

the RSV renders the same Hebrew word as "sprinkle" in about 20 passages. This change and note merely reflect its bias. I am very pleased that it is rendered "sprinkle" in the NIV, with no note about the unfounded substitute.

In 53:1 the phrase "our message" is a great improvement over the KJV "our report." The Hebrew is "what we have heard." "Report" sounds as if it is talking about "what we tell." "Message" could cover either. I might like the literal rendering still better, but would not press this point, since "message" includes the correct idea.

It pleases me that the second line of verse 8 reads, "And who can speak of his descendants?" This conveys the same idea as the KJV, "who shall declare his generation?" but is a bit clearer. I believe that it presents the view of those who thought that Jesus, being cut off in the prime of life, would leave no continuing influence. Their question is answered in the assurance of the latter verses of the chapter and particularly in the words of v.10: "he will see his offspring."

In 53:9 I was well pleased with the translation "he was assigned a grave." The verb is certainly an impersonal. In modern English the KJV "he made his grave" gives an entirely false idea. Anyway the Hebrew verb is not "made" but "gave." However, I did not like "the wicked" and "the rich." There is no article in the Hebrew in either case. The first is plural and means "wicked ones" or "wicked men"; the second is in the singular and literally means "a rich man." I would recommend as follows: "He was assigned a grave with wicked men, but was with a rich man in his death, because he had done. . ." The NIV has rendered w^e as "but" in 26:19 and 29:5, and as "yet" in 29:2. Such renderings of w^e are common. After "death" I prefer "because" to "though." Not only does it make better sense in the verse: is translated as "because"