mind” (Matt. 22:37), there is a stylistic emphasis on each individual element, also seen in the repetition of “with (*en*) all (*ole*).”

By contrast, in Matthean Greek when this emphasis is lacking, the “*sou* (thy)” is only used for the first couplet. Thus we read, “But I say to you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy (*sou*) right cheek, turn to him the other also” (Matt. 5:39). Here the emphasis is not on the “cheek” primarily, but on the “evil” of one who may “smite thee” (Matt. 5:39), and how to respond i.e., it might be in the stomach or elsewhere that one is hit, this is incidental. (Cf. commentary on “thy right cheek,” in Volume 1.) Or, “and if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy (*sou*) coat, let him have [thy] cloak also” (Matt. 5:40). Once again, the emphasis is on the “man” who “will sue thee at law,” and “take away thy coat” or other property, whether it is the “cloak” or something else does not much matter, and so it lacks emphasis. Or “Honour thy (*sou*) father and mother” (Matt. 15:4; 19:19). Here the broader emphasis is on honouring one’s parents corporately, rather than a specific reference with an emphasis on each of the two individually (as is the case in Matt. 12:47, *supra*), and so the form is “Honour thy father and mother” (Matt. 15:4; 19:19). (Cf. commentary on “thy” in Volume 2 at Matt. 15:4 and Matt. 19:19.)

With these thoughts in mind, let us now consider Matt. 20:21 in the representative Byzantine text, “grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on thy (*sou*) left, in thy kingdom.” The “thy (*sou*) left” here, immediately creates a stylistic turbulence with Matthean Greek. That is because the contextual emphasis here is *not* on Christ’s left hand, *but on the one who is desirous of sitting at it*. E.g., compare this with Matt. 6:3, where there is an emphasis on the hands because it is the hand that giveth “thine alms” (Matt. 6:4). Yet here, the contextual emphasis is the other way around, i.e., on where “the two sons may sit” (Matt. 20:21) and thus on “Zebedee’s children” (Matt. 20:20). The proposition that St. Matthew would here use “thy (*sou*)” before “left (*euonumon*),” clangs on the ears as bad Matthean Greek. It is like trying to suggest that one run electricity backwards from an electrical appliance e.g., from a fan into the power point i.e., *it is going in the opposite direction to that which the context indicates it should be going*. How can we correct so great an incongruity here at Matt. 20:21? The answer must be found in adopting the minority Byzantine reading, also

found in the Latin, namely, “grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom.” Therefore stylistic analysis of the Greek requires that this is the correct reading.

There are three possible originating points for the conflated reading of the representative Byzantine text at Matt. 20:21. Firstly, it may have been a conflation between the TR’s reading, “thy right hand, and the other on the left,” and *the John Damascus reading*, “the right hand, and the other on thy left hand.”

Secondly, it may have been introduced as “a balancing couplet” with the “*mou* (my)” of Matt. 20:23 i.e., “on my (*mou*) right hand, and on my (*mou*) left” (AV). If so, the scribe failed to properly distinguish between usage of “thy (*sou*)” from usage of “my (*mou*)” here, where such equivalence may exist (e.g., Matt. 10:32,33; 11:30). The correct reading at Matt. 20:21, i.e., “*sinistram*” / “*sinistram*” / “*sinistris*” (left hand),” together with the incorrect omission of Latin, “*meam* (my)” at Matt. 20:23c, *infra*, is found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions b (5th century), d (5th century), e (4th / 5th century), ff2 (5th century), aur (7th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading both are manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). Bearing in mind the maxim, “A little knowledge is a dangerous thing,” might such a confusion between the usage of “*sou* (thy)” and “*mou* (my),” account for the absence of “my (*mou*)” at Matt. 20:23c?

Thirdly, it may have been brought into Matt. 20:21 from Mark 10:37. There are both similarities and dissimilarities between Matthean Greek and Marcan Greek on this issue of “thy (*sou*).” In Marcan Greek, we find that where there is a couplet and the “*sou* (thy / thine),” repeated, this *sometimes* signifies a contextual emphasis is being placed on the second element of the couplet (or quadruplet). Hence in a manner reminiscent of Matthean Greek, we read in Marcan Greek, “Behold, I send my messenger before thy (*sou*) face, which shall prepare thy (*sou*) way before thee” (Mark 1:2), as per Matt. 11:10, *supra*. Or “Behold, thy (*sou*) mother and thy (*sou*) brethren without seek for thee” (Mark 3:32), as per Matt. 12:47, *supra*. Or “Go thy (*sou*) way; thy (*sou*) faith hath made thee whole” (Mark 10:52), puts an emphasis on the importance of faith. Or quadruplet, “And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy (*sou*) heart, and with all thy (*sou*) soul, and with all thy (*sou*) mind, and with all thy (*sou*) strength” (Mark 12:30); as per the triplet of Matt. 22:37, *supra*. Or “The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine (*sou*) enemies thy (*sou*) footstool” (Mark. 12:36), as per Matt. 22:44, *supra*.

So too, we find that in Marcan Greek, when this emphasis is lacking, the “*sou* (thy)” is *sometimes* used only for the first couplet. Hence in a manner reminiscent of Matthean Greek, we read in Marcan Greek, “Honour thy (*sou*) father and mother” (Mark 10:19), as per Matt. 15:14; 19:19, *supra*.

Yet Marcan Greek is not entirely like Matthean Greek on this matter. That is because a couplet in which the “thy (*sou*)” is repeated, is sometimes used without

denoting a particular emphasis on the second element of the couplet. Hence in a manner quite alien to Matthean Greek, we read in Marcan Greek, “Daughter, thy (*sou*) faith hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy (*sou*) plague” (Mark 5:34). Here the contextual emphasis is very much on “faith” (Mark 5:34), a theme reinforced in the next story where we read just two verses later, “Be not afraid, only believe” (Mark 5:36). So likewise, we read in Marcan Greek, “For Moses said, Honour thy (*sou*) father and thy (*sou*) mother” (Mark 7:10); whereas in the Matthean citation of this, it is abbreviated in harmony with Matthean Greek style, to “Honour thy (*sou*) father and mother” (Matt. 15:4), *supra*. Hence when we come to Mark 10:37, “They said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy (*sou*) right hand, and the other on thy (*sou*) left hand, in thy (*sou*) glory,” (Mark 10:37), the fact that the emphasis is on these two (to some extent moderated by the fact that they are being in “thy” i.e., Christ’s “glory,”), we find no textual turbulence, since this is the type of thing found in Marcan Greek at Mark 5:34 and Mark 7:10. Thus while the similarities between Matthean and Marcan Greek are very real on this matter, so are the differences¹¹⁹.

The practical effect of this is we can on this occasion say that the second “thy (*sou*)” of Matt. 20:21 looks very much like it could have been assimilated from Mark 10:37, and so this may well be a conflated reading from that source. It is certainly good Marcan Greek, but it just as certainly bad Matthean Greek.

The wider origins of this *Variant 2* are also conjectural.

Was this an accidental alteration? Did a scribe using a manuscript which read, “thy (*sou*) right hand, and the other on the left” (TR), in which the last word of the line was “left (*euonumon*),” followed by a space of a couple of letters spaces before the next line, wrongly think that there had been a paper fade? Was the scribe aware of an antecedent form of *the John Damascus reading*, “the right hand, and the other on thy (*sou*) left hand,” and if so, did he then bring the “*sou* (thy),” into Matt. 20:21 from such an antecedent source? Or did the scribe consult the “parallel reading” at Mark 10:37, and “reconstruct” the second “*sou* (thy)” at Matt. 20:21 from that source?

Was this a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe, seeking a “textual harmonization” between the TR’s reading, “thy (*sou*) right hand, and the other on the left,” and an antecedent form of *the John Damascus reading*, “the right hand, and the other on thy (*sou*) left hand,” deliberately conflate these two readings to form, “thy (*sou*) right hand, and the other on thy (*sou*) left hand” (*Variant 2*)? Or did a scribe, seeking a “gospel harmonization” of Matt. 20:21 with “the parallel” reading of Mark 10:37, deliberately conflate the Matt. 20:21 reading so as to produce a “standard” reading in both St.

¹¹⁹ Some rudimentary though incomplete appreciation of this appears to have been understood by certain scribes who at Mark 10:19 inserted a second “thy (*sou*)” (e.g., N 022, 6th century & F 09, 9th century). But though this is *permitted* in Marcan Greek, it is *not required, supra*. Thus we would not in this instance at Mark 10:19 be prepared to set aside the representative Byzantine reading of the TR which has only the one “thy (*sou*).”

Matthew's and St. Mark's Gospels of, "thy (*sou*) right hand, and the other on thy (*sou*) left hand" (*Variant 2*)?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate or accidental alteration? Was the source of the second "*sou* (thy)" an antecedent form of *the John Damascus reading*, or was the source of the second "*sou* (thy)" the Mark 10:37 reading? We cannot be sure. We can only be sure that it is an alteration to the reading of the Received Text.

If the great neo-Byzantines of the 16th and 17th centuries had been asked, "Where has the TR's reading *in its complete form* at Matt. 20:21, 'thy right hand (first component), and the other on the left (second component),' been through time and over time?;" their answer would surely have had to be the same as ours in the 21st century. "It has been, first and foremost, in the Vulgata!"¹²⁰ With respect to both the second component of this reading, "the left," and also the complete stylistic unit, "thy right hand (first component), and the other on the left (second component)," we thus here see an example of the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, working dutifully, as well it should, in humble submission to the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. That is because it is as a consequence of textual analysis of the Greek that we here bring into the TR this second component of the reading so clearly supported in the Latin textual tradition, being found in both St. Jerome's Vulgate and a number of old Latin versions. *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!*¹²¹

On the one hand, *Variant 2* is the representative Byzantine Greek reading, and has the further support of about half a dozen old Latin versions, two or three of which are ancient. It is also followed by a couple of ancient church Greek writers. On the other hand, the TR's reading here at Matt. 20:21 has weak support in the Greek. But it is clearly supported by textual analysis of the Greek, and enjoys strong support in the Latin, with St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate and about half a dozen old Latin versions, four of which are ancient. It also has the impressive early support of the holy church father and holy martyr of God, St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage in North Africa.

Archbishop Cyprian is remembered with a black letter day on 26 September in the

¹²⁰ "Vulgata" is a Latin adjective occasionally used as an English noun that is a synonym for the English noun, "Vulgate," but used when one wishes to give "a Latin sounding ring" to it. In the Latin, it was used for the Vulgate from the 13th century when it was known as the "*versio* (version) *vulgata* (common);" and so I sometimes refer in these commentaries to the "*Versio* (Version) *Vulgata* (Common / Vulgate) *Hieronymi* (of Jerome)" i.e., "Jerome's Vulgate Version." While I here use it for St. Jerome's Latin Vulgate, "Vulgata" is also sometimes used in the Latin for other Latin Versions such as the "Clementina Vulgata" (Clementine Vulgate, 1592); or "Biblia Sacra Vulgata" ("Holy Common Bible," Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft / German Bible Society, Stuttgart, West Germany, 1969, 5th ed., Germany, 2007).

¹²¹ 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."

1662 Anglican prayer book. The orthodoxy of “the holy martyr of God, St. Cyprian” (Book 2, Homily 19, “Of Repentance,” Part 3), is on a number of issues referred to in the Homilies of Article 35 of the Anglican *39 Articles*. E.g., Cyprian testifies that “the primitive church” has “no altars nor [idolatrous] images” (Book 2, Homily 2, “Against Peril of Idolatry,” Part 3)¹²². “And St. Cyprian saith, that after death ‘repentance and sorrow of pain shall be without fruit; weeping also shall be in vain, and prayer shall be to no purpose.’ Therefore he counselleth all men to make provision for themselves while they may, because, ‘when they are once departed out of this life, there is no place for repentance, nor yet for satisfaction.’ Let these and such other places be sufficient to take away the gross error of purgatory” (Book 2, Homily 7, “Of Prayer,” Part 3). “And ... that holy father Cyprian taketh good occasion to exhort earnestly to the merciful work of giving alms and helping the poor” (Book 2, Homily 11, “Of Alms-doing”).

Weighing up these factors, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s second component at Matt. 20:21, i.e., “the left (*euonumon*),” 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. 20:21, “thy right hand, and the other on the left” is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); 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.*

¹²² Lest this be misquoted, I remind the good Christian reader than Reformed Anglicans have historically had non-idolatrous images, e.g., stained-glass windows, or a reredos behind the Communion Table. But we historically have no graven images of Christ e.g., crucifixes, statues of saints, or icons (e.g., such as found in Eastern Orthodoxy), because it has been the experience of the church that such images e.g., icons, lead a substantial number of weaker brethren into idolatry; and therefore, if we are to “walk in” Christian “love” (Eph. 5:2), then we must ban such things (Rom. 13:9,10; 14; I Cor. 8). Now “adoration ... unto the sacramental bread ... or unto any corporeal presence” is “idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians” (Final rubric, Communion Service, *Book of Common Prayer*, 1662), and such idolatry has also been found to be connected with the places of “the reserved sacrament” (forbidden by Articles 19 & 28 of the Anglican 39 Articles), whether in the Papists’ “tabernacle” above their “altar,” or the Puseyites’ “aumbry” (unlike the Puseyites, the Papists use the “aumbry” for storing oils). Furthermore, as a Divine judgement on sin, God sometimes gives idolaters over to sodomy (I Kgs 15:12; II Kgs 23:7; Rom. 1:18-27). Thus if we help to reduce idolatry by getting rid of crucifixes, statues of saints, icons, “tabernacles” and “aumbries,” we also help to reduce the level of homosexuality. Cf. Matt. 19:29c ftn comments.

Variant 1, which omits Component 1, i.e., the “thy (Greek, *sou*)” of “right hand (Greek, *dexion*),” thus reading, “the right hand;” is followed by the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).

Variant 2, which adds a second “thy” to Component 2, i.e., “thy right hand, and the other on thy (Greek, *sou*) left,” is followed in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); 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). It is also found in the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

The combination of *Variant 1* and *Variant 2* i.e., *the John Damascus reading*, “the right hand, and the other on thy left hand,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century).

The neo-Alexandrians found themselves in an awkward position. They generally follow the two major Alexandrian texts when they are in agreement, and indeed that is what both Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle’s 21st edition (1952) did here at Matt. 20:21. But the general NT (and OT) preference for “the right hand” as the dominant hand (e.g., Matt. 22:44; Acts 5:31; Rom. 8:34 etc.), means the terminology in *the John Damascus reading*, “the right hand, and the other on thy left hand,” which reverses this order, so badly clangs on the ears as bad NT Greek, that neither Tischendorf nor the NU Text could bring themselves to adopt a reading that would so clearly make them look so silly. Their solution in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72), and the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993), was to adopt *Variant 2*, “thy right hand, and the other on thy left.” This allowed them to maintain the Alexandrian texts were “correct” in having the second “*sou* (thy)” not found in the TR, while producing what was passable NT Greek terminology (though not passable Matthean Greek terminology). At this solution, they found themselves in agreement with the Majority Text Burgonites in opposing the TR.

Hence at Matt. 20:21 the ASV follows the erroneous *Variant 2* and reads, “One on thy right hand, and one on the left hand.” So too, *Variant 2* is followed in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV, NEB, REB, TEV, TCNT, JB, NJB, and Moffatt Bible.

On the one hand, only an ignoramus totally bereft of textual analytical skills would seriously seek to suggest that at Matt. 20:21 the reading, “the right hand, and the other on thy left hand,” is viable. That is because the terminology is so clearly skew-whiff relative to any NT Greek, not just Matthean Greek. And only an ignoramus very largely, though not totally bereft of textual analytical skills, would seriously seek to suggest that the *Variant 2* reading at Matt. 20:21, “one on thy right hand, and one on thy left” (ASV), is viable. That is because *Variant 2* is a very Marcan Greek sounding reading, quite alien to, and not possibly part of, Matthean Greek. But on the other hand, in their rejection of the *Textus Receptus* reading at Matt. 20:21, *the John Damascus reading* has been adopted as “the kiss of death” (Matt. 26:48) by some neo-Alexandrians

such as Westcott & Hort and Erwin Nestle; and like an “Iron Maiden” torture-to-death device, *Variant 2* has embraced both the remaining neo-Alexandrians and all Burgonites alike in its painful “hug of death.” *Under the circumstances, I can but stand back and invite the reader to draw the obvious conclusion about the requisite textual analytical skills of those in the Neo-Alexandrian and Burgonite (Majority Text) Schools.*

Matt. 20:22b,c;23b “and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?” (vs. 22b + c)
 “and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with” (vs. 23b) (TR & AV)

Component 1 - “and” (Matt. 20:22b) {C},

Component 2 - “to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?” (Matt. 20:22c) {B}; &

Component 3 - “and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with” (vs. 23b) {B}.

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. I note that there is a *prima facie* possibility, based on the current Greek Gospel Lectionary, that the minority Byzantine reading I here endorse at Matt. 20:22b may have some stronger support as a minority Greek reading in the Lectionaries inside the closed class, since Antoniades Lectionary work of 1904 was based on c. 60 lectionaries he used from the 9th to 16th centuries; and we know the reading is found in Lectionary 673 (12th century). Of course, not all gospel lectionaries contain this reading, e.g., it is not found in Lectionaries 2378 (11th century, Sydney University) and 1968 (1544 A.D., Sydney University). But Antoniades was also known to have used some non-Lectionary sources, and possibly this is an instance of that. However the matter is to be resolved, at this point in time we can say with confidence that the current Greek Lectionary manifests a known minority Byzantine reading, i.e., on the basis that it is found in both Lectionary and non-Lectionary Byzantine Greek manuscripts, *infra*. (Cf. Preliminary Textual Discussion at Matt. 20:21, *supra*.)

Certainly, in the event that further research on the Lectionaries should act to *substantially* increase the TR’s *Component 1* strength as a minority Byzantine reading, i.e., so that it went beyond 5% of all Byzantine manuscripts, then I would be prepared to review the rating I give it of a solid “C” in the range of 60% +/- 1%. Specifically, if the minority Byzantine reading were thereby catapulted into the range of between 5% and 20% of all Byzantine manuscripts, I would be prepared to give the reading a high level “C” in the range of 63% +/- 1%.

Having said that, the present very limited data available from the UBS textual apparatus does not support such a possibility. The UBS 4th revised edition (1993) uses c. 70 Lectionaries, of which about half are *Apostolos* (Acts to Jude) and so do not contain this reading, and the other half comprises of either *Evangelion* (Gospel) Lectionaries or about half a dozen combined *Evangelion-Apostolos* Lectionaries. Of those containing

Gospel readings (and possibly not all the about half of them have this reading,) the UBS 4th revised edition says the majority of the Lectionaries follow the majority Byzantine reading here, and itemizes only one lectionary inside the closed class of sources that follows the TR's *Component 1* reading. If these proportions of about 1 Lectionary in 30 held up, i.e., c. 3.5% of Lectionaries were found to contain the *Component 1* reading, which would be less than 2% of all Byzantine manuscripts, then that would not be sufficient for me to be prepared to increase the rating I give for it, *infra*. Thus on the presently available data, we can only say that Antoniadis here followed a minority Byzantine reading. Did he do so on the basis of his study of Lectionaries? Did he do so on the basis of his study of other Byzantine manuscripts? Did he do so as a combination of studying both Lectionary and non-Lectionary manuscripts? What reason could he have had for following this reading, other than an agreement on his part with the type of textual reasons given for adopting this minority Byzantine reading, *infra*.

The reader should also bear in mind, that when he reads a statement such as the one I make when I say there are "nine known ... Greek manuscripts containing this reading," *infra*, this is made subject to the general qualifications always applicable. Specifically, in the first instance, because all textual apparatuses are selective, it is possible that there may be some relatively small number of further manuscripts not itemized in a given textual apparatus. E.g., von Soden makes no itemized reference to the support of Minuscule 2 (von Soden's ε 1214 in his Kx group), although Swanson does. In the second place, von Soden refers to a relatively small number of further manuscripts that support the TR's *Component 1* reading, but since these have not been classified outside of von Soden's system, I do not know if they are Byzantine or non-Byzantine manuscripts. Thus if further research on these von Soden manuscripts were to find that one or more of these were Byzantine text manuscripts, this would also act to minimally increase the support for this reading. (My methodological usage of projections of the type I undertake for the more general strength of Byzantine manuscripts in von Soden's groups with respect to manuscripts otherwise unclassified outside of von Soden's system, always produces "rubbery" figures which can only give a broad-brush guide, albeit a very useful one. But this methodology is so hazardous and prone to error when the manuscript numbers are very small, that I hope the reader understands why I shall not use it on this occasion.)

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron reads, "*aut* (or) *baptismum* (the baptism) *quo* (that) *ego* (I) *baptizor* (I am baptized [with]) *baptizari* (to be baptized [with])?", i.e., "or to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" This is identical with the reading found in the Vulgate at Mark 10:38. The Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, and given the general absence of this reading in the Vulgate Codices at Matt. 20:22, the likelihood is that on the balance of probabilities it was here brought in from Mark 10:38 as part of Diatessaron formatting. But since this cannot be conclusively proved, at least on this occasion I shall exercise discretion and make no reference to the Sangallensis Diatessaron, *infra*.

The Third Matter. We have become accustomed to referring to the Alexandrian Text's "*Codex Vaticanus*" or "Rome Vaticanus." But the name, "*Codex Vaticanus*" is,

by convention, also used for the Byzantine Text's S 028 since it too is housed in this Library. Because the Alexandrian Text of this name is clearly an aberrant text, some suspicion naturally attaches to its location in Rome. By contrast, because the S 028 Codex of this name is clearly of the Byzantine Text type, as with Latin manuscripts housed in the Vatican City, we may look upon them with greater favour.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:22,23, the first component (Matt. 20:22b) of the TR's Greek, "kai (and)," is a minority Byzantine reading, supported by Codex S 028 (*Codex Vaticanus*, 10th century); together with Minuscules 1207 (Sinai, Arabia, 11th century), 655 (Berlin, Germany, 11th / 12th century), 2 (Basel, Switzerland, 12th century), 73 (Christ Church College, Oxford, UK, 12th century), 443 (Cambridge University, 12th century), 1355 (Jerusalem, Israel, 12th century), and 473 (Lambeth Palace, London, England, 13th century); as well as Lectionary 673 (12th century, Athos, Greece). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379)¹²³ and Chrysostom (d. 407).

In the first component (Matt. 20:22b), *Variant 1*, Greek, "ε (or)," 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). It is further found as Latin, "aut (or)," in old Latin Versions h (5th century), f (6th century), and q (6th / 7th century). It is also followed by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation, and Marcus the Gnostic according to Irenaeus (d. 2nd century).

In the first component (Matt. 20:22b), *Variant 2a*, is interconnected with the *Variant 2b* reading of Matt. 20:22c, and omits Greek, "kai (and)" altogether. Thus this reading is followed by the same manuscripts as those at *Variant 2b, infra*. I shall refer to the combined *Variant 2a & Variant 2b* as *Variant 2*.

The second component (Matt. 20:22c) of the TR's Greek, "to (the) *baptisma* (baptism) o ('which' = 'that') *ego* (I) *baptizomai* (I am baptized [with]) *baptisthenai* (to be baptized [with])," i.e., "to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), and N 022 (6th century). It is also supported as Latin, "*baptisma* (the baptism) *quod* (that) *ego* (I) *baptizor* (I am baptized [with]) *baptizari* (to be baptized [with])?," i.e., "to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" in old Latin Versions h (5th century) and q

¹²³ St. Basil the Great in: Migne (Greek Writers Series) (1860 Paris Edition), *PATROLOGIA*, Vol. 85 (section 134), p. 284 (Oration 24) (Greek). The preceding words identify this as a quote from Matt. 20:22 i.e., as opposed to Mark 10:38; and so Migne is correct to attribute it in his footnote to "Matth. xx, 22." This is also where one finds the rest of the quote by St. Basil referred to in the second component (Matt. 20:22c).

(6th / 7th century, with spelling variant of “z” for “s” in “*baptisma*”); and in a similar reading which omits, “I am baptized [with] (Latin, *baptizor*; Greek *baptizomai*),” as Latin, “*baptisma* (the baptism) *baptizari* (to be baptized [with]) *quo* (that) *ego* (I [am])?” i.e., “to be baptized with the baptism that I am?,” in old Latin Version f (6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation, Marcus the Gnostic according to Irenaeus (d. 2nd century), Basil the Great (d. 379), and Chrysostom (d. 407).

The second component (Matt. 20:22c), *Variant 2b* (which in all instances is joined with *Variant 2a, supra*), is omitted in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). The omission is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and in the ancient Church Latin writers, Ambrose (d. 397), Jerome (d. 420), Augustine (d. 430), and *Speculum* (d. 5th century).

The third component (Matt. 20:23b) of the TR’s Greek, “*kai* (and) *to* (the) *baptisma* (baptism) *o* (that) *ego* (I) *baptizomai* (I am baptized [with]) *baptisthesesthe* (‘ye shall be baptized [with]’ = ‘be baptized [with]’),” i.e., “and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with” (vs. 23b), 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, localized spelling of last word as “*baptisthesesthai*¹²⁴”) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century). Furthermore, it is the most probable reading of N 022 (6th century), although the manuscript’s state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is also supported as Latin, “*et* (and) *baptisma* (the baptism) *quod* (that) *ego* (I) *baptizor* (I am baptized [with]) *baptizari* ([you are] to be baptized [with]),” i.e., “and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with,” in old Latin Versions h (5th century) and q (6th / 7th century, with spelling variant of “z” for “s” in “*baptisma*”); and as Latin, “*et* (and) *baptisma* (the baptism) *quo* (that) *ego* (I) *baptizor* (I am baptized [with]) *baptizamini* (you are to be baptized [with]),” i.e., “and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with,” in old Latin Version f (6th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Basil the Great (d. 379, omitting “*ego*”/ I) and Chrysostom (d. 407); and the early mediaeval church writer, Pseudo-Chrysostom in a Latin work (d. 6th century).

The third component (Matt. 20:23b), *Variant 3*, is omitted 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), n (5th / 6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). The omission is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Epiphanius (d.

¹²⁴ Greek “*baptisthesesthe* (‘ye shall be baptized [with],’ indicative passive future, 2nd person plural verb, from *baptizo*),” has here had the “*e*” suffix changed to “*ai*” in accordance with the local Greek dialect of Egypt (see Commentary at Matt. 16:8b).

403); and ancient Church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420); as well as the early mediaeval Greek church writer, John of Damascus (d. before 754); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

I shall first consider the second (Matt. 20:22c) and third (Matt. 20:23b) components, before the first component (Matt. 20:22b). That is because the second and third components combined form a couplet, which must in turn be considered to understand the relevant issues in the first component.

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading found in the second (Matt. 20:22c) and third (Matt. 20:23b) components, which are thus correct. The origins of *Variant 2* (omitting Matt. 20:22c) and *Variant 3* (omitting Matt. 20:23b) are conjectural.

Was *Variant 2* (Matt. 20:22c) an accidental omission? Was there first a paper fade of the last two letters of “*baptisthenai* (to be baptized [with]),” which ended on one line, with directly above the last word of the previous line being, “*pinein* (to drink)”? If so, did the eye of a copyist jump down from the “n” (n) ending of “*pinein*” to the “n” ending of “*baptisthen:*”, and so omit by accidental ellipsis, the intervening words, “*kai* (and) *to* (the) *baptisma* (baptism) *o* (that) *egō* (I) *baptizomai* (I am baptized [with]) *baptisthenai* (to be baptized [with])”?

Alternatively, in *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), we find that in the “AI” ending of the second last word, “*BAPTIZOMAI* (I am baptized [with]),” the cross-bar on the “A” is so high as to leave no clear paper space; and then we find that in the last word, “*BAPTISTHENAI* (to be baptized [with]),” the following “I” is so close as to touch the downward bar of the “A.” Therefore, if these two features were combined, at a quick glance an “AI” ending could be mistaken for an “N” ending. Therefore, did a scribe, working from such a manuscript in which one line ended with “*PINEIN* (to drink)” (i.e., the word next before the omitted words of this variant,) and the next line ended with “*BAPTISTHENAI* (to be baptized [with]),” mistake such an unclear “AI” ending for an “N” as his eye jumped down from the “N” ending of “*PINEIN*” to what looked like the “N” ending of “*BAPTISTHENN*”, and so omit by accidental ellipsis these words, thus giving rise to *Variant 2*?

Was *Variant 3* (Matt. 20:23b) an accidental omission? Did the eye of a scribe, working with a manuscript in which one line ended with “*piesthe* (Ye shall drink)” (i.e., the word next before the omitted words of this variant), and the next line ended with “*baptisthesesthe* (be baptized [with]),” jump by ellipsis on the “*esthe*” ending of “*piesthe*” to the “*esthe*” ending of “*baptisthesesthe*,” and so by accidental ellipsis omit the words, “*kai* (and) *to* (the) *baptisma* (baptism) *o* (that) *egō* (I) *baptizomai* (I am baptized [with]) *baptisthesesthe* (be baptized [with])”?

Were *Variants 2 & 3* deliberate omissions? Did a scribe, mistakenly consider the terminologies, “drink the cup” which refers to suffering, *infra*, and “be baptized” which refers to death, *infra*, were “synonymous terms”? Did he then omit the words of

Variants 2 & 3 as being “redundant” and “unnecessarily flowery repetition”?

Were *Variants 2 & 3* a combination of accidental and deliberate omission? Did either *Variant 2* or *Variant 3* first become lost by accidental omission, and then a scribe, realizing that the “drink” formed a couplet, and having some basic knowledge of textual analysis, realize that the reading could not be correct? But being then biased in a belief that “the shorter reading is the better reading,” and wrongly thinking that the remaining “baptism” reading had been “added in a conflation with Mark’s Gospel,” did this scribe then deliberately prune away the remaining “baptism” couplet reading?

Were *Variants 2 & 3* a simultaneous accidental omission? Did a bumbling and fumbling scribe, perhaps with “a dizzy head” from his last trip to Alexandria where he had “picked up a wog,” or perhaps suffering from other illness or fatigue, accidentally omit both variants at the same time by ellipsis, *supra*?

The reality is that all we know for sure about the relevant scribe is that he omitted the reading of the TR. Were *Variants 2 & 3* accidental or deliberate omissions or some combination thereof? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that they were omissions.

Components 2 and 3 are both strongly supported in the Greek as the representative Byzantine readings against which there is no good textual argument. They enjoy the further support of a few old Latin versions, one dating from ancient times; as well as the ancient church fathers and doctors, St. Basil the Great and St. John Chrysostom. By contrast, *Variants 2 & 3* have weak support in the Greek, but stronger support in the Latin since both are supported by the Vulgate and a number of old Latin Versions, as well as ancient church writers, mainly Latin. Weighing up these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, on the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give both of the TR’s second (Matt. 20:22c) and third (Matt. 20:23b) components each a high level “B” (in the range of 71-74%), i.e., in both instances, the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

Let us now consider the issue of Component 1 (Matt. 20:22b), i.e., the Greek, “*kai* (and)” immediately before Component 2.

In both Matthean and Marcan Greek, “*ε* (or),” is generally used disjunctively e.g., “Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or (*ε*) one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law” (Matt. 5:18) etc. (e.g., Matt. 5:36; 6:24,25,31; 7:4; 27:17; *et al*; Mark 2:9; 3:4 *et al*). Thus the “*ε* (or)” may be used to introduce synonyms (e.g., Matt. 17:25; Mark 4:30), or near synonyms, since they are disjunctive statements of the same, or near same type of things. Even when “*ε* (or)” is used conjunctively, it signifies an emphasis on the individual things or people involved so that in practice it may well prove disjunctive, though it *may* prove conjunctive e.g., Matt. 10:37 reads, “He that loveth father or (*ε*) mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or (*ε*) daughter more than me is not worthy of me” (AV) i.e., it may be that just one’s “father” or just one’s “mother” opposes a man because he is a Christian, although it may be that both do. *Thus*

the disjunctive element is still present as a potential (e.g., Matt. 19:29). Notably, when these are in succession, the “*ε* (or)” is constantly repeated. E.g., in Matthean Greek at Matt. 19:29, or in Marcan Greek where a “man” “hath left house, or (*ε*) brethren, or (*ε*) sisters, or (*ε*) father, or (*ε*) mother, or (*ε*) wife, or (*ε*) children, or (*ε*) lands, for” Christ’s “sake, and the gospel’s” (Mark 10:29).

We thus find that the commonality of a disjunctive nuance is always present in Matthean (or Marcan) Greek in the usage of “*ε* (or).” Whether or not that disjunctive element is realized or simply regarded as a potential, it is always present in, and is an irreducible part of, the Matthean (or Marcan) meaning of “*ε* (or).” With these thoughts in mind let us consider the “*ε* (or)” of Matt. 20:22. Here we find that Matt. 20:22,23 form a couplet, i.e., in the representative Byzantine text, (A) “Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, or (*ε*) to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?” and then after their response, comes the second part of the couplet, (B) “Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and (*kai*) be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with.”

Christ drank “the cup” of suffering (Matt. 26:39; Mark 14:36; Luke 22:42; John 18:11) that started in Gethsemane (Matt. 26:36; Mark 14:32) on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39,44) and finished on the cross. When a Christian suffers for Christ, there is a sense in which “the sufferings of Christ” “abound” in him (II Cor. 1:5; I Peter 4:12-14). Since the Christian is to “take up his cross” (Matt. 16:24; Mark 8:34), Christ can say to James and John, “Ye shall drink indeed of my cup” (Matt. 20:23), i.e., meaning “Ye shall indeed suffer.” The “baptism” Christ refers to in Matt. 20:22,23; Mark 10:38,39; Luke 12:50, is that of his own death. Thus in saying to James and John, “Ye shall ... indeed ... be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with,” Christ means that both James (Acts 12:2) and John will die as Christian martyrs. Thus Christ here teaches that both James and John will endure *suffering* (the cup) and *death* (the baptism), so that these are conceptualized as distinctive things i.e., these are not synonyms. Nevertheless, they are clearly conjunctive i.e., they are to *both* suffer *and* die. There is no sense in which they might do one, but not the other i.e., no sense in which they might “drink” the “cup,” but not be “baptized,” or *vice versa*. (Christ’s prophecy that St. John was to die as a martyr, is contrary to a rumour spread about him in apostolic times to the effect that he would live to see the Second Advent, John 21:20-24.)

Therefore when we compare the two elements of this couplet, given that the “cup” and “baptism” are not synonyms; given that they are not disjunctive alternatives; and given that they are *not* used conjunctively but in a manner that still leaves the disjunctive element as a potential i.e., they do *not* mean, “you might both suffer and die, but you might only suffer but not die;” it follows that the usage of the conjunction, “*ε* (or)” at Matt. 20:22 (or at Mark 10:38¹²⁵) clangs on the ears as bad Matthean Greek (and bad Marcan Greek). It is clear that in this couplet these two things are unmistakably conjunctive, so that the natural expectation in the couplet is that the “*kai* (and)” of Matt. 20:23, will also be found in the preceding verse of Matt. 20:22. Thus the natural expectation must be that in harmony with Matthean Greek, the couplet should read: A)

¹²⁵ N 022 (6th century) so reads at Mark 10:38.

“Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, and (*kai*) to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?” and then after their response, comes the second part of the couplet, (B) “Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and (*kai*) be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with.”

To the extent that this expectation is not met in the representative Byzantine text, which reverses the polarity of this expectation by incongruously using “ε (or)” in Matt. 20:22, and then meets this expectation by using “*kai* (and)” in Matt. 20:23; all in a context in which the meaning is conjunctive of two different things; it follows that the representative Byzantine text reading of “ε (or)” at Matt. 20:22 poses a serious textual problem, crying out in pain. It can only be remedied by adopting the minority Byzantine reading, “*kai* (and),” which therefore must be the correct reading.

The origins of the variant, Greek, “ε (or)” (Matt. 20:22), found in the majority Byzantine text, are speculative.

Was this an accidental change? In Manuscript Washington (W 032) which here follows the incorrect variant, there is a paper space of about 2 letter spaces before the “ε (or).” Did a scribe, probably Marcus the Gnostic, come across a manuscript which had suffered a paper fade at the “*kai* (and),” thus leaving three paper spaces? With his appreciation of Matthean Greek leaving something to be desired, did he then “reconstruct” this as “ε (or),” and think that there was meant to be a stylistic paper space of a couple of letters before it? Might continuance of this error by later scribes explain the two letter paper space in *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century)?

Was this a deliberate change by Marcus the Gnostic? Marcus the Gnostic was a disciple of Valentinus (2nd century A.D.), who believed in a gnostic dualism with rival deities of good and evil, in which knowledge was gained by gnosis i.e., esoteric knowledge¹²⁶. Did Marcus the Gnostic deliberately introduce this change in order to harness it to some “exoteric knowledge” that he then peddled, in which “secret knowledge” was “revealed” to gnostic cult members to the effect that James and John might have endured *suffering* (the cup) OR *death* (the baptism), “but did not necessarily have to endure both,” even though they did?

In turn, was this change by Marcus the Gnostic then consciously endorsed by Origen for his own reasons? Now Origen was a heretic. Among other things, Origen claimed that fallen spirits enter men’s body, and are “tested” here on earth as men, in order to see if they are yet ready again for heaven. Did Origen think in his base, carnal, and heretical mind, that it was “over the top” for Christ to say that St. James and St. John were to endure both *suffering* (the cup) and *death* (the baptism)? Did he think that *just one of these* would “be enough to prove that they were now ready for heaven”? Did he then deliberately select the variant of Marcus the Gnostic over the TR’s reading i.e., the

¹²⁶ Long before there were any Popes of Rome (Boniface III, Bishop of Rome, 607, later made first Pope, 607), when there were still only Bishops of Rome, Valentinus went to Rome and unsuccessfully sought that bishopric in c. 140 A.D. .

Greek, “*kai* (and),” to Greek, “*ε* (or),” to reflect this assessment? In doing so, in his confused, demented, and sin sick mind, did Origen wrongly think that he was thereby portraying a “more loving” and “kind” type of “Christ” than the Biblical Christ?

Was *Variant 1* (Matt. 20:22) a deliberate or accidental change? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that *Variant 1* was a change to the original text.

The minority Byzantine reading of the *Textus Receptus* at Matt. 20:23, “*kai* (and),” has relatively weak support in the Greek with just nine known precious Greek manuscripts containing this reading. It is also unknown in the Latin. But of course, just one reading inside the closed class of sources is enough if that reading clearly remedies a textual defect in the representative Greek Text, and the TR’s reading here is strongly supported by textual analysis. Hence it was understandably adopted by that past master of the Neo-Byzantine School, Erasmus of Rotterdam, in e.g., his 1516 & 1522 editions, and also thereafter followed by other great neo-Byzantines e.g., Stephanus (1550). On the one hand, *Variant 1* has clearly been “through the grind mill” of them “which corrupt the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17), with both an initial influence from Gnosticism in Marcus the Gnostic, and a later endorsement from a well known heretic, Origen. But on the other hand, to the question, “Where has this reading been through time and over time?;” the answer must be, “It has been, first and foremost, in the writings of the ancient church fathers and doctors, St. Basil the Great of Caesarea and St. John Chrysostom of Constantinople.” On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s *Variant 1* at Matt. 20:23, 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. 20:22b,c; 23b, Component 1 - “and” (Matt. 20:22b) is found in Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in the Georgian “1” Version (5th century); some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and Ethiopic Version (Takla Haymanot, c. 500).

Variant 1, “or,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); together with Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in the Syriac Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian “2” Version (5th century); and Slavic Version (9th century).

Component 2, “to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?,” (Matt. 20:22c) 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 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 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; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); the Georgian “1” (5th century) and Georgian “2” (5th century) Versions; Ethiopic Version (Takla Haymanot, c. 500); and Slavic Version (9th century).

Variant 2 i.e., the union of *Variant 2a* omitting the “and” of Component 1 (Matt. 20:22b) and *Variant 2b* omitting the “to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?” (Matt. 20:22c) of Component 2, i.e., reading nothing here at all, is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32; 22:3-16), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th 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*; as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions, together with some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and Ethiopic Versions (Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Component 3, “and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with” (Matt. 20:23b), is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century); together with Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type), 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; some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and Armenian Version (5th century).

Variant 3, omitting the “and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with” (Matt. 20:23b), of Component 3, is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32; 22:3-16), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta and 038 (9th century). It is further found in Minuscule 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*; as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain

Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is also found in the Syriac Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century) and Curetonian (3rd / 4th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions, together with some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The majority text reading of *Variant 1* is cited in Elzevir's Textual Apparatus (1624) as being found in four of the selected eight manuscripts (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; L, Codex Leicestrensis; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ's College, Cambridge, F. i. 8); and with different breathings in a fifth (Gospel manuscript: H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum). But this is said to "not" be so for one manuscript (Gospel manuscript: v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9) i.e., the TR's reading is here presented as a slim minority reading.

At Matt. 20:22b,c; 23b, *Variant 2* which omits the words, "and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" (Matt. 20:22b,c) and *Variant 3*, which omits the words "and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with" (Matt. 20:23b), are adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Thus these words are omitted in the ASV which reads only, "... Are ye able to drink the cup that I am about to drink? They say unto him, We are able. He saith unto them, My cup indeed ye shall drink: but to sit on my right hand, and on my left hand," etc. (ASV). The erroneous *Variants 2 & 3* are likewise adopted at Matt. 20:22b,c; 23b in the NASB, RSV, NRSV (with a footnote referring to the union of the incorrect *Variant 1* with the correct *Component 2*), ESV, and NIV.

In 1533, the great neo-Byzantine textual analyst, Erasmus of Rotterdam, was advised by the Prefect of the Vatican Library, John de Septueda, of some 365 places where the Alexandrian Text's Codex Vaticanus (B 03) agreed with the Latin Vulgate while disagreeing with Erasmus's Greek text. Erasmus drew the obvious conclusion that Codex Vaticanus was clearly a corrupt and unreliable text, and so the neo-Byzantines thereafter rejected the veracity of Rome Vaticanus. So likewise, the great neo-Byzantine textual analyst, Theodore Beza of Geneva, though in possession for a time of the Western Text's Codex Bezae (D 05), drew the obvious conclusion that Codex Bezae was clearly a corrupt and unreliable text, and in 1581 he donated it to Cambridge University. To be sure, the great neo-Byzantine textual analysts of the 16th and 17th centuries rejected both one of the two leading Alexandrian Texts and the leading Western Text, for essentially the same reason i.e., they were clearly corrupt and unreliable. That anyone would now advance one or both of these codices at Matt. 20:22b,c; 23b (or anywhere else), and claim that their readings here at Matt. 20, supported by the Vulgate, were some kind of "new insight" that "we just found out about from the 19th century on," is really a stand-up comic strip.

As the glistening white shining sword of the *Textus Receptus* as manifested in the Authorized Version, swirls through the air here at Matt. 20:22b,c; 23b to cut down, and render ineffectual, both the Neo-Alexandrian texts and Burgonite Majority Texts, I note

that written in the (metaphoric) chronicles of that sword's battles are the words, "Fought and defeated the Papists here, who came at the Received Text at this point with the two-edged blunted black blade of the Douay-Rheims Version and Clementine Vulgate, and to the great rejoicing of the Protestants were gloriously defeated by the breath of the Spirit, operating through the sharp silver two-edged sword of the *Textus Receptus* and Saint James Version." Thus we find that the reading of the old pre-Vatican II Latin Papists, "... Can you drink the chalice that I shall drink? They say unto him, We can. He saith to them, My chalice indeed you shall drink; but to sit on my right or left hand" etc. (Douay-Rheims); is continued by the new post-Vatican II neo-Alexandrian Papists in their Jerusalem Bible (1966) and New Jerusalem Bible (1985). And to add insult to injury, both the JB and NJB then seek to take a further nasty side-swipe at the Infallible Book by raising doubts in their footnote commentaries as to whether or not John really did die a martyr's death. *The Word of God* says here at Matt. 20:23 and at Mark 10:39 that both St. James and St. John were to die as martyrs. *The Bible says it. I believe it. That's all there is to it for me!*

Matt. 20:23a "And" (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter (Diatessaron formatting).

At Mark 10:39, the Latin Vulgate reads, "*Iesus* (Jesus) *autem* (And) *ait* (he saith) *eis* (unto them)," i.e., "And Jesus saith unto them;" whereas at Matt. 20:23, the Vulgate reads, "*Ait* (he saith) *eis* (unto them)," i.e., "He saith unto them." The Sangallensis Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, and so its reading here, "*Ait* (he saith) *eis* (unto them)," could only have been drawn from Matt. 20:23, and so I show it following the variant, *infra*.

The Second Matter. Nestle-Aland (27th ed.) show their Family 13 manuscripts following the variant here; whereas Swanson shows his Family 13 manuscripts, together with Minuscule 157, following the TR's reading. Von Soden shows 13 following the TR's reading rather than *Variant 1*; and so on balance, I shall show 13 in support of the TR's reading as opposed to *Variant 1*. Likewise, von Soden shows 13 (in his II group) as following *Variant 2*. But beyond Minuscule 13 outside the closed class of sources, I shall make no further reference to the Family 13 manuscripts, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:23a, the TR's Greek, "*Kai* (And)," at the start of Matt. 20:23, "And (*Kai*) he 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). It is further supported as Latin, "*Et* (And)," in old Latin Versions h (5th century) and q (6th / 7th century).

However, *Variant 1*, omitting Greek, “*Kai (And)*,” is followed by the early mediaeval church Greek writer, John of Damascus (d. before 754). The omission is further found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258)¹²⁷.

Another reading, *Variant 2*, adds in “Jesus” (Greek, *o Iesous*; Latin, *Iesus*), after the “he said (literally, ‘he says;’ Greek, *legei*; Latin, *ait*) unto them (Greek, *autois*; Latin, *illis* - literally ‘unto those [ones]’).” One form of this, *Variant 2a* does so without adopting *Variant 1* i.e., reading, “and Jesus saith unto them.” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Minuscule 1188 (11th / 12th century). It is also found in old Latin version h (5th century). Another reading, *Variant 2b*, also follows *Variant 1* but omits the “And (Greek, *Kai*; Latin, *Et*),” i.e., “Jesus saith unto them.” This may be reconstructed in the Greek from the Latin. *Variant 2b* is found in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century). *Variant 2b* is also found in the ancient church Latin writer, Cyprian (d. 258)¹²⁸.

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

Was *Variant 1* an accidental loss? When Stephanus first gave us our NT verse numbers in 1551, he often followed more ancient unnumbered verse divisions. Thus in Manuscript Washington (W 032), at Matt. 20:23a we find a 1 to 2 letter space gap before the “*Kai (And)*.” Was this first lost in a paper fade, and then undetected by a scribe who simply thought of it as a stylistic paper space marking the beginning of a verse?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate omission? Was the “*Kai (And)*” pruned away by a scribe who in the interests of “a more concise text” regarded it as “redundant”?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental addition? Did a Greek scribe writing, “*AYTOIC* (unto them),” accidentally repeat the “*IC*” ending; and / or, did a Latin scribe writing, “*illis* (unto them),” accidentally repeat the “*is*” ending? Did a subsequent Greek scribe, then take extra “*IC*” to be an abbreviated form of “*IHCOYC* (Jesus)” in which “there had been a paper fade” of the bar above it showing an abbreviation; and / or did a subsequent Latin scribe, likewise then take the extra “*is*” to be an abbreviated form of “*Iesus*

¹²⁷ Hans Freiherr von Soden’s *Das Lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur zeit Cyprians, op. cit.*, p. 409.

¹²⁸ Hans Freiherr von Soden’s *Das Lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur zeit Cyprians, op. cit.*, p. 409.

(Jesus)”?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate addition? Did a Greek and / or Latin scribe add in the “Jesus (Greek, *Iēsous*; Latin, *Iesus*),” for the purposes of “contextual clarification”?

Deliberate or accidental changes? We cannot be sure. But we can be sure that there was a change to the *Textus Receptus*.

The TR’s reading at Matt. 20:23a has strong support in the Greek. By contrast, the support for *Variant 1* in the Greek is limited to the Romish iconolater (icon idolater), John of Damascus, a man who when most of the Eastern Church was under the Pope of Rome (607-1054), opposed the righteous condemnation of icon idolatry by the godly Byzantine Emperors of *The First Iconoclasm* (730-787), namely, Leo III (Regnal Years: 717-741), Constantine V (Regnal Years: 741-775), and Leo IV (Regnal Years: 775-780). However, *Variant 1* has stronger support in the Latin, including the Vulgate and an ancient church Latin writer. *Variant 2* also has weak support in the Greek, although some stronger support in the Latin. Bearing in mind the fact there is also some further support for the TR’s reading in the Latin textual tradition, and the perpetual 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. 20:23a 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. 20:23a, “And” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32; 22:3-16), and (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century). It is also found in the neo-Alexandrian’s “queen” of minuscules, Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type); together with Minuscules 1071 (independent, 12th century), 13 (13th century, independent), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h Version (616); Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, *Variant 1* which omits “And” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century) and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); 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.* It is also found in Syriac: Sinaitic (3rd / 4th century), Curetonian (3rd / 4th century), and Pesitto (first half 5th century) Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Versions; and Armenian

Version (5th century).

Variant 2, adds “Jesus.” *Variant 2b*, which does so while adopting *Variant 1* i.e., “Jesus saith unto them,” is found in Minuscule 13 (13th century, independent).

The erroneous *Variant 1* which omits “And (*Kai*),” but not the equally erroneous *Variant 2*, was adopted at Matt. 20:23a by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the omission is found in the ASV which reads simply, “He saith unto them.” The incorrect variant was also followed at Matt. 20:23a in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, and ESV.

The old pre-Vatican II Council Latin Papists of the Douay-Rheims Version here followed *Variant 1* with their rendering, “He saith to them.” Thus with the Clementine Vulgate in one hand, and Douay-Rheims Version in the other, they here came to attack the Protestants, who defended this reading with the Received Text in one hand, and the King James Version in the other. Protestants still use these two trusty weapons against the Papists, but since the Vatican II Council they now come at us in exactly the same terms holding a neo-Alexandrian text in one hand, and their [Roman] Catholic RSV, Jerusalem Bible, or New Jerusalem Bible in the other. The TR and AV cut down the old Latin Papists here, even as it now cuts down the new neo-Alexandrian Papists. Our weapons remain effective, as both old and new Papists are forced to cower in the corner before them.

Both *Variants 1 & 2* were followed at Matt. 20:23a by the NIV, TEV, and Moffatt. Thus the New International Version reads, “Jesus said to them” (NIV); and likewise the Moffatt Bible reads, “said Jesus.” What of the obvious objection, “So called ‘translations’ like the NIV, TEV, and Moffatt are very vague and woolly relative to the Greek. Seeing how they don’t sensibly use italics to show added words, how can we be sure they are following *Variant 2b*, that is, rather than just adding it in themselves as part of their so called ‘dynamic equivalent’?” To this, I can but reply, “The NIV, TEV, and Moffatt Bible are very painful ‘translations’ to deal with. In precision terms their misguided readers do not know where their so called ‘dynamic equivalents’ are coming from, and nor do I!”

Matt. 20:23c “my” (TR & AV) {B}

The TR’s Greek, “*mou* (‘of me’ = ‘my’),” in the words, “and on my left” (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). It is also supported as Latin, “*meam* (my),” in old Latin Versions h (5th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), and c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379).

However, a variant omitting Greek, “*mou* (my),” i.e., “and on the left,” is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), K 017 (9th century), M 021 (9th century), Pi 041 (9th century), and S 028 (10th century). The omission of Latin, “*meam* (my),” is further found in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d

(5th century), ff2 (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, this omission is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254), Epiphanius (d. 403), and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient Church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading here at Matt. 20:23c which is thus correct. The origins of the variant are conjectural.

Was this an accidental omission? In *Codex Freerianus* (W 032), the “*mou* (my)” here comes at the end of a line. Then further down the same page of *Codex Freerianus* (Matt. 20:22-30), we see that the “*nai*” ending of “*diakonēthenai* (to be ministered unto)” (Matt. 20:28) protrudes to the general right hand side justification of the page. Therefore, might a manuscript with “*mou* (my)” coming at then end of a line, but protruding to the right by 2 or 3 letter spaces, have first been lost in a paper fade, and then undetected by a subsequent scribe copying it out?

Was this a deliberate omission? The likely origins of this variant with Origen increases this possibility, though by no means makes it certain. Did a scribe, if so, probably Origen, regard it as simply “redundant” and prune it away? Or did it originate from a line better preserved in the Vulgate and old Latin versions e, b, d, ff2, aur, & ff1, where it was deliberately omitted as “a balancing couplet” due to an inaccurate scribal equation of the usage of “*mou* (my)” (Matt. 20:23c) “paralleling” the usage of “*sou* (thy)” (Matt. 20:21)? (See my comments at Matt. 20:21 on *Variant 2*, at the second possible reason for the conflation at Matt. 20:21, *supra*, as to a reason for the possible deliberate pruning of “*mou* [my]” here at Matt. 20:23c, in the Vulgate and old Latin versions e, b, d, ff2, aur, & ff1; as manifested in the Clementine.)

A deliberate or accidental omission? We do not know. We cannot know. But we can and do know that it was an omission to the true text of *Textus Receptus* (TR).

The TR’s reading at Matt. 20:23c has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading against which there is no good textual argument. It has further support in the Latin and dates from ancient times in one old Latin Version. It also enjoys the support of the church father and doctor, St. Basil of Caesarea. By contrast, the variant looks like it comes from the hand of the notoriously unreliable Origen, a heretic whose standard of textual transmission vacillated greatly; it has weak support in the Greek codices and minuscules, but stronger support in the Latin; and it is also followed by several ancient church writers. Weighing up these factors, and taking into account the perpetual 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. 20:23c 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. 20:23c, “my” is found in Codex Delta 037 (9th century, independent text type); as well as Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent), 788 (11th century, independent), and 1241 (12th century, independent in Gospels). It is further found in all extant Syriac Versions; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which omits, “my,” 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 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), 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).

The erroneous variant was adopted at Matt. 20:23c by the NU Text *et al.* Hence it appears in italics i.e., as “added by the translators,” in the ASV which reads, “and on *my* left hand.” This same solution of italics was also adopted at Matt. 20:23c by the American Standard Version’s “better son,” the New American Standard Bible. But the ASV’s “more wayward son,” the RSV, does not use italics, and so *prima facie* one would not know that the RSV translators considered they were “adding it in;” a problem which also emerges in the RSV’s two sons, the New Revised Standard Version and English Standard Version. By contrast, the omission in the underpinning Greek is made clearer in the New International Version which reads, “my right or left” (NIV).

The NIV’s English rendering is not as “new” as some may think. For we find that the old Latin Papists of the pre-Vatican II era used it in their Douay-Rheims Version, which reads, “my right or left hand.” By contrast, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the post-Vatican II era, fell on the same rock of self-destruction as the RSV, NRSV, and ESV, since while “adding it in as part of translation,” their lack of italics means that this is not known to the reader unless he first consults a neo-Alexandrian Greek text to see where the reading is coming from (and of course, most of their readers would never do that).

Matt. 20:23d “is not mine to give” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. Cronin’s printed copy of N 022¹²⁹, shows “e. ..onnumo*k estin e... dounai, a.*”. 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

¹²⁹ Robinson, J.A., Editor, *Texts and Studies*, Vol. V, No. 4, Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus, Cambridge University, UK, 1899.

this only leaves room for “*ek* (on) *euonnumo* (the left) *mou* (of me), *ouk* (not) *estin* (is) *emon* (mine) *dounai* (to give), *all*’ (but).” While I do not have a photolith / 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. Hence there is no room for the addition of the variant’s “*touto* (this).” Thus I show the TR’s reading as the most probable reading of N 022, *infra*.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). While the reading of the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century) is the same as the Vulgate at Matt. 20:23d, *infra*, this same reading is also found in the Vulgate at Mark 10:40. Therefore I shall make no reference to this Latin Vulgate Codex, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:23d, the TR’s Greek, “*ouk* (‘not,’ word 1) *estin* (‘it is,’ word 2) *emon* (‘mine,’ word 3) *dounai* (‘to give,’ word 4),” i.e., “is not mine to give” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and is the most probable reading of N 022 (6th century), although the manuscript’s state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is also supported as Latin, “*non* (‘not,’ word 1) *est* (‘it is,’ word 2) *meum* (‘mine,’ word 3) *dare* (‘to give,’ word 4)¹³⁰,” 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; in word order 3,1,2,4), n (5th / 6th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (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), Basil the Great (d. 379), Epiphanius (d. 403), and Chrysostom (d. 407); and ancient church Latin writers, Ambrose (d. 397), Jerome (d. 420), Augustine (d. 430), Speculum (d. 5th century), and Varimadum (d. 5th century).

However, *Variant I* adding in “*touto* (this),” i.e., “this (*touto*) is not mine to give,” is a minority Byzantine reading. In *Variant Ia*, it is added in as Greek, “*touto* (this),” before Word 1 in U 030 (9th century); and in Lectionaries 68 (12th century), 76 (12th century), and 673 (12th century). In *Variant Ib* it is added in as Latin, “*hoc* (this),” between Words 2 & 3 in old Latin Version q (6th / 7th century)¹³¹. In *Variant Ic*, it is added in as Greek, “*touto* (this),” between Words 3 & 4 in W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), and in Minuscules 1505 (11th century, Byzantine in the Gospels), 1010 (12th century), 597 (13th century); and in one of two readings by the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407). In *Variant Id*, it is added in as Greek, “*touto* (this),” after Word 4 in Pi 041 (9th century).

¹³⁰ The Vulgate and old Latin versions other than d also add, “*vobis* (you)” after “*dare* (to give).”

¹³¹ Old Latin version q also add, “*vobis* (you)” after “*dare* (to give).”

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

Were there three or four independent corruptions? I.e., did the Latin scribe of old Latin q (*Variant 1b*) insert “this (*hoc*)” himself? Or is the change of location in old Latin q as a result of translation from the Greek to the Latin? If the latter, were there then three independent corruptions? I.e., is *Variant 1c* an independent conflation? Or were there then two independent corruptions? I.e., is *Variant 1c* a form of *Variant 1b* in which a scribe first accidentally omitted the “*touto* (this),” and then added it back in after he had written, “*dounai* (‘to give,’ word 4)”?

The improbability of accidental addition, coupled with the different locations of its insertion, indicates that on the balance of probabilities this was a deliberate conflation of the text. I.e., it was a popular kind of addition among a certain type of conflationist scribe, so that in all probability two, three, or four scribes each got what they independently thought up as “the bright idea” of this conflation, on two, three, or four separate occasions. But why? The reasons for this are necessarily speculative.

The Greek, “*touto* (this)” is from *outos*¹³². In Greek, *outos* is used to indicate proximity, e.g., mental, geographical, or contextual closeness¹³³. The repeated addition of this word, in two, three, or four different places in different corruptions of the text, therefore evidently reflects a desire by some scribes to emphasize that Christ here is referring to not giving something “this” proximate. Did these scribes therefore regard their conflation, “but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, this (*touto*, from *outos*) is not mine to give,” was “required as a stylistic contextual counter-weight” to the earlier words of “the mother of Zebedee’s children” (Matt. 20:20), when she said, “Grant that these (*outoi*, from *outos*¹³⁴) my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom” (Matt. 20:21)? And if *Variant 1b* is an independent conflation, did this Latin scribe likewise think the same, “this (*hoc*, from *hic*¹³⁵)” of Matt. 20:23, was “required as a stylistic contextual counter-weight” to the earlier “these (*hi*, from *hic*¹³⁶)” of Matt. 20:21?

¹³² Greek, *touto* is a neuter singular nominative pronoun, from (the masculine form,) *outos*.

¹³³ Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, pp. 325-7; Young’s *Greek*, p 78. For the purposes of the Latin *Variant 1b*, compare the usage of Latin, “*hic* (this),” which has the sense of “this *near me*” or “this *of mine*” (Allen’s *Latin Grammar*, section 33, p. 20).

¹³⁴ Greek, *outoi* is a masculine plural nominative pronoun, from *outos*.

¹³⁵ Latin, *hoc* is a neuter singular nominative pronoun, from (the masculine form,) *hic*.

¹³⁶ Latin, *hi* is a masculine plural nominative pronoun, from *hic*.

Whatever was their rationale for this conflation, “the Word of God” (II Cor. 2:17) needs no such “stylistic counter-weights,” “clarifications,” or other alterations, by which such men set about to “corrupt” it (II Cor. 2:17). “Every word of God is pure” (Prov. 30:5), give us no other!

The TR’s reading at Matt. 20:23d has both strong support in the Greek as the majority Byzantine reading, and strong support in the Latin as the majority Latin reading. It is further supported by a number of church fathers and doctors; in the Greek, by St. Basil the Great and St. Chrysostom (who also cites *Variant 1c*); and in the Latin by St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Austin. By contrast, the variant has relatively weak support in both the Greek and Latin. Its weak starting point is then further eroded as it subdivides into four rival sub-variants, with each of these rivals “in a bun fight” with each other, claiming that the variant word should be inserted in a different place. Now “Does this look suspicious?” or, “Does this look suspicious?”. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 20:23d 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. 20:23d, “*ouk* (‘not,’ word 1) *estin* (‘it is,’ word 2) *emon* (‘mine,’ word 3) *dounai* (‘to give,’ word 4),” i.e., “is not mine to give,” is supported by the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is also followed by (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century), (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century), and (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century). It is further followed by Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 700 (11th century, independent), 1243 (independent outside of the General Epistles, 11th century), 157 (independent, 12th century), 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*; as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in the Syriac Pesitto Version (first half 5th century); Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century), Middle Egyptian (3rd century), and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

Variant 1a, which adds “this” before Word 1 is found in 565 (9th century, independent).

Variant 1c, which adds “this” between Words 3 & 4 is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century), (the mixed text type) Codex 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32; 22:3-16), and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century); as well as Minuscule 33 (9th century, mixed text type).

The neo-Alexandrian texts ended up splitting between the TR’s reading as followed by the two leading Alexandrian Texts, and *Variant 1c* as followed by the leading Western Text. *Variant 1c* was followed by Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) and Nestle’s 21st edition (1952). By contrast, the TR’s reading was followed by Westcott-Hort (1881), with one of their relatively rare footnotes giving *Variant 1c* as an alternative reading. Sitting on the fence, indicating optionality and uncertainty as to whether or not to include it, square brackets were placed around the reading of *Variant 1c* in the main text of the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, together with the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993). The UBS’s 4th revised said of the choice between these two readings, “the Committee had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text.”

But why?

When the two major Alexandrian texts are in agreement, such as here, the general rule of the neo-Alexandrians is to go no further than padding the reading out with various manuscripts supporting this. But occasionally, on the up side, the neo-Alexandrians make a foray into the domain of real textual analysis. However, on the down side, in the vast majority of instances, being hopelessly out of their depth, they then “botch” the matter quite badly. Here at Matt. 20:23d we have such an instance. In fairness to the neo-Alexandrians, on this occasion they were perhaps, like Moffatt on other occasions in some of his more insane moments, to some extent “tripped up” by the Western Greek Text which here follows *Variant 1c*. Of course, like the Alexandrian Text which likes to prune the text, the Western Text which likes to conflate readings, is a Greek text that we neo-Byzantines hold in very low regard indeed. No doubt, the fact that their “queen” of minuscules, 33, also here follows *Variant 1c*, would also have been relevant to them.

Metzger says, “since the word does not appear in the parallel account in Mark, the Committee decided to retain it in Matthew, but to enclose it in square brackets in order to indicate doubt as to its proper position in the text” (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 2nd ed., 1994, p. 42). The type of reasoning used by the UBS Committee and found in the NU Text is not very good. It presumes that where multiple gospel readings agree in the Received Text, an *a priori* presumption is to be made that any variant has a good chance of being correct, and that the similarity of the multiple gospel readings is the result of “assimilation.” This type of circular neo-Alexandrian reasoning which works against the doctrine of Divine Preservation and associated requirement that one must have a *good textual reason* to either argue for such a “gospel assimilation” (which sometimes do occur), or to depart from the representative Byzantine Greek reading to another inside the closed class of sources (which sometimes does occur); is itself in turn based on a wider anti-supernaturalist denial of the Divine Inspiration of Scripture. I.e., far from believing

in the verbal inspiration of Scripture, these neo-Alexandrians consider that e.g., St. Matthew looked at St. Mark's Gospel, or some common antecedent form of it (the existence of which exists only in their imaginations), and then made "modifications" to it.

But here we come into a clear contradiction of logic. For if, as they claim, St. Matthew was "copying" from St. Mark, or "copying" from a common source with St. Mark, then surely an identical reading could be expected! We thus find, that under strict scrutiny the neo-Alexandrian textual critics "change their tune," so as to always attack the Received Text. Hence, if on the one hand, the multiple TR readings in multiple gospels concur, they say that there is a strong *a priori* presumption that assimilation has occurred, (rather than undertaking serious textual analysis to see if such an assimilation has occurred,) and so give credence to any corrupter of the Word who here made a change, thereby attacking the Divine Preservation of Holy Writ. But if on the other hand, multiple gospel readings are deemed to be diverse, they say that there is a strong *a priori* presumption that these are irreconcilable statements and thus examples of "Bible blunders" in which the gospel writers "contradict" each other, and so they attack the Divine Inspiration of Holy Writ.

Why are these neo-Alexandrian textual critics so cantankerous? Why do they, like the Devil, keep seeking to cast aspersions on God's Word (Gen. 3:4). Why do they like the hard-hearted Jews think they can "entangle" Christ's words (Matt. 22:15:22), or find some so called "Bible blunder" (Matt. 22:23-33)? Their "head problem" (I Cor. 1:22,23) relates to their "heart problem," for "the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked" (Jer. 17:9). If they are not saved, they need to first recognize their utter sinfulness and need for a Saviour (Rom. 3:9,10,23), recognize that "Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8), repent of their sins as set forth most especially, although not exclusively, in the Ten Commandments (Exod. 20:1-17; Rom. 1 & 2; 3:20,31; 7:7; 13:9), and turn to Christ in saving faith (Rom. 1:17; 3:24-26), so that they "confess with" their "mouth the Lord Jesus, and" "believe in" their "heart that God hath raised him from the dead," and "be saved" (Rom. 10:8,9). Thus their heads can never be right, till their hearts are right.

Good Christian reader, "spiritual things" "are spiritually discerned" (I Cor. 2:13,14). Hence the battle we are fighting against these neo-Alexandrian textual critics reminds us that "we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places" (Eph. 6:12). It is a spiritual battle of the religiously conservative Christian soldiers (Eph. 6:13-18) in the neo-Byzantine School against the religiously liberal secularist anti-supernaturalist soldiers in the neo-Alexandrian School.

"Sound the battle cry. See! The foe is nigh; Raise the standard high for the Lord! Gird your armour on, stand firm everyone, rest your cause upon his Holy Word.

Rouse, then, soldiers! Rally round the banner! Ready, steady, pass the word along. Onward, forward, should aloud 'Hosanna!' Christ is Captain of the

mighty throng!¹³⁷”

Matt. 20:26a “But” (TR & AV) {B}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. At Matt. 20:26a, Hodges & Farstad’s von Soden based Majority Text (1985) includes “*de* (but)” in the main text indicating their preference for it, but it shows a major split with part of the majority text (M pt) including the TR’s “*de* (but)” supporting the reading, and part of the majority text (M pt) omitting it. By contrast, Robinson & Pierpont’s von Soden based majority Byzantine Text (2005) shows “*de* (but)” in the main text but includes no side-note indicating a major split in the text. Pierpont’s von Soden based Green’s Textual Apparatus (1986) makes no reference to this variant either. The variant was followed by Erasmus (1516 & 1522); but the TR’s reading was followed by Stephanus (1550), Beza (1598), and Elzevir (1633).

Von Soden’s Greek NT (1913) says that the TR’s “*de* (but)” is supported by his Kx and Kr groups¹³⁸. The Kx subgroup of the larger generally Byzantine text K group, comprises just over 52% of von Soden’s K group of 983 manuscripts. In the Kx group, c. 500 manuscripts are Byzantine, of which c. 480 are exclusively Byzantine (in Kx parts). The Kr subgroup contains c. 160 manuscripts that are exclusively Byzantine (in Kx parts). This means that inside von Soden’s generally Byzantine text K group, *prima facie* c. 640 manuscripts, or c. 65% follow the TR’s reading, “*de* (but).” But bearing in mind the generalist nature of von Soden’s group symbols, one could only say for certain that c. 90% of these follow the reading i.e., since 90% of 65% is c. 59%, the support figure for the TR’s reading is in the range of c. 59%-65%. Or conversely, the variant is followed by c. 35%-41% of these manuscripts.

Thus between about three-fifths and two-thirds of the generally Byzantine K group follow the TR’s reading. Therefore I do not consider further analysis is required by me before concurring with Robinson & Pierpont’s majority Byzantine Text (2005) that the TR’s reading is here supported by the majority Byzantine text, *infra*.

The Second Matter. Cronin’s printed copy of N 022, shows “*ouch* [not] *ou...* [= *outos* = ‘so’] .. [= *de* = ‘but’] *estai* [it shall be],” i.e., the most likely construction of “*ouch ou... .. estai*,” is “But it shall not be so” (AV). 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 missing letters of the TR’s reading best fits the spaces.

¹³⁷ “Sound the Battle Cry” (1869) words & music by William Sherwin (1826-1888), Verse 1 & Refrain (“Rouse, then, soldiers!” etc.).

¹³⁸ See my figures for von Soden’s Kx & Kr subgroups in the Preface of this Volume 2, “*Robinson & Pierpont’s (1991) new edition Byzantine Textform (2005),” (Kx subgroup); “*Determining the representative Byzantine Text” (Kr subgroup), and Commentary at Matt. 20:15c (Kr subgroup).

While I do not have a photographic copy or access to the original codex; I can only assume 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*.

The Third Matter (Diatessaron formatting). At Matt. 20:26, the Vulgate reads, Latin, “*Non (not) ita (so) erit* (‘it shall be,’ future tense¹³⁹) *inter* (among) *vos* (you),” i.e., “It shall not be so among you;” and at Mark 10:43 the Vulgate reads, Latin, “*Non (not) ita (so) est* (‘it is,’ present tense¹⁴⁰) *autem* (but) *in* (among) *vobis* (you),” i.e., “But it is not so among you.” The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex and follows the Matt. 20:26 form. Therefore I show it following the variant, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:26a, the TR's Greek, “*de* (But),” in the words, “But (*de*) it shall not be so among you” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., M 021 (*Codex Campianus*, 9th century; Paris, France), X 033 (*Codex Monacensis*, 10th century; Munich, Germany), Gamma 036 (*Codex Oxoniensis Bodleianus*, 10th century; Bodleian Library, Oxford, England, UK); and Minuscule 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark; Paris, France). It is also the most probable reading of N 022 (6th century), although the manuscript's state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is also supported as Latin, “*autem* (but),” in old Latin Version ff2 (5th century); and as Latin, “*Sed* (But),” in old Latin Version c (12th / 13th century). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation.

However, a variant omitting the Greek, “*de* (But),” is a strong 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), E 07 (8th century), and Pi 041 (9th century). The omission of “But (Latin, *autem* or *sed*),” is further found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), h (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th 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). This reading is also followed by the early mediaeval church Greek writer, John of Damascus (d. before 754); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

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

Was this an accidental omission? Did the “*de* (but),” come at the end of a line in

¹³⁹ Indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *sum-esse*.

¹⁴⁰ Indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *sum-esse*.

a manuscript? Was it then lost in an undetected paper fade?

Was this a deliberate omission? Did a scribe, regarding the “*de* (but)” as “redundant,” deliberately omit it in the interests of “a more clear and concise text,” “better in keeping with these less flowery modern times” of the ancient world?

Was this a deliberate or accidental omission? We do not know. But we do know that it was an omission from the original text.

On the one hand, the TR’s reading at Matt. 20:26a has solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading with no good textual argument against it. When this is the case, the earlier attestation to it by Origen is significant, because even though Origen fluctuates greatly in his standard of textual transmission, we know that in this particular instance he (or his ancient Latin translator,) is following the *Textus Receptus* reading and so giving it an ancient witness. The TR has further ancient support in one old Latin version, together with later support in another old Latin version. But on the other hand, the variant is a strong minority Byzantine reading in the range of *c.* 35-41%; and is the majority Latin reading with its support including the Vulgate. Considering these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual 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. 20:26a 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. 20:26a, “But,” is supported by (the mixed text type) *Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus* (C 04, 5th century, Paris, France). This Codex, which is one of four Codices specially featured by Hodges & Farstad throughout their Majority Text¹⁴¹, received this name because its NT Greek text, subsequently recovered, was superficially erased when its parchment was designated for recycled use in the 12th century, at which time there was then written upon it a Greek translation of 38 tracts by Ephraem of Syria (303-373). Of some further passing interest then, on the principles adopted in Tischendorf’s 8th edition, he also shows this TR reading being followed by Ephraem of Syria. The TR’s reading is followed by Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere). It is further followed in the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version (3rd century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

However, the variant which omits, “But,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century); and Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent) and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is also found in the

¹⁴¹ Hodges & Farstad (1985), p. xvi & *passim*.

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

The erroneous variant was adopted at Matt. 20:26a by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the ASV reads, “Not so shall it be among you.” Likewise, this omission at Matt. 20:26a is found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

We neo-Byzantines of the holy Protestant faith have trod this sod of soil afore, in a former sword dual with the old Latin Papists. Their blunted two-edged sword comprised of the Douay-Rheims Version which here reads, “It shall not be so among you;” and the associated Latin rendering found in the Clementine Vulgate. Thus when we draw the trusty sharp two-edged sword of the *Textus Receptus* and King James Version against the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles, who here at Matt. 20:26a follow in the error of their old Latin Papist predecessors, we are fighting the Papists where we fought them afore. The old Latin Papists were struck down by the *Textus Receptus* and Authorized Version here at Matt. 20:26a, and the new neo-Alexandrian Papists fare no better, as they go scurrying back into their corner. “But! But! But!,” the Papist swordsman screams as he retreats, to which the Protestant swordsman replies, “I thought you said there would be no ‘But,’ here at Matt. 20:26a!”

Matt. 20:26b “it shall not be” (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:26a, the Vulgate reads, Latin, “*Non* (not) *ita* (so) *erit* (‘it shall be,’ future tense) *inter* (among) *vos* (you),” i.e., “It shall not be so among you;” and at Mark 10:43 the Vulgate reads, Latin, “*Non* (not) *ita* (so) *est* (‘it is,’ present tense) *autem* (but) *in* (among) *vobis* (you),” i.e., “But it is not so among you.” The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex and follows the Matt. 20:26 form. Therefore I show it following the TR, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:26b, the TR’s Greek, “*ouch* (not) ... *estai* (‘it shall be,’ indicative middle future, 3rd person singular verb, from *emi*),” i.e., “it shall not be” (AV), is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), the illuminated purple parchment *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century), the purple parchment *Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus* N 022 (6th century), and the purple parchment with gold illumination and silver writing, *Codex Sinopensis* (O 023, St. Matthew’s Gospel, 6th century). It is also supported as Latin, “*non* (not) ... *erit* (‘it shall be,’ indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *sum-esse*),” i.e., “it shall not be” 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), n (5th / 6th century), f (6th century), q (6th / 7th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron

(9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is further supported by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254) in a Latin translation; and ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407); the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

However, a variant reading Greek, “*ouch* (not) ... *estin* (‘it is,’ indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *eimi*),” i.e., “it is not,” is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Chrysostom (d. 407). It is further found as Latin, “*non* (not) ... *est* (‘it is,’ indicative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *sum-esse*),” in old Latin Version d (5th century). It is also found in the ancient church Latin writer, Speculum (d. 5th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading which must thus stand. The origins of the variant are speculative. (Cf. Mark 10:43).

Was this an accidental omission? Due to a paper fade / loss, did the original “*estai* (it shall be)” look something like, “*est:*”? Was this then “reconstructed” by a scribe as “*estin* (it is)” on the basis of “context”?

Was this a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe, failing to recognize that Christ was here saying, “*It shall not be (estai)* so among you” in the future, because from now in the present and onwards, “whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister” etc., wrongly set about to “standardize” the tenses and so also put these preliminary words of Christ in the present tense, “*It is not so (estin)* among you,” regarding this as some kind of “improvement to the text”?

A deliberate or accidental change? We do not know. But we do know that it was a change to the original text.

The TR’s reading at Matt. 20:26b has strong support in the Greek and Latin, whereas the variant has a corresponding weak support in the Greek and Latin. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s reading at Matt. 20:26b 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. 20:26b, “it shall not be (future tense),” 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); as well as in (the mixed text type) Codex 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32; 22:3-16), (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*; together with the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al*. It is further found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); Georgian “2” Version (5th century); Ethiopic Versions (Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9; & Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries); and Slavic Version (9th century).

However, the variant which reads, “it is not (present tense),” 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); and (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century). It is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and the Georgian “1” Version (5th century).

“Alarm bells” started ringing in the heads of neo-Alexandrian when they saw their two major leading texts in disagreement at Matt. 20:26b. It was one thing to “side-line” hundreds or thousands of good Byzantine manuscripts that supported the TR’s reading, since that was all part of “living up to the academic stereotype.” But it as another thing to “side-line” one of the two Alexandrian texts that essentially guided them into the meandering pathway of neo-Alexandrian error that they so cherished, since to be overly critical of an Alexandrian text might damage their “academic reputations;” which though built on meaningless nonsense in the circular replication of neo-Alexandrian power structures in tertiary institutions, nevertheless gives them some vain sense of inner semi-intellectualism and some vain sense of outer intellectualism in their secular academic culture. The problem was solved by Tischendorf through reference to his “old faithful,” i.e., when in doubt, follow Codex Sinaiticus; after all he did “discover” it, didn’t he? And what about the “external” support that Codex Sinaiticus has in the “Caesarean” Text (Georgian Versions) and Dillman’s Ethiopic Version? Thus for the wrong reasons, the TR’s correct reading was followed in Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72).

But neither Westcott and Hort, nor Erwin Nestle were so sure. What about the “external support” Codex Vaticanus has in both the Western Text (D04) and “Caesarean” Text (Georgian Versions)? Thus the variant is found in both Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle’s 21st edition (1952).

But the NU Text Committee were uneasy. If “external” support is “so important,” is not the preponderance of it on the side of the TR’s reading found in Codex Sinaiticus? Thus there was a swing back to Tischendorf’s view, as for the wrong reasons, the right reading was adopted in the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s

27th edition (1993) and UBS's 4th revised edition (1993).

Thus are the fluctuating fancies and follies of the those in the Neo-Alexandrian School, who in most instances, never really know for sure just what to do, when their two major Alexandrian texts are in disagreement. As to which way a future neo-Alexandrian text may decide this matter, we cannot now be sure. It will all depend on who is on "their Committee." Thus around the world, programmed puppets eagerly await to be told, from neo-Alexandrian edition to neo-Alexandrian edition, what they are to believe; when half a dozen or so religious liberals sit down in Stuttgart, Germany, or elsewhere, and make such momentous "decisions," ... well, at least till the next edition.

Amidst such, "stay tuned to garbage TV for the next soap-opera episode," type of fluctuations among the neo-Alexandrian texts at Matt. 20:26b, the neo-Alexandrian versions also exhibited a corresponding fluidity of view. On the side of Codex Sinaiticus, and thus by a fluke, the correct reading of the TR, came the *American Standard Version* with, "Not ... shall it be" (ASV); also followed by the RSV, NRSV, and ESV. But on the other side with Codex Vaticanus, came the *New American Standard Bible* with, "It is not" (NASB); also followed by the NIV, TCNT, and Moffatt Bible. E.g., the Twentieth Century New Testament reads, "it is not" (TCNT); and Moffatt reads, "not so with you" (Moffatt Bible), which though lacking the simple and immediate clarity of the NASB & TCNT, nevertheless naturally requires a present tense interpretation. Of course, Moffatt would no doubt have here regarded the Western Text as "the decider" in the two-way dispute between the two major Alexandrian Texts. In fairness to the religiously liberal, James Moffatt, I would agree that the Western Greek Text is about as reliable as the Alexandrian Greek Text.

Matt. 20:26c "let him be" (TR & AV) – Component 1 {B} &
Matt. 20:27b "let him be" (TR & AV) – Component 2 {B}.

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter (Matt. 20:26c: Component 1). At Matt. 20:26c (Component 1) Cronin's printed copy of N 022¹⁴², shows "...*ai umon* ('of you' = 'your')." Hence 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 variant "*estai* (he shall be)," is the most probable reading. Thus I show the majority Byzantine text variant as the most probable reading of N 022, *infra*.

The Second Matter (Matt. 20:26c: Component 1 & Matt. 20:27b: Component 2) (Diatessaron formatting). At Matt. 20:26c (Component 1), the Vulgate reads at Matt. 20:26c, "*sit* ('let him be,' subjunctive active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *sum-esse*); at Mark 10:43, "*erit* ('it shall be,' indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *sum-esse*); and in the first clause of Luke 22:26, "*fiat* ('let him become,' subjunctive active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *fio*)." Therefore the Sangallensis Latin

¹⁴² Robinson, J.A., Editor, *Texts and Studies*, Vol. V, No. 4, *op. cit.* .

Diatessaron which is a Vulgate Codex must be following Matt. 20:26c here, and so I show it supporting the TR's reading at Matt. 20:26c (Component 1), *infra*.

At Matt. 20:27b (Component 2), the Vulgate reads “*erit* (‘it shall be,’ indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *sum-esse*),” at both Matt. 20:27b and Mark 10:43. The Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron also reads “*erit*” for Component 2, but since it could be coming from either of these Gospels as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting, I make no reference to the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron at Matt. 20:27b (Component 2), *infra*.

The Third Matter (Matt. 20:27b: Component 2). Von Soden's work (1913) underpins the majority texts of Robinson & Pierpont (2005) and Hodges & Farstad (1985), as well as Green's Textual Apparatus (1986). At Matt. 20:27b (Component 2) Robinson & Pierpont's majority text (2005) has “*estō* (let him be),” with no alternative reading in its side margin indicating “the Byzantine Textform” is “significantly divided¹⁴³” (though its apparatus says the NU Text here reads “*estai*” / he shall be). By contrast, at Matt. 20:27b Hodges & Farstad's majority text (1985) has “*estō* (let him be)” indicating it is their preferred reading, but a footnote indicates a significant division, with part of their majority text following “*estō* (let him be),” and part of it following “*estai* (he shall be).” Green's Textual Apparatus (1986) makes no reference to this reading, and while all textual apparatus are selective; this here evidently indicates the same view as the text of Robinson & Pierpont (2005).

Under the circumstances, I shall consult von Soden (1913) directly. Von Soden says the TR's reading is supported at Matt. 20:27b by his entire “K” group other than the Kr subgroup¹⁴⁴. Von Soden's generally Byzantine K group contains 983 manuscripts of which 949 are Byzantine, with *c.* 914 being completely Byzantine, *c.* 35 being Byzantine only in parts, and 34 being outside the closed class of sources. Von Soden's Kr group contains 211 manuscripts, of which *c.* 209 are Byzantine, with *c.* 189 being completely Byzantine, *c.* 20 being Byzantine only in parts, and 2 being outside the closed class of sources. If we subtract the 189 exclusively Byzantine manuscripts of the Kr subgroup from the 914 exclusively Byzantine manuscripts of the K group, we have 725 out of 914 or *c.* 79% of the Byzantine K group.

But bearing in mind the generalist nature of von Soden's group symbols, one could only say for certain that *c.* 90% of these follow the reading i.e., since 90% of *c.* 79% is *c.* 71%, the Byzantine support figure for the TR's reading is in the range of *c.* 71%-79%. Or conversely, the variant at Matt. 20:27b is followed by *c.* 21%-29% of these Byzantine manuscripts. Thus between about seven-tenths and four-fifths of the

¹⁴³ Robinson & Pierpont, pp. xviii-xix, 44.

¹⁴⁴ See my figures for von Soden's K & Kr subgroup in the Preface of this Volume 2, “*Robinson & Pierpont's (1991) new edition Byzantine Textform (2005)” (K group) “*Determining the representative Byzantine Text” (Kr subgroup), and Commentary at Matt. 20:15c (Kr subgroup).

Byzantine K group follows the TR's reading. Hence I do not consider further analysis is required before I concur with Robinson & Pierpont's majority Byzantine Text (2005) that the TR's reading at Matt. 20:27b is supported by the majority Byzantine text, *infra*.

The Fourth Matter: A Cruciform Text. In February 2009, I was privileged to inspect a temporary exhibition known as "Byzantium 330-1453" A.D., at the *Royal Academy of Arts*, Piccadilly, London. Amazing treasures I saw included the front fragment of a marble sarcophagus from the Byzantine Empire's capital, Constantinople, dating to the last third of the 5th century, which depicted a man holding a cross. This shows the usage of the cross as a Christian symbol, a tradition started by Constantine the Great (d. 337).

I also saw in a glass cabinet, a 12th century Byzantine Greek Lectionary. This showed Gospel readings on both of the opened pages stylistically written so as to form a large cross (+) on each page. This manuscript style is known as "a cruciform text." I refer to such a text, Codex 047, supporting the TR's reading, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:26c (Component 1), the TR's Greek, "*estō* ('let him be,' imperative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *eimi*)," is a minority Byzantine reading¹⁴⁵. It is found in Codices 047 (8th century, cruciform text, Princeton University, New Jersey, USA), H 013 (*Codex Seidelianus*, 9th century, Trinity College, Cambridge, England), K 017 (*Codex Cyprianus*, 9th century, Paris, France), M 021 (*Codex Campianus*, 9th century, Paris, France), S 028 (*Codex Vaticanus*, 10th century, Rome, Vatican City State); together with Minuscules 27 (10th century, Paris, France), 262 (10th century, Paris, France), 23 (11th century, Paris, France), 28 (11th century, Byzantine other than in Mark; Paris, France), 660 (11th / 12th century, Berlin, Germany), 1187 (11th century, Sinai, Arabia), 2 (12th century, Basel, Switzerland), 267 (12th century, Paris, France), 485 (12th century, British Library, London, England), 1010 (12th century, Athos, Greece), 1085 (12th century, Athos, Greece), 1200 (12th century, Sinai, Arabia), 1355 (12th century, Jerusalem, Israel), 291 (13th century, Paris, France), 482 (13th century, British Library, London, UK), 945 (Byzantine outside of Acts & General Epistles, 13th century, Athos, Greece), 1441 (13th century, Athos, Greece), and 2093 (13th century, Serrai, Greek Macedonia, Greece).

¹⁴⁵ Green's Textual Apparatus, composed by Pierpont and based on von Soden's work, says the TR's reading, "*estō* (let him be)," is supported by less than 5% of all Greek texts. As I have previously noted; even though I cite the figures in Green's Textual Apparatus for my generalist purposes, the reader should think of these figures critically. I.e., bearing in mind the generalist nature of von Soden's group symbols, unlike Pierpont, we should factor in a safety error margin of up to c. 10%, i.e., 10% of 5% (= 0.5%), so that it is more accurate to say less than 4.5%-5% here support the TR's reading. But for my generalist purposes, I am happy to cite this secondary work with its very useful broad-brush calculations undertaken by Pierpont.

The TR's reading at Matt. 20:26c (Component 1), is also supported as Latin, “*sit* (‘let him be,’ subjunctive active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *sum-esse*),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions f (6th 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 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, at Matt. 20:26c (Component 1), a variant, Greek, “*estai* (‘he shall be,’ indicative middle future, 3rd person singular verb, from *eimi*),” i.e., “it shall not be,” 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) and Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century); and is the most probable reading of N 022 (6th century), although the manuscript’s state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain. It is also followed as Latin, “*erit* (‘it shall be,’ indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *sum-esse*), in old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), q (6th / 7th century), and c (12th / 13th century).

Further discussion of *Component 1* (Matt. 20:26c) shall be deferred until it may be undertaken with the connected discussion of *Component 2* (Matt. 20:27b), *infra*.

At Matt. 20:27b (Component 2), the TR’s Greek, “*estō* (‘let him be,’ imperative active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *eimi*),” is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), H 013 (9th century), and S 028 (10th century).

However, at Matt. 20:27b (Component 2), a variant, Greek, “*estai* (‘he shall be,’ indicative middle future, 3rd person singular verb, from *eimi*),” 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 N 022 (6th century). It is further found as Latin, “*erit* (‘he shall be,’ indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from *sum-esse*), 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), n (5th / 6th 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 also followed by the ancient church Greek writer, Origen (d. 254); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

The textual problem created by Component 1, “*estai* (he shall be)” (Matt. 20:26c), jumps out at the reader when this is put into the wider context of the Greek that clearly exhibits the literary stylistic influence of a Hebraic / Aramaic poetical parallelism. Specifically, let the reader first consider the poetical parallelism of the primer parallelism in the Matt. 20:25 couplet (“Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion

over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them”), and then the parallelism between the (a) lines and (b) lines of Matt. 20:26,27 (a - “but whosoever will be great among you,” b - “Let him be your minister;” a - “And whosoever will be chief among you,” b - “let him be your servant”).

Primer Hebraic /Aramaic style poetic parallel couplet of verse 25:

“oi (the) *archontes* (princes) *ton* (of the) *ethnon* (Gentiles) *katakurieousin* (‘exercise dominion over,’ indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *katakurieuo*) *auton* (them);”

“oi (the) *megaloi* (they that are great) *katexousiazousin* (‘exercise authority upon,’ indicative active present, 3rd person plural verb, from *katexousiazō*) *auton* (them)”.

Hebraic / Aramaic style poetical parallel couplet of verses 26 & 27 in representative Byzantine text form using “estai” at 1b:

1 a) “all’ (but) *os ean* (whosoever) *thele* (‘wishes’ = ‘will,’ subjunctive active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *thelo*) *en* (among) *umin* (you) *megas* (great) *genesthai* (‘to become’ = ‘be’),

1 b) “*estai* (‘he shall be,’ future tense, Component 1) *umon* (‘of you’ = ‘your’) *diakonos* (minister);”

2a) “*kai* (and) *os ean* (whosoever) *thele* (‘wishes’ = ‘will,’ subjunctive active present, 3rd person singular verb, from *thelo*) *en* (among) *umin* (you) *einai* (‘to be’ = ‘be’) *protos* (chief),”

2b) “*esto* (‘let him be,’ present tense, Component 2) *umon* (‘of you’ = ‘your’) *doulos* (servant).”

In the first instance, given the overall stylistic parallelism of verses 26 & 27, we cannot doubt that the usage of “*estai* (‘he shall be,’ future tense)” in couplet 1b and “*esto* (‘let him be,’ present tense)” in couplet 2b, creates an immediate stylistic tension between a future tense (couplet 1b) and a present tense (couplet 2b), making the passage “clang on the ears” as bad Matthean Greek. The poetical parallelism of the couplet demands that both readings be the same. But if so, then which of the two is the correct one?

Are both *present imperative* verbs, “*esto* (let him be)”)? If so, they are *imperative of commands*, i.e., “let him be your minister” (Component 1, Matt. 20:26c) or “let him be your servant” (Component 2, Matt. 20:27b). Young describes as a “popular view” among Greek grammarians, the idea that in commands and prohibitions, the aorist imperative refers to specific situations, i.e., Do this particular thing at this set time, whereas the *present imperative*, such as we have here at Matt. 20:26,27, refers to general commands i.e., Always be doing this¹⁴⁶. Thus if the two readings are “*esto* (let him be),” Christ is here saying one should always be “minister” or “servant.” That is because the *present imperative* generally has the sense of giving a command for the action as part of an ongoing process. Though generally rendered into English as “let him be,” *supra*, etc., the idea of the imperative is not permissive but has the sense of “he must be” etc.¹⁴⁷.

¹⁴⁶ Young’s *Greek*, pp. 142-143.

¹⁴⁷ Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, pp. 485-486.

Clearly then, the usage of the *present imperative*, “*estō* (‘let him be’ or ‘he must be’),” here at Matt. 20:26c,27b, makes a lot of contextual sense.

Are both *indicative middle future* verbs, “*estai* (he shall be)”? If so, both are contextually deponents¹⁴⁸, and thus have the same meaning as an *indicative active future* verb. The *indicative future* can be used for a command, in which instance it is sometimes called “the cohortative indicative¹⁴⁹.” The *cohortative indicative* is generally used as a command when quoting from the OT¹⁵⁰, e.g., in Matt. 5:43 when quoting from Lev. 19:18, Christ says, “Ye have heard that it hath been said, *Thou shalt love (Agapeseis, indicative active future, 2nd person singular verb, from agapaō)* thy neighbour;” but then immediately after in a non-OT quote, he says in Matt. 5:44, “But I say unto you, “*Love (Agapate, imperative active present, 2nd person singular verb, from agapaō)* your enemies” etc.¹⁵¹. When it is used elsewhere in the NT, such usage is at best, relatively rare. But it is not unknown, hence we read at Matt. 21:3, “And if any man say ought unto you, *ye shall say (ereite, indicative active future, 2nd person plural verb, from legō)*, The Lord hath need of them” etc. . Or at Matt. 6:5, “And when thou prayest, *thou shalt not be (ese, indicative middle future, 2nd person singular verb, from eimi)* as the hypocrites are” etc. . Or at Matt. 27:4, “See (*opsei, indicative active future, 3rd person singular verb, from oraō*) thou to it”

On the one hand, conventional wisdom considers *the cohortative indicative* is not used much outside of St. Matthew’s Gospel¹⁵². But on the other hand, a well known maxim considers, *A little knowledge is a dangerous thing*. In union of these two factors, a complicating factor in St. Matthew’s Gospel appears to be that since *the cohortative indicative* is used in both OT quotes and elsewhere, this may give a scribe an additional reason for seeking to expand the usage of the *indicative future* in this Gospel, considering that *the cohortative indicative* “sounded more Matthean.” If so, beyond this, the underlying reason would presumably be that the scribe considered *the cohortative*

¹⁴⁸ A deponent is in the middle voice, (the middle voice refers to getting something done in one’s own interest,) but as occurs increasingly in Koine Greek, it has shed the middle voice meaning, and so it has an active voice meaning i.e., the subject (“whosoever will be great” or “whosoever will be chief”) performs the action stated by the verb (“he shall be your minister” or “he shall be your servant”).

¹⁴⁹ Young’s *Greek*, p. 137.

¹⁵⁰ Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, pp. 452-3; referring to, Blass, F, & Debrunner, A., *A Greek Grammar of the NT & other early Christian Literature*, *op. cit.*, p. 183, section 362.

¹⁵¹ Blass & Debrunner (1961), *op. cit.*, p. 183, section 362.

¹⁵² Wallace’s *Greek Grammar*, pp. 452; referring to, Blass, F, & Debrunner, A., *A Greek Grammar of the NT & other early Christian Literature*, *op. cit.*, p. 183, section 362.

indicative “sounded more authoritative” as a command. Some evidence for such a tendency is found at Matt. 10:13. Here we find that the TR’s and majority Byzantine text’s “*eltheto* (‘let ... come,’ middle active aorist, 3rd person singular verb, from *erchomai*), i.e., “let your peace *come* upon it” (AV), becomes at the hands of a scribal corrupter, “*estai* (‘it shall be,’ indicative middle future, 3rd person singular verb, from *eimi*),” in Minuscule 99 (15th / 16th century)¹⁵³.

On the one hand, we live in an age when those of the Neo-Alexandrian School have greatly abused the idea of “gospel assimilations,” using the concept *a priori* with unjustified frequency. But on the other hand, we of the Neo-Byzantine School accept the *assimilation principle*, providing it can be *contextually justified as the most probable explanation* for a given reading.

At Mark 10:43,44, “*estai* (‘he shall be,’ future tense)” is twice used i.e., “But whosoever will be great among you, *shall be (estai)* your minister: and whosoever of you will be chiefest, *shall be (estai)* servant of all.” Here at Matt. 20:26c,27b, against the background fact that context requires that the 1b and 2b lines in the Matt. 20:26,27 Hebraic / Aramaic style parallel poetical couplet use the same verb; and the further fact that the *present imperative* verb, “*esto* (let him be),” used twice here as *imperative of commands* make a lot of contextual sense; there are then a trilogy of factors that act in favour of the proposition that the “*estai* (‘he shall be,’ future tense)” in the majority Byzantine text’s reading of Matt. 20:26c, is such an assimilation from Mark 10:43.

In the first instance, we have evidence of a limited scribal desire to move the text of Scripture to the *indicative future* i.e., the *cohortative indicative*, seemingly because it “sounded more authoritative as a command;” and in the second instance, this tendency is necessarily intensified in the case of St. Matthew’s Gospel where a scribe could further be influenced by the fact that *the cohortative indicative* is favoured more by Matthean Greek than other NT Greek. Hence these two factors best explain the corruption of Matt. 10:13 to the *cohortative indicative, supra*. And in the third instance, given the higher usage of the *cohortative indicative* in Matthean Greek, it seems less likely that a scribe would change an *indicative future*, “*estai* (‘he shall be,’ future tense)” in St. Matthew’s Gospel to an *imperative present*, “*esto* (‘let him be,’ present tense),” than *vice versa*.

¹⁵³ A number of examples used by Blass & Debrunner (*op. cit.* p. 183) in their section 362, are premised on the invalid presuppositions of a neo-Alexandrian text. E.g., Blass & Debrunner (1961) consider the *indicative future* reading at Matt. 10:13 (which they cite from the Western Text’s D 05), is an assimilation with the Luke 10:6 *indicative future* verb, “*epanapaesetai* (it shall rest),” found in the main Alexandrian texts. But in fact this reading is itself also a textual corruption from the *indicative present* verb, “*epanapausetai* (it shall rest),” i.e., “your peace *shall rest* upon it” (AV). Luke 10:6 thus actually exhibits a similar movement from the *indicative present* (rather than the imperative present) to the *indicative future*, presumably from the same underpinning desire to “stylistically improve” the text so that it “sounded more authoritative” as a command.

Hence this trilogy of reasons means that *on the balance of probabilities*, in this particular instance, it is more likely than not, that the majority Byzantine text reading at Matt. 20:26b, “*estai* (‘he shall be,’ future tense),” is another such example of this corrupting tendency. I.e., *on the balance of probabilities* Variant 1 arose at Matt. 20:26c via an assimilation with the “*estai* (‘he shall be,’ future tense)” of Mark 10:43. Thus we must here adopt the minority Byzantine reading, also found in the Latin Vulgate, i.e., Greek, “*esto* (‘let him be,’ present tense)” at Matt. 20:26c. This thus creates the stylistic Greek textual harmony between the 1b & 2b couplet that first brought this textual problem to our attention, as something of “a sore thumb sticking out.”

The origins of the two variants are conjectural.

On the one hand *Variant 1* was evidently an assimilation with Mark 10:43, *supra*. But on the other hand, was this an accidental or deliberate assimilation?

Was *Variant 1* (Component 1, Matt. 20:26c) an accidental change? Due to a paper fade, did the original “*esto* (‘let him be,’ present tense),” in Greek letters, “εστω” look something like, “εστ.:”? The Greek letter omega (ω) takes up about the same paper space as the two Greek letters, alpha (α) and iota (ι). (This is the same phenomenon in Greek capital or lower case letters.) Thus did a scribe then “reconstruct” this as “εσται” (*estai*, ‘he shall be,’ future tense). The immediately proceeding words of verse 26 are, “But *it shall not be (estai, future tense, Matt. 20:26b)* so among you.” Thus Christ is here saying, “*It shall not be (estai)* so among you” in the future, because from now in the present and onwards, “whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister” etc. Hence was the scribe influenced in this “reconstruction” by a superficial glance at the preceding “*estai*” of Matt. 20:26b, coupled with the “*estai*” of Mark 10:43?

Was *Variant 2* (Component 2, Matt. 20:27b) an accidental change? This variant is found in W 032. But in Manuscript Washington, the TR’s word order, “*einai* (‘to be’ = ‘be,’ word 1) *protos* (‘chief,’ word 2) *esto* (‘let him be,’ word 3),” is rearranged into word order 2,1,3. Thus, did a scribe first accidentally omit word 1, but after writing word 2, realize his mistake, and add it back in, thus making the reading, “*protos einai esto*,” which in his continuous script manuscript would look something like, “IIRWTOCEINAIECTW”. Reading a manuscript in which the first bar on the omega (W) was slightly fading, so that at a quick glance it might look like an A (alpha) with a high cross-bar followed by an I (iota) sloping to the left, an idea possibly reinforced in his mind by the “AI” ending of the preceding “EINAI,” did he accidentally change this to “IIRWTOCEINAIECTAI”, and thus, “*estai* (ECTAI, ‘he shall be’)”? Or did this same set of dynamics operate but without the manuscript having first changed word order? Either way, was the scribe “confirmed” in such a view by the second “*estai*” of Mark 10:43?

Were *Variant 1* (Component 1, Matt. 20:26c) and *Variant 2* (Component 2, Matt. 20:27b) deliberate changes? Were these deliberate assimilations with Mark 10:43 by a scribe seeking to “standardize” gospel readings? If so, he need not have bothered. The

conversation recorded in Matt. 20:20-28 and Mark 10:35-45 would have transpired over a period much longer than it takes to read these wonderful Divinely inspired gospel stories (II Tim. 3:16). Thus over a period that probably took at least half an hour, and quite possibly some hours, our Lord evidently went over things multiple times. Matt. 20:25-27 and Mark 10:42-44 are thus not precisely “parallel” readings at such, even though they would both have been said during this period of possibly several hours. Repetition is an element of teaching, and our Lord here repeated some ideas, but with a slightly different nuance on different occasions. Those who seek to create such “standard” gospel readings have an overly simplistic view of the “parallel” gospel stories; a defect also found among religious liberals today, who look at such passages and foolishly claim some kind of “Bible blunder” or “contradiction.” Their “damnation is just” (Rom. 3:8). “The Lord shall laugh at him” for his arrogant folly (Ps. 37:13), and so shall I!

Were these deliberate or accidental changes? We cannot be sure. But in either instance, they were evidently assimilations with Mark 10:43,44, and thus changes to the original text of Holy Scripture, Providentially preserved for us in the *Textus Receptus*.

To the question, “Where has the Component 1 reading of Matt. 20:26c been through time and over time?,” I reply, “First and foremost, in the Greek, it has been in the writings of the church father and doctor, St. John Chrysostom; and in the Latin, it has been in the Vulgate of the church father and doctor, St. Jerome. And since early mediaeval times, it has also been in the Latin writings of the church doctor, St. Gregory the Great.” Thus in the operations of the Latin at Matt. 20:26c, we see the servant maxim, *The Latin improves the Greek*, here working as well it should to resolve a textual problem in the Greek, and thus in humble submission to the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*. What? Hast thou not heard? Or hath it not been told unto thee? *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!* (Latin Vulgate reading of I Peter 1:25, “The Word of the Lord Endureth Forever.”)

On the one hand, the TR’s Component 1 reading at Matt. 20:26c, “let him be (present tense)” is a minority Byzantine reading, but it has strong support in the Latin textual tradition with St. Jerome’s Vulgate and several old Latin Versions, and impressive support in the Greek from the ancient Archbishop of Constantinople, St. Chrysostom. It is also clearly the reading preferred by textual analysis. But on the other hand, the Component 1 variant, “he shall be (future tense),” is the majority Byzantine reading, and is also followed by over half a dozen old Latin Versions. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, though the matter is border-line between a high level “C” (in the range of 63% +/- 1%) and a low level “B” (in the range of 66% +/- 1%), I think the unequivocal presence of this reading in the Vulgate, “pulls it over the line” to a low level “B” of 65%, i.e., at the Component 1 reading of Matt. 20:26c, the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a middling level of certainty.

On the one hand, the TR’s Component 2 reading at Matt. 20:27b, “let him be (present tense),” has solid support in the Greek as the majority Byzantine reading, and it is also the reading favoured by textual analysis. But on the other hand, the Component 2 variant, “he shall be (future tense),” is a minority Byzantine reading and has solid support

in the Latin at the monolithic reading of the Latin textual tradition; being also followed by an ancient church writer. Weighing up these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual 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 Component 2 reading at Matt. 20:27b 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.

Meditation: Justification & Sanctification – the two sides of the coin.

a) A great theological truth relevant to *justification by faith* (Rom. 1:7; 4:25; Gal. 3:11). The reader may wish to contemplate the issue of limited atonement evident in the words, "for many" (Matt. 20:28; 26:28).

b) An important truth relevant to *sanctification* or holiness of living (Rom. 6:6; Gal. 5:24; Titus 3:5; I Thess. 2:13; 4:3). In Matt. 20:20-28 Christ asks us for self-sacrificial service (Matt. 25:31-46).

Christ says at Matt. 20:20-28 that he himself came to give self-sacrificial service i.e., "came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and" indeed, to ultimately give himself in a vicarious substitutional atonement for the sins of the world. For he whom St. John the Baptist called, "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29), was "to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:28). Thus at the Last Supper, when instituting the Lord's Supper, Christ further says, "Take, eat; this is my body," and "this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matt. 26:26,28).

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct Component 1 reading at Matt. 20:26c, "let him be (present tense)," is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century); as well as Minuscules 892 (9th century, mixed text type), 157 (independent, 12th century), and 1071 (independent, 12th century). It is further found in a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Version, and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

The Component 1 variant at Matt. 20:26c, "he shall be (future tense)," is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is also found in (the mixed text type) Codex 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), and 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 some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Bohairic Version; and Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version (3rd century).

The correct Component 2 reading at Matt. 20:27b, “let him be (present tense),” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century). It is also found in Minuscules 1424 (9th / 10th century, mixed text type in Matthew and Luke, independent in Mark, Byzantine elsewhere), 1071 (independent, 12th century), and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions.

The Component 2 variant at Matt. 20:27b, “he shall be (future tense),” 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 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), 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).

On the one hand, the TR’s reading containing the correct Component 1 (Matt. 20:26c) and Component 2 (Matt. 20:27b), i.e., “*estō* (‘let him be,’ present tense)” (twice), received the support of the great 16th and 17th century Neo-Byzantine School textual analysts, being found, for instance, in the Greek New Testaments of Erasmus (1516 & 1522) and Stephanus (1550). In the case of Component 1, Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) in which Elzevir selects from up to 8 specified gospel manuscripts only, (which were but a fraction of the number he actually was able to consult,) he shows as a 3:2 ratio in favour of the variant, i.e., *Variant 1*, “*estai* (‘he shall be,’ future tense)” has three manuscripts (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; L, Codex Leicestrensis; & H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum); whereas the TR’s reading, “*estō* (‘let him be,’ present tense),” has two manuscripts (Gospel manuscripts: v, Cambridge University, Mm. 6.9; & z, Evangelistarium, Christ’s College, Cambridge, F. i. 8). In the case of Component 2, Elzevir’s Textual Apparatus (1624) show as 4:1 ratio in favour of the variant, i.e., *Variant 2*, “*estai* (‘he shall be,’ future tense)” has four manuscripts (Gospel manuscripts: i, Trinity College Cambridge, B. x. 17; w, Trinity College, Cambridge, B. x. 16; L, Codex Leicestrensis; & H, Harleian., 5598, British Museum); whereas the TR’s reading, “*estō* (‘let him be,’ present tense),” has one manuscript (Gospel manuscript: z, Evangelistarium, Christ’s College, Cambridge, F. i. 8).

But on the other hand, the erroneous Component 1 (Matt. 20:26c, *Variant 1*) and Component 2 (Matt. 20:27b, *Variant 2*), i.e., “*estai* (‘he shall be,’ future tense)” (twice), was adopted in the NU Text *et al.*

However the split between Codex Sinaiticus (*Variant 2*) and Codex Vaticanus (TR’s Component 2), caused a painful split among the neo-Alexandrian versions. The issue of how they chose on this reading at Matt. 20:27 proved decisive for how they then dealt with Component 1, since they appear to have grasped the need for the two to be the same in this Hebraic / Aramaic style couplet.

Thus on the one hand, following *Codex Sinaiticus* and the wrong reading at Component 2, “*estai* (‘he shall be,’ future tense),” and hence by derivation, also the wrong reading at Component 1, Matt. 20:26,27; the *American Standard Version* reads, “but whosoever would become great among you *shall be* your minister; and whosoever would be first among you *shall be* your servant” (ASV, emphasis mine). So likewise, these two erroneous variants are followed in the NASB.

But on the one hand, following *Codex Vaticanus* and the right reading at Component 2, “*esto* (‘let him be,’ or ‘he must be,’ present tense),” and hence by derivation, also the right reading at Component 1, Matt. 20:26,27, the *English Standard Version* reads, “But whoever would be great among *must be* your servant, and whoever would be first among you *must be* your slave” (ESV, emphasis mine). So likewise, these two correct readings are found in the RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

The (Majority Text) Burgonites in both Hodges & Farstad (1985) and Robinson & Pierpont (2005), read “*estai* (‘he shall be,’ future tense)” at Matt. 20:26c and “*esto* (‘let him be,’ present tense)” at Matt. 20:27b. Their American secular state “democratic” principles as applied to the NT text i.e., “the majority is always right,” thus here results in their adoption of a reading that is clearly wrong as it fails to understand or appreciate the poetical parallel qualities of this Hebraic / Aramaic literary style couplet. Yet the modern day battle of we Neo-Byzantines against the Burgonites here at Matt. 20:26c,27b is nothing new. In former times, we fought the old Latin Papists at this point of a Hebraic / Aramaic couplet, who in this sense were ignorant like the modern day Burgonites, although they put the two readings the other way around i.e., Component 1 is future tense with the Burgonites and present tense with the old Latin Papists, and Component 2 is present tense with Burgonites and future tense with the old Latin Papists.

The old Latin Papists of the pre-Vatican II era were strong on Latin, but weak on Greek and Hebrew. Hence they fell over the Hebraic / Aramaic couplet here, as something *they knew not what*. Thus they followed the incompatible mix found in the Clementine Vulgate, with the reading of their Douay-Rheims Version, “but whosoever is the greater among you, *let him be* [TR’s Component 1] your minister. And he that will be first among you *shall be* [Variant 2’s Component 2] your servant.” By contrast, the new neo-Alexandrian Papists of the post-Vatican II era, though by no means masters of the Greek and Hebrew, nevertheless were able to see the stylistic inconsistency of this

reading. Thus by first following *Codex Vaticanus*, kept in the Library at Rome, for Component 2, and forming the couplet, like the RSV, *supra*, which has spawned an *RSV Catholic Edition* for Papists, they achieved the correct reading, albeit partly for the wrong reasons (in that their starting point was *Codex Vaticanus*,) in their Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles.

When we compare this discrepancy between the Clementine Vulgate and Douay-Rheims Version on the one hand, and the Jerusalem and New Jerusalem Bibles on the other hand, we ask of the Roman Church, “Do you not claim to be *semper eadum* (Latin, ‘always the same’)”? To which they here seem to reply, “Yes, but when we say that, we have our fingers crossed behind our back.” To which we are left to ask their deluded followers in Popery, “Are you silly enough to trust a Popish Church like that?”

Matt. 20:30a “Have mercy on us, O Lord” (TR & AV) – Component 1 {A} &
Matt. 20:31a “Have mercy on us, O Lord” (TR & AV) – Component 2 {A}.

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

The First Matter. These two verses are discussed together as Component 1 & 2, not because there is any couplet linking them, nor any other intrinsic stylistic need for them to be the same. Rather, because they are both supported by the representative Byzantine text, and some of the variants raise similar issues and exhibit similar trends in *Variants 3 & 4*, they are therefore here discussed together purely for the sake of convenience. Hence if, like the UBS 4th edition one preferred to discuss them separately, that would also be perfectly proper.

The Second Matter (Diatessaron formatting). The Vulgate reads at Mark 10:47, Latin, “*Fili (Son) David (of David) Iesu (Jesus), miserere (have mercy) mei ([on] me);*” at Mark 10:48 and Luke 18:39, “*Fili (Son) David (of David), miserere (have mercy) mei ([on] me);*” and at Luke 18:38, “*Iesu (Jesus), Fili (Son) David (of David), miserere (have mercy) mei ([on] me).*” By contrast, at Matt. 20:30,31, the Vulgate, like the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron, reads, “*Domine (O Lord), miserere (Have mercy) nostri ([on] us).*” Therefore I show the Sangallensis Diatessaron Vulgate Codex following *Variant 4, infra*.

The Third Matter. With regard to diversity in the gospels in the “parallel” synoptic gospel readings at Matt. 20:29-34, see Commentary at Matt. 20:17c, “Preliminary Textual Discussion,” at “The First Matter.”

The Fourth Matter. W 032 and Lectionaries 2378 and 1968, all abbreviate the TR’s “*Kurie* (‘O Lord,’ word 3),” to “*KE*” with a line on top.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:30a,31a, the TR’s Greek (twice), at both Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) and Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), “*Eleeson* (‘Thou have mercy’ = ‘Have mercy,’ word 1) *emas* (‘[on] us,’ word 2), *Kurie* (‘O Lord,’ word 3),” is supported by the majority

Byzantine text, e.g., W 032 (5th century, which is Byzantine in Matt. 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.); and Component 2 is also supported by Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century), N 022 (6th century), and Lectionaries 2378 (11th century) and 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported (twice) as Latin, “*Miserere* (‘Thou have mercy’ = ‘Have mercy,’ word 1) *nostri* (‘[on] us,’ word 2) *Domine* (‘O Lord,’ word 3),” in old Latin Versions f (6th century) and q (6th / 7th century); and Component 2 is also supported by old Latin Version ff2 (5th century). The Component 1 reading is further supported by the ancient church Greek writers, Origen (d. 254) and Chrysostom (d. 407).

Variant 1, in Component 1 (Matt. 20:30a), has a different word 3, and reads, Greek, “*Eleeson* (‘Have mercy,’ word 1) *emas* (‘[on] us,’ word 2), *Iesou* (‘Jesus,’ word 3a).” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 547 (13th century). It is also found as Latin, “*Miserere* (‘Have mercy,’ word 1) *nostri* (‘[on] us,’ word 2) *Iesu* (‘Jesus,’ word 3a),” in old Latin Versions e (4th / 5th century), h (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), and c (12th / 13th century).

Variant 2, in Component 1 (Matt. 20:30a), has both words 3 and 3a, and so reads, Greek, “*Eleeson* (‘Have mercy,’ word 1) *emas* (‘[on] us,’ word 2), *Kurie* (‘O Lord,’ word 3) *Iesou* (‘Jesus,’ word 3a).” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Sigma 042 (late 5th / 6th century) and N 022 (6th century).

Variant 3, at both Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) and Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), omits word 3, and so reads (twice), Greek, “*Eleeson* (‘Have mercy,’ word 1) *emas* (‘[on] us,’ word 2).” This is a minority Byzantine reading found in Lectionary 1016 (12th century); and is the most probable reading of Lectionary 76 (12th century), although the manuscript’s state of preservation makes complete verification of this uncertain.

Variant 4, at both Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) and Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), uses word order 3,1,2, and so reads (twice) Greek, “*Kurie* (‘O Lord,’ word 3), *eleeson* (‘Have mercy,’ word 1) *emas* (‘[on] us,’ word 2).” In the case of Component 1 this is a reconstruction from the Latin. Both Components 1 & 2 are found as Latin, “*Domine* (‘O Lord,’ word 3), *miserere* (‘Have mercy,’ word 1) *nostri* (‘[on] us,’ word 2),” in Jerome’s Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions 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, both are manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). Both Components 1 & 2 are also followed by the ancient church Latin writer, Jerome (d. 420). Component 1 (Matt. 20:30a) only, is further followed by the ancient church Latin writer, Augustine (d. 430); and the early mediaeval church Latin writer, Gregory the Great (d. 604).

Component 2 (Matt. 20:31a) only of *Variant 4* is a minority Byzantine reading, found in Lectionary 890 (1420 A.D.); together with Minuscule 1010 (12th century). Component 2 (Matt. 20:31a) only, is also followed by old Latin Versions d (5th century), aur (7th century), 1 (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), and ff1 (10th / 11th century); and also as “*Domine* (O Lord), *miserere* (Have mercy) *nobis* ([on] us),” in old

Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), h (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), and c (12th / 13th century).

There is no good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading at Matt. 20:30a,31a which is thus correct. The origins of the four variants are conjectural.

Was *Variant 1* an accidental alteration? Due to a paper fade in Component 1 (Matt. 20:30a), was the original Word 3, “*Kurie* (‘O Lord,’ word 3),” lost? Did a scribe then “reconstruct” this “from context,” supplying Word 3a, “*I̅sou* (‘Jesus,’ word 3a),” from the readings in Mark 10:47 and Luke 18:38?

Was *Variant 1* a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe seeking “a more standard text,” deliberately replace Word 3, “*Kurie* (‘O Lord,’ word 3),” with Word 3a, “*I̅sou* (‘Jesus,’ word 3a),” from the readings in Mark 10:47 and Luke 18:38?

Was *Variant 2* an accidental alteration? Did the original Word 3 in Component 1 (Matt. 20:30a), “*Kurie* / *KYPIE* (‘O Lord,’ word 3),” written in abbreviated form (with a line on top) as “*KE*” come at the end of a line, with a further one or two letter spaces protruding from the lines above and below? Did a scribe, aware of both readings, wrongly conclude that “one of them must have been lost in a paper fade or loss,” and so then deliberately conflate these two readings, adding in the Variant 1 “*I̅sou* / *IHCOY* (‘Jesus,’ word 3a),” in abbreviated form (with a line on top) as “*IY*”?

Was *Variant 2* a deliberate alteration? Did a scribe deliberately conflate the TR’s reading with Variant 1?

Was *Variant 3* an accidental alteration? In both Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) and Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), was Word 3, “*KE*” (*KYPIE*, “Lord”), twice lost in undetected paper fades? If so, did scribes think nothing of the matter since this shorter terminology is also found at Matt. 9:27?

Was *Variant 3* a deliberate alteration? In both Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) and Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), was Word 3, “*KE*” (*KYPIE*, “Lord”), twice pruned by scribes seeking “a more succinct” and “less flowery” text? If so, was this a deliberate assimilation with this shorter terminology also found at Matt. 9:27?

Was *Variant 4* an accidental alteration? Here in Manuscript Washington (W 032) there is a paper space of about 3 letters spaces before Words 1 & 2, before Matt. 20:30a (Component 1); and Words 1 & 2 start on a new line for Matt. 20:31a (Component 2). This reflects a stylistic desire to mark out these quotes. Working on manuscripts which followed the format of W 032 at Component 1, coupled with a paper fade of the “*KE*” (*KYPIE*, “Lord”), did a scribe “reconstruct” the “*KE*” (*KYPIE*, “Lord”) at the start of these sections, possibly getting the idea of the “*KE*” (*KYPIE*, “Lord”) and its placement in this position from the nearby Matt. 17:15? Or if Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) comes from the hand of a Latin scribe, did a similar phenomenon occur? (The Vulgate reading at Matt. 17:15 starts with “*Domine*” / “Lord.”)

Was *Variant 4* a deliberate alteration? At both Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) and Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), did a scribe (possibly a Latin scribe in the case of Component 1,) deliberately assimilate these readings to the word order of Matt. 17:15, regarding it as “more stylistically pleasing”?

Were these deliberate or accidental changes or some combination thereof? We do not know. But it does not matter. For we do know that they were changes to the original text preserved for us in the hundreds and hundreds of manuscripts in the representative Byzantine text of von Soden’s K group, which is more than a large enough sample to in turn representatively reveal to us the representative Byzantine reading in thousands of Byzantine texts.

At both Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) and Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), the TR’s reading has rock solid support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine reading, attested to from ancient times (in W 032), with no good textual argument against it. It is further supported in a couple of old Latin Versions from early medieval times. *Variants 1, 2, 3, & 4*, all have weak support, or no support (*Variant 4*, Matt. 20:30a, Component 1), in the Greek. Looking at the Latin, *Variant 4* has some stronger support, but it is also clear that the Latin textual tradition has multi-splits over both of these readings. Taking into account these multi-splits in the Latin, this weak support in the Greek, and the absence of any good textual argument against the representative Byzantine reading; it follows that the perpetual superiority of the master maxim, *The Greek improves the Latin*, acts like a powerful axe to cut down any possibility of these four variants being taken seriously. On the system of rating textual readings A to E, I would give the TR’s readings at both Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) and Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), each an “A” i.e., the text of the TR is the correct reading and has a high level of certainty.

Meditation: Kyrie eleison - “Lord have mercy.”

The English term, “Kyrie eleison,” is a Latinized form of the Greek, “*Kurie eleeson*,” meaning, “Lord have mercy.” Hence one will find both of these Greek words in their Latin forms in e.g., Stelten’s *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Latin* (1995). Among Anglicans, the *Kyrie eleison* may refer to different things. It may describe the responses at *The Communion Service* in the *Book of Common Prayer* (1662) to each of the Decalogue’s Precepts, which for the first nine commandments is, “Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law,” and after the tenth commandment is, “Lord have mercy upon us, and write all these thy laws in our hearts, we beseech thee.” Alternatively, it may also be used for the hymn, *Kyrie Eleison*, whether sung in the Greek (with Latinized spellings) or English, “Lord, have mercy, Christ have mercy, Lord have mercy” (possibly with “upon us” added after each petition in English), in different forms e.g., one ninefold forms has three of each petitions. If the latter, it may e.g., be sung by a choir after “The Third Collect, For Grace,” at Matins or Evensong.

Another form of the *Kyrie Eleison*, found at both Matins and Evensong, is said before the second recitation of the Lord’s Prayer, The Minister says, “Let us pray.

Lord, have mercy upon us.” The congregation then says, “Christ, have mercy upon us.” The Minister then says, “Lord, have mercy upon us.” When this is done, the first “Lord, have mercy upon us” is a petition to God the Father; then “Christ, have mercy upon us,” is a petition to God the Son; and then the following “Lord, have mercy upon us,” is a petition to God the Holy Ghost. It is thus clearly Trinitarian in its theological scope.

In both OT and NT, there is only one “everlasting covenant” (Heb. 13:20), to wit, the “covenant” of “grace,” by which a man, is made “just” before God (Gen. 6:8,9,18; cf. Heb. 11:7); although it has been administered differently in the Old Testament and New Testament, as a covenant within a covenant¹⁵⁴. E.g., this “covenant” “was confirmed” “to Abraham” as a covenant inside the Abrahamic covenant (Gal. 3:16,17); and is found for we Christians as a covenant inside the NT covenant. Thus (contrary to the claims of “Dispensationalists”) in the OT e.g., both Abraham and David were justified by faith (Rom. 4:1-8), just as we Christians are. Hence we read in the OT of those who are prisoners to sin and death, and spiritually blind, “The Lord looseth the prisoners: the Lord openeth the eyes of the blind” (Ps. 146:7,8); and our Lord saith to Nicodemus, “Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?” (John 3:10). For the *sola fide* (Latin, “faith alone”) and *sola gratia* (Latin, “grace alone”) of the Reformation Motto, are as much the teachings of the OT (Gen. 6:8; 15:6) as they are of the NT (Heb. 10:38; 11:7,8-13). Hence e.g., in St. Paul’s *opus magnum*, The Book of Romans, we find the doctrine of justification by faith is replete with Old Testament quotes throughout.

Though Matt. 20:30a,31a is not the only place in the Holy Gospel of St. Matthew that we find a petition to the “Lord” to “have mercy” (cf. Matt. 15:22; 17:15), it is one of them. It is significant because the miraculous healing of these blind men is an object lesson to us. I.e., these blind men here received physical sight, as an outward and visible proof and symbol of the fact that men may receive spiritual sight and salvation through the “mercy” of the “Lord” (Matt. 9:12,13; 20:30,31), when we have “faith” (Matt. 8:10; 9:22; 15:28) in the atoning sacrifice (Matt. 20:28; 26:28) of him who died and rose on the third day (Matt. 12:40; 28:1-8); repenting of our sins (Matt. 4:17), as most especially itemized for us in the Ten Commandments (Exod. 20:1-17; Matt. 19:18,19), and calling Jesus Christ “the Son of God” (Matt. 27:54) and “Lord” (Matt. 20:30,31).

“I believe in God the Father Almighty, ... and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who ... suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, ... the third day he rose again from the dead, he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty I believe in ... the forgiveness of sins; ... and the life everlasting. Amen” (*Apostles’ Creed*). “For ... we believe and confess ... [the] Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God ..., who suffered for our salvation, ..., rose again the third day from the dead. He ascended into heaven, he sitteth on the right hand of the Father, God Almighty At whose coming ... they that have done good shall go into life everlasting This is the catholic (universal) faith: which except a man believe

¹⁵⁴ For the concept of a covenant within a covenant, compare the Jewish “sabbath” “covenant” (Exod. 31:16) inside the larger “Sinai” “covenant” of “the ten commandments” (Exod. 34:28,29; cf. 20:8-11; 31:18).

faithfully, he cannot be saved” (*Athanasian Creed*).

Textual History Outside the Closed Class of Three Witnesses.

Outside the closed class of sources the correct readings at both Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) and Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), (twice) “Have mercy on us, O Lord,” 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 33 (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), and 1071 (independent, 12th century); together with 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 Pesitto Version (first half 5th century)

At Matt. 20:30a (Component 1), the TR’s reading, “Have mercy on us, O Lord,” is also found in Minuscule 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is further found in the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and Ethiopic Versions (the Takla Haymanot, c. 500; & Pell Platt, based on the Roman edition of Rome 1548-9).

At Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), the TR’s reading, “Have mercy on us, O Lord,” is also found in Minuscule 565 (9th century, independent). It is further found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Version; the Georgian “2” Version (5th century); and some manuscripts of the Slavic Version.

Variant 1, which in Component 1 (Matt. 20:30a), reads, “Have mercy on us, Jesus,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, London Sinaiticus (4th century). It is further found in (the mixed text type) Codex Theta 038 (9th century); Minuscule 700 (11th century, independent); some of 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), and 983 (12th century, independent), *et al.* It is also found in a manuscript of the Syriac Palestinian Version; Egyptian Coptic Middle Egyptian (3rd century) Version; Armenian Version (5th century); and Georgian Version (5th century).

Variant 3, which at both Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) and Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), reads, “Have mercy on us,” is found in Minuscules 13 (13th century, independent, in the *Family 13 Manuscripts*) and 205 (independent in the Gospels & Revelation, 15th century).

Variant 3, “Have mercy on us,” at Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) is found in the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century); as well as Minuscules 565 (9th century, independent) and 157 (independent, 12th century; this

manuscript lacks verse 31b). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century); a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; and a manuscript of the Ethiopic Version.

Variant 3, “Have mercy on us,” at Matt. 20:31a (Component 2) is found in Minuscules 700 (11th century, independent) and 579 (mixed text, 13th century). It is also found in some manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version; and some manuscripts of the Slavic Version.

Variant 4, which at both Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) and Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), reads in word order 3,1,2, “Lord, have mercy on us,” is found in one of the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century); as well as (the mixed text type) Codex 085 (6th century, Matt. 20:3-32; 22:3-16). Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) is 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; and Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), is followed by (the independent text type) Codex Z 035 (6th century).

Variant 4, “Lord, have mercy on us,” at Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version.

Variant 4, “Lord, have mercy on us,” at Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), 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 Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type); and the *Family 13 Manuscripts*, which contain Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text), 346 (12th century, independent), 543 (12th century, independent), 826 (12th century, independent), 828 (12th century, independent), 983 (12th century, independent), 13 (13th century, independent), *et al.* It is also found in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version; Armenian Version (5th century); and Georgian “1” Version (5th century).

Variant 5, which in Component 1 (Matt. 20:30a), reads, “*Kurie* (‘O Lord,’ word 3), *eleeson* (‘Have mercy,’ word 1) *emas* (‘[on] us,’ word 2) *Iesou* (‘Jesus,’ word 3a),” i.e., “Lord, have mercy on, Jesus,” is a conflation of *Variants 2 & 4*. It is found in (the mixed text type) Codex L 019 (8th century) and Minuscule 892 (9th century, mixed text type). It is also found in some manuscripts of the Syriac Palestinian Version; and some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version.

Amidst such confusion both of the Alexandrian text and other non-Byzantine texts, the neo-Alexandrians also became confused with respect to Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) and Matt. 20:31a (Component 2). Tischendorf’s 8th edition (1869-72) adopted *Variant 3*, “Have mercy on us,” at Matt. 20:30a (Component 1). After all, on neo-Alexandrian principles, “Is not the shorter reading the better reading?”; and *Variant 4*, “Lord, have mercy on us,” at Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), “Well, forgetting what was just said about ‘the shorter reading’ being ‘the better reading,’ does the great ‘discover’ of London Sinaiticus really wish to forsake his great ‘discovery’ a second time here”?

Variant 4, “Lord, have mercy on us,” at both Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) and Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), was adopted by Westcott-Hort (1881) and Nestle’s 21st edition (1952). After all, on neo-Alexandrian principles, “Does not Codex Vaticanus follow this reading twice; and is it not also followed on the second occasion by Codex Sinaiticus?” “Are not both readings also found, by way of ‘external support,’ in some manuscripts of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version”?

But then, “putting the cat in among the canaries,” and “causing a lot of consternation” among the neo-Alexandrians as “feathers flew everywhere,” the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993) adopted the TR’s reading, “Have mercy on us, O Lord,” was also adopted by the NU Text at Matt. 20:30a (Component 1), with square brackets around the “*Kurie* (Lord),” indicating it might be retained as in the TR or omitted as in *Variant 3*, “Have mercy on us;” and then the TR’s reading, “Have mercy on us, O Lord,” at Matt. 20:31a (Component 2). After all, on neo-Alexandrian principles, “Is not the shorter reading the better reading?”; and so might not *Variant 3* be “the better reading” at Matt. 20:30a (Component 1)? But then again, on neo-Alexandrian principles, might not the shorter reading at Matt. 20:30a (Component 1) be an assimilation with Matt. 9:27? Hence the square brackets for “*Kurie* (Lord),” in the NU Text. And with regard to Matt. 20:31a (Component 2), is not the TRs’ reading “the non-liturgical order of words and so would” it not “Have been likely to be altered” “to the more familiar sequence”? (Metzger’s *Textual Commentary*, 1971, pp. 53-54; 2nd ed., 1994, pp. 43-44).

We are thus reminded that the neo-Alexandrian texts vary from Committee to Committee, depending on who is on the Committee; and who is applying the “neo-Alexandrian rules” at that point in time. Perhaps the only thing we can say with confidence is that the neo-Alexandrians appear to have been somewhat baffled by a couple of readings here at Matt. 20:30a,31a, that for those of us who are neo-Byzantines, by the grace of God are prepared “to walk humbly with” our “God” (Micah 6:8), and believe in the Divine Preservation of Holy Scripture (I Peter 1:25), are in fact open and shut cases of following the representative Byzantine text, with the support of hundreds and hundreds of good Byzantine Greek manuscripts. “For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity,” “I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit” (Isa. 57:15).

Confusion also reigned in the neo-Alexandrian versions.

At Matt. 20:30a,31a, the ASV followed *Variant 4*, reading (twice), “Lord, have mercy on us.” While the *Variant 4* reading was (twice) also followed in this form by the *New American Standard Bible’s* 1st edition (1960-1971) and 2nd edition (1977); in the NASB’s 3rd edition (1995), its translators decided to further muddy the neo-Alexandrian waters here at this verse by following a new *Variant 7*, so that their Matt. 20:31a (Component 2) reading is, “Lord (Word 3), Son (Word 4) of David (Word 5), have mercy (Word 1) on us (word 2)” (NASB 3rd ed.).

The NIV did likewise following this new *Variant 7* at Matt. 20:31a (Component 2); but also using this same new reading at Matt. 20:30a (Component 1), thereby further following a new *Variant 6*. I say in the case of both the NASB and NIV “following” the new *Variants 6 & 7*, for we find them earlier in the religiously liberal translation of that well known “mad rat,” James Moffatt, who rendered them (twice), “O Lord, Son of David, have pity on us!” (Moffatt Bible). But where did Moffatt get the idea from anyway? Here I simply draw the reader’s attention to the fact that *Variants 6 & 7* can be found in the old Latin Papists’ Douay-Rheims Version, which reads (twice), “O Lord, thou son of David, have mercy on us.”

Variant 3 was adopted with a footnote referring to *Variant 4* at Matt. 20:30a (Component 1); and *Variant 4* was adopted at Matt. 20:31a (Component 2) in the RSV.

Reversing the father RSV’s preference at Matt. 20:30a, *Variant 4* was adopted with a footnote referring to *Variant 3* at Matt. 20:30a (Component 1); and then the TR’s reading was adopted at Matt. 20:31a (Component 2) in the NRSV.

Once again reversing the father RSV’s preference at Matt. 20:30a, *Variant 4* was adopted with a footnote referring to *Variant 3* at Matt. 20:30a (Component 1); and then *Variant 4* was adopted at Matt. 20:31a (Component 2) in the ESV.

Variant 3 was twice followed by the NEB & its son, the REB.

Variant 3 was twice followed, but inserted after Words 4 & 5 (see *Variant 7*, supra), thus creating a new *Variant 8 & 9* in the TEV.

Good reader, does all this sound a little bit confusing? *Please ..., do not kill the messenger if you do not like the message.* It is understandable that you might find the neo-Alexandrians’ shifting train of logic in these vacillating readings somewhat confusing. But remember this. “God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints” (I Cor. 14:33). So this confusion endemic in the neo-Alexandrian texts and versions is not of God, anymore than the Neo-Alexandrian School is of God. Hence if you want a straight-shooting gospel gun with an unconfused understanding of these verses, go to the text which God has Divinely preserved over time, and which underpins our King James Versions, to wit, the Received Text. It reads at Matt. 20:30a,31a (twice), “Have mercy on us, O Lord, thou son of David.” And good Christian reader, let me assure it, it won’t change in “the next edition” of the Received Text, since there is no “next edition.” We have the Divinely preserved apographs (I Peter 1:25) from the Divinely inspired autographs (II Tim. 3:16). I say the words reverently when I say, “Thank God!” “For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, ... in all the churches of the saints” (I Cor. 14:33).

Matt. 20:34b “their eyes” (second occurrence) (TR & AV) {A}

Preliminary Textual Discussion.

Prima facie the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron supports the variant's reading, since like the Vulgate at Matt. 20:34 it simply reads, “*et* (and) *confestim* (immediately) *viderunt* (they saw).” But the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron is a Vulgate Codex, and a similar type of reading is found in the Vulgate at Mark 10:52 and Luke 18:43, “*et* (and) *confestim* (immediately) *vidit* (he saw).” Therefore on the one hand it is possible that this reading had “*oculi* (the eyes) *eorum* (of them)” omitted at Matt. 20:34 as a consequence of Diatessaron formatting as Matt. 20:34 was compared with Mark 10:52 and Luke 18:43. But on the other hand, the fact that this reading retains the plural form, coupled with the absence of any support for the TR's reading in Vulgate Codices more generally, means *on this occasion* I shall exercise a discretion in following the balance of probabilities and show the Sangallensis Diatessaron following the variant, *infra*.

Principal Textual Discussion.

At Matt. 20:34b, the TR's Greek, “*auton* (of them) *oi* (the) *ophthalmoi* (eyes),” i.e., “their eyes” (second occurrence) in the words, “*kai* (and) *eutheos* (immediately) *aneblepsan* (they received sight) *auton* (of them) *oi* (the) *ophthalmoi* (eyes),” i.e., “and immediately their eyes received sight” (AV) is supported by the majority Byzantine text e.g., *Codex Freerianus* (W 032, 5th century, which is Byzantine in Matthew 1-28; Luke 8:13-24:53), the purple parchment, *Codex Rossanensis* (Sigma 042, late 5th / 6th century), the purple parchment, *Codex Petropolitanus Purpureus* (N 022, 6th century), *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 2378 (11th century), and *Sidneiensis Universitatis* Lectionary 1968 (1544 A.D.). It is further supported as Latin, “*oculi* (the eyes) *eorum* (of them),” in *Codex Monacensis* (old Latin Version q, 6th / 7th century, Munich).

However, a variant omitting “their eyes” (Greek, “*auton oi ophthalmoi*; Latin, “*oculi eorum*”), i.e., “and immediately they received sight,” is found in Jerome's Latin Vulgate (5th century), and old Latin Versions a (4th century), e (4th / 5th century), b (5th century), d (5th century), ff2 (5th century), h (5th century), n (5th / 6th century), f (6th century), aur (7th century), l (7th / 8th century), g1 (8th / 9th century), ff1 (10th / 11th century), and c (12th / 13th century); as well as the Sangallensis Latin Diatessaron (9th century). From the Latin support for this reading, it is manifested in the Clementine Vulgate (1592). It is also found in the ancient church Greek writer, Basil the Great (d. 379).

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

Was this an accidental omission? Our two Sydney University Lectionaries both show abbreviations of these words. Lectionary 1968 reduces the “*auton* (αὐτῶν)” to four letters on the line, “*auon* (αυων)” with the “*τ*” (τ) above the line between the last two letters; and Lectionary 2378 reduces the “*ophthalmoi* (οφθαλμοί)” to five letters on the line, “*ophthal* (οφθαλ)” with the “*m*” (μ) over the “*l*” (λ),” and in turn a grave accent “\” over the “*m*” (μ) to signify the “*oi* (οι)” ending. If one combined both abbreviations (something that possibly never occurred in the script of any one scribe,) it would thus be possible to reduce these three words to 11 letters of continuous script i.e.,

“αὐωνοιοφθαλμοί.” This is still quite a long piece of text. Thus a paper fade of even these reduced dimensions at this point of the text would probably not go undetected; a fact enhanced further if no such abbreviations were used. Nevertheless, did such a paper fade occur, and a copyist, not knowing what the missing words were, and noting that the passage still “made sense without them,” simply copy out the passage, perhaps leaving less of a gap, with the next copyist simply removing the gap altogether?

Was this a deliberate omission? At Eccl. 6:9 King Solomon uses the Semitic idiom, Hebrew, “*mar’eh* (the sight of) ‘*eynaim* (the eyes),” i.e., “the sight of the eyes” (AV), found in the OT Septuagint as Greek, “*orama* (the sight) *ophthalmōn* (of the eyes)” (LXX). That St. Matthew would use such Hebraic terminology here at Matt. 20:34b, but that St. Mark (Mark 10:52) and St. Luke (Luke 18:43) would not, reflects the wider stylistic reality that St. Matthew’s Gospel is more likely to use such a Hebraism.

Did a scribe, not appreciating this type of stylistic quality of Matthean Greek, simply prune away “*autōn* (of them) *oi* (the) *ophthalmoi* (eyes)” as “unnecessary wordage” in order to produce “a more succinct text”? Either in this connection, or quite autonomously being motivated by notions of “gospel harmonizations,” did a scribe, not appreciating the difference between Matthean Greek and the other two Synoptic Gospels, deliberately prune away the words, “*autōn* (of them) *oi* (the) *ophthalmoi* (eyes),” in order to produce a “more standard text” between the three Synoptic Gospels? Or did a Marcion (d. 2nd century) type anti-Old Testament heretic who understood these words to be a Hebraism, but who “only believed in the New Testament,” deliberately prune away these words “to make the New Testament sound less like the Old Testament”?

A deliberate or accidental omission? We do not know. We cannot know. But we can know that it was a change to the text of Scripture here Providentially preserved for us in the representative Byzantine text.

On the one hand, the TR’s reading has strong support in the Greek as the representative Byzantine text reading against which there is no good textual argument. Indeed, it is a Hebraism and so the type of thing that one characteristically expects to find in Matthean Greek from time to time. It has good support over time, and through time, dating from ancient times; and includes some minority support in the Latin textual tradition. But on the other hand, the variant has the support of the representative Latin text, and an ancient church writer. Weighing up these factors, and bearing in mind the perpetual 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. 20:34b 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. 20:34b, “their eyes” (second occurrence in verse), in the words, “and immediately their eyes received sight,” is found in (the mixed text type) Codex C 04 (5th century) and (the independent) Codex Delta 037 (9th century). It is also found in Minuscules 565 (9th century),

independent), 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); as well as the *Family I Manuscripts* (Swanson), which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family I 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 Pesitto (first half 5th century) and Harclean h (616) Versions; as well as a manuscript of the Egyptian Coptic Sahidic Version.

However, the variant which omits “their eyes” (second occurrence), making the reading “and immediately they received sight,” is found in the two leading Alexandrian texts, Rome Vaticanus (4th century) and London Sinaiticus (4th century); as well as the leading representative of the Western text, Codex D 05 (5th century). It is further found in Minuscules 33 (9th century, mixed text type) and 700 (11th century, independent); as well as the *Family 13 Manuscripts* (Swanson), which contain e.g., (in agreement with the *Family 13 Manuscripts of the NU Text Committee*) Minuscules 788 (11th century, independent text) and 13 (13th century, independent). It is also found in the Syriac Curetonian Version (3rd / 4th century), and the margin of the Syriac Harclean h (616) Version; Egyptian Coptic Sahidic (3rd century) and Bohairic (3rd century) Versions; Armenian Version (5th century); and Ethiopic Version (Dillmann, 18th / 19th centuries).

At Matt. 20:34b, the erroneous variant was adopted by the NU Text *et al.* Hence the ASV reads, “and straightway they received their sight.” The omission is also found in the NASB, RSV, NRSV, ESV, and NIV.

In former days, before the Vatican II Council (1962-5), the old Latin Papists, armed with the shield of the Clementine Latin Vulgate, and the sword of the Douay-Rheims Versions translated from the Latin, would charge at Protestants with their reading, “And immediately they saw” (Douay-Rheims) here at Matt. 20:34b. Sparks flew as the Protestants raised high their shield of the *Textus Receptus*, and as the blade of the Douay-Rheims crashed down upon that shield, the Papist sword smashed into several pieces. The Protestants, then thrusting hard with their sword of the Saint James Bible, would smash to pieces the Papists’ shield of the Clementine as they defended their reading, “And immediately their eyes received sight” (Authorized Version). The vanquished Papists would flee, licking their wounds.

... Time passed. The Papists came up with “a new strategy.” The Devil who devil-possesses every Pope, from the first Bishop of Rome to become a Pope, Boniface III (Bishop of Rome, 607; First Pope, 607), said to one of his minion devils¹⁵⁵, “Remember, how in the 16th century with the *Council of Trent* we closed down the neo-Byzantines in our Roman Church, like those troublesome Complutensians of Spain and that blasted Erasmus of Rotterdam? ... Remember how before that time, when the Prefect of the Vatican Library advised Erasmus in 1533 that *Codex Vaticanus* disagreed with his Greek Text in preference to the Vulgate in some 365 places, that Erasmus then

¹⁵⁵ I am, of course, here writing with some artistic license.

repudiated this Alexandrian manuscript as an obviously corrupted text?” “I do,” said his minion devil in “Babylon” (Rev. 18:2) i.e., Rome (Rev. 17:9), “Erasmus was too smart for us on that issue.” “Well,” continued the Devil, “... what if through our great masterpiece of deception, the Roman Catholic Church, we unite our Alexandrian text Rome Vaticanus with Tischendorf’s London Sinaiticus, as indeed do the apostate Protestants already, and united with them, charge in unison against those religiously conservative Protestants who hold to the Received Text and King James Bible? With both an external attack from Romanists, aided by a fifth columnist internal attack from apostate Protestants, we might succeed where heretofore we have failed.” “A brilliant strategy,” replied the minion devil.

... Time passed. After the Vatican II Council (1962-5), the new neo-Alexandrian Papists came to replace the old Latin Papists, as the Roman Church endorsed the neo-Alexandrian text based *RSV [Roman] Catholic Edition* (1965), *Jerusalem Bible* (1966), and *New Jerusalem Bible* (1985). The NU Text Committee that produced not only the UBS 3rd (1975) and 3rd corrected (1983) editions, but also the contemporary NU Text of Nestle-Aland’s 27th edition (1993) and UBS’s 4th revised edition (1993), contained on all these editions the well known names of Kurt Aland and Bruce Metzger.

But lurking in the background, largely hidden in the shadows cast by the dazzling bright neo-Alexandrian “stars,” Aland and Metzger, there was another more concealed figure whose name appeared on all of these neo-Alexandrian editions, namely, that of Carlo Martini (b. 1927). Now Cardinal Martini, being Popish Archbishop of Milan in Italy from 1980 to 2002, was a Jesuit. Cardinal Martini was educated as a boy in a Jesuit school at Turin in northern Italy, and so he knew of the threat posed to Popery from Protestantism, for not far from Turin, at Terre Pellice, is *the place where the Vaudois roam*. Here they hid in the mountains in a cave (*Guieza d’la Tana*) which I inspected in September 2001. This is where the surviving Waldensians hid when again and again the Papists came to kill them. For “the earth helped the woman” (Rev. 12:16). And so it was, that from nearby Turin, Martini formally joined the Jesuits’ Order when he was 17 years old. He was then later further educated at the oldest and most prestigious Jesuit university in the world, the *Pontifical Gregorian University* in Rome.

And so it is, with the finger of Jesuitry in the NU Text pie, we now find that once again the Papist swordsman advances, this time in an alliance with apostate Protestants. They now advance with the shield of the NU Text, and the sword of a neo-Alexandrian version such as the *RSV [Roman] Catholic Edition*. With their faulty neo-Alexandrian reading of Matt. 20:34b, which echoes the earlier reading of the Rheims-Douay Version, they once again charge at the faithful Protestants. Once again, sparks fly as the Protestants raise high their shield of the *Textus Receptus*, and as the blade of the *RSV [Roman] Catholic Edition* crashes down upon that shield, the neo-Alexandrian sword shatters to shivers. The faithful Protestants, then thrusting hard with their sword of the Saint James Bible, smash to pieces the shield of the *RSV [Roman] Catholic Edition* as they defend their reading, “And immediately their eyes received sight” (Authorized Version). The vanquished Papists once again flee as both they and their apostate Protestant allies are routed, and both go whingeing away, licking their wounds.

Did they think that they could succeed in their attack on the *Textus Receptus* and Authorized King James Version? Good Christian reader, Hast thou not heard, or hath it not been told unto thee? Didst thou not hear what was the Motto of the First Stage of the Protestant Reformation, to wit, the Lutheran Reformation? Dost thou not know that which was writ at that time in the letters “V.D.M.I.AE” (or “V.D.M.I.A.”), as by princely order of Frederick the Wise they were sewn onto the right sleeve of the Protestant court’s official clothing? Hear then the words of I Peter 1:25 in the Latin of this Motto, *Verbum Domini Manet in Aeternum!* Which is, being interpreted, “The Word of the Lord endureth forever.”