

Now there is one case in the NT that has been much discussed and that is when Mat. gives a quotation from the book of Jer. Matthew says, As Jeremiah says, (and gives this quotation). Some have tried to say that the books of the prophets were considered as one book with Jeremiah the first. I know of no collection of books of the prophets that has Jeremiah as the first one. I think it is very unlikely there was such a book. Some have said therefore when Mat. quotes Zechariah he said, Jeremiah, meaning the whole book of the prophets.

I feel that is an excuse to get around the fact that we have a definite error there that a quotation from Zechariah is called a quotation from Jeremiah. My inclination is to think is either an early scribe wrote it or how it came in we don't know but that it came in very early and God permitted that to be copied and recopied again to give us evidence of the care the scribes took that they knew this was a quotation from Zechariah but they said == it said Jeremiah and they kept it Jeremiah. even though they knew it was wrong. They did not feel they had the authority to correct this text where they knew it was wrong.

But there are, at least in the OT, very definite errors. In the NT we have many more differences in MSS than we have in the OT. Frankly when I was in seminary I was shocked by the attitude of our professors, at that time very godly men who held thoroughly to inerrancy of Scripture but men who were strongly held the view of Westcott and Hort, and they held that on the basis of two MSS we could determine what the NT text was as over against all the 100's of other MSS -- that these two were the correct NT text. If we found 5 other ancient MSS which they called the Western Text. if one of these two agrees with the other 5 ancient MSS of the Western Text then we would say the other one is correct one because the Western Text is a bad text and therefore it must be the correct text.

So on one MS they would throw out all the other hundreds of MSS. I felt when I learned the theory well enough to write it down on exams, I did feel it was very extreme on that. I think now most scholars have retreated from that Westcott and Hort pretty far. I don't think W & H is held any more; I believe they established some principles that are very useful and are used in a much more reasonable way by others since.

It seems to me we can safely say that God has preserved the OT and the NT in such a way that if you take any sizeable number of MSS of either the OT or the NT and make a text from it and you cannot get an erroneous idea from it. That the idea of inerrancy does apply to the ideas that you get from a text as you compare Scripture with Scripture rather than from taking any one particular word as meaning a certain tense or one particular letter as being particularly normative for your interpretation.

Dr. R.D. Wilson used to say that any translation that is honestly made can show you the way of salvation. I believe that