

prove that the word means anything other than a virgin. There is no occurrence of the word in which it can be proved that the woman referred to was not a virgin. The Septuagint, translating Isaiah 7:14 two hundred years before the time of Christ, rendered it by the specific Greek word for virgin. Why are we not justified in believing that the Septuagint translators knew what the word meant? Only a determination not to believe that Isaiah could predict the virgin birth of Christ can account for the conclusion that Isaiah 7:14 should not contain the idea of a virgin birth.

If we follow the idea of these and various other passages, that the Old Testament should generally be rendered in such a way as to contradict the New Testament quotations and to invalidate the arguments which the New Testament founds upon them, we utterly destroy the unity of the Bible. It is no longer a book which God has given for the guidance of His people: instead, it is merely a record of the erroneous and fallible thoughts and words of sinful men. However, such a conclusion is not required by the evidence.

A similar attitude shows itself in other Messianic passages. I shall mention one or two.

Micah 5:2 contains the prediction quoted in Matthew 2:6 that Christ would be born in Bethlehem. The last line of the verse is translated in the RSV by the words, "whose origin is from of old, from ancient days." The King James Version uses the words "goings forth (plural) where the RSV says "origin".

A little thought will show what a difference it makes to our Christian belief whether Christ is described as one "whose goings forth" (plural) occurred in ancient times, or whether He had an "origin". Christians have always believed that Christ is the Second Person of the Trinity and was never created, but is Himself the Creator. The RSV translation denies this and makes Him a created being, thus flatly denying His deity.

The King James Version renders the Hebrew word literally. The exact form used here (feminine plural) occurs in only one other place in the Bible, and there the RSV does not translate it "origin". Other forms of the noun and of the corresponding verb are frequently translated literally in the RSV. There is no reason whatever for changing "goings forth" to "origin" except the anti-Christian theological presupposition of the translators.

Another form of the same root occurs in Psalm 121:8. The RSV translates it literally as "goings forth." If it 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."

Another illustration of the fact that this version presents what its committee desires, instead of what the Hebrew says, is found in Psalm 2:12. Here the King James Version renders as "son" an Aramaic word, differing from the Hebrew word for son that is used earlier in the same Psalm. The Hebrews had many contacts with the Aramaeans and there is no reason why an Aramaic word should not be occasionally