

God has given us that is the vital thing The original publication of the KJV in 1611 had 37 different points in which there are footnotes which say "other manuscripts read." Cases in which the translators were not sure between two, and perhaps by the vote of a slight majority of the translators they decided to put one in the text and the other in the margin.

I saw in this publication to which I referred a moment ago a statement which I've seen repeated several times so I think it is worth referring to It says of Robert Dick Wilson, the man under whom I studied Old Testament--a great defender of the Word of God. And he says--this man who studied there a little after I did said, I heard Robert Dick Wilson often say, There is no error in the Bible (and in parenthesis: he meant the KJV!)

When I hear that I think of how I often heard Robert Dick Wilson tell how one time after he gave a talk somewhere and he spoke of a certain verse and gave an interpretation quite different from the one that is usually taken. A man came up and said to him afterwards, Oh but how can you take it that way? Look here. He opened his Bible and said, See that colon. It can't possibly mean that with that colon there. And Dr. Wilson explained to him how in the original writings there is no punctuation. And he said, the man looked a little puzzled and then he said, Oh, that's been a very dear colon to me.

The Lord does not want us to put our faith in minutia. These people who I would say are taking this silly, utterly unscientific attitude toward the KJV, they greatly attack what they call the Alexandrian cult. By this they mean those who try to find what the early manuscripts of the NT said. Well, there of course we come into great difficulty. The great bulk of our manuscripts from the first three or four centuries have disappeared. Out of 4000 Greek manuscripts of the NT, comparatively few come from before 400 A.D.

When I was in seminary our professors there were quite convinced of the Westcott and Hort idea. Quite convinced. They were convinced of these principles they laid down. Some of them I thought then were nonsense. Like the one" the shorter version is always the best. That's of course nonsense. The shorter version may be the best because very often things get added in the margin and then inserted. On the other hand if you've ever had someone copy stuff for you, you'll find that sometimes the eye goes down from one line to the next, and they leave something out. It often happens. You have to study the situation.

I'm not sure we can decide what the early versions had. I would say there are two attitudes either of which I would gladly go along with. One would be the attitude: let's go to the early versions and try to figure out what was in the original, and take that. A second is: we've got 4000 manuscripts; let's look at them all and see what the majority reading is, and let's take that. If you take either of these you'll have all sorts of differences of minutia, but you will not I believe find a single difference that affects anything of real importance.