

I believe that Paul was inspired of the Lord to say that this singular word means one person; it doesn't mean a multitude. But two verses later the same word is used in the singular and means a multitude. So Paul as an inspired interpreter interpreted it this way. But I don't think he based the argument on the form. Because the same form is used of a multitude two vv. later.

Questions: I would say it was the writers of the original autographs did not have any error. Errors arose through copies.

I don't know where the errors came in. The few errors. I don't think there are many errors, but I think there are a few but I don't think they affect anything vital--the few there are.

Question: I don't think they do either

Yes, well then we agree. We are agreed on that.

Question: Yes, but I think I'd be a little more stronger on saying I don't think the originals had any errors.

That's the way it's usually said. You may be right. My mind has been moving in this direction. One has to be careful because it's easy to sound as if you were taking a view that permits a freedom in saying this is ~~w~~ right and this is wrong. I don't think we can do that. We have to compare Scripture with Scripture, and see what is taught before reaching a conclusion and not try to build on one verse alone on anything. I doubt if there's a sentence of any length that can't be interpreted in more than one way, in any language.

I was interested in the verse "If the foundations be destroyed what shall the righteous do?" Wonderful text. I found various commentators take it different ways: "If the foundations have been destroyed what will the righteous do?" "If the foundations be destroyed, what will the Righteous God do?" "If the foundations be destroyed, what have the righteous done?" If it wasn't for the righteous committing errors nobody would be able to destroy the foundations! There are many ways to take it. I think most of them give a true idea, but we have to get our ideas from Scripture as a whole. We can't get them from that particular statement because that verse is susceptible to several different interpretations. But we can use it as a summary of teaching from elsewhere taking it as any one of the interpretations most of which are true as a matter of fact even though we can't be sure what that particular sentence means.

You cannot get a degree of precision in human language beyond what was intended in that particular sentence.

Newman: One problem we face in this kind of area is the problem of extrapolation. In other words the Bible has no errors, but then how do we define an error? Does a variant spelling constitute an error? Does a variant grammatical form constitute an error? The Bible doesn't address itself to those questions. So what we're doing at that point is extrapolating beyond what the Bible says. The Bible is very clear that it can be trusted. That does not mean that any