

Sunday, February 3, 2019—Grace Life School of Theology—*From This Generation For Ever*  
 Lesson 75 False Assumptions Concerning Transmission, Part 2 (Requires Verbatim Identity of Wording)

### **Introduction**

- In Lessons 70 through 72 we considered foundational aspects of transmission by looking at the importance of presuppositions and how they impact one’s approach to the textual criticism. Having accomplished this task, in [Lesson 73](#), we embarked on a discussion of other basic matters related to the topic. Before laying out some principles for discerning, locating, or identifying the preserved text in history, it was deemed prudent to consider the following basic points regarding transmission:
  - Materials Used in Transmission
  - Witnesses to the New Testament Text
  - False Assumptions Concerning Transmission
  - Scribal Errors & Corruption
- Last week, in Lesson 74 we began a consideration of point three: False Assumptions Concerning Transmission. We did so by looking at the following subpoints:
  - Transmission & the Telephone Game Illustration
  - Transmission Requires Verbatim Identity of Wording
- Today, in Lesson 75, I want to conclude our discussion of the second subpoint.

### **False Assumptions Concerning Transmission**

*Transmission Requires Verbatim Identity of Wording*

- Noah Webster’s *American Dictionary of the English Language* defines the word “verbatim” as follows:
  - VERBA'TIM adv. [L.] Word for word; in the same words; as, to tell a story verbatim as another has related it.
- The goal of this lesson is to show that the testimony of the scriptures does not require verbatim phraseology but simply equivalent meaning. It is possible to say the exact same thing using different words.
  - “At 3:30, I drove to the store.”

- “I drove to the store at half past three.”
- Consider the following example from II Timothy 2:15.
  - Geneva—“. . . dividing the word of truth aright.”
  - King James—“rightly dividing the word of truth.”
- In both examples, the order of words and the words themselves are different but the substance is equivalent. This highlights an important point, there is a difference between 1) a different way of saying the same things and 2) a substantive difference in meaning.
- It is imperative to remember that the promise of preservation does not demand that the Word of God be transmitted in a state of *verbatim* or *exact identicality*. During the manuscript period, stretching from the writing of the New Testament in the 1<sup>st</sup> century till the invention of the printing press by Johann Guttenberg in 1455, the transmission of the Word of God was done via hand written copies. That God did not supernaturally over take the hand of every scribe/copyist during the manuscript period, or every typesetter and compositor after the invention of the printing press, to ensure that no differences of any kind entered the text, is evident via a consideration of the extant historical evidence. Please recall the following FACTS from previous lessons:
  - Fact 1—the original autographs are not extant i.e., they no longer exist.
  - Fact 2—no two Greek manuscripts, even the Byzantine MSS of the majority, are *exactly* the same.
  - Fact 3—no two printed editions of the Greek New Testament are *exactly* the same.
  - Fact 4—no two editions of the King James Bible are *exactly* the same.
  - Fact 5—the King James differs from modern versions.
  - Fact 6—no two modern versions read *exactly* the same.
- Consider the following summative statement from the pen of Kevin Bauder:
  - “If the preservation of the Word of God depends upon **exact** preservation of the words of the original documents, then the situation is dire. No two manuscripts contain **exactly the same** words. No two editions of the Masoretic Text contain **exactly the same** words. No two editions of the Textus Receptus contain **exactly the same** words. No two modifications of the King James Version contain **exactly the same** words and the Bible nowhere tells us which edition, if any, does contain the exact words of the originals. These are not speculations, these are plain facts.” (Bauder, 155)
- Given the Biblical data as well as the historical and textual FACTS, the following points are inescapable:

- God promised to preserve His word.
  - Psalms 12:6-7; 105:5; 119:89, 111, 152, 160; Isaiah 30:8; 40:8; Matthew 24:35; I Peter 1:23-25
- God did not see fit to preserve His word by preserving the original autographs.
  - This is self-evident because the originals no longer exist.
- God did not supernaturally overtake the pen of every scribe, copyist, or typesetter who ever handled the text to ensure that no differences of any kind entered the text.
  - Differences exist at every level of this discussion.
- If the standard for preservation is “plenary,” “verbatim,” or “exact” identity, why did God not just preserve the originals and thereby remove all doubt.
  - The reason is that God wants people to walk by faith in their view of the Biblical text.
- Historically, advocates of the Traditional Greek Text i.e., the *Textus Receptus* and the King James Bible have demanded that preservation/transmission occurred with *verbatim* or *exact identity* of wording as a method of refuting the claims of Critical Text and Modern Version advocates. Given the fact that conservatives believe in *plenary verbal inspiration* or the inspiration of every word, it is reasonable to assume and perhaps expect that preservation would also be both verbal and plenary. It is, therefore, easy to see why many preservationists have demanded identical wording as their standard for preservation. They view this conclusion as following logically from the doctrine of plenary verbal inspiration.
- However, when one looks at the historical data, they encounter the FACT that no two Greek manuscripts (even Byzantine); editions of the TR, or printings of the KJB, are exactly identical. This is a source of concern for many given their prior belief in and demand for *verbatim identity* as the standard for preservation/transmission. Recall the following comment from the pen of Harry A. Sturz in *The Byzantine Text-Type & New Testament Textual Criticism*:
  - “One danger of such a position is that the faith of some has been weakened when they have become aware of variant readings in the manuscripts precisely because they have confounded preservation with inspiration.” (Sturz, 38)
- Running headfirst into the FACTS, one is forced to decide. Are they going to turn away from the doctrine of preservation in favor of rationalistic/naturalistic explanations of the facts or look to the scriptures to inform their understanding of the *nature* of preservation?
- The factual reality of variant readings in the transmission of God’s word need not overthrow one’s belief in God’s promise to preserve His word (It did not for the Reformers as we will see in future lessons.). These facts need not lead one to deny/doubt the clear promise of God. Rather, one can adopt a modified position on preservation based upon faith in God’s written word. After studying the issue, I have come to believe that the presumption that preservation/transmission occurred with *verbatim identity* is the central problem in the textual/Bible version debate.

- In Term 2 of this class (Lessons 28 through 56), we learned that demanding *exact identity* of wording in the preservation/transmission of the text is carrying the corollary between inspiration and preservation too far. No verses teach the Bible Believer to make such a demand. In [Lesson 43 Passages Proving Plenary Preservation is Presumptuous](#), four scriptural proofs were offered as evidence that preservation/transmission need not have occurred with *verbatim identity*.
  - The fact that New Testament quotes of the Old Testament do not match *verbatim*.
  - The fact that Old Testament quotations of the Old Testament do not match *verbatim*.
  - The fact that New Testament quotations of the New Testament do not match *verbatim*.
  - II Kings 19 and Isaiah 37 do not match *verbatim*.
    - See Appendix A on page 7.
- Based upon the textual FACTS observed in Lesson 43 and highlighted in the Appendix, it would be wrong to require *verbatim identity* as the standard for preservation. This standard cannot even be sustained within the King James text. Consequently, it is not helpful or productive for King James advocates to adopt a standard for preservation that cannot even be sustained in the very Bible they are asserting is “perfect.”
- Moreover, the definition of preservation does not demand *verbatim identity* for something to be characterized as having been preserved. Noah Webster’s *American Dictionary of the English Language* defines [preservation](#) as follows:
  - “The act of preserving or keeping safe; the act of keeping from injury, destruction or decay; as the *preservation* of life or health; the *preservation* of buildings from fire or decay; the *preservation* of grain from insects; the *preservation* of fruit or plants. **When a thing is kept entirely from decay, or nearly in its original state, we say it is in a high state of *preservation*.**”
- If the substantive doctrinal content of the scriptures is intact, we can say without doubt that they have been preserved. Again, if the Holy Spirit can quote His own work without using *exactly identical* words and still call it scripture, then who are we to demand more from the doctrine of preservation than God almighty.
- It is only when one demands that preservation/transmission requires the same precision as inspiration i.e., *verbatim identity*, that the corollary between inspiration and preservation runs into trouble. Lessons 42 through 45 were devoted to highlighting this point.
  - [Scriptural Model for Dealing with Textual Variants](#)
- According to our biblically adjusted view of preservation (see chart at the link above), the terms “pure” and “perfect” do not demand *verbatim identity* of wording but simply substantively

equivalent meaning. I have no problem speaking about “pure” or “perfect” preservation if by perfect one means:

- The existence of a *pure text* (Psalm 12:6-7) that does not report information about God, His nature or character, His doctrine, His dispensational dealings with mankind, history, archeology, or science that is FALSE. In short, God’s promise to preserve His word assures the existence of a text that has not been altered in its *character* or *doctrinal content* despite not being preserved in a state of *verbatim identity*.
- Dr. William W. Combs of Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary is the author of an essay titled “The Preservation of Scripture” (See Lessons 28 through 56 for a detailed analysis of this essay.). In this essay, among other things, Dr. Combs points out that the textual facts do not seem to matter to most King James Only adherents, “So we see that the evidence of manuscripts, texts, and versions means nothing to those in the KJV/TR camp.” (Combs 35) Most are content to double down on faith for faith’s sake in the promise of preservation. After quoting statements regarding the need for faith in God’s word by King James supporters David Cloud and Jack Moorman; Combs states the following:

- “In one sense Moorman is absolutely correct. What the Bible teaches about its own preservation is to be accepted by faith. But that can be said of everything the Bible teaches—everything the Bible teaches is to be accepted by faith. This argument from faith or “the logic of faith,” as Hills likes to call it, actually boils down to faith in the KJV as the perfectly preserved Word of God, in spite of all the evidence to the contrary. This is not faith, at least not in the biblical sense, but pure presumption.

The fundamental fallacy in KJV/TR position can be traced to the faulty premise that the Scriptures themselves teach a perfect and inerrant preservation of the actual words of the autographs. We saw this earlier in Flanders’s statement that “the actual existence of the original text will continue eternally....” It is not enough to hold a Bible in one’s hand, even a King James Bible, and say this is the Word of God; the KJV/TR position insists that one must be able to say that these are the *Words* of God. Anything else, according to Waite, is “an apostate, heretical, modernistic, and liberal position.” (Combs, 36)

- Combs is correct that faith in “the perfectly preserved Word of God” cannot be maintained by faith in God’s word if by “perfect” one means matching the original autographs with *exact identity*. That is a presumption because the Word of God teaches no such doctrine.
- Before we are too hard on the likes of David Cloud, D.A. Waite, and Jack A. Moorman, it needs to be made clear that the Originals Only position is equally guilty of making unbiblical rationalistic presumptions. There is no verse of scripture that teaches that inspiration, infallibility, and inerrancy are confined to the non-existent original autographs alone. Therefore, the Originals Only position cannot be held by faith in God’s word either. It was a position forged as a rationalistic response to German Higher Criticism and Enlightenment Rationalism during the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. It was largely on account of the existence of textual variants that inspiration, infallibility, and inerrancy were confined to the original autographs.

- Moreover, it is imperative for Bible Believers to acknowledge that it was the false standard of *exact identity* of wording that led B.B. Warfield to confine inspiration and inerrancy to the original autographs only, in the first place. This was done on account of how modernists and rationalistic critics of the Bible were using the reality of variant readings to brow beat the Bible and question its authority. As we saw in [Lesson 71](#), instead of retreating to the historical position of the Reformers and the Westminster Confession of Faith, Warfield met his Enlightenment opponents on Enlightenment terms and thereby confined the scriptures to the non-existent original autographs as a rationalistic means of dealing with the lack of *identity* in the transmission of the text.
- Once again, the historic King James Only position and the Originals Only positions were forged by taking an equally presumptuous approach to how to account for the lack of *verbatim identity* in the surviving manuscript copies. Differences in wording are not inherently a problem so long as they do not report information that is false or contradictory. This is where we must recognize the difference between 1) a different way of saying the same thing, and 2) substantive differences in meaning. One reason that I oppose the Critical Text and Modern Versions is because they are altered so drastically in their wording or lack thereof, i.e., missing so many words/verses that they substantively alter the doctrinal content of the Bible. I know from personal experience that this distinction is lost on many King James Only believers. Please see the following visual that I created to help illustrate this point:
  - [The Historical Development of Protestant Bibliology](#)
- For many King James Only authors, such as Dr. Waite, any difference of any kind constitutes a situation where one is forced to declare which reading is the Word of God.
  - “Thus one cannot honestly, according to Waite, say that the NASB is the Word of God. He complains that if one holds “his King James in his hand and the New American Standard in his hand with 5,604 differences in their Greek texts in the New Testament alone, how can they both be the ‘Word’ of God? ‘Word of God’ could not mean the ‘Words of God’ because of these differences in the Words.”” (Dr. Waite quoted in Combs, 36)
- Dr. Waite fails to distinguish between the nature of these differences. I reject the Critical Text and the NASB because many of these 5,604 differences are substantive in nature, not merely different ways of saying the same thing. But, mark well, that is not what Waite is saying, he is making the categorical statement that any difference of wording of any kind is an attack on the Word of God. The problem here is one of consistency. The printed editions of the KJB contain different wording yet Waite is not willing to identify which edition of the KJB got all the words “perfect” or *exactly* correct in every detail.
- Professor Combs concludes his section on “The Extent of Preservation” with the following paragraph.
  - “The true situation is this: God has preserved his Word to this day, but because of the means he has chosen to use to accomplish this preservation—providentially, through secondary causation—the words of the autographs have not been inerrantly preserved.

Instead, God has chosen to allow for variations to occur—variants within the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek copies of the autographs. God has providentially provided all these copies in order to preserve the Scriptures. So it is proper to say that preservation has taken place in the totality of manuscripts. Because God chose this method of preservation, it was not possible to provide a perfectly pure text with no variations (errors). It was sufficient for God’s purpose to preserve his Word in copies of the autographs whose exact wording contains some variation. This level of purity is sufficient for God’s purposes.” (Combs, 37)

- In the end, Combs is partly right and partly wrong. Combs doubles down in the opposite direction of Waite. He insists that “the words of the autographs have not been inerrantly preserved” because he is assuming *verbatim identicality* as his standard for inerrant preservation. Therefore, according to Combs, inerrancy is only applicable to the original autographs. Combs insistence upon *exact identicality* of wording is reiterated in his statement that “it was not possible to provide a perfectly pure text with no variations.” For Combs the mere presence of textual variants negates perfect/inerrant preservation because of how he is using those words.
- I also disagree with Combs’ conclusion that preservation occurred in the “totality of manuscripts.” This is not possible since some of the manuscript copies do possess substantive differences in meaning and, in some cases, actually teach opposites.

### Conclusion

- Even Dr. Edward F. Hills, an outspoken advocate of providential preservation, acknowledges that demanding verbatim identicality as the standard of preservation is demanding more than one can prove.
  - “If the doctrine of the divine inspiration of the Old and New Testament Scriptures is a true doctrine, the doctrine of the providential preservation of the Scriptures must also be a true doctrine. 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** [note that Hills stops short of demanding verbatim identicality of wording] **of the original text have been available to God’s people in every age.** God must have done this, for if He gave the Scriptures to His Church by inspiration as the perfect and final revelation of His will, then it is obvious that **He would not allow this revelation to disappear or undergo any alteration of its fundamental character** [preservation secures the transmission of the substantive doctrinal content of the text without demanding exact identicality of wording].” (Hills, 2)
- When God promised to preserve His word, did He know that the printing press would not be invented until 1455 A.D.? Did God know that for much of the history of the dispensation of grace His word would be preserved and transmitted through handwritten copies of the Biblical documents that would be subject to both accidental and intentional errors? Did God know that during the copying process the originals would not be transmitted with *exact identicality*? The

answer to all these questions is “yes.” God, in His foreknowledge, knew all of these things yet he still promised to preserve His word.

- Consequently, our understanding of what the Word of God is ought to not be different from His. God does not require *verbatim identity* of wording in order to fulfill His promise of preservation. Therefore, we should not demand more of the promise of preservation than God does. Human reason and rationality, even within the King James Only camp, has served to bind God’s Word up (Pure Cambridge Position) in a manner that is contrary to how the King James Bible itself would teach one to think about the matter.
- I believe in “perfect” preservation and/or transmission if, by perfect, one means:
  - the existence of a **pure text** (Psalm 12:6-7) that does not report information about God, His nature or character, His doctrine, His dispensational dealings with mankind, history, archeology, or science that is FALSE. In short, God’s promise to preserve His Word assures the existence of a text that has not been altered in its *character* or *doctrinal content* despite not being preserved in a state of “verbatim identity.”
- The greatest false assumption that needs to be avoided in any discussion of textual transmission is one that requires *verbatim identity* of wording as the standard for preservation. This false assumption has caused men to err in one of two directions: 1) deny the promise of preservation and limit inspiration, infallibility, and inerrancy to the non-existent original autographs or 2) misconstrue the promise of preservation as requiring exact identity of wording and thereby adopt positions on the KJB that do not square with the historical and textual facts.

### Works Cited

- Bauder, Kevin T. “An Appeal to Scripture” in *One Bible Only? Examining the Exclusive Claims for the King James Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2001.
- Combs, William W. “The Preservation of Scripture?” in *Detroit Baptist Seminary Journal*. Fall 2000.
- Hills, Edward F. *The King James Version Defended*. Des Moines: IA, Christian Research Press, 1956.
- Sturz, Harry A. *The Byzantine Text-Type & New Testament Textual Criticism*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1984.



## Appendix A

### *Four Proofs that Scripture Approves of Substantive Doctrinal Equivalence and Does not Require Verbatim Identity of Wording in Preservation/Transmission*

- Proof 1—New Testament quotes of the Old Testament do not match *verbatim*.
- Proof 2—Old Testament quotations of the Old Testament do not match *verbatim*.
- Proof 3—New Testament quotations of the New Testament do not match *verbatim*.
- Proof 4—II Kings 19 and Isaiah 37 do not match *verbatim*.

#### **Proof 1—New Testament Quotes of the Old Testament**

- In this category I would like to consider the following two categories of passages:
  - “Scripture” Passages
  - “It is written” Passages

#### *“Scripture” Passages*

- This category explores instances where a New Testament figure is reading from a manuscript copy of the Old Testament. Yet the manuscript copies that are read from in the New Testament do not match exactly with the Old Testament texts that are being read in the KJB.

#### **Isaiah 61:1-2 & Luke 4:18-19**

<b>Isaiah 61:1-2</b>	<b>Luke 4:18-19</b>
<p>The Spirit of the Lord <b>GOD</b> is upon me;</p> <p>because the <b>LORD</b> hath anointed me to preach <b>good tidings</b> unto the <b>meek</b>;</p> <p>he hath sent me <b>to bind up</b> the brokenhearted,</p> <p>to <b>proclaim liberty</b> to the captives,</p> <p>and the <b>opening of the prison</b> to them that are <b>bound</b>;</p> <p>To <b>proclaim</b> the acceptable year of the LORD,</p>	<p>The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,</p> <p>because <b>he</b> hath anointed me to preach <b>the gospel</b> to the <b>poor</b>;</p> <p>he hath sent me <b>to heal</b> the brokenhearted,</p> <p>to <b>preach deliverance</b> to the captives,</p> <p><b>(and recovering of sight to the blind),</b></p> <p>to <b>set at liberty</b> them that are <b>bruised</b>,</p> <p>To <b>preach</b> the acceptable year of the Lord.</p>

- We have already seen this example in Lessons 5 and 42. The manuscript copy that Christ is reading from in Luke 4 is not an exact match with the King James text of Isaiah 61. Yet, the Lord Jesus Christ calls the manuscript copy He is reading from, scripture. The passages are substantively equivalent despite not possessing *verbatim* wording.

**Isaiah 53:7-8 & Acts 8:32-33**

<b>Isaiah 53:7-8</b>	<b>Acts 8:32-33</b>
<p>He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth:</p> <p>he is <b>brought as a lamb</b> to the slaughter,</p> <p>and as a <b>sheep</b> before <b>her</b> shearers is dumb,</p> <p>so <b>he openeth</b> not his mouth.</p> <p><b>He was taken from prison and from judgment:</b> and who shall declare his generation?</p> <p>For <b>he was cut off out of the land of the living:</b></p> <p>for the transgression of my people was he stricken.</p>	<p>He was <b>led as a sheep</b> to the slaughter;</p> <p>and like a <b>lamb dumb</b> before <b>his</b> shearer,</p> <p>so <b>opened he</b> not his mouth:</p> <p><b>In his humiliation his judgment was taken away:</b> and who shall declare his generation?</p> <p>for <b>his life is taken from the earth.</b></p>

- Acts 8:26-30—the Ethiopian Eunuch is on his way home to Ethiopia from Jerusalem in his chariot reading a manuscript copy of the book of Isaiah. When Philip is prompted by the angel of the Lord to join himself unto the Eunuch’s chariot, Philip finds him reading the passage above from Isaiah 53.
- When one compares the text of Acts 8:32-33 with Isaiah 53:7-8 the wording is far from identical yet the doctrinal substance is unaltered despite not possessing *verbatim* wording.
- Acts 8:32, 35—twice in this passage the Holy Spirit calls the text of verses 32 and 33 scripture despite the lack of verbatim wording with Isaiah 53:7-8 in the KJB. Once again, this proves that demanding exact sameness in wording as the standard for preservation is overreaching. God the Holy Spirit does not even demand that in His word.

*“It is written” Passages*

- In Lessons 36 and 37 we devoted two lessons to a study of how the phrase “it is written” impacts the doctrine/promise of preservation. In Lesson 37 we considered the impact of the Perfect Tense and Passive Voice upon the doctrine of preservation.
  - “The perfect tense, which He utilized, expresses a completed action with a resulting state of being. The result of the action continues from the past through the present and into the future.” (Strouse in *Thou Shalt Keep Them*, 35)
  - “Combining the perfect tense with the passive voice shows that the action of the verb was completed in the past by an agent other than the subject of the verb with the results of the action continuing into the present. The perfect tense, and the perfect passive in particular, is often used in Scripture to teach doctrine and illustrate preservation of truth.” (Sutton in *Thou Shalt Keep Them*, 76)
- After explaining the meaning and significance of both the perfect tense and passive voice and applying it to non-preservation related texts by way of explanation and illustration, Sutton explains the significance with respect to the doctrine of preservation. Every occurrence of “it is written” in the New Testament corresponds with a perfect passive verb in Greek, according to Sutton:
  - “Sixty-three times in the NT the exact phrase “it is written” occurs. The perfect passive verb *gegraptai* underlies fifty-nine of these references, while the other four occasions represent the perfect passive participle *gegramenon*.” (Sutton in *Thou Shalt Keep Them*, 78)
- In Lesson 36 we noted places where the phrase “it is written” occurred yet there was not *verbatim identity* in how the New Testament quoted the Old Testament.

**Deuteronomy 8:3 & Matthew 4:4**

<b>Deuteronomy 8:3</b>	<b>Matthew 4:4</b>
<p>. . . that he might make thee know that man <b>doth</b> not live by bread <b>only</b>, but by every <i>word</i> that proceedeth out of the mouth of the <b>LORD doth man live.</b></p>	<p>But he answered and said, <b>It is written</b>, Man <b>shall</b> not live by bread <b>alone</b>, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.</p>

- Is Matthew 4:4 in your KJB an exact word for word quotation of Deuteronomy 8:3? No! Does that mean one of these is in error? No! They are both teaching the exact same doctrinal content without using the exact same words.

#### Matthew 4:4 & Luke 4:4

Matthew 4:4	Luke 4:4
But he answered and said, <b>It is written</b> , Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word <b>that proceedeth out of the mouth</b> of God.	And Jesus answered him, saying, <b>It is written</b> , <b>That</b> man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.

- So not only does Matthew's quotation of Deuteronomy 8:3 not match exactly, but the citations of Deuteronomy by both Matthew and Luke, in the same context, do not match each other exactly. Yet no one views these verses as differing substantively in terms of their doctrinal content.
- The same phenomena are observable for the other "it is written" quotations of the Lord Jesus Christ during His temptation.

#### Deuteronomy 6:16 & Matthew 4:7

Deuteronomy 6:16	Matthew 4:7
<b>Ye</b> shall not tempt the LORD <b>your</b> God, . . .	Jesus said unto him, <b>It is written</b> again, <b>Thou</b> shalt not tempt the Lord <b>thy</b> God.

#### Deuteronomy 6:13 & Mathew 4:10

Deuteronomy 6:13	Matthew 4:10
Thou shalt <b>fear</b> the LORD thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his name.	Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for <b>it is written</b> , Thou shalt <b>worship</b> the Lord thy God, and him <b>only</b> shalt thou serve.

- There are literally scores of these types of examples that we could cite. Please consider these few in addition to what we saw in Lesson 36.

#### Micah 5:2 & Matthew 2:5-6

Micah 5:2	Matthew 2:5-6
But thou, Bethlehem <b>Ephratah</b> , <b>though thou be little among the thousands of Judah</b> , yet out of thee shall he come forth <b>unto me</b> that is to be <b>ruler</b> in Israel;	And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judaea: for thus <b>it is written</b> by the prophet, And thou Bethlehem, <b>in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda:</b> for out of thee shall come a <b>Governor</b> , that shall rule my people Israel.

whose goings forth <i>have been</i> from of old, from everlasting.	
--	--

### Zechariah 13:7 & Matthew 26:13

Zechariah 13:7	Matthew 26:13
Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man <i>that is</i> my fellow, saith the LORD of hosts:  smite the shepherd,  and the sheep shall be scattered:  and I will turn mine hand upon the little ones.	Then saith Jesus unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for <b>it is written</b> ,  <b>I will</b> smite the shepherd,  and the sheep <b>of the flock</b> shall be scattered <b>abroad</b> .

### Psalms 69:25 & Acts 1:20

Psalms 69:25	Acts 1:20
Let their habitation be desolate; <b>and let none dwell in their tents</b> .	For <b>it is written</b> in the book of Psalms,  Let his habitation be desolate, <b>and let no man dwell therein: and his bishoprick let another take</b> .

### Isaiah 59:20 & Romans 11:26

Isaiah 59:20	Romans 11:26
And <b>the Redeemer</b> shall come to Zion,  and <b>unto them</b> that <b>turn from transgression in Jacob</b> ,  saith the LORD.	And so all Israel shall be saved: as <b>it is written</b> ,  There shall come out of Sion <b>the Deliverer</b> ,  and <b>shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob</b> :

### Isaiah 29:14 & I Corinthians 1:19

Isaiah 29:14	I Corinthians 1:19
Therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, <i>even</i> a marvellous work and a wonder:  <b>for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid</b> .	For <b>it is written</b> ,  <b>I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent</b> .

- Many more examples like these could be presented for consideration. In fact, I challenge everyone to look at each occurrence of the phrase “it is written” in the New Testament and compare the associated quotation with its Old Testament counterpart. I have not been able to find

one that is completely *verbatim*, the closest one I could locate is II Corinthians 8:15's quotation of Exodus 16:18.

- So, in the above examples, which verse is right—the NT or the OT passage? The answer is that they are both right. From this we can make the following observations:
  - The NT quotations of the OT are not *verbatim* and sometimes considerably different.
  - The NT quotations specifically say “it is written,” when those *exact* words are not in fact written.
  - This proves that scripture considers the NT phrasing to be the equivalent of the OT verse even though the words are not *verbatim*.
  - It is thus possible for different phrasings to be equivalent and both be the Word of God even though they are not *verbatim*.

### Proof 2—Old Testament Quotes of the Old Testament

- In case one is tempted to argue that the examples cited in this section are illegitimate because the Old Testament was written in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek, they need to mark well that the same phenomena occur within each Testament. The Old Testament does not quote the Old Testament with *verbatim identicality*.

#### Deuteronomy 24:16 & II Chronicles 25:4

Deuteronomy 24:16	II Chronicles 25:4
<p>The fathers shall not <b>be put to death</b> for the children, neither shall the children <b>be put to death</b> for the fathers: every man shall <b>be put to death</b> for his own sin.</p>	<p>But he slew not their children, but <i>did as it is written</i> in the law in the book of Moses, where the LORD commanded, <b>saying</b>,</p> <p>The fathers shall not <b>die for the children</b>, neither shall the children <b>die for</b> the fathers, but every man shall <b>die</b> for his own sin.</p>

- II Chronicles 25:4 is a quotation of Deuteronomy 24:16 yet they do not have exactly identical wording. If *verbatim identicality* of wording were the standard which one of these verses is correct? The answer is that they are both correct and are equally the Word of God even though they are not exactly identical. This proves that God approves of substantively equivalent phraseology without demanding *verbatim identicality* or wording.

### Proof 3—New Testament Quotes of the New Testament

- Likewise, for the New Testament.

#### I Timothy 5:18 & Luke 10:7

Luke 10:7	I Timothy 5:18
<p>And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give:</p> <p>(Thou shalt not muzzle the ox <b>when he</b> treadeth out the corn.)</p> <p>For the labourer is worthy of his <b>hire</b>.</p> <p>Go not from house to house.</p>	<p>For the scripture saith,</p> <p>Thou shalt not muzzle the ox <b>that</b> treadeth out the corn (Deut. 25:4).</p> <p>And, The labourer <i>is</i> worthy of his <b>reward</b>.</p>

- I Timothy 5:18 clearly states “the scripture saith” yet when it quotes Luke 10:7, it does not do so with *verbatim identity*. Moreover, the first part of I Timothy 5:18 is a quotation of Deuteronomy 25:4 it is not an identical match either, even within the KJB.
- In this way the Word of God instructs us that demanding *exact sameness* or *verbatim identity* in wording as the standard for preservation was an excessive and unbiblical assumption. This false assumption has caused many to err to one of the following extremes:
  - **Option 1: Originals Only Position**—this position confines inspiration, infallibility, and inerrancy to the non-existent original autographs as means of dealing with the variant readings. Advocates argue that it is their job to reconstruct the Biblical text. This position is nonscientific and non-falsifiable. In the absence of the originals how does one know whether they have accurately reconstructed the text. This position is of no practical consequence and cannot be maintained by faith in God’s word.
  - **Option 2: Faith for Faith’s Sake**—pretend like the variant readings do not exist and insist upon Plenary Verbal Preservation. Some incorrectly insist that God re-inspired His Word in English between 1604 and 1611 as a means of providing the verbatim identity of wording that this view of Preservation demands. This view has the correct starting point, is consistent with the fideistic (believing) approach to Scripture; but carries the corollary between Preservation and Inspiration too far.

### Proof 4—II Kings 19 and Isaiah 37

- II Kings 19 and Isaiah 37 represent a different case than we observed in the previous point. In this case both passages are found in the Old Testament and were originally written in Hebrew. Moreover, they portray the exact same event. Yet, they are not identical.
- These chapters are not like the gospels where they are different accounts that provide different perspectives and contain different information. These are nearly identical in content but have different wording. Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John are different accounts that are written for different purposes. Therefore, when they record the same events, they include different details.
  - Differ in length
  - Some have a genealogy, some do not
  - Those that do have a genealogy do not match
  - They record different events

<b>II Kings 19</b>	<b>Isaiah 37</b>
1) And it came to pass, when king Hezekiah heard <i>it</i> , that he rent his clothes, and covered himself with sackcloth, and went into the house of the LORD.	1) And it came to pass, when king Hezekiah heard <i>it</i> , that he rent his clothes, and covered himself with sackcloth, and went into the house of the LORD.
2) And he sent Eliakim, <b>which</b> <i>was</i> over the household, and Shebna the scribe, and the elders of the priests, covered with sackcloth, <b>to</b> Isaiah the prophet the son of Amoz.	2) And he sent Eliakim, <b>who</b> <i>was</i> over the household, and Shebna the scribe, and the elders of the priests covered with sackcloth, <b>unto</b> Isaiah the prophet the son of Amoz.
3) And they said unto him, Thus saith Hezekiah, This day <i>is</i> a day of trouble, and of rebuke, and blasphemy: for the children are come to the birth, and <i>there is</i> not strength to bring forth.	3) And they said unto him, Thus saith Hezekiah, This day <i>is</i> a day of trouble, and of rebuke, and of blasphemy: for the children are come to the birth, and <i>there is</i> not strength to bring forth.
4) It may be the LORD thy God will hear <b>all</b> the words of Rabshakeh, whom the king of Assyria his master hath sent to reproach the living God; and will reprove the words which the LORD thy God hath heard: wherefore lift up <i>thy</i> prayer for the remnant that <b>are</b> left.	4) It may be the LORD thy God will hear the words of Rabshakeh, whom the king of Assyria his master hath sent to reproach the living God, and will reprove the words which the LORD thy God hath heard: wherefore lift up <i>thy</i> prayer for the remnant that <b>is</b> left.
5) So the servants of king Hezekiah came to Isaiah.	5) So the servants of king Hezekiah came to Isaiah.
6) And Isaiah said unto them, Thus shall ye say to your master, Thus saith the LORD, Be not afraid of the words <b>which</b> thou hast heard, <b>with which</b> the servants of the king of Assyria have blasphemed me.	6) And Isaiah said unto them, Thus shall ye say unto your master, Thus saith the LORD, Be not afraid of the words <b>that</b> thou hast heard, <b>wherewith</b> the servants of the king of Assyria have blasphemed me.
7) Behold, I will send a blast upon him, and he shall hear a rumour, and shall return to his own	7) Behold, I will send a blast upon him, and he shall hear a rumour, and return to his own land;



land; and I will cause him to fall by the sword in his own land.	and I will cause him to fall by the sword in his own land.
8) So Rabshakeh returned, and found the king of Assyria warring against Libnah: for he had heard that he was departed from Lachish.	8) So Rabshakeh returned, and found the king of Assyria warring against Libnah: for he had heard that he was departed from Lachish.
9) And when he heard say <b>of</b> Tirhakah king of Ethiopia, <b>Behold</b> , he is come <b>out to fight</b> against thee: he sent messengers again unto Hezekiah, saying,	9) And he heard say <b>concerning</b> Tirhakah king of Ethiopia, He is come <b>forth to make war</b> with thee. <b>And when he heard it</b> , he sent messengers to Hezekiah, saying,
10) Thus shall ye speak to Hezekiah king of Judah, saying, Let not thy God in whom thou trustest deceive thee, saying, Jerusalem shall not be <b>delivered</b> into the hand of the king of Assyria.	10) Thus shall ye speak to Hezekiah king of Judah, saying, Let not thy God, in whom thou trustest, deceive thee, saying, Jerusalem shall not be <b>given</b> into the hand of the king of Assyria.
11) Behold, thou hast heard what the kings of Assyria have done to all lands, by destroying them utterly: and shalt thou be delivered?	11) Behold, thou hast heard what the kings of Assyria have done to all lands by destroying them utterly; and shalt thou be delivered?
12) Have the gods of the nations delivered them which my fathers have destroyed; <i>as</i> Gozan, and Haran, and Rezeph, and the children of Eden which <i>were</i> in <b>Thelasar</b> ?	12) Have the gods of the nations delivered them which my fathers have destroyed, <i>as</i> Gozan, and Haran, and Rezeph, and the children of Eden which <i>were</i> in <b>Telassar</b> ?
13) Where <i>is</i> the king of Hamath, and the king of Arpad, and the king of the city of Sepharvaim, of Hena, and Ivah?	13) Where <i>is</i> the king of Hamath, and the king of Arphad, and the king of the city of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivah?
14) And Hezekiah received the letter <b>of</b> the hand of the messengers, and read it: and Hezekiah went up <b>into</b> the house of the LORD, and spread it before the LORD.	14) And Hezekiah received the letter <b>from</b> the hand of the messengers, and read it: and Hezekiah went up <b>unto</b> the house of the LORD, and spread it before the LORD.

15) And Hezekiah prayed <b>before</b> the LORD, <b>and said</b> , O LORD God of Israel, <b>which</b> dwellest <i>between</i> the cherubims, thou art the God, <i>even</i> thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth; thou hast made heaven and earth.	15) And Hezekiah prayed <b>unto</b> the LORD, <b>saying</b> ,
	16) O LORD <b>of hosts</b> , God of Israel, <b>that</b> dwellest <i>between</i> the cherubims, thou <i>art</i> the God, <i>even</i> thou alone, of all the kingdoms of the earth: thou hast made heaven and earth.
16) <b>LORD, bow down thine ear</b> , and hear: <b>open, LORD, thine eyes</b> , and see: and hear the words of Sennacherib, which hath sent <b>him</b> to reproach the living God.	17) <b>Incline thine ear, O LORD</b> , and hear; <b>open thine eyes, O LORD</b> , and see: and hear <b>all</b> the words of Sennacherib, which hath sent to reproach the living God.
17) Of a truth, LORD, the kings of Assyria have <b>destroyed</b> the nations and their <b>lands</b> ,	18) Of a truth, LORD, the kings of Assyria have <b>laid waste all</b> the nations, and their <b>countries</b> ,
18) And have cast their gods into the fire: for they <i>were</i> no gods, but the work of men's hands, wood and stone: therefore they have destroyed them.	19) And have cast their gods into the fire: for they <i>were</i> no gods, but the work of men's hands, wood and stone: therefore they have destroyed them.
19) Now therefore, O LORD our God, <b>I beseech thee</b> , save thou us <b>out of</b> his hand, that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that thou <i>art</i> the LORD <b>God</b> , <i>even</i> thou only.	20) Now therefore, O LORD our God, save us <b>from</b> his hand, that all the kingdoms of the earth may know that thou <i>art</i> the LORD, <i>even</i> thou only.

20) Then Isaiah the son of Amoz sent <b>to</b> Hezekiah, saying, Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, <b>That which</b> thou hast prayed to me against Sennacherib king of Assyria <b>I have heard</b> .	21) Then Isaiah the son of Amoz sent <b>unto</b> Hezekiah, saying, Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, <b>Whereas</b> thou hast prayed to me against Sennacherib king of Assyria:
21) This <i>is</i> the word <b>that</b> the LORD hath spoken concerning him; The virgin the daughter of Zion hath despised thee, <i>and</i> laughed thee to scorn; the daughter of Jerusalem hath shaken her head at thee.	22) This <i>is</i> the word <b>which</b> the LORD hath spoken concerning him; The virgin, the daughter of Zion, hath despised thee, <i>and</i> laughed thee to scorn; the daughter of Jerusalem hath shaken her head at thee.
22) Whom hast thou reproached and blasphemed? and against whom hast thou exalted <i>thy</i> voice, and lifted up thine eyes on high? <i>even</i> against the Holy <i>One</i> of Israel.	23) Whom hast thou reproached and blasphemed? and against whom hast thou exalted <i>thy</i> voice, and lifted up thine eyes on high? <i>even</i> against the Holy <i>One</i> of Israel.
23) By thy <b>messengers</b> thou hast reproached the Lord, and hast said, <b>With</b> the multitude of my chariots I am come up to the height of the mountains, to the sides of Lebanon, and will cut down the tall <b>cedar trees</b> thereof, <i>and</i> the choice fir trees thereof: and I will enter into the <b>lodgings</b> of his <b>borders</b> , <i>and into</i> the forest of his Carmel.	24) By thy <b>servants</b> hast thou reproached the Lord, and hast said, <b>By</b> the multitude of my chariots am I come up to the height of the mountains, to the sides of Lebanon; and <b>I</b> will cut down the tall <b>cedars</b> thereof, <i>and</i> the choice fir trees thereof: and I will enter into the <b>height</b> of his <b>border</b> , <i>and</i> the forest of his Carmel.
24) I have digged and drunk strange <b>waters</b> , and with the sole of my feet have I dried up all the rivers of besieged places.	25) I have digged, and drunk <b>water</b> ; and with the sole of my feet have I dried up all the rivers of <b>the</b> besieged places.
25) Hast thou not heard long ago <i>how</i> I have done it, <i>and</i> of ancient times that I have formed it? now have I brought it to pass, that thou shouldest be to lay waste <b>fenced</b> cities <i>into</i> ruinous heaps.	26) Hast thou not heard long ago, <i>how</i> I have done it; <i>and</i> of ancient times, that I have formed it? now have I brought it to pass, that thou shouldest be to lay waste <b>defenced</b> cities <i>into</i> ruinous heaps.
26) Therefore their inhabitants <b>were</b> of small power, they were dismayed and confounded; they were <i>as</i> the grass of the field, and <i>as</i> the green herb, <i>as</i> the grass on the housetops, and <i>as</i> corn blasted before it be grown up.	27) Therefore their inhabitants <b>were</b> of small power, they were dismayed and confounded: they were <i>as</i> the grass of the field, and <i>as</i> the green herb, <i>as</i> the grass on the housetops, and <i>as</i> corn blasted before it be grown up.
27 But I know thy abode, and thy going out, and thy coming in, and thy rage against me.	28 But I know thy abode, and thy going out, and thy coming in, and thy rage against me.
28) Because thy rage against me and thy tumult is come up into mine ears, therefore I will put my hook in thy nose, and my bridle in thy lips, and I will turn thee back by the way by which thou camest.	29) Because thy rage against me, and thy tumult, is come up into mine ears, therefore will I put my hook in thy nose, and my bridle in thy lips, and I will turn thee back by the way by which thou camest.
29) And this <i>shall be</i> a sign unto thee, Ye shall eat this year <b>such things as grow of themselves</b> , and in the second year that which springeth of the same; and in the third year sow ye, and reap, and plant vineyards, and eat the <b>fruits</b> thereof.	30) And this <i>shall be</i> a sign unto thee, Ye shall eat <i>this</i> year <b>such as groweth of itself</b> ; and the second year that which springeth of the same: and in the third year sow ye, and reap, and plant vineyards, and eat the <b>fruit</b> thereof.
30) And the remnant that is escaped of the house of Judah shall <b>yet</b> again take root downward, and bear fruit upward.	31) And the remnant that is escaped of the house of Judah shall again take root downward, and bear fruit upward:
31) For out of Jerusalem shall go forth a remnant, and they that escape out of mount Zion: the zeal of the LORD <b>of hosts</b> shall do this.	32) For out of Jerusalem shall go forth a remnant, and they that escape out of mount Zion: the zeal of the LORD <b>of hosts</b> shall do this.

32) Therefore thus saith the LORD concerning the king of Assyria, He shall not come into this city, nor shoot an arrow there, nor come before it with <b>shield</b> , nor cast a bank against it.	33) Therefore thus saith the LORD concerning the king of Assyria, He shall not come into this city, nor shoot an arrow there, nor come before it with <b>shields</b> , nor cast a bank against it.
33) By the way that he came, by the same shall he return, and shall not come into this city, saith the LORD.	34) By the way that he came, by the same shall he return, and shall not come into this city, saith the LORD.
34) For I will defend this city, to save it, for mine own sake, and for my servant David's sake.	35) For I will defend this city to save it for mine own sake, and for my servant David's sake.
35) <b>And it came to pass that night, that</b> the angel of the LORD went <b>out</b> , and smote in the camp of the Assyrians <b>an</b> hundred fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they <i>were</i> all dead corpses.	36) <b>Then</b> the angel of the LORD went <b>forth</b> , and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred <b>and</b> fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they <i>were</i> all dead corpses.
36) So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed, and went and returned, and dwelt at Nineveh.	37) So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed, and went and returned, and dwelt at Nineveh.
37) And it came to pass, as he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch his god, that Adrammelech and Sharezer his sons smote him with the sword: and they escaped into the land of Armenia. And Esarhaddon his son reigned in his stead.	38) And it came to pass, as he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch his god, that Adrammelech and Sharezer his sons smote him with the sword; and they escaped into the land of Armenia: and Esarhaddon his son reigned in his stead.

- This comparison between II Kings 19 and Isaiah 37 within the KJB yields the following baseline data (Not claiming these statistics are infallible. It is very possible that I miscounted something.):
  - 2 completely identical verses
  - 2 different prepositions
  - 4 different punctuations
  - 4 cases where singular and plural can both be correct
  - 9 different words and phraseologies
  - 12 different spellings
  - 15 different verse divisions
  - 35 different phrasings

### Conclusion

- Based upon the textual FACTS observed in this lesson, it would be wrong to require *verbatim identity* as the standard for preservation/transmission. This standard cannot even be sustained within the King James text. Consequently, it is not helpful or productive for King James

advocates to adopt a standard for preservation/transmission that cannot even be sustained in the very Bible they are asserting is “perfect.”

- The example set forth in scripture is that God’s Word can be expressed in multiple different phrasings that are equivalent. Requiring *verbatim identity* as the standard for preservation is demanding more than the Bible claims for itself.

### Works Cited

Strouse, Thomas. “Every Word: Matthew 4:4” in *Thou Shalt Keep Them: A Biblical Theology of the Perfect Preservation of Scripture*. El Sobrante, CA: Pillar & Ground Publishing, 2003.

Sutton, David. “The Perfect Passive: “It is Written” in *Thou Shalt Keep Them: A Biblical Theology of the Perfect Preservation of Scripture*. El Sobrante, CA: Pillar & Ground Publishing, 2003.