

want evidence on that particular subject. ~~Q+~~ (Q) No, I wouldn't say so, I would say if the K.J. said Old and you ~~did~~ didn't know what old is , I would rather look in Webster rather than in the Amplified, ~~because~~ because when the ~~X~~ K.J. says that Jesus is going to come having salvation and the RSV says triumphant and the Amplified just ~~x~~ says having salvation, triumphant it doesn't give~~x~~ you any help at all. I would prefer a dictionary myself.

(Q) In many cases like that ~~we~~ where the Amplified has in parenthesis something like that that enlarges a phase of the idea that might not be obvious to us, and that is helpful, but the trouble is that along with it it has modernistic~~x~~ interpretations and how's the ~~ordn~~ ordinary Bible student going to distinguish between them. (Q) B. Graham strongly recommend the ~~Lansdale~~ ^{Samuel} translation too, if I remember correctly , and the RSV. He is too busy to read these so he just recommends them. (Q) I mentioned that the ~~Williams~~ ^{Waymouth} is a Bible-believing ~~transaltio~~ translation that ~~xxx~~ makes an endeavor to put into modern English and is good in places and not so good in others. I think they are honest mistakes . It does translate saying young woman instead of virgin. Now, I don't think it ~~xxx~~ is like the case of the RSV, intentionally bringing misinterpretation in. I think it is probably a mistake rather than an intentional thing, because I don't find other similar things. But ~~there~~ - there is generally enough of that personally I like the Berkely better rather than the ~~Williams~~ ^{Waymouth}. But I wouldn't ~~x pt~~ put the Williams aside as an ~~unheld~~ unholy one at all. I would say it would be definitely ~~x~~ helpful. (Q) Yes, it's much better if you want to find their beliefs. It brings out the ideas much more, but ~~x~~ there are many cases where it is not at all accurate. (Q) ~~Not,~~ No, I wouldn't quite say that.