

Why a new translation? Rather the question asked should be “Why this long for a translation?”

I found myself constantly asking, how can I trust a translation that refuses to translate God’s name to “Yahweh” when this is what the text clearly reads? This is a blatant *intentional* mistranslation of the text due to tradition. Every scholarly book and technical commentary has no problem translating “Yahweh” to “Yahweh.” It is not a translation the word for “Lord.” (which is *adonai* in Hebrew and is a distinctly different word). It is the name of the one true God. So when every single modern translation translates “Yahweh” to “LORD”, then it is apparent that it is no longer a translation and now becomes a commentary or a personal interpretation. No scholar would ever translate the name of a god to “LORD” if it appeared in any other text, and no one censors the name of any pagan god. This betrays all honest and integrity of a trustworthy translation.

DEFENSE OF USING YAHWEH

Even if the emissaries (apostles) of our Lord followed the tradition of the Septuagint and rendered “Yahweh” into “LORD”, it does not follow that a translation of the text should follow that same principle. An accurate New Testament translation, however, will rarely use “Yahweh” because of the tradition of the emissaries (apostles) to render ‘Yahweh’ as LORD. But if we are translating, not teaching or interpreting, then we must translate the Old Testament usage to “Yahweh” and the New Testament usage to “LORD” because we are merely translating the texts. The only usage of “Yahweh” in the New Testament is in Revelation, where “Praise-Yah(weh)” is the correct translation of [“Halalujah”]

God wants his name “Yahweh” to be known. (Exodus 3:15, Exodus 9:16)

God does not want the names of pagan Gods to be known. (Exodus 23)

Exodus 3:15

“And God said again to Moses: This is what you shall say to Israel’s sons: Yahweh, God of your fathers, God of Abraham, God of Isaac, and God of Jacob, has sent me to you. This is my name to the age, and this is my memorial from generation to generation.”

Exodus 9:16

“ [Yahweh God:] And yet for this, I have caused you to stand, so as to show to you my power, and for the sake of declaring my name in all the earth.”

Jeremiah 23:27

“...who are devising to cause my people to forget my name by their dreams, which they related, *each* man to his companions, just as their fathers forgot my name because of Baal”

Romans 10:13

“Everyone, whoever might call-on the name of the Lord for himself, will be saved.”

Here, when Paul says “the Lord”, he is referring to Yahweh, not to Jesus. For he is quoting Joel 2:32:

“And it shall come to pass: Everyone who calls on Yahweh’s name will be saved.”

Translators ironically disobey Yahweh by censoring his name which he wants everyone to know, while yet having no problem making sure that everyone knows the names of pagan gods. (However, since the original text does preserve the names of pagan gods, a translation should still retain these.)

BUT AGAINST NONSENSE HEBREW WORDS—MOST TRANSLATIONS THAT USE “YAHWEH” ARE USUALLY CORRUPTED JUDIAZING TRANSLATIONS WHICH ALSO TRY TO USE NONSENSE HEBREW WORDS LIKE “TORAH” AND “ELOHIM” WHICH GIVE A HUGE ANACHRONASTIC DISTORTION.

GOD with DEFINITE ARTICLE

God is NOT a proper name in Hebrew or Greek. Yahweh is a god. There is an understanding in the culture (both religious and non) that there are many gods, but there still is the Christian understanding that there is only one who is supreme above them all. Therefore, in Greek, they might say. “A god came to me. I spoke to the god.” When “the god” seems to be referring to the true god, I render it as “God” (for “the god” may be too jarring) but when it states “a god” I render it as “a god”, whereas other translations will corrupt it into “God” as if it had the word “the” before.

Therefore, Jesus is both “a son of a god” and “a son of the god” (or as I render it to help the English render so it doesn't sound so jarring “son of God”)

For example, right away in John 1:6

"There came-to-be a human, having been sent from a god; his name was Johanan. "

“angels” are considered gods by Psalms (which Jesus actually quotes), and Hebrews.

This brings up the doctrinal situation in which Paul states that for “us” we have only “one god.”

The idea of “god”, especially in Hebrew, is a “supreme divine being.” Therefore, unlike the pagans, in which one can choose any god of their liking who all have some sort of equality, Paul is stating that there is one before all. So when someone of the time read this passage, they understand that there is one “supreme divine being” amongst all the “supreme divine beings.”

We have a similar situation with the word “chief-priest”.

Jesus is the chief-priest.

One individual was the chief-priest.

There was also a group of chief-priests. When referring to any one of these, one may say “I went to see John the chief-priest” even though he wasn’t the actual chief-priest among them all, but only one out of the body. (When the bible says “Jeremiah the prophet” that doesn’t mean that there are not other prophets.)

There were also the “priests.”

Even though all of these are true, I could say there is only one chief-priest whether I was referring to Jesus or the current human chief-priest in Israel, and all of that in spite of the fact that there is an entire body of chief-priests.

Therefore, when Paul says that there is only one god (“supreme divine being”) this does not disqualify the others from also being legitimately divine.

NONSENSE WORDS:

When the texts of the bible were originally composed, there were very few jargon words, that is, words exclusive to the religion. Most of the words would be used in both non-religious and religious contexts. However, many translations, especially in English, have created many jargon words which were never intended to be exclusive to Christianity by the original authors. One of the most glaring is the transliteration, instead of translation, of the word “baptismo” to “baptism”. Because of this, there has even arisen questions as to whether baptism must be immersion. It is impossible for this question to be introduced into the Greek language. The word baptism means immersion. And baptism was a normal secular word in Greek without any religious connotation. If a ship was sunk into the ocean, the word baptized is frequently used. Therefore, any translation must seek to translate a word which is found both in secular and religious texts into a word in that particular language which can be used in both secular and religious texts. The failure to do this results in jargon words which were not intended by the authors. Here are a list of many jargon words which no longer retain their Greek meaning in an English translation due to transliterations and have now become words with absolutely no meaning:

Angel -> Messenger, which may be used of a human or spiritual being. The Hebrew and Greek reader must rely on context to determine which one is meant (which means sometimes this is vague and inconclusive). The English reader also should be required to rely on context instead of being forced to decide based on the translator’s bias. (However, when translating Latin writings, “angel” (which, by that time has become a Greek loanword, many times being transliterated into Latin and not translated), it is translated to “heavenly-messenger” since in the Latin text it would not have the broad definition of “messenger”).

Apostle -> Emissary (more literally “placed-off-one”) [could also be translated “Missionary”, but this may give the modern English reader the idea that the modern concept of missionary is meant].

Baptism/Baptize/Baptist -> Immersion/Immerse/Immerser

Bishop -> Overseer

Cleric -> Allotted-One

Christ -> Anointed-One

Church -> Assembly

Deacon -> Minister (“Waiter” may be an even more accurate translation)

Devil -> Slanderer (this is a title, not a name, and may apply to any sort of being, both spiritual and physical)

Evangelist -> Good-Messenger (maybe more literally ‘a bringer of a good-message’)

Friar -> Brother

Gospel -> Good-Message

Parish -> Sojourning

Patriarch -> Fatherland-Chief

Pastor -> Shepherd (only translated inconsistently to “pastor” in one verse of every modern translation, due to faulty theological biases of making an ‘office’ out of something which was not intended by the passage)

Pope -> Papa

Presbyter -> Elder

Satan -> Adversary (this is a title, not a name and may apply to any sort of being, both spiritual and physical / Chronicles is clearly not talking about a spiritual enemy when the census is being taken / a messenger of God stands as an adversary against Balaam / however, in the New Testament, it does seem to start having an exclusive reference to one particular adversary, and it certainly does with the Latin writers, where, being transliterated and not translated, it now has a definite meaning of “supernatural-adversary”)

See ->

SPECIFIC:

Messenger (use examples from Revelation, Acts (with Peter))

Assembly/Church

Adversary/Satan (use examples from Chronicles, Numbers, Kings, etc.)

PLURAL YOU:

One thing that is lost from every modern translation, due to the degeneration of the English language, is the singular vs. plural you, both of which have been condensed into “you”. However, almost every other language, even contemporary, contain this important difference, to know if the author is addressing multiple people or a single individual. (One example of the importance of this is Revelation, where the rebuke to each of the assemblies is directed to the ‘messenger of the assembly’ and not to the entire assembly.) The normal singular you has been kept as “you” and the plural you is denoted by “*all of you**” or “*you**”.

RENDERING PARTICIPLES MORE DISTINCT

“many translations <> AND <>

“After..., <z> --- confessing sins

makes it clear that these are not contemporary actions

GREEK WORKS TRANSLATED WITH MORE THAN ONE ENGLISH WORD DEPENDING ON CONTEXT

kai = and/also/even

de = now/but

te = also/as-well-as/both

= now

ean mh = literally “if-at-any-time not”, is rendered in this translation as “unless”

account/discourse/rationalization (Greek ‘logos’)

all/every

alone/only

because/that

become/come-to-be/come-to-pass

dismiss/forgive

earth/land

make/do (both in Greek and in Latin)

have-faith/put-faith

lifestyle/lifetime/livelihood

in-this-manner / in-this-*same*-manner / this-is-how

went-off / came-off

LATIN:

“minister” translates Latin “diaconon” (which is a Greek transliteration)

“minister*” translates Latin “minister”

In literal Greek, some prefixes may be simultaneously added to both the verb and to the sentence itself. Therefore in Greek, you may have the sentence “came-out out of him” and “came-out of him”. In order for this to flow more naturally in English, such duplications of prefixes will be rendered such as “came-forth out of him”. Therefore, in the English translation, the reader must keep in mind that there is no difference in the underlining Greek between “came-out” and “came-forth” (or other such words as “going-out” and “going-forth”)

Some English words being used for multiple Greek words

“going” (as in walking)

“going” (as in, it is “going” to happen)

There are two Greek words for neighbor. The second one is always designated as “neighbor*”

grammata – literally “writement” --- referring to either an individual “letter” itself or a series of letters rendered into a “document”. Therefore, this word is usually translated document, but whenever it is translated “letter” in order to distinguish it from epistle “letter” it is rendered “letter*”

CONSISTENCY WITH WORDS WITH PRECISE MEANINGS NOT USUALLY RENDERED DIFFERENTLY IN ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

HUMAN VS. MAN

One unfortunate lost of English translations is the use of “man” to translate two words with distinct difference in meaning. “Anthropous”, which means “human”, and refers to someone being a “human” as opposed to a dog or cat, whereas “aner” refers to a “man” as opposed to a woman. Because of this, the clear distinction in almost 100% of English translations when an actual man is made as opposed to a woman is not obvious, and the reader may often be confused or led to the wrong conclusions, not realizing that only actual men are meant. Every other ancient language, and most contemporary languages – even in their bible translations – make this difference clear. English is one of the few languages that does not. This distinction must be clearly retained to prevent English-only readers from failing to recognize this and coming to the wrong conclusions.

HEBREW: adam vs. []

GREEK: anthropous vs. aner

LATIN: human vs. vir

GERMAN:

ENGLISH: human vs. man

The only exception made to this rule is the title “son of man”, which literally in Greek is “son of the human”.

Due to the awkwardness of this translation, “son of man” has been retained, with footnotes in each instance clearly reminding the reader that the best translation would be “son of the human”.

TEMPLE & INNER-SANCTUM

In many English translations, the Greek word for “temple” and “inner-sanctum” are both rendered as “temple”. While these have related meanings, they are specifically different. The temple refers to the entire complex, while the inner-sanctum is a specific part of the temple. This is especially important in certain narratives, and can most clearly be distinguished in the Judean War. It also gives the proper precise imagery and setting when Jesus and the emissaries are in Jerusalem.

MILITARY TERMINOLOGY

Military terminology (such as weapons and armor and war machines) have been translated to be the specific types that they are instead of general words. While this may be insignificant to any sort of doctrinal conclusion, it does reflect the precise usage and word choice which the original Greek author used. In military segments, especially in Maccabees and Judean War, this is very specific for a reason. And since these are historical war novels, these must be retained for that very reason. Many of the war machines are also very specific, and the translation of such paints an appropriate image in the minds of the readers instead of general vagueness.

For example, most English translations translation five different Greek words to “sword”, whereas this translation specifically distinguished them to “long-sword”, “short-sword”, “scimitar”, “saber”, etc. Shields are usually designated into two types: “round-shield” and “oblong-shield”, the latter which was primarily used by the Roman military. The same is done for spears, lances, pikes, etc. and for war machines and helmets and armor.

MORE NOTES ABOUT SPECIFIC WORDS

LOGOS

There are two Greek words that are usually translated to "word" in most English translations, which is unfortunately because there is usually absolutely no distinction between the words.

One should be translated to "word" (which is NOT that word which I translated to "account")

The other, "logos" which I usually translated to "account" (once in awhile "discourse") has to do with rationalization/logic being emitted from the mind in some sort of logical construction or assessment via some sort of method which is NOT limited in any means to word, but words may be a way to express such. But it is NOT a word - it is a series of logical statements formed into an "account". And it is not a hasty use of words, but something that is well thought out by means of logic (or reasoning or rationalization). And almost all translators will admit (including myself) that it is not easy to find a single English word that gets across the full meaning of "logos" and can be used in every context.

The verb form of the word is "to account" (which I believe is 100% consistent in my translation, but sometimes translated in certain translations "to reckon"). As in the sentence "Now Abraham had-faith in God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness." (James 2:3).

Or "Now the wage is not being accounted to the one who is working according-to a favor, but instead according-to a debt." (Romans 4:4)

If a translated is going to be consistent, they would have to render those verbs as "worded" -- "it was worded to him for righteousness", which does not get across what that is meaning. And "the wage is not being worded to the one who is working" is nonsense, and a perfect example of how this word cannot be limited "word".

Therefore, we can see that Abraham had an "account of righteousness", not a "word of righteousness".

Now this word in Greek, which is "Logos" is where we get English words today such as "logical", "logistics" etc.

So, if you wanted to be even more literally, it could be rendered:

"In the beginning was the logic" or "In the beginning was the logical-assessment" or something of the sort.

And when you hear "word" you think of a single word not a carefully thought out account of something. But this is an entire account of something.

Such as someone making an account of their travels, which may be expressed by words or by writing.

"He told all of us the account of his travels."

"I read the account of his travels in a book."

There is also Greek philosophy related things to the word "logos" which is a bit difficult to explain -- but Jesus being "logos" actually makes a lot more sense to a Greek philosopher than even to a normal Greek (and especially to English) readers. (Some of the early church fathers understand this, as the Gospel of John is very philosophical and seems to be a rebuke in part to Greek philosophers and the then arising Gnostic heresies which also rely on a bunch of nonsense Greek philosophy)

However, I have decided that I am not going to follow an less accurate translation merely because the more correct translation sounds less pleasing to the ear. I don't think that some early translations should have the domination on the market and overshadow correctness merely because they got the first stakes in time.

Also, the adjective form of "logos" (or it's opposite) should be translated either

"logical/illogical" or "rational/irrational"

Such as in 2 Peter 2:12

"But these men, like irrational animals which have been born instinctive for capture and corruption, while reviling in what they are ignorant of – they will also be corrupted in their corruption,"

(as I said, it is nearly impossible to have a one-to-one English word ratio with "logos" (I currently use "account" and "rationalization" and "rational-discourse" for "logos" (and for the verb "accounted" and for the adj "rational/irrational"), but this should give you an idea of what is implied by the word)

SPIRIT

Spirits means "invisible-force". Includes wind, emotion, intentions, gravity, demon, heavenly messengers when in an invisible form, pulse in a human's vein, etc. It may be or may not be an intelligent being.

PROPHECY/PROPHET

Now in modern times, some have sought to pervert the word "prophesy" to mean something which it does not mean—such as "giving an encouraging message" or "preaching" or "reading the bible" or "sharing Jesus with someone" (usually in the support of a false teaching or a justification). No native Greek reader would ever, in any way even remotely, come to such a conclusion. First, the word prophesy is translated from the Greek word "profeteuw" which literally means "to pre-declare" or "to fore-declare" or "to declare-before(hand)". It is a combination of the Grek words "pro" + "femi". The "pro" prefix may be attached to any Greek word, and alters the word into meaning to do something "before(hand)". For example:

- proeipwn - to foretell
- pronoian - foreight / to foresee
- prognwsei - foreknowledge
- promhtheia - forethought
- proooida - foreknew (know before(hand))
- prothesin – preordain (to ordain before(hand))
- prokhrussw - to preach before(hand)
- prokrinw – to pre-judge (to judge before(hand))

Even the etymology of the English word "prophet" is:

Middle English; from Old French 'prophete'; via Latin; from Greek "prophetes", from "pro" ("before") + "phetes" ("speaker") (from "phenai" ("speak")).

Furthermore, there is not a single instance in the entire bible, in which a narrative has someone doing anything but pre-declaring something when the word "prophesy" is used.

PAUL'S TEXT NOT INTENDED TO BE OVER ANALYZED. A DIFFERENT WORD DOES NOT MEAN AND INTENTIONALLY DIFFERENT MEANING AND IS MERELY A VARIATION IN STYLE AS ANY CONTEMPORARY WRITER WOULD DO, YET THIS VARIATION IN STYLE SHOULD BE RETAINED IN A TRANSLATION. --- "do" vs "perform"

CONSISTENCY WITH TRANLATION OF PEOPLE/PLACE NAMES

THE WRONG CONCLUSION ABOUT THE PRESENT TENSE IN GREEK MEANING "CONTINUALLY".

Saying that the "present" tense doesn't mean a "present" action, but instead means a continual action, is incorrect. While in some cases the context would result in the action being continuous, this is not true in all cases. If we are going to call it anything but the "present" tense, perhaps we could use "currently". But "continually" certainly is not accurate, and, in many prohibition commands, would give the false impression that it was okay to be doing something as long as it was not continually. The context of thousands of passages themselves, demonstrate that even a one time instance is included in the "present" tense. Therefore, this is why every Greek grammar book calls it the "present" tense, not the "continual" tense.

Let us observe a passage in 1 Corinthians 10:20

"But I am not wanting you to be becoming communers of demons."

“I am not wanting” is a present indicative
“to be becoming” is a present infinitive.

Even if this is not an imperative, it is clearly an absolute restriction nonetheless. They are not supposed to be doing this. Likewise, in 1 Timothy 2:11~12 women are not supposed to be teaching or to be controlling a man at all, not allowed to do so if they only do it once, or occasionally rather than “continuously”.

Even if we were to wrongly conclude that the "present infinitive" is continuous, the context of 1 Corinthians 10:20 would also clearly include a one time infraction. Paul's above-statement is in no way implying that this activity of being communers with demons is wrong *only* if it is continuous as opposed to a one time instance. Therefore, it is clear that, even if it would be consented to that “present infinitive” is continuous, it also includes the one time instance. Therefore, the teaching that the “present” exclusive once time or infrequent situations is in error. We can clearly see that the "present infinitive" in 1 Timothy 2:11 prohibits a woman from teaching absolutely, not just continuously.

A case may even be brought up in modern English:

“I told him not to kick the ball.”

vs.

“I told him not to be kicking the ball.”

Even though the present infinitive may seem to imply a wider more general sense of the activity beyond a one time occurrence, it still would encompass the one time instance. It is the same in Greek. Thousands of verses could be cited. (For example, in some Greek manuscripts (not all) it reads “It is better to be marrying than to be burning.” Really? If it is correct that the “present” tense is actually the “continuous” text, then we must conclude that better to be continually marrying? However, it should show that the “present infinitive” has to do with an absolute beyond a possible one time situation, but would also include the one time situation.

SYMBOLS

Bold text is used when an emphatic word is being used in place of the normal non-emphatic version of that word. There are only certain words which have an emphatic version, which is usually limited to words such as “me” and “you” and “all”.

Italics are used for words which are not part of the original text, but are necessary to be included for what is portrayed in the Greek to be properly understood in an English translation. Even though they are italicized, these words in almost all cases cannot be omitted and would usually be already understood by the reader of the text. In many cases, these words prevent a misunderstanding in a passage which would not be misunderstood in Greek, but due to a syntax more vague in English may be accidentally misread.

Even though words such as “have”, “been”, “a”, etc. are not independent words in the Greek text, they have not been italicized, as this information is usually stored within a Greek verb and are actually present in some sort of way.

Greek does not have an indefinite article, but it does have a definite article. In most cases, the lack of the definite article is the Greek indefinite article. Therefore, even though this word is not physically present in Greek, it is present. Therefore, “a” has not been italicized. (Though in certain cases, “a” must be entirely omitted due to English syntax. For example, it might sound fine to say “He learned a wisdom” in another language, but in English it must be rendered “He learned wisdom.”) However, Latin does not have either a definite or an indefinite article. Therefore, “a” and “the” in any Latin translation will be italicized.

Underlined text is used to warn the readers of passages or words which are uncertain, doubtful, or most-certainly spurious due to their exclusion from certain weighty manuscripts or sources. Because the authenticity of these passages are inconclusive, they should not be used for the formation of any sort of doctrine. However, due to the chance that there is a possibility that they might in fact be truthful and because there should be fear of removing anything from such holy writings, they have been left in for the discretion of each individual. The translation should read but with and without the use of the underlined text. If a smooth reading cannot be done in this way, the differences between different manuscripts have been detailed in the exhaustive textual footnotes.

[] = Conjectural restorations of physical holes in an ancient manuscript, where due to this damage the text is not extant. This text should never be thought of as part of the original text, but merely a conjectural restoration in an attempt to help the reader make sense out of what does survive. This is usually used in fragmentary books, such as Enoch or a few fragments from the Revelation of Petros. This is also used in at least one other instance, in which it cannot be determined which of the available textual variants is authentic (such as John 1:18); therefore, the reader is advised to consult the footnotes in such cases.

<> = When the text has been conjecturally emended.

{ } or { { } } = Usually used for marking text where the original text of the book is no longer extant except in a translation. (For example: Certain parts of the Shepherd of Hermas, a book originally written in Greek, are currently not extant except in a Latin translation of the work.)

° on a verb means that a present tense verb in Greek is being rendered as aorist for the sake of the English reader. This is usually done in historical texts. (For example, “said^o” is literally “says”)

° on a name means that the definite article (which cannot be translated in English) is before the name

TEXTUAL FOOTNOTES

DSS = Dead Sea Scrolls

SP = Samaritan Pentateuch (Hebrew)

MT = Hebrew with Masoretic vowel marks added

VH = Original Vowelless Hebrew

Tar = Jewish Targum (O = Onkelos / J = Jonathan / N = Neofiti / Y = Jerusalem)

LXX = Greek Septuagint Translation of Old Testament (original translation about 300BC)

Aqu = Aquila of Sinope Greek Translation of Old Testament (original translation about 130AD – a Judean)

Theo = Theodotion Greek Translation of Old Testament (original translation about 150AD – Hellenistic Judean)

Sum = Summachos Greek Translation of Old Testament (original translation about 200AD – a Judean Ebionite)

Gk = Greek

NU = NA28 (Greek)

TR = Textus Receptus (Greek) (1516AD)

M or Byz = Majority/Byzantine Text (Greek)¹

Gk(A) = Codex Alexandrinus (c.400~440AD)

Gk(A) = Codex Athos (Shepherd of Hermas only) (15th century)

Gk(B) = Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (c.400AD)

Gk(C) = Codex Claromontanus (c.550AD)

Gk(C) = Codex Constantinopolitanus (Barnabas, Clemens only) (1056AD)

Gk(E) = Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (c.450AD)

Gk(F) = Florilegium (Shepherd of Hermas only) (13th century)

Gk(G) = Codex Vaticanus Graecus 859 (Barnabas, Polykarpos, Ignatios only)

Gk(L) = Codex Laudianus

Gk(M) = Michigan Papyrus (Shepherd of Hermas only) (3rd century)

Gk(M) = Codex Medicio-Laurentianus (Ignatios only)

Gk(P) = Codex Parisiensis-Colbertinus (Ignatios only)

Gk(S) = Codex Sinaiticus (c.330~360AD)

Gk(V) = Codex Vaticanus (c.300~325AD)

Gk(W) = Codex Washingtonianus (c.300~500AD)

Gk(Xxxxx) = Papyrus Oxyrhynchos xxxx (where xxxx is papyrus scrap number) (3rd~5th century)

Gk(O) = Codex Boernerianus (9th century)

Gk(\$) = Codex GA1141 (9th/10th century)

Gk(P4) (150~200AD)

Gk(P25) = Berlin Papyrus (4th century)

Gk(P45) = Chester Beatty Papyrus (3rd century)

Gk(P46) = Chester Beatty Papyrus (4th century)

Gk(P47) = Chester Beatty Papyrus (3rd century)

Gk(P59) = P. Colt 3 (7th century)

Gk(P61) = Nessana (7th century)

Gk(P66) = Bodmer (3rd century)

Gk(P72) = Bodmer (4th century)

Gk(P74) = Bodmer (7th century)

Gk(P75) = Bodmer (3rd century)

Gk(P85) = (4th/5th century)

Gk(P911) = (3rd century)

Gk(P961) = (4th century)

Gk(Ber5104) = Berlin Papyrus (Shepherd of Hermas only) (5th century)

Gk(Ber5513) = Berlin Papyrus (Shepherd of Hermas only) (3rd century)

¹ Contrary to popular belief, the King James did *not* use the Textus Receptus or the Majority Text exactly, but was only based on it.

Gk(Ber6789) = Berlin Papyrus (Shepherd of Hermas only) (6th century)
Gk(Ber13272) = Berlin Papyrus (Shepherd of Hermas only) (4th century)
Gk(Bod) = Bodmer Papyrus 38 (Shepherd of Hermas only) (4th or 5th century)
Gk(614) = Miniscule 614 (13th century; used when Bezae is non-extant for portions of Acts)

Note, a number following the manuscript letter denotes which hand transcribed the text. For example, A1 would be the original scribe. A2 would be the second hand, which is the first editor/corrector of the text. A2, would be the third hand, which is the second editor/corrector of the text.

OL = Old Latin Translation (Pre-Vulgate)
Vul = Latin Vulgate Translation
Lat(P) = Codex Palatine (Shepherd of Hermas only) (15th century)
Lat(V) = Vulgate (Shepherd of Hermas only) (9~12th century)
Amc = Aramaic
Arm = Armenian Translation
Arab = Arabic Translation
Boh = Bohairic Translation
Cop = Coptic Translation
Got = Gothic Translation
Eth = Ethiopic Translation
Sah = Sahadic Translation
Slv = Slavonic Translation
Syr = Syriac Translation

Dia = Diatessaron Harmony (only exists in late translations/revisions, not original)
Justinus Martyr (Gk) (100~165AD)
Eirenaios (Gk) (130~202 AD)
ClemAlex = Clemens of Alexandria (Gk) (c.150~c.215)
Tertullianus (Lat) (155~c.240AD)
Hippolytos (Gk) (170~235AD)
Origenes (Gk) (184~253AD)
Cyprianus (Lat) (c.200~258AD)
Eusebios (Gk) (260~340AD)
Athanasios (Gk) (c.296~373AD)
Epiphanius (Gk) (c. 310~403AD)
Didymus the Blind (Gk) (c.313~c.398)
Ambrosios (Ambrose) (Lat) (c.340~397)
(Jerome) (Lat) (347~420AD)
Augustinus (Augustine) (Lat) (354~430AD)