

Now it would have not made much sense for Paul to say that the Scriptures that Timothy did not have (i.e., the autographs) were able to make him wise unto salvation, were God-breathed, and profitable to equip Timothy for every good work. Rather, Paul is saying that the Scriptures that Timothy had, which Timothy had known from childhood, were able to make him wise unto salvation, were God-breathed, and were profitable to equip Timothy for every good work.

That is, the copies of the Old Testament books available to Timothy in A. D. 43 (when he was, say, five years old), and the copies of those New Testament books that had thus far been written, put into circulation, and made available to Timothy in A. D. 63 (at the time of the writing of II Timothy) were inspired, in the sense that they carried in them the quality of "inspiredness". In other words, whatever books could properly be called Scripture were inspired.

Again, 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." If not one truth of Scripture could 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, the words of which they could 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 in transmission.

Again, in II Peter 1:19 Peter says that "we have more certain the prophetic word." Peter was referring to the Old Testament Scriptures, which predicted the first coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. Yet the prophetic word that Peter "had" was not the originals, but copies. However, when Peter speaks of the manner in which the prophecy of Scripture originally came into being (in verses 20 and 21), he is speaking of the autographs, not of copies. And yet both are inspired. The autographs had the quality of "inspiredness" because of the Holy Spirit's unique act of Inspiration; the copies had the quality of "inspiredness" because they were derived from the autographs. In spite of the fact that the inscripturated revelation was transmitted across centuries, copied, translated, and marred by copyists' errors, its truths were preserved in such a way that Peter could tell his readers to pay the closest attention to the prophetic word which was available to them.

Two important implications flow from this proposal. The first is that the term "inspiredness" represents a relative concept. To the degree (or extent) that copies, versions, translations, and