

identical with the King James Version, but in which the archaic words have been replaced with words that are understandable to the average person today, would be the correct procedure. If, as a third possibility, you should find that the results are so much less than those of forty years ago as to lead you to think it probable that the average man with no biblical background, on picking up the Bible and beginning to read at random, would find the language so strange to him that he would have little urge to read further, you might then safely conclude that the time has come when it is necessary to give very careful consideration to the possibility of substitution of a version in the language of today.

As a member of the Committee on Revision of the Scofield Bible, which met in Chicago twice a year from 1954 to 1960, I presented at the very first meeting of the Committee the desirability of changing those words which had become quite archaic, or which had completely changed their meaning. As a result, the Committee, while leaving the syntax of the King James Version intact, and practically never making any change in word order or in sentence structure, altered about an average of one word per page, showing the reading of the KJV in the margin. This New Scofield Reference Bible, which is to be published by the Oxford University Press on April 13, contains a minimum number of changes in the language of the King James Version, trying, as it does, to maintain the identical meaning of the original version, but to replace words which have become completely archaic with words that will give the same meaning in modern English. It is a comparatively slight step, and yet it adds tremendously to the readability of the text.

If the third alternative should seem to you to be necessary, you do indeed face a difficult problem, since today so many biblical scholars have been infected with rationalism and disbelief in the Word of God. I enclose a copy of my tract on the Revised Standard Version. In it I deal particularly with the Old Testament. I have confined myself to instances where it seems to me to be easy to demonstrate the fact that a strong prejudice against belief in the possibility that God might predict details of the life of Christ hundreds of years in advance led the translators of the RSV to produce renderings that go contrary to all the evidence. This was indeed unfortunate, since they managed to retain a large amount of the splendid literary quality of the King James Version. I do not feel nearly so bad about their New Testament as I