

original but defies translation it is often good to make up a new word by transliterating the original, or if a word in the original expresses an idea which is not clear at all, but yet you have a unity among your references, it perhaps is good to ..(6).. so they argue, by not translating but transliterating. I am not at all sure how wise it is at this time after we've had an English Bible for 300 years to introduce new transliteration just like the introduction to the new technical term like pit with a capital P. It seems to me that that is a revolutionary act in the Bible to introduce Pit with a capital P. Before one does it, he ought to have a discussion of it to give warning. It wouldn't be revolutionary perhaps with the very first translation made. Yes?

Student... Yes, the idea of pit with a capital P to the liberals is nothing new. To them it is a part of Old Mythology. But it's not a part of Bible tradition as known to the English-speaking world. It is developed in their liberal traditions and it might be interesting to study back into it more and see who started that tradition and what evidence he gave for it.

Student.... The King James? You always translate the same Hebrew term, pit with a capital P, it means there's a technical Hebrew term which we are not transliterating like they do sheol but translating in a certain technical way. But if they take some uses from one term and some uses from another term and translate it pit with a capital P it means there is a concept, a Pit with a capital P. A concept which is expressed in different ways than the Hebrew. Well now, if that's so obvious why it ought to be obvious to the translators of the King James version or to the translators of some of our earlier versions, like that. It shouldn't be a thing that is just - it should be a thing which such a thing may be discovered but first, before he introduces it into a translation it would seem to have an obligation to give proof, that such a