

a long book and have a long list you all know when keeping our straight but we have perhaps as well, we have one of the best systems of writing that has ever been devised, the only way I can think of anything better would be to have 12 instead of 10 be the unit. That of course would be much better. But we have become accustomed to the 10. In the last few centuries we systems(?) of writing, but up to that time the Roman numerals were used. Imagine writing MCXL and multiplying it by XXIX. Imagine trying to do that! Well the Babylonians had a worse system, and yet the Babylonians worked out some of the most difficult problems of higher math using a very cumbersome system. But I suppose there were very few of ~~xxxx~~ us who could do that sort of thing. It is always possible with numbers and with names to ? ?

To point to numbers particularly and say this proves that the Bible is not inerrant simply shows one's ignorance of the fact that we do not have the original manuscript. Inspiration applies to the original manuscripts. There is always the slight possibility of an error of transmission. If we recognize that fact most of the alleged difficulties of some of the difficulties some people talk about a great deal disappear almost immediately. In any verse there is the possibility of an error in copying. The possibility is very slight. There are people who try to make us believe that the particular MSS that the KJV had at their disposal were absolutely accurate. They differed from each other many many times. ? ? But there are always errors in copying, and the most remarkable thing is that our VSS are very very similar --- our MSS to the ? but they are not identical. It is among those who are trying to hold that we must follow the MSS the KJV followed, there is a tendency to talk about Westcott and Hort and try to show that at some points W & H were not altogether orthodox, and say, We should follow the KJV rather than the text of W & H. I don't know anybody today that follows W & H. But W & H worked out some principles, some of which were good, and at some points I think they were in error. I think they worked a work that was very valuable. But Dr. Hort, whom these people like to speak so slightingly of, said, that there is not one word in 1000 of which we have reason to have any doubt as to the exact meaning of a word. In other words, we are very very close to the original but we do not have the original. I think God must have wished it that way. He must have or it would not be that way. But God wished it that way, because we are not to think we can take a verse and squeeze it and think we can get a great deal out of one verse alone. By inerrancy we mean that the vv. in the original were free from error. As you look at any verse where the possibility of an error may have crept in, if there is not evidence of variation of MSS, it is very very slight. So we can trust the Bible when we compare Scripture with Scripture. Take one verse by itself we are apt to get into confusion. I believe that most of your isms and cults, in fact some of our differences in our great denominations, result from putting too much stress on one or two verses instead of taking Scripture as a whole and seeing what is there.

One problem they make a great deal of when they speak of