A TEXTUAL GUIDE TO
THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

A TEXTUAL GUIDE TO
THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

An Adaptation of
BRUCE M. METZGER's *Textual Commentary*
for the Needs of Translators

by

ROGER L. OMANSON

*This volume is intended to be used with the fourth edition
of the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament.*

The German Bible Society is a not for profit religious foundation.
Its mission, in collaboration with other members of the United Bible Societies,
is to promote biblical research and worldwide Bible translation work in order
to make the Bible available to everybody in their own language.

7.2015

CONTENTS

PREFACE

The notes in this volume are based on the second edition of Bruce M. Metzger's *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (1994), and are meant to be read alongside the text and textual notes in the United Bible Societies' *The Greek New Testament 4th revised edition, 8th printing 2004 (UBS⁴)*. During one of our triennial translation workshops a few years ago, the translation officers of the United Bible Societies expressed the need for a revision of Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, one which would assist translators who have not received formal training in textual criticism to discover more easily for themselves the reasons that certain variant readings in the NT are more likely to be original than others. The notes are not intended to replace Metzger's original notes, but merely to simplify and expand them. One way the notes have been simplified is by not repeating the manuscript evidence for the different textual variants. Readers should consult the *UBS⁴* text to see which manuscripts support the different readings.

Metzger's notes have met admirably the needs of advanced students of textual criticism since they were first published in 1971, and they will continue to do so. Furthermore, Metzger's volume discusses several hundred additional readings that are not included in the critical apparatus of the United Bible Societies' *Greek New Testament* and which are not, therefore, included in this present volume.

The notes in this volume were prepared in the awareness that English is not the first language of most translators of the NT. Therefore, technical matters have been explained in non-technical language. But use of some technical terms and expressions is unavoidable, and for this reason, the chapter "The Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism" provides a brief overview of textual criticism, including explanations of key terms, a history of the text, and methods that are used by text-critical scholars to arrive at their conclusions.

In the present volume, Metzger's notes have been expanded by considerations related to translation of the readings in the critical apparatus (see, for example, Luke 4.17; Acts 2.37; 2 Cor 5.17). In a case such as 1 Cor 4.17, for example, translators will easily understand from the critical apparatus in *UBS⁴* that the text reads "in Christ Jesus," and that the variants are "in Christ," and "in the Lord Jesus." But with variant readings such as those in 1 Cor 7.34, it may not be clear what the differences in meanings are, so the

notes help sort out how the different variants will be interpreted and trans-
lated.

It will be noted that some of the variant readings have little or no sig-
nificance for translation. The difference between the variant readings may
be one of style only (Matt 20.31; 23.9), such as the presence or absence of a
preposition with a noun (Mark 1.8). Often variant readings of this kind will
be translated the same in the receptor language. Or the variant readings may
be synonyms (Matt 9.8; 16.27; 28.11) or may consist of the presence or
absence of a definite article (Mark 10.31; 12.26) or a third-person pronoun
used to express possession (Matt 19.10; Mark 6.41). Characteristics of the
receptor language may require that variant readings of this kind be trans-
lated the same as the reading in the text. For functional equivalence trans-
lations, other kinds of variants such as different spellings of a person's name
(Matt 13.55) or the presence or absence of the subject or object of a verb
(Matt 8.25; Mark 9.42) may also be insignificant.

The textual notes also include discussions of some of the more significant
differences in divisions and punctuation of the text where those involve
differences in meaning (see "The Discourse Segmentation Apparatus" in
the Introduction to UBS⁴). Modern editions of the Greek NT, as well as
modern translations, sometimes differ in where breaks are made in the text.
This is certainly true in terms of where new paragraphs and new sections
begin. Among the kinds of significant segmentation differences discussed
are the following:

(1) breaks between paragraphs (1 Tim 3.1),
(2) breaks between words and phrases (Mark 13.9; 2 Cor 8.3; Eph 1.4),
(3) use or non-use of quotation marks (1 Cor 6.12, 13; 7.1),
(4) beginning and ending of direct quotations (John 3.13, 15, 21; Gal 2.14),
(5) ending of embedded quotations (Matt 21.3),
(6) existence of parenthetical comments (Luke 7.28; Acts 1.18),
(7) punctuation of sentences as declarative or interrogative (1 Cor 6.19),
(8) use of poetic format to indicate use of traditional material (Phil 2.6;
    Col 1.15),
(9) ὅτι understood as recitative (introducing a direct quotation), as intro-
    ducing an indirect quotation, or as introducing a causal clause (Mark
    8.16).

Translators are urged to follow the readings in the text of *The Greek New
Testament*. The textual notes here frequently provide a translation both of
the readings in the text and of the variant readings so that the differences in
meaning among the variants may be more clearly understood. Often major
contemporary versions such as RSV, NRSV, REB, NIV, TEV, NJB, TOB,

FC, Seg, and a few others have been quoted to illustrate these differences. The use of these quotations is not intended to recommend either the variant itself or its translation, but only to illustrate it.

The notes on different possible segmentation and punctuation do not present the exegetical evidence for or against the various possibilities, nor do they argue in favor of one or the other. By means of these notes, translators are alerted to places where the meaning and translation will be different, depending on how the words, phrases, and sentences in the text are divided. Translators should consult the standard commentaries, some of which are listed in the sources cited at the end of the notes on each book.

Throughout this volume, references are made to recent commentaries in English, most of which are still in print and are easily available. There are many useful books and articles related to the study of the NT text in other major languages such as French and German, but the references here have been limited to English-language books and articles in keeping with the intended audience.

ROGER L. OMANSON
United Bible Societies
Consultant for Scholarly Editions

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW

For a brief but informative discussion of the text of Matthew, see Boring, "The Gospel of Matthew," p. 91.

1.7-8 Ἀσάφ, Ἀσάφ (Asaph, Asaph) {B}

The names for the genealogy from vv. 6b-11 come from 1 Chr 3.5, 10-17. According to 1 Chr 3.10 (also 1 Kgs 15.9 ff), this king's name was Asa. However, it is clear that the name "Asaph" (so FC) is the earliest form of text preserved in the NT manuscripts, since manuscripts from several different families and text-types agree in reading "Asaph." In addition to the manuscript evidence, it is most likely that copyists would have noted that "Asaph" was the name of a psalmist (compare the titles of Ps 50 and 73–83) and would have corrected the name to read "Asa," the king of Judah. Later manuscripts, as well as the Textus Receptus, read Ἀσά (Asa). (See also the comments on v. 10.)

Some interpreters think it most unlikely that the author of this Gospel would have written this list of names without consulting the OT names of the kings. They think that the name "Asaph" must, therefore, be a very ancient scribal error for "Asa." But it is possible that the Gospel writer had used a genealogical list in which the spelling error already existed. Among modern translations the name "Asa" is read in RSV, REB, NIV, NJB, TOB, and Seg. TEV uses the name "Asa" because of the principle of consistency between the Old and the New Testaments when referring to the same person. If translators follow this same principle in the receptor language, then the name "Asa" will be translated, even if the reading Ἀσάφ is accepted as original.

1.10 Ἀμώς, Ἀμώς (Amos, Amos) {B}

The textual evidence for the reading "Amos" is nearly the same as that which reads Ἀσάφ in vv. 7 and 8. On the basis of such superior manuscript evidence, "Amos" is most likely the original reading. "Amos" is, however, an error for "Amon," the name of the king of Judah. In 1 Chr 3.14 most Greek manuscripts present the name correctly as Ἀμών or Ἀμμών, but Ἀμώς is read by a few Greek manuscripts. In the account concerning King Amon in 2 Kgs 21.18-19, 23-25; 2 Chr 33.20-25, several Greek manuscripts incorrectly

read Ἀμώς. So although the Masoretic text (Hebrew) consistently has the name "Amon," manuscripts of the Septuagint vary between the names "Amon" and "Amos."

According to Davies and Allison (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, Vol. I, p. 177), the name Amos "may represent a corruption in Matthew's source or in the post-Matthean textual tradition, or perhaps Matthew simply made an error. In the last instance, it might be intentional, a change designed to bring in a note of prophecy – just as the change of Asa to Asaph might hint at an interest in the psalmist's hopes."

Modern translations are divided between "Amos" (RSV, NRSV, NAB) and "Amon" (REB, NIV, NJB, TOB, FC, Seg). TEV uses the name "Amon" because of the principle of consistency between the Old and the New Testaments when referring to the same person. If translators follow this same principle in the receptor language, then the name "Amon" will be translated, even if the reading Ἀμώς is accepted as original.

1.11   ἐγέννησεν (became the father of) {A}

According to the text, Josiah was the father of Jechoniah (that is, Jehoiachin); but Josiah was in fact the father of Jehoiakim and the grandfather of Jechoniah. In order to make the text of Matthew agree with the genealogy in 1 Chr 3.15-16, several of the later uncial manuscripts, as well as a variety of other witnesses, have added the words τὸν Ἰωακίμ, Ἰωακὶμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν (Jehoiakim, and Jehoiakim became the father of). Although it is possible that these words were accidentally omitted by a copyist, the manuscript support is stronger for the shorter text. Furthermore, when the name Ἰωακίμ is added, there are fifteen generations between David and the exile instead of fourteen.

1.16   τὸν ἄνδρα Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός
        (the husband of Mary, from whom was born Jesus, the one called
        Christ) {A}

There are three main variant readings: (1) "And Jacob begot Joseph *the husband of Mary, of whom Jesus was born, who is called Christ*" ; (2) "and Jacob begot Joseph, *to whom being engaged the virgin Mary bore Jesus, who is called Christ*," and (3) "Jacob begot Joseph; *Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the virgin, begot Jesus who is called the Christ.*" Among modern translations the third reading is followed only by Moffatt, who says, "Jacob the father of Joseph, and Joseph (to whom the virgin Mary was betrothed) the father of Jesus, who is called 'Christ.'"

The manuscript support for the first reading is extremely good. The second reading probably arose because a copyist thought the wording "the husband of Mary" might mislead a reader to think that Jesus was the physical son of Mary and her husband Joseph. So the wording was changed to "being engaged," in agreement with the verb μνηστεύεσθαι (being engaged) in v. 18. As for the third reading, a Syriac manuscript of the fourth century is the only support for this reading, which probably is the result of a copyist's having carelessly followed the standard genealogical pattern in which every name is repeated.

1.18 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (of Jesus Christ) {B}

The great majority of manuscripts read "Jesus Christ." Other variant readings include (1) "Christ Jesus," (2) "Jesus," and (3) "Christ." It is difficult to decide which is the original reading. On the one hand, the manuscript support for "Jesus Christ" is very strong. But, on the other hand, the presence of the definite article τοῦ before the name "Jesus Christ" is very unusual in the NT and seems to suggest that "Jesus Christ" is not the original reading. Furthermore, copyists often expanded the names "Jesus" and "Christ" by adding other words; but here the reading "Christ" in some manuscripts may have originated under the influence of the words ἕως τοῦ Χριστοῦ in v. 17. And the reading "Jesus" may have originated under the influence of v. 21, which says, "you shall call his name Jesus."

If translators follow any of the readings with the name Χριστοῦ, they must decide whether the name here functions as a proper name or as a title. The presence of the definite article τοῦ, combined with the emphasis in Matthew on Jesus as Son of David, leads some interpreters to understand Χριστοῦ here as a title. Compare NRSV: "Now the birth of Jesus the Messiah took place in this way."

1.18 γένεσις (birth) {B}

Both γένεσις and the variant reading γέννησις mean "birth," but γένεσις also means "creation," "generation," and "genealogy" (compare v. 1). The word γέννησις means "begetting" or "birth," and it became the usual word in later Christian writings to refer to the Nativity. It is easy to understand why copyists confused these two nouns since they are written and pronounced similarly.

Here in v. 18, early manuscripts of several text-types support the reading in the UBS[4] text. Furthermore, copyists would have tended to substitute the word γέννησις, with its more specialized meaning, for the noun γένεσις,

which had been used in the different sense of "genealogy" (or, "birth-record") in v. 1. Since γένεσις should be translated "birth" or "origin" here in this verse (unlike its translation in v. 1), both γένεσις and γέννησις will be translated the same way in the receptor language here.

1.25   υἱόν (a son) {A}

The Textus Receptus, following several uncials and most minuscules, inserts the article τόν before υἱόν and adds αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον (her firstborn son) from Luke 2.7.

2.4   Segmentation

If a break is made after the pronoun αὐτῶν, the following four words may be punctuated as a question, as in TEV: "…and asked them, 'Where will the Messiah be born?'"

2.18   κλαυθμός (wailing) {B}

The longer reading, θρῆνος καὶ κλαυθμός (a song of grief and wailing), appears to be a scribal addition in order to make the wording agree more closely with the Septuagint text of Jer 31.15 (which is 38.15 in the Greek text). This longer reading is in the Textus Receptus and lies behind the rendering of the AV, "lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning."

3.16   [αὐτῷ] ([to him]) {C}

The combination of Greek manuscripts, early versions, and Church Fathers gives strong support to the reading without the pronoun αὐτῷ, followed by RSV, NIV, REB, NJB, TOB, and Seg. On the other hand, it is possible that the pronoun is original but was omitted by copyists who thought it was not necessary. The pronoun αὐτῷ emphasizes either (a) that the vision was seen by Jesus only or (b) that the vision was for his benefit. In order to show the uncertainty regarding whether the pronoun is original, it has been put in brackets.

3.16   [καὶ] ἐρχόμενον ([and] coming) {C}

The reading which has the conjunction καί has the support of diverse textual groups and is therefore placed in the text. But since καί is absent from early manuscripts of both the Alexandrian and the Western text-types,

it may not be original. To reflect this doubt, καί is put in brackets. The meaning is the same regardless of which reading is followed. The difference is simply one of style.

4.10 ὕπαγε (go away) {A}

If the words ὀπίσω μου (behind me) were originally in the text, no satisfactory reason can be found to explain their omission. On the other hand, if they were originally absent, copyists who remembered the words of Jesus to Peter in Matt 16.23 (ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ [Get behind me, Satan]) would have been likely to add them here.

4.17 μετανοεῖτε, ἤγγικεν γάρ
(repent, for [the kingdom of heaven] is at hand) {A}

The words μετανοεῖτε (repent) and γάρ (for) are absent from the Old Syriac and one manuscript of the Old Latin. It is possible that these words were not original but were rather added under the influence of the similar wording in 3.2. But the Greek manuscripts, as well as the overwhelming agreement of the rest of the ancient versions and Church Fathers for the longer text, makes it likely that this text is original.

5.4-5 μακάριοι … παρακληθήσονται. (5) μακάριοι … τὴν γῆν.
(Blessed … they shall be comforted. [5] Blessed … the earth.) {B}

If v. 5 had originally followed immediately after v. 3, with their opposition of heaven (v. 3) and earth (v. 5), it is unlikely that any copyist would have placed v. 4 between them. On the other hand, as early as the second century, some copyists reversed the order of the two beatitudes in vv. 4 and 5 so as to produce this opposition and to bring πτωχοί (poor) and πραεῖς (meek) into closer connection. Among modern translations NJB and TOB reverse the order of vv. 4 and 5, although the verse numbers are not changed.

5.11 [ψευδόμενοι] ([lying/telling a falsehood]) {C}

It is uncertain whether the participle ψευδόμενοι should be included or omitted from the text. On the one hand, if the participle is original, its absence in the Western tradition can be accounted for as the result of copyists' changing the wording to agree with the form of the beatitude in Luke 6.22. On the other hand, if the participle is not original, more than one copyist would have been tempted to insert ψευδόμενοι in order to limit the

wide generalization in Jesus' teaching, and to make explicit what was considered to be implicit in the meaning (compare 1 Pet 4.15-16), that is, that Christians are not blessed when people speak evil about them with good reason. Morris (*The Gospel According to Matthew*, p. 102, n. 36) notes that ψευδόμενοι is implied, "for what the enemy said would not really be evil if it were true." In order to show uncertainty about whether copyists added or omitted this participle, it is included within brackets. REB and Seg follow the shorter reading.

5.22   αὐτοῦ (of him/his) {B}

It does not seem likely that copyists would have omitted the word εἰκῇ (without a cause) after αὐτοῦ if it had been original. Although the reading with εἰκῇ is widespread from the second century onwards, it is much more likely that the word was added by copyists in order to soften Jesus' extreme demand.

5.32   καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχᾶται
       (and whoever marries a divorced woman, commits adultery) {B}

The reading of manuscript B (ὁ ... γαμήσας [the one marrying ...]) seems to have been substituted for the reading found in the text in order to make the grammatical construction similar to the words ὁ ἀπολύων (the one divorcing ...) at the beginning of this verse. The omission of καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχᾶται in a few manuscripts may be due to copyists who considered these words unnecessary. That is, if "everyone who divorces his wife, except on the ground of unchastity, makes her an adulteress [when she remarries]," then it would go without saying that "whoever marries a divorced woman [also] commits adultery."

The difference between ὃς ἐὰν γαμήσῃ and ὁ γαμήσας is basically a difference in style rather than meaning (Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, p. 122, n. b). Receptor language style and grammar must be considered regardless of the text that is followed.

5.44   ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν
       διωκόντων ὑμᾶς
       (Love the enemies of you and pray for those persecuting you) {A}

Later manuscripts enrich the text by adding clauses from the parallel account in Luke 6.27-28. If clauses such as "bless those who curse you, do good to those who hate you" were originally present in Matthew's account

of the Sermon on the Mount, their omission in early manuscripts of the Alexandrian, Western, and Egyptian traditions would be very difficult to explain. The fact that the additions come in different places in the different manuscripts and do not agree in wording suggests that they are all later scribal additions.

5.47   ἐθνικοί (Gentiles/pagans) {B}

In later manuscripts, followed by the Textus Receptus, the reading τελῶναι (tax collectors) appears to have been substituted for ἐθνικοί in order to bring the statement into closer parallelism with the preceding sentence. The Armenian version combines the reading τελῶναι with the form of the reading found in Luke 6.32-34 to read τελῶναι καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί (tax collectors and sinners).

6.4   σοι (to you [singular]) {B}

The phrase ἐν τῷ φανερῷ (openly) is absent from the earliest manuscripts of the Alexandrian, Western, and Egyptian types of text. It appears to have been added by copyists in order to make an explicit parallelism with the preceding words ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ (in secret). The point in the whole section, however, is not so much the openness of the Father's reward as its superiority to mere human approval (compare vv. 6 and 18).

6.6   σοι (to you [singular]) {B}

See the comments on v. 4.

6.8   ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν (the father of you) {A}

The expanded reading ὁ θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν (God, your Father) occurs nowhere else in Matthew and is a scribal addition reflecting the common placing together of "God" and "Father" in Paul's letters. The reading ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος (your heavenly Father), found in several later manuscripts, is obviously an addition made to agree with the wording of vv. 9 and 14. The occurrence of the first person pronoun ἡμῶν (of us) in several manuscripts is due to scribal error, since in later Greek the vowels η and υ were pronounced alike. FC says, "God, your Father," but it is not clear whether this is based on the variant reading or is the result of the translation principles followed.

6.13   πονηροῦ. (the Evil one/evil.) {A}

Early and important manuscripts of the Alexandrian, Western, and other types of text, as well as commentaries on the Lord's Prayer by early Church Fathers, end the Lord's Prayer with the word πονηροῦ in v. 13. Copyists added several different endings in order to adapt the Prayer for use in worship in the early church. Additions include the following: (a) "for yours is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen" (so Seg); (b) "for yours is the kingdom and the glory forever. Amen"; and (c) "for yours is the kingdom and the power and the glory of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit forever. Amen."

6.15   ἀνθρώποις (to people) {C}

The words τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν (their trespasses) occur after the word ἀνθρώποις in many manuscripts, so that the text means "forgive [to] people their trespasses." These words may be original but were omitted by copyists as unnecessary since they occur in v. 14. Or τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν may have been added by copyists in order to provide a balance with v. 14a. Copyists added a verse after Mark 11.25 under the influence of this verse in Matthew; and since the addition in Mark does not have the words τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, they are probably not original here either. Even though the short text should be followed, it may be necessary in some languages to make the words τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν explicit in translation. It is not clear whether NIV is based on the longer reading or has added the words "their sins" for translational reasons.

6.18   σοι (to you [singular]) {A}

See the comments on v. 4.

6.25   [ἢ τί πίητε] ([or what you shall drink]) {C}

On the one hand, the reading without the words ἢ τί πίητε may be original, and these words may have been added to the text to agree with the wording of v. 31. NJB, TOB, and Seg follow this shorter text. On the other hand, these words may be original but may have been accidentally omitted because a copyist jumped from the ending of the verb φάγητε (eat) to the end of the verb πίητε. Since the evidence is evenly balanced between the two readings, these words are put in brackets to indicate doubt regarding the original text.

6.28 αὐξάνουσιν· οὐ κοπιῶσιν οὐδὲ νήθουσιν
(they grow; they do not toil nor spin [wool]) {B}

The original reading of Codex Sinaiticus (א) appears to be "they do not card/comb (wool) neither do they spin nor toil." ("To card wool" is to untangle and collect the wool fibers.) Some interpreters consider this to be the original reading, but it seems to have been one copyist's error (ξένουσιν [= ξαίνουσιν] for αὐξάνουσιν), which was almost immediately corrected. A few other manuscripts reverse the order of the verbs "toil" and "spin."

The major difference in most manuscripts, however, is between singular and plural forms of the verbs "grow," "toil," and "spin." The verbs are plural in the text. The noun κρίνα (flowers, traditionally "lilies" in English translations) is neuter plural, and since neuter plural subjects take singular verb forms in Greek, the singular verb forms appear to be a correction for grammatical reasons. The difference is one of style and not meaning; so translators will need to use whichever form of the verb is appropriate in their receptor language.

6.33 τὴν βασιλείαν [τοῦ θεοῦ] καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ
(the kingdom [of God] and the righteousness of him) {C}

Some manuscripts have "the kingdom of God and his righteousness" or "the kingdom of heaven (τῶν οὐρανῶν) and his righteousness." Others read "the kingdom and his righteousness." The shorter reading, "the kingdom and his righteousness," best explains the origins of the others since copyists would add "of God" or "of heaven" rather than delete these words if they had been present originally. However, Matthew seldom refers to the "kingdom" without a modifier, so the absence of a modifier such as "of God" or "of heaven" in several manuscripts may be due to accidental omission (see Davies and Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, vol. I, p. 660, n. 25). To show the doubt regarding the original text, the words τοῦ θεοῦ have been put in brackets. Even if the shorter text is followed for text-critical reasons, translators may wish to make explicit that "the kingdom" is "the kingdom of God" or "his kingdom" (NJB and NIV).

7.11   Segmentation

This verse may be translated as an exclamation (so many modern translations) or statement (TOB) as in the text or as a (rhetorical) question. See also Luke 11.13.

7.13   πλατεῖα ἡ πύλη (wide the gate) {B}

The words ἡ πύλη (the gate) are absent in v. 13 from several manuscripts and Church Fathers. NJB, following this variant reading, says, "Enter by the narrow gate, since the road that leads to destruction is wide and spacious." It is possible that ἡ πύλη are not original but were introduced into the text to complete the parallelism with v. 14. But the external evidence is overwhelming in support of the longer text. The words ἡ πύλη in vv. 13 and 14 were probably omitted by some copyists who failed to understand that the intended picture is that of a roadway leading to a gate.

7.14   τί (How!) {B}

The interrogative pronoun τί has wide manuscript support. It is often translated "Which?" or "What?" but is used here to represent the Semitic exclamation מָה ("how!"). But copyists, not understanding this unusual usage, changed τί to the conjunction ὅτι (because/for), which is found in v. 13. NAB expresses the exclamatory sense of this pronoun: "How narrow the gate and constricted the road that leads to life."

7.14   ἡ πύλη (the gate) {A}

See the comments on v. 13.

7.24   ὁμοιωθήσεται (he/she will be made like) {B}

The variant reading has little significance for translation since the difference is more one of style than of meaning. The future passive verb form has the support of good and diverse manuscripts. Copyists probably changed the passive verb to the first person singular active form ὁμοιώσω αὐτόν (I will compare him), especially if they remembered the form of the saying in Luke 6.47 ("I will show you what he is like").