

Do Psalms 12:6-7 Teach the Preservation of God's Words?

Pastor Bryan Ross

These notes were originally taught as part of the [From This Generation For Ever](#) adult Sunday School class at [Grace Life Bible Church](#) in Grand Rapids, MI on 10/2/16 and 10/16/17 (Lessons 31 & 32).

Introduction

- Any study of preservation must begin with a consideration of Psalm 12:6-7. These verses are shrouded in controversy and are in many respects a microcosm of the entire debate regarding preservation.
- For many King James supporters Psalm 12:6-7 comprise the clearest statement of God's promise to preserve His "words" found in the entire canon of scripture. It is from this passage that many derive their belief in the doctrine of preservation. This is due largely to the fact that the King James actually uses the word "preserve" in verse 7.
- Meanwhile, many modern version advocates view these verses as referring to something altogether different. The controversy centers on what is being preserved in this passage; God's "words" or God's people? To be clear, just because one does not hold that Psalm 12:6-7 are referring to the preservation of God's "words" does not automatically mean that they do not believe in the doctrine of preservation.
- Generally speaking, those who seek to deny that Psalm 12:6-7 is teaching the preservation of the "words" do so by utilizing grammatical and contextual arguments.
- In order to adequately discuss all the relevant aspects of this controversy, we will consider the following points regarding whether or not Psalm 12:6-7 is teaching the preservation of the "words."
 - Grammatical Arguments: Gender Discordance
 - Contextual Arguments: Preservation of the Righteous
 - Correct Exposition: Preservation of the Words
 - Extreme uses of Psalm 12:6-7 in pro-King James argumentation

Grammatical Arguments: Gender Discordance

- A consideration of how various translations render these verses in English illustrates the issue of alleged "gender discordance".

KJB	NIV	NASB	ESV
6) The words of the LORD <i>are</i> pure words: <i>as</i> silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times. 7) Thou shalt keep them, O LORD, thou shalt preserve them from this generation for ever.	6) And the words of the LORD are flawless, like silver purified in a crucible, like gold refined seven times. 7) You, LORD, will keep the needy safe and will protect us forever from the wicked,	6) The words of the LORD are pure words; As silver tried in a furnace on the earth, refined seven times. 7) You, O LORD, will keep them; You will preserve him from this generation forever.	6) The words of the LORD are pure words, like silver refined in a furnace on the ground, purified seven times. 7) You, O LORD, will keep them; you will guard us from this generation forever.

- The NIV, NASB, and ESV all have the LORD protecting, preserving, or guarding his people “from this generation forever.” This is evident from their use of the pronoun “us” (NIV and ESV) and “him” (NASB) in verse 7.
- In contrast, the King James has the LORD preserving “them” in verse 7. In order to determine what is being preserved in the King James one must look to the nearest antecedent which is found in verse 6. What is being discussed in verse 6 in all four versions? The “words of the LORD.” So to what is the “them” referring to in verse 7 in the King James? To the “words of the LORD” in verse 6. So what is the King James saying that the LORD will preserve “from this generation for ever” in verse 7? The “words of the Lord” in verse 6.
- In summation, modern versions teach the eternal preservation of God’s people whereas the King James is teaching the eternal preservation of the “words of the Lord.” A substantive difference in meaning if ever there was one.
- The reason for the discrepancy is based upon an alleged technicality of Hebrew grammar often referred to as “gender discordance” in the relevant literature.
- Professor William W. Combs of Detroit Baptist Seminary succinctly summarizes the grammatical concerns as follows:
 - “. . . it is more probable that verse 7 (“Thou shalt keep them. . . thou shalt preserve them”) is not referring to “the words of the LORD” in verse 6. That is, the antecedent of “them” in verse 7 is probably not the “words” of verse 6. The Hebrew term for “them” (twice in v. 7) is masculine, while the term for “words” is feminine. Therefore, most interpreters and versions understand the promise of preservation in verse 7 to apply to the “poor” and “needy” of verse 5.” (Combs, 15)
- Professor Combs goes on to cite the NIV as an example. Please note the phenomena on the following table comparing the KJB with the NIV. A similar chart could be produced for both the NASB and the ESV.

KJB	NIV
<p>5) For the oppression of the poor (mas.), for the sighing of the needy (mas.), now will I arise, saith the LORD; I will set <i>him</i> in safety <i>from him that</i> puffeth at him.</p> <p>6) The words (fem.) of the LORD <i>are</i> pure words: <i>as</i> silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.</p> <p>7) Thou shalt keep them (mas.), O LORD, thou shalt preserve them (mas.) from this generation for ever.</p>	<p>5) "Because the poor (mas.) are plundered and the needy (mas.) groan, I will now arise," says the LORD. "I will protect them from those who malign them."</p> <p>6) And the words (fem.) of the LORD are flawless, like silver purified in a crucible, like gold refined seven times.</p> <p>7) You, LORD, will keep the needy (mas.) safe and will protect us (mas.) forever from the wicked,</p>

- In short, this argument asserts that the masculine words in verse 7 must match the masculine words in verse 5 because there must be an agreement in terms of gender. Therefore, what is being preserved in verse 7 is not the “words” from verse 6 because the Hebrew word is feminine not masculine.
- W. Edward Glenny of Central Baptist Theological Seminary concurs with Professor Combs regarding the grammar of the passage.
 - “Hebrew grammar requires that it be the righteous whom God is keeping and preserving in verse 7. The word “them” (v. 7a) is a masculine pronominal suffix and “the words” of verse 6a is feminine in gender. In the Hebrew text, verse 7b reads “You will preserve him from this generation forever.” Delitzsch says the “him” refers “to the man who yearns for deliverance mentioned in the divine utterance (v. 5 in Eng.). The connection is clear in the Hebrew because these pronouns are both third masculine singular.” (Glenny, 91)
- So for many expositors these arguments based upon “gender discordance” are sufficient to disqualify Psalm 12:6-7 as a passage teaching the preservation of scripture.
- As one might expect, not all expositors agree with Combs and Glenny regarding the role of “gender discordance” in establishing the correct understating/translation of Psalm 12:6-7. One such example is Dr. Thomas Strouse, who wrote an “Article Review” of Professor Combs’ article on “The Preservation of Scripture” quoted above for *Sound Words from New England* in the spring of 2001.
- According to Strouse, the grammatical arguments put forth by Combs and Glenny are flawed in at least two ways.
 - “However, two important grammatical points overturn his argument. First, the rule of proximity requires “words” to be the natural, contextual antecedent for “them.” Second, it is not uncommon, especially in the Psalter, for feminine plural noun synonyms for the “words” of the Lord to be the antecedent for masculine plural pronouns/pronominal suffixes, which seem to “masculinize” the verbal extension of the patriarchal God of the

Old Testament. Several examples of this supposed gender difficulty occur in Psalm 119. In verse 111, the feminine plural “testimonies” is the antecedent for the masculine plural pronoun “they”. Again, in three passages the feminine plural synonyms for “words” have masculine plural pronominal suffixes (vv. 129, 152, 167).” (Strouse, 2)

- In other words, it seems quite common, especially in the other Psalm dealing with God’s word to exhibit the same “gender discordance” exhibited in Psalm 12:6-7. Let’s consider the following examples.

Psalm 119:111

KJB	NIV	NASB	ESV
Thy testimonies (fem. pl) have I taken as an heritage for ever: for they (mas. pl) are the rejoicing of my heart.	Your statutes (fem. pl) are my heritage forever; they (mas. pl) are the joy of my heart.	I have inherited Your testimonies (fem. pl) forever, For they (mas. pl) are the joy of my heart.	Your testimonies (fem. pl) are my heritage forever, for they (mas. pl) are the joy of my heart.

Psalm 119:129

KJB	NIV	NASB	ESV
Your testimonies (fem. pl) are wonderful; therefore my soul keeps them (mas. pl).	Your statutes (fem. pl) are wonderful; therefore I obey them (mas. pl).	Your testimonies (fem. pl) are wonderful; Therefore my soul observes them (mas. pl).	Your testimonies (fem. pl) are wonderful; therefore my soul keeps them (mas. pl).

Psalm 119:167

KJB	NIV	NASB	ESV
My soul hath kept thy testimonies (fem. pl); and I love them (mas. pl) exceedingly.	I obey your statutes (fem. pl), for I love them (mas. pl) greatly.	My soul keeps Your testimonies (fem. pl), And I love them (mas. pl) exceedingly.	My soul keeps your testimonies (fem. pl); I love them (mas. pl) exceedingly.

- These verses are all talking about the word of God and exhibit the same gender discord as Psalm 12:6-7. Yet, modern versions have not seen fit to rectify the discord in these passages by translating them different from the KJB. Therefore, it seems that proximity takes precedence over gender accord even in modern versions.
- The grammatical argument against the preservation of God’s words in Psalm 12:6-7 appears to be false. The classic Hebrew Grammar book *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar* states the following regarding “gender discordance” so called in the Hebrew text.
 - “Through a weakening in the distinction of gender, which is noticeable elsewhere and which probably passed from the colloquial language into that of literature, masculine

suffixes (especially in the plural) are not infrequently used to refer to feminine substantives.” (Kautzsch, 440)

- Here are some other examples of so called “gender discordance” from elsewhere in the Hebrew scriptures.
 - Genesis 31:9—Thus God hath taken away the cattle of your **(masculine plural pronoun suffix—referring to Rachel and Leah)** father, and given *them* to me.
 - NIV, NASB, and ESV all follow the King James
 - Genesis 32:15—Thirty milch camels with their **(masculine plural pronoun suffix—referring to the thirty female camels)** colts, forty kine, and ten bulls, twenty she asses, and ten foals.”
 - NIV, NASB, and ESV all follow the King James
 - Exodus 1:21—And it came to pass, because the midwives **(fem.)** feared God, that he made them **(masculine plural pronoun suffix — a reference to the midwives)** houses.
 - NIV, NASB, and ESV all follow the King James
- More recently (1990), the Hebrew grammar by Bruce K. Waltke and M. O’Conner titled *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* states, “The masculine pronoun is often used for a feminine antecedent.” (Waltke & O’Conner, 361)
- Before offering some closing comments on this matter, I would like to consider one more occurrence of “gender discordance” from Psalm 119.

Psalm 119:152

KJB	NIV	NASB	ESV
Concerning thy testimonies (fem. pl) , I have known of old that thou hast founded them (mas. pl) for ever.	Long ago I learned from your statutes (fem. pl) that you established them (mas. pl) to last forever.	Of old I have known from Your testimonies (fem. pl) That You have founded them (mas. pl) forever.	Long have I known from your testimonies (fem. pl) that you have founded them (mas. pl) forever.

- Once again, we see an occurrence of “gender discordance” in a Psalm speaking about the eternal nature of the Lord’s “testimonies.” Yet, once again, the modern versions follow the King James and make no attempt to fix the “discord” as they did in Psalm 12:6-7.
- Above, we quoted from Professor William Combs’ article “The Preservation of Scripture” in which he cited “gender discordance” in Psalm 12:5-7 as a means for arguing that the passage is

not referring to the preservation of the “words” and can therefore not be used to establish a “doctrine of preservation.” (Combs, 15)

- Later, in the same article, however, we find Professor Combs stating that Psalm 119:152 “appears to be a fairly direct promise of preservation” (Combs, 18). In the whole of his comments on this verse, Combs says nothing about the “gender discordance” clearly demonstrated above.
- Why would someone hold that “gender discordance” disqualifies the preservation of the “words” in one passage (Psalm 12) while, at the same time, asserting that another passage (Psalm 119:152) exhibiting the same grammatical phenomena is “a fairly direct promise of preservation”?
- If accordance in gender trumps proximity, why is the principle not applied consistently throughout the Hebrew Old Testament? Why is gender accordance all of sudden a problem in Psalm 12:6-7 when it is not in a host of other passages?
- At a minimum, it would seem that the alleged grammatical rule regarding gender agreement in the Hebrew text is selectively applied at best. Regarding the instances of “gender discordance” in Psalm 119 noted above, Dr. Thomas Strouse states:
 - “These examples show the importance of maintaining the Biblically accepted Hebrew grammar of closest antecedent and the Biblically accepted gender discordance in exception cases for theological reasons.” (Strouse, “The Permanent Preservation of God’s Words: Psalm12:6-7, 32)
- As demonstrated above, even modern versions adopt discordance in gender in order to adequately convey the sense in English.
- On the other end of the spectrum, grammatical arguments based on “gender discordance” demonstrate the lengths some are willing to go in their argumentation to remove the testimony of the clearest verse in the canon regarding the preservation of scripture.
- On this point it seems that Daniel B. Wallace and W. Edward Glenny are more consistent in their total denial of a doctrine of preservation than William W. Combs. Combs holds that “gender discordance” excludes Psalm 12:6-7 from teaching the preservation of the “words” while at the same time maintaining Psalm 119:152 does while exhibiting the same grammatical realities.
- If Psalm 12:6-7 does not teach the preservation of the “words”, proof must be furnished via a different line of argumentation. Grammatical arguments based upon “gender discordance” are inconsistent and unpersuasive.

Contextual Arguments: The Preservation of the Righteous

- For the sake of consistency, let’s begin our discussion by looking at William W. Combs’ essay “The Preservation of Scripture.” Combs summarizes the contextual arguments as follows:

- “David’s subject in the Psalm is stated right in verse 1: “Help, LORD, for the godly man ceases to be, for the faithful disappear from among the sons of men.” David is concerned about the righteous who are being oppressed by the wicked of “this generation.” In the midst of this he declares his assurance that God will preserve the righteous forever. Taken in this sense, this passage has no bearing on the doctrine of preservation.” (Combs, 15)
- In other words, according to Combs, the context of the passage is about the preservation of God’s people not the “words” of God.
- W. Edward Glenny agrees with Combs regarding the context of Psalm 12 and offers the following expanded explanation in his essay, “The Preservation of Scripture”:
 - “The psalm is an expression of David’s confidence in the pure words of God. In verse 4 he prays for deliverance from the proud flatterers all around him who cannot be trusted (v. 2b). Verse 5 gives the source of David’s confidence; he is assured that the Lord will deliver him from those maligning him. In verses 6-8 David declares that his confidence is in God’s Word. In this context, David’s expression of confidence in God’s Word in verse 6 refers to his confidence in God’s affirmation that He will deliver the afflicted (v. 5). Then, in verse 7, on the basis of his confidence in God’s Word (vv. 5-6), David declares his assurance that God will preserve forever the righteous, who are being afflicted, by the wicked of “this generation.” The pronoun “them” in verse 7 (“thou shalt keep them”) does not refer to the “words” of verse 6. It refers to the “poor” and the “needy” of verse 5, and the “godly” and “faithful” men of verse 1, whom the Lord will “preserve” (v. 7b). Furthermore, in context the “generation” (v. 7) must be the wicked who are all around the psalmist and dominate his society (vv. 1-4). It would not make sense to say that God will preserve His Word from the generation of David throughout eternity. What about the generations before David? Was God not concerned about His Word then? The point of the psalm is that the godly man will never cease; the faithful will never “fail from among the children of men” (v. 1). The righteous will never disappear from the face of the earth because God will “preserve them from this generation forever” (v. 7). Verse 8 clinches the contextual arguments. It again returns to the topic of the wicked all around from whom David and future generations of the righteous will be delivered.” (Glenny, 90-91)
- First, it is important to note that Glenny’s contextual argument is predicated and depended upon the grammatical argument regarding “gender discordance.” We have already concluded in Lesson 31 that grammatical arguments based upon gender accordancy are inconsistent and inconclusive. Consequently, since Glenny’s contextual argument is so grammar dependent, I find his exposition based upon contextual consideration to be inconclusive.

- Second, to argue that since David states, “from this generation for ever” in verse 7 means that God was not concerned about the preservation of His word before David’s generation, is not a sound argument and disregards a host of relevant cross references.
 - Exodus 24:4—is Glenny saying that God did not care what happened to the words written by Moses before the time David.
 - Isaiah 30:8—does this verse mean that God was not concerned about His word before the book of Isaiah was written?
- In Psalm 12, David is speaking from the point of view of the scriptures he is in the process of penning.
- Third, where are the relevant cross-references to support Glenny’s contextual interpretation that God’s people will be perpetually preserved in an earthly sense from evil doers? God’s people continue to suffer many things at the hands of wicked men even in the dispensation of grace. While there are no cross-references to support the notion that God will preserve His people from evil doers, there are ample parallel passages to support the teaching that God will preserve His word “forever.”
 - Psalm 119:152, 160; Isaiah 30:8; Matthew 24:35; I Peter 1:23-25
- Combs and Glenny are not the only writers to deny that Psalm 12:6-7 is referring to the preservation of God’s written word based upon grammatical and contextual arguments. Jon Rehurek’s “Preservation of the Bible: Providential or Miraculous? The Biblical View” uses Combs, Glenny, and J.J. Stewart Perowne’s *Commentary of Psalms: 2 Volumes in 1* to argue similarly. Rehurek concludes:
 - “. . . this passage does not speak of the preservation of God’s written Word; it only addresses the purity and trustworthiness of His words and the preservation that is being spoken of concerns the righteous men.” (Rehurek, 83)
- After considering the relevant writings, it is evident that grammatical and contextual arguments are working in concert with each other by those who seek to deny that Psalm 12:6-7 are teaching the preservation of the written word.

Correct Exposition: Preservation of the Words

- Preservationist Thomas M. Strouse acknowledges that the King James rendering of Psalm 12:6-7 stands in contradiction to that of modern versions. Strouse views the passage as one of the “clearest promises” of preservation in the Old Testament.

- “Psalm 12 is a psalm of contrasts. It contrasts the Godly with the ungodly and the Words of the Lord with the words of men. The latter contrast provides the backdrop to one of the clearest promises in the OT of the preservation of God’s Words.” (Strouse, 29)
- Structurally, Strouse sees the psalm as one of asymmetric contrasts:
 - “The structure of the psalm is asymmetric. This structure causes the focus to be on C, God’s Promises (see below). David’s lament carries the reader from the need for Divine help, because of the words of the ungodly, to focus on the promises of God for deliverance, which include the permanent preservation of His Words, the antidote to the words of the ever-present wicked.
 - (A) The recognition of the need for Divine help (v. 1)
 - (B) The threat of the words of the ungodly (vv. 2-4)
 - (C) God’s promises (v. 5)
 - (A’) The antidote of the Words of God (vv. 6-7)
 - (B’) The recognition of the need for Divine help (v. 8) (Strouse, 30)
- Without reproducing the totality of his article, Strouse draws his reader’s attention to verse 5, or statement C above.
 - “The structure of the psalm focuses on the promises of God. The Lord promised that, because “of the oppression of the poor,” and “of the sighing of the needy,” He would “arise and set him in safety from him that puffeth at him.” Since the “poor” were despoiled and the “needy” were groaning, the Lord made significant promises.” (Strouse, 31)
- Psalm 12:5—notice that the protection of the “poor” and “needy” is based upon what the LORD said i.e., His words. In the near context, the psalmist has already expressed that the Lord will “arise” to help the “poor” and “needy”.
 - Psalm 9:18-19—contains the Lord’s promise to “arise” and protect the “poor” and “needy.”
 - Psalm 10:12-14—the Lord will “arise” to help the “poor.”
- The promise of hope offered in verse 5 is only as good as the Lord’s ability to perform/execute His promise.

- Psalm 12:6-7—with the promise of God in mind in verse 5, the words of the Lord are contrasted in verses 6 and 7 with the words of the ungodly in verses 2 through 4. Regarding verses 6 and 7 Strouse writes:
 - “The content of God’s help was the assurance of His ever-present Words with promises of deliverance as an antidote to the words of the wicked. The psalmist reflected on this quality and endurance of the great tangible help that the Lord desires to give man—His perfect words. The quality of the Lord’s Words is likened to purified silver from a refining furnace. The result of the seven-fold refining process produced one hundred percent perfect silver in the ancient world, an apt illustration for the quality of the perfect Words of the Lord. David revealed the endurance of God’s Words, indicating that they would be preserved from that generation forever.” (Strouse, 31)
- The expression “from this generation for ever” reflects that David is referring to the “words” of hope he has been in the process of penning. In other words, the statement applies to the words David is in the process of writing under inspiration. Attempts to argue that the verse is not teaching the preservation of God’s “words” because it only mentions the current generation and nothing before David, are weak and fail to take into account how Psalm 12 fits into the book of Psalms as a whole.
- Psalm 12:8—David concludes the psalm by recognizing his need for the Lord’s help given that the wicked surround him on every side. Consequently,
 - “David recognized that the proud words of the wicked flatterers were a constant problem, but the perfect words of God will always counter man’s lies.” (Strouse, 31)
- Without the preservation of the “words”, what hope do the poor and needy have of their foretold future deliverance. Arguing that this passage does not teach the preservation of the “words” throws the content of the Lord’s promise in verse 5 into question. Not only that, as we have already pointed out, the poor and needy have not been perpetually and supernaturally kept safe from the wicked since the generation of David.
- The entire psalm is about the words of the wicked versus the words of God.
- In the end, I believe that the passage is teaching the preservation of the “words.” That being said, I would disagree with Strouse that His promise necessitates “exact sameness” or “verbatim” wording.

Extreme uses of Psalm 12:6-7 in pro-King James Argumentation

- Many King James advocates hold either explicitly or implicitly that Psalm 12:6-7 is referring to the KJB. In other words, they have in their thinking the notion that David is speaking directly about the KJB in this passage.

- The expression “as silver tried in a furnace of earth purified seven times” at the end of verse 6 is taken to be a direct reference to the KJB. This argument is made because the KJB is the seventh translation of the *Textus Receptus* into the English.
 - 1525—Tyndale
 - 1535—Coverdale
 - 1537—Matthews
 - 1539—Great Bible
 - 1560—Geneva Bible
 - 1568—Bishops Bible
 - 1611—King James Bible

- This assertion is based upon the numerical argument that seven is the number of perfection coupled with King James having been the seventh transition of the TR into English; therefore, it is argued that the King James is “perfect.” In order to make this argument one must make the following assumptions:
 - David is speaking about the KJB when he wrote Psalm 12.
 - All the various editions of the six earlier TR translations into English should not be counted.

- In her booklet, *The Hidden History of the English Scriptures: Given by Inspiration to All Generations* commemorating the 400th anniversary of the KJB, Gail Riplinger includes a section titled ““Purified Seven Times” Not Eight.”
 - “The KJB translators would not approve of further tampering with the English Bible. . . The KJB translators did not see their translation as one in the midst of a chain of ever evolving English translations. They wanted their Bible to be one of which no one could justly say, ‘It is good, except this word or that word. . .’ They planned: ‘to make . . . out of many good ones (Wycliffe, Tyndale, Coverdale, Great, Geneva, and the Bishops’) one principal good one, not justly to be expected against; that hath been our endeavor, that our mark’ The translators said that their translations was “perfected.” . . . The KJB translators’ assertion that their edition “perfected” leaves no work left for the new version translators. The enemy is at war with the word of God.” (Riplinger, 48-49)

- Gail Riplinger’s comments above typify the type of reasoning regarding Psalm 12:6-7 present in much pro-King James literature and teaching.

- A less extreme view of Psalm 12:6-7 might hold that the verses in question necessitate a sevenfold refinement process in any receptor language in order for God’s “perfect” word to exist in that language.

- The dictionary defines a simile as a comparison between two things using the words “like” or “as”. Psalm 12:6 contains a simile to explain how pure God’s “words” are. How pure are the words of God, “as silver tried in a furnace of earth purified seven times.”
- While I believe that Psalm 12:6-7 is teaching the preservation of the “words” I do not believe that the psalmist penned these verses with an early 17th century English translation in mind. Rather David is referring to the “words” he is the process of writing in Hebrew.
- It was those Hebrew words that God preserved thereby giving the King James translators something to translate into English. This is not to say that translations cannot be part of the preservation process, it simply means that David is not referring to or speaking about the KJB in Psalm 12.

Works Cited

Combs, William W. “[The Preservation of Scripture?](#)” in *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal*. Fall 2000.

Glenny, W. Edward. “The Preservation of Scripture” in *The Bible Version Debate: The Perspective of Central Baptist Theological Seminary*. Minneapolis, MN: Central Baptist Theological Seminary, 1997.

Kautzsch, E. [Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar 2nd Ed.](#) Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.

Rehurek, Jon. “Preservation of the Bible: Providential or Miraculous? The Biblical View” in *The Master’s Seminary Journal*. Spring 2008.

Strouse, Thomas. “[Article Review](#)” in *Sound Words from New England Vol. 1, Is. 4*. Spring 2001.

Strouse, Thomas. “The Permanent Preservation of God’s Words: Psalm 12:6-7” in *Thou Shalt Keep Them: A Biblical Theology of the Perfect Preservation of Scripture*. El Sobrante, CA: Pillar & Ground Publishing, 2003.

Waltke, Bruce K. and M. O’Conner. [An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax](#). Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, IN, 1990.