

"in returning~~z~~ and rest." You look ahead to v. 30 and you find they speak of the descending blow of the Lord's arm. The word they translate descending there is nachath, exactly the same word that they translate in the same chapter as "rest", the form being absolutely identical as you see. The two possibilities for the origin of naketh or of nakath exactly corresponding to the ~~kwzoziziz~~ two possibilities of the origin of shakath of which they insist that only one is possible!

Here's a case then where the claim is made that the NT has misquoted the Old. I think we can take the LXX as pretty good evidence that the translation they used in a number of cases was at least a possibility. The translators of the LXX were a lot nearer to the time of the spoken Hebrew of the Bible than we are.

According to the RSV, Peter who made this bad error had already made a bad mistake even before his first sermon. In Acts 1:20 we find Peter quoted from the Psalms. Acts 1:20--It is written in the book of Psalms, Let his habitation become desolate and his office let another take. KJV: let another take his bishoprick. The Gk. is episcopo. Bishoprick is exactly derived from episcopo! It means an overseer; one with oversight. That is the quotation given by Peter as evidence of what they should do. RSV very properly gives us a footnote: refers us to Ps. 109:8.

You look back to Ps. 109:8 and you find it says, May his days be few; may another seize his goods! Not take his office. Not take his bishoprick. But seize his goods. Pretty poor basis for Peter to use in determining what the infant church should do. We find that the OT word there is piqudim. Those of you who are familiar with Hebrew I'm sure immediately recognize that is derived from the verb paqad. And paqad is a verb which is difficult to translate accurately into English. Although its meaning is very clear, it is a meaning that is broad enough so that I don't know any one English word that will give it. There was a word in the time of King James that exactly gave it. That was the word "visit". But it did not mean pay a visit.

God visited his people when Naomi had been some years across over in Moab escaping from the famine, God visited his people in giving them relief from the famine. He by his superior power brought relief. In other cases we find that God visited sin upon them. God brought punishment to them, and so the tendency of modern translations is to render the word either as "to give favor, or as to punish" which to us are opposite, but actually the word means the intervention of a higher power into the affairs of a lower power. It is used of the levying of an army. Well, piqudim would be an abstract from it. Oversight would be the exact meaning of the word. His oversight, his bishoprick is an exact translation.

Just as we can say that you have charge of something, and you can say This is my charge, it is not impossible to use the thought of oversight for the things that you have oversight of. But simply to translate it as "goods" in this way, is certainly not a fair way to treat it. So here we have a problem which at first sight seems to show an utter misunderstanding of the OT but which on examination we find that out of several possible interpretations, the one