

heard it over and over. Also I'm sure they compared the RSV and other versions from time to time. So whether you can really say this is simply a revision and really say that is really a new translation, may be questioned. But I can say this that the translators of the NIV do not deserve the criticism that Christ gave to those disciples when he said, "O foolish men and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken." They do not deserve that criticism because every effort was made to have the more than 100 scholars who participated in making the NIV be men who thoroughly believe that the entire Bible is inspired from God and free from error.

While on the other hand, the committees that made the Old and New Testaments of the RSV, was made up of fine scholars excellent students, men prominent in different universities in different parts of this country, but I am not at all sure that there was one in the entire number who believed that the prophets actually predicted Jesus Christ!

When the RSV of the NT came out in 1946, I was pleasantly surprised. I did not find much that I considered to be erroneous or harmful in the NT when it first came out. I found very little. In fact, I found one or two things that I thought brought out the clear teaching of the deity of Christ a little more clearly than the KJV did. And I said, Isn't it amazing, that most of these men whom I have every reason to believe do not believe that Jesus Christ was actually God, and do not think that He actually died for the sins of humanity, and do not think the Bible is free from error, that they can give us a NT which brings out all of these great doctrines very clearly!