

And so if we had a lot of scribes correcting what they thought were errors, we would not be anyway near as _____ as if we have scribes faithfully copying what they found and even copying what they knew were errors which are comparatively few, and yet there are a few.

Question: Going back to this matter of MSS, do you think there are biblical presuppositions which a translator must apply as a criteria to MSS that are available? Simply majority usage? Is that the only criteria? Don't the Scriptures have something to say about how we are to approach all the MSS extant?

Answer: I don't think any Scripture _____ but wherever we have more than one copy of an ancient book it is customary to try to _____ the real text, and in trying to do that naturally we pay great attention to early MSS.

Erasmus found that in the Latin Bible's that were copied and recopied, it spoke of three heavenly witnesses in 1 John. Three in heaven and three on earth. The phrase "three in heaven" is not in the Greek MSS; it says there are 3 witnesses and then names them. The KJV calls the earth(?) _____ manuscript. So Erasmus' first edition did not include this phrase. And people who were accustomed to their beautiful Latin Bibles, and wanted to keep that idea exactly even though it wasn't in the Greek, they were quite upset and they pled with Erasmus to include those words.

And Erasmus said if you can find me one single Greek MS that has those words, I'll put them in the next edition. And they brought him one MS which had them in, which had been made in that very same century in Oxford in England.

They brought one MS that had that phrase in it. So he put them in the second edition as he promised to, but in all his subsequent editions he left them out, because he was quite sure they didn't belong in there!

But they are in our KJV. They don't affect out that at all. They don't add anything to what we have elsewhere. So to my mind it's not particularly important.

I feel the same way about the end of Mark. The two oldest MSS do not have the last 16 vv. of Mark. Now to my mind those 16 vv. have only one thing in it which is not in the account of Luke. So to my mind it's a rather good guess that in early copies of Mark got the ending broken off. And some of them may have _____ an improvement and _____. That may not be true. These may be _____, but they don't add anything we don't have in Luke! Except this one statement. So what difference does it make whether they were part of the original or not?

Otherwise if you say there was no ending, it ends with "and they were sore afraid." I don't think Mark ended that way. I think there was an ending. But whether this ending or some other ending, the only difference between it and Luke _____ is that "they shall take up snakes and not be hurt." If anybody questions whether that's true they only have to read Acts