

used in Hebrew, just as French or German words are occasionally used in English. As a matter of fact, this same Psalm has another Aramaic word in it where there is a Hebrew word that has the same form, but the RSV has translated the word as an Aramaic word, instead of using the interpretation which would be used if it were Hebrew. Surely it is not at all strange for a Psalm which has already used one Aramaic word to use another one as well. Yet the RSV abandons the translation "son" altogether, substituting "his feet," and saying in a footnote "On The Hebrew of 11b and 12a is uncertain." Actually there is nothing uncertain about it. The RSV itself translates the very same word "son" three times in Proverbs 31:2. The rendering "his feet" has no warrant whatever. It is only a guess on the part of the translators, with no evidence, and is based entirely on their idea that it would not be possible for the Psalm to predict Christ as the Son of God.

These and other instances of similar character lead me to feel that the RSV is a very harmful book, and is far from being a dependable translation of the Bible. I am extremely sorry the RSV is the sort of book it is, for our present generation needs a Bible that is in the type of English we use today. The King James Version was the climax of nearly a century of Bible translation, and cumulatively represented the efforts of many consecrated scholars, to find the best way of expressing the thoughts of the original in English as it was then spoken. May God lead consecrated scholarly men to engage in a similar process now, so that eventually we may have a Bible in today's English that is equally good, and equally dependable.

- - - - -

The Apocrypha has now been printed as part of the RSV. The American Council has a tract - "The Revised Standard Version and the Apocrypha" by Dr. MacRae, who wrote the article above. Copies 25¢ per dozen. Send orders to:

American Council of Christian Churches, 15 Park Row, New York 38, New York

- - - - -