

the evidence of eight different Septuagint passages. Yet the RSV itself demonstrates that this argument has no validity, for in Isaiah 30:15 it translates the noun nachath as "rest", deriving it from the verb nuach, "to rest", but in v. 30 of the same chapter it translates the noun nachath as "descending", deriving it from the verb nachath, "to descend"!

Hebrews 1:8 reads in the RSV, "But of the Son he says, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, the righteous scepter is the scepter 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 scepter is a scepter 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 translator 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.

The wonderful description of Christ's redemptive work in Isaiah 52:12 to 53:12 contains a summary statement near its beginning in 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 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 evidence whatever that it ever meant "startle," save for the fact that the Greek Septuagint here says, "Thus shall many nations wonder at him." This decision of the RSV to select a rendering which is contradicted by at least twenty uses of the Hebrew word itself cannot possibly rest upon anything except a theological presupposition which would deny the possibility of Isaiah's predicting that people could be saved through "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

The RSV does the exact opposite in Isaiah 7:14. In the first chapter of the New Testament, it is said that Joseph was thinking of putting away his betrothed wife on account of her condition, when 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 v. 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 (700 years before). 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 change the word "virgin" here to "young woman"? Is there any proof that it does not mean virgin? Since the 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 young woman who should be Isaac's bride. Surely in this case there is nothing to