

Transmission and Preservation of the Biblical Text

By Ekkehardt Mueller

Some people have been perplexed by the difference in translation of various Bible texts as well as some additions or deletions of parts of verses in Scripture. In order to evaluate these claims we need to understand how biblical texts were preserved and transmitted. This brief overview intends to provide some basic concepts with which to respond to such irritations. Given space constraints, the present study addresses the issue from the perspective of the New Testament.

At the outset we should keep in mind that the NT documents were written in a brief period of a few decades instead of more than a millennium, as was the case with the Old Testament. We also do not have autographs but only copies, which were preserved in papyrus and animal skins (parchment). The NT books had to be copied not only because the material used for writing was deteriorating but also because Christianity grew and the churches needed the writings of the New Testament.

Categories of Manuscripts

Almost six thousand NT manuscripts are currently available. In addition, there are also translations in ancient languages—such as Syriac, Latin, Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopic—and references to Scripture in the church fathers.¹ The number of Greek manuscripts grows as new documents are discovered. These NT manuscripts come to us in four categories:²

Papyri. They are in uncial script (uppercase letters). Only about one hundred of the papyri have been preserved and found. Most of them come from Egypt where the dry climate is conducive to longer preservation. “These manuscripts are early (second to eighth centuries AD). And most of them have been discovered in the past hundred years. Only nine of the papyri were discovered before the year 1900.”³

Uncials. These are manuscripts written on animal skins, using only uppercase letters. They date from the third to the tenth century AD. About three hundred uncials have been found so far. Only one has the complete text of the New Testament.

Minuscules. These manuscripts use lowercase Greek in a cursive script. There are about 2,850 of them. They date from the ninth century AD onward until printing replaced manual copying of the manuscripts.

Lectionaries. These are manuscripts arranged to reflect the liturgical year and provide passages for daily reading. They can be uncials or minuscules. They are the least important group among the four, although there are about 2,400 of them.

Text Families

Scholars have grouped the large number of manuscripts into three major text types or families. This is not an ironclad decision, but similarities between manuscripts allow for their classification. Although in the past various text families have been suggested,⁴ manuscripts today are classified as *Majority text*, *Alexandrian text*, and the *Western text*.

Majority Text. Majority text is also called the Byzantine text. Lectionaries as well as a large number of minuscules are of this text type. The so-called *Textus Receptus* was derived from this family of manuscripts, but the *Textus Receptus* is not identical with the Majority text. This is important to know because oftentimes the two are taken to be identical. About eighty percent of the manuscripts of the New Testament belong to the Majority text. The earliest members of this family come from the fourth century AD, but most manuscripts are a thousand years or more later than the original manuscripts. They are characterized by “smoothness, conflation (combining two variant readings to form a new reading not exactly identical with either of the two

source readings), harmonization of the text (making parallel passages agree), and its liturgically motivated readings.”⁵ This text type dominated Eastern Christianity and was the text of the Orthodox Church that remained with the Greek language, while the Roman Church chose Latin. The Orthodox Church also adopted the LXX for the Old Testament, including a number of apocrypha that are not found in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament.

While some Christians treasure the Majority text, others consider it inferior to the other text types. The reason is because this family consists of many late documents and only very few are found among the early manuscripts. This text type is not found in the papyri before the fourth century or in the Ante-Nicene Fathers, and its style is inferior to other manuscripts. K. Aland, whose NT text is an eclectic text and not based on the Majority text, still tries to strike a balance. This text type cannot just be ignored but must be considered as other types are. He writes, “In fact, the ‘Majority text’ . . . may yet prove to hold a multiple significance for the history of the text.”⁶ On the other hand, it should not be assumed that the manuscripts of the Majority text do not differ from one another. “Admittedly no adequate history has yet been written of the Byzantine text—a text which is in no sense a monolithic mass because its manuscripts share the same range of variation characteristic of all Greek New Testament manuscripts.” In other words, the manuscripts of this text family have some common ground, and yet each one is distinct from the other.

Western Text. This type is the least clearly defined. It comes from around AD 200. It is “reflected in the earliest Christian writers in Palestine and Asia Minor... The Western text type tends to be a full text and is especially important where it agrees with one of the other two text types.”⁷ It is, for instance, represented in the Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis also called D.⁸

Alexandrian Text Type. This text type is typically found in the oldest manuscripts, even as early as the second century. It is also called the Egyptian Text or the Neutral Text.⁹ Aland says “its reading tend to be more difficult (thus best accounting for the existence of the variants in other text types) and shorter. Most textual critics believe that this text type, as represented in the early uncials (the one later called Vaticanus and Sinaiticus) and the early papyri, is the best text now extant.”¹⁰ Codex Alexandrinus is part Byzantine and part Alexandrian.¹¹

The question has been raised about why we have so many copies of the Byzantine Text. Because of the sheer number of manuscripts people may be tempted to go by quantity rather than quality. Here are possible answers: (1) Christianity started out with more or less one common language—Greek. The early church fathers still wrote in Greek. However, the later patristic authors switched to Latin. Jerome had already completed his translation into Latin in AD 405, which became the Vulgate.¹² But there were earlier versions or manuscripts too. As Latin became the language of the West, Greek manuscripts became less important. However, the Eastern Church stayed with Greek and consequently produced hundreds of documents. (2) Aland suggests that during Diocletian’s persecution Christians were forced to burn all holy books. This led to a lack of biblical manuscripts. However, soon after Diocletian, the age of Constantine began with a marked change for Christianity that became the official state religion. Therefore, there was suddenly a huge demand for NT manuscripts. Bishops started copying houses. “The exegetical school of Antioch, where students of Origen’s theology and Arians maintained a well-organized center, provided bishops for many dioceses throughout the East... Each of these bishops took with him to his diocese the text he was familiar with, that of Lucian (i.e., the Koine text), and in this way it rapidly became very widely disseminated even in the fourth century.”¹³ The Koine text is the later Byzantine text. (3) The growth of Islam in Northern Africa hindered the spread of Christianity and even managed to get Christianity mostly extinct in these territories. Bauder suggests that “Muslims often burned Christian manuscripts when they could find them.”¹⁴ This may explain the predominance of manuscripts of the Byzantine text type.

Textual Problems

Variant readings have crept into manuscripts. For some sincere Christians this may sound very disappointing since, at first glance, it might cast doubt on the reliability of the biblical text. However, this is not the case as argued below.

Although we have a large number of variants, the Bible is better attested than any other book of antiquity. In the vast majority of cases, variant readings are inconsequential. For example, sometimes we find the particle “and” while in other cases it is omitted (Rev 4:10); the apostle speaks about “we” and “you” and in some manuscripts he includes himself with the believers, while in others he does not (1 John 1:4). Most variants arose while copying manuscripts. These variants do not change the theology of the Bible.

In a few cases, slight theological modifications have been introduced, but these manuscripts stand out as odd. Why is this so? At the end of the first and during the second centuries the well-known heretic Marcion created his own biblical canon based on the idea that the God of love of the New Testament has nothing to do with the presumed terrible creator God of the Old Testament. Therefore, he purged some NT books of OT references and eliminated others from his canon. Why do we know that he was wrong? Because of the overwhelming witness of the NT manuscripts. No biblical doctrine is changed because of variants in the manuscripts. By the way, biblical doctrines are normally based not on only one biblical text but are often spread throughout the Bible.¹⁵ Even if one text had been miscopied, the error would be rectified by the others. Aland summarizes well:

When identifying the text type of a manuscript it is all too easy to overlook the fact that the Byzantine Imperial text and the Alexandrian Egyptian text, to take two examples that in theory are diametrically opposed to each other, actually exhibit a remarkable degree of agreement, perhaps as much as 80 percent! Textual critics themselves, and New Testament specialists even more so, not to mention laypersons, tend to be fascinated by differences and to forget how many of them may be due to chance or to normal scribal tendencies, and how rarely significant variants occur – yielding to the common danger of failing to see the forest for the trees.¹⁶

While we have to wrestle with the question of which variant is better and reflects more faithfully the original text, we must not get discouraged. God’s word is reliable. D. A. Carson writes, “Nothing we believe to be doctrinally true, and nothing we are commanded to do, is in any way jeopardized by the variants. This is true for any textual tradition. The interpretation of individual passages may well be called in question; but never is a doctrine affected.”¹⁷ What are the causes for variants in the manuscripts that we can identify? There are unintentional changes and rarely intentional changes.¹⁸

The unintentional changes are caused by the following scribal lapses: (1) *Scriptio continua*: the uncial manuscripts leave no space between words, leading to confusion and, in the worst-case scenario, to a reading other than the one meant by the author. (2) *Confusion of letters*: Some letters look similar. If they are not written very distinctly or if something happened to the manuscript, the scribe may confuse them. (3) *Dittography and haplography*: by mistake the copyist repeats one or more letter or syllable, or inadvertently omits a letter or a sequence of letters. (4) *Fatigue*: the scribe confuses cases or other things especially when copying continuous script. (5) *Homoioteleuton and homoioarcton*: when words or phrases begin with similar groups of letters, it is easy for the eye to move directly from one group to the other and omit material. (6) *Itacisms*: this is the danger of homonyms being misinterpreted, especially when copying is done from dictation. (7) *Problem of punctuation*: Continuous script does not contain punctuation. A comma or a period in the wrong place can make a great difference (see Luke 23:43). (8) *Change of a single letter*: In Luke 2:14 some manuscripts have an additional sigma on the term *eudokia*. This changes the translation from “On earth peace, good will to men” to “On earth peace among men with whom he is pleased.”

The intentional changes are more challenging. However, we should not have the worst-case scenario in mind right away. Sometimes the scribe was wrestling with a text that does not seem to make much sense; in some cases the original language is so difficult that people try to improve it in order to make sense. Here are intentional changes: (1) *Explanatory supplement*: The scribe is not satisfied to read “the disciples” so he writes “his disciples.” Instead of “he said” the scribe adds “the Lord.” Sometimes devotion is expressed with these additions. “Jesus” becomes “Jesus Christ” and finally “the Lord Jesus Christ.” (2) *More stylistically polished*: the language and grammar is improved. (3) *Harmonizations*: the copyist may find differences between parallel texts and try to soften them. (4) *Use of synonyms*: The scribe replaces words and/or changes the word order. In contrast to the Hebrews, Greeks had sanctity for the content and not the letter—which would then allow for changes in the text. (5) *Tenacity of a reading*: once a reading occurs it will persist no matter what happens. (6) *Mixed or conflated readings*: a scribe familiar with two different readings will combine them. (7) *Major disturbances in the NT text*: They can be caused through theological or pastoral motives. But “major disturbance in the transmission of the New Testament text can always be identified with confidence.”¹⁹ This is due to the other unaffected manuscripts.

We can assume that God guards His Word,²⁰ otherwise His plan of salvation would be spoiled and humans would not be saved. It does not help to have Scripture given under inspiration, and then to allow it to be disfigured and destroyed through human activity. But this safeguarding does not mean that God would not allow for variants in manuscripts. The Bible has both a divine and a human side. Nevertheless, God helps us understand His Word and He does not leave us alone where it is crucial. However, we should not expect that God would bestow special protection upon one manuscript or one family of manuscripts. As E. Glenny says, “it is better to say that He has preserved His Word in and through the thousands of extant manuscripts, and that those who seek truth must compare those manuscripts to determine the correct reading when the manuscripts differ.”²¹

Here is what Ellen G. White says on this subject:

Some look to us gravely and say, “Don’t you think there might have been some mistake in the copyist or in the translators?” This is all probable, and the mind that is so narrow that it will hesitate and stumble over this possibility or probability would be just as ready to stumble over the mysteries of the Inspired Word, because their feeble minds cannot see through the purposes of God. Yes, they would just as easily stumble over plain facts that the common mind will accept, and discern the Divine, and to which God’s utterance is plain and beautiful, full of marrow and fatness. All the mistakes will not cause trouble to one soul, or cause any feet to stumble, that would not manufacture difficulties from the plainest revealed truth.

God committed the preparation of His divinely inspired Word to finite man. This Word, arranged into books, the Old and New Testaments, is the guidebook to the inhabitants of a fallen world, bequeathed to them that, by studying and obeying the directions, not one soul would lose its way to heaven. . . .

The Bible is not given to us in grand superhuman language. Jesus, in order to reach man where he is, took humanity. The Bible must be given in the language of men. Everything that is human is imperfect. Different meanings are expressed by the same word; there is not one word for each distinct idea. The Bible was given for practical purposes. . . .

The Bible is written by inspired men, but it is not God’s mode of thought and expression. It is that of humanity. . . . The divine mind and will is combined with the human mind and will; thus the utterances of the man are the word of God.²²

Editions of the Greek New Testament

The conflict these days relates to the major Greek texts and which ones to accept or reject. The issue becomes more loaded when no mediating position is allowed for and the proponents become overly dogmatic concerning the absolute reliability of a certain text family. The danger is also to turn probabilities into certainties and judge those taking different positions. W. Pickering has intensively dealt with this issue and clearly favors the *Textus Receptus*.²³ He writes, “If the Scriptures have not been preserved then the doctrine of inspiration is a purely academic matter with no relevance for us today. If we do not have the inspired Words or do not know precisely which they be, then the doctrine of Inspiration is inapplicable.”²⁴ This is not completely unproblematic because his narrow understanding of inspiration seems to lead him to a specific understanding of God’s preservation of Scripture, which in turn leads him to a specific group of documents. “I believe in the verbal plenary inspiration of the Autographs. I believe that God has providentially preserved the original wording of the text down to our day, and that it is possible for us to know precisely what it is (though due to our carelessness and laziness we do not, at this moment).”²⁵ Yet he affirms “against all the assaults of corruption the traditional text.”²⁶ We will look at three texts, the Eclectic text, the Majority text, and the *Textus Receptus*.

Eclectic Text. This Greek text is not based on one manuscript and not on one family of texts. Rather it uses all text types. It is the Greek text commonly used by NT scholars, either in the Nestle-Aland twenty-eighth edition of the *Novum Testamentum Graece* or in the fourth edition of the United Bible Societies’ *Greek New Testament*.²⁷ Both texts are the same, but the apparatus differs in both editions. Decisions on which reading to choose are based on external and internal evidence. This text favors, to some extent, the earlier manuscripts. It differs from the Westcott and Hort text insofar that it is not restricted to the Alexandrian text type but allows other text types to provide input. For instance, the NASB and the NIV are based on the Eclectic Text.

Majority Text. *The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text*, edited by Zane C. Hodge and Arthur L. Farstad, was published in 1982.²⁸ It is assumed that a reading is genuine if it is overwhelmingly attested by the manuscripts. “However, the Majority text type is not always united. In fact, there are five distinct strands of manuscripts in this text type, and the manuscripts of this text type often differ on individual readings.”²⁹ The Majority Text differs from the Eclectic Text in more than 6,500 places. But it differs also from the *Textus Receptus* in about 1,800 places. “No translation is based on the Majority Text.”³⁰

Aland seems to suggest that with the later NT manuscripts the influence of the church as a structuring agent has increased and that before the fourth century there was more freedom. Therefore, one has to expect more uniformity from the fourth century onward:

Major revisions of Greek manuscripts must certainly have occurred toward the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century. In neither of these instances was the primary motivation of the revision philological. It was prompted rather by ecclesiastical theological interests. . . . The text of the early period of the third/fourth century was, then in effect, a text not yet channeled into types, because until the beginning of the fourth century the churches still lacked the institutional organization required to produce one.³¹

Textus Receptus. In 1633, this title was given to the text originally published by Erasmus of Rotterdam, a Catholic priest and humanist. This text was edited a number of times by him as well as by others. The first edition rested only on seven manuscripts and was quickly thrown together. The manuscripts were late, coming from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries. None of them contained the entire New Testament. For Revelation he had only one manuscript that he edited. Occasionally, he introduced words from the Latin into the Greek

text. Under pressure he also included the *Comma Johanneum* (addition in 1 John 5:7) into the Greek text, which according to his and our conviction did not belong there.

As already mentioned, the *Textus Receptus* differs in many places from the Majority Text and is based on only a few manuscripts instead of hundreds and thousands. It has produced Greek readings that were not present before 1516. The *Textus Receptus* was also edited by Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevirs. But the development in the *Textus Receptus* from Erasmus to Stephanus to Beza to the Elzevirs makes inadmissible the claim of inspiration or perfect preservation for the *Textus Receptus*. The history of the *Textus Receptus* leaves no doubt that its text has changed many times. This is a major problem for those who would claim that it exactly represents the originals.³²

In addition, the King James Version was not only based on the *Textus Receptus* but also on other manuscripts, and it underwent revisions so that the present KJV differs substantially from the 1611 edition. Therefore, the claim that the KJV as a translation is inspired and yet has errors that should be changed is embarrassing for KJV-adherents. The next question would be: “If it has been changed, which edition is the inspired edition?”³³ Glenny even claims that the modern *Textus Receptus* is also a sort of an eclectic text.³⁴ It is markedly different from the original editions.

How do Bible Scholars Deal with the Different Readings? Our study so far has shown what some of the issues are with regard to NT manuscripts. Here so-called textual criticism comes in to help with a solution of the problems. Textual criticism is distinct from what Ellen G. White rejects and calls “higher criticism.”³⁵ Glenny defines textual criticism this way:

Textual criticism . . . is the study of the copies and translations of any written composition of which the autograph (the original) is unknown for the purpose of determining as closely as possible the original text.³⁶

Modern Translations

Next, the question arises as to which translation(s) one should choose. Which is the best translation? This question is not easy to answer. It depends on circumstances and purpose.

In this regard, we have to think in broader terms. Many people may not have an option. They may have to live with the only translation available in their native language. There may not even be a translation in their language at all. We can assume that even in the twenty-first century many people would be happy to have any Bible at all. So the question about which version to choose is one that affluent people of industrialized nations can ask, having at their fingertips a variety of Bibles. Taking into consideration this broader context may help us see a little clearer what the issues are. To tell someone who has just one Bible that their Bible may not be good enough or, even worse, that it has to be rejected—as some concerned church members may say—would be cruel and possibly rob them of their only hope. While we acknowledge that some translations are better than others, under certain circumstances we should be happy to have any Bible. This puts the initial question in perspective, teaching us to not be dogmatic about this question.

For those living in affluent nations with several options for a Bible translation, the questions may be about which version to use and how the versions differ. We will approach the question of how the versions differ first.

First, they differ with regard to the Greek text of the New Testament on which they are based. There are two major options. One can go for the *Textus Receptus* and disregard or reject all other manuscripts or one can choose a Greek text that is eclectic and based on more than one text type. In the second case there are more options for translations to choose from. Opting for the *Textus Receptus* to presumably have a pure text is questionable. As shown above, the *Textus Receptus* is based on a limited number of manuscripts and ignores the thousands of manuscripts that the compiler of that text—Erasmus of Rotterdam—did not have at his disposal but that we have today. It also relies on late manuscripts only. Furthermore, the text is not purer

since variants are also found in the *Textus Receptus*. Indeed, it went through a number of revisions which should not have been the case, if it were so pure and the only inspired text.³⁷ It is not wrong to have a preference for the *Textus Receptus*. What is wrong is to despise and accuse those who use a translation other than KJV or NJKV.

Second, translations differ with regard to their underlying translation theory. Translation is always a difficult task. And because a translation process can never be perfect, theology students have to study Greek and Hebrew. While the good translators have the “goal to produce the most accurate rendering of the original text,”³⁸ the task is momentous. There is the issue of how to translate poetry and idioms, and how to deal with terms that are wider or narrower in the source language or the receptor language. Does accuracy mean faithfulness to wording and grammar or to content? Sometimes it is an “either or,” and not a “both and.” Furthermore, “must one be most concerned with a word-for-word translation . . . ? Or, does one show greater sensitivity to the receptor language, converting the meaning of the source text into forms . . . that the receptor or reader will more readily understand?”³⁹

Bibles are sometimes distinguished into formal equivalent versions, paraphrases, and dynamic or functional equivalent versions. We will exclude from further discussion the paraphrases because oftentimes they are not real translations but a reformulation of a former translation into the modern language without returning to Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic. They are free renderings of the original and therefore also quite open to the interpretation of the respective author.

Formal equivalent versions are quite literal and attempt to preserve word order, sentence structure, and grammar of the original language. Furthermore, the translator tries to translate a term always with the same word in the document. If words are added, they are normally shown in italics. A formal equivalence approach is basically a word-for-word translation theory. Although in modern translation theory this is normally no longer sought for, formal equivalence theory has a place in Christianity, because interpretation is dependent on precise wording. However, a word-for-word translation can become wooden and at times even unintelligible and therefore has its limitations.

The dynamic equivalence translation attempts to remedy this situation, to reveal the intended meaning of the author. The goal is to allow the reader to come to a better understanding, and read more quickly. Translators following this approach may, for instance, translate nouns with verbs. They may provide a definition rather than a word that is not understood (“propitiation,” “reconciliation,” “flesh”), and may use inclusive language. The possibility to influence the interpretation of a translated passage is certainly higher and the translator must exercise care. Both approaches have strengths and weaknesses and therefore may be both needed. RSV, NASB, ESV, and NKJV belong to the formal equivalent versions. The NIV falls between the formal equivalent translations and the dynamic equivalent versions are represented by the TEV, CEV, and NLT.

So which version to choose? For serious study a formal equivalent translation should be used. Oftentimes this would be the NASB or ESV. For devotional reading the NIV is a good choice. Milliman suggests:

The people whom Christians hope to reach today—the unchurched person, the post-Christian individual, the child, the homeless person—need a Bible that is free of difficult theological jargon, strings of dependent clauses, and college-level vocabulary. Yet they also need one that conveys accurately the meaning of the original. . . . Paraphrases also have a place in the Christian’s library. These are excellent tools for introducing inquiring people to the Bible. . . . In addition, many seasoned believers have had the words of Scripture confront them in a new and fresh way with a paraphrase, or even with a dynamic equivalent translation. . . . Does such a thing as an “all- purpose” Bible exist? Probably not. The NIV might provide the best balance between the literal and dynamic

equivalent translation method. . . . Whichever version(s) you choose to own, pick up your Bible and read it! Read it, meditate on it, and memorize it. It is a lamp to your feet and light for your path; it is more precious than gold and sweeter than honey. In it alone, with unmistakable clarity, you will find Him, whom to know is life eternal.⁴⁰

Conclusion

Scripture is the Word of God coming to us in a human garment so that we can understand what God wants to communicate to us. While we do not deny the challenges and difficulties, we do not solely focus on them. We see the larger picture. We are amazed by the wonderful attestation and transmission of the divine message. We marvel when we see the harmony and unity in God's Word. And we follow Jesus our Lord, who lived by the Word of God and who challenged us to know our Bible.

Ekkehardt Mueller is Deputy Director of the Biblical Research Institute

¹ For more information, see Bruce Manning Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 67–92.

² Cf. Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament, Volume 2: History and Literature of Early Christianity* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987), 21–31.

³ W. Edward Glenny, "The New Testament Text and the Version Debate" in *One Bible Only? Examining Claims for the King James Bible*, eds. Roy E. Beacham and Kevin T. Bauder (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2001), 76. For the importance of the papyri, see Eldon Jay Epp, "The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission," in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*, ed. William L. Petersen (Notre Dame, MI: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 71–103.

⁴ E.g., the Caesarean Text; see Richard N. Soulen, *Handbook of Biblical Criticism, 3rd edition* (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1981), 29; and Christopher Tuckett, *Reading the New Testament: Methods of Interpretation* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1987), 24–25.

⁵ Glenny, 78.

⁶ Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd edition (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1989), 146.

⁷ Glenny, 78.

⁸ Soulen, 211

⁹ *Ibid.*, 4.

¹⁰ Glenny, 79.

¹¹ Aland, 50, states, "The same question is raised by Codex Alexandrinus (A). Its text in the Gospels is quite poor (differing only slightly from the Majority text). But beginning with Acts its quality changes remarkably: In Acts it is comparable to B and N., while in Revelation it is superior to N. and even p47."

¹² Soulen, 209–210.

¹³ Aland, 65; cf. Koester, 41.

¹⁴ Kevin T. Bauder, "Frequently Asked Questions in the Translation Controversy," in *One Bible Only? Examining Claims for the King James Bible*, eds. Roy E. Beacham and Kevin T. Bauder (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2001), 109.

¹⁵ Glenny, 125.

¹⁶ Aland, 28.

¹⁷ D. A. Carson, *The King James Version Debate: A Plea for Realism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1979), 56.

¹⁸ See *ibid.*, 2–294.

¹⁹ Aland, 295.

²⁰ This may be indirectly indicated in texts such as Rev 22:18, 19.

²¹ Glenny, 109.

²² Ellen G. White, *Selected Messages*, (Washington, DC: Review and Herald, 1958)1:16, 20.

²³ Wilbur N. Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1977)

²⁴ Wilbur N. Pickering, "An Evaluation of the Contribution of John William Burgeon to New Testament Criticism," Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1968, 88.

- ²⁵ Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, 143.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, 141.
- ²⁷ United Bible Societies, *Greek New Testament*, 4th edition (New York: American Bible Society, 1993) and Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28th edition (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012).
- ²⁸ Zane C. Hodge and Arthur L. Farstad, *The Greek New Testament according to the Majority Text* (Nashville, TN: Nelson Publishers, 1982).
- ²⁹ Glenny, 81.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*
- ³¹ Aland, 50-51, 64.
- ³² Glenny, 86.
- ³³ *Ibid.*
- ³⁴ *Ibid.*, 88.
- ³⁵ Ellen G. White, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1911), 474.
- ³⁶ Glenny, 76.
- ³⁷ See Robert W. Milliman, "Translation Theory and Twentieth-Century Versions, in *One Bible Only? Examining Claims for the King James Bible*, eds. Roy E. Beacham and Kevin T. Bauder (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2001), 135–136.
- ³⁸ Milliman, 137.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*, 138.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 149-150.

4/15