

root, one of which meant "corruption" and the other "pit". On this ground the RSV casts aside the evidence of eight different Septuagint passages.

Is this sound philological reasoning, or is it really the reflection of the theological views of the RSV translators? If it were the former, we would expect the same principle to be applied throughout the Bible. But in Isaiah 30, dealing with a word which is not the basis of any argument of the apostles, the whole idea is completely discarded. The word in question is *nachath* (note the close similarity to the word *shachath*). In Isaiah 30:15 the RSV, like the KJV, translates this noun as "rest", deriving it from the root *nuach*, "to rest". Yet in the thirtieth verse of the same chapter, it translates the same noun, *nachath*, as "descending", deriving it from the verb *nacheth*, "to descend"!

The change in Psalm 16:10 does not rest upon philological principles that are carried through elsewhere. I find it hard to believe that a version that thus arbitrarily removes what Peter and Paul considered to be basic foundations of Christianity is a proper version for the use of sound Biblical churches.

CAN JESUS BE ADDRESSED AS GOD?

Hebrews 1:8 reads in the RSV: "But of the Son he says, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, the righteous sceptre is the sceptre of thy kingdom.'" This is a literal quotation of the Hebrew of Psalm 45:6. Yet there the first part of the verse is translated, contrary to normal Hebrew usage: "Your divine throne endures for ever and ever. Your royal sceptre is a sceptre of equity." The literal rendering, which would correspond to the New Testament quotation, is simply mentioned in a footnote: "Or *your throne is a throne of God, or your throne, O God.*" Neither the reading in the text nor the first suggestion in the footnote has any warrant at all, aside from a dislike on the part of the translators of addressing Christ as God. This dislike is also shown by the RSV New Testament translators, who put a footnote at Hebrews 1:8: "Or *God is thy throne.*"

Only a determination to oppose any recognition of the fact that Jesus is actually God could produce these results in both Testaments of the RSV.

Nor is this an isolated instance. The Book of Hebrews is filled with quotations from the Old Testament. It is shocking to see how differently most of them are rendered in the RSV Old Testament.

ISAIAH FIFTY-THREE

The description of Christ's redemptive work in the passage that runs from Isaiah 52:12 to the end of Isaiah 53 contains a summary statement near its beginning (in Isaiah 52:15): "He shall sprinkle many nations." St. Peter indicated the fulfillment of this in I Peter 1:1,2 where he referred to people of many nations as being saved through "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." The RSV Old Testament changes "sprinkle" to "startle" with a footnote which says: "The meaning of the Hebrew word is uncertain."

Actually there is nothing uncertain about it. It is absolutely certain that this word means "sprinkle" in Hebrew and it is so translated in the RSV itself in a score of instances. There is no real evidence that it ever meant "startle". This decision of the RSV to select a rendering which is contradicted by at least twenty uses of the Hebrew word itself betrays a theological pre-supposition which would deny the possibility of Isaiah's predicting that people could be saved through "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

WAS JESUS BORN OF A VIRGIN?

In the first chapter of the New Testament we read that when Joseph was thinking of putting away his betrothed wife on account of her condition, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, telling him that the Holy Ghost had caused her to conceive a Son who would be called Jesus. Despite the fact that the RSV ends the quotation of the angel's words with Matthew 1:21, it seems reasonable to consider that verses 22 and 23 are also part of what the angel said, since verse 24 tells of Joseph's obedience when he awoke from sleep. Whether this is the case or not, the verses state that the virgin birth of Christ had been predicted by Isaiah, who lived seven hundred years before Christ.

In Matthew 1:22-23a, the RSV translates as follows: "All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet: 'Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son.'" Yet in Isaiah 7:14 the RSV says, "Behold a young woman shall conceive and bear a son," thus reducing the New Testament quotation to nonsense.

Why does the RSV here change the word "virgin" to "young woman"? Is there any proof that it does not mean virgin? Since this particular Hebrew word is used less than ten times in the Old Testament it is difficult to prove its meaning on the basis of usage. It occurs in Genesis 24:43 where Abraham's servant prays to the Lord to lead him to the