

consequently, they like to render it "beginning," thus considering all the activities of the God-man during His first advent as a beginning. This is a possible interpretation of the word, but impresses us as being less likely.

The English word "generation" does not really convey either of these two ideas in any adequate way. I feel that a very definite improvement was made by substituting "genealogy" in the New Scofield Reference Bible.

It is unfortunate that people should attack the Revised Standard Version for the good things that it did. If it were as good on the whole as it is in this particular feature, we could rejoice in using it. Unfortunately, it has certain very severe blemishes which, to my mind, make it unsuitable for evangelical Christians.

I wonder whether you have seen my little tract on the Revised Standard Version. It deals almost entirely with the treatment of the Messianic passages in the Old Testament. Time and again the New Testament quotes an Old Testament statement as having been fulfilled in connection with Christ and there is a footnote referring to the Old Testament passage. Then when the Old Testament is examined it is found that the translation there is quite different from the New Testament quotation. I carefully examined a number of these cases in my pamphlet, and gave evidence to show that the natural interpretation of the words exactly fits the Messianic interpretation, and that the editors of the RSV have in many instances given a rendering that has no factual evidence in its favor. This, to my mind, is the greatest flaw in the RSV. Unfortunately, some people are ready to oppose almost any departure from the King James Version on extremely minor points, including matters on which the RSV contains a translation that actually can give the reader of today a much clearer idea of what the Hebrew or Greek means.

I expected that our New Scofield would receive many such criticisms, and have been surprised at the small number that came.