

A Short Ending of Matthew

In George Howard's Shem Tob passage of Matthew 28:19¹ he only has two Hebrew words: לכו אתם, which he translates as simply "Go." Actually it should be "Go to them." Verse 20 carries on with "and (teach)² them to carry out all the things which I have commanded you forever." While the Authorized (King James) Version has: Mt 28:19 Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: 20 Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen.

Why the difference? Which one is most likely the correct one? Here are some web sites with much evidence that backs up the "Go to them" reading rather than the longer Trinitarian or Triune reading which makes out that each of the three members has the same name: <http://www.apostolic.net/biblicalstudies/matt2819-willis.htm> which is on "A Collection of Evidence Against the Traditional Wording of Matthew 28:19 by Clinton D. Willis (Cwillis@ipa.net)" and http://www.godglorified.com/matthew_2819.htm which is on an "Analysis of Matthew 28:19 in A study of the Text of the New Testament" by Randall Duane Hughes.

This last author points out that there are no Greek or any other language manuscripts before the fourth century or for 300 years after Matthew wrote his gospel that includes any of Matthew's Gospel past 26:52. Why is that? Could all the ones that had that portion have omitted the Trinitarian formula and so they were destroyed. Could they have all been very similar to the Shem Tob copy?

Conybeare noticed that Eusebius of Caesarea in seventeen (17) places "in his works prior to Nicea, . . . quotes Matthew 28:19 as "Go and make disciples of all nations in my name" without mentioning the Trinity baptism command." (R. D. Hughes' above site).

This is another good site: <http://jesus-messiah.com/apologetics/catholic/matthew2819.html>, which has comments from an A. Ploughman, who is now deceased. It is called "A Collection of the evidence for and against the traditional wording of the baptismal phrase in Matthew 28:19."

This next site by Clarke Wildeman (clwideman@yahoo.com) <http://jesus-messiah.com/html/evr-last-gosp.htm> includes seven citations of Eusebius discussing the words of Jesus, similar to Shem Tob's copy. Another good site is <http://www.focus-search.com/shc/matt2819.html> by Mark Kennicott (mrmrk008@aol.com), http://www.lightbearer.org/archives/2004/04/the_authentic_m.html, and <http://jesus-messiah.com/apologetics/catholic/matthew-proof.html> by Dr. G. Reckart, of the Apostolic Theological Bible College.

There is also the book, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt edited, with English Translations* by E. A. Wallis Budge, M. A., Litt.D., which is Volume V

¹ George Howard, *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew* (Macon, Georgia, U. S. A., Mercer University Press, 2002).

² The (teach), just means this word was missing in one manuscript but was there in another manuscript of the nine that he used for his book.

of a set of books called *Coptic Texts* (reprint of a 1915 edition). In the *Discourse on Mary Theotokos* by Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem (lived from about A. D. 315 to 386) he convinced a poor holy and conscientious monk by the name of Annarikhus that he was wrong on a point of doctrine and to submit all his books to be burnt. Before doing so though, he said, "**The Christ said, Go ye forth into all the world, and teach ye all the nations in My Name, in every place.**" (p. 637). After the books were apparently burned, Cyril baptized the monk "in the name of Saint Mary." (p. lxxix).

One more point that someone pointed out (perhaps G. Howard) is that the *Hebrew Gospel of Matthew* was obviously written to convince the Hebrew people to trust in what John the Baptist said and to follow whatever Jesus said and did. There is apparently no mention though of the need to join up with the gentiles or other nations throughout the whole gospel, so a sudden mentioning of baptizing all the gentiles in one name, which is the same for the Father, the son, and the holy Spirit appears to be very out of place and not consistent at all with the rest of the gospel. It therefore must have been added on by people like Athanasius (A. D. 296-372), the chief defender for the Trinitarian doctrine.

This Athanasius thought he was doing the Church a favour by promoting the teaching of the Trinity but he was really promoting a devilish erroneous teaching as found amongst the Babylonians, who used the equilateral triangle to symbolize their supposed God of three persons. This symbol is used by the Romish Church today.³ "[I]n the monastery of the so-called Trinitarians of Madrid, [the Papacy has] an image of the Triune God, with three heads on one body. The Babylonians had something of the same."⁴ Similar things can be found in India, Japan, Thibet, and China, but some include a mother and a child as part of the trinity as some Roman Catholics seem to do with Mary and Jesus as a baby.⁵

Obviously, most theologians have not checked out the Bible thoroughly enough to discover many inconsistencies in their theories and philosophies about a Father God, a Son God, and a Holy Spirit God, all being one. They do not even realize that the real meaning of *EI* is simply a Superior One like Jesus or Angels, while without the capital letter the *eI* is simply a superior one, such as the judges, kings, the patriarchs, and the chiefs of the tribes of Israel. Of course though, in the original autographs of the Scriptures, there was no difference in the size of the letters so one would have to go by context to figure out the true meanings of *EI* or *Eloah*, an alternative spelling. *Elohim* is simply the plural form of the same word. Please see this web site to see the use of this term in Joshua 22 and its obvious true meanings: http://tIm55.org/#anchor_70. Also see the book *The Day of the LORD is at Hand: The Real God of the Universe* at http://tIm55.org/Revelations_on_t_Real_God_y.pdf and see chapters like #25, The Special Nature of God Most High and 45, Just One God.

³ Rev. Alexander Hislop, *The Two Babylons* (Neptune, New Jersey: Loizeaux Brothers, 1959) pp. 16, 17.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 17.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 20.

Note that God said that there is no superior one beside him (Isa. 44:6; 45:5, 6, 21). Does this not make sense, that the Father who is greater than Jesus, would therefore be the Superior one while Jesus, would be the lesser one? St. Paul also said in 1Co 8:6 “But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him. {in: or, for}” and then there is Isa 42:8 I am the LORD: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another [even to Jesus?], neither my praise to graven images.

C:\Documents and Settings\COMPAQ\My Documents\Religion\A Short Ending of Matthew.wpd February 9, 2007