

Therefore when they come to translate the OT you can be quite sure they would not make what you would call an honest translation. So I wrote a tract, a few thousand of which were distributed, which said the RSV is not a holy Bible. The reason ~~was~~ was that in practically every case of a Messianic prophecy in the OT ~~th~~ they translate it in such a way as to get rid of the Messianic prophecy. But in addition to that, they do what the KJV never did. In every NT reference where it quotes the OT they put in the footnote where/ what it is quoting.

You look at that footnote in the RSV and look up the passage in the OT and you find they don't fit together. So when Peter says you can believe Christ was raised from the dead and it is a fulfillment of what is said in Ps. 16 that "thou wilt not allow my Holy One to see corruption" -- Peter said that and it is corrected translated in the RSV-NT. There is a footnote that refers you back to Ps. 16. You look back to Ps. 16 and find there it says, Thou wilt not allow thy Holy One to see the PIT! They explain the PIT as the lowest part of hell. So it simply meant that the Psalmist wouldn't go to the lowest part of hell!

Peter then would have been absolutely stupid or dishonest, and the fact that in the RSV-NT they refer constantly to the OT passage and the OT passage is translated in such a way as to have no relevance to the NT seems to me to make it not the Holy Bible. I would say that from our viewpoint the RSV-OT is not an honest translation. I would not say these were men who were consciously dishonest, but I would say the effect is the same as if they were. They had a set idea that ~~is~~ it is nonsense that these people could have predicted Christ! Therefore there are many cases where in the OT they take some Messianic phrase where it refers to Christ's redemption where it says "so shall he sprinkle many nations". They say, So shall he startle many nations, and put a footnote "Hebrew obscure."

You look up that Heb. word nazah as it was used in the OT and you find that 20 times the RSV translates it as "sprinkle." One time they translate it "spattered." In this one case they have a footnote "Heb. obscure." And they translate it "startle" which has nothing to do with sprinkle at all. They could not believe there was a prediction there of something that would happen 700 years later. They could not believe it. That may not have been intentional, but I don't like to say they were actually dishonest. I think they were misled in their unbelief. Because in the NT where the deity of Christ is brought out, they do bring it out. Like in this one case where the KJV did not bring it out.

I was interested in the fact that the NEB which is more modernistic than the RSV, it rendered it "out great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ" and in the OT it is even worse than the RSV. When RSV says "kiss the Son" they make it "kiss his feet". They put a footnote "Heb. obscure." It is true that the common word ben for son is not used there. An Aramaic word is used there (bar) meaning son. You might say, Well that Aramaic word wasn't used in Hebrew, so we can't ~~take~~ take it the Aramaic word. But you look in Prov. in another case where bar occurs in RSV and it does translate it by son there. So if they would there they certainly would have here if it were not for their presupposition that such a thing would be impossible.