

Appendix A

Response to Questions Raised During the Teaching of Lesson 10 Regarding Mark 1:2-3

Sunday, December 6, 2015

Introduction

The following appendix was prepared in response to a question raised in Lesson 10 (originally taught on 11/29/15) regarding the manuscript support for the *TR*/King James reading found in Mark 1:2-3. It was argued based upon the findings of “textual criticism” that the reading found in the Critical Text and its resulting translations into English in Mark 1:2-3 **is not a mistake**. For the sake of clarity we have reproduced the passage in question below.

Mark 1:2-3

KJB	NASB	ESV
2) As it is written in the prophets , Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. 3) The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.	2) As it is written in Isaiah the prophet : "BEHOLD, I SEND MY MESSENGER AHEAD OF YOU, WHO WILL PREPARE YOUR WAY; 3) THE VOICE OF ONE CRYING IN THE WILDERNESS, 'MAKE READY THE WAY OF THE LORD, MAKE HIS PATHS STRAIGHT.' "	2) As it is written in Isaiah the prophet , "Behold, I send my messenger before your face, who will prepare your way, 3) the voice of one crying in the wilderness: 'Prepare the way of the Lord, make his paths straight,'"

In Lesson 10, I offered the following commentary on the differences exhibited above.

- Mark 1:2-3 contains quotations from Malachi 3:1 (Mark 1:2) and Isaiah 40:3 (Mark 1:3) as the KJB accurately reports with the use of “prophets” plural. Meanwhile the modern versions quoted above both read “As it is written in Isaiah the prophet” singular. This is a flat out mistake in the NASB and ESV; one can read Isaiah from now till the rapture and not find the contents of Mark 1:2 in the book of Isaiah.
- This is not a TRANSLATION issue. It is a TEXTUAL issue. The issue here is not how to properly translate individual Greek words into English. The reason the English texts differ is because their underlying Greek texts differ. This is an example of a substantive difference in meaning. They both cannot be correct.
- This is a clear cut case where modern versions and their underlying Greek text are wrong. They present information that is FALSE. The Old Testament quotation found in Mark 1:2 cannot be found in the book of Isaiah. (Lesson 10)

During the teaching of Lesson 10, two primary objections were raised in response to the information quoted above. First, the manuscript support for the reading “Isaiah the prophet” as contained in the Critical Text was cited as evidence that the *TR* reading is incorrect. Second, an objection to the *TR*’s reading was raised based upon 1st century Jewish forms of source citation which gave precedence to the major or more prominent author over a minor or less prominent author when dealing with “conflated” or compound quotations as found in Mark 1:2-3. According to this line of thought, there is nothing wrong

with the Critical Text's reading, even though the content of Mark 1:2 cannot be found in Isaiah, on account of the fact that Isaiah is the major prophet and is therefore given precedence over Malachi in terms of source citation.

The goal of this appendix is to offer a written response to both of these objections. To that end, we will consider the writings of James R. White, a supporter of the Critical Text and Thomas Holland, a supporter of the *TR* or what he calls Traditional Text as representative of the two positions in question. Throughout and in summation, I will offer my own commentary and thoughts on the issues at hand.

James R. White & The Critical Text Position on Mark 1:2-3

For purposes of comparison we will use the comments found in James R. White's book *The King James Only Controversy: Can You Trust the Modern Versions* on Mark 1:2-3 as emblematic of the Critical Text position on this matter. White's comments are essentially identical to the objections raised during the public teaching of Lesson 10.

Manuscript Support for the Critical Text Reading

Regarding the manuscript support for the reading "Isaiah the prophet" as found in the Critical Text and modern versions, White offers the following comments in Part Two of his book on page 254.

- "The USB 4th assigns to the reading "Isaiah the prophet" a rating of {A}, and that for good reason. The reading has the support of both the external and internal evidence. Externally the word "Isaiah" is found in various forms in Ɀ B D L Δ Θ f¹ 33 205 565 700 892 1071 1241 1243 2427 l 253 arm geo Irenaeus^{gr} Origen Serapion Epiphanius Severian Hesychius and numerous Latin manuscripts, which alone would be sufficient." (White, 254)

For purposes of clarification, what White is trying to identify using scholarly language, symbols, numbers, and names are all the manuscript witnesses that contain the reading "Isaiah the prophet" as found in the Critical Text. For example, the symbols "Ɀ B D L Δ Θ" designate Greek uncial manuscripts (Greek mss written in all capital letters) containing the reading whereas the numbers "33 205 565 700 892" are references to specific Greek minuscule manuscripts (Greek mss written in all lower case letters) supporting the reading. Meanwhile, the names "Irenaeus^{gr} Origen Serapion Epiphanius Severian Hesychius" are references to the writings of the church fathers that support the reading "Isaiah the prophet" in Mark 1:2. Lastly, the statement regarding USB 4th assigning the reading "Isaiah the prophet" a rating of {A} is a reference to what I was talking about in [Lesson 3](#). According to the preface of the latest edition of the Greek text published by the United Bible Society (USB5) the grading system works as follows:

- A—Indicates the text is certain;
- B—Indicates the text is almost certain;
- C—Indicates the text is difficult to determine;
- D—Indicates the text is very difficult to determine. ([Ballard](#))

So White's point in mentioning the {A} rating attached to Mark 1:2 by the 4th Edition of the Greek text published the United Bible Society is that textual scholars are universally agreed that "Isaiah the Prophet" is the correct reading.

1st Century Jewish Forms of Source Citation

In the same paragraph quoted above, after presenting the external manuscript evidence for the reading “Isaiah the prophet,” White turns his attention to the internal support for the reading which he views as “even stronger.” By internal support, White is speaking about the 1st century Jewish method of source citation spoken about in the introduction to this appendix. Specifically White states,

- “But the internal considerations are even stronger. The desire to rescue Mark from an (misapprehended) error in citing Isaiah when the quotation is from Malachi and Isaiah together (see our discussion in the text above regarding this) is a strong argument in favor of the reading found in the modern texts.” (White, 254)

White’s parenthetical note to “see our discussion in the text above regarding this” is a reference to his discussion of Mark 1:2-3 found in the main body of his book on pages 166-168. It is on these pages that one finds White’s full explanation of why the Critical Text reading is acceptable based upon 1st century Jewish forms of source citation.

- “Why are KJV Only advocates so confident that “the prophets” is the only possible reading? The argument is that since part of the quotation given by Mark is from Malachi, Mark couldn’t have written “in Isaiah the prophet,” for this would be a “mistake” on the part of the inspired writer. Even though Mark 1:3 is from Isaiah, the preceding section is from Malachi, hence, it *must* be “in the prophets.”

It is quite certain that some scribes early on in the transmission of the text of the New Testament had the very same thought. In fact, the reason why modern scholars are so confident that the proper reading is “in Isaiah the prophet” stems partly from this very fact: it is much easier to understand why a scribe would try to “help Mark out,” so to speak, and correct what seems to be an errant citation than to figure out why someone would change it to “Isaiah the prophet.” But as in so many instances where a scribe thought he had encountered an error in the text, the error was, in fact, the scribe’s, not the text’s.

The problem with the KJV Only argument at this point is simply one of ignorance of the common form of citation at the time of the writing of the New Testament. We have at least two instances recorded for us by the apostles where a conflated citation of two different Old Testament prophets is placed under the name of the more important or major of the two prophets. One of these instances is found in Matthew 27:9, where Matthew attributes to Jeremiah a quotation that is primarily drawn from Zechariah. We note in passing that the KJV has “Jeremiah” at Matthew 27:9, and hence must make reference to this phenomenon of citing a conflated Old Testament passage by the name of the more major of the two authors to explain this. Also we find the very same attempt on the part of some later scribes to change “Jeremiah” to “Zechariah” at Matthew 27:9, though in this case their attempts did not become the majority reading of the manuscripts. The other instance is here at Mark 1:2-3, where a conflated reading, combining Malachi 3:1 with Isaiah 40:3, is cited under the single name of the more major of the two prophets, Isaiah. This was, as we said, common practice in that day, and we cannot fault the apostolic writers for using the conventional means of expressing themselves. The “error” exists when modern readers try to force the ancient writers into modern standards of citation and footnoting.

We see, then, that Mark was quite accurate in his original wording and did not need the editorial assistance of later scribes, nor of KJV Only advocates, at all.” (White, 167-168)

Once again, I would like to point out that White is very confident as to the “original wording” of Mark 1:2 despite never having seen an original manuscript a day in his life. His certainty that the Critical Text reading is correct, despite his admittance that the *TR* reading also dates from “early on in the transmission of the text of the New Testament,” rests upon his knowledge of 1st century Jewish citation practices utilized by the apostles. White offers Matthew 27:9 as the lone supporting example for the apostles’ “conventional means of expressing themselves” when dealing with “conflated” or compound quotations of the Old Testament. No other support for this notion is mentioned by White.

Having duly established White’s reasoning for why the Critical Text reading is correct, we will now turn our attention to Dr. Thomas Holland’s argument for the accuracy of the *TR*’s reading in Mark 1:2-3.

Dr. Thomas Holland & The *TR* Position on Mark 1:2-3

Just as we used James R. White’s book *The King James Only Controversy* as emblematic of the Critical Text position in the previous section of this appendix, in this section we will use Dr. Thomas Holland’s book *Crowned with Glory: The Bible from Ancient Text to Authorized Version* as representative of the *TR* position on Mark 1:2-3. A portion of Holland’s book was read during the public teaching of Lesson 10 (See Lesson 10 [video](#)).

For purposes of consistency, we will follow the format established in the previous section. First we will address the manuscript support for the *TR* reading. Second, we will look at Holland’s reply to the 1st century Jewish forms of citation argument summarized above by White.

*Manuscript Support for the *TR* Reading*

Holland chronicles the following manuscript support for the reading “written in the prophets” as found in the *TR* and the King James Bible for Mark 1:2.

- “The Traditional Text reads, “*As it is written in the prophets,*” and then cites from Malachi 3:1 and Isaiah 40:3. Other texts read, “As it is written in the Prophet Isaiah,” before quoting Malachi and Isaiah. The reading of the Traditional Text has considerable support. It is found in many of the Greek uncials (A, K, P, W, Π), the majority Greek minuscules (28, 1009, 1010, 1079, 1195, 1216, 1230, 1242, 1252, 1344, 1365, 1546, 1646, 2148) and the majority of Greek lectionaries. Thus the Greek support dates from the fourth century onward. Additionally we find the same reading in the Syriac Harclean version (616 AD), the Armenian version (fourth/fifty century) and the Ethiopic versions of the sixth century. It also received patristic citations from many of the church fathers such as the Latin version of Irenaeus (202 AD), Photius (895 AD), and Theophlact (1077 AD).” (Holland, 146-147)

Textually, there is just as much if not more manuscript support for the *TR* reading of “written in the prophets” than there is for the reading “Isaiah the prophet” in the Critical Text. In addition, to the manuscript evidence catalogued above, King James Bible researcher Will Kinney adds that the *TR* reading is quoted by “Tertullian in 220, long before anything we have in the Greek copies.” (Kinney, [Gospel of Mark: A Modern Version Mix-up](#)) In 202 AD Irenaeus stated the following in his *Against Heresies*:

- “Wherefore also Mark, the interpreter and follower of Peter, does thus commence his Gospel narrative: “The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God; as it is written in THE PROPHETS, Behold, I send My messenger before Thy face, which shall prepare Thy way”. . .

Plainly does the commencement of the Gospel quote the words of THE HOLY PROPHETS and point out Him at once, whom they confessed as God and Lord;" ([Book III, Chapter 10](#))

This Latin quotation from Irenaeus in 202 (White cites a Greek copy above that agrees with the Critical Text) coupled with the quotation by Tertullian in 220 highlights the fact that the manuscript evidence supporting the *TR* reading in Mark 1:2 is of equal antiquity with any of the witnesses supporting Critical Text reading. Therefore, secondary arguments regarding 1st century Jewish source citation are necessary on the part of textual scholars to justify their self-ascribed {A} rating for Mark 1:2 in the critical apparatus.

Response to 1st Century Jewish Forms of Source Citation Argument

Thomas Holland maintains that the notion posited by White and others that a copyist made the change from "Isaiah the prophet" to "the prophets" in Mark 1:2 in order to correct a perceived error is complete conjecture and cannot be proven. Furthermore, Holland argues that there are significant problems with the 1st century Jewish source citation argument. Holland writes:

- "Contextually there arises a problem with the reading as found in the Critical Text. The passage cites both the Prophet Malachi (3:1) and the Prophet Isaiah (40:3). The reading, "As it is written in Isaiah the Prophet," seems inconsistent. Nevertheless, it has been noted that Isaiah was the major prophet and therefore he takes preeminence over Malachi. To illustrate this point, scholars often refer to Matthew 27:9. They claim this passage is not really a citation of Jeremiah but instead a quotation of Zechariah 11:12. Jeremiah received the preeminence as the major prophet.

However, this point can be argued. The text in Matthew does not say it was *written* as the passage in Mark does. Instead the text in Matthew states, "Then was fulfilled that which was *spoken* by Jeremy." God, the Author of Scripture, is aware of who writes what and who speaks what. Simply because Zechariah writes the passage does not mean Jeremiah did not speak it. Also, Zechariah warned Israel to pay attention to what the former prophets had spoken (Zech. 7:7). The ancient Jews had a saying that, "the spirit of Jeremiah was in Zechariah." Much of what Zechariah received, he did so from both the Lord and the former prophet, Jeremiah.

The position presented by many that some copyist made the change from "Isaiah the Prophet" to "the prophets" in Mark 1:2 in order to correct what was perceived as a possible error is conjecture. One can just as easily speculate that an Egyptian copyist not overly familiar with Jewish Old Testament prophets recognized the Isaiah quote and made the change for what he considered to be better clarity. The point still remains that both sides have textual support for their respective positions. It also is understood, as Dr. George Kilpatrick has noted, that most of these types of textual variants were introduced into the manuscripts by the second century. Therefore, one reading is as likely (textually speaking) as the other. The difference is contextually. It is more truthful to say "the prophets" when citing two prophets. Accordingly, the reading in the Traditional Text is both textually substantial and contextually correct." (Holland, 147-148)

Dr. Holland argues for the validity of the *TR*'s reading in Mark 1:2 based upon the "substantial" nature of the manuscript evidence and the fact that the reading is "contextually correct." It is more accurate to say "the prophets" when citing two prophets than it is to say "Isaiah the prophet." Holland is not the only commentator to have reached this conclusion.

- John Gill—"As it is written in the prophets ... **Malachi and Isaiah; for passages out of both follow;** though the Vulgate Latin, Syriac, and Persic versions read, "as it is written in the prophet

Isaias"; and so it is in some Greek copies: **but the former seems to be the better reading, since two prophets are cited, and Isaiah is the last; to which agree the Arabic and Ethiopic versions, and the greater number of Greek copies.**" ([John Gill's Exposition of the Bible](#))

John Lightfoot in his [A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica](#) uses the exact same textual facts regarding the manuscript evidence from Mark 1:2-3 to make the exact opposite argument from James R. White. Rather than scribes changing the alleged original reading of "Isaiah the prophet" to "written in the prophets" to fix a perceived "error" as White contends, Lightfoot argues the converse. Lightfoot reasons that "written in the prophets" was the original reading based upon both the manuscript evidence and the "congruous" nature of the statement and that Christian Jews altered the text by inserting "in Isaiah the prophet" for "in the prophets" to make the passage conform to their custom.

- "[As it is written in the prophets.] Here a doubt is made of the true meaning: namely, whether it be *in the prophets*, or *in Esaias the prophet*. **These particulars make for the former:**

When two places are cited out of two prophets, it is far more congruously said, *as it is written in the prophets*; than, *as it is written in Esaias*: but especially when the place first alleged is not in *Esaias*, but in another *prophet*.

It was very customary among the Jews (to whose custom in this matter it is very probable the apostles conformed themselves in their sermons) to hear many testimonies cited out of many prophets under this form of speech, *as it is written in the prophets*. If one only were cited, if two, if more, this was the most common manner of citing them, *as it is written in the prophets*. But it is without all example, when two testimonies are taken out of two prophets, to name only the last, which is done here, if it were to be read, *as it is written in Esaias the prophet*. . .

But what shall we answer to antiquity, and to so many and so great men reading, *as it is written in Esaias the prophet*? "I wonder (saith the very learned Grotius), that any doubt is made of the truth of this writing, when, beside the authority of copies, and Irenaeus so citing it, there is a manifest agreement of the ancient interpreters, the Syriac, the Latin, the Arabic." True, indeed; nor can it be denied that very many of the ancients so read: but the ancients read also, *as it is written in the prophets*. One Arabic copy hath, *in Isaiah the prophet*: but another hath, *in the prophets*. Irenaeus once reads *in Isaiah*: but reads twice, *in the prophets*. And "so we find it written," saith the famous Beza (who yet follows the other reading), "in all our ancient copies except two, and that my very ancient one, in which we read, *in Esaias the prophet*."

The whole knot of the question lies in the cause of changing the reading; why, *as it is written in Esaias the prophet*, should be changed into, *as it is written in the prophets*. The cause is manifest, saith that very learned man, namely, because a double testimony is taken out of two prophets. "But there could be no cause (saith he) of changing of them." For if Mark, in his own manuscript, wrote, *as it is written in the prophets*, by what way could this reading at last creep in, *as it is written in Esaias*, when two prophets are manifestly cited?

Reader, will you give leave to an innocent and modest guess? I am apt to suspect that in the copies of the Jewish Christians it was read, *in Isaiah the prophet*; but in those of the Gentile Christians, *in the prophets*: and that the change among the Jews arose from hence, that St. Mark seems to go contrary to a most received canon and custom of the Jews: "He that reads the prophets in the synagogues *let him not skip from one prophet to another*. But in the lesser

prophets he may skip; with this provision only, that he skip not backward: that is, not from the latter to the former."

But you see how Mark *skips* here from a prophet of one rank, namely, from a prophet who was one of the twelve, to a prophet of another rank: and you see also how he *skips* backward from Malachi to Isaiah. This, perhaps, was not so pleasing to the Christian Jews, too much Judaizing yet: nor could they well bear that this allegation should be read in their churches so differently from the common use. **Hence, in Isaiah the prophet, was inserted for in the prophets."**
(Lightfoot)

So once again, we see the so-called experts contradicting each other in the realm of textual criticism. One thing is apparent; the situation with respect to Mark 1:2-3 is not as clear cut as James White leads his readers to believe in *The King James Only Controversy*. What does one do when two "scholars" interpret the exact same data in directly contradictory ways? Remember what we studied in [Lesson 2](#) about Hegelian Dialectic and the tactics of the Adversary. Satan's objective from the beginning was to question and deny what God said with the goal of establishing a competing authority. Placed in this conundrum man would become his own authority as he gets to choose for himself what he believes God said. Who is right White or Lightfoot?

As we saw in section 1, James R. White buttresses his belief that "Isaiah the prophet" is the correct reading based upon 1st century Jewish citation practices. To support this argument, Professor White appeals to Matthew 27:9-10 as another example of how Jewish scribes handled "conflated" or compound quotations from more than one prophet. The problem here is that White is making an apples to oranges comparison to try and prove his point. Mark 1:2-3 and Matthew 27:9 are not both examples of "conflated" or compound quotations from more than one prophet.

Mark 1:2-3	Matthew 27:9-10
2) As it is written in the prophets , Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee (Comes from Mal. 3:1). 3) The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight (Comes from Is. 40:3).	9) Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value; 10) And gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me (The entire quote is from Zech. 11:12-13).

Mark 1:2-3 is a compound quotation to be sure in that its contents can be found in more than one prophet. Meanwhile, Matthew 27:9-10 is certainly **not** a "conflated" quotation seeing that its contents are only found in Zechariah 11:12-13. The passage that White directs his readers to (Matt. 27:9-10) in order to prove that 1st century Jewish citation practices explain why the Critical Text reading in Mark 1:2-3 is correct does not even exhibit the phenomenon that White is attempting to prove. White cannot even offer one apples to apples comparison within the Biblical text to prove his assertion regarding 1st century Jewish citation practices. Even from an extra Biblical standpoint, White offers no proof that 1st century Jews cited sources in the manner he is asserting. One is just supposed to take his word for it.

Dr. Holland compounds matters further for White when he points out that Mark 1:2-3 is discussing what was "written" by the prophets whereas Matthew 27:9-10 reports what was "spoken" by Jeremiah. Holland rightly points out that "God, the Author of Scripture, is aware of who writes what and who speaks what. Simply because Zechariah writes the passage does not mean Jeremiah did not speak it." In others words, Matthew 27:9 does not assert that Jeremiah *wrote* the words contained in

Zechariah 11:12-13 but merely that Jeremiah said or *spoke* something similar. Dr. Holland than directs his readers attention to Zechariah 7:7 where the prophet tells his readers to pay attention to the things spoken by the former prophets (i.e. Jeremiah), “**Should ye not hear the words which the LORD hath cried by the former prophets**, when Jerusalem was inhabited and in prosperity, and the cities thereof round about her, when *men* inhabited the south and the plain?”

Textually, the Greek words translated “written” in Mark 1:2-3 and “spoken” in Matthew 27:9 are not the same and carry different meanings. This is true in both the *TR* and the Critical Text. The Greek word translated “written” in Mark 1:2 is *graphō* which means to write and is variously rendered as some form of “write” or “writing” in English. In contrast, the Greek word rendered “spoken” in Matthew 27:9 is the word *rheō* which means to utter audibly and is variously translated: “speak” twelve times, “speak of” three times, and “command” one time. Is James White really saying that there is not a difference between what was “written” down and what was “spoken?” It appears that he is.

In seeking to rescue the Critical Text from a clear mistake in Mark 1:2-3, White engages in a line of unfounded Biblical reasoning and sloppy reading of Biblical texts that he would never accept from anyone else he was debating on any other topic. Yet, explanations such as these are passed off as “scholarly” when they are used defend the Critical Text and modern versions against the King James Bible and its underlying Greek text. If this does not constitute a double standard, I am not sure what does.

Conclusion

I maintain that the reading for Mark 1:2-3 as found in the King James Bible is the correct reading. First, there is ample early and abundant manuscript support for the reading across a host of various types of witnesses i.e., Greek manuscripts, early translations, lectionaries, and patristic citations. Second, the reading “written in the prophets” is contextually consistent with the FACT that Mark is quoting from two different prophets Malachi and Isaiah. Third, I find any arguments based upon unproven 1st century Jewish citations practices to be unconvincing, shabbily argued, and guilty of perpetrating greater damage to the text than what they are supposed to be fixing.

Remember the King James and its underlying text is presumed to be wrong by **most** modern textual scholars before any discussion of the facts commences. This is done in much the same way that **many** so-called scientists exclude the possibility of intelligent primary causes before they even begin investigating the question of origins. White conveniently leaves out of his book any discussion of manuscript evidence and/or scholarly opinion that contradicts the position he is advancing. Meanwhile, the Christian public is supposed to view this type of textual criticism as not only helpful but necessary for establishing the correct text.

Here again, as with parallel influence and harmonization, White and his troop are found to be grasping at straws in their attempt to disprove the validity of the *TR* and the KJB. Once again, in the absence of the “originals”, how does White know that what the “original wording” of Mark 1:2-3 actually was. On the surface, White’s arguments about parallel influence, harmonization, and 1st century Jewish citation practices sound reasonable and scholarly. But under closer inspection, White’s reasoning falls apart because the verses he uses to build his argument do not even assert what he is trying to force them to say.

Must one read White, Holland, Gill, and Lightfoot in order to have confidence in the Bible they have before them? Does one need to know about 1st century Jewish citation practices to determine which reading of Mark 1:2 is correct? Are Protestant scholars who claim to believe in *sola scriptura* actually saying that one must consult extra Biblical data to identify scripture?

In the end, my main point from Lesson 10 stands. There are substantive differences in meaning that affect the accuracy of the text between *TR* and the Critical Text and their representative English translations. Determining which text or reading is correct cannot be determined by textual criticism alone without the aid of insight gained from the doctrine of preservation. It is the doctrine of preservation that will assist the Bible student in being able to determine which text/reading is correct, not so-called neutral or natural textual criticism which treats the Bible as though it were any other book. Textual criticism must be guided and reined in by the doctrine of preservation. Once again, this is why a proper grounding in what the Bible says about itself is a mandatory prerequisite to sorting out the textual and translational issues. It is to this task that we will now turn our attention to in Lesson 11 as we begin a detailed study of the doctrine of inspiration.