

“Scofield Slip-Ups”
2 Corinthians 2:17

1. Notice a suggestion found on page 1325 under letter “o” concerning I John 5:7. “It is generally agreed that v. 7 has no real authority, and has been inserted.”
2. Look at what Scofield desired to omit on page 1325 under letter “q” concerning I John 5:8. “Omit ‘*in earth.*” Why does Scofield continuously say omit such as found on page 1336 under letter “e” concerning Revelation 6:1? “*Come!* Omit ‘and see.’ So vs. 3, 5, 7.” Does not the Bible warn about omissions (Revelation 22:19)? What about page 1216 under letter “d” concerning I Corinthians 5:5? “Some ancient authorities omit *Jesus.*” Why would Scofield suggest taking out “Lord Jesus”?
3. Is Scofield implying that we should omit Mark 11:26 as found on page 1061 under letter “i” concerning Mark 11:26? “Mt. 6:12, *note* Verse 26 is omitted from the best MSS.”
4. Which manuscript does Scofield deem better than the Textus Receptus? Notice his comment on page 1057 under letter “u” concerning Mark 9:29. “1 Ki. 18:42-45; Acts 13:2. The two best MSS. Omit ‘and fasting.’ Cf. Mt. 17:21.”
5. Could the two best manuscripts be the “Sinaitic” and “Vatican” that Scofield refers to in Mark 16:9? Is this why he made reference to them on page 1069 under number “1” concerning Mark 16:9? “**(16:9)** The passage from verse 9 to the end is not found in the two most ancient manuscripts, the Sinaitic and Vatican, and others have it with partial omissions and variations. But it is quoted by Irenaeus and Hippolytus in the second or third century.”
6. Does Scofield believe that the better version is the Revised Version? Notice the note found on page 1173 under letter “y” concerning Acts 17:26. “‘blood’ is not in the best manuscripts. R.V. omits.”
7. Could the Revised Version render the best translation as suggested by Scofield on page 1175 under number “1” concerning Acts 19:2? “**(19:2)** Not as in A.V., ‘since ye believed,’ but as in R.V. and *margin*: ‘Did ye receive the Holy Spirit when ye believed?’ Paul was evidently...”
8. Is this why Scofield attacked the A.V. on page 1212 under number “2” concerning I Corinthians 1:8? “The expression, ‘day of Christ,’ occurs in the following passages: 1 Cor. 1. 8; 5. 5; 2 Cor. 1. 14; Phil. 1. 6, 10; 2. 16. A.V. has ‘day of Christ,’ 2 Thes. 2. 2, incorrectly, for ‘day of the LORD’ (Isa. 2. 12; Rev. 19. 11-21). The ‘day of Christ’ relates wholly to the reward and blessing of saints at His coming, as ‘day of the LORD’ is connected with judgment.”

9. Since Scofield believes that, the Revised Version has the better rendering, could this be why the Scofield text is changed in four places from the King James Bible. Let us compare the Scofield text with the Cambridge text, which was left alone. The Cambridge University Press is documented as the oldest printers/publishers in the world. They began in 1591 with the Geneva Bible, which came to America with the Pilgrims. Cambridge University Press printed the King James Bible, which is still in print today and can be purchased from them.

<u>Verse</u>	<u>Cambridge</u>	<u>Scofield</u>
Jeremiah 34:16	“whom ye”	“whom he”
II Chronicles 33:19	“all his sin”	“all his sins”
Nahum 3:16	“flieth away”	“fleeth away”
Matthew 26:39	“further”	“farther”

Conclusion: It is important for us not to pick apart all of Scofield’s notes. We must consider that he may have made these writings during a difficult time in his life. Therefore, he could have written some things that later he regretted. Certainly, we must remember that he was going through a divorce and second marriage during his writing. This could have made a dramatic influence on his writings. The important thing for us to do is to look over a few little errors and glean what we can (Job 14:4). Surely, since other great men use this Bible, it makes it acceptable for us to use it (II Corinthians 10:12).