

# **“Your Article on Rock Music is Biased and Unjust”**

Dear Mr. Jerry Solomon,

I stumbled across [your page](#) when I was looking for a song on the internet, I thought what you noted was extremely biased and unjust. From what I picked up from your page you obviously have a concern for rock music, maybe this email is completely out of no where but I think you are being slightly over the top. I love rock music and I am a Christian, I go to church twice a week every week and my friends at my church love rock too.

Music is just a way of feeling less stressed for me and rock is just a way of getting everything out of my system when I am at home. I think that you should let your daughter decide what music she likes and no offence but I think that what religion she chooses should be up to her. Also many rock bands are Christian based and maybe you should have done a bit more research on “rock music” before you wrote your page for the whole world to see.

Please don't get me wrong I really don't want to appear rude I just felt quite offended by what you said about the music I enjoy. Thank you very much for your time and would be interested to hear from you.

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

Jerry Solomon went home to be with His Lord several years ago so I will answer your questions.

On the one hand I don't think you read Jerry's article very carefully. Jerry's only real problem with rock music was with the frequent anti-biblical message contained in some lyrics. As the quote below makes clear, he emphatically said that

there is nothing “evil” in the music itself.

*So rock music basically consists of certain instruments— such as guitars, keyboards, and percussion—a particular rhythm, and the human voice. And none of these is evil. People can be evil, and people abuse rock music, just as they abuse all parts of life. Our sin nature is actively involved in desecrating everything.*

*This desecration can best be seen in the lyrical content of the songs. We have come a long way from the inane “do-wa-diddies” of early rock history. It is at this point that those in the Christian community are challenged the most. The music alone may be of quality, but the message may be totally in opposition to a Christian worldview. A decision is required. Do I continue to listen, even though the message is awful? Or do I decide to reject it because of the message, even though I like the music?*

*Unfortunately, the well-worn statement, “I only listen to the beat!” is simply not true. If they are honest, most people who have heard a rock song several times can sing the lyrics upon request. When you consider the fact that most popular songs are heard dozens, if not hundreds, of times, it is not difficult to understand how the messages are embedded. The lyrics come through; we can’t escape that. This does not necessarily mean we always listen and think to the point of really considering what the messages have to say, and that is exactly part of the problem. The lyrics can be subtly incorporated into our thoughts simply because we haven’t stopped long enough to sort them out.*

Jerry was simply concerned about young people’s willingness to listen without discerning the message they were pumping into their brain. I am 51 and still listen to some rock music from the 60s and 70s. But I listen selectively and know what the biblical messages are and what is clearly antithetical to what

I believe. Jerry was simply appealing to others to do likewise.

I'm sorry you were offended but I simply think you misread Jerry's intent.

On one further note I would respectfully disagree with your statement that children should be free to choose their own religion. On the one hand, of course, children should choose for themselves, but that doesn't mean, on the other hand, that I leave them completely to their own search for meaning and truth. If I have found the Truth, why wouldn't I work to persuade them of that same Truth by taking them to church, providing a copy of the Scriptures for them to read, teaching them from the Scriptures at home, and living a holy life before them to deliberately try to influence them? Anything less is unloving and irresponsible.

Respectfully,

Ray Bohlin, Ph.D.  
Probe Ministries

© 2005 Probe Ministries

---

## **“How Do You Explain Knowledge of Past Lives Unless It's True?”**

On the History Channel I saw a program on reincarnation, in which a woman named “Jenny Cockel” had memories of being in Ireland. She remembered facts about her previous life, such as the name of her eight children. She drew the correct map of

her childhood town, gave an accurate description of her house etc. These things were later found to be true. How can a woman remember the name of her 8 children, the place where she lived, what was in their house (two oval-shaped photos, one of her and a child and the other of a soldier) this accurately? Is there any other proof of people more solid than this of people remembering their past life? Her past life son says what she says is exactly correct, and only she could know it. Please see this program on the History Channel. Please tell me something about other solid experiences that support reincarnation.

Since the Bible's teachings do not allow for reincarnation to be true ("It is appointed unto man to die once, and after that comes judgement," Hebrews 9:27), we believe that the type of information given to people like Jenny Cockel is the result of the deception of demons. These fallen, sinful beings have been around people since Adam and Eve. They know all kinds of information not available to people naturally, and they will feed this information to those open to believing it.

This is similar to the stage "psychics" who have their skills circulate among the audience, picking up information that the "psychic" would never know on his own, and then this outside information is fed to the performer via a small earpiece receiver. When he reveals it publically, people are impressed with his "supernatural" knowledge.

Demons have no trouble knowing geography to be able to feed someone specific map information, nor do they have trouble collecting genealogical information on a family, or descriptions of physical artifacts, to feed someone. (Demons are sneaky. They can't read minds, but being spirits, they can speak in ways that we think it's our own thoughts. That's what I mean by "feeding.")

(For a purely natural explanation, it's also possible that people gained information from reading books and other sources

that they forgot about.)

I hope this helps.

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

---

## **“Why Doesn’t the Bible Specifically Condemn Father-Daughter Incest?”**

In [“How Can a Just God Order the Slaughter of Men, Women and Children?”](#) your author quoted the Bible as saying incest with someone’s daughter was forbidden. I have Revised Standard Edition of the Bible, and I have noticed that in this version, at least, it says “You shall not uncover the nakedness of your son’s daughter or your daughter’s daughter, for their nakedness is your nakedness.”

Out of this whole long list of people (relatives) one is not supposed to have sexual relations with, in Leviticus 18, only the daughter is omitted. I have always wondered about this. You could say, well, it’s inferred that someone should not commit incest with one’s daughter. But why list all the other relatives one by one, and leave out the daughter??? It seems very suspect that the author of Leviticus would make a very detailed, explicit list, and yet still leave out the daughter.

As an incest survivor, this bothers me greatly that even one version of the Bible would have this translation.

My heart hurts for you. I am so sorry to hear about your sexual abuse. Did you know that the Hebrew word for incest is

“confusion”? Appropriate, isn't it?

You're right, there isn't a specific prohibition against father-daughter incest in the Bible, although I do believe it is covered under Lev. 18:6, “None of you shall approach any blood relative of his to uncover nakedness; I am the LORD.”

I found this interesting statement on a website ([www.arlev.clara.net/lev038.htm](http://www.arlev.clara.net/lev038.htm)):

### ***Father and Daughter***

*It needs to be noted that sexual relations between a father and his daughter aren't mentioned as being forbidden in either this passage or chapter 20 which follows. This is a tricky problem but it seems best to follow Wenham's explanation on this in seeing this prohibition as already in existence amongst the Israelites and so not repeated here.*

*The implication of Genesis 19:30-38 appears to be that such a union was unacceptable in the eyes of the natural culture of the tribes and didn't warrant a comment forbidding what was already accepted as illicit.*

*Wenham notes (page 254) that:*

*It is expressly forbidden both in the laws of Hammurabi . . . and in the Hittite laws . . . In other words these regulations extend the prohibitions on incest already accepted in other parts of the ancient Near East*

Since even the Gentiles knew that incest with one's daughter was unthinkable, perhaps that's why the umbrella prohibition of Lev. 18:6 was understood to include one's own daughter.

I also checked with a great friend of Probe, Dr. Reg Grant (professor at Dallas Theological Seminary), who also added this:

I went to the [NET Bible](#) and found this little note on 18:6 (which is the place I would have taken her as well):

Heb “Man, man shall not draw near to any flesh of his body/flesh.” The repetition of the word man is distributive, meaning “any” [or, “every”] man (GKC 123.c; cf. Lev 15:2). The two words for flesh are combined to emphasize the physical familial relatedness (see Hartley, *Leviticus [WBC]*, 282 and Levine, *Leviticus [JPSTC]*, 119).

It’s interesting to me to see the emphasis of the Hebrew in Lev. 18:6: first, literally, “no man, man,” indicating that this is across the board for EVERYONE, and secondly, the repetition of both Hebrew words for “flesh” (literally, “flesh of flesh to him”) to cover every family relationship.

I hope the fact that the unspeakable horror of father-child incest is not specifically forbidden in Scripture does not make you feel that it is any less heart-breaking to God than it is. There are no words for the depth of my compassion for anyone who has to live with the soul-wounds of this horrible sin and trauma. Again, I am so sorry.

Sue Bohlin

Probe Ministries

P.S. A reader sent an email responding to this article, suggesting that the prohibition in Lev. 18:17 (“You shall not uncover the nakedness **of a woman and her daughter**; you shall not take [in marriage] her son’s daughter or her daughter’s daughter, to uncover her nakedness they are close relatives, it is evil counsel”) also works to include daughters and step-daughters.

---

# **“Should Our Kids to Be Required to Study Islam and Recite Islamic Prayers in School?”**

I recently stole a look into my nephew's high school history book. It has three chapters on Islam but only one mention of Jesus. Some parents are concerned that these kids are required to read Islamic doctrine and recite Islamic prayers, which the teachers consider “education.” Yet Christianity is not taught because it violates the supposed separation of church and state. Is this not contrary to court decisions?

And since my nephew and my children attend church every Sunday and we are making every effort to raise our kids to be good Christians, is the school not violating our civil rights if they are required to recite Islamic prayers?

Actually the courts have supported teaching about religion as long as no proselytizing occurs. However, I am not aware of any laws that mandate equal time for the different faith systems. It would be helpful if the fans of multiculturalism promoted giving equal attention to the major world religions, but Christianity seems to be the only faith that often does not get a fair hearing.

Reciting prayers is definitely over the line; I would gently inform the teacher or administrator in charge that while you do not mind your child learning about other faith systems (preferably with Christianity getting equal time), forcing a child to pray definitely violates the restrictions established by the Supreme Court on prayer in school.

For Him,



## **“You Promote Hate and Intolerance”**

How can people who say they are God's children stand in judgment of others. . . only God can judge man! “He who is without sin cast the first stone.” You promote hate and intolerance and I am quite sure that Jesus would be ashamed of your actions.

It would be helpful if we had any idea of what you had read on our website. I'm curious where you saw hate; intolerance is another matter altogether since today's values, elevating a new kind of tolerance, say that everything is equally valid. I guess you don't believe that, or you would have a live and let live attitude toward our position.

What did you read?

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries Webservant

This was written by you Sue Bohlin ..... [http://www.\\*\\*\\*\\*\\*.com](http://www.*****.com)  
Regardless on how you feel about homosexuality and I am a straight female by the way your complete lack of compassion by showing a man with AIDS and how he looks before and after death is sick. I am a Christian and ashamed that there are so called “Christians” out there that can be so cruel that is not what Jesus preached when he walked this earth. Remember he died on the cross for all of our sins and no one is without sin even YOU. So before you start judging others start with

yourself for not being able to show compassion and love something that Jesus preached over and over again.

You have your right to disagree with homosexuality but it is the manner in which you choose to disagree that makes me sick. I wonder if you have ever met a homosexual, believe it or not they are no different than you and me. They are human beings and deserved to be loved and respected like everyone else.

I will pray for you and your "ministry" that you will come to find compassion for those who are different than you. Remember God loves us all ...regardless...that is why his Son Jesus died on the cross.

Thank you for writing me back. I appreciate the time it took you to find the article you were referring to. I truly want to make sure that my heart for those dealing with homosexuality comes through, and if I have written something in a way that invites misunderstanding, I definitely want to fix it.

Which is why I was so puzzled by your reference to this: "by the way your complete lack of compassion by showing a man with AIDS and how he looks before and after death is sick."

I am so glad you said you found my article on the \*\*\*\*\*.com website, which provided the key to the mystery. The people who have that website republished my article on Homosexual Myths from our Probe Ministries website, Probe.org (and actually didn't even ask permission, as I recall). I am not connected with the \*\*\*\*\*.com people and didn't even know what else was on the website. No wonder you thought I agreed with them! I am quite sure that Dr. Throckmorton, a good guy with a HUGELY compassionate heart, whose article follows mine on their website, would agree with me that we are distressed to be linked to such unloving, uncompassionate people.

I am glad to be able to reassure you that you and I are on the same page. I have a huge, joyful passion for those dealing

with unwanted homosexuality, and in fact minister on a daily basis to women dealing with same-sex attraction. It is one of the highlights of my life to watch God change lives of the sexually broken through the power of Jesus Christ, and I tell my struggler friends all the time that they are my heroes.

In fact, if you're interested, here's a [link](#) to a number of my e-mail answers to homosexuality questions from real, hurting and questions people on the Probe website.

I am glad to be able to clear up this misunderstanding with one of my sisters in the Lord BEFORE we get to heaven! <smile>

The Lord bless you and keep you today!

Sue

---

## **“When Is It Wrong to Have Lust For Your Spouse?”**

I read this in your [article](#) about God's plan for sex in marriage and I need some clarification.

Here's their list of what God prohibits in His Word:

**Fornication (immoral sex, which is any sex outside of marriage)**

**Adultery**

**Homosexuality**

**Impurity**

**Orgies**

**Prostitution**

**Lustful passions**

**Sodomy**

**Bestiality**

## **Incest**

### **Obscenity and coarse jokes**

**Can you please give a more specific definition of impurity, and lustful passions? What is the difference between being attracted to your spouse, and lusting after your spouse? When does it become evil? I am really concerned about this because I don't know if the passion my husband has for me is too much, to the point of being evil lust...**

Within marriage, there isn't a problem with lust toward our spouses, since lust is a strong desire for something God hasn't given us, and He HAS given us our spouse! In fact, I heard Linda Dillow (co-author of *Intimate Issues*) once suggest to wives that we pray for a "holy lust" for our husbands, which is a way of praying for greater sexual desire (a win-win for everybody).

Impurity is having thoughts and engaging in actions that are directed toward the wrong person (i.e., someone other than one's spouse), such as thinking about being sexual with another person, or dressing in a way to be alluring to anyone other than one's husband.

The passion your husband has for you is God-designed and God-given. Men are visual creatures, and when you combine that with the testosterone that God created to flow through his body, it means he has a strong desire for sex—WITH YOU. When he directs that desire toward you and you alone, this is the safety net that marriage provides. God means for our sexuality to flow within the banks of marriage alone, and not overflow those banks into other relationships or a habit of physical masturbation (a temptation for men and a growing number of women) or emotional fantasy (a temptation for mainly women).

Speaking as one woman to another, we will probably never understand how strong a man's sex drive is, or the power of his attraction for us and our bodies, but that's the way God

designed it, so you don't need to worry about it being lustful in a sinful way. Being desired is one of the great joys of life (think about the opposite: not being wanted!!), and may I suggest that you enjoy it as the gift that God intends for it to be.

I hope this helps!

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

---

## **“How Do I Deal with My Prof Who Hates Christianity?”**

I'm taking a class on the history of Antisemitism, but it has turned into the history of why Christians are the most terrible people on the earth. Can you help me refute my teacher? A few points I need to know about are: Why did the gospel writers present a central conflict between the Pharisees and Jesus? Why was such a conflict extremely unlikely? What would a Christian historian say about this? How can I argue with an overly zealous antichristian? She thinks the New Testament is completely false, only made up to morph Jesus into the Messiah the gospel writers wanted him to be, so I need evidence outside of the NT. I have read *Case for Christ*, which is awesome, but there's still a lot of stuff from there that doesn't help because she says the NT is false; the evidence that it was written in too short of a time for legend to creep in is false to her. Please help me with this problem.

I would personally not recommend arguing with an overly zealous anti-Christian for the simple reason that they are not

presently open to what you have to say. I would rather pray for that individual, asking God to enlighten them to the truth of the Gospel. However, there is certainly a place for confronting error with the truth and for healthy dialogue about whether or not Christianity is true. With professors, this is usually best done one-on-one, in a friendly way, outside of class. Your professor will not like being made to look foolish in front of the class. (Who would?)

As for the other questions you ask, they can be somewhat involved. For this reason, let me recommend some additional resources that will be helpful to you for future opportunities of this kind.

- F.F. Bruce, *Jesus and Christian Origins Outside the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1974).
- Gary Habermas, *The Historical Jesus: Ancient Evidence for the Life of Christ* (Joplin, Missouri: College Press Publishing Company, 1996).
- Craig Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1987).

If you look under Probe's ["Theology and Philosophy"](#) section and our ["Reasons to Believe" \(Apologetics\)](#) section you can find many other helpful articles.

Also, bible.org has a number of excellent resources on their site. Articles on the Bible can be found at [http://www.bible.org/topic.asp?topic\\_id=5](http://www.bible.org/topic.asp?topic_id=5) and articles on Christology can be found at [http://www.bible.org/topic.asp?topic\\_id=6](http://www.bible.org/topic.asp?topic_id=6).

Finally, I have written a very short article dealing with some of the available evidence from Tacitus, Pliny the Younger, Josephus, the Babylonian Talmud, and Lucian which you can find at:

[www.probe.org/ancient-evidence-for-jesus-from-non-christian-sources-2/](http://www.probe.org/ancient-evidence-for-jesus-from-non-christian-sources-2/). My article is just a summary, written at a popular level for radio, and I don't know if you would find it helpful or not.

I hope this information will be useful to you.

Best wishes,

Michael Gleghorn  
Probe Ministries

---

## **“How Can You Be Pro-Life and For the Death Penalty? Isn't That Judging?”**

In my college class, a girl asked the other day, “How can you be for the death penalty if you are pro-life?” She also said the Bible says don't judge, so how can you use the death penalty (because you would be judging). I was trying to find out the correct way to let her know that you can be pro-life and for the death penalty.

The point of being pro-life is that we put the same high value of all life that God does, from the earliest pre-born baby to the last breath of an elderly, dying person. We derive our high value of life from the fact that every human being is made in the image of God. Thus, when someone takes the life of another in murder, they are treating the person they murdered as less important and valuable than they are. God instituted the death penalty Himself after the flood when He said, “Whoever sheds man's blood, by man his blood shall be shed,

for in the image of God, He made man.” (Gen. 9:6)

The reason the death penalty is pro-life is that it puts the highest possible value on the life of the person murdered by exacting the life of the person who violated that value by murdering. It’s a strong way to say, “It is not OK for one human being to take the life of another. If you murder, you forfeit your own life because the person you killed is so valuable.”

Concerning judging: yes, the Bible does say don’t judge, but it also commands us to judge rightly. So you have to look at the context of commands such as “Judge not, lest ye be judged” (Matt. 7:1), which is about condemning others for doing the very same thing we do. Judging also means “be discerning” and “make a distinction between right and wrong.” Jesus repeatedly taught men to judge rightly, insisting they “judge with righteous judgment” (John 7:24). He praised a man who “rightly judged” (Luke 7:43). Jesus also said, “And if your brother sins, go and reprove him, and if he refuses to listen, tell it to the church” (Matt. 18:15,17). Obeying such a command is only possible by making a judgment on one who sins. Jesus’ apostle Paul later gave God’s command to the church: “Do you not judge those who are within the church? . . . Remove the wicked man from among yourselves” (1 Cor. 5:12,13).

Also, the Bible tells us that governments (which are the only entities entitled to carry out capital punishment) are instituted by God for maintaining order: “[F]or [government] is a minister of God to you for good. But if you do what is evil, be afraid; for it does not bear the sword for nothing; for it is a minister of God, an avenger who brings wrath on the one who practices evil. (Rom 13:4)

Thus, I would argue that the Bible supports capital punishment, although it is extremely important to make absolutely sure that only the guilty are executed.



Hope this helps!

Sue Bohlin  
Probe Ministries

---

## **“Help Me Understand These Bible Contradictions”**

I stumbled upon a website that has an exhaustive list of apparent contradictions in the Bible. Now, I can go through many of them and figure out that what is seen as an apparent contradiction is nothing of the sort, but many of them leave me searching vigorously for an answer. Can you help me on these?

**God is tired and rests [Ex 31:17, Jer 15:6]**

**God is never tired and never rests [Is 40:28]**

**and:**

**God is the author of evil [Lam 3:38, Jer 18:11, Is 45:7, Amos 3:6, Ezek 20:25]**

**God is not the author of evil [1 Cor 14:33, Deut 32:4, James 1:13]**

Let's begin with the first difficulty:

*God is tired and rests [Ex 31:17, Jer 15:6]*

*God is never tired and never rests [Is 40:28]*

This alleged difficulty confuses the issues of being tired, on the one hand, and resting, on the other. Exodus 31:17 does say that God “rested” or “ceased” His creative work on the seventh day. It does not say that God was tired. Jeremiah 15:6 (at

least the relevant portion) might be translated, "I am weary of relenting" or "I have grown tired of feeling sorry for you". The idea is not that God is "tired" in the sense of "fatigued." Rather, God is weary of holding back His righteous judgment. Note what He says right before this phrase, "So I have unleashed my power against you and have begun to destroy you" (Net Bible – [netbible.bible.org](http://netbible.bible.org)). These are not the words of a being who is tired in the sense of needing rest. These are the words of one who is tired of restraining His righteous judgment.

Thus, there is no contradiction with Isaiah 40:28, "He does not get tired or weary." For Exodus 31:17 does not say that God was tired, and Jeremiah 15:6 does not mean that God was tired in the sense of being "fatigued." The Bible does say that God rested, but it does not imply that this was due to tiredness on God's part. The Net Bible comments on Gen. 2:2 as follows: "The Hebrew term (shabbat) can be translated 'to rest' ('and he rested') but it basically means 'to cease.' This is not a rest from exhaustion; it is the cessation of the work of creation."

But what about the second alleged difficulty?

*God is the author of evil [Lam 3:38, Jer 18:11, Is 45:7, Amos 3:6, Ezek 20:25]*

*God is not the author of evil [1 Cor 14:33, Deut 32:4, James 1:13]*

Geisler and Howe have an excellent discussion of this issue in their book, *When Critics Ask: A Popular Handbook on Bible Difficulties*. I would heartily recommend this book, along with Gleason Archer's *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties*. Both books deal with just about every Bible difficulty which critics raise against the Bible. So what do they say about this difficulty?

God is NOT the author of evil in the sense of "sin" or "moral

evil” – at least not directly. God created free morally responsible creatures (like human beings) who chose to misuse their freedom to do what was morally evil. However, God is not the author of this evil; human beings are. God made such evil possible (by creating free moral creatures), but the creatures made such evil actual (by sinning, etc.).

However, God is sometimes the author of evil in the sense of “calamities” or “non-moral evil.” Such calamities might also be caused by Satan or demons (e.g. Job 1-2). However, God can also bring about calamities as a form of judgment against sin, etc. God does punish sin, sometimes through various calamities. But God is not the author of moral evil or sin.

I hope this makes sense. I would definitely recommend the books mentioned above by Archer and Geisler. I would also recommend the Biblical Studies Foundation website at [www.netbible.com](http://www.netbible.com). They have hundreds of articles on a variety of biblical and theological issues.

The Lord bless you!

Michael Gleghorn  
Probe Ministries

---

## **“The Bible Has Been Changed and Corrupted Over Time”**

You Bible-thumping Christians are so deluded and stupid. The Bible has been so changed and translated and mistranslated over time that it can't be trusted. Didn't you play the telephone game when you were a kid? Whatever the first person whispered to the second person, is going to be very different

**from what the last person hears. Stop acting as if you have all the answers—your Bible is a book of myths.**

You're in good company; a lot of people think that way because they simply don't know the facts about how trustworthy the Bible really is. When you find out the truth about how the Bible has been handed down from one generation to the next, your charge will have as much significance as proclaiming that courts have no basis for determining the constitutionality of issues since the Constitution was written so long ago we can't know what it originally said.

But we can go back to the original Constitution and check, right?

We don't have the original biblical documents, but we have the next best thing: thousands of copies of the original New Testament manuscripts, by which we can determine what was originally said. The Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts ([www.csntm.org](http://www.csntm.org)) tells me that the current number is about 5500 copies of just the Greek New Testament, and when we combine the Greek with all translations in the various languages before the printing press was invented, there are a staggering 15,000 copies of NT manuscripts in existence, with more being found every day!

Greg Koukl of Stand to Reason ([www.str.org](http://www.str.org)) helps illustrate how Bible scientists (the discipline of textual criticism) can assure us of the Bible's accuracy:

### **RECONSTRUCTING AUNT SALLY'S LETTER**

Pretend your Aunt Sally learns in a dream the recipe for an elixir that preserves her youth. When she wakes up, she scribbles the directions on a scrap of paper, then runs to the kitchen to make up her first glass. In a few days Aunt Sally is transformed into a picture of radiant youth because of her daily dose of "Sally's Secret Sauce."

Aunt Sally is so excited she sends detailed, hand-written instructions on how to make the sauce to her three bridge partners (Aunt Sally is still in the technological dark ages—no photocopier or email). They, in turn, make copies for ten of their own friends.

All goes well until one day Aunt Sally's pet schnauzer eats the original copy of the recipe. In a panic she contacts her three friends who have mysteriously suffered similar mishaps, so the alarm goes out to the others in attempt to recover the original wording.

Sally rounds up all the surviving hand-written copies, twenty-six in all. When she spreads them out on the kitchen table, she immediately notices some differences. Twenty-three of the copies are exactly the same. Of the remaining three, however, one has misspelled words, another has two phrases inverted ("mix then chop" instead of "chop then mix") and one includes an ingredient none of the others has on its list.

Do you think Aunt Sally can accurately reconstruct her original recipe from this evidence? Of course she can. The misspellings are obvious errors. The single inverted phrase stands out and can easily be repaired. Sally would then strike the extra ingredient, reasoning it's more plausible one person would add an item in error than 25 people would accidentally omit it.

Even if the variations were more numerous or more diverse, the original could still be reconstructed with a high level of confidence if Sally had enough copies.

This, in simplified form, is how scholars do "textual criticism," an academic method used to test all documents of antiquity, not just religious texts. It's not a haphazard effort based on hopes and guesses; it's a careful linguistic process allowing an alert critic to determine the extent of

possible corruption of any work.{1}

When the thousands of copies of manuscripts (far more than for any other document of antiquity) are compared, we can know that the New Testament is 99.5% textually pure. In the entire text of 20,000 lines, only 40 lines are in doubt (about 400 words), and none affects any significant doctrine.{2}

Even if all the manuscripts in the whole world were to disappear, the New Testament is so comprehensively quoted by early church letters, essays and other extra-biblical sources that we could still reconstruct almost the entire testament.

We have a much fuller explanation of this in our article "Are the Biblical Documents Reliable?" at [www.probe.org/are-the-biblical-documents-reliable](http://www.probe.org/are-the-biblical-documents-reliable)

The historical evidence for the reliability of the biblical documents is so great that we can rest assured that the Bible we read today is the same Bible that God intended for us to have from the very beginning.

Wishing you well,

Sue Bohlin

Probe Ministries

### **Notes**

1. Greg Koukl, *Solid Ground*, Jan/Feb 2005, Stand to Reason.
2. Norman Geisler and William Nix, *The Text of the New Testament* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 475.