

illustrations. No. 26: I would have to see some illustrations. No. 27: Probably this is correct. No. 28: "Diver's" is completely obsolete. No. 29: These expressions are certainly obsolete. No. 30: Probably yes. No. 31: I would think it best to use American spelling in most of such cases. No. 32: This question needs to be decided in each case and might entail some research. No. 33: It would seem to me that it would be best to follow the usage of the King James whatever it was, making a footnote wherever necessary. I think it very important this is also done wherever matters as between denominations are involved. No. 34: The question of what to do about textual evidence in the New Testament is somewhat difficult. I would incline to think that it might be most useful for this book to simply have it be the King James Version keeping the text of the King James but putting notes at the bottom where the best evidences differ. My impression is that critical views as to which manuscripts are the best manuscripts change considerably over the period of a few years and I am rather hesitant about making too sweeping statements on this regard. However here I am a bit out of my field and do not feel too much weight should be attached to my ideas. No. 35: Footnotes should certainly not be present in too great quantity but some of them are surely necessary. It might be that in some cases notes in the back would be better than footnotes. No. 36: This is a matter for the Greek department. Probably "sanctify" is best. It is well established in usage it seems to me, and not at all obsolete. No. 37: It seems to me that the Old English usage has greatly changed by the present day.

It would impress me that it would be very wise to make a great deal of study in connection with this work of the Oxford Dictionary to see just how these words were used in the past and to try to get in the present version the idea which the King James translators had in mind, simply changing the words to give in modern English the idea that they thought was right. I do not think that a really new translation is particularly desirable just at the present moment.

I have rushed through these rather rapidly giving you my judgments of them. I fear, now that I think of it, that it sounds a little too much as if I were trying to give the last word on these things. Consequently I think it is probably best if you don't read my letter to the committee but simply read my opinion on any particular point where you think there is advantage in doing so. The committee should certainly decide these matters. I am not suggesting at all that they take my ideas on them. I am only saying that on some of the vital matters I fear that if a different line is taken, the product will not be the sort of thing I have been hoping for.

I am very happy to learn that the Oxford Press is definitely interested. If a work could be published which would secure the approbation of the true Christians, regardless of denominational background, it would be a very great contribution. My fear is that changes will be made which are not demonstrably simply putting the King James into modern language and that this will break up the possible constituency.

It seems to me that before we have a really first class new translation that it is desirable to have new commentaries and discussions of the various points. New translations are good, but I don't think a really new translation at present can expect to get a wide acceptance.

My personal impression is that the Revised Standard Version has done a very good job of the New Testament. They have kept a great deal of the beauty of the language of the King James. It would be unfortunate if in trying to be different from the Revised Standard Version you were to miss a great deal of the beauty of the King James. Probably the result will be that: