

is true. I would go so far as to say that just about any translation that was even half-way honestly made will show you the way of salvation because it is so clear in Scripture that it would be pretty hard to make a translation and not still have the way of salvation showing pretty clearly in your translation.

The RSV of the NT was made by excellent scholars who very carefully studied in order to get the ideas they found into their translation. As far as I know there is no dishonesty in their translation of the NT. They looked at the Greek text, and I believe most of the members of that committee thought it was a lot of foolishness--these ideas! The deity of Christ etc. They thought it was a lot of foolishness but they believed they could see what those books said in the Greek and they translated it. So you can not only get the way of salvation from the RSV--NT, you can get from it a greater part of the truth in Scripture you can get there.

One very interesting evidence of this is found in Titus 2:13 "Of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (KJV). When I wrote the review of the RSV I pointed out that in that case they made the deity of Christ clearer than the KJV, because KJV says "of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." One of my colleagues at that time said (a person of whom I have had great regard) rebuked me for saying that. He was against the RSV root and branch. He said that may refer to two individuals rather than referring specifically to Christ. I don't know just what his argument was. I personally felt the RSV had given a translation which brought out the deity of Christ more clearly than the KJV did.

I just looked at the RSV, the NEB which is much more modernistic than the RSV, and also the NIV, and the NASB, and every one of these recent translations renders it "of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." It is a proper translation of the Greek which brings out the deity of Christ. RSV and NEB both render it--that particular verse in such a way as to bring out the deity of Christ more clearly than the KJV.

When the RSV first came out to me it was such an improvement over the antiquated language of the KJV that I --that my first feeling was we should accept this NT. It is a good translation. It is beautiful English, and I put that over against those who said it does away with the deity of Christ. I put that verse against those who said it does away with the deity of Christ. They put in a couple of footnotes that did, but they were so clearly false that they dropped them in a later edition of it. But the text was an honest text of trying to get what those people said, actually said, even though I don't believe one of those translators believed it himself.

But then as time went on and we began to hear that the OT RSV was coming out, I began to think I had probably been unwise in that attitude toward the RSV--NT because I said to myself, Those scholars could look at that Greek and they could say, This is what those people believed; we will write down what they believed. But I don't believe those modernists could possibly believe that the OT writers could actually predict the coming of Christ centuries later. It was just beyond the possibility for these modernists to believe such a thing.