

[Click this to go back to the free articles and media page.](#)

## Do You Believe God (or not)?

*The words of the LORD are pure words, Like silver tried in a furnace of earth, Purified seven times. You shall keep them, O LORD, You shall preserve them from this generation forever” (Psalm 12:6-7). The grass withers, the flower fades, But the word of our God stands forever” (Isaiah 40:8).*

Do you believe these promises? If so, prove it by speaking out against the numerous so-called “scholars” that are actively **undermining these promises**.<sup>1</sup> It is sad that while they may not be aware of it, most Christians have accepted the false notion that we cannot know for certain every single word of the Greek New Testament. They bought into the textual criticism industry narrative which calls these promises of God into question. Are you one of these Christians who have accepted the textual criticism industry narrative?

The entire premise of “textual criticism” conflicts with these promises of God. The beginning assumption is that since there are so many disagreements (variants) between the ancient Greek manuscripts, we cannot objectively know for certain the original wording of the New Testament. By nature, to practice textual criticism, one must hold to a **deistic view of God**,<sup>2</sup> assuming that He either failed or did not care to preserve His Word perfectly.

For the sake of keeping matters straight, let me provide a definition of the term textual criticism.

*“Textual Criticism (of the New Testament) has to do with the study of ancient Greek manuscripts of the New Testament to determine as best as possible its authentic text. It involves critically evaluating the variants between the **ancient manuscripts**<sup>3</sup> to figure out the original words of the New Testament.”*

Now let me point out the foundational flaw of the practice of textual criticism using this definition. If God did indeed preserve every single word of the Greek New Testament, then the entire premise of textual criticism is flawed and doomed to fail because the starting premise assumes He did not preserve it perfectly. I ask you, why should men have to use deductive reasoning to figure out whether certain words belong or do not belong in the New Testament? If this approach does not bother you, let me suggest that you also are not believing God’s promise to preserve His Word perfectly.

Using the book of Mark as an example, let me propose a more God-honoring way to approach this. There are about 1700 ancient Greek manuscripts of the book of Mark. If God did indeed preserve every single word of the book of Mark, shouldn't one or two complete manuscripts of Mark exist that are **perfect (every single word)**?<sup>4</sup> Assuming that the sovereign God did indeed preserve His Word perfectly, then you can rest assured that such a manuscript does exist, and likely more than one.

Instead of relying upon human reasoning to figure out which words belong, and which words do not belong in the New Testament, we should start with the assumption that God did indeed preserve His Word as He promised. If we really believe that God preserved His Word, we should focus our attention on identifying the perfectly preserved ancient Greek manuscript(s). What should logically characterize such a manuscript? Logically, it should not be **riddled with obvious errors**.<sup>5</sup> Also, since God expended the energy to preserve it, such a manuscript should be identifiable by comparing it to all the other manuscripts that exist.

---

<sup>1</sup> One way to speak out and make a stand against those who undermine these promises is to “share” this article with your friends.

<sup>2</sup> Hort, the pioneer of the textual criticism movement, did not believe that Jesus was God, nor that the Bible was God’s Word. He also embraced Darwin’s theory of evolution. All this can be verified by reading his biography written by his son.

<sup>3</sup> The two manuscripts (Aleph and B) that the textual critics rely upon the most are riddled with errors. They disagree with each other over 3000 times in just the gospels alone.

<sup>4</sup> If you really claim to believe the promises of God at the top of this article, you should logically believe that at least one perfect manuscript exists for each book of the New Testament. You should want those perfect ones to be identified objectively and then used as the basis for the translation of your Bible (since such manuscripts are pure and free of human induced errors).

<sup>5</sup> It should be noted that the two manuscripts (Aleph and B) that the textual criticism industry relies upon the most are riddled with errors. They disagree with each other over 3000 times in just the gospels alone.

[Click this to go back to the free articles and media page.](#)

Christians have been led to believe that there are so many disagreements between the various ancient manuscripts that it would be impossible to identify one that has been perfectly preserved by God. But did you know that for most books of the Bible, there are multiple manuscripts, from different cities and countries that agree word-for-word? In light of the fact that there were no copy machines or printing presses, this is nothing short of miraculous. Does not such perfection suggest that supernatural preservation was involved? I suggest that this is evidence of God's supernatural watch-care. His fingerprints are visible to anyone who takes the time to look for them. Rather than rely on human reasoning to figure out the original wording of manuscripts that are riddled with errors, we should compare all the manuscripts together as the means to identify perfect, complete manuscripts by looking for "God's fingerprints" of preservation.

Let me provide just one example. What if there are two or more manuscripts of Mark that agree word-for-word? Manuscript # 586 and 2382 agree word-for-word! Manuscripts 867, 35 and 867 are in almost perfect agreement with them. There are many more that are extremely close to them. Is this not evidence of God's supernatural preservation? This approach is based upon faith (believing that God did do as He promised). It starts with the assumption that God preserved His word perfectly (word-for-word), and seeks to identify His perfectly preserved word objectively, by comparing all the manuscripts together.

The textual criticism industry does not bother to do this because they start with the deistic assumption that the exact wording of the New Testament cannot be known for certain. They ignore the fact that there are manuscripts of most New Testament books that agree word-for-word with each other and numerous others that are in almost perfect **agreement with them.**<sup>6</sup> Instead, they use deductive reasoning to figure out what the original words probably were.

You may claim to believe that God has preserved His Word. But your claim may be called into question if you accept the textual criticism premise that we cannot know for certain every word of the New Testament. If you agree with the textual criticism industry, your claim must be modified to make it more accurate. Your claim, at best, should be, "God has preserved His Word **for the most part.**"<sup>7</sup>

If a person genuinely believes that God has preserved every single word of His New Testament, he will not rely on human reasoning to piece back together the wording of the New Testament. Do you believe God's promise to preserve His Word, or not? If so, you must reject the entire premise of the textual criticism industry. You should insist on an approach that is focused on identifying complete manuscripts that are perfect (every single word). Though most Christians are unaware of it, numerous scholars have been carefully comparing the ancient Greek manuscripts now for decades to objectively identify the original text. As a result, a family of ancient Greek manuscripts (Family 35) has proven itself **objectively**<sup>8</sup> to represent the exact wording of the original New Testament (as penned by people like John, Paul, Peter, etc.).

Lastly, let me point out another fact that should make you very suspicious of the motives of those so-called scholars that make up the textual criticism industry. When people choose to ignore God's instruction and instead, lean on their own understanding, bad decisions and errors go from bad to worse. I believe that Romans 1:22 is relevant, "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." Did you know that there are about 1700 ancient Greek manuscripts of Mark? **All but 2 or 3**<sup>9</sup> (demonstrably inferior manuscripts) of the 1700 contain **Mark 16:9-20.**<sup>10</sup> In spite of these facts, the textual critics insist that the Mark 16:9-20 passage is probably not part of the original wording. This is ample evidence that their entire approach is not one based upon faith that God did indeed preserve every single word of the Greek New Testament. This is a clear case of human reasoning gone wrong.

---

<sup>6</sup> Did you know that there are 27 ancient Greek manuscripts of II Thessalonians from all over the Mediterranean area that agree word-for-word? In spite of this overwhelming evidence of God's supernatural preservation, the textual critics ignore these and rely mainly on grossly inferior, error-riddled manuscripts that don't even agree with each other, let alone these 27 that do agree with each other.

<sup>7</sup> If this is all you can claim, your faith is being undermined and you are more vulnerable to falling away from Jesus.

<sup>8</sup> The textual criticism approach is not objective, based upon empirical evidence. It relies on subjective methodology (using human deductions) that cannot be objectively verified.

<sup>9</sup> There are more likely only two. The third manuscript is considered by many to be fraudulent in this portion of the book. In addition, these 2 or 3 manuscripts are riddled with errors. (They disagree with each other throughout, proving that they are unreliable witnesses that cannot be trusted.)

<sup>10</sup> The notes (on Mark 16:9-20) in the modern translations give the opposite impression. [Such notes are blatantly deceptive.](#)