

to reach a conclusion as to the meaning of the whole. There is no other possible translation. That is why I wrote a little pamphlet some years ago which the ACCC has distributed a good many thousand copies of, in which I showed that it is wrong to call it a Holy Bible when it unites a NT which quotes the OT as saying certain things with an OT in which very different things are stated in the points to which they refer in the NT. So in examining any translation, we have to ask ourselves, Is this translation ~~XX~~ made by people who were antagonistic to Christianity or is it made by people who recognize the unity of the Bible? We also, of course have to ask, Is it made by people who have the sufficient background and the sufficient knowledge of the facts to give us a translation that is near to the original. Then what is still more difficult we have to ask, Do they have the literary knowledge to put it in words which will convey impact? Of course that's the great thing about the BJV. The KJV does not represent the great scholarship of these men who produced it. They were good scholars - no question about that, and they were Bible-believing Christians, but those men had a dozen translations of the Bible made in ^{the} ~~X~~ previous hundred years. A dozens different translations in which a man could try to find an English word to express this idea, and another man would find a different expression, and another would find a different. And in about nine-tenths of the cases they picked the best one; and in about one-tenth of the cases they picked the worst one! Like where they said, Charity suffereth long and is kind. Most of the earlier English Bibles translated the Greek correctly: Love sufferent long and is kind. There are a few very very bad things like that in the KJV. But on the whole it is a wonderful translation.