

beginning of Saul's reign it says ~~ix~~ he was a son of years and then it gives no number, and then that he reigned years, and no number is given. The KJV translated this "he says (copy what the KJ° says)

The sentence as quoted does not make much sense. It would be will be interesting to see what the new American Standard or the Berkeley (sp?) or some other recent ~~v~~ versions~~l~~ does with it. Please check.

It is easy to see that what happened was that at a very early time a small section of the page got was torn off which took both statements of numbers. We do not know how old Saul was when he became king and we do not know how many years he reigned. In v. (reference?) [here insert the account of Samuel's oldest son]

~~These~~

These are a few of the comparatively very few instances that can be given where there is absolute proof that an error took ~~place~~ place in transmission of the text. Thus we see that these are a few of the comparatively small number of evidences of absolutely unmistakable evidences that could be given that God has not chosen to give us the Bible so we can be absolutely sure of everything as it was originally written.

A few years ago I received a letter ~~from~~ from a man who was ~~in~~ doing Chn° work with students in a great /university. ~~He~~ He said that the issue of a ~~picture~~ picture magazine that had come out just before had made such an impact on the students there that it would be years before any of them would be willing to listen again to any presentation of anything from the Bible. I had already seen this article. Actually the article was a discussion of recent textual criticism of