

with a certain amount of adherence to traditional phraseology, and gives comparatively little evidence for its interpretations, often making changes in the Hebrew without a footnote whatever. One is far better off with a commentary or an out and out modernistic version than with a mixed version such as this one.

The New Testament, as we have noticed above, is quite different. It follows the original in the main, ~~w~~ quite closely. Occasionally, theological presuppositions of the writers lead them to translate in a certain way when then if they had had different theological presuppositions they would have translated them a different way. But, in the main, the New Testament seems to have been objectively~~written~~ rendered. It can be far more helpful for interpretation than the version of the Old Testament can ever be. Occasionally the ideas of the writers lead them into doing rather sly things, so it seems. For instance, the word "propitiation" has been the regular translation of a certain Greek word, stressing clearly that God, Who is angry ~~with~~^{at} sin must be propitiate, this is the teaching clearly taught in the Bible, and believed by the historic Christian Church through the ages. However, it is a teaching that is distasteful to modernists, andⁱⁿ/this version, the word "propitiation" is replaced by "expiation".