

probably was just referred to as the 'man of sin.' Rome, after all, checked the Jews of the earlier period of the church from doing their worst." This note is very hard to make sense of in the context, especially as the next verse continues: "Then shall the lawless one be revealed" and most interpreters think the lawless one who is going to be revealed after the one who indeed is taken out of the way is the same one earlier referred to as the man of sin, ^{who} Verse 3 says must be revealed. This again is an example of an unfortunate note ~~but~~ the number of them is not great.

The attempt is made in the book to give dates to everything. Sometimes they are good, it seems a bit uncertain to suggest a date like 13673 for the origin of man. Most careful students of the O. T. believe that the O. T. does not give a date by which we can know when man was created. It could have been any time between 100,000 B. C. and 10,000 B. C. as far as the Biblical evidence goes.

d.3 (1)

The translation of ancient weights and measures is always difficult. The translator is tempted to put them into modern terms. Perhaps this is a temptation which would be best avoided because modern values, particularly in our days of inflation, tend to change and thus easily can lead to absurdity. We read in 2 Kings 6:25 such a severe famine resulted from their that a donkey's head brought \$50 in silver and of dove's leaving brought \$3 in silver. Insertion of dollars into the text makes it easier for people to understand but raises the danger that they may misunderstand particularly as our values change.

This is, though it may not be a version to replace the King James but it is a notable step in the direction of securing such a version. May there be many fine efforts in days to come. There will have to be if eventually we are to secure a version as good for our day as the King James was for its day. If we do succeed in securing such a version