Matthew 1 and the number 7 Heptadic Analysis

Matthew the number 7 Part 1: Matthew 1:1-17: Beginning: If we look at the first 17 verses of the New Testament (The Gospel of Matthew) which deals with a single principal subject: the genealogy of Jesus Christ, It contains 72 Greek vocabulary words in these initial 17 versus (#note; The verse divisions are man's allocation for convenience, added in the thirteenth-century A.D.). We find the following Heptadic (7) structure throughout these original Greek verses in the King James Bible. #1. The number of words which are nouns is exactly 56, or 7 x 8. #2. The Greek word "the" occurs most frequently in the passage: exactly 56 times, or 7 x 8. #3. Also, the number of different forms in which the article "the" occurs is exactly 7. #4. There are two main sections in the passage: verse 1-11 and 12-17. In the first main section, the number of Greek vocabulary words used is 49, or 7 x 7. #5. Of these 49 words, The number of those beginning with a vowel is 28, or 7 x 4. #6. The number of words beginning with a consonant is 21, or 7 x 3. #7. The total number of letters in these 49 words is exactly 266, or 7 x 38-exactly. #8. The numbers of vowels among these 266 letters is 140, or 7 x 20. #9. The number of consonants is 126, or 7 x 18-exactly. #10. Of these 49 words, the number of words which occur more than once is 35, or 7 x 5. #11. The number of words occurring only once is 14, or 7 x2. #12. The number of words which occur in only one form is exactly 42, or 7 x 6. #13. The number of words appearing in more than one form is also 7. #14. The number of 49 Greek vocabulary words which are nouns is 42, or 7 x 6. #15. The number of words which are not nouns is 7. #16. Of the nouns, 35 are proper names, or 7 x 5. #17. These 35 nouns are used 63 times, or 7 x 9. #18. The number of male names is 28, or 7 x 4. #19. These male names occur 56 times or 7 x 8. #20. The number which are not male names is 7. #21. Three women are mentioned-Tamar, Rahab, and Ruth. The number of Greek letters in these three names is 14, or 7 x 2. #22. The number of compound nouns is 7. #23. The number of Greek letters in these 7 nouns is 49, or 7 x 7. #24. Only one city is named in this passage, Babylon, which in Greek contains exactly 7 letters. And on and on it goes. Just to understand how unique these properties are try to design a genealogy-even from fiction that meets the following criteria: 1) The Number of words must be divisible by 7 evenly (In each of these constraints, it is assumed that the divisions are without remainders.) 2) The number of letters must also be divisible by 7. 3) The number of vowels and the number of consonants must be divisible by 7. 4) The number of words that begin with a vowel must be divisible by 7. 5) The number of words that begin with a consonant must be divisible by 7. 6) The number of words that occur more than once must be divisible by 7. 7) The number of words that occur in more than one form must be divisible by 7. 8) The number of words that occur in only one form shall be divisible by 7. 9) The number of nouns shall be divisible by 7. 10) Only 7 words shall not be nouns. 11) The number of names in the genealogy shall be divisible by 7. 12) Only 7 other kinds of nouns are permitted. 13) The number of male names shall be divisible by 7. 14) The number of generations shall be 21, also divisible by 7. There are even more features in the numerical structure of the words themselves. As you may know, both the Hebrew and Greek use the letters of the alphabet for numerical values. Therefore, any specific word in either Hebrew or Greek- has a numerical value of its own by adding up the values of the letters in that particular word. The study of the numerical values of words is called gametria. The 72 vocabulary words add up to a gametrical value of 42,364, or 7 x 6,052. The 72 words appear in 90 forms-some appear in more than one form. The numeric value of the 90 forms is 54,075, or 7 x 7,725. Exactly. It becomes immediately obvious that hidden below the surface are aspects of design that cannot be accidental or just coincidence. Part 2: Matthew 1:18-25: The History of Christ's Birth: 1. The number of words in the seven word passage is 161 (7 x 23 = 161) 2. The

number of Vocabulary words is 77 (7 x 11 = 77) 3. Six Greek words occur only in this passage and never again in Matthew. These six Greek words contain precisely 56 letters (7 x 8 = 56) 4. The number of distinct proper names in the passage is 7 5. The number of Greek letters in these seven proper names is 42 (7 x 6 = 42) 6. The number of words spoken by the angel to Joseph is 28 (7 x 4 = 28) 7. The number of Greek forms of words used in this passage is 161 (7 x 23 = 161) 8. The number of Greek forms of words in the angel's speech is 35 (7 x 5 = 35) 9. The number of letters in the angel's 35 forms of words is 168 (7 x 24 = 168) This phenomenal discovery by Panin has been examined by numerous authorities and the figures have been verified. In total, Panin accumulated over forty thousand pages of detailed calculations covering most of the text of the Bible before his death. These incredible, mathematical patterns are not limited to the number seven. There are numerous other patterns. These amazing patterns appear in the vocabulary, grammatical forms, parts of speech, and particular forms of words. They occur throughout the whole text of the Bible containing 31,173 verses. When you consider the amazing details of this mathematical phenomenon you realize that the change of a single letter or word in the original languages of Hebrew or Greek would destroy the pattern. Now we can understand why Jesus Christ declared that the smallest letter and grammatical mark of the Scriptures was persevered by God's Hand: "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matthew 5:18). Part 3: Other Implications: There are words in the passage just described that occur nowhere else in the New Testament. They occur 42 times (7 x 6) and have 126 letters (7 x 18). How was this organized? Even if Matthew contrived this characteristic into his Gospel, how could he have known that these specific words-whose sole characteristic is that they are found nowhere else in the New Testament-were not going to be used by the other writers? Unless we assume the absurd hypothesis that he had an agreement with them, he must have had the rest of the New Testament before him when he wrote his book. The Gospel of Matthew, then, must have been written last. It so happens the Gospel of Mark exhibits the same phenomenon. It can be demonstrated that it would have had to be written "last." The same phenomenon is found in Luke, John, Peter, Jude, and Paul. Each would have had to write after the other in order to contrive the vocabulary frequencies! You can demonstrate that each of the New Testament books had to have been "written last." There is no human explanation for this incredible and precise structure. It has all been supernaturally designed. We simply gasp, sit back, and behold the skillful handiwork of the God who keeps his promises. The number "seven" permeates the totality of Scripture because the number speaks of God's divine perfection and perfect order. The actual number 7 appears 287 times in the Old Testament (7 x 41 = 287) while the word "seventh" occurs 98 times (7 x 14 = 98). The word "seven-fold" appears seven times. In addition, the word "seventy" is used 56 times (7 x 8 = 56). Ivan Panin discovered literally thousands of such mathematical patterns underlying all of the books of the Old Testament before his death in 1942. I refer the interested reader to Panin's book, "The Inspiration of the Scriptures Scientifically Demonstrated", which discusses these phenomena extensively. Panin and others have examined other Hebrew literature and have attempted to find such mathematical patterns, but they are not found anywhere outside the Bible. By the way, the crucifixion of Jesus took place at Golgotha, elevation = 777 meters above sea level. What a coincidence?

I’m checking the textual basis of these Matthew 1 claims and the logic behind the conclusions, especially whether they actually show design or whether they depend on text-selection and counting choices.

I've already found one major problem: these patterns depend heavily on a chosen Greek text. Matthew 1 has real textual variants, and Panin's method relies on exact wording and even exact letters, so variant spellings and manuscript choices can change the counts.

Thought for 4m 8s

These patterns are interesting, but they do **not** amount to a rigorous proof that Matthew was supernaturally encoded, and they definitely do not prove Panin's larger conclusions. Some of the counts for Matthew 1 **can** be reproduced in a particular edited Greek text: for example, one pro-Panin verification gives Matthew 1:1–17 a vocabulary of 72 words with 56 nouns, and Matthew 1:18–25 as 161 words with 77 vocabulary words. But notice that even there the big headline totals are not all "multiples of 7" in the simple way people usually imply: 72 is 9×8, and the case is built by collecting many selected features, not by one obvious, global heptadic lock.

The first big weakness is **text dependence**. Matthew 1 has real textual variants. In the genealogy, the earliest witnesses behind many modern editions read **Asaph** where many later readers expect **Asa**, and **Amos** where many later readers expect **Amon**; some medieval manuscripts also add **Jehoiakim** in verse 11, and the NET notes explicitly say that addition changes Matthew's own count of fourteen generations. In other words, the exact letters and exact forms are not fixed across all manuscripts, and Panin's method depends precisely on exact letters and forms.

That matters even more because Panin did not merely use one neutral, universally accepted Greek text. A detailed verification of Matthew 1 notes that its interlinear is based on **Panin's 1934 Greek New Testament**, and McKay's critique notes that Panin used Westcott and Hort as a basis but also selected among variant readings and eventually published his own numerically adjusted Greek text. Once the method is allowed to pick a text that makes the numbers work, the argument becomes circular: the numbers are no longer independently proving the text; the text is being shaped to satisfy the numbers.

The second weakness is **methodological freedom**. Dunn's review points out that Panin shifts between different kinds of values and categories: raw word counts, vocabulary counts, forms, gematria, place values, sums of factors, digit sums, and sometimes even dictionary forms instead of the form actually appearing in the text. Dunn's point is not that every individual count is fake; it is that Panin has no stable rule established in advance, so he can keep searching until he finds a divisible-by-7 feature. That is classic cherry-picking.

The third weakness is that the method is **not consistent across Scripture**. Dunn tested 3 John and found that key Panin-style expectations failed there: the vocabulary count was not divisible by 7, the consonant-starting words were not divisible by 7, and the noun count was not divisible by 7. That means the system does not function as a universal signature in any clean way.

The fourth weakness is **non-uniqueness**. McKay argues that many such numerical "miracles" can be found in ordinary texts if one is free to search enough dimensions and report only the hits. He also shows that R. McCormack published a different set of strong heptadic features for Matthew's opening chapters using a **different text**. If two different edited texts can both be

“mathematically proven,” then the numerics are not identifying one exact divinely preserved wording.

The “each book would have had to be written last” argument is also not sound. That conclusion is based on a **retrospective property** like “words found nowhere else in the New Testament.” But that property is defined only after the whole corpus is assembled and counted. It does not mean Matthew knew all later NT books; it only means a later analyst looked at Matthew in relation to the final collection. If the same method makes Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Peter, Jude, and Paul all appear to have been written last, then the method is collapsing under its own contradiction. That is a logical problem, not a mystery.

A smaller but telling point: the phrase “the original Greek verses in the King James Bible” is imprecise. The KJV is an **English translation**. Panin’s calculations were done on Greek editions, and one of the Matthew 1 verification documents explicitly uses Panin’s own Greek text rather than “the KJV Greek.”

On the Golgotha line, I could not verify the “**777 meters above sea level**” claim. The traditional site of Golgotha is within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but the exact historical site is still a matter of location tradition and archaeology. Open elevation sources place Golgotha/Holy Sepulchre roughly around **765–771 meters**, not a clean 777, so that specific number should not be treated as established fact.

So my bottom-line assessment is this: **Panin’s Matthew counts may contain real arithmetic inside one chosen text, but they do not prove divine inspiration, perfect preservation of one exact edition, or supernatural control of the whole New Testament canon.** The argument depends on manuscript selection, flexible counting rules, post hoc feature hunting, and conclusions that outrun the data.

A stronger Christian case for Matthew is still the ordinary one: its textual transmission can be studied historically, its theology can be read in context, and its truth-claims stand or fall on content, witness, prophecy, resurrection, and covenant coherence—not on numerological filters that change when the text base changes.

We could next test one specific Panin claim in Matthew 1 line by line against a named Greek text such as the Textus Receptus or NA/UBS and see exactly where the count depends on editorial choices.

I am not a big fan of university documentation, bias is not only a huge factor, but the system is anti biblical and is motivated to disprove the Bible, in order to keep their financial system stabilized and profiting. However, it is important to know what text Panin was using, and compare that text to any known old findings of the books, to see how close to the originals. I lean toward the uniqueness, and maybe panin stretched a few things, but where 3 John did not “map out”, the first five books of the Old Testament have Gematria that is unique to those books, so 3 John is not a proof.

I'm narrowing this to two things: what Greek text Panin actually counted, and how that text compares to early manuscript evidence in Matthew 1.

I agree with your narrower point: one passage or one short book failing to "map" does not, by itself, disprove every numeric claim everywhere. The real question is whether the specific passage survives in a stable enough text-form to support the claim being made.

Thought for 3m 39s

I think your narrower framing is the right one.

A fair question is not, "Did one critic dislike Panin?" but, **"What text did Panin actually count, and how close is that text to the earliest recoverable form?"** On that question, Panin's own 1934 edition is very clear: he called it **"The New Testament in the Original Greek … established by … Bible Numerics,"** and in the introduction he says it is **a revision of the Greek text by means of Bible Numerics**. In Matthew 1:18–25 he explicitly argues that numerics decide disputed readings, and he even says numerics correct the spelling of David used by Westcott and Hort. Bruce Metzger later summarized Panin's procedure the same way: Panin started from Westcott-Hort and altered readings where his numerics favored another form.

So Panin was **not simply taking an untouched manuscript and reading off the sevens**. He was working from a critical text close to the Westcott-Hort stream, and then using numerics to adjudicate variants inside that stream. Panin even says that in Matthew 1:18–25 the omission of certain words would "destroy the design," which shows the method is functioning as a textual selector, not merely as an observer of a fixed text.

On the manuscript side, Matthew 1 is actually pretty well placed for testing because we do have early witnesses. Papyrus 1 is a **third-century** witness containing Matthew 1:1–9, 12, 14–20, and the Penn Museum identifies it as one of the oldest extant copies of part of a New Testament Gospel. Codex Sinaiticus is over **1600 years old** and contains the oldest complete New Testament.

That early evidence matters because some Matthew 1 readings that affect counting are not late inventions. The NET textual notes state that **Asaph** in Matthew 1:7–8 and **Amos** in Matthew 1:10 are supported by the earliest and broadest witnesses, even though many English readers expect Asa and Amon. The same notes say the medieval addition of **Jehoiakim** in Matthew 1:11 is later and alters Matthew's own fourteen-generation structure.

That means one important thing in Panin's favor: on at least some points, the text-line he used is not automatically "late" or "corrupt." In Matthew 1, parts of the early Alexandrian line do go back very far. But there is also an important limit: **Panin's numeric text is still not identical to the earliest manuscripts themselves**.

The biggest caution, in my view, is this: Panin's counts are not confined to what the earliest manuscripts visibly preserve. In his own introduction he says the old manuscripts lack many later orthographic features, yet he still treats things like **rough breathing** and **iota subscript** as part of

the text because they affect numerics. That is a major issue. Once the count depends on features not consistently written in the earliest manuscripts, the argument shifts from “the manuscripts show this design” to “an edited form of the text shows this design.”

So I would state the conclusion this way:

Panin’s strongest possible case is **not** “numerics prove one exact printed text beyond question.” His stronger case is: **some very early textual lines of Matthew 1 may preserve remarkable numeric structures, and Panin believed those structures help choose between variants.** That is a much tighter and more defensible claim than the broad popular version.

On your 3 John point, I agree with the logic. **A failure in 3 John would not, by itself, disprove a claim about Matthew 1 or the Pentateuch.** But it does weaken any claim that there is one simple, universal numeric signature that cleanly authenticates every book in the same way. If the Pentateuch carries stronger structures, then it should be argued **on its own manuscript base**, not borrowed from Matthew or 3 John.

And that is where your Pentateuch instinct becomes important. The Dead Sea Scrolls give us **the oldest known copies of biblical texts**, so if someone wants to test whether the Hebrew books carry durable numeric patterns close to the originals, that is exactly the kind of evidence set that should be used.

The clean way to test this would be:

1. Fix the text **before** counting.
2. Run Matthew 1 across Panin 1934, Westcott-Hort, and the earliest witnesses for the places they preserve.
3. Separate **manuscript-visible letters** from later editorial features like breathings and subscripts.
4. Mark which heptadic patterns survive across witnesses and which depend on Panin’s editorial decisions.

That would tell you something real: not whether numerics are pretty, but **how much of the pattern is early, and how much is editorial**.