

Nearly 400 now. A very excellent translation. I don't think there is any better translation today. I think there are points at which the KJV is much clearer the thought than any present translation that I have seen.

But the KJV was translated into a language which nobody today understands. As I see it if you want to study the Bible and don't want to use a modern version you have your choice of two things: You can get the Heb. and Gk. and study them and learn what they say. Or you can take a few years and study Elizabethan English and try to learn exactly what those words meant 400 years ago. That will be a difficult task, but you will have to do that if you understand everything that the KJV says because words do change their meaning.

I was shocked a few years ago when I was asked to speak to a Inter-Varsity group at the U. of PA. They asked me if I could suggest a couple of subjects for the meetings. I mentioned two subjects I thought would be useful. When I mentioned the subjects the young man said, That's terrific! At that time I, like almost everybody who is over 50 today does, though that terrific meant bad. If you find almost anything by anybody over 50 today if he uses the word terrific he is speaking of a terrible catastrophe or something really miserable. But anything today by anybody under 50 means good. I had never heard the word terrific to mean good. When he said my subjects were terrific I thought I'd have to change them for sure.

But that word has changed its meaning completely in this short space of time. That shows the great difficulty of expressing things in human language. expressing things accurately. So a false view of inerrancy is that the Bible is exactly what the KJV says.

Another false view I'll very briefly speak of but in my opinion an utter absurd view is the idea that the NT is the so-called textus receptus. The word was only an advertiser's blurb that was put on a particular edition of the Greek NT that came out about 20 years after KJV was written and which represented with a few changes the translation that Erasmus made when he had only a very few copies of the NT from which to make it. I believe the TR has very little that is erroneous in it. Very little. Personally I am not at all opposed to the TR, but to say this is the Bible that is inerrant is utter nonsense.

If you're going to take such a view, then I say take the view that the majority of the Greek MSS whatever they say ~~is~~ is the text. I would have no objection to anyone taking that view, if he desires. When I was in seminary I remember Dr. Machen and others there were very convinced that the Westcott-Hort edition was about as close as we could get to the original. They were very strongly convinced that a few very oldest MSS that we have gave us the truth. As I heard it I was very skeptical of the view which seemed to me that if Aleph and B, two manuscripts agreed that was the Bible! And if they disagreed then the one which had