

can immediately recognize that it is the name of God that is being used.

Personally I would incline a little bit toward Jehovah as to my own liking, but it has not caught on particularly well so I think we are probably just as well off just to stick to LORD. However, I think it is very important that it be written in caps so as to distinguish the cases where it represents the divine name from those where it represents the common word Lord.

No. 4: It seems to me that they should definitely be kept, although not too conspicuously. No. 5: This is, of course, a problem. I would think you would have to work into it a bit before you would know what is wise.

No. 6: The same as 5. No. 7: The same is true. No. 8: It probably would seem best to employ quotation marks, although it makes a real problem in some cases to decide where they should be used. The Revised Standard Version has certainly done wrong in Matthew 1 in putting them around part of what the angel said and leaving them off from the angel's quotation of Isaiah which the context shows clearly to be a part of the angel's remarks and not an insertion by the author. No. 9: The question is not worded quite accurately. The term Elijah is not used not only in the Old Testament, but also in a portion of the New Testament. It would seem that when the King James version was prepared, the translators of a certain section of the New Testament insisted on using the Greek forms of Old Testament names while the translators of another section of the New Testament used the forms found in the Old Testament. It would impress me as much wiser to use the Old Testament forms throughout, but this can well be considered at length by the committee. No. 10: It would seem to me that it would be very wise as far as the general acceptance of such a work is concerned to stick to the Hebrew text as it lay at the back of the King James Version. I would recommend not amending the text on the basis of ancient versions except where the evidence would be absolutely overwhelming. As, for instance, I would say in Psalm 22 where it says, "They pierced my hands and my feet". In a case like this a footnote in the margin might be desirable. It probably would be good to follow the interpretation of the King James Version, but where there is substantial evidence to the contrary, to make a footnote, making changes in interpretation only where absolutely necessary.

No. 11: Is not No. 11 the same as No. 3? I am a little uncertain about this. No. 12: It would seem to me that the word would fail of its purpose altogether if the pronouns thou, thee and thine were kept anywhere. I feel personally very strongly on this and shall be extremely disappointed if it is not done. I know that doing it will meet a good bit of prejudice, but I think this is an utterly unreasonable prejudice and it is worth meeting now, and far better than having very definite and important disadvantages later on.

No. 13: As to No. 13, it seems to me that is covered in No. 1, although it is a matter on which it will be necessary to experiment a bit as you go along. No. 14: This is probably wise. No. 15: This seems to me unwise. No. 16: It seems to me this has already been covered. I would say yes. No. 17: I think your suggestion of a distinction between "brothers" and "brethren" is probably a good one since "brethren" is still used in church services to some extent in this meaning, although in general I would think that if "brothers" could be used altogether it might be better. No. 18: Probably "to" is modern English rather than "unto". No. 19: As in all other matters, I think good modern usage ought to be followed.

No. 20: I think it is very important that the word "no" be retained when it is a literal translation of the Hebrew, thus retaining the exact figure which the Hebrew has, and not giving false ideas as in the Revised Standard Version where it says, "How can this be when I do not have a husband?" No. 21 (or 22): This is surely simply a question of what is good modern usage. It doesn't seem to me that "on this wise" or "privily" are good modern usage so I shouldn't think there would be any question about this. No. 23: That is a matter of study of present usage. I would have to look at some