

particularly in recent years say simply do not fit. I was looking over an issue of JBL yesterday (a quarterly, an edition that came out a very few years ago and a professor at the University of Virginia has an article headed something like this--How Matthew Twisted the OT. In the article he told how Matthew had taken OT statements and twisted them completely out of their original meaning. His conclusion was If Moses was -- If Matthew got the OT so twisted, isn't it reasonable to think he got Mark twisted equally? And so what he said about Jesus is no more dependable than what he said about the OT.

I believe until comparatively recently, the average Christian reading the NT would not be particularly troubled by the problem of whether the NT quotes the OT accurately. The cases where there are problems are after all comparatively few, even though it appears like quite a sizeable number if you put them down one right after the other. But the average Christian reading the NT would not be bothered much as he read the KJV.

But as you read any of most of the modern versions, you find they have footnotes which refer you to the OT passage. They merely give the reference. If you look up the reference and find it gives something entirely different, from what the NT said, it's apt to be quite a blow to your faith in the honesty and certainly the intelligence of the NT speakers. This problem perhaps came particularly to the fore with the appearance of the RSV. Because in the RSV they very carefully in the NT give us the references wherever it claims to be quoting the OT. I would think that a person who is really interested in knowing what the Bible teaches would look it up in the OT and see what the context was.

When they look it up they would be amazed with the RSV to see how frequently something entirely different is said. Peter in his first sermon of which we have record, and Paul in the first sermon which is quoted at any length, both of them quote from Ps. 16. In the RSV you find the quotation given, and in both cases it tells how David said, Thou wilt not abandon my soul in Hades nor allow thy Holy One to see corruption." Then there is a footnote that refers you to Ps. 16:10.

You turn to Ps. 16:10 in RSV and you find, For thou dost not give me up to Sheol or let thy godly one see the pit. What does that have to do with what Peter and Paul said. "Nor let thy godly one see the Pit." The idea of translating this word PIT is not original with the RSV. It is interesting to note that this word shakath in BDB-- and by the way, though it was prepared by three modernists, a good many years ago, I think that is by far the best Heb. dictionary that we have. Not because their opinions are necessarily better than those of anybody else, but because they put in the time and effort to look at all the cases and in most instances give us the references.

So when they say a word has a certain meaning, and they give a large number of references, we can feel quite content that they probably have a correct translation. When they give only one or two we can look into the evidence further ourselves. While with