

The image is a book cover for 'The Myth of Verbatim Identicality'. It features a medieval-style library with high wooden ceilings and bookshelves. A monk in a brown robe stands in the foreground, operating a modern copier. The floor is covered with scattered papers and books. The title and subtitle are in white text at the top left.

The Myth of
Verbatim Identicality
How God Actually Preserved His Word

David W. Reid and Bryan C. Ross

The Myth of Verbatim Identicality: How God Actually Preserved His Word

Grace School of the Bible

Soldiers Training For Service Meeting

April 27, 2024

David W. Reid & Bryan C. Ross

Outline

- Brief History of Topic
- Printed History of the King James Text
- Definition of Terms & Factual Application
- Scriptural Model For Dealing With Textual Variants
- Scriptural Proof That Preservation Requires *Verbal Equivalence* Not *Verbatim Identity*
- “Every Word” Verses
- Do Modern Versions Have *Verbal Equivalence* With The KJB?
- Conclusion

Brief History

A Textual History
OF THE
King James Bible

DAVID NORTON

A Textual History of the King James Bible

- Read David Norton's book in the Spring of 2011.
- Textual facts were not lining up with what I had been led to believe about the printed history of the text.
- Only differences in KJ editions were:
 - Spelling
 - Punctuation
 - Printer Errors
- Variant Readings In KJB (Ap. 8, 150 pages)

References	1611 and Sources	Variation	Original	NCPB	Notes
2 Cor. 11:32	the citie 1602: <i>the citie of</i> Damascus. MS 98: the citty of the Damascenes.	the city of the Damascenes, 1629	τὴν Δαμασκηνῶν πόλιν	the city of the Damascenes	1629 = MS 98. 1611 appears to have an accidental omission here.
2 Cor. subscription	Philippus = 1602. MS 98: Philippi.	Philippi, 1629	φιλιππων	Philippi	1629 = MS 98.
Gal. 3:13	on tree = 1602. MS 98: —.	on a tree, 1629	ἐπὶ ξύλου	<u>on tree</u>	Though this seems strange English, a succession of translators approved it (only <i>R</i> has ‘a tree’).
Gal. 5:15	take heed ye be not 1602: take heed least ye be. MS 98: —.	take heed that ye be not, 1629	βλέπετε μὴ	<u>take heed ye be not</u>	1629’s change is unnecessary.
Eph. 1:9	he had purposed = 1602, MS 98.	he hath purposed, 1629 (1817 8 ^o = 1611)	προέθετο	<u>he had purposed</u>	1611 follows the Great Bible (approved by <i>G</i> and <i>B</i>) in rendering the Greek aorist with an English pluperfect.
Eph. 4:24	that new man = 1602, MS 98.	the new man, 1616, 1629	τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον	<u>that new man</u>	MS 98 appears to confirm that the translators chose to follow Tyndale and <i>B</i> against <i>G</i> (which has 1616’s reading).
Eph. 6:24	sinceritie. 1602: sinceritie. Amen. = MS 98 (sincerity [no period]).	sincerity. Amen, 1616, 1629	ἀφθαρσία. ἀμὼν	<u>sincerity.</u> [Delete ‘Amen’.]	‘Amen’ was present in Bishops’, so the omission appears to be deliberate, presumably acknowledging that ἀμήν is not found in all texts.

Exact Sameness & The 2011 GSB Seminar

- 2011 Great Lakes Grace Bible Conference chatted about Norton's Appendix with:
 - David Reid
 - Ted Fellows
- 2011 GSB Summer Conference seminar on the topic of inerrancy.
- Called Richard to discuss what I was seeing before the Conference.
- Exact Sameness—1st descriptor.

Inerrancy and the King James Bible

**Is it possible or proper to claim
inerrancy for a translation of the
Scripture?**

Printed History Of King James Text

Genesis 15:18

1611

1769

- “In **that** same day the LORD made a couenant with Abram, saing : Vnto thy seed haue I giuuen this land from the riurer of Egypt vnto the great riuier, the riuier Epuphrates:”

- “In **the** same day the LORD made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates:”

Genesis 19:21

1611

- “And he said vnto him, See I haue accepted thee concerning this thing, that I will not overthrow this citie, for the which thou has spoken.”

1769

- “And he said unto him, See, I have accepted thee concerning this thing **also**, that I will not overthrow this city, for the which thou hast spoken.”

Genesis 22:7

1611

- “And Isaac spake vnto Abraham his father, and said, My father: and he said, Here am I, my, sonne. And hee said, Behold the fire and wood: but where is the lambe for a burnt offering?”

1769

- “And Isaac spake unto Abraham his father, and said, My father: and he said, Here *am* I, my son. And he said, Behold the fire and **the** wood: but where *is* the lamb for a burnt offering?”

Matthew 3:12

1611

- “Whose fanne is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floore, and gather his wheat into the garner: but wil burne vp the chaffe with vnquenchable fire.”

1769

- “Whose fan *is* in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but **he** will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.”

Romans 6:12

1611

- “Let not sinne
reigne therfore in
your mortall body,
that ye should obey
it in the lusts
thereof.”

1769

- “Let not sin
therefore reign in
your mortal body,
that ye should obey
it in the lusts
thereof.”

Romans 12:2

1611

- “And bee not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renuing of your minde, that ye may proue what is that good, **that** acceptable and perfect will of God.”

1769

- “And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what *is* that good, **and** acceptable, and perfect, will of God.”

Jude 25

1611

- “To the onely wise God our Sauour, be glory and maiestie, dominion and power, now and euer. Amen.”

1769

- “To the only wise God our Saviour, *be* glory and majesty, dominion and power, **both** now and ever. Amen.”

Additional Examples

- Examples from David Norton's *A Textual History of the King James Bible*

Verse	KJV 1611 edition	KJV subsequent edition	Nature of change	Year of change
Deut. 23:25	neighbours	neighbour	Changed from plural to singular	1769
1 Kings 2:42	that on the day	on the day	Removed a word	1769
2 Chron. 34:10	mend	amend	Changed a word	1769
Prov. 6:19	him	he	Changed a pronoun	1769
Psalms 24:3	and	or	Changed a conjunction	1769
Zech. 4:2	were	are	Changed verb tense	1762
Matt. 26:75	words	word	Changed from plural to singular	1762
Luke 19:9	the sonne	a son	Changed from definite article to indefinite article	1762

Additional Examples

- Examples taken from *The Text of the King James Bible* by Lawrence M. Vance

Verse	KJV 1611 reading	Modern KJV reading
Gen. 31:27	flie	flee
Exod. 38:11	hoopes	hooks
Num. 6:14	lambe	ram
2 Chron. 3:10	place	house
2 Chron. 32:5	prepared	repaired
Ezra 2:22	children	men
Isa. 44:13	maketh	marketh
Jer. 22:3	spoiler	spoiled
Jer. 36:21	fet	fetch
Ezek. 44:23	men	them
Ezek. 46:23	new	row of
Hosea 6:5	shewed	hewed
Mark 5:6	came	Ran
Mark 14:36	that	what
Acts 4:17	farther	further
1 Cor. 4:9	approved	appointed
1 Cor. 9:24	price	prize
1 Cor. 14:23	some	one
1 Cor. 15:6	And	After
1 John 3:22	commandment	commandments
Rev. 17:4	stone	stones

Implications

- It is not reasonable to conclude that all these textual changes are printer errors.
- Changes made in 1762 or 1769 after the death of the translators do not necessarily reflect their original choices.
- Later editors impacted the text.
- There is not *verbatim identity* of wording in the printed history of the King James text.

Definition of Terms & Factual Application

What Is *Verbatim Identicality*?

- To define the term *verbatim identicality*, we rely upon the following dictionary definitions of each word:
 - ***verbatim*** = word for word; using exactly the same words as in the original; in the exact words (OED)
 - ***identical*** = being the same in identity; the very same; selfsame (OED)
- We define *verbatim identicality* to mean when the reading in a particular document or verse is word for word the very same as the reading in another document or verse. *Verbatim identicality* is “xeroxed” identicality in that the two readings are word for word, letter for letter, punctuation mark for punctuation mark, identical. If the reading in the first document or verse has the same substantive meaning but uses a synonym or different phrasing or alternate spelling from the second document or verse, then *verbatim identicality* does not exist.

What Is *Verbal Equivalence*?

- To define the term verbal equivalence, we rely upon the following dictionary definition of each word:
 - **verbal** = with reference to the accuracy or faithfulness of a transcription, translation, quotation, etc.: that takes account of each individual word. (OED)
 - **equivalent** = having equal or corresponding import, meaning, or significance: chiefly of words and expressions; that is virtually the same thing; identical in effect. (OED)
- We define *verbal equivalence* to mean when the reading in a particular document or verse has the same substantive doctrinal meaning as the reading in another document or verse even if the readings do not have verbatim identity. For there to be *verbal equivalence*, the words do not have to be *verbatim* word for word identical, but the words have to have the very same substantive doctrinal meaning. The principle of *verbal equivalence* applies not just in English, but also in Hebrew and Greek, as will be demonstrated.

Comparing The Principles of VI & VE

First reading	Second reading	Verbatim Identity?	Verbal Equivalence?
"I went to the shop at 3:30."	"I went to the shop at 3:30."	Yes	Yes
"I went to the shop at 3:30."	"I went to the shop at half past three."	No	Yes
"I went to the shop at 3:30."	"At 3:30, I went to the shop."	No	Yes
"I went to the shop at 3:30."	"I went to the shoppe at 3:30."	No	Yes
"I went to the shop at 3:30."	"I went to the shop at 4:30."	No	No

Verbal Equivalence Is Not Dynamic Equivalence

- To be clear, verbal equivalence does not approve of *dynamic equivalence*. Linguist Eugene Nida invented the term *dynamic equivalence* and gave it the following definition:
 - ***dynamic equivalence***: quality of a translation in which the message of the original text has been so transported into the receptor language that the RESPONSE of the RECEPTOR is essentially like that of the original receptors.
- Notice that *dynamic equivalence* focuses not on the words themselves but the *response* of the *receptor*.
- The foundational flaw of *dynamic equivalence* is that it places too little importance on the words of scripture. In contrast to *dynamic equivalence* which focuses on the vague, subjective, and unpredictable response of the receptor, *verbal equivalence* instead focuses on the substantive doctrinal meaning of the words themselves. *Verbal equivalence* is far different from and vastly superior to *dynamic equivalence*.

Six Textual Facts

- Different editions of the KJV (1611, 1629, 1638, 1762, 1769) do not have *verbatim identicality* with each other.
- None of the 5,200+ extant Greek manuscripts have *verbatim identicality* with one another.
- There is no extant Greek manuscript that matches any edition of the Textus Receptus published by Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, or the Elzevirs with *verbatim identicality*.
- Different editions of the Textus Receptus do not have *verbatim identicality* with one another.
- The Cambridge and Oxford printings of the KJV 1769 edition do not have *verbatim identicality* with one another.
- The American printings of the KJV frequently do not have *verbatim identicality* with each other or with the British printings of the KJV.

Implications if *Verbatim Identicality* is the Required Standard for Preservation

- With one possible exception, none of the editions of the KJV represent the preserved word of God.
- 99.9+% of extant Greek manuscripts do not represent the preserved word of God.
- Either no extant Greek manuscript represents the preserved word of God or no edition of the Textus Receptus represents the preserved word of God.
- With one possible exception, none of the different editions of the Textus Receptus represent the preserved word of God.
- At least one of the Cambridge or the Oxford printings of the KJV does not represent the preserved word of God.
- The vast majority of American printings, perhaps all, do not represent the preserved word of God.

Scriptural Model For Dealing With Textual Variants

Scriptural Model for Dealing with Textual Variants

Plenary Verbal Inspiration—Bible's assertion for itself (II Tim. 3:16; II Pet. 1:21).



Promise of Preservation—Bible's claim for itself (Ps. 12:6-7; 119:111, 152, 160; Is. 30:8, 40:8; Matt. 4:4; 24:35; I Pet. 1:23-25).



Preservation is the Corollary of Inspiration—it is reasonable to conclude that Preservation occurred with the same precision as Inspiration (i.e. Plenary Verbal), but many mistakenly assume that this requires *verbatim identity* of wording. **This false assumption underlies the entire textual variant discussion and leads to unscriptural conclusions.**

Option 1: Originals Only Position—this position confines inspiration, infallibility, and inerrancy to the non-existent original autographs as a 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.



Belief in the Scriptures leads one to maintain a belief in both Inspiration & Preservation



Result: A Biblically Amended Position on Preservation—drop *verbatim identity* as the standard for Preservation. If one allows the KJB to teach them about the *nature* of Preservation, they will conclude that demanding *verbatim identity* as the standard for Preservation was overreaching to begin with. There are at least four Scriptural proofs found within the KJB that support this conclusion:

- 1) How the OT quotes OT
 - 2) How the NT quotes the OT
 - 3) How the NT quotes the NT
 - 4) Comparison between II Kings 19 & Isaiah 37
- Observing these realities allows one to maintain their belief in the Promise of Preservation without overstating the facts. This Biblically revised position can still be maintained by faith in God's word without abandoning the believing approach to Scripture.



Variant Readings are a Historical Fact—no two Greek manuscripts (even Byzantine); editions of the TR, or printings of the KJB are identical. Leads to the realization that Preservation did not occur with *verbatim identity* of wording.



Option 2: Faith for Faith's Sake—pretends like variant readings do not exist and insists upon Plenary Verbal Preservation. Some incorrectly assert that God re-inspired his Word in English between 1604 and 1611 as a means of providing the *verbatim identity* of wording this view of Preservation demands. Has the correct starting point, is consistent with the believing approach to Scripture; but carries the corollary between Preservation and Inspiration too far.



Option 3: Biblically Amend One's Position on Preservation—the facts need not overthrow one's belief in the Promise of Preservation. Rather one should look back to the Scriptures which taught them to believe in Preservation in the first place to learn how to think about variant readings. When one does this, they will conclude that the insistence upon the standard of *verbatim identity* was excessive and an overstatement of what the Scriptures teach about Preservation.

**Scriptural Proof That
Preservation Requires *Verbal
Equivalence* Not *Verbatim
Identicality***

Old Testament Quotations Of The Old Testament

Deut. 24:16

The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin.

2 Chron. 25:4 But he slew not their children, but [did] as [it is] written in the law in the book of Moses, where the LORD commanded, saying, The fathers shall not die for the children, neither shall the children die for the fathers, but every man shall die for his own sin.

2 Chronicles 25:4 quotes Deuteronomy 24:16 but not with *verbatim identity*. Is 2 Chronicles 25:4 therefore in error? Rather than accuse 2 Chronicles 25:4 of error and thus impugn the word of God, the obvious solution is to recognize that “be put to death” and “die” have the same meaning. The two readings possess *verbal equivalence*. Either *verbal equivalence* is sufficient, or one of the above verses contains error.

Old Testament Quotations Of The Old Testament

Exod. 20:25 And if thou wilt make me an altar[H4196] of stone, [H68] thou shalt not build [H1129] it of hewn stone: [H1496] for if thou lift up[H5130] thy tool [H2719] upon it, thou hast polluted [H2490] it.

Josh. 8:31 KJV - As Moses the servant of the LORD commanded the children of Israel, as it is written in the book of the law of Moses, an altar [H4196] of whole [H8003] stones, [H68] over which no man hath lift up [H5130] [any] iron: [H1270] and they offered thereon burnt offerings unto the LORD, and sacrificed peace offerings.

While Joshua 8:31 says “as it is written”, it does not quote Exodus 20:25 with *verbatim identity* but instead uses a paraphrase that is *verbally equivalent*. The difference in wording between Exodus 20:25 and Joshua 8:31 exists not only in English but also in the underlying Hebrew, thus demonstrating that the principle of *verbal equivalence* exists in Hebrew and that even in the original autographs, the Holy Spirit utilized *verbal equivalence*.

Old Testament Quotations Of The Old Testament

Deut. 29:9 Keep therefore the words of this covenant, and do them, that ye may prosper in all that ye do.

1 Kings 2:3 And keep the charge of the LORD thy God, to walk in his ways, to keep his statutes, and his commandments, and his judgments, and his testimonies, as it is written in the law of Moses, that thou mayest prosper in all that thou doest, and whithersoever thou turnest thyself:

1 Kings 2:3 says, “as it is written in the law of Moses” and then quotes Deuteronomy 29:9 in a manner that is *verbal equivalent* but far from verbatim identity.

Based on the above examples, it is evident from how the OT quotes itself that scripture does not follow *verbatim identity* but instead *verbal equivalence*. This conclusion is true in Hebrew as well as in English. Therefore, this is not merely a translational issue but the original intentional design of the Holy Spirit.

New Testament Quotations Of The Old Testament

In Acts 8, the Ethiopian eunuch was explicitly said to be reading Esaias (i.e. Isaiah), but what he read did not match the book of Isaiah with *verbatim identicality*.

Note that Acts 8:32 describes the manuscript that the Ethiopian eunuch was reading as scripture even though it did not match with *verbatim identicality*.

<p>Isa. 53:7 He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is <u>brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth.</u></p>	<p>Acts 8:30 And Philip ran thither to [him], and <u>heard him read the prophet Esaias</u>, and said, <u>Understandest thou what thou reatest?</u></p> <p>Acts 8:32 The place of <u>the scripture which he read</u> was this, He was <u>led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth:</u></p>
<p>Isa. 53:8 <u>He was taken from prison and from judgment:</u> and who shall declare his generation? for <u>he was cut off out of the land of the living:</u> for the transgression of my people was he stricken.</p>	<p>Acts 8:33 <u>In his humiliation his judgment was taken away:</u> and who shall declare his generation? for <u>his life is taken from the earth.</u></p>

New Testament Quotations Of The Old Testament

Deut. 6:16 Ye shall not tempt the LORD your God, as ye tempted [him] in Massa.

Matt. 4:7 Jesus said unto him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.

Deut. 6:13 Thou shalt fear the LORD thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his name.

Matt. 4:10 Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.

The NT quotes the OT hundreds of times, often with the phrase “it is written” preceding the quotation, thus explicitly stating that the words set forth in the NT correspond to certain words in the OT. However, such NT quotations almost never match the OT with *verbatim identity*.

New Testament Quotations Of The Old Testament

Mic. 5:2 But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, [though] thou be little among the thousands of Judah, [yet] out of thee shall he come forth unto me [that is] to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth [have been] from of old, from everlasting.

Matt. 2:5 And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judaea: for thus it is written by the prophet,

Matt. 2:6 And thou Bethlehem, [in] the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel.

The phrase “it is written” is in the present perfect tense, which indicates action that occurred in the past with effect that extends to the present. The fact that almost every instance of “it is written” in the scriptures is followed by verbally equivalent phrasing is a clear testimony that God considers His word to continue to exist with complete veracity and authority in the present even though without *verbatim identicality*.

New Testament Quotations Of The New Testament

Luke 10:7 And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the labourer is worthy of his hire [G3408: *misthos*]. Go not from house to house.

1 Tim. 5:18 For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, The labourer [is] worthy of his reward [G3408: *misthos*].

1 Timothy 5:18 states “the scripture saith”, yet when it quotes Luke 10:7, it does not do so with *verbatim identicality* in English in that it renders the same underlying Greek word differently.

If *verbatim identicality* is the required standard, then 1 Timothy 5:18 is in error when it says, “the scripture saith.” The obvious solution to this difficulty is to recognize that the required scriptural standard is not *verbatim identicality* but *verbal equivalence*.

New Testament Quotations Of The New Testament

Acts 9:5 And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: [it is] hard for thee to kick against the pricks.

Acts 22:8 And I answered, Who art thou, Lord? And he said unto me, I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest.

Acts 9:6 And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord [said] unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do.

Acts 22:10 And I said, What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do.

New Testament Quotations Of The New Testament

Matt. 27:37 And set up over his head his accusation written, THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS.

Mark 15:26 And the superscription of his accusation was written over, THE KING OF THE JEWS.

Luke 23:38 And a superscription also was written over him in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS.

John 19:19 And Pilate wrote a title, and put [it] on the cross. And the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS.

Note that even when the Bible quotes the same written inscription, it does so with no less than four different *verbal equivalent* phrasings.

Notice that none of the four gospel accounts agree as to the exact wording. Are three of them wrong? Obviously not. What the four different records of the superscription clearly demonstrate is that the scriptural standard is *verbal equivalence* not *verbatim identity*.

2 Kings 19 & Isaiah 37

The situation with 2 Kings 19 and Isaiah 37 is quite different. These two chapters are identical in substance and meaning and nearly identical in the underlying Hebrew text but yet have many differences in wording. God did not include both of these chapters in the scriptures to provide differing, supplemental information. On the contrary, it is obvious that the information and meaning is the same but just phrased differently. Thus, these chapters demonstrate beyond dispute that it is possible for the Holy Spirit to communicate the same meaning while using different wording, different word order, different spelling, different punctuation, different sentence structure, etc. We consider the two chapters side by side to see this clearly.

2 Kings 19 & Isaiah 37

2 Kings 19	Isaiah 37	Comment
2 Kings 19:1 And it came to pass, when king Hezekiah heard [it], that he rent his clothes, and covered himself with sackcloth, and went into the house of the LORD.	Isa. 37:1 And it came to pass, when king Hezekiah heard [it], that he rent his clothes, and covered himself with sackcloth, and went into the house of the LORD.	These verses have verbatim identity, which demonstrates that God could have written every verse in 2 Kings 19 and Isaiah 37 with verbatim identity if He had so desired.

2 Kings 19 & Isaiah 37

<p>2 Kings 19:17 Of a truth, LORD, the kings of Assyria have <u>destroyed</u></p> <p>the nations [H1471: <i>Gôy</i>]</p> <p>and their <u>lands</u>, [H776: <i>'ereş</i>]</p>	<p>Isa. 37:18 Of a truth, LORD, the kings of Assyria have <u>laid waste</u></p> <p><u>all</u> the nations, [H776: <i>'ereş</i>]</p> <p>and their <u>countries</u>, [H776: <i>'ereş</i>]</p>	<p>Synonyms with verbal equivalence</p> <p>Different Hebrew words translated by the same English word</p> <p>The same Hebrew word translated using different English words</p>
--	---	--

2 Kings 19 & Isaiah 37

2 Kings 19	Isaiah 37	Comment
2 Kings 19:26 Therefore their inhabitants were of small power, they <u>were</u> dismayed and confounded; they were [as] the grass of the field, and [as] the green herb, [as] the grass on the housetops, and [as corn] <u>blasted</u> [H7711: š ^a dēpâ] before it be grown up.	Isa. 37:27 Therefore their inhabitants [<u>were</u>] of small power, they were dismayed and confounded: they were [as] the grass of the field, and [as] the green herb, [as] the grass on the housetops, and [as corn] <u>blasted</u> [H7709: š ^a dēmâ] before it be grown up.	Different italics with verbal equivalence Different Hebrew words translated by the same English word, which demonstrates that the Holy Spirit inspired the original autographs using verbal equivalence not verbatim identity

“Every Word” Verses

“Every Word” Verses

Deut. 8:3 And he humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know; that he might make thee know that man doth not live by bread only, but by every [word] that proceedeth out of the mouth of the LORD doth man live.

Matt. 4:4 But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

The very OT verse that says that man lives by “every word” is not quoted by the NT with *verbatim identity*, even while saying “it is written”!

Furthermore, the difference in wording cannot be explained away based on differences between Hebrew and Greek because Matthew 4:4 and Luke 4:4 do not match with *verbatim identity* either.

(See the next slide.)

“Every Word” Verses

Matt. 4:4 But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

Luke 4:4 And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.

This is remarkable. Some who insist on *verbatim identicality* cite verses such as Deuteronomy 8:3, Matthew 4:4, and Luke 4:4 to make the point that words of equivalent meaning are not sufficient because man needs *every word* that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. Yet, none of these supposed proof verses match each other with *verbatim identicality* even though the NT verses explicitly state “it is written.” It is hard to imagine a stronger disproof of *verbatim identicality*.

Furthermore, the difference between Matthew 4:4 and Luke 4:4 exists in the Greek text itself as Matthew 4:4 contains multiple Greek words that are not in Luke 4:4.
(See the next slide)

“Every Word” Verses

Matt. 4:4 But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth [G1607: *ekporeuomai*] out of [G1223: *dia*] the mouth [G4750: *stoma*] of God.

Luke 4:4 And Jesus answered him, saying, It is written, That man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.

Thus, the differences between Matthew 4:4 and Luke 4:4 arise not from the translational decisions of the KJV translators but from the Holy Spirit Himself in how He chose to inspire the original manuscripts. Thus, the Holy Spirit believes in and utilized *verbal equivalence*, not *verbatim identity*, in inspiring the scriptures.

“Every Word” Verses

- In light of such indisputable evidence, arguing for *verbatim identicality* as the required standard of preservation is actually arguing against preservation having occurred since preservation with *verbatim identicality* obviously did not happen. If one wishes to defend the authority of scripture, it is far better to advocate *verbal equivalence*, which is the standard that scripture repeatedly affirms, and which is consistent with the evidence.

**Do Modern Versions Have
Verbal Equivalence With the
KJB?**

Modern Versions Are Not Verbally Equivalent The KJB

KJV	Modern versions
2Sam. 21:19 And there was again a battle in Gob with the Philistines, where Elhanan the son of Jaareoregim, a Bethlehemite, slew <u>[the brother of] Goliath</u> the Gittite, the staff of whose spear [was] like a weaver's beam.	2Sam. 21:19 NASB20 - And there was war with the Philistines again at Gob, and Elhanan the son of Jaareoregim the Bethlehemite killed <u>Goliath</u> the Gittite, the shaft of whose spear was like a weaver's beam.

Many claim that the modern versions say the same thing as the KJV except that the archaic language has been updated. In other words, they claim that the modern versions have *verbal equivalence* with the KJV but without the archaic words. However, since *verbal equivalence* is different ways of expressing the same substantive doctrinal meaning, any difference in wording that changes the substantive doctrinal meaning is not *verbal equivalence*.

**Modern
Versions
Are Not
Verbally
Equivalent
The KJB**

Matt. 5:22 But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.

Matt. 5:22 ESV - But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother will be liable to judgment; whoever insults his brother will be liable to the council; and whoever says, 'You fool!' will be liable to the hell of fire.

The omission of the phrase “without a cause” in Matthew 5:22 creates a theological problem in modern versions with Mark 3:5 when Jesus “looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts.” Was Christ our sinless savior, or wasn't he? Modern versions have Christ condemning himself out of his own mouth.

**Modern
Versions
Are Not
Verbally
Equivalent
The KJB**

Col. 2:18 Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind,

Col. 2:18 NIV - Do not let anyone who delights in false humility and the worship of angels disqualify you. Such a person also goes into great detail about what they have seen; they are puffed up with idle notions by their unspiritual mind.

These reading are directly contradictory. They do not possess *verbal equivalence* and cannot both be correct.

The NIV's reading creates an internal problem with Colossians 1:16 which teaches that principalities and powers in the heavens are "invisible."

**Modern
Versions
Are Not
Verbally
Equivalent
The KJB**

Moreover, modern versions frequently omit entire passages or verses, such as Mark 16:9-20, John 5:3b-4, John 7:53-8:11, 1 John 5:7b-8a, and/or other verses. Leaving out an entire verse or more obviously cannot be *verbal equivalence* with the KJV which includes such verses. Accordingly, there are no modern versions in popular use that have *verbal equivalence* with the KJV because all of them differ in meaning.

Conclusion

Conclusion

- It has been abundantly demonstrated that scripture does not require preservation with *verbatim identicality*. Nor has preservation with *verbatim identicality* in fact occurred in history. Recognizing that God in His wisdom chose to preserve His word with *verbal equivalence* will free one from a false standard that God never promised to perform and that is incompatible with the evidence. Understanding that *verbal equivalence* is the correct scriptural standard of preservation will cause doubts to dissolve.

Conclusion

- Who made the following statements and when were they made?
 - “I accept the words of the Authorized Version as the words that God intends for me to have. Any verse can be read maybe a half dozen ways logically, correctly and acceptably. If I get seven different translations out here a verse might be translated four different ways correctly and logically and within the bounds of the proper grammar of the original language.”
 - “I’m not saying that the way your Bible is translated is the only way it can be translated. Any verse can be translated half a dozen different ways from any language to another language. “
- Richard Jordan in P&D 201, Lesson 7 and P&D 202, Lesson 9
- Our position is building upon the foundation of GSB.