

Jesus Christ, or a scribe inserts a statement of the trinity which was not there. Or a scribe reading a passage in one Gospel which has a certain sentence which does not occur in the other Gospel where that incident is recorded, inserts that ~~same~~ sentence perhaps without realizing it at all, simply remember it. These mistakes I don't think any of them were intentional. But these mistakes would naturally come in. But when you think of all these mistakes, and yet no important doctrine ~~is~~ affected. All the changes I know of consist of repetitions of things somewhere that are not in another place. The ideas are not injured in any way. I say if you want to study what God teaches, Here is the KJV. And if you want to spend a couple years learning to thoroughly understand Elizabethan English and then you use this for a source, you've got a source that will not lead you into any error. If some group of people want to make a translation from the textus receptus, I don't object to their doing it. But I do feel that it is more reasonable to go back to the MSS ^{that were} ~~we have~~ written within ^{few} ~~the first two or three~~ hundred years after Christ instead of copying from MSS written 1000 yrs. after Christ. I feel it is more reasonable to be content/having a statement in one Gospel without inserting it in another if we don't find it there in early MSS. And I think that far more important than the difference between the textus receptus and the text as we find it ~~in~~ in the early MSS, is getting the Bible in the language of today so that people today can understand it and not have to guess at the meaning of words simply from context.

Now someone asked me yesterday if I would ~~say~~ say a word about