

THE PRINCIPAL REASON why I find it necessary to reject the Revised Standard Version is the fact that many passages, particularly in the Old Testament, have been altered for no visible reason except to get rid of the evidence for the prediction of the deity of Christ.

In about a thousand places the RSV Old Testament contains footnotes stating that the text has been changed from what we find in our Hebrew manuscripts. In two-thirds of these, evidence from versions is alleged, and even this is often extremely questionable. In one-third there is no evidence at all for the change.

It would be interesting to go through the speeches and writings of the apostles to see what was the basis on which they argued that Christ was what He claimed to be. Anyone who has never looked into this matter will be amazed to see how often they rest their argument upon the claim that the Person and Work of Christ were exactly what one might expect, if he knew what had been predicted many centuries earlier by the Old Testament writers. Whenever this argument is used in the New Testament, the RSV contains a footnote referring to the Old Testament passage involved. Yet, time after time, when one looks up the passage in the RSV Old Testament, he finds that it has been translated, by decision of the same group (for the entire RSV committee passed on all changes in either Testament), in such a way as to contradict the New Testament quotation and thus destroy the entire force of the argument for the deity and work of Christ.

DID CHRIST'S BODY SEE CORRUPTION?

In Acts 2:27 the apostle Peter quotes Psalm 16:10 as proof that David had predicted the bodily resurrection of Christ. In the RSV New Testament we find the verse quoted as follows: "For thou wilt not abandon my soul to Hades, nor let thy Holy One see corruption." The same verse is quoted by St. Paul in Acts 13:35. The whole point of the quotation is in the word "corruption". Yet when we turn back the pages of the RSV to Psalm 16:10 (the verse that is indicated in the footnote of both of these passages), we find it there translated in such a way as to indicate that Peter and Paul were quite mistaken in thinking that David had predicted a resurrection. The keyword "corruption" disappears, and the RSV Old Testament renders the verse this way: "For thou dost not give me up to Sheol, or let thy godly one see the Pit." This completely destroys the force of Peter's and Paul's argument, and makes them appear to have utterly misunderstood the Old Testament. The RSV

form, and there the RSV does not translate it as "origin". There is no reason whatever for changing "goings forth" to "origin" in Micah 5:2 except the anti-Christian theological presupposition of the translators.

Another form of the same root occurs in Psalm 121:8, where the RSV translates it literally as "going out." But had it been consistent and followed the same procedure as it did in the Micah passage, the RSV would have said, "The Lord will keep your origin and your coming in from this time forth and forevermore." And this does not make sense.

IS JESUS THE SON OF GOD?

Another illustration of the fact that this version presents what its translators think the Bible ought to say, instead of what the original actually says, is found in Psalm 2:12. This is a wonderful Messianic Psalm. Acts 13:33 and Hebrews 1:5 quote the latter part of its seventh verse, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," as a prediction of Christ. Its last verse begins with the words, "Kiss the Son". But here the RSV abandons the translation "son", substituting "his feet".

Why is this change introduced? As is indicated by the notation "Cn" in the RSV footnote, there is no basis in the original for the reading, "his feet". Why abandon the word "Son", especially since it has already occurred in verse 7? In answer to this question the RSV translators would point out that a different word is used here than in verse 7, which contains *ben*, the common Hebrew word for "son". Here the word is *bar*. There is a Hebrew noun *bar* which means "corn", and a Hebrew adjective *bar* which means "pure". Obviously neither of these would make sense in the verse. However, Aramaic, a related language, has a word *bar* which means "son", and this fits the context perfectly, particularly in view of verse 7. Yet this interpretation is not only discarded by the RSV—it is not even mentioned in a footnote.

Why should it be considered impossible that the Psalm would use an Aramaic word? The Hebrews had many contacts with the Aramaeans and there is no reason why an Aramaic word should not occasionally be used in Hebrew, just as French or German words are occasionally used in English.

Moreover, even though David is writing a prediction of the rising of kings and nations against Christ, it would be natural for him to think also of the hostile kings around him who had been forced to submit to his control. Most of these kings spoke Aramaic, and it would be