

Personally, I just as soon take another year or two at it , because it is a tremendous job. (Q) Yes, I'm very glad you mentioned that, because it is --I'd hoped there would be a question on that, in fact , I had thought of putting a section on it, but I got a letter from someone in ~~Califon~~ California just about two months ago asking about information about that , and I don't know how much you hear about it. But about two years ago , or was it three or four years, fairly recently , there came out this translation of the Bible by ^{Sansa} ~~Lansdale~~, claimed to be from the original Aramaic, in which he said the Greek was translated and it was in the front about the great abilities of this man for translating, etc. And they got some names of some prominent churchmen who said this was the most wonderful translation. I mentioned it to the head of the Bible Department of the Oxford press , and he said , Well, these men that would recommend this, some of them would recommend anything that comes out . But , I looked into it very carefully. I was asked to review it for the Sunday School Times, and I made quite a thorough investigation of it, and I would say this, that ~~ix~~ in the first place the Bible was not originally written in ~~Aramaic~~ Aramaic, the Old Testament ^{all but} for a few chapters was in Hebrew, the N.T. was all in Greek, and the Aramaic that this man knows is the present day Aramaic, a dialect spoken in one very small section of the Near East and very different~~x~~ from ancient Aramaic, and the Aramaic in the points where he's changed from the K.J. Version, and in some of them I tested the Aramaic and examined the copies of the original manuscripts, and found that there is nothing in them to warrant the translation that he ~~x~~ has made . I ~~den~~ do not think he has any proper training or ability for any such translation, I can see no evidence that he has done anything except go through the King James and