

Matt. 6:13 – The Doxology: Original or Unoriginal?

The longer ending of the Lord's prayer in Matt. 6:13 occurs in many of the Greek manuscripts, but is absent from some others. The longer phrase is in the KJV, but is absent from the text of most modern versions. Why? Or more to the point, did Matthew write the longer ending which has the doxology, or didn't he? I explained much of the data related to the methods and materials for how we answer such questions in the post on Matt. 5:44; if someone wants that data, I simply refer them to that post. I will assume that information here. In Matt. 6:13, the TR/KJV reads;

καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.
(And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil/the evil one.)

- (1) ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν (for yours is)
- (2) ἡ βασιλεία (the kingdom)
- (3) καὶ ἡ δύναμις (and the power)
- (4) καὶ ἡ δόξα (and the glory)
- (5) εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. (into the ages/forever)
- (6) ἀμήν (amen)

While the NA 28/UBS5, and most modern versions read simply;

καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.
(And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil/the evil one.)

All 6 of the clauses of the longer reading are not present in most modern versions. Which is the original reading? And why is the KJV different from most modern translations here? Let's examine the evidence.

External Evidence

There is a lot of data for this passage, and rather than just list the external evidence, in a way that may not be easy to follow, I decided to present it all in a chart form, organized by chronology, so we can see not only the data, but how each part of it relates to the whole. The left side of the chart is the evidence for the shorter reading. The right side of the chart is the evidence for any form of the longer reading. I have bolded and underlined the columns for the Greek evidence, because I believe priority should go to the actual Greek manuscripts themselves in NTTC work. In fact, I think that patristic and versional support should only be used to support readings found in the Greek manuscripts. I don't personally believe that we should ever follow the patristic or versional evidence when it is at variance with the entirety of the Greek manuscript tradition. At the bottom right of the chart, I have shaded one field much darker, and written the evidence in bold and underline, so that the reader clearly understands that the majority of manuscripts belongs there. I chose not to list out all of those manuscripts, and am not sure I would be capable of doing so accurately, as that would make the size of the chart much less manageable. Note that I have only examined the manuscripts from the first 9 centuries (and a few of those I could not gain access to), and spot-checked some of the later manuscripts. As it stands now, the data for this chart is mostly compiled from the standard NTTC apparatuses found in NA28, UBS5, CNTTS, Tischendorf, and the NET Bible TC notes, using the standard abbreviations. More data about each witness is available in

any standard introduction to NTTC. Notice that on the right side of the chart, some witnesses are italicized, and some are not. An *italicized* witness represents the longer reading as it is found in the TR/KJV. An unitalicized witness represents the longer reading, but in some form different than that found in the TR/KJV. I occasionally see KJV works list such witness as “supporting the KJV” and then simply add “with variation.” But that is disingenuous at best. A desire for accuracy compels us to note what that “variation” is, and explain where these differences might have come from. We will seek to do this as we go through the internal evidence.

A brief note on Polycarp’s reference;

Polycarp was the bishop in Smyrna shortly after John the apostle, and in all likelihood was trained by the Apostle before his death on the isle of Patmos in the 90s. He was martyred in the mid second century (somewhere between 155-160 AD). The story of this faithful pastor who had served Jesus for 86 years being brutally martyred for his faith still stirs the hearts of all who read it (see *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 8-16). Polycarp wrote a letter to the Philippians around the turn of the first century. (I have the standard critical Greek text of that letter, and am more comfortable dealing here than in many places where I have only uncritical English translations of a late manuscript of a father). In that letter, he could very well be alluding to Matt. 6:13 when he speaks of “the sayings of the Lord” about prayer, and calls the church to “be self-controlled with respect to prayer and persevere in fasting, earnestly seeking the all-seeing God to *lead us not into temptation*” (Pol. Phil. 7:1-2). If he is in fact referencing the text of Matthew, and if the text he had before him had the doxology which read “*for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever*” it seems incredibly unlikely that he wouldn’t mention the doxology, especially since the entire context of his seventh chapter is to refute the docetic Gnostics who “deny the testimony of the cross” and, with a dualistic eschatology “claim that there is neither resurrection nor judgment” (7:1). In fact, in this context, the “temptation” which Christians should pray to be delivered from is the “false teaching” (7:2), which would maintain that there will be no future *eschaton* in which believers will be bodily judged prior to an eternal rule of Jesus. There would be little that would so clearly and so strongly refute such claims as the powerful quotation of the doxology “*for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever*” coming from the lips of Jesus himself, and there seems to me to be no chance that Polycarp knew the longer ending at such an early date, or he would surely have used it here. However, as with much of the patristic data, it is sometimes hard to tell if a Father is intending to directly cite a passage, allude to a passage, or even simply unconsciously reiterate some of the language of a passage. In the case of Polycarp, he is early enough that he could even be referring to a form of the words of Jesus that is entirely separate from the canonical gospels. Since scholars are not certain that he is directly quoting Matt. 6:13, and since he refers only to a snippet of the text, his reference is not included in any of the critical apparatuses, and I don’t include it in the chart. I think Polycarp did have a copy of Matthew, (I think are clear quotations of Matthew in *Poly. Phil.* 2:3; 7:2; & 12:3, etc.), in which case 7:1-2 would be a reference to Matthew, and the absence of a quote of the doxology here would speak strongly against its being original, and would be the only evidence which we could place in the “1st century” column. We would grant a place of privilege to any evidence so early. Nonetheless, I will follow the careful scholarship of the modern apparatuses here, and not use evidence that is open to ambiguity. The introduction to the UBS5 is a model of careful scholarship in explaining that they only cite patristic evidence that is clear, and they and other textual apparatuses don’t cite Polycarp as support for the shorter reading, and I follow that lead here. They also don’t cite Chrysostom’s quote of the passage, or the Apostolic Constitutions, for some of the same reasons, but I have included them as support for the longer reading, as we will see below. I have noted Chrysostom as referring to the passage 3 times, because I have heard that suggested, but can personally only find him quoting it once (in his Homilies on Matthew). Most of the Patristic evidence I have included is that verified in the major apparatuses. In addition, I have performed an search for the reference in the electronic version of Schaff’s English translation of the early fathers, and have gone through the references in his “scripture index,” all of which are far from perfect. There is a reason patristic data is sometimes considered ambiguous.

Matthew 6:13 – The External Evidence

Date	Shorter reading				Longer reading - KJV.TR / Different Form		
	Greek	Versions	Patristic Commentary	Patristic Citation	Greek	Versions	Patristic Citation
1 st							
2 nd				Diatessaron ^{syr}			<i>Didache</i>
3 rd			Tertullian; Cyprian; Origin;			Cop ^{sa} (cir. 80 copies, 5 th +); Cop ^{ray} ; Syr ^c	Apost. Const.
4 th	<u>01, 03</u>	it ^a ; cop ^{meg} ; (2 ms 4 th)		Cryil of Jerusalem; Gregory of Nyssa; Ambrosiaster; Ambrose		It ^k	<i>Chrys.</i> 3/3?
5 th	<u>05, 0170</u>	it ^b ; it ⁿ ; vg (4 eds., 7000+ copies from 5 th – 15 th centuries);		Jerome ^{5/6} (1/6+ amen); Cyril; Chromatius; Augustine ^{20/20}		syr ^d (300+ copies, from the 5 th -15 th centuries) Geo; (3 ms 6 th +) arm; (100s of ms 9 th +)	
6 th	<u>035</u>				<u>042,</u> <u>043,</u> <u>047</u>	it ^t ; syr ^{pal} ; eth; (cir. 200 copies, 10 th +)	
7 th		it ^{aur}			<u>032^{supp}</u>	It ^(q) ; syr ^h	
8 th		it ^{ff1} ; it ¹			<u>07, 019, 0233</u>	It ⁹¹	Apos. Cons.
9 th	<u>017</u>				<u>011, 017,</u> <u>021, 031,</u> <u>037, 038,</u> <u>041, 045,</u> <u>0211, 0257,</u> <u>0287</u>	Cop ^{bo.pt.} ; slav	
10 th		it ^c			<i>c. 100 miniscules from 10th</i>		
11 th +	<u>1, 118,</u> <u>209, 205,</u> <u>130, 131,</u> <u>1582,</u> <u>1547,</u> <u>288,</u> <u>17</u>				<i>Over 1300 Miniscules from 11th and after</i> c. 100 miniscules 11 th + have the longer ending in a variety of forms different than the TR.		

External Evidence

Remember that the goal of textual criticism is to recover the text, as much as possible, in its original form. When all the manuscripts are essentially the same (as they are in the vast majority of the New Testament), there is no real need for textual criticism. In such places, we have multiple, early, and widespread witness to the text of the NT, and we rest deeply confident that we know what the original said in those places, which make up the vast majority of the NT. However, in some minor places, like this text, the manuscripts are not all the same. And that is where Textual Criticism comes in. Different manuscripts have different readings in this text, and we want to try to figure out which reading is the one that was originally penned by Matthew 2000 years ago when he wrote under inspiration. The first step is to examine the external evidence. What do the manuscripts say? We will now walk through the data from the chart above.

On the left side of the chart, all of the witnesses (which include our earliest Greek witnesses by far) have the text entirely without the doxology, with one minor exception. In one of the 6 places that Jerome quotes the text, he adds an “amen” to the end of the prayer, so that his text in that one place reads, “and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. Amen.” Since he quotes the text without the amen 5 other times, this is likely his own addition, and doesn’t represent a Greek manuscript which might have had an “amen” in it. All the other witnesses on the left side of the chart have the text exactly the same, without the longer ending. Thus the witnesses on the left side of the chart all read simply;

καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.
(And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil/the evil one.)

On the right side of the chart, we have the longer ending, noted below, but in several different forms. I have numbered each of the clauses of the longer ending so we can easily see the different forms it shows up in.

- (1) ὅτι σοῦ ἐστίν (for yours is)
- (2) ἡ βασιλεία καὶ (the kingdom and)
- (3) ἡ δύναμις καὶ (the power and)
- (4) ἡ δόξα (the glory)
- (5) εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. (into the ages/forever)
- (6) ἀμήν (amen)

First up is the *Didache*. In the second century, the author composed this manual for church order. We will explain more below what the *Didache* is, and the context of the passage, but for now note that the *Didache* has the longer ending, but it does not have clause #2 (the kingdom and) or clause #6 (amen). Thus, the text in the second century in the *Didache* reads,

“And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil:
For thine is the power and the glory forever.”

The Coptic Sahidic (cop^{sa}) and Fayyumic (cop^{fay}) translations of the 3rd century have followed suit, and have mostly the same form, with clause #2 absent. The Sahidic translation became widely used and distributed in Egypt, and thus there are quite a few copies (around 80) of the Sahidic translation, which all have the longer ending in this form.

Next up is the Apostolic Constitutions. While books 1-6 of the Apostolic Constitutions is almost universally recognized to be of a date much later than the 3rd century (usually the 8th century is suggested), scholars mostly agree that book 7, (where a quote of Matt. 6:13 is found) is from the 3rd

century, so I have placed it in the chart as early support for the longer reading. But the reading in the Apostolic Constitutions is of a slightly different form than the TR. It has clauses 1-2, and 5-6, but clauses 3-4 are absent from the quote. Thus, the text reads,

“And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil:
For thine is the kingdom forever. Amen.”

Then, we have the Old Syriac translation, represented here by the Curetonian manuscript (Syr^c), also from the 3rd century. It has the longer ending, but doesn't have clause #3 (and the power). It thus reads,

“And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil:
For thine is the kingdom and the glory forever. Amen.”

Next up is the African Old Latin Translation, in codex bobiensis (it^k), in the 4th century. It has the longer ending, but clauses 2 (the kingdom), 4 (the glory), and 6 (amen), are absent. It thus reads,

“And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil:
For thine is the power.”

Towards the end of the 4th century, we have the quotation from Chrysostom, which is the first evidence that we have for the exact form found in the TR. However, using any quotes from Chrysostom as textual evidence is always somewhat difficult, except in places where we have critical editions of Chrysostom. We have hundreds of copies (i.e. handwritten manuscripts) of Chrysostom's writings (probably more than any Christian writer apart from Augustine). Just as in the case of the NT, no two of these manuscripts of Chrysostom is exactly the same. Thus, in places where they are different, we must do textual criticism of Chrysostom's writings to determine what exactly he wrote. I have access only to the English translation of a very late, uncritical edition of Chrysostom, so I can't say exactly what he actually wrote at points where the manuscripts of his writings differ. Interestingly, it has been repeatedly noted by Chrysostom scholars that the form of the biblical text used in his writings seems to always conform to the text current in the Greek manuscripts of his day. Thus, in the early manuscripts of his writings, the text is usually in the form found in the early Greek manuscripts found in that same period. However, as we move forward in time several centuries, in copies of exactly the same passages of Chrysostom's writings, the form of the text quoted in those later manuscripts conforms to the text found in the Greek manuscripts of those centuries. As scribes copied Chrysostom's writings, when they came to his citations of Scripture, they didn't write the Scripture text as their exemplar of Chrysostom had it – they imported the text in the form that they knew it in in their day.

This shouldn't surprise us. I suspect almost everyone reading this has done the same thing. You are writing a Sunday school lesson, or church bulletin, or sermon, and you want to use that great quote from that awesome book. Maybe it's a C.S. Lewis quote. Maybe some great modern author. In their quote, they quote a passage of Scripture. But, when they quote it, they quote the RSV, or the NASB, or maybe the NIV. So what do you do? You can't go around quoting a modern version. (That would probably get most who are reading this in trouble in any kind of church context). So in your sermon, or written lesson, or bulletin, you reproduce the quote, only, where the original author quotes a passage of Scripture, you put in the King James Version of that passage. This is OK, because that is what the Bible “actually says” in that passage. At the very least, it is that passage of Scripture in the form that is current in your context. Ancient scribe were not different, and they did the same when making copies of the ancient Christian writers. This becomes painfully obvious when they put a form of the text into a manuscript of a father that is different from the form he is actually commenting on. Then, his comments don't even match the text that is put on his own lips! This occurs to some degree in all manuscripts of the fathers, but it is most

common in Augustine and Chrysostom, where we have many different copies made by many different scribes. It is quite possible that Chrysostom didn't actually quote the longer reading here, but I simply don't have access to the resources that would let me figure that out. Thus, I will give the longer ending the benefit of the doubt, and assume he did quote that form. His form then is the same as the TR, and it is the first place that the longer reading in any form shows up in Greek. His text reads,

“And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil:
For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.”

Next comes the Syriac *Peshitta* translation. It is basically a 5th century revision of the Old Syriac translation, occasionally incorporating variants from other streams. However, it continued to be copied, and became the dominant translation of Syrian Christendom in the east and the west after the 5th century. It was the standard Bible of Syrian Christians in Antioch for centuries. Thus, we have almost 350 manuscripts of the Peshitta (which, of course, differ from the TR in major ways, even in some of the largest variants in the NT – but we will perhaps deal with those in a later post). By the time it was translated, the text of Matt. 6:13 had stabilized somewhat from the previous Syriac translation, so it contains the longer readings, with each of the clauses, except for clause #6 (amen). The text of the Peshitta manuscripts thus reads,

“And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil:
For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.”

Then, in the 6th century, we have our first Greek manuscripts to contain the longer reading in any form. They appear primarily in the east, where Chrysostom had been one of the most revered pastors. Apparently, the text had stabilized at this point into the longer form known in the TR, and thus, from this point on, most of the Greek copies of the text produced in this part of the world propagate this exact form as it has stabilized. When Greek became the predominant language of Byzantium, and the Byzantine empire continued to expand around the 10th century, this text then became copied and copied again many times over, and thus from the 10th century and on we have **over 1300 Greek manuscripts** which perpetuate the longer reading in its full form, which is first evidenced in Greek in the 6th century. This certainly creates a strong majority among the Greek witnesses *in toto* today, but again, it is not a majority among Greek manuscripts until the 8th century, and not a strong majority until the 10th, when there is an explosion of the copying of Byzantine manuscripts. Also, we should note that around 100 manuscripts from the 10th century and on, while having the longer ending, have it in a variety of forms different than the TR, including some longer expansions, like “For thine is the kingdom and the glory and the power, of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, forever and ever, amen.” But certainly, for the most part, the text seems to stabilize somewhat in the 10th century.

Next comes the Georgian and Armenian translations. We have only a handful of the Georgian manuscripts today, none dating prior to the 6th century, but most believe that the translation was made in the 5th century, so I have placed it in the 5th century in the chart. It replicates exactly what was clearly becoming the dominant reading, which is the longer form with all 6 clauses found in the TR. The Armenian translation is an interesting phenomenon. Sometimes called “the queen of the versions” because we have over 1000 manuscripts of parts or all of this translation, it became a dominant form of the text in the further East. While we have more copies of this translation than any other ancient version (except Latin), our earliest Armenian copies that contain the gospel of Matthew actually come from the 10th century and later. However, since most scholars believe the translation was produced in the 5th century, I have placed in the 5th century on the chart. The Arminian manuscripts have the longer form of the text, as found in the TR. The Ethiopic is a similar story. We have a few hundred copies of the Ethiopic translation, but almost all of them come from after the 16th century (giving them zero text critical value, even as a the kind of secondary witness that a version provides). The earliest copies that contain the

gospels come from the 10th century however, and most believe the translation was actually first produced in the 5th century, so I have placed the Ethiopic translation in the 5th century on the chart. As you can see in the chart, a few other of the Old Latin manuscripts, and the Old Slavonic translation from the next several centuries also have the longer reading in the full form.

As is obvious from the left side of the chart, the shorter reading continued to be copied in most of the Old Latin (it) translations, all of the copies of Jerome's revision of the Latin, and occasionally in some of the Greek manuscripts not as influenced by the Byzantine stream. It was always the dominant form among Western Christianity, and, apart from a small handful of the individual Old Latin manuscripts, is the only form that any Latin speaking Christian was ever even able to read the text in. There are more copies of the Latin text with the shorter reading than all the copies in all the other languages in any time period combined. It was the clear majority among western Christianity. However, I believe we should give privilege to Greek manuscripts, even when the Latin heavily outweighs them.

External Evidence Summary

Working through the chart of external evidence reveals that the textual problem here is somewhat complex. If we simply count numbers the longer reading as found in the TR is the majority reading today among the Greek Manuscripts (found in around 1400 of 1528 Greek manuscripts). But even that statement must be nuanced, and is only accurate in one small sense. When we speak of a "majority" reading, we must always ask, a majority *when*? And a majority *where*? And a majority in *what language*? While I always give preference to Greek manuscripts, it is worth noting that in this case, among the versions, and the early Greek manuscripts, the evidence is decidedly against the longer reading in the TR form. In fact, in this case, the longer reading is *not* the majority reading even among the Greek manuscripts until the 8th century, and not a strong majority until the 10th. It is to this day not the majority reading among the ancient versions. The longer reading is entirely unknown in any form in any Greek manuscript until the 6th century. The "majority" reading before that point is definitely the shorter reading. In fact, the longer reading, in the form found in the KJV/TR is entirely unknown anywhere, until the (somewhat dubious) quote of the passage in a sermon(s) by Chrysostom towards the end of the 4th century.

In other words, based on the evidence that we have today, we can say that if you lived prior to Chrysostom, you didn't know the longer reading in the TR form. We have literally hundreds of manuscripts of translations of Greek texts, at least 4 Greek manuscripts, as well as multiple patristic citations of the passage from 8 different early preachers (and in the case of Jerome and Augustine, we even have multiple places where they quote the passage, and they always quote the shorter reading, making it all but impossible that they quote the shorter reading but have the longer reading before them), in vastly different parts of the world, and even 3 clear verse-by-verse commentaries on the Greek text from the first 5 centuries. That's a lot of early data. And none of them except a quote in a sermon by a single preacher (Chrysostom), evidences the longer reading in the TR form prior to the end of the 5th century (and that's only by graciously including the Georgian and Armenian versions that early). Note that I have made a separate column for the commentaries of Origen, Tertullian, and Cyprian, as opposed to the other citations of a passage in various fathers. Beza's 1588 note about this variant pointed out to me the fact that these are a wholly different and more stable kind of witnesses. While multiple quotations from multiple fathers in different parts of the world (like we have for the shorter reading) have a little more strength, we must always be cautious with patristic citations, which are at best a secondary attestation to a Greek original. A quotation of a passage in a father can be very ambiguous evidence, especially a quote like in Chrysostom's homily (what preacher hasn't misquoted a passage of Scripture in a sermon while preaching?). But the verse-by-verse commentaries are an entirely different thing. In those instances, the writer is professedly directly sharing and commenting on every part of the Greek text exactly as he has it. He is claiming to share all of the text, and carefully elucidate its meaning. In other words, the fact that three major commentaries by three different fathers, in different locations, (including

Tertullian, who most “Baptist perpetuity” folks would identify as an early Baptist), all contain the shorter reading, is strong evidence that the Greek manuscripts which they had in their day simply did not contain the longer reading.

The situation is similar with Tatian’s Diatessaron. It is more certain in that it is not a random (and possibly ambiguous quotation), but is part of his gospel harmony, which combines the 4 gospels into one larger gospel, and would have the text exactly as Tatian had it in Greek (though when there are gospel parallels, it would have the form which is longest). It should probably stand in the “commentary” column as even stronger evidence for the shorter reading, but evidence from the Diatessaron does have its difficulties. While it was originally compiled from Greek manuscripts in either Greek or Syriac, it was at a later time translated into Armenian, and then at a much later time into Arabic, then, even later, translated into Latin. (Most English translations of the work available today are English translations of a late Arabic translation of a Syriac translation of a possibly Greek original!) We thus have it in several different forms. The later the translation of the work, the more different the form of the text from its original. However, when we are looking at the Syriac text, (as in the chart above), we are most likely looking at the text of the Diatessaron as it originally stood in the second century. Nonetheless, I have placed it in the “patristic citation” column, which is a little less certain, choosing to err on the safe side due to some of those difficulties.

Think through what the external evidence presented here means. If you lived before the end of the first five centuries, based on the evidence which we have available (and it is rather substantial in this case), the only way you could have heard the longer reading in the TR/KJV form is if you heard Chrysostom preach his sermons. If you were reading in Old Latin, you had only the shorter reading. In fact, if you spoke Latin at all, then among the thousands of Latin manuscripts, in any age, you would only be able to find the KJV form of the reading if you happened to be reading the one Latin manuscript It^f (and BTW, It^f has plenty of other disagreements from the TR in many others passages, should someone think to call it, “the perfect Bible in Latin” at this point). Any other Latin translation, of any date, either has the shorter reading, or has the longer reading in a form different than the KJV. If you were reading the Bible in the middle-Egyptian translation, you only had the shorter reading. If you were reading the Bible from any one of the thousands of copies of Jerome’s revision of the Old Latin, you only had the shorter reading. If you were reading the Bible in its Syriac translation, you had *part* of the longer ending, but not the full TR reading. If you were reading the Bible in its Sahidic or Fayyumic translations, you had *part* of the longer ending, but not the full reading of the TR. The early, widespread, and multiple attestation to readings different from the TR is in fact rather strong. Among 4 different languages, in 7 different dialects, in hundreds of different manuscripts, from places all over the globe, the longer reading of the KJV/TR form cannot be found anywhere in the first 5 centuries, except possibly in a quote, in a sermon, by *one preacher*. The external evidence is not decisive, but it does clearly lean strongly in the direction of the TR reading being unoriginal. The fact that the longer reading, when it does show up, occurs in several different forms, raises serious questions about the authenticity of the longer reading. However, we do have a great many Greek manuscripts, later though they may be, that do have the longer reading. And we have several different forms of it that must be explained. The data is not uniform, we do have a textual variant here, and that does give us some cause for doubt. The external data might be said to lean towards the shorter reading, but it is not decisive, and certainly the proliferation of the longer reading in the manuscripts after the 10th century gives us some cause for uncertainty. So now we turn to the internal evidence, to see if we can make sense of the various forms of the passage as we find it.

Internal Evidence

Remember that external evidence deals with the actual physical materials (primarily, the Greek manuscripts, but also, the secondary support that can be provided for Greek readings through the ancient versions, and patristic quotations). Internal evidence, on the other hand, looks within the materials, and

asks, “Of the different readings which the external evidence provides, which would the original writer be most likely to have written, and which would a scribe be most likely to have provided us?” Because we have a textual variant, or a place where the Greek manuscripts differ, we have more than one reading. That is the raw data that the external evidence provides us with, but, as is often the case, the external data is not conclusive. Thus, we examine the internal evidence to see which of the readings we have would be most likely to have been written by the original author, and which would be most likely to have been provided by a later scribe. When the external evidence is somewhat divided, we clearly can’t just pick and choose the reading we like best. And while some would disagree with me, I would suggest that we can’t just ask “which one the did KJV translators choose?” I don’t believe they were infallible and incapable of mistakes when they made choices, and neither did they. They made those choices with a much more limited base of data, and I personally don’t believe we should just assume that their decision represents the final verdict of the almighty upon the issue. I believe we should actually look at the evidence, and not just assume that the KJV translators were always infallible in their choices.

Intrinsic Probability

First, we examine intrinsic probability. That is, which reading is *Matthew* more likely to have written? A caveat should be made at the start – we are not just “making the Bible say whatever we want it to” as some might charge against intrinsic probability. In other words, we don’t look at just *any* text in the Bible and go, “well I don’t think that’s original, because it doesn’t seem likely that the author would write that.” That would be an extreme skepticism towards the Bible. Rather, what we are doing in this case is taking the physical data as we actually have it, and saying, “it is obvious that we have a textual variant here. Different copies of the gospel of Matthew have different readings, and we want know which, *of the readings which we actually have*, is the original one.” This is not questioning the Bible. This is not questioning Matthew. This is not questioning inspiration, or inerrancy, or anything of the like. In fact, the case is precisely the opposite. We are operating on the assumption that the Bible is the Word of God, and thus, we are concerned to know, to the best of our ability, exactly what the original autograph of Matthew actually said. The only reason we are asking “what did Matthew original write here?” is because we don’t have the autograph of Matthew, all we have are copies. But the copies are not all the same. And in places, like this one, where the copies are different, and the external evidence is not uniform, internal evidence can help us determine which reading is the original one. So, which reading is more likely to have been written by Matthew?

One could point out that Mathew contains doxologies elsewhere in his gospel, which makes a doxology as the longer reading consistent with his style. But one could also point out that Matthew contains prayers that *don’t* end with doxologies, which makes the absence of one in the shorter reading equally consistent with his style. Thus, the doxological form adds nothing inherent to either intrinsic argument.

Perhaps more promising would be suggestions relating to the synoptic problem, or the literary relationship between the synoptic gospels. Luke explains in the preface to his gospel (1:2) that he was not an eyewitness to the events which he narrates in his first volume, and explains that he has investigated the history that went before him, and has used sources in compiling his narrative by those who were eyewitness. The occasional scholar (Farmer and a few followers) has suggested that Matthew may have written his gospel first, and that Luke then could perhaps have used Matthew as one of his sources. If this were the case, then if Matthew had originally written the longer ending, one could wonder what would have caused Luke to omit the longer ending when he writes his account of the same prayer of Jesus in Luke 11. It seems hard to come up with any good reason why Luke would omit it if he had it before him, thus making it more likely that the shorter ending was original. But, the suggestion that Matthew wrote first and that Luke used Matthew is a decidedly minority view (held only by maybe 3% or so of scholars today), and is I think an incredibly unlikely suggestion. The consensus view is that Mark wrote first. But it could be possible, from the other angle, to suggest that Luke wrote using Mark, and that Matthew may have used Luke in writing up his account. We could then see Matthew perhaps having Luke’s account

before him, and deciding to add the doxology to it, perhaps from his own memory of the teaching of the Lord. But it would be just as likely, if Matthew were using Luke, that he would have left the text as Luke had it. Thus, the synoptic issue doesn't really weigh in for either reading.

What about lexical issues? Words like glory, power, and especially kingdom, are all used elsewhere by Matthew, so they are consistent with his usage. This wouldn't provide any direct evidence for the longer reading (Matthew uses the words in some places, but, obviously, not in every place, otherwise all we would have in Matthew would be doxology), but it is consistent with it.

But one comes to a slightly different situation with the use of the word "amen" at the close of the doxology. Matthew doesn't anywhere else have Jesus ending a prayer with an "amen," and he doesn't conclude any other doxology with an "amen." Frankly, such a usage seems decidedly reminiscent of later liturgical use. In fact, none of the gospel writers use the word anywhere in their gospels, except in the same two very consistent ways; (1) at the very end of their works, as the clear way to signal the reader that they are closing their account, and (2) on the lips of Jesus, as a presentation of his unique teaching style. They never place the word on the lips of anyone else, including the disciples. In terms of how they portray Jesus as using the word, there is an incredible significance to the consistent pattern they use for Jesus discourse. Every time the synoptic authors place the word "amen" on the lips of Jesus, they present him not as using it at the end of a statement, but always present him as using it at the beginning of the statement. They do this very intentionally as a direct counter of the common way that rabbinic scribes taught.

It was the common form of rabbinic teaching to end a particular teaching by supporting what was said, after it was said, by appealing to a precedent authority. A teacher would make a statement, and then conclude upon its accuracy by appealing to a previous authority. "It is true because rabbi so-and-so has said. Amen." This was the common form of rabbinic teaching. But each gospel author does something fascinating with the speech of Jesus. Jesus doesn't support what he says, after he says it. He rather places the "support" before he even makes the statement. The gospel writers present Jesus as saying essentially, "I don't need to support this statement *after* I make it by appealing to someone *else's* authority. What I say can be taken as true, before I even say it, on my own authority." It is commonly recognized in Jesus scholarship that this is one of the manifold ways through which the Evangelists point towards the deity of Jesus, by highlighting the unique authority of His teaching (see the standard works by Blomberg, Keener, etc.). Thus, the gospels present Jesus as placing the "amen" at the beginning of His pronouncements. Most translations pick up on this usage by translating the word "truly" or "verily" every time the word is used in the gospels (except for the closing of each, where translating "amen" conveys the conclusion of the literary unit). John, with his typically more reflective Christology, does the same thing each of the synoptic Evangelists does, only every time He presents Jesus as saying "amen" he consistently presents him as using the word twice. Thus, "verily, verily" is how Jesus speaks over and over again in John, for John sees His pronouncements as *doubly* true before he makes them (2x each in Jn. 1:51; 3:3, 5, 11; 5:19, 24-25; 6:26, 32, 47, 53; 8:34, 51, 58; 10:1, 7; 12:24; 13:16, 20-21, 38; 14:12; 16:20, 23; 21:18, and to indicate the conclusion of his gospel at 21:25). Matthew follows this pattern over 30 times (Matt. 5:18, 26; 6:2, 5, 13, 16; 8:10; 10:15, 23, 42; 11:11; 13:17; 16:28; 17:20; 18:3, 13, 18; 19:23, 28; 21:21, 31; 23:36; 24:2, 34, 47; 25:12, 40, 45; 26:13, 21, 34; and to indicate the conclusion of the gospel, at 28:20). "Amen" is only in his gospel on the lips of Jesus prior to his pronouncements, never on the lips of anyone else, then at the end of his gospel it is used to show its conclusion as a literary unit. I suspect he is following the literary device set in place by Mark, who follows the same pattern, using the word to close his gospel, and only elsewhere to highlight this unique authority of Jesus' speech, over a dozen times (Mk. 3:28; 6:11; 8:12; 9:1, 41; 10:15, 29; 11:23; 12:43; 13:30; 14:9, 18, 25, 30; and to indicate the conclusion of the gospel at 16:20). Luke follows suit half a dozen or so times (Lk. 4:24; 12:37; 13:35; 18:17, 29; 21:32; 23:43; and to indicate the conclusion of his gospel at 24:53). None of them use the word in any other way, which would break this pattern. This single passage in Matthew 6:13, if the longer reading were original, would represent Matthew breaking the pattern which he follows everywhere else, which Mark had left him, and which Luke and John so clearly followed. In fact, to put it another way, it would represent Matthew using

the word in a way that is different from every single use of the word (over 100 times) in the entirety of the four gospels. In light of the already dubious nature of the reading rendered from the external evidence, the evidence from intrinsic probability weighs heavily on the side of Matthew originally having written the shorter reading.

Transcriptional Probability

When we come to transcriptional probability, we are asking, “which reading is more likely to have been the product of *scribes*?” Since we have several different readings, we have to not only “select” a reading as the original one, we have to also be able to explain *why* we have different readings, and *where* they each came from. The guiding rule of textual criticism, (for both internal and external evidence), regardless of whether a textual critic prefers the Byzantine text, the Majority text, or a reasoned eclecticism, is to *choose the reading which best explains the rise of the others*. When we can show that one reading, if it were the original one, makes most sense of each of the other variants and how they came about, we can have a good measure of confidence that we have landed at the original reading. If we suggest as original a reading which leaves us deeply puzzled about how all the different variants from that reading could have occurred, we have probably chosen a reading which is not the original, and we should go back to the drawing board. So, let’s walk through the different forms of the passage. Technically, to be thorough, we should start with each different form of the variant, and ask how, if it were original, we could make sense of each of the other forms. The textual apparatuses of the NA28 and UBS5 of course present each form, so that the reader is certain to have access to every possible form that might be the original text. However, that would multiply the size of this paper many times, and there are really only two forms which are typically proposed as the original; the full longer reading of the TR, and the shorter reading of most modern versions. So I will only work through transcriptional probability for those two readings. All of the manuscripts contain the phrases;

καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.
(And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.)

But there are differences between the manuscripts based on whether or not they also include the following phrases, and which of them they do or don’t include;

- (1) ὅτι σοῦ ἐστίν (for yours is)
- (2) ἡ βασιλεία καὶ (the kingdom and)
- (3) ἡ δύναμις καὶ (the power and)
- (4) ἡ δόξα (the glory)
- (5) εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. (into the ages/forever)
- (6) ἀμήν (amen)

The longer reading as original – explaining the variant forms

Lets begin by asking what would have happened if the longer reading were original. How could we explain the rise of each of the variants on the right side of the chart above?

First up is the *Didache*. An author is creating his manual to help churches know how to practice their liturgy, how to handle prophets, determine if they are false or true, how to baptize, how to pray, etc. We are assuming here that the phrase as it occurs in the *Didache* represents a direct quote, and that the longer ending thus is part of their quotation, we will challenge this assumption below, when we consider things from the other angle, but obviously, if the longer ending is original, then their use of it here represents a quote of it. In this scenario, the author of the *Didache* has before him a copy of Matthew, with the longer ending. He copies the text of the gospel. He does a pretty good job. There is one minor variation in the case of a noun in the first part of the prayer, but overall, he gets it pretty right. He manages to copy clauses 1-5 just fine for the most part, except that, strangely, he skips over clause

number #2. And even more puzzling, he skips the final clause #6 (amen). Why? What possible reason could we pose? He mentions kingdom language elsewhere, and has no apparent aversion to the word. He uses the word amen elsewhere and has no reason to skip it. In fact, it makes a much more fitting end to the prayer. Why would he skip these two clauses, and why only these two? It doesn't make much sense. Oh well, we'll move on.

Next we move two Egypt, and travel forward in time a bit. There are two scribes there. One speaks Sahidic and wants a gospel in his language. One speaks Fayyumic and wants the gospel in his language. They thus both set down to make a copy of Matthew's gospel. They do a pretty good job, but the strangest thing happens. They start copying the longer ending, (which they have of course, because it is the original ending). But then, they make the same totally random mistake that the *Didache* author made. They skip clause #2. Hey, maybe they are simply copying the *Didache* instead of the gospel! Only, if they had done that, then they only did it for one paragraph, and they would also have dropped the "amen," which they didn't do. So weird, right?

About the same time, in Syria, a scribe wants to make a translation of Matthew's gospel into Syriac. He does a very good job, through the whole of the Lord's Prayer. He doesn't mess up any of the earlier part of the prayer. But for some weird reason, when he gets to clause #3, he totally skips over that clause. Why? We can think of no good reason. Weird.

Well, forward in time a little bit, and now we fly to Africa. Here, a scribe wants to make a translation of Matthew's gospel into the Old Latin dialect. We call this translation it^k. He does a really good job with this whole section of Matthew. He comes to the ending of the Lord's Prayer, and it's like he all of a sudden forgets how to write copies. I guess it's not like riding a bicycle. He has the TR reading in front of him. He translates clause one, but then, strangely, skips the next 3 words of clause #2 (the kingdom and). Interestingly, he doesn't skip just one of the words, like an accident, but skips all three, so that the grammar still works. Weird. Then, he regains his senses. He copies clause #3 (and the glory) just exactly right. Then, he forgets how to do his job again, so he completely skips clause #4, but again, in a way that makes the grammar work just fine. So weird. It's ok. He gets it back, so he copies clause #5 (for ever and ever) just exactly right. Back on track. Oh, darn it, he lost it again, so he skips over clause #6, almost like it wasn't even there at all! One wonders how on earth he managed to make such a good copy of the rest of the manuscript, since he seems to have trouble here copying more than three or four words in a row. How could this happen? Why? I guess we'll never know.

So, a few years pass, and we jump back to Antioch. There, a scribe is making a translation of Matthew's gospel into Syriac, which we call Sry^p. He doesn't know it, but lots of people are going to love his translation, and it will become an instant New York Times bestseller. He has the longer reading of course, and he copies it all excellently, but then, for some reason, which we just can't figure out, when he gets to the end, he skips over the "amen" at the end of the verse. We can't figure out why. Oh well. Too bad he has condemned Antioch to know only a corrupt form of the text for the next several centuries.

Finally, we come to Chrysostom in the late 4th century. He is preaching, and manages to, in all the precision that comes with the heat of preaching, share the text exactly as Matthew wrote it, with the full ending of the TR. It's a good thing too, because as far as we can tell from history, the incredible precision he has during the fury of preaching is the first time in the first five centuries of Christianity that someone finally didn't make a bunch of mistakes with this part of the Lord's prayer. Of course, every scribe had managed to copy the rest of the prayer relatively well and without error, (there is one other minor variant in the prayer, but mostly everyone got it right), but for some reason no one has been able to do a very good job in the ending of the prayer, and we just can't figure out why. Fortunately, Chrysostom's sermons regularly get written out, and once his sermons start to spread around, the other copyist, for the most part, seem to finally stop making mistakes. And from this point on, like magic, most of the scribes making copies of the text in Greek seem to figure out how to stop making mistakes (with some exceptions). Frankly, if all I had were the data on the right side of the chart, which supports the longer reading, and if I had never seen any witnesses from the left side, all the variant forms would make me

wonder if the longer reading wasn't some kind of unoriginal addition. It is simply incredibly difficult to explain how all these differences came about if each scribe had the longer ending in front of him.

But then there are all those *other* guys. I didn't walk through the left side of the chart yet, because it's easier to do all at once. And it's really quite an oddity. Since we are assuming the longer ending is the original one, we've had a really hard time figuring out why everybody who copies it keeps making so many mistakes. Frankly, we wonder how some of them even managed to keep their jobs as a scribe. That diversity would be hard enough to figure out. And especially troubling is that they keep making mistakes of *omission*, which are really hard to explain without a clear reason. We could explain a single mistake in the ending of the prayer as a random mistake. That happens to every scribe. But we have seen that a lot of scribes seem to make mistakes, all in the same section of the prayer, and it is very difficult to explain why. But then we come to the left side of the chart, and improbability becomes implausibility. Think through the scenario as it would have to have happened. Tatian in the second century is writing a harmony of the gospels, trying to combine them all to create a single full account. He has the longer ending of the TR in front of him. But then, inexplicably, he totally skips over clauses 1-6. So weird, right? What happens next is even crazier. Cyprian and Tertullian set down to write commentaries on the Lord's Prayer. They are both beautiful works, which inspire deep devotion for Christians to this day. Depending on when exactly Cyprian writes his work, he is either in Rome or in Carthage. Tertullian is in Africa. Yet the craziest thing happens. They both are trying to write commentary on each part of the prayer, and yet, strangely, when they get to the longer ending, they both make *exactly* the same mistake, and skip over the entire doxology at the end. This simply doesn't make sense. They are professing to write on the whole prayer. How could they make a mistake like that? How could they make exactly the same mistake that Tatian made, in exactly the same way? As if that wasn't strange enough, over in Alexandria, a little later in the century, Origen is also writing a commentary. And yet, strangely enough, he makes exactly the same mistake. This doesn't make sense at all!

Then, factor in something even crazier – 8 pastors in Jerusalem, Milan, Rome, Alexandria, Africa, and elsewhere, all make exactly the same mistake when they quote the Lord's prayer – they all accidentally make an omission from the text, and strangely, they all make exactly the same omission, in places all over the then known world. They all accidentally skip over the doxology at the end of the prayer. This is all the more odd when one considers the great love that they have for doxologies all through their writings. Frankly, even a single omission of the longer ending would be hard to explain if the longer reading were original. There probably wasn't a Christian alive in the first 5 centuries that wouldn't have loved to have had their Bible contain such a beautiful text, with such powerful devotional content. How could they all make exactly the same mistake here, and omit part of the text which is setting right in front of them? It's almost as if the doxology wasn't even there.

As if that wasn't odd enough, we then look over the shoulders of several different translators who are producing translations of Matthew's gospel in the 4th and 5th century, in Italy and Egypt (*it^a*; *cop^{meg}*; *it^b*; *it^h*; *vg*). A translator usually tried not to accidentally skip over big chunks of the text he is translating, and in fact, would probably be fired if he made such mistakes often. Yet strangely, every single one of these translators makes exactly the same mistake. They have the doxology in front of them (since it is clearly original), and yet strangely, they all accidentally omit it. Then, we look over the shoulders of 4 different scribes who are making copies of the Greek NT (01, 03, 05, 0170), attempting to carefully create a second copy of the original before them. Since these are the only 4 early scribes we have access to in this passage, we could say that we are looking over the shoulders of every singly scribe that we know of in the first 4 centuries. Oddly enough, all four of them make exactly the same mistake at exactly this same passage, and skip over the whole doxology. At this point, I almost think I can hear the tune to "The Twilight Zone" playing in the background, and Rod Sterling's voice saying, "You're traveling through another dimension, a dimension not only of sight and sound but of mind. A journey into a wondrous land whose boundaries are that of imagination. That's the signpost up ahead - your next stop, the Twilight Zone!" Surely such a crazy scenario is more reminiscent of the Twilight Zone than of anything approaching real life.

The Shorter Reading As Original – Explaining The Variants

Trying to make sense of the longer reading as the original one leaves us absolutely befuddled when we examine the early variants. But what if we switch things around? What if we assume that the *shorter* reading is the original one, and then try to see if we can explain the rise of the variant forms? Maybe we can come up with another scenario that doesn't depend on probabilities that seem less likely than me winning the lottery.

The Didache

Our first variant comes with the *Didache*. But we need to understand what the *Didache* is. It is a sort of "Manual for Church Order." Some would date it very early (some even put it into the first century, but I think that highly dubious). But most would say that its present form took shape in the beginning of the second century. The quote of the Lord's Prayer comes in chapter 8. I count 4 (relatively minor) differences between the earlier parts of the prayer in the *Didache* and the Matthew version in the TR, but it is certainly closer to the Matthean form than the Lukan, and so is legitimately dependent upon Matthew (as most any textual apparatus notes – I'm not convinced that the *Didache* author had access to Luke at all – he may have, but most of the time he seems to use Matthew). Before I give you the quote of the Lord's Prayer though, let's examine briefly how the *Didache* handles Scripture, so we have a good running context to get us into its use of the prayer. The *Didache* opens with the statement, "There are two ways, one of life, and one of death, and there is a great difference between these two ways. Now this is the way of life: first, thou shalt love God, who madest thee. Second, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: but whatever ye would that would happen to you, do not thou to another." (did. 1:1-3). There are clear references to instructions of Jesus (like the golden rule), but note how seamlessly the author(s) reword Jesus' statements, and mix and mesh them with material from the OT. They have taken material from Jesus' instructions (eg., Matt. 22:37-39, etc.) reworded it, and meshed it together with OT material reminiscent of Deut. 30 to form instruction for believers of their day. The whole rest of chapter one contains a similar use of NT material, meshed with OT material. This continues in chapter 2. "The second commandment of the teaching is: thou shalt not murder; thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not corrupt children; thou shalt not be sexually immoral; thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not practice magic; thou shalt not engage in sorcery; thou shalt not abort a child or commit infanticide..." and on and on it goes. It clearly relies on OT texts, and mixes and meshes material freely from the texts which its author(s) know. Feel free to read through the next several chapters on your own, and note how they do this repeatedly, referencing statements from Jesus (for example, "bless those who curse you... pray for your enemies... For what profit is it if ye love those who love you? Do not even the Gentiles the same... turn the other cheek...if someone compels thee to go with him a mile, go with him twain... if someone take thy cloak, give him thy tunic also..." etc.), but adding to them, expanding them, and occasionally meshing them together with OT material.

To jump ahead a little, note how they handle the Great commission in chapter 7, "Now about baptism, baptize as follows: after thou hast reviewed all these things, baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost in running water. But if thou hast no running water, then baptize in some other water; and if thou art not able to baptize in cold water, then thou mayest do so in warm. But if thou hast neither, then pour water upon the head thrice in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. And before the baptism let him who baptizeth and him who is baptized fast, as well as they who are able. Furthermore, instruct thou him who is baptized to fast for several days aforetime." (did. 7:1-4). Did you see how they borrowed the Trinitarian formula directly from Matthew's version of the Great Commission in Matt. 28? But then what did they do to it? They added to it expansion, explanation, and instruction. (And please, let's set aside for now what I think were their innocent but misguided instructions about effusion as a form of baptism – that's a whole other FB page!). Then follows similar instruction in chapter 8 about fasting and prayer. Since that is the text we are looking directly at, we'll come back to it last. How about chapter 9? Note how they take the simple institution of communion

and add to it, and watch especially for how often they add doxology to the prayers, “Now about the Lord’s table, give thy thanks as follows. First, about the cup: Our Father, we give thanks, for the holy vine of David thy servant, which thou hast made known unto us through Jesus thine servant; *for thine is the glory forever*. And concerning the broken bread, Our Father, we give thanks, for the life and knowledge that thou hast made known unto us through Jesus, thy servant; *thine is the glory forever*. As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains and then was scattered together and hath become one, so thy church may be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom; *for thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ forever*. But let no man eat or drink of thy communion but those who have been baptized into the name of the Lord, for the Lord hath also spoken concerning this; give not that which is holy to the dogs.” (did. 9:1-5). Several salient points should be noted from chapter nine. Note how they again take the material from the NT and expand it, add to it, and turn it into instruction for the church. But more importantly, note how they add a doxology to the end of each of the prayers. This was apparently the common way to end a prayer at the time. In fact, *the Didache adds a doxology to the end of every single prayer which it contains*. Is it any surprise then when we come to chapter 8 that it reads, “When you fast, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are. For they fast on Monday and Thursday, so thou must fast on Wednesday and Friday. Nor shouldst thou pray like the hypocrites do. But after this manner therefore pray ye, as the Lord commandeth in his gospel, Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed by thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. And give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one. *For thine is the power and the glory forever*. Pray like this three times a day.” (did. 8:1-3). They have the shorter ending in front of them, but they do the same thing with it that they do with every single prayer which they list in their entire work – *they add a doxology to the end of it*. They mix and mesh material from the OT often, (note for example, did. 1:2; 2:2-3; 3:7; 4:13; etc.), so it is very possible that they are adding this particular doxology from OT material. I Chron. 29:11-13 has been suggested as an OT source, “Thine, O LORD, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O LORD, and thou art exalted as head above all. ¹² Both riches and honour come of thee, and thou reignest over all; and in thine hand is power and might; and in thine hand it is to make great, and to give strength unto all. ¹³ Now therefore, our God, we thank thee, and praise thy glorious name.” It is certainly possible that they are doing the same kind of mix-and-match meshing of an OT text with the words of Jesus here. Even if they are not, it seems almost undeniable that they are following their common practice of adding a doxology here, whatever it’s source may have been. How could we expect them to do anything else than what they do everywhere else? If the shorter ending is original, their addition to it makes perfect sense, and is completely consistent with their normal handling of Scripture (and especially prayers) all throughout their work.

The Apostolic Constitutions

Then comes the Apostolic Constitutions, from the 3rd century. The Apostolic Constitutions is a compilation of works originally written by different authors. While most of the work is from the 7th -8th centuries, book 7 is from much earlier, and is our concern here. Book seven is very similar in structure and content to the *Didache*, and is likewise a sort of manual for church order. Although, it likewise often mixes and meshes OT material with words of Jesus. It also commonly (though not in every case) adds doxologies to the end of its prayers. However, in book 7 of the Apostolic Constitutions, there is a regular concern for and use of “kingdom” language. (I count over a dozen uses of such language in book seven). It seems to especially love language like “thy kingdom” in chapter 25, and “whose kingdom is forever” in chapter 35. Thus, we can easily see its expansion of the Lord’s Prayer. The use of the prayer comes in chapter 24, which reads,

“Now, when ye pray, be not as the hypocrites are; but as the Lord hath appointed us in the Gospel, so pray: Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth; give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors;

and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; *for thine is the kingdom for ever. Amen.* Pray thus thrice in a day, preparing yourselves beforehand, that you may be worthy of the adoption of the Father; lest, when you call Him Father unworthily, you be reproached by Him, as Israel once His first-begotten son was told: If I be a Father, where is my glory? And if I be a Lord, where is my fear? For the glory of fathers is the holiness of their children, and the honour of masters is the fear of their servants, as the contrary is dishonour and confusion. For saith He: Through thee is my name blasphemed among the Gentiles.”

Notice how, though they have the shorter reading before them, (since we are assuming it as original in this scenario), just as they so often do, they add an expansion and doxology to the end of the prayer. However, since they have a greater concern for kingdom theology, their expansion uses kingdom language. In fact, it could very well still be dependent upon I Chron. 29:11-13 again, just using different parts of the passage for the “mixing and the meshing” here.

Take careful note of what happens here. In at least two very early works, the *Didache* and the *Apostolic Constitutions*, we find that the common tradition of expanding prayer with doxology has the same impact upon the Lord’s Prayer that it does in most of the other prayers in both works. And it gives us a “glimpse through the window” so to speak into Christian worship and use of the prayer in the first several centuries. It had been common in Jewish devotion to pray three times in a day (e.g., Dan. 6:10). Christianity began as a sect within Judaism, and likely for the most devout, a thrice daily prayer remained as a vestige of that devotion. But they now prayed the prayer which Jesus had instructed them to pray. (McKnight’s “The Jesus Creed” traces some of this development and its practical and devotional implications as I recall.) Yet it is evident that they prayed it in the expanded forms affected by the common doxological practices. We could easily find another document from the first centuries of the church that has the prayer with a different ending. It became the common way to pray. Eventually, it became not only the way that pietistic Christians prayed; it became the way the prayer was recited in the churches, during Sunday worship. This practice of worship in the Church is known as “liturgy.” There were apparently several different forms of the liturgy floating around in the churches for the first several centuries, and they easily explain every single one of the variant forms of the Lord’s Prayer that we find in the Greek manuscripts, the ancient versions, and the church fathers. Around the 5th and 6th centuries, one particular form of the liturgy began to dominate (the form which, interestingly enough, exactly resembles the TR form of the prayer). Some have attributed that form to Chrysostom. I don’t know if we can say that for sure, but either way, most of the manuscripts from that time forward have it in that form. The Greek manuscripts then begin to sort of stabilize, and reflect more and more conformity to each other. This mistake of addition influenced by the common liturgy is one that could be made anywhere, at any time, by many different scribes, over and over and over again. In fact, we don’t even need to go in detail through each of the rest of the witnesses, (which would make this paper much longer), because we can tell exactly what they will do after the 3rd century. And what we predict is exactly what we find. We could continue to find more witnesses to put on the right side of the chart someday. In fact, we could double the amount of every supporting witness on the right side of the chart, and it would only make the conclusion that the longer reading was not original even more likely.

In addition, I might note that if one were to suggest that in some way the left side of the chart were the result of liturgical influence, and claim that the liturgy commonly didn’t have the people say the ending of the Lord’s prayer, they could then suggest that every witness who has the shorter reading has it only has it under the influence of the liturgy (Burgon made this suggestion for example). But if that were true, think what the evidence would have to show. If the shorter reading was the result of liturgical influence, then we would only find the longer ending in one form – the original one. Every liturgically motivated ending would result in the omission of the doxology altogether. Every other scribe would reproduce the original. Thus, there would be only two kinds of manuscripts – those that have the longer ending exactly in the TR form, and those that don’t have it at all. But the diversity of witnesses on the right side of the chart shows that such a scenario is utterly impossible. It is simply not allowed by the data itself.

Think through it. If the shorter ending were original, then scribes would come to the text in Matthew, ending at “and deliver us from evil.” But they would know the prayer well from reciting it in church every single week. The more devout would know the prayer well from reciting it three times a day. And it would seem to them like whoever wrote the manuscript from which they were copying had accidentally left something out. It would then be perfectly natural for many of them to add the longer ending, according to the liturgy which they were familiar with. However, since there were a variety of different forms of the liturgy floating around in the first several centuries, and since they are adding from their memory of the liturgy, rather than from a written text, they would add it in a variety of different forms. Some scribes would be familiar with more than one form of the liturgy, and so they might combine two forms into one longer form. For example, anyone who knew the liturgy as found in the *Didache* and that found in the *Apostolic Constitutions* could easily combine them into the longer form found in the TR. And there were plenty of other forms. Some would not have “the kingdom,” while some would. Some would not have “the glory” while some would. Some would not have “the power” while some would. Some would not have the “amen” while some would, and on and on it goes. If the shorter ending is original, then the great diversity of forms in which the longer ending is found in the manuscript tradition makes perfect sense. In fact, if the shorter ending were original, we would then expect to find two different kinds of manuscripts; first, we would expect to find those that do not have any form of the longer ending, because they are preserving the original reading carefully. This is exactly what we find in *every single witness on the left side of the chart*. While it seems almost impossible to explain the left side of the chart if the longer ending is original, it is *exactly* what we would expect to find if the shorter reading was original.

But if the shorter reading is original, we would expect to find another kind of witness as well; we would expect to find manuscripts, which contain the longer ending, but we would expect to find it in a variety of different forms, since it is being provided by liturgical influence. And guess what, this is exactly what we find in *every single witness on the right side of the chart*! In fact, we find the longer ending in over 20 different forms, including not only those we have spelled out, but also a few others that come in the hundred or so manuscripts from the 10th century which we didn’t examine in detail, which have the longer ending in forms verbally different from the TR. When we examine the external evidence through the lens of transcriptional probability, starting with the assumption that the longer ending is original, we are left feeling like we are in the Twilight Zone, and nothing makes any sense. But when we examine the external evidence through the lens of transcriptional probability, starting with the assumption that the shorter reading is original, we can make perfect sense of every single piece of the external data. In fact, a good textual critic would be able to predict the variants as we find them, before you even showed him all of the data. If you showed most experienced textual critics the data just from the Greek manuscripts in the first 4 centuries and the *Didache*, they would predict the many different forms of the variant, before they even saw them, because they each make such perfect sense, and they could guess exactly what many scribes would do with the text.

But perhaps someone says, “Yeah, but what about the fact that you have so many manuscripts that do have the TR reading. Sure they are late, but shouldn’t we just look at the numbers to figure out which one is original?” I would say, no, we should in fact do much more than simply count noses. It is about more than just simple numbers. We do have to actually use our brains for a few minutes. A single manuscript from a few centuries after the autograph is simply much more likely to be like the autograph than multiple manuscripts from almost a full millennium after the autographs. This is basic common sense, which seems to be all too often ignored. The fact that at a later time, when Greek manuscripts began to be copied in more abundance, many (but not all) of them have the same form of the reading is actually exactly what we would expect to find. This is natural, for a really obvious reason – the scribes copying the many Byzantine manuscripts didn’t all have access to an original autograph, and the fact that they make lots of copies of what they have doesn’t make what they have any more likely to be original. Maybe some of them did have a manuscript copied from an autograph, or something from around that time, but certainly most of them did not. Thus, they mostly made multiple copies of the same form of the text,

which had already been obviously influenced by the common liturgy. This is part of why textual critics say that witnesses must be weighed, not counted.

For example, I could hand write an addition to the TR, and then go out and make 10,000 copies of my new expanded form. However, the fact that someone could now find 10,000 copies of *my* version of the text doesn't mean that my version is more likely original! If they did some good historical work to discover that the form of the text I had copied didn't exist until I produced it, then they could easily explain that what I had created as a "majority" reading actually had zero chance of being original. It would be a majority reading, but it is so late (2000 years after the original!) that multiple copies at that stage have a text-critical weight of "zero." (Actually, any manuscripts copied after the first Greek New Testament was printed have a text-critical weight of zero, since they could easily be reproductions of a now widespread printed text.) This is why witnesses must be weighed, not just counted. But say you do want to count, and pretend you don't have to use your brain at all. *What* do you count? *Where?* *When?* It all depends on what century you count in, in what part of the world, in what language. Count in Latin and there are almost 7 times more manuscripts with the shorter reading than the longer one. Count in Greek in centuries previous to the 6th, and the TR reading isn't a majority. Count in any place but Byzantium, and the TR form is never a majority. Counting noses to determine what reading is original doesn't make good sense to me. There are scholars who essentially do that (of both the Byzantine priority, and Majority Text flavor). But understand well that if that is your procedure, you must now be consistent with it. If you choose to never use your brain, and only count noses, with no consideration given to when a witness is written, where, or in what language, then you are now committed to that procedure. Thus, anytime that the majority of Greek manuscripts, from any century, disagrees with the TR, you must blindly and slavishly follow the majority, and correct the TR. This would result in around 1800 changes to the TR, including several of the texts which most KJV only folks consider most precious.

Summary of Internal Evidence

Internal evidence seeks to look at the data from actual physical materials (the external evidence) and to think through which reading would be more likely to be the original one. The guiding principle is, *accept as original the reading which best explains the rise of the others*. We have considered two different aspects of the internal evidence: intrinsic probability (what reading Matthew was more likely to have produced), and transcriptional probability (what reading a scribe was more likely to have produced). Our examination of intrinsic probability has shown that it is very unlikely that Matthew could have written the longer ending in the TR form. Our examination of transcriptional probability has shown that it is extremely unlikely that the longer ending could have been the original one. If it is, we can't really make any sense of the external data. It also has shown that if the shorter ending is the original one, then every single piece of the external data falls neatly into place. Thus, the internal data from intrinsic probability, and the internal data from transcriptional probability, are both very strongly on the side of the shorter ending being the original one.

Combining External and Internal Evidence

Sometimes when we look at the external and internal data, they seem to go in opposite directions, and a decision about the original reading can be really difficult. In other cases, like this one, the external and internal data all point quite clearly in the same direction. If the only external evidence I had was the data on the right side of the chart, and I had never seen any of the data on the left hand side, I would have serious questions about whether the longer ending were original. The great variety of different forms it is found in is like a giant red flag waving and saying, "Hey, something doesn't make sense here." If the only external data I had was the data on the left side of the chart, I would conclude that the shorter reading was the original one (obviously, since that is what they consistently have). Combine the two together, and

the external evidence speaks rather clearly against the longer reading. But then, add in the data from intrinsic and transcriptional probability, and you have a three-fold chord that is very hard to break. The combination of external and internal data weighs in very strongly against the longer ending being the original one. This is why, in the UBS5, they provide the shorter reading in the text, and they give their decision a grade of “A,” meaning that they are very confident that the shorter reading in the text is the original one. However, there is a textual variant here. Since all of the manuscripts do not agree here, we cannot be 100% certain, even with the data that we have. That is why they include in the apparatus each of the textual variants, and list the witnesses for each. They are acknowledging that while we can be rather confident, we cannot be 100% sure. Thus, they note the variant. I would take exactly the same position here. I am rather confident that the TR reading was not originally written by Matthew. But I am not absolutely certain, because there is a textual variant here. Thus, I would want to put the shorter ending in the text, but provide a marginal note explaining that there is a textual variant here.

Looking Through the Greek Texts

Complutensian Polyglot, 1514 –

The very first Greek New Testament to come off the printing press was the Complutensian Polyglot, printed in 1514. However, for a variety of political reasons, it was not published until several years later, in 1520. So how does the very first printed Greek text handle the variant here, over 100 years before the KJV was translated? The polyglot has the shorter reading in the text. However, it includes a long note in the left hand margin of the Greek text which explains that some Greek manuscripts have a longer reading here, and explains why its editor doesn't think the longer is original. Scrivener believes the KJV translators had the polyglot before them as a source. I'm not sure that they did, and my opinion isn't formed on that issue yet, but if they did, they had a text before them that didn't have the longer ending, and a few texts that did have it, and so they made a choice about which to follow. See the polyglot text and note at,

http://www.cspmt.org/pdf/printed_editions/Complutensian%20Polyglot%201520.pdf

Erasmus, 1516

(view at <http://www.csntm.org/printedbook/viewbook/ErasmusNovumInstrumentum>)

In Erasmus' first edition, he includes the longer reading in the actual text. (*Novum Instrumentum*, pg 11., 1516). But in the “annotations” at the back, he notes the variant. (*Annotationes*, 1516, pg. 250). He explains that some “Greek copies have added this ending” and provides what he sees as an example of scribal doxological addition in the *Benedictus*, then suggests that the same thing could likely have happened here, and the longer reading could very likely be an addition from the common prayer, “stitched together” by later scribes. He ends quoting Jerome's words that when something becomes part of regular prayer, (i.e., the longer ending if incorporated from the liturgy), it has a way of sealing it, which explains the later manuscripts. Interestingly, this is exactly what textual critics typically claim today to have been the case. This “pre-1611 textual critic,” which is producing the text the 1611 will translate, is providing exactly the rationale that will cause modern translations not to include the longer reading. His text is the result of this textual criticism. He makes a textual decision, which produces what the KJV translates, but he notes in his annotation that he is not certain about his choice. He of course makes that decision with much less evidence available to him that we have available to us today. What evidence did he have? Most scholars think that for the gospels he had miniscule 1, 2, 817, and 69. For his second edition, he also had access to miniscule 3. Several of these are viewable at the INTF VMR. Thus, one can see that miniscule 1 does not have the longer ending

(<http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/community/modules/papyri/?zoom=20&left=5&top=-617&site=INTF&image=30001/10158/3410/10/2721>). But Miniscule 2 does (<http://ntvmr.uni->

muenster.de/community/modules/papyri/?zoom=20&left=5&top=-114&site=INTF&image=30002/10158/310/10/242). None of his manuscripts were earlier than the 10th

century (or we would probably have printed the shorter ending. But of the five he had, 4 had the longer ending, and one had the shorter ending. So he made a textual critical decision to include the longer reading in the text, but explain the shorter reading in the note.

However, one should note that in his 1522 and 1527 editions, while Erasmus still includes the longer ending, he greatly expands the note in his annotations. He explains in his longer note that yes, Chrysostom does have the longer ending, but that he has likely added it from "*quod solennis usus ecclesiae quotidie sonaba*" the regular use of the daily prayer. He still includes the longer ending in the text, out of deference to tradition, but now, in his Latin column, he prints the ending in a smaller font, to note that it is not original. In fact, his 1522 edition of the annotations (which is what the KJV translators lean on, either directly, or through Tyndale), he prints now as the heading beside the annotation, "*The addition of a Sunday prayer in the Greek copies,*" beside the longer ending, noting for the reader that he did not think that Matthew wrote the text with the longer reading. (*Novum Instrumentum*, pg 11., 1522.) And note in "*Annotaciones*" 1522, pg. 31-32). When Tyndale translated his English NT, and had this note, he decided to follow the text in the column, and chose not to translate the text as it was explained in the margin. The KJV translators apparently made the same choice, deciding to follow what was in the text instead of what was in the margin. I guess we could say their choice was surely infallible, if they were inspired in their choice. I personally don't believe they were inspired, and I think Erasmus was rather brilliant in his comment in his annotations. If he would have been more bold, and printed the shorter reading in the text, which he clearly later thought belonged there, the KJV would almost certainly have the shorter reading in Matthew 6:13.

Stephanus, 1550

(view at <http://www.csntm.org/printedbook/viewbook/RobertusStephanusNovumTestamentum1550>)

Stephanus includes the longer ending in his text, (*Novum Testamentum*, 1550, pg. 9), but includes sigla in the margin that I think note that some manuscripts have the variant here (I am still trying to figure out some of his note, and what all the abbreviations mean). He also writes, "Εκκλησιασι κοδ κη. Α" in the margin. I am still trying to figure out what his abbreviations mean and what he is referring to here.

Beza, 1598

(view at <http://www.csntm.org/printedbook/viewbook/TestamentumNovum>)

Beza follows Erasmus and prints the longer reading in the text (*Novum Testamentum* pg. 31), but notes below the text that he thinks that the longer ending has "Slipped into the context," and he is not sure if it is original because it "is left out of some Greek manuscripts," he further notes that the longer ending "is not in Cyprian, Augustine and Chrysostom," even where, as he explains, they profess to comment upon the entire prayer (*etiam vbi ex professo totam hanc precationem, interpretantur*). But he has nonetheless included it in the text, even though he thinks it likely not original, noting that it is found in many Greek copies. He chose to follow common tradition, and the KJV translators choose to follow the text, rather than his marginal note. I suppose one could say that the KJV translators were inspired in their choice, when they had to decide whether to follow the text in the column, or the text in the note below it. I happen to think they were not inspired.

Mill, 1707

John Mill prints the longer ending in the text,

(http://images.csntm.org/PublishedWorks/JohnMillNovumTestamentum1707/Mill_NovumTestamentum_1707_0007b.jpg)

but has a footnote explaining the variant, and listing support for the shorter reading from Jerome, Augustine, Tertullian, etc.

Tischendorf in 1831

Prints the shorter reading, but notes the variant.

Tregellas in 1859

Prints the shorter reading, but notes the variant.

Von Sodon (printing date?)

Prints the shorter reading, but notes the variant.

Wescott and Hort, 1881

And of course, Hort and Wescott, in 1881, following the lead of the scholars since Erasmus, (100 years prior to the KJV), who had thought the shorter reading original, print the shorter reading, but note the variant under their “Notes on Selected Readings.”

Scrivener, 1881

Scrivener, in 1881, since he is seeking to reproduce the text behind the KJV, prints the longer reading, but notes the variant in all three of his major editions. Only someone using an abbreviated form of the TR like the TBS reprint (which doesn’t reprint his preface, or text-critical notes – see the longer explanation in the comments on Matt. 5:44) would not realize that there was doubt about which reading was original, and might then presume that they could be certain that the longer reading is what Matthew wrote.

NA28

Has the longer reading, but notes each of the variant forms of the text in the apparatus, and provides extensive evidence for each.

UBS 5

Has the shorter reading in the text, but notes the variant forms in the apparatus, and provides extensive manuscript, versional, and patristic support for each.

The history of Printed Greek New Testaments begins in 1514 with printing the shorter reading. Which reading has the longest history? If referencing the printed Greek New Testaments, the shorter one does. If referencing Greek manuscripts, instead of printed texts, then as our chart above shows, the most ancient witnesses all have the shorter ending. Or perhaps one actually means, which one was most used the longest by the most Christians? In that case, the Latin Vulgate’s translation of the shorter reading would win out. But more importantly, in almost every single printed edition of the Greek Text, including the ones from which the KJV was translated, because there is some doubt about which reading is original, they include a note to present the variant. So, whichever side of the fence you come down on about which reading is original, the undisputed “historical” thing to do is to explain in the margin that there is a variant, and that you are not 100% certain which of the readings is the original one. I want to stand in that deep, long, rich historical tradition, which begins over a century before the KJV, and continues right on into the present.

English Translations

Tyndale translates the longer reading, apparently without comment. The 1611 of course translates the longer reading. Why? They almost certainly had Beza and his note before them. Likewise they probably had Stephanus and his note. They probably had Erasmus and his note as well. They may even have had the Polyglot, which printed the shorter reading, and provided a note. Thus, they had to look at the “Pre-KJV textual criticism” (to use an odd term someone on this page coined recently), which had

created the Greek texts that they used, and they had to make a choice about which reading to translate. They chose to translate the longer reading. Why anyone would fathom that their choice must represent the infallible and unquestionable will of the Divine is beyond me (unless of course one believes they were inspired by God). I think they happened to be wrong in their choice. At the very least, I think they should have provided a marginal note explaining the variant. But that was simply not their purpose, and they had to fight hard enough for the marginal notes which they did include, and had they noted every single place where there was some doubt, their translation would have become a massive multivolume work (which might have ended up looking more like Beza's text, where there is typically more marginal note than there is text). For the most part they left such details to the scholars who produced the texts that they used, and simply made a decision and translated it. Of course, they could never have foreseen that someone would come along some day and claim that their choice was infallible. They would no doubt be appalled at such a sentiment.

Today, the NKJV has the longer ending, but notes the variant, and as promised in their preface, there is no language about which is "better." They simply note that "NU-Text omits *For Yours* through *Amen*." The NASB prints the longer reading in the text (*italicized*), but notes the variant in a footnote. The HCSB prints the longer reading in the text, but brackets it and explains in the footnote that it likely is not original. The ESV prints the shorter reading, but notes the variant in a footnote. The NET Bible has the shorter reading in the text, but notes the longer reading in its textual note, and provides evidence for both. The NIV prints the shorter reading in the text, but notes the variant in a footnote. These translations, and many like them, are simply continuing the tradition that began with the polyglot almost 100 hundred years prior to the KJV, and was continued by Erasmus when he produced the text that would essentially stand behind the KJV. He chose one of the readings, and then noted in a marginal note that there is some doubt about the variant. Almost all printed Greek text and modern translations stand in that same tradition. The only text and translations which really stand outside that tradition would be a post-humus reprint of Scrivener which didn't include his marginal notes, or a KJV that didn't choose to clutter their margin with textual notes, since they would likely have assumed that people would continue to make use of the standard tools that had been around for a hundred years that would explain that there is some doubt in this passage about what Matthew originally wrote.

Conclusion

We have covered a lot of ground. We first examined the external evidence itself, and placed it into a chart for convenience. We explained that the data from the external evidence is not uniform, and does provide us with a textual variant. There are over 100 Greek manuscripts that do not have the reading as it is found in the KJV/TR. There are also over 1400 or so manuscripts that do. However, both of these large groups of Greek Manuscripts come from very late in history (almost a full millennium after the writing of the originals). When we consider the early evidence, which naturally carries greater weight in determining the original reading, we find that not a single Greek Manuscript prior to the 6th century has the TR reading. All of the Greek manuscripts before that time have the shorter reading. Further, we noted that from the first five centuries, among 8 different patristic writers, from places all over the world, and three different patristic commentators, on multiple continents, and 4 different ancient translators, again, in a variety of locales, totaling several hundred manuscripts, in multiple different languages, in multiple places, the TR/KJV reading could not be found anywhere except in the printed sermon(s) of a single preacher. At the very least, one must say that the early external evidence does not lend a strong and decided vote in favor of the KJV/TR reading. Then, we turned to the internal evidence. An examination of intrinsic probability (what Matthew is likely to have written) has shown that if Matthew wrote the longer ending, he is not only abandoning his clear usage of a literary device intending to support the unique authority of Jesus, he is also running contrary to the same clear usage of that literary device in every single usage of that language in all four of our gospels (over 100 occurrences, if counting in Scrivener's TR). This seems highly unlikely. Then, we examined transcriptional probability. An examination of

transcriptional probability (what the scribes are most likely to have written) has shown that it is almost impossible (and at the very least, incredibly statistically unlikely) that the scribes had before them the longer ending found in the TR. If we assume the longer ending of the TR to be original, we simply can't make any sense of the external data. However, if we assume the shorter ending to have been the original one, and understand the variants on the right side of the chart to be liturgically motivated (an almost inescapable conclusion, even if the only evidence we had was the *Didache*, let alone the later data), then every single piece of the external data falls neatly into place, and we can describe exactly what happened, and why some manuscripts have the longer reading, in a great variety of forms. Thus, the external data, the internal data from intrinsic probability, and the internal data from transcriptional probability, all clearly support the shorter reading as being the original one.

Further, we examined the printed Greek texts to see how it was that the longer ending came to be in the KJV. As it turned out, every single one of the printed Greek texts that came prior to the KJV exercised the process of textual criticism to decide whether to print the longer reading or the shorter reading. (I guess this is what some have called 'pre-KJV textual criticism,' but then, I am still really fuzzy on what precisely is being set forth as the difference between those two things.) Every single printed Greek after them did the same. In fact, the first printed Greek text (1514) chose to print the shorter reading (thus, the reading with the greatest history behind it is the shorter reading). Erasmus in 1516 had 1 manuscript that had the shorter reading, and a few that had the longer reading. So he chose (there's that 'pre-KJV textual criticism' again) to put the longer reading in the text. But he had serious doubts about whether it was original, so he provided a long note in his annotations explaining some of the patristic support for the shorter reading. In his later editions, while he still included the longer reading, he printed it in smaller font to note that he didn't think it original. Of course, Beza has an even more extensive note. Others, like Tischendorf, Tregellas, and Von Sodon, (all prior to 1881), all print the shorter reading in the text, but note the variant in the margin. One is almost tempted to suggest that works such as the HCSB, or the NASB might actually be more closely following the Erasmian 'pre-KJV' lead by including the longer reading in the text, with brackets around it or in italics. Or that modern versions which put the longer reading in a footnote are likewise standing in a tradition which goes back almost a century before the KJV. Modern printed texts like the NA28 and the UBS5 of course stand in that long 'pre-KJV' lineage by choosing a reading (in this case, the shorter one) to put in the text, but then including a footnote in their apparatus that presents the actual external data, so that the reader is certain to have the text as Matthew wrote it, either in the text, or in the footnote. Seems like good, honest, careful scholarship to me. My conclusion is that Mathew most likely did not write the longer ending found in the KJV. However, there is a textual variant, and so we can't be 100% sure, so I would want the variant to be noted for me in a marginal note. It really doesn't matter to me which one you put in the text, and which one you put in the margin, but I would definitely want to know about both when I am reading my Bible. And I suppose that almost anyone, reading almost any Greek NT (except for the abbreviated edition of Scrivener), and almost anyone, reading from most modern English translations, would have exactly that information right at their fingertips. The only ones who wouldn't, and who might then face the very likely possibility of thinking that Matthew wrote something here that he probably didn't, would be someone using the abbreviated version of Scrivener's TR, or the KJV. Of course they would still be just fine, and wouldn't likely assume that what they are reading was exactly what Matthew wrote without error. So I guess really, the only ones who might have a chance of "getting it wrong" would be anyone who chooses to put an "O" or "Only" at the end of either Scrivener's TR or the KJV. That is the only position which has a chance of getting it wrong, and I happen to think that they probably would get it wrong at Matt. 6:13.