

***INSPIRED PRESERVATION -
A STUDY OF THE INSEPARABLE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN BIBLICAL INSPIRATION AND PRESERVATION***

BY

JESSE M. BOYD

“The words of the LORD are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever” (Psalm 12:6-7, KJV).

“It is better to trust in the LORD than to put confidence in man” (Psalm 118:8, KJV).

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	2
CHAPTER 1. DEFINING THE RELATIONSHIP	4
CHAPTER 2. HISTORICAL CONSENSUS CONCERNING THE RELATIONSHIP	11
CHAPTER 3. IMPLICATIONS OF A BIBLICAL VIEW OF THE RELATIONSHIP	19
CHAPTER 4. THE FALLACY OF MODERN THOUGHT CONCERNING THE RELATIONSHIP	24
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUDING THOUGHTS	38
APPENDICES	40
BIBLIOGRAPHY	49

INTRODUCTION

For students of the Holy Scriptures, systematic theology is a familiar topic, one “which treats directly of God and His relationship to the world and man.”¹ Such a topic is of extreme importance to the minister of the Gospel, for as Cornelius Van Til promulgates, “Systematic theology seeks to offer an ordered presentation of what the Bible teaches about God.”² Furthermore, as Charles Ryrie explains, it “correlates the data of biblical revelation as a whole in order to exhibit systematically the *total picture* of God’s self-revelation . . . it focuses on the *total structure* of biblical doctrine . . . it presents the *total structure*.”³ Unfortunately, the total structure of biblical doctrine is rarely explicated to the student of systematic theology whether it be in the classroom or between the covers of a theology textbook. Many times, doctrines that are difficult to understand are mentioned only briefly, or completely neglected. Such a phenomenon is not only unfaithful to the purpose of systematic theology, but in many instances, reflects the personal theological prejudices of the author or teacher. A prime example of this occurs with regard to the Scriptures themselves, otherwise known as bibliology. Since, as Gary Habermas ardently proclaims, “the major source for S.T. [Systematic Theology] is the inerrant Scripture,” omission in the area of bibliology can prove extremely detrimental.⁴ Without the Scriptures, there would be no “Systematic Theology.” The common systematic bibliological presentation will discuss such subtopics as inspiration, inerrancy, illumination, canonicity, etc., but the topic of biblical preservation is missing.

¹Oliver J. Buswell, *A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion*, Vol. 1 (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1962), 13.

²Cornelius Van Til, *An Introduction to Systematic Theology* (Phillipsburg, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1978), 1.

³Charles Ryrie, *Basic Theology* (Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1987), 14-15. Emphasis mine.

⁴Gary Habermas, *Classnotes: Theology Survey I* (Lynchburg, VA: Liberty University, 1994), 3.

It is simply not talked about.⁵ Major theological works such as Charles Ryrie's Basic Theology and Millard Erickson's Christian Theology fail to even mention the subject.

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the biblical doctrine of preservation and establish its inseparable relationship with the doctrine of inspiration. These two doctrines, although often treated separately, cannot be comprehended accurately except in lieu of one another. Considering their interrelatedness will provide a better understanding of the authority and divine nature of Holy Scripture. In short, this will be done by defining the relationship between inspiration and preservation, overviewing the historical consensus regarding that relationship, discussing the important implications of such a relationship, and pointing out the fallacy of modern thought concerning the relationship. Perhaps the reason for such a study is best echoed in the words of John Burgon, former Dean of Chichester:

There exists no reason for supposing that the Divine Agent, who in the first instance thus gave to mankind the Scriptures of Truth, immediately abdicated His office and took no further care of His work; that he abandoned those precious writings. That a perpetual miracle was wrought for their preservation, that copyists were protected against the risk of error, or evil prevented from shamefully adulterating copies of the Deposit, it is presumed that no one is so weak to suppose.⁶

In the end, it should become clear that God's inspired Word has been perfectly preserved for Christians today. May the Almighty guide this quest which seeks to glorify His Holy Word.

⁵Perhaps a reason for this lies in the fact that a true biblical doctrine of preservation inevitably comes into conflict with the science of textual criticism and the plethora of modern English translations of the Bible.

⁶John W. Burgon, "The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels" in Unholy Hands On The Bible, Vol. 1, Including the Complete Works of John W. Burgon, Dean of Chichester, Ed. by Jay P. Green (Lafayette, IN: Sovereign Grace Trust Fund, 1990), 7.

CHAPTER 1

DEFINING THE RELATIONSHIP

The relationship that exists between biblical inspiration and preservation is quite simple, for it is evidenced not only by biblical data, but sheer logic as well. Before describing the relationship, however, it is appropriate to briefly define the two doctrines in and of themselves.

The Doctrine of Inspiration

The key passage for the doctrine of biblical inspiration is found in II Timothy 3:16. “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God . . .” Another important passage is II Peter 1:21. “For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” These verses teach that the Scriptures are the very words of God who inspired them through holy men of old. Millard Erickson remarks, “By inspiration of the Scripture we mean that supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit upon the Scripture writers which rendered their writings an accurate record of the revelation or which resulted in what they wrote actually being the Word of God.”⁷ Inspiration is both verbal and plenary. In other words, it refers to the words themselves, and to Scripture as a whole.⁸

The inspiration of the Bible is also confirmed by the teachings of Jesus (e.g. Luke 16:17; John 10:35). These teachings, in turn, are further verified by the Resurrection. Habermas states it succinctly, “Both the O.T. and the N.T. are inspired by God, as confirmed especially by the teachings of Jesus, which are in turn validated particularly by

⁷Millard Erickson, *Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1985), 199.

⁸Although there are several popular views of inspiration such as natural, dynamic, concept, and partial inspiration, the author concludes that verbal / plenary inspiration is the only view that fits the biblical description. Other views come into conflict with inerrancy, infallibility, and preservation.

His resurrection.⁹ In conclusion, “starting with belief in the incarnation and a very general belief in the historical truth of the Gospels, we have found ourselves apparently compelled to accept our Lord’s view of Scripture. According to his teaching God so guided the authors that the words they wrote were his words.”¹⁰

The Doctrine of Preservation

Inspiration is when God takes a blank piece of paper and uses men as instruments to write down His words. Preservation, on the other hand, is when God takes those words already written and uses men to preserve them down through the ages. “The Bible repeatedly speaks of God’s promise to preserve his word—not, however [*sic*] the paper on which the Autographs were written, nor early copies of these originals. God commanded Jeremiah to throw his ‘originals’ in the river (Jeremiah 51:63).”¹¹ A key passage which discusses such a phenomenon is Psalm 12:6-7.¹² The Psalmist writes, “The words of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.”¹³ Like inspiration, preservation is verbal and plenary (cf. Matthew 4:4, 5:18, 24:35), being rooted in the eternal and immutable character of God. Elmer Towns writes, “If an all-powerful God cannot control the vehicle of His self-revelation, then His power and nature can be questioned.”¹⁴ Just as the apostles and prophets were God’s vehicle for inspiration, the Church has been God’s vehicle for preservation for the

⁹Habermas, 20.

¹⁰John Wenham, Christ and the Bible (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984), 187.

¹¹Gail Riplinger, New Age Bible Versions (Ararat, VA: AV Publications, 1995), 508.

¹²see also Isaiah 30:8, 40:8, 59:21; Matthew 24:35; I Peter 1:23

¹³Although some modern versions translate verse 8 as “You will keep *us* Lord and preserve *us* from this generation forever.” An honest look at the Hebrew reveals that the pronoun agrees with the nearest antecedent which happens to be “words.” The King James rendering of this verse is correct and true to the Hebrew text.

¹⁴Elmer Towns, Theology For Today 2nd ed. (Lynchburg, VA: University Press, 1994), 49.

past two thousand years. God controls the vehicle because He is sovereign. “It must be that down through the centuries God has exercised a special, providential control over the copying of the Scriptures and the preservation and use of the copies, so that trustworthy representatives of the original text have been available to God’s people in every age.”¹⁵

The Relationship Between Inspiration and Preservation

As can be clearly derived from a casual treatment of the doctrines of inspiration and preservation, there exists an inseparable bond that ties the two together. In other words, one cannot be considered without the other. The Committee Statement on Bible Preservation of the Dean Burgon Society clearly defines the relationship:

Bible inspiration and Bible preservation are supremely important. The undermining or destroying of either doctrine renders the other meaningless. If the Bible is not verbally, plenary, and inerrantly inspired, and if inspiration does not extend to all matters of which the Bible speaks, it does not matter if the Bible has been preserved or how it has been preserved. It also follows that, if the Bible has not been preserved, it does not matter how it was inspired.¹⁶

Such a statement is not only backed by biblical evidence, but conforms to simple logic.

Inspiration and preservation are supported by biblical evidence.

The heart of the aforementioned relationship lies in the nature of the term “scripture.” Jack Moorman writes, “While it may be assumed that the Bible’s usage of the word “Scripture” has reference to the original autographs; yet virtually each time the word is used it is the copies or even translations of the Scriptures that are in view, e.g. it is the Scriptures the people had access to.”¹⁷ In II Timothy 3:16, Paul speaks of the Scriptures as being inspired in the same context that he proclaims Timothy had known

¹⁵Edward Hills, The King James Version Defended (Des Moines, IA: Christian Research Press, 1956), 9.

¹⁶Committee Statement on Bible Preservation, (Dean Burgon Society) quoted in David Cloud, “Some Thoughts on Inspiration and Preservation,” O Timothy Magazine (Vol.9, Issue 8, 1992), Ed. by David Cloud [journal on-line]; available from <http://www.aloha.net/~bstaggs/inspire.txt>; Internet; accessed 10 October 1997.

¹⁷Jack Moorman, “Principles of Bible Preservation,” O Timothy Magazine (Vol.9, Issue 8, 1992), Ed. by David Cloud [journal on-line]; available from <http://www.dsinclair.com/~dcloud/library/ti0800002.htm>; Internet; accessed 25 February 1997.

them as a child (v. 15). Paul and Timothy were both separated from the original Old Testament Scriptures by hundreds upon hundreds of years. Yet, what they had access to was considered Scripture. Moreover, Paul calls the God-inspired Scriptures useful, being “profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works” (II Timothy 3:16-17). Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown argue:

The *Greek* [γραφη = Scripture] is never used of *writings* in general, but only of the sacred Scriptures. The position of the two *Greek* adjectives [θεοπνευστος, ωφελιμος] closely united by ‘and,’ forbids our taking the one as an epithet, the other as predicated . . . Clearly the adjectives are so closely connected that as surely as one is predicate, the other must be so too.¹⁸

In other words, the Scriptures are both *inspired and profitable*. If this is only a reference to the “original autographs,” then Christians do not have useful Scripture, for no person has seen any of the originals for almost two thousand years. A better interpretation of this passage argues that the originals were inspired and profitable. Consequently, they were providentially preserved by God in perfect copies made by men who were providentially guided by the Almighty. Therefore, the copies which Paul and Timothy had were inspired in the sense that they had been preserved. Preservation is an inevitable outgrowth of inspiration.¹⁹ A copy or translation can be inspired in the sense that it has been perfectly preserved.

Another aspect of the close relationship between inspiration and preservation can be seen in the words of our Lord in Matthew 4:4. The text reads, “Man shall not live by bread alone, but by *every word* [emphasis mine] that proceedeth out of the mouth of

¹⁸Robert Jamieson, A.R. Fausset, and David Brown, *Commentary On The Whole Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1979), 1380. The phrase to which Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown are referring to reads: “πασα γραφη θεοπνευστος και ωφελιμος . . .”

¹⁹For other passages which use the term “scripture” in a context not restricted to the original copies see Matthew 21:42, 22:29, 26:54, 26:56; Mark 14:49, 15:28; Luke 4:21,24:24; John 2:22, 5:39, 7:38, 7:42, 10:35, 13:18, 17:12, 19:24, 19:36, 19:37, 20:9; Acts 1:16, 8:32, 8:35, 17:2, 17:11, 18:24, 18:28; Romans 1:2, 4:3, 9:17, 10:11, 11:2, 15:4, 16:26; I Corinthians 15:3, 15:4; Galatians 3:8, 3:22, 4:30; I Timothy 5:18; James 2:8, 2:23, 4:5; I Peter 2:6; II Peter 3:16.

God.” If man is to live by every word of God, then the Almighty is duty-bound to provide him with every word. He made such a provision through inspiration and preservation. If inspiration and perfection only apply to the original manuscripts, and error has crept into all subsequent copies, then we have an imperfect Bible and are unable to live by every word of it. Bruce Lackey writes,

If only the autographs are inspired, no one has the inspired scripture. Thus, no one could obey Matthew 4:4 . . . Did God intend for only those who had the autographs to obey this? Or did he intend for only those who could read Hebrew and Greek to obey this? The answer must be obvious to any thinking Christian. When God made the statement, and when Christ repeated it, did he not know that the scripture would be copied and translated many times?²⁰

Similar arguments can be built upon the exhortations found in II Timothy 4:2 and Revelation 22:18-19.

I Peter 1:23-25 is another interesting passage. The apostle teaches that we are born again by the incorruptible Word of God “which liveth and abideth forever.” Peter also states that this incorruptible word is “the word which by the gospel was preached unto you.” Without the uncorrupted Word of God beyond the original autographs, there is no salvation for mankind for the past two thousand years. The people to which Peter was writing had not heard the originals, but copies, and more likely, translations. Yet, he stated that they were born again by an uncorrupted word. God perfectly preserves his inspired Scripture without corruption.

Finally, let it be noted that perfect preservation beyond the inspired originals is far from inconceivable. According to Psalm 119:89, the inspired words preceded the original manuscripts of Scripture (cf. John 12:48-50, 17:8).

Inspiration and preservation supported by logic.

²⁰Bruce Lackey, “Inspiration and Translation,” *O Timothy Magazine* (Vol. 9, Issue 11, 1992), Ed by David Cloud [journal on-line]; available from <http://www.aloha.net/~bstaggs/transl.txt>; Internet; accessed 10 October 1997.

Not only do the Scriptures argue for preservation as a necessary outgrowth of inspiration, but logic favors this claim as well. It is simply illogical to think that Almighty God, who perfectly inspired his words, did not have enough power to guide the Church to perfectly preserve them. Why would God inspire the originals and then lose them at the hands of fallible men? If God gave a perfect Bible to men such as Peter, James, John, and Paul, who saw the Lord face to face, would he not give it to us? If anyone ever needed a perfect Bible, it is modern man, separated by almost two thousand years from a Saviour he has never seen. Dean Burgon once asked the question of those who denied the preservation of the Scriptures, “Is it indeed credible that Almighty Wisdom—which is observed to have made such abundant provision for the safety of the humblest forms of animal life, for the preservation of common seeds, often seeds of noxious plants—should yet have omitted to make provision for the life-giving seed of His own Everlasting Word?”²¹ Philip Mauro writes, “He who gave to men the Holy Scriptures to serve throughout the age as the sure foundation of that ‘faith of the Son of God’ which alone avails for personal salvation, and to be also the sufficient rule of life and conduct for ‘the household of faith,’ *has not failed to devise effectual means for the preservation of His written Word.*”²² In accordance with God’s character it is only logical to believe that he supplied the divine safeguard of verbal preservation for his inspired text.

In conclusion, one must consider the words of Ed Hills:

If the doctrines of the divine inspiration and providential preservation of the Scriptures are true, then THE ORIGINAL . . . MANUSCRIPTS WERE WRITTEN UNDER SPECIAL CONDITIONS, UNDER THE INSPIRATION OF GOD, AND THE COPIES WERE MADE

²¹John Burgon quoted in “Publisher’s Preface” in Unholy Hands on the Bible, Ed. by Jay P. Green (Layfayette, IN: Sovereign Grace Trust Fund, 1990), iv.

²²Philip Mauro, “Which Version? Authorized or Revised?” in True or False, Ed. by David Otis Fuller (Grand Rapids, MI: Institute for Biblical Textual Studies, 1973), 83.

AND PRESERVED UNDER SPECIAL CONDITIONS, UNDER THE SINGULAR CARE AND PROVIDENCE OF GOD.²³

Inspiration and preservation are inseparably related. Just as sanctification inevitably proceeds from the justification of the believer, so divine preservation proceeds from God-breathed inspiration. The two doctrines cannot be treated separately, for one without the other is “vain and profane babbling” (cf. I Timothy 6:20).

²³Hills, 9. In the complete quotation, Hills only makes reference to the New Testament manuscripts. This is simply because the crux of his argument in The King James Version Defended deals with the New Testament, the battleground for naturalistic textual criticism. Most obviously, Hills would apply the same argument for the Old Testament.

CHAPTER 2

HISTORICAL CONSENSUS CONCERNING THE RELATIONSHIP

Having defined and described the relationship between inspiration and preservation, it is necessary to provide a brief historical overview of how the Christian Church has handled this issue over the centuries. Until modern times, the Church as a whole has stood pretty much in agreement.²⁴ Ed Hills writes:

The Christian Church has long confessed that the books of the *New Testament*, as well as those of the *Old*, are divine Scriptures, written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit . . . Although the doctrine of the *providential preservation* of the Old and New Testament Scriptures has sometimes been misused, nevertheless, it has always been held, either implicitly or explicitly, by all branches of the Christian Church as a necessary consequence of *divine inspiration* of these Scriptures.²⁵

The Biblical Period

There is no question that the Biblical writers adhered to the doctrine of *preserved inspiration*.²⁶ In fact, the practice of copying manuscripts employed by the ancient Hebrews supports such a claim. D.A. Waite writes, “There were eight or more important, strict rules that were followed by the Hebrew scribes who copied and recopied the Masoretic Hebrew O.T. These rules were to insure that each letter, word, and sentence of the Hebrew text was preserved exactly.”²⁷ God authorized the Jewish race to be the exclusive guardians of His precious words (cf. Romans 3:1-2). They strongly believed in divine preservation, for they themselves were the instruments of it. In fact, Jesus accused the Jews of many sins; failing to preserve the Scriptures through corrupted copies was definitely not one of them.

²⁴Let it be noted that preservation is rarely if ever mentioned as a doctrine in ancient Christian theological writings because it was considered to be inseparably tied to inspiration. The two doctrines were considered one in the same.

²⁵Hills, 8.

²⁶From this point on, the term *preserved inspiration* will be used to refer to a the biblical view of inspiration and preservation, one that takes into account the inseparable relationship.

²⁷D.A. Waite, “The Four-Fold Superiority of the King James Version” [article on-line]; available at <http://www.aloha.net/~bstaggs/kjvwaite.txt>; Internet; accessed 20 February 1997.

The attitude of Jesus and the apostles was exactly the same, as has already been indicated. Further evidence of this is promulgated in passages such as I Timothy 5:18 where Paul calls Luke 10:7 Scripture. Most obviously, he was not quoting from the original document because it had been given to Theophilus several years before. Paul was looking at a copy of the original, believing it to be inspired in the sense that it was preserved. A similar situation presents itself in II Peter 3:16 when Peter puts Paul's epistles on the same level as "other scriptures." Most obviously, Peter never saw the original copies because they were sent to various churches throughout Asia Minor and the Roman Empire. He was reading and studying copies of the original Pauline epistles.

The Patristic Period

Following the era of the New Testament, the Church Fathers had much to say about the nature of the Scriptures. Practically all orthodox Christians at that time adhered to the doctrine of divine inspiration although their view of its nature often differed.²⁸ Because of the great multiplication and spread of the Scriptures, error had begun to seep into some of the copies both unintentionally and intentionally. Thus, there was a need to address and define the doctrine of divine preservation. In spite of errors in some of the copies, there did exist inspired copies in the sense that they had been perfectly preserved. A Western Church Father by the name of Caius wrote in the second century:

For this reason is it they have boldly laid their hands upon the divine Scriptures, alleging that they have corrected them. And that I do not state this against them falsely, any one who pleases may ascertain. For if any one should choose to collect and compare all their copies together, he would find many discrepancies among them . . . their disciples were very zealous in inserting the corrections, as they call them, i.e., the corruptions made by each of them . . . For one may compare those which were formerly prepared by them with those which have been afterwards corrupted with a special object, and many discrepancies will be found. And as to the great audacity implied in this offence, it is not likely that even they themselves can be ignorant of that. *For either they do not believe that the divine Scriptures were dictated by the Holy Spirit, and are thus infidels; or they think themselves wiser than the Holy Spirit, and what are they then but demoniacs* [emphasis is mine]? Nor can they deny that the crime is theirs, when the copies have been written with their

²⁸James Leo Garrett, Systematic Theology (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990), 114-115.

own hand; nor did they receive such copies of the Scriptures from those by whom they were first instructed in the faith and they cannot produce copies from which these were transcribed.²⁹

Caius obviously held to the preservation of Scripture because he exclaimed that those who corrupted the Scriptures did not believe in divine inspiration. According to the early church fathers, the two doctrines were one in the same. Irenaeus, also from the second century, wrote, “We have learned from none others the plan of our salvation, than from those through whom the gospel has come down *to us*, which they did at one time proclaim in public, and at a later period by the will of God, handed down *to us* in the Scriptures, *perfect*, inasmuch as they were uttered by the Word of God and His Spirit.”³⁰ In Irenaeus’ opinion, he had the perfect Scriptures providentially passed down to him. In the third century, Origen while expressing the faith of all to Africanus spoke of the Providence behind the sacred Scriptures.³¹ The attitude toward the Scriptures of the patristic period is clear.

The Reformation and Post-Reformation Periods

During the period of the Protestant Reformation, much was said about the nature of the Holy Scriptures because the Roman Catholic Church had hidden them for so long from the eyes of the common people, veiled in the Latin Vulgate. Therefore, many translations were made into the vernacular and preservation had to be defined. Furthermore, the authority of Scripture was pitted against the Roman Catholic Church. If the Reformers were to have any claim at all, they had to believe they were standing on a perfect book, providentially preserved for them from the days of its inspiration.

²⁹Ante-Nicene Fathers (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1971), 5: 602.

³⁰Irenaeus, MPG, Vol. 7, Col.805, Col. 844 quoted and translated in Ed Hills , The King James Version Defended (Des Moines, IA: Christian Research Press, 1956), 8. Emphasis mine.

³¹Origen, De La Rue, Vol. 1, 16 quoted and translated in Ed Hills, The King James Version Defended (Des Moines, IA: Christian Research Press, 1956), 9.

Some of the great theological giants of the day had interesting opinions regarding preserved inspiration. For example, Desiderius Erasmus' purpose in compiling the first printed edition of the Greek New Testament was to clear-up difficulties present in the text of the Latin Vulgate. In Epistle 149, he writes: "Latin scholarship, however elaborate, is maimed and reduced by half without-Greek . . . since the translators of Scripture, in their scrupulous manner of construing the text, offer such literal versions of Greek idioms that no one ignorant of that language could grasp even the primary, or, as our own theologians call it, literal meaning."³² In other words, Erasmus compared the Vulgate with *the* Greek text, the "Received Text" which he has well as other reformers believed to have been passed down from the days of the apostles. How could Erasmus have legitimately laid claim against the translation of the Vulgate unless the Greek text which he appealed to was believed to be perfectly preserved, for the Roman Catholic Church also believed in preservation and claimed it to be found in the Vulgate. "It was assumed that the making of the Vulgate Latin version had been guided by inspiration of the Holy Spirit."³³ Also, many medieval scholars had begun to teach that the Latin Scriptures were more reliable than the Greek manuscripts.³⁴ Whether or not Erasmus' Greek text was perfectly preserved or the Latin Vulgate (for there were many discrepancies between the two) is not important at this juncture. What is important is that both the Protestant Reformers and the Roman Catholics believed in the verbal-plenary preservation of the God-inspired Scriptures.

³²Desiderius Erasmus, Epistle 149 quoted and translated in "The Correspondence of Erasmus," Vol. 2 in The Collected Works of Erasmus, Ed. by R.A.B. Mynors and D.F.S. Thomson (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975), 25.

³³B. Hall, "Erasmus: Biblical Scholar and Reformer," in Erasmus Ed. by T.A. Dorey (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1970), 85.

³⁴William Combs, "Erasmus and the Textus Receptus" in Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal (Spring 1996), 39.

Martin Luther also held to the preserved inspiration of the Bible. His appeal to *sola scriptura* necessitates such a belief, for if the Scriptures had not been providentially preserved, how could they have had supreme authority? Luther once wrote, “What else do I contend for but to bring everyone to an understanding of the difference between the divine Scripture and human teaching or custom, so that a Christian may not take the one for the other and exchange gold for straw, silver for stubble, wood for precious stones?”³⁵ To Luther, the Scriptures he possessed were gold compared to the traditions of men. They were gold because they came from the breath of God Almighty and had been providentially preserved for him.

John Calvin argued that the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit with regard to the Scriptures was absolutely paramount.³⁶ In opposition to the view that the church was the final authority on Scripture, Calvin believed that “the authority of Scripture is intrinsic. Authority derives from the Holy Spirit who *inspired it*, caused it to be written, and *gave it to the church* . . . He went on to argue that the Scripture now needs no proof to substantiate its *present authority*.”³⁷ Calvin was quite sure that the Church possessed the same Scriptures that God inspired. They had been perfectly preserved and were the sole authority.

Several well-known creeds that were born out of the Reformation had something important to say about preserved inspiration. For example, the Helveticus Consensus of 1675 reads, “God, the supreme Judge, not only took care to have His word . . . but also has watched and cherished it with paternal care ever since it was written *up to the present*

³⁵Martin Luther, “Answer to the super Christian, super spiritual, and super learned book of Goat Einser” in *Works*, 3:372 quoted in Alan Johnson and Robert Webber, What Christians Believe (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1993), 44.

³⁶Garrett, 115.

³⁷Alan Johnson and Robert Webber, What Christians Believe (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1993) 44. Emphasis mine.

time, so that it could not be corrupted by craft of Satan or fraud of man.”³⁸ The Presbyterian Westminster Confession of Faith drawn up between 1643-1648 contains a similar exhortation. “The Old Testament in Hebrew . . . and the New Testament in Greek . . . *being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentic* . . . they [the Scriptures] are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come, that the word of God dwelling plentifully in all . . .”³⁹

The Modern Period

Despite a favorable consensus to the inseparable relationship between inspiration and preservation held throughout the history of the Christian Church, modern times have yielded quite a shift. Prior to the late 1800’s preservation was assumed to be true in light of God’s character and promise. It was rarely, if ever, questioned and considered to be a natural outgrowth of inspiration. However, the shift came as men began to question the Scriptures themselves, particularly the Authorized King James Bible which God has used to reach the English-speaking people for almost four hundred years. The full-blown attack against the preserved Scriptures began around 1881 with B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort and their subsequent release of a critical Greek New Testament which differed from the Textus Receptus of the King James Bible in thousands of places.⁴⁰ According to

³⁸Helveticus Consensus of 1675 quoted in Unholy Hands on the Bible, Ed. by Jay P. Green (Lafayette, IN: Sovereign Grace Trust Fund, 1990), iv. Emphasis mine.

³⁹Westminster Confession of Faith, Chapter I, Section VIII quoted in Archibald Hodge, A Commentary on The Confession of Faith (Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1869), 64. Emphasis mine.

⁴⁰The phrase Textus Receptus refers to the traditional text of the New Testament used by the translators of the AV 1611 King James Bible. It represents the Syrian-Byzantine type text (the majority of Greek manuscripts) for the most part with a view non-Byzantine readings (e.g., I John 5:7-8; Acts 8:37; Matthew 18:11). Technically speaking, this term was first applied to an edition of the Greek New Testament put out in 1632 by the Elzevir Brothers. However, the previous editions of the Greek New Testament all presented substantially the same text, and the variations were not of great significance and never affected the sense of the passage. In the course of time, the title “Textus Receptus” came to be

Wilbur Pickering, “Although men such as Tischendorf [sic] Tregelles, and Alford had done much to undermine the position of the Textus Receptus, Westcott and Hort are generally credited with having furnished the death blow and with beginning a new era—an era in which we still find ourselves.”⁴¹ Out of this occurrence arose the modern science of naturalistic textual criticism which seeks to establish the original text of Scriptures by treating the Bible as any other book. Greater weight is given to the subjective opinions of men rather than the providential care and safekeeping of God. Westcott and Hort’s theories initiated an era which has witnessed the publication of countless critical editions of the Greek Text as well as English translations. The doctrine of preservation is virtually non-existent in modern theology and when it is mentioned, it is termed “general” and held captive to the practice of textual criticism. Although inspiration is still claimed by evangelical conservatives, preservation is all but forgotten.

A Note on Baptist Heritage

The relationship that exists between inspiration and preservation has been an important issue particularly in Baptist heritage. For example, the London Confession of 1644, a creed of the English Baptists reads:

The Rule of this Knowledge, Faith, and Obedience, concerning the worship and service of God, and all other Christian duties, is not mans inventions, opinions, devices, lawes, constitutions, or traditions unwritten whatsoever, but onely the word of God contained in the Canonickall Scriptures . . . In this written Word God hath plainly revealed whatsoever he hath though needfull for us to know . . .⁴²

It was clear to the English Baptists that God had plainly revealed to them His words in the Holy Scriptures which had been inspired and passed down through the ages as the

associated with the Traditional Text as contained in the editions of Erasmus, Stephens, Beza, and the Elzevirs.

⁴¹Wilbur Pickering, “Contribution of John William Burgon to New Testament Criticism,” in True or False?, Ed. by David Otis Fuller (Grand Rapids, MI: Institute for Biblical Textual Studies, 1973), 218.

⁴²First London Confession, VII-VIII, quoted in W.J. McGlothlin, Baptist Confessions of Faith (Philadelphia, PA: American Baptist Publication Society, 1911), 176.

absolute “Rule of Faith.” Only through perfect preservation could this possibly have been true.

In 1833, the American Baptists drew up the New Hampshire Confession.

Concerning the Scriptures, it reads,

We believe [that] the Holy bible was written by men divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction; that it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter . . . and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the world, the true centre of Christian union, and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and opinions should be tried.⁴³

This could only be true if God’s words had been inspired and perfectly preserved.

For Baptists to deny the perfect providential preservation of the Holy Scriptures is to defy their Baptist heritage as well as the general consensus of the Christian Church for most of history prior to the modern era. Unfortunately, this has occurred all too often as Baptist schools and seminaries are rejecting the doctrine of preservation in favor of naturalistic textual criticism. Michael Maynard, while speaking of particular Baptist scholars such as A.T. Robertson and D.A. Carson, who rejected perfect preservation of the “Received Text” of Scripture, argues that they “betrayed their Baptist heritage when they adopted the textual theories of the Anglican scholar F.J.A. Hort, the Presbyterian B.B. Warfield, and the Lutheran K. Tischendorf.”⁴⁴

The historical consensus toward the idea of “preserved inspiration” is clear. Up until the past century, preservation has been considered far and wide an inevitable outgrowth of divine inspiration, especially in Baptist circles. Now, one must consider several important implications of such a relationship.

⁴³New Hampshire Confession, I, quoted in W.J. McGlothlin, Baptist Confessions of Faith (Philadelphia, PA: American Baptist Publication Society, 1911), 302.

⁴⁴Michael Maynard, A History Of The Debate Over 1 John 5:7-8 (Tempe, AZ: Comma Publications, 1995), 330. Hort, Warfield, and Tischendorf were all prominent naturalistic textual critics. Baptist scholars such as John Gill and Andrew Fuller, both of whom argued for the inspired preservation of the Received Text, have largely been ignored by modern Baptists in favor of the claims of men from other denominations.

CHAPTER 3

IMPLICATIONS OF A BIBLICAL VIEW OF THE RELATIONSHIP

A biblical view of the relationship between inspiration and preservation, one which recognizes that God Almighty perfectly preserved his words for mankind in all ages of history, must take into account several important implications. These deal with the issue of final authority and the necessity of a standard as well as the triumph of the Authorized King James Version and the plethora of modern English translations.

As Relates to the Issue of Final Authority.

The fact of verbal preservation implies that all authority concerning the Christian faith is to be settled in the Scriptures. It is the *FINAL AUTHORITY!* Louis Gaussen proclaims:

One of the strongest proofs of the divine authority of the Scriptures is that majesty of theirs which fills us with respect and awe. It is the imposing unity of that Book, the composition of which extends over fifteen hundred years, and which has had so many authors, who all nevertheless pursue one and the same plan, constantly advancing as if they had all understood each other, towards one sole grand end, the history of the world's redemption by the Son of God.⁴⁵

This being true, the necessity for a standard Bible becomes apparent. “Nothing settles disputes so soon as when the contending parties have confidence in the same umpire and are willing to abide by his decision.”⁴⁶ This truth immediately raises a question concerning the identity of such a standard.

As Relates to the Authorized King James Bible

There can be absolutely no denying that the Authorized King James Version, which has stood the test of time, is the English standard that all Christians should appeal to, especially if they believe in preserved inspiration. Theologically speaking, the AV must

⁴⁵Louis Gaussen, “The Divine Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures,” in *True or False?* Ed. by David Otis Fuller (Grand Rapids, MI: Institute for Biblical Textual Studies, 1983), 43.

⁴⁶Joseph Charles Philpot, “The Authorized Version--1611,” in *True or False?* Ed. by David Otis Fuller (Grand Rapids, MI: Institute for Biblical Textual Studies, 1983), 22.

represent God's preserved words, for it is based upon a pure text that was passed down from the days of the apostles and was the only English translation that remained in existence for 250 years.⁴⁷ Each and every generation of believers has had access to God's Word in its perfectly preserved form, the AV being a case and point. Even F.F. Bruce, a rank liberal, admits that the King James Bible is "The Bible *par excellence* wherever the English tongue is spoken for over three hundred years . . . of all versions the most excellent . . . by sheer merit the Authorized Version established itself as The English Bible."⁴⁸

Many years before the plethora of modern versions arrived on the scene, Joseph Philpot predicted that great turmoil such an occurrence would cause.

Who would undertake it [a new translation]? Into whose hands would the translation fall? What an opportunity for the enemies of Truth to give us a mutilated false bible! . . . It would unsettle the minds of thousands, as to which was the Word of God—the old translation or the new . . . there would be two bibles spread throughout all the land, the old and the new, and what confusion would this create in almost every place . . . If the new translation were once to begin, where would it end? . . . All our good Bible terms would be so mutilated that they would cease to convey the Spirit's meaning and instead of the noble simplicity, faithfulness, and truth of our present version, we should have a bible that nobody would except as the WORD OF GOD, to which none could safely appeal, and on which none implicitly rely.⁴⁹

Sure enough, all of his predictions came true. One translation has led to another and many of the old familiar Bible terms and verses have been mutilated to the point where Bible professors and scholars all over the country claim to possess the Word of God, but do not believe it, as is evidenced by their constant appeal to the "Original Text" which is non-existent. In order to clear up all the confusion, there needs to be a return to the standard.

⁴⁷This paper is a theological treatise. Therefore, it is not necessary to refer to manuscript evidence in building a defense of the King James Bible. However, such an angle of defense can and does strengthen the argument for the preservation of the King James ten-fold. For more information on such an approach to the argument, one should consult the works by Burgon, Riplinger, Fuller, Hills, and Waite as conveyed in the bibliography.

⁴⁸F.F. Bruce, The Books and the Parchments (London: Pickering & Inglis, 1953), 217-219.

⁴⁹Philpot, 21-23.

The present English Bible (Authorized Version) has been blessed to thousands of the saints of GOD; and not only so, it has become part of our national inheritance which we have received unimpaired from our fathers, and are bound to hand down unimpaired to our children. It is, we believe, the grand bulwark of Protestantism; the safeguard of the Gospel, and the treasure of the Church; and we should be traitors in every sense of the word if we consented to give it up to be rifled by the sacrilegious hands of the Puseyites, concealed papists, German Neologians, infidel divines, Arminians, Socinians, and the whole tribe of enemies of GOD and godliness.⁵⁰

Such a powerful statement of truth brings about one final implication of a correct view of inspiration and preservation—a proper response to the plethora of modern English translations of the Bible.

As Relates to Modern English Translations

In light of a proper view of biblical inspiration and preservation, how should a Bible-believing Christian approach modern English translations? First, he must consider the evidence. Practically all modern versions differ from the King James in thousands of places.⁵¹ The *New International Version*, for example, contains almost 70,000 less words. Furthermore, around sixteen entire verses are missing.⁵² As shocking as it may sound, there are even doctrinal differences that exist between the AV and modern versions. For example, in some places modern versions deny the Virgin Birth (Luke 2:33, 43), the deity of Jesus Christ (Zechariah 12:10) and the blood atonement (Colossians 1:14).⁵³

As most Christians are led to believe, the differences between the versions are not simply matters of translation. There are two completely different lines of Hebrew and

⁵⁰Ibid., 23.

⁵¹Of the modern versions, the NKJV sticks the closest to the Textus Receptus of the King James Version. Although claiming to follow the text exactly, it differs in over 1,200 places (e.g., Acts 7:45; Hebrews 4:8; Romans 3:29; Acts 26:17; II Corinthians 7:2; Acts 9:22; II Corinthians 11:29 and many more). Moreover, the NKJV adds words, changes words, changes nouns to pronouns, changes the number of pronouns, changes the person of pronouns, changes plurals, changes pronouns to nouns, and omits the subjunctive mood. Whatever the reason for doing this is irrelevant because these changes deviate from the Textus Receptus. The editors of the NKJV claim otherwise, but check for yourself.

⁵²These verses include Matthew 17:21, 18:11, 23:14; Mark 9:44, 9:46, 11:26, 15:28; Luke 17:36, 23:17; John 5:4; Acts 8:37, 15:34, 24:7, 28:29; Romans 16:24; I John 5:7.

⁵³For a more detailed list of differences see Appendix C.

Greek texts. The King James Old Testament is translated from the Hebrew Masoretic text edited by Ben Chayyim. It is also called the Daniel Bomberg edition, the Second Great Rabbinic Bible (1524-25), or the Letteris text of 1866. This is the text passed down across the centuries and recognized by Hebrews to represent the perfect preserved words of God. F.F. Bruce writes, “And as regards the Old Testament section of the Authorized Version, its high quality as a worthy representative of the sacred Hebrew has been widely acknowledged by Jewish scholars.”⁵⁴ Modern versions, on the other hand, refer to the Masoretic Text as edited by Ben Asher. It is found in Stuttgart edition of BIBLIA HEBRAICA (BHS). These are two completely different Masoretic Texts. Modern Versions also utilize the Septuagint (a Greek translation by Jews who were out of God’s will in Egypt), the Samaritan Pentateuch (produced by a group of half-breeds who refused to acknowledge Jerusalem as the center for worship of Jehovah in Israel), and the Dead Sea Scrolls (the Scriptures of the Essenes who were a cult). It is not an issue of translation!

The New Testament presents a similar situation. The AV is based upon the Textus Receptus, the received text based upon the majority of extant Greek manuscripts and passed down from the days of the apostles, recognized by the Church throughout history as the words of God. The new versions, however, are based upon modern Greek editions such as that of the United Bible Societies. The fourth edition of the UBS text is around 2,500 words shorter than the Textus Receptus. It is not an issue of translation!

A proper view of inspiration and preservation would not allow for success of modern versions. Unfortunately, as has already been shown, this doctrine is no longer held in order to accommodate constantly changing and updated versions of Scripture. According

⁵⁴Bruce, 218.

to modern scholars, there is no standard. God forbid! The next time some biblical “scholar” says that the AV mistranslates the original language of a passage, realize that the translators may have been translating a completely different Hebrew or Greek word.

It is simply unquestionable that the Authorized King James Version is and has been the standard Bible for English-speaking people. Such is no surprise in light of God’s promise of preserved inspiration. God promised to give us His word, so we have it. As previously explicated, this position comes into conflict with textual criticism and the motives that lie behind modern English versions. As a result, many modern theologians and Bible scholars have compromised their beliefs on preservation and consequently, have either redefined or completely ignored it. Therefore, it is necessary to expose the faults of the modern view of biblical preservation.

CHAPTER 4

THE FALLACY OF MODERN THOUGHT CONCERNING THE RELATIONSHIP

Having established the doctrine of inspired preservation, let us consider the fallacy of modern thought concerning the issue. Modern thought concerning biblical preservation is very general. Inspiration and inerrancy are applied only to the original manuscripts, and God's Word is said to have been "generally preserved" in the mass of extant manuscripts.⁵⁵ The modern theologian relies heavy upon the naturalistic science of textual criticism to establish the original text of the Scriptures. The presence of discrepancies in the manuscripts is magnified and such is presumed to exist in all lines of biblical transmission without the possibility of God having preserved every word in a pure line. In summarizing the modern position on biblical preservation, Ed Hills writes, "The most they [modern scholars] can say for the . . . text is that its 'general integrity' has been preserved. This, however, is a very loose phrase which allows for many errors, additions, and omissions . . ." ⁵⁶ Hills' words ring true, for while standing firmly upon the inspiration and infallibility of the original manuscripts, most conservative evangelicals find themselves attempting to clear up or even correct the Scriptures. Such a practice has resulted in a plethora of Hebrew and Greek texts as well as English translations. Has God's Word been perfectly preserved? According to the modern critic, it has not. This position, needless to say, is faulty in several major areas.

⁵⁵These same critics go on to say that differences and discrepancies in manuscripts do not matter because they only represent about 1% of the text and none of the variants have to do with Christian doctrine. Such an assertion is simply not true. The actual margin of difference is around 10% and there are numerous variants that affect doctrine. For examples, one should consult Appendix C.

⁵⁶Hills, 16.

A Faulty Presupposition

The modern position which advocates “general preservation” is based upon the faulty supposition that errors have crept into all lines of biblical transmission throughout the centuries.⁵⁷ It is true that there exists many extant copies and that practically none agree with each other, but does such a fact overshadow the power of God and His promise to preserve His words? At this juncture, it is only appropriate to consider a few quotes from modern critics themselves. Bruce Metzger writes,

As the physician must make a correct diagnosis of a disease before attempting to effect its cure, so the textual critic must be aware of the several kinds of injuries and dangers to which a text transmitted by handwriting is liable to be exposed before he can rectify the errors. In fact, it is important to see not only what *might* happen, but also what *has* happened in the copying of manuscripts.⁵⁸

Alexander Souter defines the study of textual criticism in this manner:

Textual criticism seeks, by the exercise of knowledge and trained judgment, to restore the very words of some original document which has perished, and survives only in copies complete or incomplete, accurate or inaccurate, ancient or modern . . . The original documents, however, have long perished, and we have to make the best of the copies which have survived, by howsoever many removes they may be distant from their ultimate originals.⁵⁹

James White says pretty much the same thing by comparing the errors in manuscripts with sports.

Men make mistakes, even when they are trying really hard. The greatest baseball player still strikes out. The greatest basketball player will miss the clutch free-throw and lose a game once in a while. The best archer will sometimes fire an arrow wide of the target. To err is human . . . there is not one single handwritten manuscript of the Bible, in Greek or Hebrew, that does not contain, somewhere, an oversight, a mistake. To err is human.⁶⁰

Millard Erickson, a well-known modern evangelical theologian, explains,

. . . what is being affirmed by the concept that only the originals are inerrant is that inspiration did not extend to copyists and translators. While divine providence was doubtless operative, there was not the same type of action of the Holy Spirit as was involved in the original writing of the text.⁶¹

⁵⁷The term “general preservation” is used to refer to the idea that preservation is represented very broadly in the mass of extant manuscripts. In other words, it is hidden for the textual critic to discover.

⁵⁸Bruce Metzger, The Text of the New Testament (London: Oxford University Press, 1964), 186.

⁵⁹Alexander Souter, The Text and Canon of the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1917), 3.

⁶⁰James White, The King James Only Controversy (Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House, 1995), 36.

⁶¹Erickson, 240.

The list of quotes could go on and on, however the general presupposition is clear. None of these men ever considered the preservation and power of God in transmitting the biblical text down through the centuries. The Bible was treated like any other book. It is true that humans make mistakes, but we are talking about the Word of God. If the Almighty had the power to inspire it, He definitely had the power to perfectly preserve it. As has already been mentioned, if anyone needs a perfect Bible, it is those who have been separated from the New Testament era for almost two thousand years. The presupposition of “general preservation” is false.

A Faulty Foundation

The modern position concerning inspiration and preservation is also built upon a faulty foundation. Basically, the student of the Scriptures is faced with two options:

The Bible-believing Christian begins with Scripture and ends with full assurance that God was able to do what He proclaimed He would do . . . modern scholarship begins with the knowledge of men and the science of textual criticism. Their final conclusion is not certainty, but ambiguity. They are certain that they are right, but they are uncertain as to the final product.⁶²

Just as theistic evolutionists and progressive creationists favor the claims of science as opposed to the literal meaning of Scripture, so the modern theologian prefers the subjective science of textual criticism over the Authorized King James Bible and its promise of verbal preservation. Textual criticism is the foundation for establishing the “Original Text.” Such groundwork is faulty because it rests solely upon the subjective views and theories of the critics and is completely one-sided and biased against the Received Text of the King James Bible. Maurice Robinson argues, “Such a method of textual determination becomes subjective in the extreme, making textual criticism the pawn of the critic rather than the tool of the exegetical, historical scholar . . . modern

⁶²Thomas Holland, “A Biblical Starting Point” [article on-line], available at <http://members.aol.com/jbabster/holland/lesson01.html>; Internet; accessed 10 October 1997.

eclecticism offers no integrated solution or way of escape from the subjective morass in which it is mired.”⁶³ Ed Hills adds, “the final authority is not the testimony of the extant manuscripts, even in places in which they all agree, but the subjective insight and judgment of the critics.”⁶⁴ Psalm 118:8 says, “It is better to put trust in the LORD than to put confidence in man.” A true view of biblical preservation rests upon the eternal promises of Jehovah, not the subjective and biased insights of sinful men.

A Faulty Association

Not only does the modern concept of “general preservation” rest upon a faulty foundation with defective presuppositions, but it associates with ungodly company—men and manuscripts.

The apostate men.

This line of argument may be considered *ad homonym*, but in this case, it is appropriate in light of I Corinthians 2:14-15. The apostle Paul writes “But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he *know* them, because they are *spiritually discerned*. But he that is spiritual judgeth *all things . . .*.”⁶⁵ Some argue that this statement only refers to Scriptural interpretation and understanding, but such an interpretation is just a way of excusing the acceptance of questionable presuppositions, speculations, textual research, and translations. The natural man cannot receive the things of the Spirit of God. The Holy Scriptures are from the Spirit of God, so the natural man cannot know or understand them properly. His perspective is clouded. This involves anything having to do with the

⁶³Maurice Robinson, “The Recensional Nature of the Alexandrian Text-Type: A Response to Selected Criticisms of the Byzantine-Priority Theory,” in Faith and Mission (Vol. XI, Number 1, 1993), 48.

⁶⁴Hills, 14.

⁶⁵Emphasis mine.

Scriptures such as theology and textual criticism. Therefore, it is dangerous for any Christian to put his faith and trust in translations and theological interpretations of the Bible that were produced by unregenerate skeptics and apostates. As Henry Morris, one of the leading creation scientists, argues:

So one of the serious problems with most modern English translations is that they rely heavily on Hebrew and Greek manuscripts of the Bible developed by liberals, rationalists, and evolutionists, none of whom believed in the verbal inspiration of the Bible. Is this how God would preserve His word? Would He not more likely have used devout scholars who believed in the absolute inerrancy and authority of the Bible?⁶⁶

Modern thought clings to the theories of Westcott and Hort who were closet-Catholics that dabbled in the occult.⁶⁷ Riplinger promulgates, “The errors in the ‘New’ Greek Text and new versions, stemming from the liberal and hypocritical lives of Westcott and Hort, are leaving a generation of souls hungry.”⁶⁸ The textual critics and editors behind modern Greek texts such as the Nestle/Aland tradition and the work of the United Bible Societies also convey questionable outlooks on theology. For example, Eberhard Nestle was a staunch evolutionist.⁶⁹ Carlo Martini, the chief editor of the UBS text is being seriously considered as the next Roman Catholic Pope!⁷⁰ Other members of the UBS committee such as Kurt Aland and Bruce Metzger are also interesting cases. A casual reading of Aland’s The Text of the New Testament shows that he is far and distant from being considered a believer in biblical inspiration and inerrancy. In fact, he never uses either of these words while discussing in-depth the text of the New Testament in several hundred pages. Something is most definitely amiss. How can someone spend so much

⁶⁶Henry Morris, “Should Creationists Abandon the King James Version?” Vital Articles on Science/Creation (El Cajon, CA: Institute for Creation Research, 1996), 2.

⁶⁷Riplinger, 616-629. Riplinger offers a plethora of quotes from the mouths of Westcott and Hort themselves that prove their heresy.

⁶⁸Riplinger, 628.

⁶⁹Morris, 2.

⁷⁰Kevin Fedarko, “Who Will Be First Among Us,” in Time Magazine Vol. 144 No. 26 (December 26, 1994), 72.

time on the text and not even consider its inspiration or preservation? Aland does exactly what other liberal scholars do when approaching the New Testament—he treats it as any other book.⁷¹ Bruce Metzger is the Professor Emeritus of New Testament Language and Literature at Princeton Theological Seminary and serves on the board of the American Bible Society. He is also the head of the continuing NRSV translation committee of the liberal National Council of Christian Churches in the United States. The RSV was soundly condemned for its liberal modernism when it first appeared in 1952. Today, Metzger, the chief editor of its revised form, is invited to speak at Evangelical forums. “The RSV hasn’t changed, but Evangelicalism certainly has!”⁷² Some of Metzger’s works such as the Reader’s Digest Bible (Pleasantville, NY: Reader’s Digest Association, 1982), the New Oxford Annotated RSV (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), and A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (Germany: United Bible Societies, 1993) clearly indicate that while on the one hand Metzger piously claims the Bible to be inspired, on the other he argues that it is filled from beginning to end with myths, legends, folk tales, and lies. In simplest terms, Metzger is a liberal. He has been called an evangelical by some, but based upon his writings, it is safe to say that he is not in the true sense of the word.

A question must be asked. Would God “generally” preserve the “message” of His word through the subjective and liberal theories of men such as these? Certainly not, for based on biblical teaching, these are the type that Satan uses to corrupt God’s Word as he himself did in the Garden of Eden (cf. Genesis 3).

⁷¹Kurt and Barbara Aland, The Text of the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987)

⁷²David Cloud, For the Love of the Bible: The Battle for the King James Version and the Received Text from 1800 to the Present (Oak Harbor, WA: Fundamental Baptist News Service, 1995), 112.

The corrupted manuscripts.

Modern textual critics rely heavily upon the Alexandrian family of manuscripts, namely Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, when attempting to establish the “generally preserved” text of the New Testament in particular.⁷³ In fact, these two manuscripts are behind nearly all modern English translations of Scripture.

Codex Sinaiticus (Aleph) was originally a complete Bible containing the Apocrypha.⁷⁴ The New Testament portion, in particular, is well preserved and includes the *Letter of Barnabas* and the *Shepherd of Hermas*, two pseudepigraphical works.⁷⁵

Bruce Metzger admits:

In the light of such carelessness in transcription, it is not surprising that a good many correctors (as many as nine) have been at work on the manuscript . . . Tischendorf’s edition of the manuscript enumerates some 14,800 places where some alteration has been made to the text . . . [with] more recent detailed scrutiny of the manuscript . . . by the use of ultra-violet lamp, Milne and Skeat discovered that the original reading in the manuscript was erased . . .⁷⁶

And this is supposed to represent the purest form of the New Testament text? Faulty reasoning is at work here. Speaking of Constantinus von Tischendorf, he was the one who found Aleph in St. Catherine’s Monastery on Mount Sinai in 1853. A good portion of the codex (43 leaves) was in a wastebasket containing materials that were about to be

⁷³The Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts also known as codices Aleph and B respectively, are two old uncials that date to around the fourth century.

⁷⁴Most obviously, the author of this thesis has not personally examined Codex Sinaiticus, but this assertion is based upon the fact that Alfred Rahlfs’ edition of the Septuagint (Septuaginta. Ed. by Alfred Rahlfs. Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, 1935, rep. 1979) gives readings from Aleph in the critical apparatus for many of the Apocryphal books (Although citations are not found in all fourteen books, it is not inconceivable that the manuscript once contained them all). It is also interesting to note that the Apocryphal Books were not set aside or separated from the canon, but interspersed amidst the true books. For example, the story of “Bel and the Dragon” is found in the Book of Daniel. This fact is well-known and is clearly explained by Peter Ruckman in his lecture on “Greek Manuscript Evidence” (Greek Manuscript Evidence. Pensacola, Florida: Bible Believer’s Press, n.d. Tape #2). Let it be noted at this juncture that the AV 1611 is often hastily criticized for including the Apocrypha as well. However, such a statement is made out of ignorance, for the AV translators included the fourteen Apocryphal books between the two testaments, making it abundantly clear that they were not a part of the Scriptures. These books were only included for historical and study purposes.

⁷⁵Christian Tindall, Contributions to the Statistical Study of the Codex Sinaiticus (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1961), 4.

⁷⁶Bruce Metzger, Manuscripts of the Greek Bible (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 77.

burned. Six years later (1859), the rest of this so-called “bible” was found wrapped in a red cloth and hidden on a bookshelf.⁷⁷ Dean Burgon characterizes this codex as “recently recovered from a monastery wastebasket.”⁷⁸ One is forced to question what 43 pages were doing in a trashcan in the first place?⁷⁹ Burgon also notes that, Aleph, when collated and compared to the Traditional Text, differs in 8,972 places. Moreover, 3,455 words are omitted, 839 words are added, 1,114 words are substituted, 2,299 words are transposed, and 1,265 words are modified.⁸⁰

Codex Vaticanus (B) was likewise originally a complete Bible containing the Apocrypha as part of the canon.⁸¹ All of the New Testament has been preserved in Vaticanus save the books of Philippians, Titus, I-II Timothy, part of Hebrews, and Revelation. Moreover, it adds the *Epistle of Barnabas*. The history of this manuscript is enshrouded in mystery. It was written in the fourth century but was not even used or referred to until 1481 when it suddenly appeared in the Vatican. Immediately thereafter, Codex B was used to help repress the Reformation. In 1582, it was released as the Jesuit-Rheims Bible. This is “logical considering the manuscript’s omission of anti-Catholic sections and books (i.e. Hebrews 9:14, Revelation, etc.).”⁸² The Catholic slant of Vaticanus is further “evidenced by the fact that at Vatican Council II, each bishop was given his own copy with an introduction by Jesuit priest, Carlo Martini [the UBS’

⁷⁷Tindall, 3.

⁷⁸John Burgon, “The Revision Revised,” in Unholy Hands on the Bible, Vol. 1, Including the Complete Works of John W. Burgon, Dean of Chichester, Ed. by Jay P. Green (Lafayette, IN: Sovereign Grace Trust Fund, 1990), D-6.

⁷⁹Perhaps a Bible-believing Christian trashed the codex because it was so filled with blatant omissions and alterations.

⁸⁰Burgon, “The Revision Revised,” in Unholy Hands on the Bible, D-6.

⁸¹As was the case with Sinaiticus, this assertion is based upon the fact that Alfred Rahlfs’ edition of the Septuagint (Septuaginta, Ed. by Alfred Rahlfs. Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, 1935, rep. 1979) gives readings from B in the critical apparatus for many of the Apocryphal Books. This fact is also explained by Peter Ruckman in his lecture on “Greek Manuscript Evidence” (Greek Manuscript Evidence, Pensacola: Florida: Bible Believer’s Press, n.d. Tape #2).

⁸²Riplinger, 552.

own].”⁸³ Modern textual critics have never been able to study Codex B firsthand, because it is locked away securely in the Vatican. Only copies and/or pictures of the manuscript are available for study. Like Sinaiticus, Vaticanus was also subject to the hands of correctors. Recent technology has been able to show that at least two correctors worked on the manuscript, one being as late as the twelfth century. Vaticanus differs from the Traditional Text almost 50 per cent of the time. According to Dean John Burgon, 237 words, 452 clauses, and 748 whole sentences are missing from the Gospels alone.⁸⁴ As far as the entire codex is concerned, it differs from the Traditional Text in 7,578 places (2,877 words are omitted; 536 words are added; 935 words are substituted; 2,098 words are transposed; and 1,132 words are modified).⁸⁵

Not only do these manuscripts disagree with the Traditional Text, but they do not agree with each other. The thousands of changes in Aleph and the thousands of changes in B are not the same changes. According to Herman Hoskier, these two manuscripts differ from each other over 3000 times in the Gospels alone.⁸⁶ Dean John Burgon goes on to say that “It is easier to find two consecutive verses in which these two differ from one another, than two consecutive verses in which they entirely agree.”⁸⁷ Together, the two manuscripts differ from the Traditional text in over 13,000 places, omit 4000 words, add 2000 words, transpose 3500 words, and modify 2000 words.⁸⁸

⁸³Ibid.

⁸⁴Burgon, “The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels” in Unholy Hands On The Bible, 41.

⁸⁵Burgon, “The Revision Revised,” in Unholy Hands On The Bible, D-6.

⁸⁶Herman Hoskier, “Codex Vaticanus and its Allies” Which Bible? Ed. by David Otis Fuller (Grand Rapids, MI: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1974), 136.

⁸⁷John W. Burgon, “The Revision Revised,” D-6.

⁸⁸Riplinger, 554.

All in all, the manuscripts Aleph and B are extremely problematic. An honest evaluation of the evidence surrounding them would render a conclusion much like that of Dean John Burgon's. He asserts that Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are:

. . . the most scandalously corrupt copies extant; they exhibit the most shamefully mutilated texts which are anywhere to be met with—yet they have strangely become, by whatever process, for their history is wholly unknown, the depositories of the largest amount of fabricated readings, ancient blunders, and intentional perversions of Truth which may be found in any known copies of the Word of God.⁸⁹

He goes on to characterize them as “the foulest in existence” and “the most corrupt known.”⁹⁰ Those who accept this “text are basing their accusations of untruth as to the Gospellists upon an Egyptian revision current 200 to 450 A.D. and abandoned between 500 to 1881, merely revised in our day and stamped as genuine.”⁹¹ These two manuscripts may very well be the oldest extant and the best preserved, but “who will venture to deny that those codices are indebted for their preservation solely to the circumstance that they were long recognized as the depositories of Readings which rendered them utterly untrustworthy.”⁹² In the same way that Bibles become tattered and worn from extensive use, the early manuscripts representing the Traditional Text rotted away and were lost because of their extensive use in spreading the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, on the other hand, were corrupt manuscripts that Bible-believing Christians did not even think about using. Therefore, they were never handled and consequently, were preserved.

Because these manuscripts are supposedly the oldest, they are considered the best and vice versa. This presupposition is quite circular in nature. James Borland argues:

Which readings (or variants, when two texts differ) are best is an assumption used to prove which manuscripts are best. Likewise, which manuscripts are best is an assumption used to prove which

⁸⁹Burgon, “The Revision Revised,” in Unholy Hands on the Bible, D-8.

⁹⁰Burgon, “The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels,” in Unholy Hands on the Bible, A-39.

⁹¹Hoskier, 143.

⁹²Burgon, “The Revision Revised,” in Unholy Hands on the Bible, D-12.

readings are best. It is similar to the evolutionist's argument that (1) evolution is proven by the great age of the fossils and conversely (2) the great age of the fossils is proven by evolution. Both are unwarranted assumptions.^{93[93]}

Besides, recent discoveries have proven the Textus Receptus readings to be older in many instances. For example, epi-flourescent confocal laser scanning has shown that the Magdeline Papyrus (the oldest fragment of St. Matthew's Gospel dated to around A.D. 60) agrees with the Textus Receptus in 26:22.⁹⁴ Carsten Thiede and Matthew D. Ancona argue:

It is self-evident that this original reading preferable on the grounds of internal criteria and now corroborated by the oldest papyrus of St. Matthew's Gospel, must replace the text in the two most widely used versions of the Greek New Testament, that of the United Bible Societies (at present in its fourth revised edition) and the so-called Nestle-Aland, the *Novum Testamentum Graece* (now in its twenty-seventh revised edition).⁹⁵

These so-called "oldest and best manuscripts" (Aleph and B) are supposed to be new-found evidence that was unavailable to textual critics of bygone days. The truth is, these critics knew about these manuscripts but also were aware of their perverted and corrupt nature. For example, Erasmus, when compiling his fifth edition of the Greek New Testament, was supplied by Sepulveda, a Spanish humanist and historian, with 365 readings from Codex Vaticanus that differed from the Received Text of his fourth edition. Seeing as Erasmus' fourth and fifth editions hardly differ from each other with reference to the text, "the likelihood is that Erasmus rejected nearly every reading on Sepulveda's list, if not every one."⁹⁶ It is also interesting to note that Vaticanus was not enough proof for Erasmus to cut out the *Johannine Comma* (the famous Trinitarian declaration in I John 5:7) which first appeared in his third edition and remained there in

⁹³James Borland, A General Introduction to the New Testament (Lynchburg, VA: University Book House, 1995), 158.

⁹⁴The Textus Receptus renders "εκαστος αυτων" (each one of them - AV) while the UBS⁴ reads "αυτω εις εκαστος" (one after the other - NIV). The TR rendering corresponds exactly to the reading found in the Magdeline Papyrus.

⁹⁵Carsten Theide and Matthew D'Ancona, Eyewitness to Jesus: Amazing New Manuscript Evidence About the Origin of the Gospels (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 63.

⁹⁶Maynard, 89.

the fifth edition. This so-called “oldest and best” manuscript was not even given the time of day by one of the greatest textual critics of all time. Modern editions and translations are hardly based on “new evidence.” D. A. Waite promulgates that this minority-type text of modern editions:

has only 45 manuscripts that go along with it as over against 5,210 that go along with the TR that underlies the KJV. This 45 includes ‘B’ (Vatican) and ‘Aleph’ (Sinai) and forty-three of their little heretical puppets that follow them. The theory behind the acceptance of these less than 1% is that ‘The oldest are the best.’ The oldest are not necessarily the best especially if they have been tampered with by heretics!^{97[97]}

These manuscripts are not the best, and they were tampered with very early after their composition. Waite goes on to argue that “This is especially true since the heretics had their knives out ‘correcting’ the Greek NT almost as soon as it was written. The Egyptian scribes and editors of ‘B’ (Vatican) and ‘Aleph’ (Sinai) were some of the most vicious ‘correctors’ of God’s Word’s; yet these two Greek texts form the very bedrock of the new versions and perversions of our day.”⁹⁸

Theologically speaking, would God utilize instruments such as these to only partially preserve His Word? Moreover, should a bible-believing evangelical conservative associate himself with such company? Has His Word been hidden in 1% of the Greek manuscripts for 1800 years in the sands of Egypt only to resurface in the 20th century at the hands of apostates? How absurd!

A Faulty Faith

If the evidence presented against the modern concept of “general preservation” is not enough, this premise is also based upon a faulty and inconsistent faith. In order to see this, one must consider the issue of the Scripture’s canonicity. Most evangelical conservatives will argue for divine intervention and guidance behind the Church’s

⁹⁷Waite, 8.

⁹⁸Ibid.

selection of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament. However, these same people will not take such a step of faith when it comes down to the words of the New Testament text. They assume error in the human copying process, but not in the human judgment behind the selection of the canon. Jay Green explains,

Why did the Christian church receive the twenty-seven New Testament books and these only as her canonical New Testament Scripture? This question can be satisfactorily answered only on the basis of Christian faith . . . If we believe that God gave the Church guidance in choosing the N.T. books, then surely it is logical to believe that God also guided the Church to choose the true words of the Scriptures, and to guard them.⁹⁹

It is only logical to apply the same faith that trusts in the establishment of the canon to the inspired preservation of the words themselves. However, modern scholars and theologians do not do this.

One cannot rightfully approach the preservation of the Scriptures without an attitude of faith, for it is the entire crux of the matter. Hebrews 11:6 reads, “Without faith it is impossible to please him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.” The fact that all problems cannot be answered should not affect one’s faith in the clear doctrine of inspired preservation. Such a faith can and should override any unanswered questions about textual criticism.

A Faulty Conclusion

All in all, the modern concept of the relationship between biblical inspiration and preservation, a relationship that is virtually non-existent, yields a faulty conclusion—the Bible is only inspired and inerrant in the original manuscripts and has only been generally preserved in the mass of manuscripts. It is the duty of the textual critic himself to pinpoint the original reading. Unfortunately, as Metzger admits, “Occasionally none of the variant readings will commend itself as original, and he [the textual critic] will be

⁹⁹Unholy Hands on the Bible, xxiii.

compelled either to choose the reading which he judges to be the least unsatisfactory or to indulge in conjectural emendation . . . one must seek not only to learn what can be known, but also to become aware of what . . . cannot be known.”¹⁰⁰ What a sad ending. The modern scholar is left with a plethora of Hebrew and Greek texts as well as English translations. This is the only remnant of the Word of God that he possesses. From such a mass of confusion, he must search for the original readings.

For the Bible-believer, on the other hand, the situation is quite different. He can rest assured in the verbal preservation of God’s inspired words according to the promises of the Almighty Himself, knowing that he can stand on that “Great Book” as his final authority rather than the speculative insights of men. God’s words have been perfectly preserved for him in the Authorized King James Version. Through faith, he can be assured of it.

¹⁰⁰Metzger, 246.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

The evidence presented in this paper has clearly shown that there exists a close relationship between biblical inspiration and preservation. One doctrine is simply meaningless without the other. Therefore, the modern concept which applies inspiration and inerrancy only to the original manuscripts is faulty. It is simply a “convenient faith” which allows for corruption and rationalization. Furthermore, it subverts the absolute authority of the Word of God.

There is a frightening similarity between today’s situation and the discourse between Eve and Satan in the Garden of Eden. Eve informed Satan that God had forbidden them to eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Satan responded by changing the words of God. “Eve, God said this, but He really meant this” (Author’s paraphrase). There is not much difference between Satan’s words in Eden and the familiar requiem that rings from the classrooms of colleges and seminaries all over the country. “The Bible say this, but it really should be translated like this . . .” The Bible believing Christian is naive to think that Satan will not try to destroy God’s words; he hates them. However, Isaiah 40:8 crashed his party. “The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.”

God’s Word is perfectly preserved today just as it has been down through the ages. When all the world was Greek speaking, it needed a Greek Bible, which it had. When all the world was Latin speaking, it needed a Latin Bible, which it had. When the heart of the Reformation involved German speaking people, it needed a German Bible which it had. Now, when all the world is English speaking, it needs an English standard, which is

has in the form of the Authorized King James Bible. Before concluding, one should consider the words of the Boston Herald from August 1, 1923 in which some striking facts concerning the Bible are put together. Let it be remembered that it is the Authorized Version which is regarded in the article as “The Bible.”

Every day 80,000 copies. every year 30,000,000 copies. And the presses day and night straining their bolts to supply the demand. A new book? No, a very old one. Indeed, the first book ever put on the press. It has never been off since. An oriental book with a vast occidental circulation. An ancient book, but fitting modern needs, if the demand for it is any criterion. A book so cheap that a copy may be had for a few cents, yet for a single copy \$50,000 was paid a few years ago, and many other copies have sold for large sums. A book of universal circulation. Translated into 700 languages and dialects. Put into raised type for the blind. Placed in all guest rooms of the hotels, aboard all the ships of the navy, in all barracks of the army. A newspaper recently stated that the captain of one of the vessels of the shipping board having died that it was found when the funeral service was held that no copy of the book was on board. Next day a hundred copies were on the way to the port where the ship would dock. The world’s best seller. Outstripping all the novels with their occasional records of 100,000, even 200,000, occasionally more, in a single year. Every body knows that books is—THE BIBLE OF COURSE.¹⁰¹

Yes, the Bible is the Absolute Monarch of All Books. By faith, we believe it was inspired and by faith we should believe that God has perfectly preserved it for us in the Authorized King James Version. Faith which is based upon a clear promise is far stronger than objections which are raised because of a lack of information. The Bible’s inspiration demands perfect preservation. Instead of trying to correct it, Christians should spend more time reading it to be wise, believing it to be safe, and practicing it to be holy. It truly is THE BOOK. Ο Βιβλιος!

For those who refuse to acknowledge the inseparable relationship between inspiration and preservation, you are being unfaithful to the purpose of systematic theology when you neglect this important doctrine. “Guesses or God, fear or faith, haughty or humble. These are the perpetual options for the Christian.”¹⁰²

¹⁰¹“The Real Best Seller, ” Boston Herald, 1 August 1923.

¹⁰²Riplinger, 511.

APPENDIX A

A REFUTATION OF COMMON OBJECTIONS TO THE PRESERVATION OF THE
AUTHORIZED KING JAMES VERSIONObjection #1

Psalm 12:6-7 is not talking about the KJV.

Refutation #1

This is true, but the passage does teach that God has and will preserve His words for all generations. The KJV is an example of this. It must represent God's preserved words, for it is the only English translation that people had for almost 250 years after prior versions had passed into obscurity. Moreover, it is the only authorized standard that has ever existed, and God obviously blessed its use in history.

Objection #2

The KJV is too difficult to understand. We do not speak 17th century English anymore.

Refutation #2

17th century English represents the peak of the English language. What better language with which to capture the inspired word of God? Since 1611, the English language has degraded. Why should the Word of God be subject to such decline? Besides, try memorizing a verse in the KJV as opposed to a modern version. Which is easier? If you cannot understand a word, look it up in the dictionary. After all, Christians are supposed to "study to show thyself approved unto God" (II Timothy 2:15).

Objection #3

Its better to know the original languages and revert back to them when seeking to study the Scriptures.

Refutation #3

When is the last time someone got saved through the Hebrew and Greek languages? Better yet, when was the original Greek last seen? How about 2000 years ago. The original copies do not exist. The KJV is based on totally different texts than the modern versions. What Greek and Hebrew are you going to go back to? A better approach is to trust in the providential preservation of God. He gave you a standard Bible in English. That is what He wanted you to have, so read it. Ancient Hebrew and Greek are dead languages. Practically everything surrounding them with regard to biblical exegesis is shrouded in speculation and subjective insight anyway.

Objection #4

Preservation cannot be proved, so it does not exist in a verbal sense.

Refutation #4

Since when do the claims of Scripture require scientific proof? There is no proof of inspiration, yet conservative evangelicals cling to that doctrine. The whole crux of the

matter boils down to faith. Is God able to do what he said He would do? He was powerful enough to inspire them and powerful enough to preserve them. Without faith, it is impossible to please God (Hebrews 11:6). Faith that is based upon a clear promise is far stronger than objections which are raised from a lack of information.

Objection #5

Incomplete preservation of the Scriptures keeps Christians from worshipping them and committing idolatry.

Refutation #5

This argument is so ridiculous that it does not deserve a refutation. Nevertheless, Matthew 4:4 says that man cannot live by bread alone but by *every word* of God. Therefore, the Almighty is duty-bound to provide him with those words. Furthermore, God has magnified His Word even above His name (Psalm 138:2).

Objection #6

Even though there are differences between the KJV and the modern versions, the margin is small and none of the variants affect doctrine in anyway.

Refutation #6

10% is not such a small margin of difference. The NIV, for example, contains almost 70,000 less words than the KJV. Many of the variants do affect doctrine (e.g. I John 5:7, I Timothy 3:16). One should consult Appendix C for more examples.

Objection #7

Modern versions are based on the latest evidence which includes older and better manuscripts.

Refutation #7

Readings in the KJV have proved to be much older in numerous places. One of the oldest fragments of a manuscript ever found (the Magdeline papyrus which dates to about A.D. 60) agrees with the Textus Receptus of the King James over modern Greek editions. Modern versions rely on Aleph and B, two corrupted manuscripts that have been around for hundreds of years. There is nothing new about that evidence. In fact, Erasmus was approached with readings from B in the sixteenth century and he dismissed them as corrupt without much discussion.

Objection #8

How can the italicized words in the KJV be preserved, for they were not even in the original manuscripts.

Refutation #8

The KJV is not the only English translation that utilizes italicized words. Such a practice is necessary when translating or else the English would make no sense. Besides, recent manuscript discoveries have confirmed the presence of many italicized words in the Greek (e.g. ten italicized words in I John 2:23 and the italicized “the church” in I Peter

5:13). Also, it's interesting to note how many times the New Testament writers quote verbatim the italicized words in the King James Old Testament. For example, Deuteronomy 8:3 reads, “. . . that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every *word* that proceedeth out of the mouth of the LORD doth man live.” Now, note the New Testament quotation of this passage in Matthew 4:4—“It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.” “Word” is not italicized in the NT, so the King James translators had it right, no, God had it right. Other similar examples include Psalm 16:8 / Acts 2:25; Deuteronomy 25:4 / I Timothy 5:18; Psalm 82:6 / John 10:34; Isaiah 28:16 / I Peter 2:6.

Objection #9

If the Greek and Hebrew texts of the KJV are superior, then there needs to be a new translation of them that is easier to understand.

Refutation #9

Who would be responsible for such a project? I wouldn't dare want the responsibility. Besides, no one could even come close to matching the cadence, rhythm, and poetic beauty of the KJV that makes it unique and easy to memorize. A new KJV would only cause confusion. The editors of the NKJV already tried this and failed drastically.

Objection #10

The issue of Bible versions and preservation is irrelevant. We should be spending our time winning others to Christ.

Refutation #10

The Bible is the source of all truth concerning Jesus Christ. Without it, you would not even begin to know how to win someone to Him. It is the final authority in all matters of faith and practice. You better care about it, for God has magnified it even above His name (Psalm 138:2). It must be pretty important.

APPENDIX B

THE PRESERVED LINE OF SCRIPTURE VERSUS THE CORRUPTED LINE

The Corrupted Line

The Apocrypha (ca. 300-350 B.C.)
 Philo (20 B.C. - A.D. 50)
 Sahidic (Thebaic)
 Bohairic (Coptic, Memphitic)
 Clement of Alexandria (150-215)
 Origen (184-254)
 Marcion the Heretic (120-160)
 Eusebius (260-340)
 Augustine of Hippo (354-430)
 Vellum Scrolls containing the Apocrypha
 Vaticanus (B) - 4th century
 Sinaiticus (Aleph) - 4th century
 Revised Alexandrinus (A) - 5th century
 Jerome (340-420)
 LATIN VULGATE
 Cantabrigensis (D) - 5th century
 Koridethi (θ) - 9th century
 Latin text of the Roman Church
 Revised Peshitta
 Ephraemi Rescriptus © - 5th century
 Sixtina Vulgate
 Clementina Vulgate
 LATIN BIBLES
 The Popes (Leo: 440 - Paul: 1970)
 J.J. Griesbach (1774)
 Carl Lachmann (1842)
 Tregelles (1857)
 Tischendorf (1869)
 Westcott & Hort (1881)
 Revised Version (1884)
 Eberhard Nestle (1898)
 Weiss (1901)
 American Standard Version (1901)
 Nestle-Aland Text (1950)
 Revised Standard Version (1952)
 New English Bible (1961)
 UBS Greek New Testament (1966)
 TEB, NASV, NIV, NKJV, et. al

The Preserved Line

The Masoretic Text of the OT
 Peter, James, John, Paul, etc. (30-90)
 Syrian mss in Asia Minor (100-200)
 Old Latin, Old Syriac (100-200)
 P⁵², P³⁰, P⁴⁶ (150-400)
 The Gothic Bible of Ulfilas (310)
 The Syriac Peshitta
 Syrian texts of the Greek church
 Freerianus (W) - 4th century
 Alexandrinus (A) - 5th century
 P¹⁰, P¹⁵, P¹⁶ - 4th century
 P²⁵, P⁵⁴, P⁴⁰ - 5th century
 Byzantine text of the Greek church
 Bibliothecae (L) - 8th century
 Basiliensis (E) - 8th century
 Cyprus (K) - 9th century
 Mosquensis (V) - 9th century
 Seidelianus (G) - 10th century
 The Latin Bibles of the Waldensians
 (1100-1300)
 The Latin Bibles of the Albigenses
 (1300-1500)
 The Latin Bibles of the Lollards
 (1382-1550)
 Martin Luther's German Bible
 (1522-1534)
 Erasmus' readings (1516-1535)
 Stephanus' Receptus (1550)
 Beza's Receptus (1565)
 Elzevir's Receptus (1624)
AUTHORIZED VERSION (1611)
 Russian, French, Norwegian, Spanish,
 Italian, Bulgarian, Rumanian, Swiss,
 Swedish, Austrian, and Czech
 Bibles from Luther's Version
 (1540-1900)
 Chinese, Burmese, Malayan, Indian,
 Japanese, Persian, African, Arabic,
 Hebrew, and other Bibles that came
 from AV 1611.

APPENDIX C

SCRIPTURE PASSAGES TAMPERED WITH BY MODERN VERSIONS

MATTHEW

- 1:25 - "Firstborn" is out (speaking of the Lord Jesus).
 5:44 - "Bless them that curse you" is out.
 6:13 - "Kingdom, Power, and Glory" is out.
 6:27 - "Stature" is changed to span of life.
 8:29 - "Jesus" is out (as Son of God).
 9:13 - "to repentance" is out (calling sinners . . .).
 12:35 - "Of the heart" is out (Good treasure . . .).
 12:47 - Verse is bracketed as doubtful (About Christ's mother).
 13:51 - "Jesus said unto them" and "Lord" is out.
 15:8 - "Draweth unto me with their mouth" is out.
 16:3 - "O ye hypocrites" is out.
 16:20 - "Jesus" is out.
 17:21 - Verse is out (about prayer and fasting).
 18:11 - Verse is out (Tells that Jesus came to save).
 19:17 - "God" is out (None good but God).
 20:7 - "Whatsoever is right receive" is out.
 20:16 - "Many be called but few chosen" is out.
 20:22 - "Baptized with Christ's baptism" is out.
 21:44 - Verse is bracketed as doubtful (About Christ the stone).
 23:14 - Verse is out (Woe to scribes and hypocrites).
 25:13 - "Wherein the Son of Man cometh" is out.
 27:35 - "Fulfilled spoken by the prophet" is out.
 27:54 - "The Son of God" is changed to "A Son of God" in modern versions.
 28:2 - "From the door" is out.
 28:9 - "They went to tell his disciples" is out.

MARK

- 1:1 - "Son of God" is bracketed as doubtful.
 1:14 - "of the kingdom" is out (speaking of the Gospel).
 1:31 - "Immediately" is out (The fever left . . .).
 2:17 - "To repentance" is out (call sinners . . .).
 6:11 - "More tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha" is out.
 6:16 - "From the dead" is out (John is risen . . .).
 6:33 - "Him" is changed to "them."
 7:8 - "Washing of pots and cups" is out.
 7:16 - Verse is out (about having an ear to hear).
 9:24 - "Lord" is out (A believer called Him Lord).
 9:42 - "In me" is bracketed as doubtful (Little ones that believe).
 9:44 - Verse is out (about fire not quenched).
 9:46 - Verse is out (where worm dieth not).
 9:49 - "Every sacrifice shall be salted" is out.

- 10:21 - "Take up the cross" is out (Jesus said . . .).
- 10:24 - "For them that trust in riches" is out.
- 11:10 - "In the name of the Lord" is out.
- 11:26 - Verse is out (If ye do not forgive . . .).
- 13:14 - "Spoken by Daniel the prophet" is out.
- 13:33 - "And pray" is out.
- 15:28 - Verse is out (Scripture was fulfilled . . .).
- 15:39 - "The Son of God" is mistranslated as "A Son of God" in many modern versions.
- 16:9-20 - Put in double brackets and declared not to be part of the original text.

LUKE

- 1:28 - "Blessed art thou among women" is out.
- 2:33 - "Joseph" is changed to "his father" (denies Virgin Birth)
- 2:43 - "Joseph and his mother" is changed to "parents" (denies Virgin Birth)
- 4:4 - "but by every word of God" is out.
- 4:8 - "Get thee behind me Satan" is out.
- 6:48 - "founded upon a rock" is out.
- 7:31 - "And the Lord said" is out.
- 9:54 - "even as Elijah did" is out.
- 9:55 - "ye know not what manner of spirit" is out.
- 9:56 - "Son of Man is come to save lives" is out.
- 11:2-4 - Lord's Prayer is butchered.
- 11:29 - "the prophet" is out (about Jonah).
- 17:36 - verse is out (one taken, another left)
- 21:4 - "cast into the offerings of God" is out.
- 24:49 - "of Jerusalem" is out.

JOHN

- 3:15 - "should not perish" is out.
- 4:42 - "the Christ" is out.
- 5:3 - "waiting for the moving of the water" is out.
- 5:4 - verse is out (Pool of Bethesda)
- 6:47 - "on me" is out (He that believes . . .)
- 6:69 - "that Christ the Son" is out.
- 7:53-8:11 - placed in double brackets and deemed doubtful.
- 8:36 - "Father" is out (changed to "he").
- 9:35 - "Son of God" is out.
- 11:41 - "where the dead was laid" is out.
- 16:16 - "because I go to the Father" is out.
- 17:12 - "in the world" is out.
- 20:29 - "Thomas" is out.

ACTS

- 2:30 - "according to flesh raise up Christ" is out.
- 7:30 - "of the Lord" is out (Angel--).

7:37 - "him shall ye hear" is out (Christ--).
 8:37 - verse is out
 9:5-6 - much is omitted concerning God's call
 10:6 - "what thou oughtest to do" is out.
 15:18 - "known unto God his works" is out.
 16:31 - "Christ" is out.
 17:26 - "blood" is out.
 20:25 - "of God" is out (the kingdom--).
 20:32 - "brethren" is out.
 23:9 - "let us not fight against God" is out.
 24:6-8 - much is omitted
 24:15 - "of the dead" is out (resurrection--).
 28:16 - half of verse is out.
 28:29 - verse is omitted

ROMANS

1:16 - "of Christ" is out.
 1:29 - "fornication" is out.
 8:1 - last 10 words are out.
 9:28 - "in righteousness" is out.
 10:15 - "of peace" is out.
 10:17 - "of God" is out, "of Christ" is substituted.
 11:6 - last 18 words are omitted.
 13:9 - "shall not bear false witness" is out.
 14:6 - 15 words are out (regarding the day).
 14:21 - "offended made weak" is out.
 15:29 - "of the Gospel" is out.
 16:24 - verse is omitted.

I CORINTHIANS

6:20 - last 7 words are out (your spirit, etc.).
 7:5 - "fasting" is out.
 7:39 - "by the law" is out (the wife is bound--).
 10:28 - "the earth is the Lord's" is out.
 11:24 - "take eat" is out (this is my body--).
 11:29 - "Lord's" is out (referring to the body).
 15:47 - "The Lord" is out (Lord from heaven).
 16:22 - "Jesus Christ" is out.
 16:23 - "Christ" is out.

II CORINTHIANS

5:10 - "The Lord" is out.
 5:18 - "Jesus" is out.
 11:31 - "Christ" is out.

GALATIANS

- 3:1 - "that ye should not obey truth" is out.
- 3:17 - "in Christ" is out.
- 4:7 - "through Christ" is out.
- 6:15 - "in Christ Jesus" is out.
- 6:17 - "Lord" is out.

EPHESIANS

- 3:9 - "by Christ Jesus" is out (God created--).
- 3:14 - "of our Lord Jesus Christ" is out.
- 5:30 - "of his flesh and of his bones" is out.
- 6:10 - "my brethren" is out.

PHILIPPIANS

- 3:16 - "let us mind the same thing" is out.

COLOSSIANS

- 1:2 - "the Lord Jesus Christ" is out.
- 1:14 - "through his blood" is out.
- 1:28 - "Jesus" is out.
- 2:11 - "of the sins of" is out.
- 3:6 - "sons of disobedience" is out.

I THESSALONIANS

- 1:1 - "from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" is out.
- 2:19 - "Christ" is out.
- 3:11 - "Christ" is out.
- 3:13 - "Christ" is out.

II THESSALONIANS

- 1:8 - "Christ" is out.

I TIMOTHY

- 1:17 - "wise" is out (The only wise God).
- 2:7 - "in Christ" is out.
- 3:16 - "God is out" (was manifest in the flesh).
- 4:12 - "in spirit" is out.
- 6:5 - "of thy hands" is out.

HEBREWS

- 3:1 - "Christ" is out.
- 7:21 - "after the order of Melchizedek" is out.
- 10:30 - "saith the Lord" is out.
- 10:34 - "in heaven" is out.
- 11:11 - "was delivered of a child" is out (Sarah--).

JAMES

- 5:16 - "faults" is changed to "sins."

I PETER

- 1:22 - "through the Spirit" is out.
- 4:1 - "for us" is out (Christ suffered--).
- 4:14 - last 15 words are out.
- 5:10 - "Jesus" is out.
- 5:11 - "glory and dominion" is out.

II PETER

- 2:17 - "forever" is out.
- 3:9 - "us" is changed to "you."

I JOHN

- 1:7 - "Christ" is out.
- 2:7 - "from the beginning" is out.
- 4:3 - "Christ is come in the flesh" is out.
- 4:9 - "begotten" is out.
- 5:7-8 - many words are omitted and changed.
- 5:13 - last 13 words are out.

JUDE

- 1:25 - "wise" is out (referring to God).

REVELATION

- 1:8 - "the beginning and the end" is out.
- 1:11 - 10 words are out (Alpha and Omega etc.).
- 2:13 - "thy works" is out.
- 5:14 - "him that liveth forever and forever" is out.
- 8:13 - "angel" is changed to "eagle."
- 11:17 - "and art to come" is out.
- 12:17 - "Christ" is out.
- 14:5 - "before the throne of God" is out.
- 16:17 - "of heaven" is out.
- 20:9 - "God out of" is out (Fire came from--).
- 20:12 - "God" is changed to "throne."
- 21:24 - "of them which are saved" is out (Nations--).
- 22:19 - "book of life" is changed to "tree of life."

WORKS CITED

- Aland, Barbara and Aland, Kurt. The Text of the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Ante-Nicene Fathers. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1971.
- The Bible
- Borland, James. A General Introduction to the New Testament. Lynchburg: VA: University Book House, 1995.
- Bruce, F.F. The Books and the Parchments. London: Pickering & Inglis, 1953.
- Burgon, John W. "The Revision Revised." In Unholy Hands on the Bible. Ed. by Jay P. Green. Lafayette, IN: Sovereign Grace Trust Fund, 1990.
- _____. "The Traditional Texts of the Holy Gospels." In Unholy Hands on the Bible. Ed. by Jay P. Green. Lafayette, IN: Sovereign Grace Trust Fund, 1990.
- Buswell, Oliver J. A Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1978.
- Cloud, David. For the Love of the Bible: The Battle for the King James Version and the Received Text from 1800 to the Present. Oak Harbor, WA: Fundamental Baptist News Service, 1995.
- Combs, William. "Erasmus and the Textus Receptus." In Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal 1 (Spring 1996): 35-53.
- Comfort, Philip. Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale Publishing House, 1990.
- Committee Statement on Bible Preservation, (Dean Burgon Society) quoted in Cloud, David. "Some Thoughts on Inspiration and Preservation." O Timothy Magazine (Vol.9, Issue 8, 1992). Ed. by David Cloud [journal on-line]; available from <http://www.aloha.net/~bstaggs/inspire.txt>; Internet; accessed 10 October 1997.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. Epistle 149 quoted and translated in "The Correspondence of Erasmus," Vol. 2 in The Collected Works of Erasmus. Ed. by R.A.B. Mynors and D.F.S. Thomson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.
- Erickson, Millard. Christian Theology. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1985.
- Fedarko, Kevin. "Who Will Be First Among Us?" In Time Magazine. Vol. 144 No. 26 (26 December 1994): 72-73.

- Garrett, James Leo. Systematic Theology. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Gausson, Louis. "The Divine Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures." True or False? Ed. by David Otis Fuller. Grand Rapids, MI: Institute for Biblical Textual Studies, 1983.
- Habermas, Gary. Classnotes: Theology Survey I. Lynchburg, VA: Liberty University, 1994.
- Hall, B. "Erasmus: Biblical Scholar and Reformer," in Erasmus. Ed. by T.A. Dorey. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1970.
- Hills, Edward F. The King James Version Defended. Des Moines, IA: Christian Research Press, 1956.
- Hodge, Archibald. A Commentary on The Confession of Faith. Philadelphia, PA: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1869.
- Holland, Thomas. "A Biblical Starting Point" [article on-line], available at <http://members.aol.com/jbabster/holland/lesson01.html>; Internet; accessed 10 October 1997.
- Hoskier, Herman. "Codex Vaticanus and its Allies." In Which Bible? Ed. by David Otis Fuller. Grand Rapids, MI: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1974.
- Jamieson Robert; Fausset, A.R.; and Brown, David. Commentary On The Whole Bible. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1979.
- Johnson, Alan and Webber, Robert. What Christians Believe. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1993.
- Lackey, Bruce. "Inspiration and Translation." O Timothy Magazine (Vol. 9, Issue 11, 1992). Ed. by David Cloud [journal on-line]; available from <http://www.aloha.net/~bstaggs/transl.txt>; Internet; accessed 10 October 1997.
- Mauro, Philip. "Which Version? Authorized or Revised?" In True or False? Ed. by David Otis Fuller. Grand Rapids, MI: Institute for Biblical Textual Studies, 1973.
- Maynard, Michael. A History of the Debate Over 1 John 5:7-8. Tempe, AZ: Comma Publications, 1995.
- McGlothlin, W.J. Baptist Confessions of Faith. Philadelphia, PA: American Baptist Publication Society, 1911.
- Metzger, Bruce. The Text of the New Testament. New York: Oxford Press, 1968.
- _____. Manuscripts of the Greek Bible. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

- Moorman, Jack. "Principles of Bible Preservation." O Timothy Magazine (Vol.9, Issue 8, 1992). Ed. by David Cloud [journal on-line]; available from <http://www.dsinclair.com/~dcloud/library/ti0800002.htm>; Internet; accessed 25 February 1997.
- Morris, Henry. "Should Creationists Abandon the King James Version." In Vital Articles on Science/Creation. El Cajon, CA: Institute for Creation Research, 1996.
- Philpot, Joseph Charles. "The Authorized Version--1611." True or False? Ed. by David Otis Fuller. Grand Rapids, MI: Institute for Biblical Textual Studies, 1983.
- Pickering, Wilbur. "Contribution of John William Burgon to New Testament Criticism." In True or False? Ed. By David Otis Fuller. Grand Rapids, MI: Institute for Biblical Textual Studies, 1973.
- "The Real Best Seller." Boston Herald. 1 August 1923.
- Riplinger, Gail. New Age Bible Versions. Ararat, VA: AV Publications, 1995.
- Robinson, Maurice. "The Recensional Nature of the Alexandrian Text-Type: A Response to Selected Criticisms of the Byzantine-Priority Theory." Faith and Mission (Vol. XI, Number 1, 1993).
- Ryrie, Charles. Basic Theology. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1987.
- Septuaginta. Ed. by Alfred Rahlfs. Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, 1935, 1979 (rep).
- Souter, Alexander. The Text and Canon of the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.
- Thiede, Carsten and D'Anocona, Matthew. Eyewitness to Jesus: Amazing New Manuscript Evidence About the Origin of the Gospels. New York: Doubleday, 1996.
- Tindall, Christian. Contributions to the Statistical Study of the Codex Sinaiticus. London: Oliver and Boyd, 1961.
- Towns, Elmer. Theology for Today (2nd Edition). Lynchburg, VA: University Press, 1994.
- Van Til, Cornelius. An Introduction to Systematic Theology. Phillipsburg, PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1978.

Waite, D.A. "The Four-Fold Superiority of the King James Version" [article on-line]; available at <http://www.aloha.net/~bstaggs/kjvwaite.txt>; Internet; accessed 20 February 1997.

Wenham, John. Christ and the Bible. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.

White, James. The King James Only Controversy. Minneapolis, MN: Bethany House Publishers, 1995.