

Then I thought further about it and I thought these men are men who have studied the Greek language thoroughly. Many of them have studied literature of various types, and they can take something objectively and they can say that these men back there 2000 years ago had a lot of queer ideas -- this idea that Jesus was god; this idea that the Bible was free from error. This idea that His death on the cross had something to do with out eternal welfare. They had a lot of queer ideas, but we can objectively look at the Greek statements, and gather from them what strange things those people believed, and then we can put into English exactly what those ~~men~~ people believed.

I think that while there are a few places where their prejudices affected them in their NT translation, I believe that in general that is a fair statement about ~~them~~ the RSV of the NT.

But when that came out in 1946 and I was pleasantly surprised with it. Many of my friends were strongly attacking it mainly because of the character of the men who translated it. Mainly because of the attitude they knew of these men from other sources, etc. I felt that compared with trying to teach people to know God's Word in a language nobody speaks today, that it was a tremendous step forward to have it put into language that is intelligible to every body today. Yet, as I looked forward to the fact that before long their OT would come out, I thought, How can they do the same sort of a job with the OT? Can they possibly? They can look at the NT and say, These NT writers had some queer ideas, very strange _____, but we can find out objectively what they thought, and we can put it down.