

that prediction has fulfilled its purpose except as we see from the fulfillment another evidence that God actually spoke. But where it is a statement of a principle or of a fact it will continue until it has completely fulfilled its purpose. God said His Word will not return to him void but will accomplish that to which it is sent.

So when Jesus said not a jot or tittle would disappear from the Law till all was fulfilled, He meant any jot or tittle which affects the meaning in a deleterious way by its omission. I think that is clear what he meant by that statement. Whatever you can legitimately draw from the statements of Scripture that is dependable and true, not that no errors will ever come in. I believe it is good that we get a clear understanding on this.

You take most any sentence and you can interpret it in various ways, but we are to compare Scripture with Scripture. We are to examine passages in context, we are to get the ideas that are there. The ideas that can legitimately be drawn from the Scripture is an idea which is without error. I like this word inerrant myself better than the word inspired, because inspired (the word) has many meanings, it is a positive word and is easy to lead to this idea that you can just squeeze the verse and get more and more meaning out of it. Inerrant means without error. It is a negative word. It means the idea you get is absolutely ~~xxxxx~~ can be trusted and depended upon.

Now for those who feel that it is a matter of the exact words having been ~~xxx~~ preserved absolutely this way and that every word and every letter is equally important, I believe that it is good for us to be aware of the fact there is no question that in the preservation of the Hebrew Bible there are certain definite errors. I am not speaking of comparison of MSS and finding errors in one MS because there are certain things we find in all MSS that were definite errors. Not many of them but enough to show us that we have to compare Scripture with Scripture. There are enough to make that clear.

One of these is where we read that Saul was a year old when he became king and he reigned two years, in Jerusalem. That is a very definite statement in 1 Samuel. The translators of the KJV got around it very nicely. They said Saul reigned one year and when he had reigned two years in Jerusalem he went on to do such and such. Of course there is no "when" in the original, and the word they translated as "reigned" is quite generally used to mean the beginning of one's reign, but the proof is found when we find that in about a dozen cases the exact same formula is used about another king. Saul is of course the first of the kings.

Literally it says, Saul was a son of years years so many in his reign when he became king, and he reigned so many years in Jerusalem. This figure (expression) is used of many kings at least 8 or 10 or a 12. I looked them all up once but don't have them right at hand, but there is a very sizeable number using exactly this same phrase. So there's no question that that is the correct translation of it as it stands.