

Proving The Bibles validity!

One of the main arguments non-believers throw at us is the junk mind set that the Bible has been corrupted and is therefore not worthy of validation or belief.

Consider the following ~

Some would argue that the Bible can't be trusted because we do not know if the copies we have of the Bible are accurate, or if the original manuscripts are accurate.

To determine the accuracy of the manuscripts, we can compare the Bible manuscripts to manuscripts of other literature. If we are going to be fair, we should not require more of the Bible than we do other literature, but the Bible will hold up to even more scrutiny.

The chart below lists some documents, how many known original manuscripts, and the time span from the first known manuscript and when the document was authored.

Author	No. of Copies	Time Span
Caesar	10	1,000 years
Plato (<i>Tetralogies</i>)	7	1,200 years
Tacitus (<i>Annals</i>)	20	1,000 years
Pliny the Younger (<i>History</i>)	7	750 years
Suetonius (<i>De Vita Caesarum</i>)	8	800 years
Homer (<i>Iliad</i>)	643	500 years
New Testament	Over 24,000	25 years

After looking at the chart above, which document do you believe is the most trustworthy in being accurate regarding being closest to the original? Homer's *Iliad* does not even come close to the New Testament. Time span is critical when determining if the manuscript is close to the original. The longer the time span the more of a chance of error. The first New Testament manuscript has only a 25 year span compared to 500 years for *Iliad*. Yet many readers would claim *Iliad* as the gospel before the Bible.

We should also mention that of the 24,000 New Testament manuscripts they are in 15 different languages and they all are accurate in their translation. How's that for DIVINE!

Let's look at one more point regarding the accuracy of manuscripts. It is the concept of textual variations and textual corruption. We will compare *Iliad* with the New Testament. The *Iliad* has about 15,600 textual line variations compared to the New Testament which has about 20,000 textual line variations. Not bad considering there are over 23,000 more manuscripts of the New Testament than the *Iliad*.

The *Iliad* has 764 lines of textual corruption (or errors) whereas the New Testament only has 40 lines of textual corruption. So, which is the more accurate document? Of those minimal 40 lines of corruption in the New Testament none of them deal with any of the main tenants of the faith. They are basically insignificant. Only 40 insignificant textual line errors in over 24,000 original manuscripts spread over 15 different languages!

I tell people all the time that it actually takes more real deal hardcore faith to believe in evolution (with absolutely no real evidence proving it) than it does to have faith in what I know to be true about the existence of a real living creator God. I also follow that up with,, it also takes someone totally checking their brains and common sense at the door to maintain a hell bent (no pun intended) position of denial.

It is a complete mathematical improbability that man, on his own, in some weird crazy conspiracy, brought the Bible and its contents together perfectly preserving it's original message for thousands of years....still feel like rejecting it? Well then, it's a conscious decision on your part to do so regardless of the very large mountain now standing in front of you called evidence.