

# THE TRANSMISSION OF THE BIBLE

## INTRODUCTION

Christians believe that the Bible is the inspired word of God, meaning that the Bible is from God's divine initiative. He is the source of Scripture. We believe the word of God is infallible and inerrant in the original. The sum of God's word is truth. Yet, it is at this point that we have a dilemma. We believe it is inerrant in the originals but we no longer have the originals. So the question we want to examine in this paper is how accurate has the transmission of the Bible been? We know that the copies that we have contain errors. How accurate are the copies? Can we have confidence that the word that we possess is an adequate reflection of the original? We can also take this a step further: what about translations of the Bible? Does this take us a step further away from the original and inerrancy? How adequate are our translations as compared to the originals? Can we have confidence that they adequately reflect the word of God as given in the originals?

Some will insist that since the church has no inerrant word today, this means we have no Bible to live by and preaching is made impossible because it is founded on the inspired word of man. In other words, they take an all or nothing approach. Either it is all inspired and inerrant, or it has errors and it cannot be trusted. What I hope to show you is that this is a faulty argument, and that we can have assurance that we have an adequate copy of the original word of God to man. We can be assured that we possess the word of God in our present Bibles because of God's providence. The original text has been providentially kept pure in transmitted texts and present translations are adequate for the needs of God's people in every age. We will also see that the results of textual criticism confirm that we possess a biblical text that is substantially identical with the originals.<sup>1</sup>

We want to begin by looking at:

**A. The biblical attitude regarding copies and translations of the Bible.** What attitude does the Scriptures have about the then-extant copies and translations? It views the copies as adequate and authoritative.

**1. Old Testament examples.** As the time for David came when he would die, he exhorted his son Solomon to "keep the charge of the Lord your God . . . according to what is written in the Law of Moses that you may succeed in all that you do and wherever you turn" (**1 Kings 2:3**). Solomon lived nearly five hundred years after Moses (cf. 1 Kings 6:1). What Solomon possessed was obviously a copy of the original Mosaic law. Kings were required to copy the law (cf. Deut 17:18). Yet, what Solomon possessed was considered to contain, truly and genuinely the charge of the Lord.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Geisler, Norman L., ed., *Inerrancy*, "The Inerrancy of the Autographa," by Greg Bahnsen (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1980), 150.

<sup>2</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 159.

Ezra had a copy of the law of God (**Ezra 7:14**), which was obviously a copy of the original. Yet, we see that it was authoritative. King Artaxerxes issued a decree for Ezra based on “the law of your God which is in your hand” (Ezra 7:14). Ezra read from the book of the law of Moses which the Lord had given to Israel, which was a copy (**Neh 8:1-8**). He read from the book of the law (vs. 3). The Levites explained the law to the people (vs. 7). They also read from the book, from the law of God, translating to give the sense (vs. 8). They apparently translated into Aramaic from the Hebrew so the people could have a better understanding of the word of God, since the people had become better accustomed to Aramaic while they were in captivity.<sup>3</sup>

**Proverbs 25:1** tells us that the men of Hezekiah, king of Judah, transcribed or copied the following proverbs of Solomon. The copies are themselves held to be canonical and authoritative. In all of these examples the secondary text or copy does the work and has the authority of the original text.

There are also:

**2. New Testament examples.** When the New Testament authors appeal to the authority of the Old Testament, they used the texts and versions they had available, just as we do today. Jesus preached and taught from the book of Isaiah that was handed to him (**Luke 4:16-21**). This was a copy of Isaiah that had been written hundreds of years before, yet Jesus treated this copy as **Scripture** (vs. 21). It was Paul’s custom to reason with the Jews from the Scriptures that were handed to him (**Acts 17:2**). There was a belief that the original message had been preserved in the copies, therefore they were authoritative. Apollos powerfully refuted the Jews demonstrating from the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ (**Acts 18:28**). Here we see again that the copies of the original Scriptures were considered to be Scripture. They were considered to be the word of God because there was a belief that God had carefully preserved His word. The Bereans examined the Scriptures daily to see if what Paul was teaching them was true (**Acts 17:11**). The authority for the Berean Jews was the Scriptures, which were copies of the originals. Jesus confronted the Jews by saying, “You search the Scriptures” (**John 5:39**). This is in the present tense. They continually searched the Scriptures, which were merely copies of the originals that they had on hand. In Jesus’ mind and in the mind of His opponents, the extant copies represented accurately the original writings. This is also seen in the statements that we see repeated over and over again of Jesus confronting His opponents with statements such as, “Have you not read?” (Matt 12:3, 5; 21:16, 42), and “What is written in the Law? How do you read it?” (Luke 10:26). The available manuscripts that they had were considered to be the word of God and authoritative to them. They did not fret about not having the originals. The manuscripts they possessed apparently were adequate copies of the originals.

Paul told Timothy that from childhood he had known the sacred writings which are able to give you the wisdom that leads to salvation (**2 Tim 3:15**). The sacred writings he possessed or had been taught were merely copies of the originals, and they may have been the Septuagint translation (the Old Testament which was translated into Greek), yet they could still make him wise unto salvation!<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 160.

<sup>4</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 161.

From these examples we see that the message conveyed by the original autographa were reliably reflected in the copies and translations available to the New Testament authors. Jesus Himself raised no doubts about the adequacy of the copies. Jesus actually regarded the extant copies of His day to be so reliable, that He appealed to them as the authoritative word of God. The root of His confidence must have been grounded in God's providential preservation of the copies and translations to be substantially identical with the inspired originals.<sup>5</sup> We can therefore assume that the first century text of the Old Testament was a wholly adequate reflection of the divine word originally given.<sup>6</sup>

Present copies of the Scriptures function authoritatively because they are viewed as reflecting the originals correctly. Jesus said the devil, "It is written, 'Man shall not live on bread alone, but on every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God'" (**Matt 4:4**). What Moses wrote is what God spoke. You hear God's voice; God is speaking through what Moses wrote. But Jesus was quoting this from a copy not the original. Apparently it was copied so well that it adequately reflected the original. We are told by Jesus that David speaks through their copy of the Psalms of David (**Matt 22:43-44**). He is still speaking. Those who possess the existing copies of Moses and the prophets can hear what they actually said (**Luke 16:29**). In these examples, the original text is assumed to be present in the extant copy that is consulted.<sup>7</sup> So much so, that when you read them you hear what they actually said, so that they are still speaking! The writings that were in hand and which indicted the hearers were assumed to be same with what Moses wrote (**John 5:45-47**). The one who accused the Jews was Moses. They heard Moses through the copies they had. It is assumed by Jesus that the writings they had were identical with what Moses wrote. What they had accurately reflected the original! God has providentially preserved His word through the Jews. They were very careful when they copied the text to make sure it was line for line, word for word, and even letter for letter correct.

In **John 10:34-36**, Jesus says, "Has it not been written in your law?" What was their law? The **law** He was talking about was their copies of the original law! According to Jesus, their copies of the originals were authoritative precisely because they accurately reflected the originals given by inspiration. Jesus rests His whole argument on one word in the text. He called them **gods**, to whom the word of God came (vs. 35). (These men were acting like God because they had been given authority to judge.) Notice the word of God came through the original author of Scripture to the people at that time. In other words, the inspired word came through Asaph the psalm writer who wrote this verse that Jesus is quoting. Jesus is emphasizing that the **law** that the Jews now possessed, which was a copy of the original written in this case by Asaph, reflected the original accurately. It is so accurate that He can base His argument on one word in the text. The inspired word of God that originally came to the Jews is now found written in their present day law books. The authority of the present copies is traced to the original lying behind it.<sup>8</sup>

Over and over again, when the New Testament authors quote the Old Testament it was with the assumption that their copies were an accurate reflection of the originals given by inspiration. This is why Peter can say, "Brethren, the Scripture had to be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit foretold by the mouth of David concerning Judas . . . For it is written in the book of Psalms, 'Let his homestead

---

<sup>5</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 161.

<sup>6</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 161.

<sup>7</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 163.

<sup>8</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 164.

be made desolate, and let no one dwell in it'; and 'Let another man take his office'" (**Acts 1:16, 20**). Peter is saying, "Here is what the Holy Spirit said through David." He then quotes the copy of the psalms that he had available. He believed that copy was an accurate reflection of the original. Paul had the same confidence in his copy of Isaiah (**Acts 28:25ff**). He believed that his quotation of Isaiah given in his copy was true to the original given many hundreds of years before.

It seems clear from these many examples (and many more could be given), that the biblical writers made use of existing copies with the significant assumption that their authority was tied to the original text of which the copies were a reliable reflection.<sup>9</sup> These copies are adequate for bringing people to a knowledge of saving truth and for directing their lives. Their adequacy and authority are seen in the phrase "It is written" which is used dozens of times in the New Testament to quote the Old Testament and to cinch an argument. This phrase is always in the perfect tense which emphasizes that something is established, accomplished or completed and it continues to have enduring effect.<sup>10</sup> What has been written in the original remains so, written in the present copies. New Testament arguments based upon a phrase (Acts 15:13-17, "God would save the Gentiles"), a word (Matt 22:32 "I am [not was] the God of Abraham"), or even the difference between the singular or plural form of the word (Gal 3:16, not seeds but "seed"), would be completely emptied of genuine force if the word or phrase did not appear in the copy and if it did not appear in the original. What this emphasizes is that present copies can faithfully reflect the original text and therefore function authoritatively.<sup>11</sup>

We may ask how could they be so confident that their copies were an accurate reflection of the original? Their confidence was in the providence of God to protect and keep pure the inspired word through the copies. This was done through the meticulous way the Old Testament was copied and preserved.

## **B. The integrity of the Old Testament. We first see:**

**1. A model for copying.** When we look at the Old Testament we see a number of examples where the Old Testament text needed to be restored. These examples become models for all later copying of the originals. The first example is seen in the writing of the Ten Commandments (**Ex 32:15-16, 19**). When Moses came down from the mountain and saw the idolatry, his anger burned and he shattered the tablets. When God rewrote the tablets, He put the same words that were on the former tablets (**Ex 34:1, 27-28**). God wrote on the second tablets the words that were on the former tablets (**Deut 10:2, 4**). This is a significant model for how all later copying should be done. They should reproduce the exact words to preserve the full divine authority of the message they convey.<sup>12</sup> This is a belief that the very words are inspired and that it takes words to make concepts and ideas. This is simply common sense!

Kings were commanded to make a copy of the law so that they would learn to fear God, by carefully observing all that words of this law and these statutes (**Deut 17:18-20**). They were to carefully observe the words. The copy would offer authoritative guidance only as it reflected

---

<sup>9</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 164.

<sup>10</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 169.

<sup>11</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 169.

<sup>12</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 165.

accurately the original. The king was not to turn aside from the commandment, either to the right or to the left. He could only be assured of this if his copy was an accurate reflection of the original.

Jeremiah had Baruch write on a scroll all the words of the Lord (**Jer 36:4**). The scroll was then read in the presence of the king who cut it and destroyed it in the fire (**vs. 23**). God had Jeremiah take another scroll and write on it “all the former words that were on the first scroll” (**vs. 28**). The standard for the copy was the words on the original text. It is common sense that a reliable copy ought to reproduce the original text accurately.

Secondly, the integrity of the Scriptures remained intact because of:

**2. The warnings against altering the text.** “You shall not add to the word which I am commanding you, nor take away from it, that you may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you” (**Deut 4:2; 12:32**). The only way we can know the commands of the Lord that we are supposed to keep is if we don’t add or take away from what was originally written. “Do not add to His words or He will reprove you, and you will be proved a liar” (**Pro 30:6**). Honesty required that one stick to the original given message of God without supplementing it with new features.<sup>13</sup> If it was not accurately copied then how could Isaiah say, “To the law and to the testimony! If they do not speak according to this **word**, it is because they have no dawn” (**Isa 8:20**). The New Testament has this same jealousy for its purity (**Rev 22:18-19**). If you add to the word, God will add to him the plagues written in this book. And if anyone takes away from the words, God will take away his part from the tree of life.

The conflict Jesus had with the Pharisees over their tradition was that it did not convey the accurate meaning of the Old Testament text, but actually obscured its meaning (**Mark 7:8-13**). They neglected the clear command of God for the sake of their tradition. They invalidated the word of God by their tradition. Jesus also condemned Jewish teaching when it altered the text of the Old Testament. We see this in their teaching of hatred (**Matt 5:43**). The Pharisees said it was okay to hate your enemy. This is not what the Old Testament taught. It taught to love your neighbor. We also see this in their teaching on divorce (**Matt 19:7-8**). Their tradition was that Moses allowed them to divorce for whatever reason. Jesus again gives the correct teaching on this. God never planned for people to divorce. It was because of their hardness of heart. God knew they would divorce so He provided a way to protect the woman. The point of these examples is to show that if tradition did not accurately reflect the original, it was confronted as wrong.

**3. How it was copied.** We know that from an early date, the Old Testament was copied (cf. **Deut 17:18**). The scribes who copied the Old Testament were hired professionals. They had a great reverence for the Scriptures, at times superstitious. Strict rules were employed so that the rolls would be copied scrupulously. One such rule was that no word or letter, or even a yod was to be written from memory.<sup>14</sup> If a manuscript was found to contain even one mistake it was discarded and destroyed.<sup>15</sup>

**4. The reliability of the Old Testament text.** The reliability of the Old Testament text

---

<sup>13</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 167.

<sup>14</sup> Norman Geisler and William Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, (Chicago: Moody Press, 1986), 349.

<sup>15</sup> Geisler, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, 380.

can be evaluated from the available manuscript evidence. There are no surviving manuscripts from before the Babylonian captivity (586 B.C.).<sup>16</sup> There are, however, tens of thousands of Old Testament Hebrew manuscript fragments throughout the world.<sup>17</sup> The most significant date from the third century B.C. through the fourteenth century A.D. There is one codex of the whole Old Testament that is thought to be written in about A.D. 930, and another from about A.D. 1008.<sup>18</sup> The most remarkable manuscripts, however, are from the Dead Sea scrolls which date from the third century B.C. to the first century A.D. These were first discovered in 1947. They include a complete copy of the book of Isaiah and thousands of fragments, which together represent every Old Testament book except Esther.<sup>19</sup>

The significance of the discovery of the Dead Sea scrolls is that they are about one thousand years older than any other manuscripts of the Old Testament that we have. By comparing the Dead Sea scrolls to the later copies, we are able to see how well the Old Testament was preserved over those thousand years. What is remarkable is how well the text was preserved. There is an overwhelming accuracy between them! One man has observed that the copies of Isaiah discovered at the Dead Sea “proved to be word for word identical with our standard Hebrew Bible in more than 95% of the text. The 5% of variation consisted chiefly of obvious slips of the pen and variations in spelling.”<sup>20</sup> Let me give you an example of how accurate the Old Testament had been preserved. With the discovery of the Isaiah scroll at Qumran which dated back to the first century B.C., the Revised Standard Version, which was already in print before the discovery of this scroll, only made thirteen changes. Eight of these changes were known from ancient versions and few of them were significant.<sup>21</sup>

The reliability of the Old Testament text is also confirmed by archaeology. Numerous discoveries have confirmed the historical accuracy of the biblical documents. Dates, places, the names of kings have all been confirmed to be accurate.

The integrity of the Old Testament text was established primarily by the fidelity of the transmission process, which was later confirmed to be very reliable and accurate through the Dead Sea scrolls. Therefore, we have a reliable copy of the Old Testament.

**5. A note about the Septuagint.** The Septuagint (Greek translation of the Old Testament) was the most popular version of the first century. What is interesting is that the New Testament authors quoted most often from this when quoting the Old Testament. There is some disagreement between the Septuagint and the Hebrew Old Testament, but the authors of the New Testament were able to quote from it up to the point where it most accurately reflected the Old Testament original. We believe that the Holy Spirit moved on them to write exactly what He wanted written (cf. 2 Pet 1:21). They were therefore shielded from quoting any error. The authors evidently accepted this translation as being an adequate representation of the originals. They were adequate

---

<sup>16</sup> Geisler, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, 348.

<sup>17</sup> Geisler, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, 358.

<sup>18</sup> Geisler, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, 359.

<sup>19</sup> Geisler, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, 360.

<sup>20</sup> Geisler, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, 367, quoting Gleason Archer.

<sup>21</sup> Geisler, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, 382.

because they could be assumed to portray the true sense of the original.<sup>22</sup> So we see that even translations of the Old Testament were considered to be authoritative and adequate for life and practice as long as they accurately reflected the original.

**C. The integrity of the New Testament.** The integrity of the New Testament rests on the thousands of different manuscripts. The New Testament letters were written first on papyrus. They were not made by professionals, so the New Testament manuscripts are of a poorer quality than the Old Testament manuscripts. The manuscripts of the New Testament are numerous but so are the variant readings. There are over 5,600 Greek manuscripts containing New Testament texts.<sup>23</sup> There are complete manuscripts of the New Testament that date within three hundred years after it was first written. Also, most of the New Testament is preserved in manuscripts that date within two hundred years of the originals.<sup>24</sup> In addition, there are more than 36,000 citations from the early church fathers containing almost every verse of the New Testament.<sup>25</sup> One man researched this out and found the entire New Testament is quoted by the early church fathers except eleven verses!<sup>26</sup>

In all of these manuscripts there are thousands of variants in the New Testament text. This however, does not hinder the accuracy of the text, but it actually helps us discover what the originals said. With the science of textual criticism, scholars are able to determine from the variants what the original said with great accuracy. Most of the variants come from two classes of errors: intentional and unintentional.

Unintentional are by far the vast majority of all errors. When the letters were first written and then copied, there was no space between letters. So some of the errors occurred with the wrong divisions of words. For example, heisnowhere could be broken up: he is now here or he is nowhere. There were also omissions of letters, words or even whole lines, which could happen when a scribe mistook one group of letters or words for another sometimes located on a different line. Sometimes there was repetition of words (cf. Matt 27:16, 17). Some manuscripts call Barabbas – Jesus Barabbas. Transposition is the reversal of position of two letters or words. In 2 Chronicles 3:4 the transposition of letters makes the measurements of the temple out of proportion – 120 cubits high, instead of twenty as in the LXX. Other confusions of spelling, abbreviation or scribal insertion account for the remainder of scribal error.<sup>27</sup> This may account for many of the numerical discrepancies in the Old Testament. For example, the 40,000 stalls in 1 Kings 4:26 rather than the 4,000 in 2 Chronicles 9:25. Also the 42 years in 2 Chronicles 22:2 in contrast to the correct reading of 22 years in 2 Kings 8:26 (KJV, NKJV, NASB, but not updated!). There were also errors of ear when one word which (or witch) sounded like another word was wrongly inserted. There were errors of judgment when a scribal note may have been added to the end of a verse (cf. Rom 8:1 NKJV verses all the rest). There were also errors of writing due to poor writing styles. (See: Textual criticism section below).

---

<sup>22</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 171.

<sup>23</sup> “Manuscript Evidence for Superior New Testament Reliability,” <http://carm.org/manuscript-evidence> (accessed October 5, 2010).

<sup>24</sup> Geisler, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, 405.

<sup>25</sup> Geisler, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, 467.

<sup>26</sup> Geisler, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, 430.

<sup>27</sup> Geisler, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, 469.

There were also intentional errors. There were changes to correct grammar or to make the reading more up to date. For example the NASB was updated and they removed all the 'Thee's' and 'Thou's.' Some intentional changes were made to try to harmonize parallel passages. Some changes were made to correct what the scribe thought was inaccurate. Most deliberate changes were those which were doctrinal. The reference to the Trinity in 1 John 5:7 is an example of this (NKJV verses NASB).<sup>28</sup>

From all these different kinds of errors, scholars have been able to determine with great accuracy what the originals said. One man has estimated that only one out of sixty of the variants may be considered a substantial variation. Others see the degree of substantial purity of the New Testament to be 99.75 percent, while another said the reconstruction of the New Testament is 99.9% accurate. Warfield observed, "The great mass of the New Testament . . . has been transmitted to us with no, or next to no variations."<sup>29</sup> So we can see that the evidence for the integrity of the New Testament is overwhelming. God has preserved His word for us. Some may wonder about that .1 – .25 percent that is still in doubt. Though we cannot be one hundred percent accurate, we can be assured that of the .1 – .25 percent that we are still unsure of, no Christian doctrine hangs on one of these debatable texts. The end result of all this evidence is that we can restore the exact text of the Hebrew and Greek not only line for line, or word for word, but even letter for letter. God has preserved His word for us. It is reliable, authoritative and binding on us today.

**D. The assurance of possessing God's word.** We can have great assurance that God has preserved for us His word. How can we be so sure?

**1. The providence of God.** God in His wise counsel did not preserve for us inerrant copies of His word. But the copies that He has preserved for us He did not allow to become so corrupt as to become unintelligible for God's original purposes in giving it. He can and does work through our errant copies to bring us to saving faith. He has worked through errant copies and the church has grown and survived.

You may wonder why God went through all the trouble to give us an inerrant original, but did not preserve inerrant copies. We can ponder that question and possibly think of many different answers, but in the end it is all speculation. In the end we have to say, "we don't know why." "The secret things belong to the Lord our God, but the things revealed belong to us" (Deut 29:29).

God has preserved for us His word even in the copies. The Scriptures themselves promise that God's word will abide forever. "The grass withers, the flower fades, but the word of our God stands forever" (Isa 40:8). "For truly I say to you, until heaven and earth pass away, not the smallest letter or stroke shall pass from the Law until all is accomplished" (Matt 5:18). "But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one stroke of a letter of the Law to fail" (Luke 16:17). Though God did not preserve for us an errorless copy, He has exercised a remarkable care over His word and has preserved it in a state of essential purity and He has enabled it to accomplish its purposes.<sup>30</sup> The Bible that we hold in our hands is fully adequate to bring us to Christ, instruct us in doctrine, and guide us to righteous living.

---

<sup>28</sup> Geisler, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, 473.

<sup>29</sup> Geisler, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, 474.

<sup>30</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 185.



The other assurance comes from:

**2. Textual criticism.** This is concerned with determining the correct or original reading from among all the variants. There are certain errors that creep into the text that can be easily explained. We have looked at these above. (There are copyist errors like haplography, which is the writing of a word, letter or syllable only once when it should have been written more than once; dittography is writing twice what should have been written only once; metathesis is reversing the proper position of letters or words; fusion is the combining of two separate words into one; fission is the dividing of a single word into two words; homophony is the substitution of a word for another that is pronounced like it (e.g. “two” for “to”); homoeoteleuton is the omission of an intervening passage because the scribe’s eye skipped from one line to a similar ending on another line; accidental omissions occur where no repetition is involved.<sup>31</sup>

What textual criticism has shown is that we possess the text of the Bible today in a form which is substantially identical with the originals.<sup>32</sup> The great mass of the New Testament has been transmitted to us with no or next to no variation. Not one article of faith or moral precept has been either perverted or lost. Our copies virtually supply us with the original text. To all intent and purposes we have the autographs.<sup>33</sup> We possess the word of God necessary for salvation and our walk.

**E. The translation of the Bible.** How this relates to the translation of the Bible:

We should not hesitate to affirm that to the degree translations and versions capture the authorial intention of the autographs, to that same degree these translations are the Word of God and are therefore authoritative . . . It is still the very Word of God . . . to the degree that it reflects the original work of God.<sup>34</sup>

The Hebrew and Greek text appear to be amazingly well preserved, so that we are amply justified in affirming, with the Westminster Confession, a singular providence of God in this matter and in declaring that the authority of Scripture is in no way jeopardized by the fact that the copies we possess are not entirely error-free. Similarly, no translation is or can be perfect, and all translations are an additional step away from the autographa. Yet . . . no series translation of Holy Scripture will so destroy its meaning as to render it unable to make its reader “wise for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus” (2 Tim. 3:15).<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Geisler, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, 370.

<sup>32</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 187.

<sup>33</sup> Bahnsen, *Inerrancy*, 188.

<sup>34</sup> Robert Reymond, *A New Systematic Theology of the Christian Faith*, (Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1998), 90.

<sup>35</sup> James Boice, *Standing On The Rock*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Kregel Publications, 1994), 159.