

should not be twisted or changed into something different. However, a word is not a point. It is an area. There is always a certain possible area of interpretation. Just where within the area the meaning is in the particular passage must be decided in the light of the context.

Sometimes it is found that there is an ambiguity and it is impossible to tell exactly what is meant between two possibilities. Occasionally this ambiguity can be carried over exactly in a translation so that the person reading it in his own language has exactly the same problem to decide between two possibilities as was had by the translators. Usually, however, where the one language is ambiguous the other permits a precise definition and vice versa. There may be two possible senses to a Hebrew phrase. There may be an English phrase which will properly interpret one of these and another English phrase which will interpret the other. Each of these two <sup>English</sup> phrases may have another interpretation which would be entirely foreign to the Hebrew phrase. In such a case, it is necessary to decide in the light of the context which phrase to give and sometimes there is no escape from putting the other phrase in a footnote as another possibility.

In the case of the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament we are much surprised to find that as far as ~~theology~~ translation is concerned, to find that the translation has been affected by a theology and that this theology is the exact opposite of the theology taught in the New Testament. At point after point there is a translation, a reasonable and proper translation of an Old Testament word which would exactly fit with the use which is made with a passage in the New Testament, or with the events which happen in the N.T. which event the N.T. writers tell us were fulfilling