

Then toward the end of the hour we looked at a book that was presented 25 years ago with tremendous acclaim --- the New Revised Standard Version which its authors thought would replace the KJV. And I would not be surprised that in a great many churches it has replaced the KJV. I doubt if in many of the church ~~from~~<sup>with</sup> which the people here are connected, the RSV is the text that is used. But I would not be surprised if there were more churches today, or a larger number of people attending churches that for public reading are using the RSV than are using any other particular version. So it is certainly important that we be aware of that. I would not try to lead someone away from one of those churches on the ground of the errors of the RSV; there are far greater and more important grounds. It is far better for one to read the RSV than for him not to read the Bible at all. The RSV New Testament is on the whole quite a good translation. These men, not perhaps believing anything that the NT writers believed, thinking it was a lot of mythology, nevertheless had a book in which there was clearly stated what those queer people of 2000 years ago believed. And they have succeeded in putting that into pretty good English. Rather than spending a lot of time arguing with somebody who is approaching Christianity as to whether he should use the RSV ~~or~~ I would encourage him to read it, study it, and he can get from it the way of salvation. But when you take the RSV NT and put it together with the RSV OT and call the whole thing a Holy Bible, that is a misnomer! Because the RSV NT repeatedly says that certain things happened because it was predicted in the OT and then you turn to the RSV OT and you find an entirely different statement. And you