

go into the mind of the original writer and see what he meant better than the Bible books as we have it today. This makes most of these books very dangerous/to use. I find/often very useful if you use them along with the original in front of you to see where they give you interesting suggestions to check into and see whether they are right or not but, for instance, Moffatt's translation of the Old Testament is at many places hopelessly different from the original. He will take a Hebrew word and just throw it aside and put/an English word with an entirely different meaning. But this so-called Modern Reader's Bible which appeared about thirty years ago is entirely different. In it Professor Moulton has checked exactly the words of the American Revised Version except that occasionally he uses the marginal text instead of the text that is in the main text ^{there}, but he never departs from that text. Now he takes that and he arranges it with headings according to what he finds to be the literary structure of it. You may differ with his literary structure at places but you always find it interesting and suggestive. That our psalms as printed in our Bibles are simply a series of verses and we lose sight of the fact that most of them have stanzas with/certain number of verses in each stanza and a different theme for ~~it~~ ^{each} somewhat like modern poetry and you don't get the sense of it very clearly from the fact that we simply have each word printed as a separate line without any division between them. Now Moulton tries to give you an arrangement according to what he thinks to be the literary arrangement, the literary division, rather, and often it's very useful. Now in his notes on it he makes this remark about the book of Isaiah which I think is extremely interesting. He says that when we proceed to the matter and ~~fellow~~ ^{thought of} Isaiah, the literary matter quite apart from the theology founded on it, how can we explain the neglect of such a masterpiece in our plans of liberal education? It is the boast of England and America that its higher education is religious in its spirit. Why is it then that our youth are taught to associate exquisiteness of expression, force of presentation, brilliance of imaginative pictures only with literatures in which the prevailing matter and thought is on a low moral plane? Such a paradox is part of the paganism which came in with the Renaissance and which our higher education is still too conservative to shake off. This was