

to keep to the King James ideas though altering getting rid of archaisms and  
 correspondence  
 using present-day English. One or two correspondents that I have made with them  
 make me fear that in some places the idea is being changed to conform to present  
 ideas where I think these ideas are erroneous. However, I have not seen more  
 than a comparatively small part of this work and so am not able to judge. Anyway,  
 the committee rejected any idea of changing verb structure verb forms and structure,  
 but merely changed words that are definitely archaic, and sometimes we had  
 considerable discussion about making a change. I remember one of the strongest  
 discussions we had was early in the work where it said that God tempted Abraham  
 and we voted seven to two to change it to "tested" Abraham, but the two were very  
 strong in their opposition to making that change at that point. Now the reason  
 I am mentioning this is because that at the end we had so many ~~xxx~~ ~~xxxx~~  
 words in the latter part of the NT<sup>o</sup> were suggestions for word changes that the  
 whole committee could not handle in the brief time that was left before the  
 conclusion of our last meeting that they divided us into groups and each group  
 took a list of suggested changes of words in particular passages and the group  
 would make its decision without the group as a whole giving consideration/ to it  
 at all. One such group consisted of Dr. Culbertson and myself me, and Dr. English  
 said he was putting the two of us together because Dr. Culbertson was the most  
 conservative member of the committee and I was the most radical. These terms ~~were~~  
~~fixes~~ of course were quite misnomers. By it he meant that Culbertson was one who  
 was most opposed to changing the ~~KJV~~ KJV at all, while I was the one who was  
 most anxious to be sure that it was in language that would be understood by someone  
 today. But Dr. Culbertson and I went through the section and agreed as to which  
 changes to make and which not. This merely shows how a good bit of the last part  
 was rushed through, not merely of word changes but of other features. ~~It~~ I believe  
 it would be a much better book if the this last part, which is so unfortunate,  
 could have been discussed at greater length/<sup>than</sup> ~~and that~~ it was, and the first part  
 and even if the first part had to be pushed through a bit more rapidly. Better