

should be necessary to give credit to any so-called "new hermeneutics" for something that should have been recognized throughout the history of interpretation, nor do I feel that the importance of the matter is strengthened by quotations from men whose vision is clouded by their failure to accept the Bible's claim to inerrancy. His remarks about "the pitfalls of the new hermeneutics" in the first half of the middle paragraph on p. 8 would seem to give sufficient reason for Bible believers to avoid this particular movement.

II. BIBLICAL CRITICISM ^{p.9}

A. Textual Criticism

God has enabled us to possess far more manuscript copies of the Old Testament and of the New Testament than of any other ancient writing. Many a text of an ancient Greek or Roman classic has been preserved to us in only one copy--sometimes in one written as late as the 12th century A.D; yet material from such a copy may be used to try to contradict a statement in all the manuscript copies of the Bible. The amount of material available to us for textual criticism of the Bible is so great that there are very few questions of real significance about the actual wording of either Testament.

God has stated and emphasized in Scripture the important truths He wishes His people to have. I know of no variation attested by any substantial number of manuscripts that affects any important teaching. I know of no place where the deletion of a word, phrase or verse that is said not to be in the earliest manuscripts of the New Testament would remove any thought from the Scripture.