practices that show up in NEB I don't think would be characteristic of contemporary scholarship at all! In that sense-- not in its translation technique, - but particularly in the practice of textual criticism, it is kind of a monument to a generation already past.

Aldrich: I don't use it regularly but I like to use it because $\dot{\mathbf{x}}$ of the style. To me it has the English suave-que(?) that American translations (?) / . . .

Dillard: literature, it is very definitely that.

Aldrich: - but not great theology, itself?

Aldrich: Whatsoever that meaneth! . . . How about the RC Jerusalem Bible? How would you evaluatewak that? That's the most popular RC version now.

Dillard: I don't know if that's accurate or not, but the Jerusalem Bible in English is a translation of the French Bible of the 1950's, and it does suffer from double dip. It suffers a little from text critical problems as well. In terms of contemporary RC translations the far more readable than the Jerusalem Bible and it is a direct translation, is the New American Bible.

Aldrich: You like that?

Dillard: Yes, I do. It's outstanding.

Aldrich: You think it's theological fairly acceptable too?

Dilaard: Well, in the large. No man has been able to do the labor of translating without recourse to his theological understanding. We are kidding ourselves to think otherwise.

Aldrich: But you think that has less error than for instance the RSV, or NEB.

Dillard: I'd would hesitate (?) to qualify it that way, I think.

Aldrich: What would you say Doctor?

MacRae: I would incline to think so, yes.