

committees, and one senior editorial committee. I was on the senior editorial committee. I remember the first day we got into that. There was Dr. Palmer and Dr. Gaebelien, and several others. They were going over the book of Deuteronomy. It spoke about the land the different groups received. And they were translating it "their heritage." I said but shouldn't it be "inherritance?" Isn't heritage a cultural thing? The land they get and pass on wouldn't that be "inherritance"? Oh no, they all said. It is heritage!

Well, they were so unanimous with it that I did not say anything more right then. But I felt surely they were wrong. And so after a little. I went over, and they had two or three big dictionaries. I got hold of one of these big dictionaries and looked into it and found it gave the first meaning land, or property that one inherits. The second -- no, the first meaning was cultural inherritance. Then it gave a second meaning-- land property that you inherit, and then it said archaic. Then I think there was a third. It was a dictionary which they thought very highly of and I interrupted. I hated to ask them to go back. But I interrupted and said, See here what I found in this dictionary. They looked in it and saw it said archaic. One said, Well, let's look at this dictionary. He pulls out another big dictionary and it did not even give that meaning at all which this one said was archaic. ((Check over this paragraph to see if it correctly gives the meaning it is supposed to express re "inherritance"))

It was sort of baffling to me that with little groups like that they seemed ready to say No right away to whatever opinion I would give. And

Neher: They switched it to inherritance then from then on?

They switched it from then on it was inherritance. They never used heritage again for that. They made the switch completely, immediately. But it did not as far as I could see increase my influence on any later point!

That same winter I was in Chicago with a group. There were two comparatively young men who teach at Dallas Seminary. They sat on the other side of the table, and I was here and I forget there were 2 or 3 others. It seemed like whatever I would propose they would say, No, no. Turned it down immediately. It did not seem the fact I proposed it even made it worth thinking about! I got kind of frustrated. So after a little. When they would take up a verse I would not say anything. Then they would consider different possibilities. They had a system I had found out the previous summer. There was one fellow there who had been on an intermediate committee on the first 12 chs. of Deuteronomy. They went through those chs. and everywhere that he had a particular idea, he'd say, "I want this put in the margin." He'd say, It only takes one vote to put a thing in the margin. That is each committee makes up its thing and then it's passed to the next committee.