

25 Theological Reasons To Consider Supernatural Bible Changes

We are not heretics, deceivers or rebels.

We are not calling God a liar or attacking the scriptures.

We simply disagree with your interpretation regarding preservation

The following arguments provide a theological foundation that explains how all Bibles including the KJV can be supernaturally changing without there being any controversy within the Godhead.

God preserves His Word, but not the Bible

We believe God preserves His Word, we just don't believe that the text teaches that God is promising to preserve the Bible or the scriptures. The text does not say “*Forever Oh Lord, Thy Bible is forever settled in heaven.*” (Psalm 119:89) Nor does it say “Heaven and earth will pass away but my Bible will not pass away.” Therefore, although we are subject to the authority of Scripture, we are not subject to your interpretation of it. We sharply disagree with the current understanding of preservation that is held by over 90% of the church, and I will personally debate anyone that has the temerity to face me on this topic.

We are not heretics or deceivers because we refuse to rely on so many assumptions as you do. As I will show, our theology is more Sola Scriptura, more conservative and more orthodox than yours is. Theological necessity is a guess but it forms the basis of much of your certainty. The sentimental assumption that God would never do something like this is not a doctrine, but it's also something that many of the unconvinced rely on to demand that the Bible can't be changing. It's also contradicted by the fact that God has done this very thing many times before as I will show. Many demand that the devil doesn't have that much power, but they haven't considered that God might be the one calling for this judgment because so many worship the book instead of him.

You assume that because God doesn't change, the Bible can't change, but the Bible teaches the opposite (Heb 1:10). You assume that because the word is inspired that it is therefore preserved but there isn't one passage that teaches that. You assume that the words “Bible,” “Scripture,” and “word” are synonymous and you base much of the way you mishandle the preservation proof texts on that misconception.

This document argues against those, and many other misconceptions and will expose the reckless disregard for semantics and context that the majority of church leaders are guilty of.

We are not conflicted if we are using the Bible to prove our position, while at the same time suggesting that its changing. We can easily work around the changes that now appear in the text,

because we have hidden the unchanged word in our hearts prior to the changes. Additionally, many of the changes are still fairly subtle, so the general meaning of the text is still intact. We also supplement our memories with consensus from the community to confirm what may or may not be a change. As a result, we are well able to “correctly handle the word of truth” (2 Tim 2:15).

Contact John at wakeuporelse@proton.me

For speaking engagements, interviews counseling for leaders, debates

Theological arguments

#1 Sovereignty of God

#2 Bible, Scripture, Word (Synonymous?)

#3 Where is it preserved (“Not with ink”)

#4 Preserved but inaccessible

#5 God has removed His word before

#6 God can do it differently the next time

#6 God told us He was going to do this

#8 The devil doesn’t have that much power

#9 Inspired doesn’t mean preserved

#10 God doesn’t change ≠ Bible doesn’t change

#11 God cannot lie is not an argument

#12 God is willing to appear unrighteous

#13 God is the author of confusion

#14 Theological necessity is a guess

#15 Providential preservation is not an argument

#16 Perseverance of the Saints is not an argument

#17 Psalm 12 is not a preservation promise

#18 The Bible has been changing from its inception

#19 The law of 1st mention

#20 God breaks down so that He may build up

#21 The word of the Lord grew

#22 It pleased God not to give us a Bible

#23 Promises can be modified

#24 Promises can be rescinded

#25 Promises can have time limits

Sovereignty of God

The poster child preservation promise of Psalms 119:89 was written approximately 250 years before Amos 8:11, which seems to illustrate that God is willing to promise to preserve His word, and then turn around and remove it 250 years later.

I do not believe that Psalm 119:89 promises to preserve the Bible, but the majority of the church does. The majority of the Church believes that the context and the wording of Psalm 119:89 is clear. Most believe the meaning of that text is that the King James Bible in English will never change until the end of the age. But how do you come to that conclusion? What specific text did the psalmist have in mind when he wrote the psalm, because the Bible hadn't been written yet and the text doesn't tell you what text it is promising to preserve?

What text do you provide to prove that Psalm 119:89 can be applied to the canon? The answer is you don't have one. Therefore, whatever commentary you provide to insist that this is being taken out of context is unprovable. The semantics of both passages are sufficient to establish a precedent. The precedent is that God is sovereign, and He can override any preservation promise any time He wants.

If you are going to interpret the Bible as a single unit, then you have to consider the timeline relationship that these two passages have to one another.

In a broad sense, if you consider the authorship date of both passages, it's clear that God promised to preserve His word in Psalm 119:89, and then revoked His promise as a judgement 250 years later. This clearly demonstrates that God is free to exercise His sovereignty over His creation whenever and however He pleases.

- Isaiah 46:10 "...My purpose will stand, and I will do all that I please."

To insist that these two passages are unrelated cannot be argued from the text and has to be assumed. Additionally, the argument that Psalm 119:89 is speaking about the written text while Amos is not, is irrelevant, because God is under no obligation to judge us the same way every time.

In other words, it's irrelevant if your interpretation is correct, because even if the Amos 8:11 famine was only referring to the spoken word being removed, there's nothing in the text indicating that it can't be the written word the next time. God is under no obligation to you to repeat His judgments the same way every time. Do you have a passage that says He can't do it differently, because I have passages that says He can do it differently?

Both passages refer to the term "word." In one He is saying it's "settled" in the other He's saying the "word" will be inaccessible. If you can commandeer Psalm 119:89 as a preservation promise of the text without clear context, then I can force Amos 8:11 into a prophecy regarding the written text as well.

- Psalm 119:89 "For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven."
- Amos 8:11 "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord GOD, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord."

Here are a few examples where God judged one way the first time, and differently the 2nd time. If He has demonstrated that pattern, then I can suggest that He would be willing to change the written text today based on the fact that He has changed or removed the spoken word in the past.

Water vs Fire

- God judged the world by water; then later says the next world judgment will be by fire. (Genesis 6 / Genesis 9:11)
- **Seeing vs hearing**
 - (Seeing) 1 Samuel 3:1 — “And the word of the LORD was precious in those days; there was no open vision.”
 - (Hearing) Amos 8:11 — “I will send a famine in the land... of hearing the words of the LORD.”
- **Slow vs fast death**
 - God judged Israel in the wilderness by death over time, then later judged Ananias and Sapphira by immediate death (Numbers 14:29 / Acts 5:5)
- **Death by earth quake vs death by army**
 - God judged rebellion by opening the earth under Korah, but later judged rebellion through serpents, plague, or military defeat (Numbers 16:31 / Numbers 21:6)

God has come down through the SBCs to tell all of you theological know-it-all's to sit down and be quiet. He says, “I will do whatever I want, and when I do it, you may think it is unbiblical or unrighteous, but you will be mistaken, because all of my judgments are right and true” (Psalm 119:137).

Bible, Scripture, Word NOT synonymous

As unimaginable as this may sound, it appears that the entire church has been mishandling the preservation promises by conflating the terms “Bible,” “Scripture,” and “word” as though they all mean the same thing. Based on my own experience and my interactions with other ministers, I am quite sure it has never dawned on most church leaders to question whether there is any difference between these three terms. This is what you are doing when you say, “The Bible can’t change because God preserves His word.”

People rarely say, “The Bible can’t change because God preserves His Bible.” That is because words mean things, and the Bible, or Scripture, does not teach that “Heaven and earth will pass away, but my Bible will not pass away” (Matthew 24:35). It does not say, “Thy Bible, O Lord, is forever settled in heaven” (Psalm 119:89). Isn’t that distinction important? Why is everyone assuming that these two statements mean exactly the same thing?

- “Thy word, O Lord, is forever settled in heaven.”
- “Thy Bible, O Lord, is forever settled in heaven.”

Think of all the effort preachers go through to bring out the exact nuanced meaning of a word when they are preaching. But when it comes to these three terms, they are like a bull in a China shop that could care less what the meanings are.

If you insist that those semantic distinctions do not change anything, then you are proving my point that my theology is stricter and more conservative than yours. It absolutely does matter. Your conclusion requires assumptions about the meanings of words that are not in the text. Mine takes the clear meanings of the words, along with what the text is saying, and demands a strict interpretation of both.

If you said, “The **word** can’t change because God promises to preserve His **word**,” I would agree with you. But people never say that. They always say “The **Bible** can’t change because God preserves His **word**.”

This careless oversight has allowed church leaders to claim that a promise to preserve the word always equates to a promise to preserve the Bible. This is simply a universal assumption that everyone is making without giving it a thought. Depending on the context, the term “word” may apply to the text, but the following scriptural arguments will show that the term often refers to something other than the written text.

- John 1:1 “...and the Word was God.”

We have always assumed that the term “word” meant our Bible, but here is a yes-or-no question that illustrates the point:

When John 1:1 tells you that “the Word was God,” would you agree that at least in this example, it is giving you a definition of the term “word” that does not equate to your King James Bible in English? Yes or no?

When most people read, “Heaven and earth will pass away, but my word will not pass away,” they automatically convert that in their minds to mean that their Bible will not pass away, but the text is not necessarily promising that. How do you conclude that the term “word” always means your Bible, because I keep finding passages that seem to indicate otherwise?

- Revelation 19:13 “And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God.”

Revelation 19:13 shows that the phrase “Word of God” can refer to Christ Himself, not merely to written Scripture. Therefore, when we encounter biblical promises concerning “the word,” we should not automatically assume they are direct promises about the preservation of a physical, written Bible. The context of each passage must determine whether “word” refers to Christ, divine speech, revealed truth, or written Scripture.

Revelation 19:13 does not prove that every promise concerning “the word” refers to Christ rather than Scripture, but it does prove that the term is broader than the written text alone. That means preservation passages cannot simply be assumed to guarantee the preservation of a physical Bible without careful contextual consideration.

- Hebrews 4:12 “For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.”
- Revelation 2:23 “And I will kill her children with death; and all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts: and I will give unto every one of you according to your works.”

When taken together, these two passages do not seem to define the term “word of God” in Hebrews 4:12 as simply ink on a page, because what Hebrews describes is virtually identical to the actions of Jesus described in Revelation 2:23.

Hebrews 4:12 attributes a morally discerning power to the word of God that seems inappropriate for an inanimate object like a book. It seems to transcend the idea of a mere physical text. Revelation 2:23 shows Christ Himself exercising that same heart-searching function described in Hebrews 4:12, and this seems to unify the two passages. The reference to the word of God in Hebrews, then, appears to carry a meaning much more profound than ink on terrestrial pages.

Have you never experienced the mystery of the holographic and revelatory nature of Scripture? Have you never experienced a passage suddenly opening up and yielding a completely different meaning than it ever did before, even though you have read it a hundred times?

- John 1:4 “In him was life; and the life was the light of men.”
- John 5:39 “Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me.”

If Scripture is the witness, and Christ is the life to which it bears witness, then promises about preserving the “word” may point beyond the mere survival of documents to the preservation of God’s living truth, His ongoing commitment to speak in our inner man, His divine testimony, and His self-revelation in the earth.

The SBCs are awakening Bible believers to the fact that God is much bigger than the book, and the meaning of the term “word” may be more profound than we have been taught to believe.

If you believe the term “word” always means your Bible, then it seems that you have a problem when you get to John 1:1. It's defining the term “word” as God, not your Bible, so what do you do with that conflict of definitions.

I brought this question before the Lord while I was struggling to understand John 1:1. I asked, “How can the term ‘Word’ be defined as God?” I do not believe the book itself is God, so what is John 1:1 actually telling us?

As I began thinking through the different aspects of this question, the Lord gave me a sequence of thoughts that helped guide me to a more meaningful definition of the term Word. Here is what I believe the Holy Spirit is trying to convey.

What we know, is that God the Father sent the Son (John 3:16). This observation tells us that the only reason we received a visit from Jesus, is because the Father willed it to be so. It doesn't say that Jesus volunteered, it says He was sent, so this means that to some degree, Jesus' life and ministry was an expression of the will of the Father.

- John 1:14 “...and the word was made flesh and dwelt among us.”

This phrase then gives us a further understanding of what “and the word was God,” means.

Since John 1:14 directly associates the person Jesus with the term word, and since Jesus represents an expression of the will of the Father, we have a slightly deeper level of understanding of what ‘the word was God’ means.

Jesus confirmed this further when He said “the Son can do nothing of Himself” (John 5:19). This tells us that Jesus recognized the Father as being an authority over Him that He was choosing to obey. He stated that the presenting characteristic of His life and ministry was to only do the will of the Father. So, when Jesus spoke, you were virtually hearing the Father speak. The things that Jesus did, were the things that the Father wanted done. So perhaps when we are told that “the Word was God” (John 1:1), it is describing the expressed will of the Father as seen in Jesus Christ. The term “word” means the express will of the Father as seen in the Son. Didn't Jesus say, “he that hath seen me hath seen the Father?” (John 14:9) So let this broader meaning now enter your mind when you read the following preservation promise.

- Isaiah 40:8 (Revised for illustration) “The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the (express will of the Father as seen in Jesus) shall stand for ever.”

The “Word of the Lord” is a conversation

Genesis 15:1: “After these things the word of the Lord came unto Abram in a vision, saying, Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward.”

- Genesis 15:2 “And Abram said, Lord God, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless, and the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus?”

- Genesis 15:4 “And, behold, the word of the Lord came unto him, saying, this shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir.”

Genesis 15 is the first place in the Bible where the term “the word of the Lord” appears. The law of first mention is often relied upon to help determine the true meaning of a word, phrase, or concept. In Genesis 15, the term “word of the Lord” clearly refers to a conversation, not to the written text. This is another example in which the term “word,” or “word of the Lord,” does not refer to the written text.

The “Word of the Lord” is God speaking

1 Samuel 3:1 “And the child Samuel ministered unto the Lord before Eli. And the word of the Lord was rare in those days; there was no open vision.”

I think it is clear that what is being referred to in 1 Samuel 3:1 is not the written text, so isn't it possible that when you quote a preservation promise, it's not referring to your Bible? So, if 1st Samuel 3:1 isn't referring to a written text, then isn't it possible that “Thy word, O Lord, is forever settled in heaven” is not referring to your KJV Bible? What specific text did David have in mind when he wrote Psalm 119:89? Your KJV Bible hadn't been written yet, so it is a hermeneutical assumption that allows you to apply that promise to Grandma's Gutenberg. Why am I required to follow you into such theological presumption when I prefer to be led by the clear testimony of scripture alone.

- Psalm 33:6 “By the word of the LORD were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth.”
- Jeremiah 1:4 “Then the word of the LORD came unto me, saying, Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee;

The Bible change denier would respond by saying; “God's word is eternally settled in heaven. That settled word was progressively revealed through prophets and apostles, and once it is revealed, God is able to preserve it. Therefore, later believers can apply Psalm 119:89 to the completed body of scripture, not because David personally envisioned a KJV Bible, but because the completed Bible is part of the same eternally settled word of God. But these broad assumptions require a reckless disregard for the context and the clear meaning of words.

For people that pawn themselves off as being so ruthlessly governed by the text alone, the doctrine police seem to have no problem taking endless liberties like this with their interpretation. I have had an endless parade of Bible bashers push Psalms 119:89 in my face like I didn't know it existed. They're tone drips with contempt because to them, I seem incapable of coming to the same conclusion that they have about this little ten-word sentence.

They view this as an open and shut case with no room for interpretation. But it turns out, that this passage is a proof text for us, and not them, because it sets the jurisdiction of the preservation as heaven and not the pages of the book. The way that it's worded seems to support our narrative more than yours. Don't the meanings of words matter when you're interpreting the text.

It's not promising to preserve the words on the pages, it's promising to preserve His word in heaven, and those definitions matter. You have just been ignoring them until now, so stop it. It's also a reckless interpretation to assume that the word "settled" and the word "preserved" are synonymous when they're not.

- Psalm 119:89 KJV — "For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven."

Hebrew word: נָצַב — natsab Strong's: H5324

Basic meaning: to stand, take one's stand, be fixed, be stationed, be established, be set.

I can "settle or station" an apple on the counter, but it won't be preserved because I do. "Settled" does not directly translate to a promise to preserve the written text, not by a long shot. That is a huge assumption that you have chosen to adopt, and the fact that I haven't, doesn't make me an unbiblical heretic that is attacking the scriptures. Here's what it would need to say, for it to truly mean what you all want it to mean.

- Psalm 119:89 — "For ever, O Lord, thy written word shall be perfectly preserved on earth in a future King James Bible in English, and no corruption shall ever be permitted to enter that text till the end of time." (Revised for illustration)

Of course, this perfectly exact rendering seems almost silly because of its specificity. All of us accept the somewhat cryptic nature of the Bible, and understand that it requires some interpretation using context and the full council of God.

However, the IMF believer will regularly take these kinds of liberties with the text when it suits their narrative, but when they're challenged, they suddenly demand this unrealistic level of detail to even consider an alternate interpretation.

But even if you had a promise that was this clear and thorough, God could still come in and rescind the promise because He's sovereign. Later in this chapter, I will give you examples of where promises by God were rescinded because God's people kept rebelling against Him. If you weren't aware that God can rescind promises then you don't know your Bible.

In the beginning was the "Scripture"

Here is another way to see that the terms "Scripture" and "word" are not interchangeable. If they are, then you should be able to substitute one for the other in John 1 and still have it mean the same thing. Read it aloud, replace the term "word" with "Scripture," and decide whether the meaning changes.

- John 1:1-5 "In the beginning was the scripture, and the scripture was with God, and the scripture was God. The scripture was in the beginning with God. All things were made by the scripture; and without the scripture was not anything made that was made. In the scripture was life; and the scripture was the light of men." (Revised for illustration)

If you substitute “Scripture” for “Word,” or for the personal pronouns in John 1, the passage becomes theologically distorted. To me, it sounds downright blasphemous, and it clearly does not mean the same thing. John is speaking of a divine person, not a written document, so how many other passages that allegedly promise to preserve the “word” are not referring to your Bible?

John chapter 1 proves that the term “Word” does not always mean the written text of Scripture, because in this passage the Word is personal, divine, pre-existent, and active in creation. Therefore, anyone who treats “word” and “Scripture” as universally interchangeable is using the terms too loosely.

If you insist that every mention of the term “word” in a preservation promise means the Bible, then you would be forced to include John 1:1 in that assessment. That would mean you would have to take the unenviable doctrinal position that your Bible is God.

So, if you do not believe your Bible is God, then you are forced to agree that, at least in some cases, when the Bible promises to preserve the word, it is not necessarily promising to preserve your KJV Bible in English sitting on your coffee table. In many cases, it is promising to preserve something much more profound.

Where is it preserved (“Not with ink”)

I know you believe that God preserves His word, but has it ever dawned on you to ask WHERE God promises to preserve it? Until the SBCs forced me to go back into the Scriptures with a new set of eyes, it had never dawned on me to ask. My research indicates that it has probably never dawned on most of the people reading this either.

If you look closely, you will find that most of the passages used to demand preservation say nothing about where it will be preserved.

Promises that DO NOT include WHERE it will be preserved:

- Isaiah 40:8, Isaiah 55:11, Psalm 12:6–7, Proverbs 30:5, Matthew 5:18, Matthew 24:35, John 10:35, John 17:17, 2 Timothy 3:16–17, 1 Peter 1:23–25, Revelation 22:18–19.

Here are two examples from this list of passages that do not indicate where the word will be preserved.

- Isaiah 40:8 “The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever.”
 - (It doesn’t say where it will be preserved)
- Matthew 24:35 “Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.”
 - (It doesn’t say where it will be preserved)

So here is my question: “So what, if it promises to preserve the word? If it doesn’t promise to preserve it on the pages of the book, then it’s not promising to preserve the Bible. You’re assuming the term word means Bible, but you’re also assuming that He is going to preserve His word in the book, when He’s clearly not promising that. Why does it make me a heretic if I refuse to follow you into a mountain of unbiblical presumption?”

If you rely on any of these passages to demand that the Bible is preserved, the only thing promising that the Bible is preserved is you. These passages are not telling you that the word is preserved in the Bible. You are reading that into the text. I on the other hand am basing my beliefs on the clear testimony of scripture. I’m doing what you say you are doing; I am basing my beliefs on what the Bible teaches.

And the few passages that do indicate where it will be preserved identify a jurisdiction that either promises to preserve the word in our hearts, our minds or in heaven. None of them tell you that it will be preserved on paper. If you try to argue that I am merely splitting theological hairs, then I would point to this as yet another example of how the theology of the Christian Mandela effect community is more sola scriptura and more orthodox than yours. I am showing you the clear testimony of Scripture, and all you are offering is wishful thinking, presumption, and your denominational party line.

If you have some obscure theory that supposedly ties these vague, nonspecific, or even contrary promises to the physical book, then let's hear it. But I am dealing with the bare promises most Christians repeatedly cite "as is." These passages are being mishandled through reckless disregard for context, wording, and semantic limits.

Promises that DO include WHERE it will be preserved

- Jeremiah 31:33, Hebrews 8:10, Hebrews 10:16, Psalm 119:89, Isaiah 59:21, Deuteronomy 30:14, Romans 10:8, Psalm 119:11, Psalm 37:31, Isaiah 51:7, 1 John 2:14, 1 John 2:24, 2 John 2, Colossians 3:16, 2 Corinthians 3:3.

All of these preservation promises tell you where it will be preserved, and none of them point to your Bible. I think that observation may factor into our discussion, don't you?

Here is a summary of the passages listed above so you can see that none of them promise to preserve the word in the book. These passages are clearly telling you where He promises to preserve the word and you are ignoring that instruction. You ignore the meanings of the words that give you the jurisdiction and replace it with one of your own creation. You assume the opposite of what all the promises are telling you, and then call me a heretic for demanding that we let the text speak for itself.

- Jeremiah 31:33 — Heart / inward parts
- Hebrews 8:10 — Mind / heart
- Hebrews 10:16 — Heart / mind
- Psalm 119:89 — Heaven
- Isaiah 59:21 — Mouth / seed
- Deuteronomy 30:14 — Mouth / heart
- Romans 10:8 — Mouth / heart
- Psalm 119:11 — Heart
- Psalm 37:31 — Heart
- Isaiah 51:7 — Heart
- 1 John 2:14 — Believer
- 1 John 2:24 — Believer
- 2 John 2 — Believer
- Colossians 3:16 — Believer
- 2 Corinthians 3:3 — Heart

Do you see any promises in this list that include the book?

None of the preservation promises that includes a jurisdiction point to the book, they only point to the heart, the mind or the believer. Virtually all the other preservation promises provide no jurisdiction of where it will be preserved. It says the word will be preserved, but it doesn't say where. I think it's fair to suggest, that if it's not promising to preserve it in the book, then it's not "sound doctrine" to simply assume that it is.

Promises that mention recording a physical copy but do not prove universal preservation

- Isaiah 30:8, Exodus 17:14, Exodus 24:4, Exodus 25:16, Deuteronomy 10:2–5, Deuteronomy 31:24–26, Joshua 24:26, 1 Samuel 10:25, 2 Kings 22:8–13, 2 Chronicles 34:14–21.

Here is a summary of these passages that provide some instruction to record a physical copy of an individual event. But I submit, that a command to record a specific event is not a promise to preserve a canon of 66 books that wouldn't exist for thousands of years in the future.

- Isaiah 30:8 — Table / book
The words are written in a physical record “for the time to come for ever and ever.”
- Exodus 17:14 — Book
The memorial concerning Amalek is commanded to be written in a book.
- Exodus 24:4 — Written record
Moses writes “all the words of the LORD.”
- Exodus 25:16 — Ark
The testimony is placed inside the ark.
- Deuteronomy 10:2–5 — Ark
The stone tables are placed in the ark.
- Deuteronomy 31:24–26 — Side of the ark
The book of the law is placed beside the ark as a witness.
- Joshua 24:26 — Book / sanctuary
Joshua writes the words in the book of the law and sets up a stone by the sanctuary.
- 1 Samuel 10:25 — Before the LORD
Samuel writes the manner of the kingdom in a book and lays it up before the LORD.
- 2 Kings 22:8–13 — House of the LORD
The book of the law is found in the temple.
- 2 Chronicles 34:14–21 — House of the LORD
The book of the law is found in the temple during Josiah's reform.

Written record; not a perpetual promise

It would seem, from listening to the teachers on this topic, that they consider Isaiah 30:8 to be one of the strongest proof texts for perpetual preservation of the entire Old and New Testament. But it seems like a large leap to suggest that Isaiah 30:8 is clearly teaching that God is promising to preserve the written text of the entire KJV Bible from this passage.

Isaiah 30:8 would need to contain some additional language to qualify for such a promise. It would need to move from “preserve this written prophecy as a witness” to “preserve the entire future Bible canon on earth.”

Here is a revised version for illustration so you can see the liberty that your teachers are taking. This is what it would really need to say to function as a preservation promise for the whole future canon of scriptures.

Isaiah 30:8 — revised for illustration only

- “Now go, write all the words which I have spoken, and all the words which I shall yet speak by my prophets and apostles, in a book; and I will preserve the same book in the earth among my people, complete and unchanged, from generation to generation, even unto the end of the world, that all Scripture may remain as my witness for ever.”

What it actually says.

- Isaiah 30:8 “Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever

Isaiah 30:8 is not a preservation promise for the 66 books of the Bible. It commands Isaiah to write a specific prophetic witness on a tablet and in a book about one specific event. But the passage does not identify the whole canon as the object of preservation, it does not promise the preservation of every future copy, it does not specify earth as the protected jurisdiction, and it does not say the written medium will be immune from corruption or alteration. Claiming this as a preservation promise for the entire cannon also refuses to consider that God can step in any time He wants and remove access to the scriptures through an Amos 8:11, Tower of Babel type judgment. A written witness is not the same as a perpetual promise to preserve a compilation of books that wouldn't be written and assembled for thousands of years in the future. It would be about 2,350 years from Isaiah to the Protestant 66-book canon codified at Westminster.

The commentaries also seem to agree that this prophecy that was to be recorded represented a specific event, not the entirety of scripture.

- **Benson Commentary** - Benson explicitly identifies the thing being written as “this prophecy and warning”—not the canon.
- **Barnes' Notes on the Bible** - Barnes is very explicit. The preserved record is about Judah's rebellion and God's dealings with them, not the full Bible.
- **Matthew Poole's Commentary** - Poole is also very clear. The object is this prophecy and warning, and its purpose is to serve as a witness against that rebellious generation.
- **Jamieson-Fausset-Brown** - This does support physical preservation language, but only of “the prophecy” in Isaiah 30—not the whole canon.

Not with ink

- 2 Corinthians 3:3 “Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart.

2 Corinthians 3:3 does not forbid His word from being written with ink, it says the Corinthians themselves are an epistle of Christ:

- “written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God.”

So it is contrasting two kinds of inscription:

- Physical inscription — ink / stone
- Spiritual inscription — Spirit / heart

2 Corinthians 3:3 does not forbid written Scripture, but he is stating that the New Covenant epistle that he is writing is not ultimately stored on paper, it will be stored in the hearts of his disciples.

“2 Corinthians 3:3 does prove however that biblical language about preservation cannot automatically be assigned to physical manuscripts, because Paul explicitly identifies a divine writing that is ‘not with ink’ but ‘with the Spirit’ on ‘fleshy tables of the heart.’ Therefore, any preservation argument must prove its jurisdiction from the text itself. If the passage locates the word in the heart, mind, mouth, believer, Spirit, or heaven, it cannot simply be converted into a promise of permanent paper preservation.”

Psalm 119:89 is a proof text for us not you.

Psalm 119:89 proves the opposite of what you’re claiming. It does not say, “Forever, O LORD, thy **Bible** is preserved on **earth**.” It says, “thy **word** is forever settled in **heaven**.” The jurisdiction of the settled Word is heaven, not paper. You have to write a lot of meaning into the text that isn’t there to get it to mean what you want it to say. You are assuming four things that the text clearly does not say.

- 1) You assume that this passage somehow automatically applies to the canon when there is no indication that it does.
- 2) It doesn’t say, “Forever Oh Lord, Thy **Bible** is preserved in Heaven,” so you ignore the clear meanings of words and presume that the terms Bible and Word are interchangeable.
- 3) You assume that the term “settled” and “preserved” are synonymous
- 4) You assume that the jurisdiction is earthly when it clearly says it’s heavenly.

Questions:

- What specific text did the psalmist have in mind when he wrote the psalm because the Bible hadn’t been written yet?
- What text do you provide to prove that Psalm 119:89 can be applied to the canon?

This further solidifies the position that the Bible can be changing without any controversy, because God never promised that He would preserve the word on the pages of your Bible. He promised to preserve the word in the hearts of His people. This is another way the Bible teaches that the Bible can be changing even though the word is preserved.

Preserved but inaccessible

According to Wycliffe Bible Translators, there are presently over 1,600 living languages with no Bible translated into those languages.¹ And this observation presents a fourth theological argument why all Bibles, including the Authorized King James version can be supernaturally changing.

Preservation and access are not the same thing. God may preserve His Word objectively while still making it inaccessible to certain people as judgment. Scripture already establishes this principle. God can give nations over to blindness, idolatry, delusion, famine of hearing, and spiritual darkness.

- Psalm 9:17 “The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God.”

Amos 8:11 says God can send “a famine...of hearing the words of the LORD.” Isaiah 29 describes a vision becoming like a sealed book. Romans 1 says God gives people over after they reject the truth. Second Thessalonians 2 says God sends strong delusion because men received not the love of the truth.

Therefore, the argument “if the Bible became inaccessible, then God failed to preserve His Word” is a category error. Something can be preserved and still judicially withheld. Millions of people have lived and died without Scripture in their own language, yet they are still morally accountable before God. Romans 3:19 says “all the world may become guilty before God,” and Galatians 3:22 says “the scripture hath concluded all under sin.” Their lack of access does not nullify God’s authority; it proves that preservation does not guarantee universal access.

The same principle can be applied to the modern church. If God judges pagans by allowing them to remain without clear access to the Word, then it is not unthinkable that He could judge a Bible-idolizing church by allowing the Word to become obscured, corrupted, or inaccessible in another form.

The sentimental objection — “God would never allow that” — is not an argument from Scripture. Anyone that says that sounds like Peter when he told Jesus that he wasn’t going to allow Him to go to the cross.

Scripture shows repeatedly that when people reject truth, worship substitutes, or forget God, He may judge them not only by removing blessings, but by removing access to truth itself. Scripture establishes that nations can be judged for forgetting God, and one form of judgment can be loss of access to the Word.

You may resist the idea that God would allow this for sentimental reasons, but that is not proof that it isn’t happening. The unconvinced demand that if Bibles are changing and becoming inaccessible, then God is a liar. But if that’s true, then God is already a liar, because He’s already allowed the word to become inaccessible to the pagan, even though it’s still preserved in relation to them.

¹ <https://wycliffe.org.uk/statistics#:~:text=Updated:%201%20April%202026,down%20%20from%20last%20month>

God has removed His word before

The sentimental argument that God would never allow this because it would be too disruptive is unbiblical. God has removed His Word as a judgment before, which establishes a precedent for His willingness to do it again. There isn't enough commentary that you could possibly assemble, that could cancel out the weight of all of these passages that I'm about to give you. God has removed His word so many times that it's laughable for anyone to suggest that He would never do something like this.

Who cares about your little nuanced theological arguments that you're going to try to bring forward to discredit this mountain of precedent. God is under no obligation to execute a word removing judgment the exact same way He did before because of your profound interpretation of the context. He doesn't have to jump through your little theological hoops and He's not your Genie that only comes out if you rub the bottle three times.

This manic, made-up rule, that everything has to be clearly delineated for it to be authentic, is not found in the text. Besides if you're going to regurgitate the mantra that "if it's not in the word then it's not of God," then I will use that made up rule against you.

Unless you can show me where it's specifically delineated that God has to execute His judgments the exact same way every time, then there's nothing stopping God from supernaturally changing the Bible. If that prohibition is not in the word, then it's not of God that He can't do it differently this time. He's already demonstrated that He's prone to do this to His people. So what, if this time, instead of no longer giving the prophets a word, He is allowing Satan to alter the word. As I said before, He is sovereign; He doesn't need your permission to do it differently the next time. Get it!

Passages where God removed His word

- Amos 8:11 Behold, the days come, saith the Lord GOD, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the LORD:
- Lamentations 2:9 Her gates are sunk into the ground; he hath destroyed and broken her bars: her king and her princes are among the Gentiles: the law is no more; her prophets also find no vision from the LORD.
- Micah 3:6 Therefore night shall be unto you, that ye shall not have a vision; and it shall be dark unto you, that ye shall not divine; and the sun shall go down over the prophets, and the day shall be dark over them.
- Micah 3:7 Then shall the seers be ashamed, and the diviners confounded: yea, they shall all cover their lips; for there is no answer of God.
- Psalm 74:9 We see not our signs: there is no more any prophet: neither is there among us any that knoweth how long.
- 1 Samuel 3:1 And the child Samuel ministered unto the LORD before Eli. And the word of the LORD was precious in those days; there was no open vision.
- 2 Chronicles 15:3 Now for a long season Israel hath been without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without law.

- Ezekiel 7:26 Mischief shall come upon mischief, and rumour shall be upon rumour; then shall they seek a vision of the prophet; but the law shall perish from the priest, and counsel from the ancients.
- Hosea 4:6 My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children.
- Ezekiel 14:4 Therefore speak unto them, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord GOD; Every man of the house of Israel that setteth up his idols in his heart, and putteth the stumbling block of his iniquity before his face, and cometh to the prophet; I the LORD will answer him that cometh according to the multitude of his idols;
- Ezekiel 14:9 And if the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the LORD have deceived that prophet, and I will stretch out my hand upon him, and will destroy him from the midst of my people Israel.
- 1 Kings 22:19 And he said, Hear thou therefore the word of the LORD: I saw the LORD sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left.
- Numbers 22:20 And God came unto Balaam at night, and said unto him, If the men come to call thee, rise up, and go with them; but yet the word which I shall say unto thee, that shalt thou do.
- Psalms 18:26 With the pure thou wilt shew thyself pure; and with the froward thou wilt shew thyself froward.

God can do it again differently

If God is doing this again, He is under no theological obligation to remove His word in exactly the same way He did the last time. Therefore, the aforementioned examples of God removing His word are sufficient to serve as precedent and to provide proof texts that He could be doing it again.

- Ecclesiastes 11:5, Isaiah 43:18–19, John 3:8

God told us He was going to do this

If God warned in advance that a season would come in which Satan would be permitted to work “with all power and signs and lying wonders” (2 Thessalonians 2:9), and that the beast would be “given” power to “make war with the saints, and to overcome them” (Revelation 13:7), then that later prophetic warning must govern how earlier preservation promises are understood. God’s promises are never void, but later revelation can define the manner, limits, timing, or judgment-context in which those promises operate. Daniel 7:25 specifically says this enemy would “think to change times and laws,” and that “they shall be given into his hand” for an appointed season. Amos 8:11 likewise foretells a famine, not of bread or water, but “of hearing the words of the LORD.” Therefore, if God Himself foretold a temporary judgment in which access to His words would be supernaturally assaulted, that prophecy would supersede any assumption that preservation means the written text could never be touched, corrupted, hidden, or placed under satanic attack.

This does not make God unfaithful; it makes men guilty for ignoring the warnings God already gave. Revelation 22:18 proves that adding to the words of God is a real transgression serious enough to bring divine judgment; the warning would be meaningless if alteration were impossible in every sense. The theological principle is simple: when God gives a general promise and later gives a specific prophetic exception, judgment, or permitted satanic operation, the specific prophecy controls the interpretation of the general promise. Therefore, if Scripture foretells that the enemy would be permitted to change “times and laws,” create a famine of hearing God’s words, and deceive through lying wonders, then the church has no right to use earlier preservation texts as a blanket denial of the very event God warned would come.

- Daniel 7:25 “And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.”
- Amos 8:11 “Behold, the days come, saith the Lord GOD, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the LORD:”
- 2 Thessalonians 2:9 “Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders,”
- Revelation 13:7 “And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations.”
- Revelation 22:18 “For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book:”

I have a much more comprehensive treatment of these passages in Chapter 2 of my second book, entitled “The Mandela Effect: Supernatural Bible Changes.” These passages clearly provide a solid theological foundation for claiming that supernatural Bible changes are possible. You can try to pick these passages apart and claim that my interpretation is invalid, but they are more than sufficient for everyone who has said, “If this is real, I will need to see it in the word.”

The devil doesn't have that much power

The unconvinced will often blurt out that this could never be happening because the devil doesn't have that much power. But it's never dawned on most people that God is the one calling for this judgment. You see this clearly described in Amos 8:11 when God says "I will send a famine, not a famine of bread, but a famine of the word." Didn't God tell you that "judgment begins with the house of God," well this is what it looks like.

A similar thought that I hear a lot is the idea that "God is strong enough to protect His word. Those sentiments assume that He's isn't upset with you because you are using the Book to keep Him away from doing miracles in your meetings. Instead of just making the decently and in order directive go away, He's scrambling the whole thing to force you to "walk worthy of the calling with which you were called." (Ephesians 4:1)

God has clearly demonstrated that He's willing to lift the hedge and give permission to the Devil to run wild so that He may accomplish His will in the earth. It is God allowing it and the Devil doing it. Since God has demonstrated His willingness to do this in the following passages, it's theologically sound to suggest that He would do it again by allowing the Bible to be supernaturally changed.

Satan permitted to afflict God's people

- Job 1:12 — God gives Satan power over Job's possessions.
- Revelation 13:7 — The beast is given power to make war with and overcome the saints.
- 2 Thessalonians 2:9 — The coming of the wicked one is empowered by Satan with signs and lying wonders.
- Luke 22:31 — Satan is permitted to sift Christ's disciples.
- 2 Corinthians 12:7 — Paul's thorn is described as satanic, yet permitted by God to prevent pride.
- 1 Corinthians 5:5 — A sinful believer is delivered unto Satan for chastening.
- 1 Timothy 1:20 — Hymenaeus and Alexander are delivered unto Satan so they may learn not to blaspheme.
- Revelation 2:10 — The devil is permitted to imprison some believers.

God removing protection

- Isaiah 5:5 — God removes the hedge from His vineyard, allowing it to be eaten and trodden down.
- Psalm 80:12–13 — God's vineyard is exposed after the hedges are broken down.
- Lamentations 2:3 — God withdraws His protective hand from Israel.
- Lamentations 2:17 — God commands the enemy to prevail.

God giving Israel into the hands of enemy nations

- Judges 2:14 — God delivers Israel into the hands of spoilers.
- Judges 3:8 — God sells Israel into the hand of Chushanrishathaim.
- Judges 3:12–14 — God strengthens Moab against Israel.
- Judges 4:2 — God sells Israel into the hand of Jabin king of Canaan.
- Judges 6:1 — God gives Israel into the hand of Midian.
- Judges 10:7 — God sells Israel into the hands of the Philistines and Ammonites.
- Judges 13:1 — God delivers Israel into the hand of the Philistines for forty years.
- 1 Samuel 4:10–11 — Israel is defeated by the Philistines, and the ark is taken.
- 1 Samuel 12:9 — God sells Israel into the hands of several enemies.
- Psalm 106:40–42 — God gives His people into the hand of the heathen.

God giving Judah into captivity

- 2 Kings 17:20 — God rejects Israel and delivers them into the hand of spoilers.
- 2 Kings 21:14 — God says He will deliver His people into the hand of enemies.
- 2 Chronicles 36:17 — God brings Babylon against Judah.
- Daniel 1:2 — God gives Judah’s king into Nebuchadnezzar’s hand.
- Jeremiah 20:4 — God gives Judah into the hand of Babylon.
- Jeremiah 21:7 — God delivers Jerusalem into Nebuchadnezzar’s hand.
- Jeremiah 25:9 — God calls Nebuchadnezzar “my servant” and brings him against Judah.
- Jeremiah 27:6 — God gives nations into Nebuchadnezzar’s hand.

God sending or permitting evil spirits

- Judges 9:23 — God sends an evil spirit between Abimelech and Shechem.
- 1 Samuel 16:14 — An evil spirit from the LORD troubles Saul.
- Samuel 18:10 — The evil spirit comes upon Saul again.
- 1 Kings 22:22–23 — God permits a lying spirit to deceive Ahab’s prophets.

Prophetic examples of saints being overcome

- Daniel 7:21 — The little horn makes war with the saints and prevails.
- Daniel 7:25 — The saints are given into his hand.
Daniel 8:24 — A coming king destroys the holy people.
- Daniel 11:33 — The wise among God’s people fall by sword, flame, captivity, and spoil.
- Zechariah 13:7 — God commands the sword to smite the shepherd, scattering the sheep.
- Matthew 26:31 — Jesus applies Zechariah 13:7 to His disciples.
- Luke 21:24 — Jerusalem is given over to Gentile domination.
- Revelation 11:7 — The beast is allowed to kill God’s two witnesses.
- Revelation 12:17 — The dragon makes war with the remnant.

Inspired doesn't equal preservation

There isn't one passage that teaches that because the Word is inspired, it is therefore preserved. Yet when church leaders teach about preservation, they will spend a lot of time talking about inspiration.

In many cases, they don't state plainly that inspiration equals preservation, but instead will insinuate that because it's inspired it is therefore preserved. They insinuate that because the word is God's property, it is sacrosanct. This of course is true, and the controversy arises because no one is making a distinction between the word and the scriptures. They insist that because God created it and He owns it, it only makes sense that no one can wander past His no trespassing signs and scratch the throne. Well that idea is true to some degree, but it isn't Bible when it comes to preservation of the text.

“Every, NOT “All” scripture is inspired.

Since the inspiration of scripture is a cornerstone of the preservation philosophy, we need to examine the central proof text that inspiration is based on, which is 2 Timothy 3:16. This commentary on 2 Timothy 3:16 was really shocking to me. This was another aspect of the DOP that I never really investigated as I should have. Forty years in the church, and it never dawned on me to look closely at what 2 Timothy 3:16 was really saying.

- **Ellicott's commentary for English readers** “All scripture is given by inspiration of God.— Although this rendering is grammatically possible, the more strictly accurate translation, and the one adopted by nearly all the oldest and most trustworthy versions (for example, the Syriac and the Vulgate), and by many principal expositors in all ages (for instance, by such teachers as Origen, Theodoret, Grotius, Luther, Meyer, Ellicott, and Alford), runs as follows: ‘Every scripture inspired by God is also profitable for doctrine, for reproof.’”

The idea that this passage says “every” instead of “all” opens us to the possibility that some scriptures are not inspired. In other words, what the Holy Spirit was inspiring Paul to say was “each of the passages that are inspired,” or “those passages that are inspired” are profitable. This is a very different meaning than “all scripture is inspired.”

When I realized that the more probable translation for this passage is “every,” I was relieved because there were many passages I was familiar with that seemed to contradict the idea that every single passage of the Bible is inspired at the same level.

I remember thinking, if all scripture is inspired, how do you explain 1st Corinthians 7:12? In verse 10, Paul clearly indicates that what he is saying is inspired when he says:

- 1 Corinthians 7:10: “Now to the married I command, yet not I but the Lord.”

But then in verse 12, we see the opposite, where he makes a clear distinction that what he is saying is not inspired. He qualifies his statement by saying:

- 1 Corinthians 7:12: “But to the rest I, not the Lord, say:”

Barnes’ Notes on the Bible on verse 12 says:

“Not the Lord - ‘I do not claim, in this advice, to be under the influence of inspiration; I have no express command on the subject from the Lord; but I deliver my opinion as a servant of the Lord.’” The inspired Scripture writer is literally saying, “What I am saying right now is not inspired.” Was he inspired to say he wasn’t inspired, thereby making his uninspired statement inspired? I’m not sure.

The bottom line is if you can’t produce one passage that teaches “inspiration equals preservation,” but you keep making that argument anyway, then you prove once again that our theology is more conservative and more sola scriptura than yours is.

God doesn't change ≠ Bible doesn't change

God does not change, but His inspired creations do change. The fact that God does not change does not automatically mean that the Bible will not change. The Bible does not teach that; it actually teaches the opposite.

- Hebrews 1:10-12 “You, Lord, in the beginning laid the foundation of the earth, And the heavens are the work of Your hands. They will perish, but You remain; And they will all grow old like a garment; Like a cloak You will fold them up, and they will be changed. But You are the same, And Your years will not fail.”

This argument is similar to the argument regarding inspiration. Inspiration doesn't equal preservation, and God's unchanging nature doesn't equal a force field around your Bible either.

It is very common for the unconvinced to blurt out, “Jesus is the same yesterday, today, and forever.” This statement is rarely accompanied by any explanation. The listener is expected to understand the implication and connect the dots themselves. But the Bible doesn't teach that since Jesus is the same yesterday, today, and forever, it is therefore a forgone conclusion that the terrestrial book could not possibly be part of an end-times sign and wonder that God Himself has called for. The reality is that the only thing holding up your belief that the Bible can't change is you. Your position is supported by a panic-level need for this to be true. This mindset is driving a world of willful ignorance when it comes to rightly dividing the word on this topic, and so this observation stands as yet another theological argument that explains why the Bible can be supernaturally changing.

“God cannot lie” is not an argument

The statement that “the Bible cannot change because God cannot lie” is a presumption based on a false premise. It first assumes that the preservation promises are teaching that the Scriptures are preserved, which they are not. This presumption is then coupled with the teaching that God cannot lie, so the final conclusion becomes: if God promised to preserve His word, and He cannot lie, then the Bible cannot change. The problem with this argument, as we have shown, is that the Bible does not promise that the Bible will be preserved. Therefore, the entire premise is flawed. I agree that God cannot lie, but if the Bible is being changed, it doesn't mean that God is a liar, because He never promised He would preserve the Bible.

God is willing to appear unrighteous

In very rare situations, it appears that God is willing to appear unrighteous in order to test His servants. We see this clearly demonstrated when He lifted the hedge around righteous Job and allowed Satan to bring devastation into his life. God endorsed Job as a righteous man, but then allowed Satan to buffet him for His higher purposes. God also appeared unrighteous to Abraham when He commanded him to sacrifice his son. I am not saying that God was unrighteous, only that He was willing to appear that way. If you do not believe that He appeared to be unrighteous, just ask Job's wife; she would tell you differently.

God is pressing on a pain point with His bride that is so sensitive that it's right up there with what He required of Abraham. God required Abraham to accept something that made God seem unjust, and the fact that God is allowing Slewfoot to go frolicking through the pages of the Good Book seems equally unimaginable.

This then provides yet another theological argument that can provide an explanation of how this can be happening. Isn't it fair to suggest that if God has appeared unrighteous before, that He would do it again to test His servants in modernity?

I would suggest that He is, by allowing Satan to supernaturally change all Bibles. For most believers, this appears to be a failure or betrayal on the part of God, so the test requires the believer to look past his theological understanding to his experiential knowledge of God in order to evaluate this event properly. That's what Job and Abraham had to do, so why not you?

That is the test in a nutshell: Do you know Him, or do you just know the book?

- Job 1:8 "And the LORD said unto Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil?"
- Genesis 22:1 "And it came to pass after these things, that God did tempt Abraham, and said unto him, Abraham: and he said, Behold, here I am."

God is the author of confusion

Although the text clearly reveals that God is not the author of confusion, (1 Corinthians 14:33) He has still used confusion as a judgment numerous times. As a result, it is conceivable that the supernatural Bible changes are God's decision to implement a Tower of Babel type judgement on the last days church to get them to stop using the Bible to justify their rampant unbelief. Here are the passages where God used confusion as a judgment.

- Genesis 11:7–9 — God confounded the language at Babel so the people could no longer understand one another: “there confound their language, that they may not understand one another’s speech.”
- Judges 7:22 — God caused Midian’s army to turn on itself in confusion: “the LORD set every man's sword against his fellow.”

Theological necessity is a guess

This is a concept that permeates every denominational flavor, even if it is not taught openly. Theological necessity teaches that “because God went to so much trouble to give us His word, it only makes sense that He would preserve it.”

You could fill huge libraries with the books that have been written to illustrate this one concept. Theological necessity has been reiterated so many times, and in so many ways, that most believers simply accept it as fact. Unfortunately, this is a sentimental guess taught as doctrine, and it is exactly what Jesus rebuked the Pharisees for in Matthew 15:9.

- Matthew 15:9 “And in vain they worship Me, Teaching as doctrines the commandments of men.”

Here are two “theological necessity” quotes from theologians.

Edward F. Hills: ²

- “God must have done this, for if He gave the Scriptures to His Church by inspiration as the perfect and final revelation of His will, then it is obvious that He would not allow this revelation to disappear or undergo any alteration of its fundamental character.”

It is not a doctrine if Edward F. Hills says “well, if God gave us His word, it is obvious that He would not allow this revelation to disappear?” Many church leaders don't even realize how much they draw on this concept for the certainty that they have about preservation. They will demand that the Bible could not be changing with such consternation while accusing me of being a biblically illiterate charlatan for claiming that this could be happening. But much of their certainty comes from this concept that is anything but sola scriptura. They will tell you they're solo scriptura but they're not.

Timothy Tow: ³

- “To hold to the doctrine of inspiration without preservation is equally illogical. ... Without preservation, all the inspiration, God-breathing into the Scriptures, would be lost.”

Well God is illogical, unpredictable and He is perfectly fine with the scriptures being lost if you deserve it.

² The King James Version Defended
https://ia601502.us.archive.org/0/items/TheKingJamesVersionDefended/TheKingJamesVersionDefended.pdf?utm_source=chatgpt.com

³ A Theology for Every Christian, p.47
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Verbal_plenary_preservation?utm_source=chatgpt.com

Theological necessity is loosely made up of two theological pillars. The first pillar is the presumption that if God went to the trouble of giving us the Bible, then it only makes sense that He would preserve it. But that is an inference, not a doctrine explicitly stated in the text. The second pillar consists of the preservation promises themselves. Both pillars are flawed: the first is a theological guess, not a direct biblical proof; the second often mishandles the preservation passages by assuming that the term “word” always means the completed Bible, when that is not necessarily what the text is referring to.

Very few Christians have ever even heard of theological necessity, much less understand it. Many leaders who parrot the idea have never really studied it either. I was in ministry for 40 years before I ever even heard of it, much less looked into the concept and found out what theologians were teaching about it. I do not think I am very different from many other Christians or church leaders.

The bottom line is this: It may be true that God has preserved His word up until now, but that is no promise that He is going to continue to preserve it. Theological necessity is wishful thinking and provides no certainty that the Bible is stable. If God went to all that trouble to give us His word, it only makes sense that He would preserve it, unless He is upset with us, which He is.

Providential preservation is not an argument

Another presumption similar to this is what is called providential preservation. This is the observation that God has seemed to order circumstances throughout history to perpetuate and preserve the Scriptures. Based on this observation, it is assumed that since God has been preserving the Bible up until now, He will continue to do so.

So again, this observation may have been true up until now, but that does not mean it will continue to be true. Your teenage child may have a cell phone now, but if they sneak out without you knowing it, they will surely lose their phone and be grounded. Neither theological necessity nor providential preservation provides any certainty regarding the enduring nature of the text. I agree that the word is preserved, but I don't agree that the Bible is preserved, because the Bible doesn't promise the Bible is preserved.

Perseverance of the Saints is not an argument

Ephesian 1:13 “In Him you also trusted, after you heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, having believed, you were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise...”

Promises like Ephesians 1:13 are used to teach a concept called the perseverance of the saints. In layman’s terms, it means Jesus will not give up on you. But these passages are promises to preserve the saint, not his Bible, and using them as proof texts for Bible preservation is not sound doctrine. It never ceases to amaze me how the people who make such a big deal about always observing sound doctrine, have some of the worst doctrine in the entire church. Just because you have been sealed does not mean the Bible has been sealed.

Psalm 12 is not a preservation promise

The reason why Psalm 12 is the most quoted preservation proof text is because verses 6 and 7 provide the clearest wording to support preservation in the entire Bible. The semantics of these two verses are irresistible, and the fact that it isn't promising preservation of the text is irrelevant. It really sounds like it's teaching that the Bible will be preserved, but most commentaries and Bible translations disagree. But this does not stop the preserved word ambassador from twisting this poor little psalm into a pretzel to get it to mean what they want. But Psalm 12 is not a promise to preserve the word, it's a promise to preserve the godly man.

This Psalm is not hard to understand. It's only eight verses long, and it's completely unambiguous. There are no mystical metaphors or historical references to trip you up. The context is clear, and you don't need a Bible school degree to understand what the Psalmist is saying.

You find out what the subject is in verse one.

- Vs 1: "Help, LORD; for the godly man ceaseth; for the faithful fail from among the children of men."

What is being discussed here in verse one? What is the topic of this Psalm so far? Would you agree that the topic in this Psalm so far is "the godly man?" What leads you to believe that the subject changes between now and the end of the Psalm when you have to decide what verse seven is referring to? Verse seven is referring to verse one. You know it, and I know it. No other themes that the Psalm explores will change that. If the psalmist explores the contrast between the words of deceitful, evildoers and the pure, reliable words of God, it doesn't change the subject of the Psalm. The subject is what is discussed in verse one and verse five. The subject is the godly man.

Almost every commentary concludes that verse seven is referring to verse one, not verse six. Most translations translate it that way as well. It seems that the only people trying to suggest otherwise are DOP proponents with an agenda.

The obvious subject of this Psalm is further reinforced in verse five when we read:

- Vs 5: - "For the oppression of the poor, for the sighing of the needy, now will I arise, saith the LORD; I will set him in safety from him that puffeth at him."

And so it is, verse seven is referring to verse one and verse five. Anyone that believes otherwise is in the minority. Why should anyone believe that you are right when virtually all commentaries and most Bible versions disagree with you? It's crystal clear what is being discussed prior to verse seven. Verse six is endorsement of the prophecy that is given in verse five. Verse six is like when someone tells you, "Hey man, this is me you are talking to; you can trust me on this one." God's promise to protect you is as good as gold or in this case silver. His promise given in verse five is like silver that has been tried seven times in a furnace. That is what verse six is saying.

Benson Commentary

- "Thou wilt preserve them" — Hebrew, תצַרְנִי, titzrennu, "thou wilt keep him," that is, "thy poor and lowly servant" (spoken of in Psalm 12:5).

Matthew Henry's Concise Commentary

- "God will secure His chosen remnant; however bad the times are. As long as the world stands, there will be a generation of proud and wicked men. But all God's people are put into the hands of Christ our Saviour; there they are in safety, for none can pluck them thence."

Barnes' Notes on the Bible

- "Thou shalt keep them, that is, the persons referred to in Psalm 12:5."

Gill's Exposition of the Entire Bible

- "Thou shalt keep them, O Lord.... Not the words before mentioned, as Aben Ezra explains it, for the affix is masculine and not feminine; but the sense is that God will keep the poor and needy."

The Bible has been changing from its inception

If the Bible cannot change, then why has it been changing through seven different covenants since its inception? If preservation, as it is widely held, is true, then Hebrews 8:8 should not be in your Bible.

- Hebrews 8:8 “The days are coming, declares the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel.”

A new covenant is a changed covenant. You cannot commentary your way out of Hebrews 8:8. Whatever explanation you try to provide is irrelevant, because you are saying the Bible cannot change even though it tells you it is changing.

Your logic would have to be this: “Well, it has been changing, but now that it has been canonized, all that changing is over and done with. No more changing from here on out.”

But do you have chapter and verse that teaches that once a handful of mortals put a bow on a collection of parchments, there will be no more changes? The underlying reason for the change from the Old Testament to the New Testament is irrelevant.

The fact that it was prophesied does not change the fact that the Bible has been changing since its inception. So when someone says that the Bible never changes, that claim is wildly inaccurate. The New Covenant is only one of seven covenants, and each one introduces new doctrines and new changes from the one before it. The book has therefore been changing since its inception, revealing a more dynamic nature than most people would care to admit. Here are a list of the different covenants and the changes that they introduced to a Bible that supposedly never changes.

- Edenic — Genesis 1:28–30 — dominion and stewardship in an unfallen creation
 - Change from prior covenant: This is the original arrangement. Man is placed under God’s authority in innocence, given dominion over the earth, commanded to be fruitful, and provided food from the created order.
- Adamic — Genesis 3:14–19 — curse, death, toil, pain after the fall
 - Change from Edenic: The covenantal condition changes from innocence and blessing to judgment and survival under the curse. Dominion remains, but it is now exercised in a fallen world marked by death, sweat, pain, conflict, and eventual physical decay.
- Noahic — Genesis 9:8–17 — stability of the world order and human government
 - Change from Adamic: After the flood, God establishes a renewed world order. The earth will continue with seedtime and harvest, man is again commanded to multiply, animals now fear man, meat is permitted for food, and human government is implied through the command to punish murder.
- Abrahamic — Genesis 12:1–3; formalized Genesis 15:18–21 — election of Abraham and his seed

- Change from Noahic: The focus narrows from all humanity under a general world order to one chosen man, one chosen family, and one chosen seed-line. God begins working through Abraham's descendants to bring blessing to all nations.
- Mosaic — Exodus 19:3–6 — Israel under written law and conditional covenant terms
 - Change from Abrahamic: The Abrahamic covenant was rooted in divine promise, but the Mosaic covenant places Abraham's physical descendants, Israel, under a national legal covenant with commandments, priesthood, sacrifices, blessings for obedience, and curses for disobedience.
- Palestinian — Deuteronomy 30:1–10 — promised restoration to the land after exile
 - Change from Mosaic: The Mosaic covenant warned Israel that disobedience would bring exile; this covenant adds the promise that even after exile, God would restore Israel to the land upon repentance and divine mercy.
- Davidic — 2 Samuel 7:12–16 — eternal dynasty and throne through David
 - Change from Palestinian: The covenant focus moves from Israel's restoration to the land to the royal line through which Israel will be ruled. God promises David an enduring house, kingdom, and throne, establishing the messianic kingship line.
- New — Jeremiah 31:31–34; inaugurated Luke 22:20 — inward law, forgiveness, spiritual renewal
 - Change from Davidic: The Davidic covenant promises the king and kingdom; the New Covenant provides the inward spiritual transformation necessary for covenant faithfulness. The law is written in the heart, sins are forgiven, and relationship with God is made inward rather than merely external and national.

The law of 1st mention

Another guiding principle when trying to rightly divide the word is the principle of first mention. Looking at how a term or concept is first used in the scriptures can often help clarify the true meaning of the thing you are studying. The first usage of the phrase “Word of God” involves a lengthy conversation that Abraham had with God, not something written down on scrolls.

Based on this example, the term “Word of God” can be describing a vital connection to a living God as opposed to a written communication. As a believer, I need to interpret this term accordingly. The Bible is not like something that you simply memorize so you can pass a test; it is more like the instructions you get from the tower on how to fly the plane right after your pilot dies of a heart attack. It’s relational, and it’s always inviting you into encounter by its teaching and the examples of its characters.

Genesis 15

- **God speaking: Vs 1** - “After these things the ‘word of the LORD’ came unto Abram in a vision, saying, ‘Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward.’”
- **Abraham speaking: Vs 2** - “And Abram said, ‘Lord GOD, what wilt thou give me, seeing I go childless?’”
- **Abraham speaking: Vs 3** - “Then Abram said, ‘Look, You have given me no offspring.’”
- **God speaking: Vs 4** - “And behold, the word of the Lord came to him, saying, ‘This one shall not be your heir, but one who will come from your own body shall be your heir.’”
- **God speaking: Vs 5** - “Then He brought him outside and said, ‘Look now toward heaven, and count the stars if you are able to number them.’ And He said to him, ‘So shall your descendants be.’”
- **God speaking: Vs 7** - “Then He said to him, ‘I am the Lord, who brought you out of Ur of the Chaldeans, to give you this land to inherit it.’”
- **Abraham speaking: Vs 8** - “And he said, ‘Lord God, how shall I know that I will inherit it?’”

God breaks down so that He may build up

In Jeremiah 1:10, God told Jeremiah that He set him over the nations so that he could “...root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant.”

Why do we believe that we would somehow be insulated from something similar to what God did in Jeremiah’s day? It appears that He is doing that again.

- Ecclesiastes 3:1 To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven:
- Jeremiah 18:7 At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it;

There is a pattern throughout scripture that God tears down before He rebuilds. He wounds before He heals. He humbles before He exalts. Ecclesiastes teaches that there is “a time to break down, and a time to build up,” establishing that destruction itself can serve a divine purpose when God is correcting pride, idolatry, or rebellion.

Scripture repeatedly demonstrates that God is not committed to preserving human systems when those systems become idols. He disrupts them, scatters them, and confounds them in order to expose the heart.

The modern church has increasingly exalted intellectual certainty, textual mastery, institutional authority, and scholarly confidence as substitutes for living dependence upon God. Many believers no longer approach scripture trembling before the Spirit of God, but instead approach it as a controlled object they possess, categorize, defend, and weaponize. In that sense, the Bible itself has often become part of a new Tower of Babel: a monument to human certainty, denominational pride, and intellectual self-exaltation. In scripture, when mankind united in pride at Babel, God responded by confounding language and scattering comprehension. The judgment was confusion, but the purpose was restraint and eventual redirection. Under this framework, supernatural alteration or destabilization of the biblical text would not contradict God’s character; it would fit an established biblical pattern of divine disruption aimed at humbling human arrogance.

The word of the Lord grew

- Acts 19:20 “So the word of the Lord grew mightily and prevailed.”

Obviously, the use of the term “word of the Lord” here is not the written text because it is described as growing. The term “word of the Lord” is describing the effect or the influence that the message was having on the people. This is yet another example of this term meaning something other than the Bible.

It pleased God not to give us a Bible

This is one of my favorite proofs that the Bible can be changing. Because if the KJV only and preserved word Baptist are right about how important the Bible is to our faith, then why did it take so long for God to give us one. If actions speak louder than words, then I think God would beg to differ.

If you believe that it has been about 6,000 years since Adam and Eve were in the garden, then we have only had a Bible for about 7 percent of the entire church age. This seems to indicate that God is not as worked up about having a perfect, flawless Bible as you are. And I will use the theological necessity argument in reverse. If God was as worked up as you are about having a perfect, flawless Bible, it only makes sense that He would have gotten it to us a lot sooner.

God's actions speak louder than your doctrine. He seems to be perfectly content with us not having a Bible, so it should not be surprising if He's decided to take it away from us. In fact, it seems like He prefers for us not to have one. He likes it better when we have to wrestle with Him directly to figure things out rather than always having a perfect, flawless Bible to rely on.

- Acts 17:27 “so that they should seek the Lord, in the hope that they might grope for Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us;
- Proverbs 25:2 “It is the glory of God to conceal a matter, But the glory of kings is to search out a matter.”

God chose a vulnerable storage medium

The only time God directed His decrees to be recorded on an indelible medium, was with Moses and the Ten Commandments. It pleased God for the rest of His decrees to be scribbled on a napkin. All other decrees of God were to be stored on a vulnerable medium subject to unauthorized alteration, aging, fire, and all manner of corruption. God purposely chose an unreliable storage medium because He prefers that we remain dependent rather than relying on our intellect. He also chose the subjective transfer process of inspiring human writers to deliver His message. That one decision has caused unimaginable suffering and death because men were forced to know God directly instead of knowing Him through the certainty of understanding. He could have given His decrees to angels on indelible golden scrolls that were then delivered to humanity. The scrolls would be accessible at millions of floating orbs that were protected by angels with flaming swords. This would have avoided a lot of suffering, but that's not how God rolls.

This is another example of why God would allow all Bibles to be changed. If He were so intent on preserving your King James Bible, He would have directed it to be indelibly etched on golden scrolls that were protected by angels.

Preservation promises can be modified

The Bible can change because the preservation promises can be modified or overturned by other passages. The modifying passage would act as a trump card and override the original command or promise entirely.

Warning someone “to consider the full counsel of God” is an example of this idea. This “full counsel of God” idea suggests “You may think you have a promise nailed down, but there may be other passages that will come in and essentially trump or modify your interpretation.”

Examples of scripture changing scripture

- **Leviticus 23:4-5** “These are the feasts of the LORD, even holy convocations, which you shall proclaim in their seasons.”
- **Colossians 2:16** “Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:”

Leviticus 23:4 is unambiguous until you run into something like Colossians 2:16. You can offer whatever commentary you like about why this is happening, but you cannot deny that Colossians 2:16 directly nullifies Leviticus 23:4.

Here’s another one

- **Leviticus 3:17** “It is a perpetual statute throughout your generations in all your dwellings: you shall not eat any fat or any blood.”
- **Romans 14:20** “Do not destroy the work of God for the sake of food. All food is clean, but it is wrong for a man to let his eating be a stumbling block.”

This passage clearly indicates that this command is to be observed forever. The way that it is worded, it appears to be more “in stone” than most of the preservation promises that the unconvinced rely on to demand that the Bible can’t change. Yet we have pesky Paul coming in like a wrecking ball and throwing a spanner into the whole operation in Romans 14:20

In a similar way, there are scriptures that modify the promises that you are relying on to demand that the Bible could not be undergoing supernatural changes.

Scriptures that modify preservation promises

Not that I believe that Psalm 12 is promising that God will preserve the scriptures or the Word, but most preachers do, so I will use it in my first example.

- **Preservation Promise - Psalm 12:6-7** “The words of the Lord are pure words, like silver refined in a furnace on the ground, purified seven times. You, O Lord, will keep them; you will guard us from this generation forever.”
- **Modifier - Daniel 7:25** “And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.”

Daniel 7:25 doesn't only apply to Psalm 12; it gives theological permission to accept that the whole Bible can be changed. I found that pairing each one directly with a promise helps people see it better.

Here are more examples;

- **Preservation promise - Matthew 5:17** “For I tell you truly, until heaven and earth pass away, not a single jot, not a stroke of a pen, will disappear from the Law until everything is accomplished.”
- **Modifier - Amos 8:11** “Behold, the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord.”
- **Preservation Promise - Psalm 119:89** “Forever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven.”
- **Modifier #1 - Revelation 13:2** "And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority."
- **Modifier #2 - Revelation 13:7** “And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations.”
- **Preservation Promise - Isaiah 40:8** “The grass withers, the flower fades, but the word of our God will stand forever.”
- **Modifier - 2 Thessalonians 2:9** “Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders,”

Modifying passages

(Matthew 5:17 vs Daniel 7:25), (Psalm 119:89 vs Amos 8:11), (Isaiah 40:8 vs 2 Thessalonians 2:9)
 Other examples of scripture changing scripture: Hebrews 8:6-9, 13, Matthew 12:3-6, (Leviticus 23:4-5 vs Colossians 2:16), (Leviticus 3:17 vs Romans 14:20), Galatians 2:14, (Exodus 20:13 vs Matthew 5:21-22), (Leviticus 11:1-23 vs Acts 10:9-16)

Preservation promises can be rescinded

I know this is going to be hard for people to accept, but God seems to be willing to take back what He has promised on rare occasions. So perhaps He is doing it again by allowing the Bible to be changed.

- **1 Samuel 2:30** “Therefore the LORD, the God of Israel, declares: ‘I promised that members of your family would minister before me forever.’
But now the LORD declares: ‘Far be it from me! Those who honor me I will honor, but those who despise me will be disdained.’”

There you have this doctrine illustrated in one verse. First He says, “I promised,” but then you hear, “But now the LORD declares: ‘Far be it from me!’

Here are some additional examples that need no commentary:

- **Jeremiah 18:7-10** “If at any time I announce that a nation or kingdom is to be uprooted, torn down and destroyed, and if that nation I warned repents of its evil, then I will relent and not inflict on it the disaster I had planned. And if at another time I announce that a nation or kingdom is to be built up and planted, and if it does evil in my sight and does not obey me, then I will reconsider the good I had intended to do for it.”

God will reconsider? God says, “then I will reconsider the good I had intended to do for it?” I didn’t know He could do that. It seems like He’s reconsidered letting us have the Bible if you ask me.

- **Genesis 6:5-7** “The LORD saw how great the wickedness of the human race had become on the earth, and that every inclination of the thoughts of the human heart was only evil all the time. The LORD regretted that He had made human beings on the earth, and His heart was deeply troubled. So the LORD said, ‘I will wipe from the face of the earth the human race I have created—and with them, the animals, the birds, and the creatures that move along the ground—for I regret that I have made them.’”
 - “I will wipe from the face of the earth the human race I have created.”
 - “...for I regret that I have made them.”
 - How about this one: “I gave them the Bible, and all they do is read the thing and brag about how much they know. I’m going to take it back.”
- **Exodus 32:9-14** - The Golden Calf: God declared His intention to destroy them and make a great nation out of Moses instead, but Moses interceded, and God relented. God relented. God relented.

In verse 9, Moses reasons with God and points out that if He destroys the Israelites after bringing them out of Egypt, CNN is going to spin that like He's a bad actor, and it will hurt Him in the polls. And in verse 12, he petitions God to change His mind.

- **Verse 12** "Turn from thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against thy people."

And in verse 14, we read God's response:

- **Verse 14** "And the LORD repented of the evil which He thought to do unto His people."

The clear testimony of scripture here is that Moses convinced God to change His mind. God may have promised you that He was going to preserve your KJV Bible until you are raptured, but it seems as though He can turn around and say never mind if He chooses; He's sovereign like that.

- **1 Kings 21:17-29** "Then the word of the LORD came to Elijah the Tishbite: 'Have you noticed how Ahab has humbled himself before Me? Because he has humbled himself, I will not bring this disaster in his day, but I will bring it on his house in the days of his son.'"
- **Jonah 3:10** "When God saw what they did and how they turned from their evil ways, He relented and did not bring on them the destruction He had threatened."

If the Bible can't change, then why has it been changing since the beginning. Here is a list of all the covenants that God introduced throughout the church age. Each new covenant introduces new promises, new rules and new changes.

Preservation promises can have time limits

God puts time limits on some promises in Scripture. The time limit for all of the preservation promises that you are relying on is found in Daniel 12:4: “shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end.” The prophecy that God would allow the Bible to be changed in Daniel 7:25 was sealed until now. This event, described in Daniel 7:25, was delayed until Revelation 22:10, where we hear the words, “Seal not the words of the prophecy.” This means that the changing of times and laws mentioned in Daniel 7:25 can commence. The word translated as “laws” in Daniel 7:25 is also translated “the law of God” in Ezra 7, so it’s fair to suggest that this is speaking of the supernatural Bible changes. God warned you in Daniel 7:25 that He would allow the beast to change the Bible as well as space time. Time here is not calendars; it’s time itself.

There is a full treatment of what I’m saying here in my 2nd book, I suggest you read that first before branding my interpretation as unbiblical or out of context.

This would be yet another way to suggest from scripture that the preservation promises could be conditional and subject to a time limit. Here are a few examples of promises with time limits or timetables that would determine when they would be activated or when they would end.

- **Genesis 15:13-14** “Then the LORD said to him, ‘Know for certain that for four hundred years your descendants will be strangers in a country not their own and that they will be enslaved and mistreated there.’”
- **Jeremiah 29:10** “This is what the LORD says: ‘When seventy years are completed for Babylon, I will come to you and fulfill My good promise to bring you back to this place.’”
- **Daniel 9:24** “Seventy ‘sevens’ are decreed for your people and your holy city to finish transgression, to put an end to sin, to atone for wickedness, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal up vision and prophecy and to anoint the Most Holy Place.”
- **2 Kings 20:5-6** “Go back and tell Hezekiah, the ruler of My people, ‘This is what the LORD, the God of your father David, says: I have heard your prayer and seen your tears; I will heal you. On the third day from now you will go up to the temple of the LORD. I will add fifteen years to your life.’”

My suggestion here is very simple. If Daniel 7:25, Amos 8:11 or Thessalonians 2:9 are predicting that the Bible would change in the last days, but its activation and understanding would be sealed until the time of the end according to Daniel 12, then whatever preservation promises are being relied upon up until that point would also have a time limit on them.

- **Daniel 12:4** “But you, Daniel, roll up and seal the words of the scroll until the time of the end.”

As I mentioned already, Daniel 12:4 is my primary proof text because “the words” that are sealed are the prophecy given in Daniel 7:25. The clearest wording that we have that this Bible change event was foretold is: “He will seek to change times and laws.” This prediction was then said to be sealed up until the time of the end.

How could anyone comprehend that Daniel 7:25 was alluding to miraculous Bible alterations until this event had occurred and been, in a sense, "unsealed." Additionally, most Christians have assumed that the “time of the end” has meant until the end of time. To most Christians, the time of the end is after heaven and earth pass away.

In other words, the “sealing up,” or in this case the preservation of the word, would remain until Jesus comes or the White Throne Judgment. But it doesn’t say that. It says, “until the time of the end.”

All the different "time of the end" schools of thought have one thing in common: They all agree that it does not mean all the way to the end. In other words, "the time of the end" can certainly be whenever you are reading these words. The time of the end is probably right now.

If what I’m saying is true, then all bets are off; all promises of preservation have been rescinded. All of God’s promises are withdrawn the moment you land in hell, but that can happen here as well.

- Hosea 4:17 "Ephraim is joined to idols: let him alone."
- Jeremiah 15:1 Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my heart would not turn toward this people.
- Ezekiel 8:18 "Therefore I will act in wrath; my eye will not spare, nor will I have pity. And though they cry in my ears with a loud voice, I will not hear them."
- Hosea 1:6 ‘Call her name No Mercy, for I will no more have mercy on the house of Israel, to forgive them at all.’”

When is the time of the end?

- **Pre-millennial:** This perspective has different flavors. You could be Pre-trib, Mid-trib, or Post-trib, but ultimately, you believe that Christ will come again before the millennium to establish His earthly kingdom.
- **Post-millennial:** After the millennial reign, when the gospel has spread over the world and the church has been brought into their everlasting condition, Christ returns to lead the church.
- **A-millennial:** After His resurrection, Christ established His kingdom, and He now rules over everyone and has conquered Satan. Amillennialists reject the idea that a millennium will actually occur on Earth, either before or after Christ returns. Rather, they see the millennium as a period of time between Christ's two comings during which He reigns with His saints.

Satan's Little Season:

- This is where I think we are in the eschatological time clock. The evidence is overwhelming that we are now living in the time after the millennial reign. If this is true, it is yet another explanation for how the Bible could be changing. This entire period of time is characterized by one thing, and that is deception. And it's a deception that God has allowed. So how far does that deception permission extend?
 - **Revelation 20:7**

"And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, And shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea."

Contact John at wakeuporelse@proton.me

Speaking engagements, counseling for leaders, debates