

New Testament – Galatians -- was even written, in AD 49. Timothy had been raised in Judaism by a Jewish mother. The "Scriptures" on which he had been nourished were undoubtedly those of the Old Testament. Now we must pointedly ask, "What Scriptures of the Old Testament did Timothy's mother and grandmother have in their synagogue (or perhaps, if they were very fortunate, in their possession) -- the originals or copies?" The overwhelming probability is that they were copies -- apographs. Yet Paul says that these apographs are able to give the knowledge of salvation (verse 15); and he goes on to say that all Scripture is God-breathed and profitable. It would not make a great deal of sense for Paul to have said that the Scriptures which Timothy did *not* have -- the autographs -- were God-breathed and profitable to equip him for every good work. I believe that Paul was saying that the Scriptures which Timothy *did* have were God-breathed and profitable to equip him for every good work. That is, I believe that the copies of the Old Testament books available to Timothy in AD 43 (when he was, say, five years old), and the copies of those New Testament books which had thus far been written, put into circulation, and made available to Timothy in AD 63 -- in other words, whatever books could properly be called Scripture -- were inspired, in the sense that they carried in them the quality of "inspiredness."

In John 10:35, Jesus referred to Psalm 82, argued for the propriety of calling himself the Son of God on its basis, and said "the Scripture is not able to be set aside." Now if not one truth of Scripture can be set aside, nullified or omitted, to what Scripture was Jesus referring? To the *autograph* of Psalm 82? Or to the copies which the Jews had in the temple and in their synagogues, whose words they could check and read for themselves? Most probably the apographs. Incidentally, this text would argue not only for the "inspiredness" (and thus the truth and divine authority) of copies, but would also argue for the uncorrupted preservation, in the apographs, of the truths of the autographs, in spite of errors of transmission.

In 2 Peter 1:19 Peter says that "we have more certain the prophetic word." I believe that Peter was referring to the Old Testament Scriptures, which predicted the first coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Yet the prophetic word which Peter had was not the originals, but copies. However, in verses 20 and 21 Peter is referring to the manner in which the prophecy of Scripture originally came into being; and I believe he is there speaking of the autographs, not of copies. And yet both are inspired. The autographs