

We can't be that sure. Something later may be a better copy than one of these. The Westcott and Hort extreme attitude is not followed by any scholar I know of today. So it is foolish to attack W & H on this basis. They had some good ideas, but they went to an extreme. The important thing is to recognize that any group of MSS, any sizeable group, will not introduce what is the wrong thing. It will not. The important thing is to get it out, not to get the exact words because you won't have the original even then!

The Hebrew as it satands stands says Saul was king -- was one year old when he became king and he reigned two years in Jerusalem. That's what the original says. The KJV translates it that Saul became king one year and two years he reigned in Jerusalem and then he did so and so. But the transtion I gave you follows exactly the pattern that is used in at least seven or eight other cases in speaking of other kings. Those exact words only differ different numbers.

We don't know how long Saul reigned. We don't know how old he was when he became king. Those figures are lost and we might as well recognize the fact. I don't think they affect us at all as to our faith . . . I think God allows little things to come in on matters that are not important so that we will put our stress on the ideas that are clearly taught in Scripture rather than on _____

Question: Have there been changes in the KJV since it was originally printed? Some people have the idea there is only one KJV.

There were two printings of it the first year it came out. They differed in about 200 places. Which is the accurate KJV? Then a few years later they were both revised and another one was gotten out. The differences were very minor, but there are differences and this is important: The original KJV in about 15 cases has footnotes in the NT saying "other MSS read," showing that they recognized the fact that where MSS differ we cannot be sure which one is right so long as it doesn't contradict other passages of Scripture.

Question: (unclear somewhat) I understand there was quite an uproar in England with the KJV when it replaced the Geneva Bible. Also there was the charge that the king tampered and that the translators to some degree compromised in translating the KJV to some degree. Would you address yourself to that?

I would say in some ways it was a little sloppy. That is to say they had a small committee dealing with one part of Scripture and a small committee dealing with another part, like you find Elias in the Gospels and Elijah in the book of James. How is the average Christian to know they are the same person? They should have been consistent one way or the other. There are little differences like that. There was very little opportunity of the type we have today. --- There were many who did believe the truth and did not follow it but attacks on the Christian religion such as we have they didn't have.