

# CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

---

Worship: The Divine Alchemy  
THOMAS COATES

Rectilinear or Typological Interpretation  
of Messianic Prophecy?  
WILLIAM J. HASSOLD

The Jerusalem Bible: A Critical Examination  
FREDERICK W. DANKER

Brief Study

Theological Observer

Homiletics

Book Review

Vol. XXXVIII

March 1967

No. 3

# The Jerusalem Bible: A Critical Examination

FREDERICK W. DANKER

The contents of *The Jerusalem Bible* (JB) are well known to the scholarly world through the French publication of the Dominican Biblical School in Jerusalem, which in 1956 published a one-volume edition of their studies of individual books of the Bible, popularly known as *La Bible de Jérusalem*. Because of the concern of the British translators that this work should represent the best of contemporary scholarship, attention was paid to the original Hebrew and Greek, with accent on fidelity to the most ancient sources and conformity to the demands of modern idiom, so far as this is possible in the translation of works from cultures alien to our own. The notes in the volume are a direct translation from the French edition, with account taken not only of recent discovery but also of the "decisions and general implications of the Second Vatican Council." In addition to helpful and concise introductions to the various sections and individual books of the Bible, appendixes include a chronological table, a chart of the Hasmonaean and Herodian dynasties, a calendar (including the annual feasts), a table of measures and money, and an index of Biblical themes

---

*This article presents an extended review of The Jerusalem Bible published in 1966 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., Garden City, New York, under the general editorship of Alexander Jones. Author of the review is Frederick W. Danker, associate professor of exegetical theology (New Testament) at Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis.*

cited in the footnotes. The last is a compact index to Biblical theology.

## PARAPHRASE

Fortunately translators of the Scriptures are almost unanimous in their understanding that translation is a primary act of interpretation. If there are indeed ambiguities in the original, it is the task of the translator to preserve the ambiguity, but he cannot excuse himself from the task of determining whether what appears to be an ambiguity may not be dissipated by closer attention to the text. A reader may not like the resolution of the problem, but he must at least explore the path the interpreter has taken to reach his own solution. A word like ἰδοὺ cannot simply be omitted just because its use is a mannerism of certain writers. JB has done an ingenious job of paraphrasing this troublesome particle. In Matt. 8:24 it is rendered "without warning"; 8:29, "they stood there"; 7:4, "all the time"; 10:16, "remember"; 11:19 and 12:2, simply "look"; and 11:8 with an exquisite "Oh no." But in John 19:5, behold the disappointing "Here is the man."

The word ἔρημος is difficult to render because the single words in our vocabulary that are ordinarily used to signal uninhabited or lonely places are usually associated with specific types of locale, such as "desert," "prairies," or "wilderness." The last word ordinarily suggests an area with tangled vegetation, but Palestine does not abound in such locales. JB does well, there-

fore, in rendering Mark 1:45 with the words "where nobody lived," and the translators might have done the same in Mark 1:3: "A voice cries where no one lives."

The word *παράβασις* in Rom. 5:14 is neatly handled: "even though their sin, unlike that of Adam, was not a matter of breaking a law." In the case of 1 Cor. 15:35 the translators paraphrase where a single English word can reproduce Paul's point precisely. This is how the dialog really went:

Corinthian philosopher-theologian: "How are the dead raised; what sort of body do they have when they come back?"

Paul: "Stupid! Don't you know that what you sow cannot have life unless it dies?"

But this is the way the translators render Paul's *ἄφρων* ("stupid"): "They are stupid questions." More genteel, perhaps, but gentility is not to be bought at the expense of apostolic forthrightness. In Acts 17:18, however, JB makes atonement: "does this parrot know what he's talking about?"

Some paraphrase is called for in the rendering of Gal. 5:8 to make clear that it is God who does the calling; JB is obscure here, but the succeeding clause reads with telling effect: "The yeast seems to be spreading through the whole batch of you." In Luke 18:11 *ἄδικοι* is rendered "unjust." I tried the passage out on a few "unjust" persons and drew a blank. In a case like this the rich resources of our language must be brought into play. When I read "swindlers" the message went through. So also Matt. 20:13 is better rendered: "My friend, I am not cheating you." And 1 Cor. 6:8 undoubtedly sounded like this: "You cheat!"

The use of the word "blasphemy" in Luke 5:21 is also questionable. The term

is a loan-word from the Greek, which now conveys an impression of horror because of specific associations the English transliteration has developed, whereas the Greek word was used generally of "disrespectful language" to or about people or God. The *Basic English* translation conveys the sense well with the word "no respect for God."

Felicitous paraphrases abound in the rendering of the Old Testament. Since explanations of special difficulties are usually given in the notes, some clarification might have been included for the ingenious rendering "treacherous fields," in 2 Sam. 1:21 (where RSV adopts H. L. Ginsberg's emendation "upsurging of the deep.") The casual reader may not be aware that 1 Kings 22:39 does not say that an entire house was built of ivory. A paraphrase such as "house with ivory inlay" might be appropriate.

#### A MODERN TRANSLATION

Although the translators lack the charism of snappy phraseology, as found in NEB, there is repeated evidence that the translators have endeavored to avoid glaring archaisms, including Semitic structures. Thus John 1:14 is rendered "only Son of the Father," but Moffatt still remains the only translator who has caught the Semitism in John 14:6: "I am the real and living way." "Harps from God" in Rev. 15:2 should be rendered either "great harps" (as the note to Ps. 36:6 suggests for the phrase "mountains of God") or "harps to praise God." Similarly in 2 Chron. 7:6 "canticles of Yahweh" is better rendered "the chant to Yahweh," as the translators have correctly done with the parallel phrase in 1 Chron. 16:42, "the hymns to God." Matt. 21:5 reads "daughter of Zion," but this is a Semitism, and our idiom requires,

"Say to the people of Zion." Matt. 11:29 reads, "*you will find rest for your souls.*" Hebrew often uses *nephesh* (נפש) for the person, and JB has, in fact, removed the Semitism in Ps. 7:5 through the rendering, "and catch me," with the notation: "lit. 'my soul.'" In Matt. 11:29 it would be well, then, to read "You will find rest."

Acculturated sequences are properly altered in most cases. Thus in John 10:30 we read: "the Father and I"; in 1 Cor. 9:6, "Barnabas and I"; in Gal. 2:9 "with Barnabas and me." But in Rev. 3:15 we find "cold nor hot," and in Rev. 11:18 "small or great." English idiom prefers "hot nor cold" and "great or small." 1 Peter 1:13 protests indigenization, and it seems impossible to preserve the Passover associations of the text. "Free your minds then, of encumbrances" approaches the thought, but is typical of some of the lack of ease in this translation. R. G. Bratcher's rendering in *Good News for Modern Man* (American Bible Society: New York, 1966) is more direct: "Have your minds ready for action, then." Ps. 80:5 reads "such measure"; better, "full measure," since the Heb. *shalish*, "a third," corresponds to the British idiomatic "half-pint." In Numbers 9:22 "two days" is perhaps "a few days"; cf. 1 Kings 17:12, which JB neatly renders "a stick or two" (although I would prefer "a few sticks.")

The translators have taken seriously the task of modernizing what is modernizable. A "day's wages" as a rendering for δηνάριον is helpful for the understanding of Rev. 6:6, but why is "penny" used for κοδράντης in Mark 12:42, while δηνάριον is otherwise transliterated? "A silver coin" would be sufficient in Mark 12:15, since it is clear that the coin has a design of

Caesar's head on it. The numismatist will know which coin is meant, but the translators are not writing for numismatists. Why Moses wears shoes (Acts 7:33 and Ex. 3:5) but the prodigal son gets a fresh pair of sandals (Luke 15:22) is not at all clear, especially since the Israelites' footwear, which never wore out, is "sandals" (Deut. 29:5), which renders the same word used in Ex. 3:5. Since "sandals" are a species of shoes, and since modern sandals are largely copies of ancient footwear, "sandals" is in the best semantic taste.

"Let's throw dice to decide who is to have it" (John 19:24) sounds ponderously pedantic. Better: "Let's throw for it," although I suspect that what the soldiers really said sounded something like, "Let's shoot craps for it." Anachronistic is the rendering "about remaining celibate" (1 Cor. 7:25). So also is "saints" in Rom. 1:7; "God's people" is preferable, and accents the divine prerogative implied in ἄγιοι. Jude 14 trips most translators, and JB has stumbled with the ambiguous "seventh patriarch from Adam"; better: "sixth patriarch after Adam" (take a count in Gen. 5). Jude's idiom is inclusive. "Swaddling clothes" (Luke 2:7) is an interesting archaeological item, but few of us are archaeologists and "wrapped him up" will do for most readers. Similarly "handmaid" in Luke 1:8 creaks in the context of more contemporary diction. The context clearly indicates it is a woman who speaks, therefore render "slave." On the other hand, "retter" (RSV) has taken a turn for the better with "rash" in JB's rendering of Lev. 13:39.

No exception can be taken to the Britishisms in this version, but readers in the United States are advised to pull out

"weeds" instead of "darnel" and not to attempt feeding hogs on British "corn," which is the standard word for wheat. "Hosanna" in the translation of Matt. 21:9 is gibberish. The translators have done much better in rendering the source, Ps. 118:25. *Maher-shalal-hash-baz* ("Spoilsoonpreyquick," Moffatt) is retained in its Hebrew form in Is. 8:1 but translated in the notes. However, *Lō' ruḥamah* (Hos. 1:6) is translated in the text, "unloved." In order to decrease unnecessary risibility factors, should this version be read by convicts, it is to be hoped that "*robbers' den*" (Mark 11:17) will be altered to "robbers' hideout."

Proverbs are bound to carry an antique flavor, but in an annotated edition the current idiom might be included in the notes. For example, Prov. 10:4 equals "no gain without pains." Amos 5:19 corresponds to the admittedly less suspenseful: "Out of the frying pan into the fire." But congratulations to the translators for producing one of the few versions that leaves to Shakespeare the "thees" and "thous," also in Mark 1:11; Matt. 6:9; Heb. 1:8 ff., where NEB curiously retained archaic forms.

#### GRAMMAR

Brilliant displays of grammatical consciousness intermingle in this version with occasional glaring lapses. The question of precision in rendering the Greek imperfect tense is not easy to resolve, and the road to death "from the waist down" is broadly paved. The following passages are often mishandled, and they illustrate well the sensitivity of the translators: Matt. 3:14; Mark 5:32; Luke 5:6; 8:23; John 6:18; and Acts 26:11. Mark 9:38 concludes "we tried to stop him" (*ἐκωλύομεν*). This is

well done, but the translators miss their opportunity to reproduce the point of the original in Jesus' reply: *μὴ κωλύετε αὐτόν*. The negative present imperative is certainly designed here, but is lost in the bland "You must not stop him." Better: "Don't try to stop him." In chancel reading the word "try" would then receive a slight accent, with fine interpretive effect. One might dispute the rendering of the imperfects in Matt. 4:11; 5:2; Mark 12:18; Luke 1:64; Acts 11:2; 13:5; but the translators perhaps had their reasons for not expressing these with greater precision. However, less defensible are the renderings in Mark 7:26 (the point is the repeated nagging cry for help); 7:35 (he began to speak clearly); 14:35 (the repeated act of falling and praying is missed); 15:23 (the imperfect suggests repeated offers, which are definitely declined by Jesus). In Luke 10:18 the imperfect *ἔθεώρουν* expresses with keen insight the congratulatory reception by Jesus of His disciples' pride in their recent raid on the demonic world: "I was watching Satan coming down like a streak of lightning out of heaven" (our translation); JB misses the imperfect and with it the faint touch of sarcasm warming up to the thought: It's great to trounce demons, but make sure your names are written in heaven. Luke 14:7 is rendered: "He then told the guests a parable, because he had noticed how they picked the places of honour." Here the imperfect is submerged, and with it the picture of the constant, restless search for the seats of honor, under Jesus' observant gaze.

The perfect tense of *πεπίστευκα* in John 11:27 is rendered "I believe that. . ." The point, however, seems to be: "There has been no doubt in my mind that. . ."

Present imperatives require delicate handling. Apt renderings are given for Rev. 5:5 and John 20:27, but Luke 7:13 clearly requires "dry your tears," or "weep no more," instead of "do not cry." Similarly John 20:17 should read "Stop clinging to me," instead of "Do not cling to me." NEB neatly caught the point of Rom. 6:12: "So sin must no longer reign in your mortal body . . ."; JB misses the change in aeons. Matt. 6:19 might better read: "Stop your hoarding," and 7:1, "No more passing of judgment!" Luke 11:7 is a rhetorical disaster in the present phrasing: "Do not bother me." Not even an exclamation mark to express the lively indignation!

The rendering of compound verbs is a further sign of professional competence. In Matt. 16:27 the word ἀποδώσει is well rendered: "he will reward." Not to be commended is the condensation of κατεδῶξεν, "they found him," in Mark 1:36, where NEB caught it well: "searched him out." Matt. 23:24 should be read with a "gulp" not a "swallow." καταμάθητε in Matt. 6:28 does not mean "think of" but "note well." Acts 17:18 should read "took issue with," not "argued." Since "burn" is ordinarily used in JB to render καίω, "burn up" is preferable to the simple form "burn" in Matt. 3:12.

The point of the present participle is lost in Luke 9:62, where the accent is on repeated looking back. The aorist participle in Acts 9:30 is better rendered with the NEB as "learned," not as JB, following RSV, "knew." But in Acts 25:13 the troublesome ἀσπασάμενοι is, I think, correctly rendered "and paid their respects to Festus."

In Matt. 11:3 and Luke 7:20 the emphasis in οὐ should have been caught. The

resources of modern typography permit italics for emphasis, and the word "you" in the translation might have been so indicated. However, since the translators use italics for words borrowed from the Old Testament, this alternative might be misleading. Therefore a recasting is necessary: "Is it you who is to come, or are we to look for another?" Acts 27:34 is rendered "your safety is not in doubt," but πρὸς with the genitive suggests in its context the necessity of breaking the long fast. In Heb. 2:9 the relation of the verse to the preceding context is obscure not only in the translation but also in the explanatory notes. In Rom. 1:18 the important particle γάρ is completely overlooked, to the detriment of the argument, and the editorial division obliterates all connection between vv. 17 and 18.

#### OF TERMS AND PHRASES

We now turn our attention to a number of phrases and terms that are the bane of translators and in some cases the bone of doctrinal contention.

The phrase "what is it to you and to me" is well rendered in 2 Sam. 16:10: "What business is it of mine and yours?"; 2 Sam. 19:23: "What is there between me and you?"; 1 Kings 17:18: "What quarrel have you with me?" and finally in 2 Kings 3:13 "What business have you with me?" When it comes to the New Testament the translators bog down. John 2:4 is rendered "Woman, why turn to me?" Why not: "Why do you interfere?" Similarly in Mark 5:7 the demon wishes to know why Jesus is meddling at the wrong time.

"Justice" for δικαιοσύνη in Rom. 1:17 and other passages does less than justice to the term. NEB is better with "God's way

of righting wrong." The translators are on the right path in 8:33 with "acquits," but why not use the same expression in 3:26, 28, 30? At least the connection with God's sense of covenant obligation ought not to be obscured. The translators of the Old Testament do much better with words like "integrity" (Is. 54:14) and "salvation" (Is. 46:13) for *tsidqah*, which the LXX renders δικαιοσύνη.

The translators have struggled with the word σάρξ and come up with a number of various renderings. In general the point of σάρξ is that man is viewed in terms of his existence prior to the take-over by God through the Christian experience. Therefore in Rom. 7:5 "before our conversion" is an excellent rendering. But the contrasts of "unspiritual" and "spiritual" (*passim*) communicate rather vaguely. The contrast between σάρξ and πνεῦμα is rather the contrast between an old self determining its own existence and a new self whose existence is determined by God and under His direction. It is the contrast between two aeons. Hence the rendering "unspiritual nature" in Rom. 8:3 is not adequate, because it is the total man who is σάρξ, not some lower nature. Moreover, the Christian may legitimately be interested in what are commonly understood as "unspiritual" matters. Therefore the rendering "Your interests, however, are not in the unspiritual but in the spiritual" (Rom. 8:9) can be misleading. The point is that the Christian is not one who permits his existence to be determined, as he had before his conversion, by his own principles, but by God's principles. Hence he slaves for God, not in the oldness of the letter of the Law but in the newness of a life determined by God (Rom. 7:6), and this

applies to "unspiritual" things as well. *Sarx*-life is life run on one's own terms, *pneuma*-life is life run on God's terms. Until a better term is found, a contrast like old self—new self may be the best device to convey Paul's thought. Thus Rom. 8:13-16 might be rendered: "If you live as the old self dictates, you are headed for death. But if through your new self you put to death the deeds of the body, you will live. For those who are led by God's Spirit are the sons of God. For you did not receive a new self to slave out of fear, but you received a new self that knows what it means to be a son, and you are now prompted to cry out 'Abba, Father.' God's own Spirit bears testimony with the spirit of our new self that we are God's children." The principal loss in a rendering of this type is the paranomasia of the original, which can relate the πνεῦμα of man to the πνεῦμα of God, but paranomasia is not to be purchased in translation at the expense of clarity. In any case, personal experiment with untutored listeners outside theological specialty indicates that "old self—new self" communicates more effectively than "flesh" or "spiritual" and "unspiritual."

The word πνεῦμα, in reference to the Holy Spirit, is tricky in the original, and the translators find themselves trapped on occasion. In John 7:39 we read "the Spirit which," but in 14:26, "the Holy Spirit, whom," and again in Rom. 5:5, "the Holy Spirit which." Which is He?

The wrath (ὀργή) of God is not satisfactorily rendered in this version, except in Matt. 3:7, where "retribution" appears. Not only is the eschatological dimension lost in Rom. 1:18 ("anger of God") and in Col. 3:6 ("makes God angry"), but the

rendering is indistinguishable from that for θυμός. In Heb. 11:27 we read "king's anger," and in Rev. 15:1 "the anger of God."

In Matt. 11:2; 16:16; 27:17; Luke 9:20; Rom. 9:5 χριστός should have been rendered not "Christ" but "Messiah," an adopted word with distinctive associations in English. In these texts χριστός is not a proper name and requires translation by the term which is generally recognized as expressive of the hope of Israel, for which the Greek term happens to be χριστός. For a primary principle of translation is that when the language into which a translation is made possesses distinctive terms that correspond to the meaning suggested by an undifferentiated term in the original, then the resources of the translator's language should be brought into play. On the other hand, in John 1:41 the word χριστός is explicitly used by John as a translation of "Messiah," and χριστός should therefore in turn be translated as "The Anointed One" in this passage.

In Acts 7:38 ἐκκλησία is well rendered "assembly," but the term should have been used also in Heb. 12:23, and it is difficult to determine what prompted the translators not to follow the same practice in Matt. 18:17; Acts 11:26; and 11:22. In 1 Cor. 12:28 Paul does not use the term ἐκκλησία (rendered "Church") in a completely different sense from that in 14:4 and 14:12, where the translators render "community." In these passages the question concerns the use of the gifts of the Spirit for the benefit of God's assembly. That assembly may be understood in a broader or narrower perspective, but it is always "the assembly" or "community" of God. The capitalized form "Church"

(1 Cor. 12:28) suggests a special technical sense not implicit in 14:4 or 14:12, or for that matter in the uncanceled forms in Rev. 1—3.

Since the context must determine what the content of κηρύσσω is, a term such as "preach," which already suggests the nature of the content, should not be used where the content is indeterminate. Proclaim is therefore better in 1 Peter 3:19.

"If you, then, who are evil," Matt. 7:11, is better rendered in NEB: "You, then, bad as you are." Matt. 8:26 has Jesus asking "Why are you so frightened?" NEB reads more naturally, and more accurately, "Why are you such cowards?" 1 Thess. 4:13 uses the euphemism "sleep" for death. Since the euphemism is a part of modern vocabulary in that context, "those who have died" is an unnecessary departure. And is it really the "gift of languages" that Paul is discussing in 1 Cor. 13:8? 1 Tim. 3:12 and 5:9 are rendered in harmony with epigraphical evidence.

In Matt. 26:30, "after psalms had been sung," is accurate and neatly done. Further excellent renderings of difficult phrases include the following: Matt. 27:11, "It is you who say it." Debate on this appears academic. Matt. 25:26 picks up NEB: "So you knew that I reap where I have not sown . . . ?" Isaiah "so rightly" prophesied, in Mark 7:6. But σκληροκαρδία in Matt. 19:8 is more than "unteachable"; it is "stubbornness." On the other hand, "the kandake" (Acts 8:27), a downfall for most translators, is skillfully skirted.

The rendering "pagans" (Rom. 1:13) will be resented by Jews, since pagan is ordinarily understood as non-Christian; besides, the Romans are no longer "pagan." The word used by Paul is ἔθνος, which



can mean "nation" or "people." NEB does it better with "other parts of the world." In Phil. 2:12 Paul does not tell his addressees, "work for your salvation," but "give expression" to your salvation, or "make the reality of your salvation known." "Wrote down" in Rom. 16:22 is a neat rendering in Tertius' personal note, but ἀνδραποδιστής in 1 Tim. 1:10 is not recognizable in the translation. The word means "slave-dealer" or "kidnapper," perhaps as procurer.

Mark 3:20 is rendered: "that they could not even have a meal." The situation suggests that they "had no time to eat." The Roman custom of resettling veterans is obscured in Phil. 3:20 with the rendering "homeland." Moffatt elegantly rendered "we are a colony of heaven"; that is, we are citizens of heaven, but like a Roman colony of veterans are living outside its precincts. In 1 Cor. 7:14 and other passages "saints" is better rendered with NEB "belong to God." In Acts 17:11 it is questionable whether the Bereans "welcomed the word very readily." The point is rather that they displayed a willingness to investigate the claims; there is a difference. The *Basic English* translation grasps the point: "They gave serious attention to the word."<sup>1</sup>

In John 17:12 "son of perdition" is rendered "the one who chose to be lost"; in 2 Thess. 2:3 simply "the Lost One." In the former passage the interpretative paraphrase is questionable. Mark 4:39 is rendered with a stilted "Quiet now! Be calm!" Better: "Save your breath! Quit your barking!" It is the perfect squelch as of a master annoyed by a barking cur. The text

of 1 Cor. 7:2 reads: διὰ τῆς πορνείας, and NEB caught it: "because there is so much immorality." The translators hazardously generalize this into "but since sex is always a danger." Even Paul would not agree to that. Luke 15:13 is rendered "got together everything he had." Moffatt caught the economic point: the young man turned "everything into cash."

In Is. 3:18 "sun-ornaments" might be considered instead of "pendants" for *shēbīsim* and in v. 20 "perfume" instead of "scent bottles," for *nephesh*.<sup>2</sup> For Ps. 68:6 Cyrus H. Gordon's suggestion: "He brings out prisoners with the songstresses" is worth considering.<sup>3</sup> The point is that the prisoners will rejoice greatly in their deliverance. In Ps. 68:4 the Ugaritic "Rider of the Clouds," a tag from the cult of Baal, is caught by the translators, but Albright's brilliant rendering of Ps. 89:19b is not picked up:

I have placed a youth above the mighty man;

I have raised a young man above the people.<sup>4</sup>

JB reads:

I have conferred the crown on a hero,  
and promoted one chosen from my people.

In line with the tenor of Koheleth is Ginsberg's insistence that *kēbar* be rendered "long since"<sup>5</sup> and not "already," as in JB's

<sup>2</sup> See John Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan*, in "Supplements to Vetus Testamentum," V (Leiden, 1957), p. 191.

<sup>3</sup> C. H. Gordon, "Hebrew Origins," in *Biblical and Other Studies*, "Studies and Texts," I, ed. Alexander Altmann (Cambridge, Mass., 1963), p. 6.

<sup>4</sup> *Archaeology of the Bible*, Pelican Books A 199 (rev. ed., Baltimore, 1960), p. 234.

<sup>5</sup> "Quintessence of Koheleth," *Biblical and Other Studies*, pp. 52—53.

<sup>1</sup> See Frederick Danker, "Menander and the New Testament," *New Testament Studies*, X (April 1964), 366—67.

rendering of 2:12; 4:2; 6:10. (In 9:6 the word is not translated, and in 9:7 it is rendered "beforehand.")

#### CONSISTENCY

Consistency is a matter of taste, and it is unfair to insist that the same Hebrew or Greek word must be rendered uniformly with a single corresponding English equivalent. However, when departures are made, the reader ought to be able to rest assured that there is a specific nuance in the text that prompts the change. "Sir" seems adequate in Matt. 8:5, but the cowardly disciples say "Lord" in Matt. 8:25. What is the criterion? It is possible that in both cases we are dealing with the post-Easter affirmation of Jesus' Lordship, which is now part and parcel of any narrative in which κύριος appears, and that any attempt at a historical-Jesus analysis is anachronistic. The problem is accentuated in Matt. 15:21-28, where there is a bewildering shift from "Sir" to "Lord" and back to "Sir," and the entire word-play is lost by the erroneous rendering of the plural κυρίων with the singular "master's" (v. 27). The woman's point is that Jesus as Lord must take care of His charges, just as the dogs' "lords," that is, the children, take care of theirs. Similarly in Mark 15:39 it seems sheer pedantry to render "a son of God." The centurion may or may not have understood the depths of Jesus' claims. We have no way of knowing. The movement of Mark's Gospel, however, is in the direction of a firm affirmation, and the translation must not obscure Mark's editorial theological intention. In Matt. 3:16 a "dove" appears, but the same word underlies "pigeons" in Matt. 21:12. The phrase συντέλεια αἰῶνος is theologically important. In Matt. 13:40,

49; 28:20 it is rendered "end of time"; in 13:39; 24:3 "end of the world"; and in Heb. 9:26, "end of the last age." The first two renderings do less than justice to the qualitative distinction between this age and the age to come.

Capitalized "Good News" is ordinarily used by the translators, as in Acts 8:12, where the verb is used in the original, but lowercase is used in Eph. 2:17, without any discernible reason. Where parallel texts occur, the translators ordinarily strive for identical wording, but two different translations are given of the same Greek text (only a change of case) in 1 Peter 2:8 and Rom. 9:33 (λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου). The phrase οὐ θέλω δεῦν ὑμᾶς in Rom. 1:13; 1 Cor. 10:1; 2 Cor. 1:8 is rendered affirmatively, but the meiosis is preserved in Rom. 11:25. In 1 Cor. 6:16 we read "one flesh," but in the parallel, Mark 10:8, the two become "one body." In Acts 19:28 "Diana" should be renamed "Artemis," since we have "Areopagus," not "Mars" hill, in Acts 17:19, and "Zeus" and "Hermes" in Acts 14:12.

In Matt. 5:3 μακάριος = "happy," but in Titus 2:13 we wait "in hope for the blessing." Why not "hope of happiness?" Is this perhaps an indication that the rendering in Matt. 5:3 is not adequate? Something like "God's favored ones" is required in the Matthaean statement, and I would suggest for Titus 2:13 "we await expectantly the seal of God's favor." Moreover, ἐλπίς here is more than our customary evanescent hope; it is faith's assurance of the fulfillment of God's promises.

Most disappointing is the confused rendering of δοῦλος. The word "slave" ought to be retained wherever it appears in the original. The context will reveal to the

modern reader, even as it did to the ancient reader, the direction in which it is to be understood. In most of the Gospel occurrences JB renders "servant," but "servant" is the proper word to render δίδκονος, as in Mark 10:43-44, where the term is used in conjunction with δοῦλος. In Luke 7:8 the point is lost with "servant," for the accent is on unqualified obedience, and Hellenistic readers knew that when a slave was given orders, especially by a centurion, he hopped to it. In Colossians δοῦλος is rendered "slave," except in 4:12, where the point is obscured by a change to "servant." In 2 Cor. 4:5; Gal. 1:10; and 2 Peter 1:1, we find "servant" for δοῦλος, with loss in meaning of the passages. However, in Rom. 6:18, 1 Peter 2:16, and 2 Peter 2:19, the point of the passages is preserved with "slave(s)."

Poetic passages in the Old Testament generally read well. More attention, however, could be paid to the vigor of Hebrew syntax, which often produces elegant English poetic expression. The Hebrew word order in Job 16:15, for example, produces: "and in the dust have rubbed my brow," which JB renders: "and rubbed my brow in the dust."

#### PUNCTUATION

Punctuation is a guide to interpretation, and the translators use it with good effect, especially the exclamation mark. In the use of quotation marks, however, the translators are not an infallible guide. John 3:31-36 may be editorial comment of the evangelist, and at least a note should have hinted this. Matt. 8:7 may be read as a question. 1 Cor. 6:12 contains an objection of the Corinthians, and it is correctly set off as a quotation. However, v. 13a seems to be another Corinthian slogan, but the

typography does not indicate this, nor is a note appended. Lam. 5:22 should not be flattened into a declarative statement. Questions are a characteristic mark of ancient lamentation.<sup>6</sup>

#### TEXT

Criteria for determining the text behind the translation are not always discernible, but in the main the Westcott-Hort tradition can be recognized in the text of the New Testament. According to the footnote, the interpolated legend in John 5:3-4 is said to be omitted by the "best witnesses." Yet the passage is retained in the text. In the case of Mark 9:44 and 46, where the evidence is fairly divided, the passage is dropped but John 7:53—8:11 and Acts 24:6a-8a, which are even less well attested, are retained in the translation. The addition in Matt. 9:13 "to repentance" is not even indicated as a significant variant, nor is πρωτότοκον noted for Matt. 1:25. The note on John 19:29 reads "conj. 'on a spear,'" but 476 and 1242 have what is probably the correct reading, and "conj." is in any case misleading, although correct historically. In 1 Cor. 10:2 some note should have been made indicating the variants in the case of the word "baptized." The translators have opted for the passive, which is an inferior reading. Similarly in Heb. 9:11, the translators have chosen the inferior μελλόντων το γενομένων. The writer's accent is on the "good things already here."

Emendations or departures from the Masoretic text are frequent in this version's rendition of the Old Testament. In almost

<sup>6</sup> See, e.g., the Sumerian lament cited in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, ed. James B. Pritchard (2d ed. rev. and enlarged, Princeton, 1955), p. 456.

all cases such departures from the received text were necessary, and the renderings are well done. Many of these changes are carefully noted, as in the treatment of Is. 53, where seven alterations are cited. However, an examination of the editors' work on 1 Chronicles suggests that the value of the marginal notes as indicators of the original text leaves something to be desired: The following alterations are made without comment:

- 2:50 "sons of Hur" is a LXX reading. Heb.: "son of Hur."
- 3:21 "his son," five times. Heb. reads "his sons." Also, "Sons of Hananiah" is obscure, since only one son is mentioned, and the reader may not catch the Semitic view of the descendants as a unit.
- 5:6 "Tiglath-pileser." Heb.: *til'gat pil'e-ne' eser*.
- 7:35 "Sons of Helem." Most mss., "Son of Helem."
- 8:8 The Hebrew is corrupt, but no hint of alteration is given.
- 9:33 "from service." The paraphrase conceals the difficulty in the Hebrew.
- 10:7 "men of Israel" is supplied.
- 11:11 "whom he killed" is a paraphrase. Heb.: "slain at one time."
- 11:20 "Thirty." Heb.: "three."
- 17:17b A reworking of the Hebrew text.
- 19:8 "with all the common soldiers and the champions" obscures the syntactical problem.
- 20:3 "set them to work with saws." Heb.: "sawed them with saws."
- 24:23 "of Hebron." Most Heb. mss. omit, but the addition is required.
- 28:18 "with wings outspread" is read from the LXX.

The manner in which the translators have handled other textual problems in 1 Chronicles also requires comment. "Sons of" in 1 Chron. 2:7 is odd, since only Achar

is mentioned. The same may be said of vv. 8 and 31, inasmuch as other changes in the interest of sense are made, for example, in 2:24, 42 and 7:14. In 7:16 Maacah is the wife of Machir, but in v. 15 his sister. Here the Hebrew requires correction, but the translators let the text stand. In connection with 13:5 some indication might have been given that Shihor has something to do with the canals of the Nile. In 10:11 "all the inhabitants" should not be cited as a mere correction; it is read by the LXX, and the translators elsewhere indicate that version when they adopt its reading. The rendering in 19:18, "killed seven thousand of their chariot teams," is faithful to the MT, but correction of the text is required, as the AV long ago noted with its italics.

A cursory examination of other passages suggests a similar unequal pattern. The phrase "will be full of it," in reference to the blood, Ezek. 32:6, may be a needed correction of the Hebrew, but no reference is made to the MT, which reads "full of you." On the other hand, the MT may well be original, expressing a vivid identification of persons with their blood. A note is appended to Ps. 16:9, but a related shift from *ke'bôdî* to *ke'bêdî* is not signaled in connection with Gen. 49:6. H. L. Ginsberg's brilliant emendation of "glaze" for "silver of dross" in Prov. 26:23 is adopted, but without comment. In Eccl. 3:3 *laharôs* ("wrecking") for *laharôg* ("killing," read by JB) seems more appropriate in view of the formal structures in the chapter. Then the verse would read: "A time for wrecking, and a time for repairing."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> H. L. Ginsberg, "Quintessence of Koheleth," p. 49.

Tahtimhodshi (2 Sam. 24:6 AV) is well rendered with the help of Lucian's recension "Kadesh in the land of the Hittites," inasmuch as Tahtimhodshi is located in Erewhon and not in the Near East. In 1 Sam. 23:7 the reading of the LXX (πέπρακεν) is preferred by the translators and may have found support at Ugarit;<sup>8</sup> however, πέπρακεν means "sold," and "delivered" (which the margin cites as the meaning of the Greek) is a paraphrase.

The note on Matt. 21:5 does not call attention to Matthew's use of the LXX for Zech. 9:9 (but the translation in JB is more accurate than in NEB, which omitted the καί). The unwary reader would not notice that Zech. 9:9 speaks of one animal, whereas Matthew refers to two distinct animals.

#### SOURCES

Old Testament allusions are noted in the margins and will be of appreciable value to the Bible student. Ex. 24:8 is correctly signaled in connection with 1 Peter 1:2; however, the probable allusion to Ps. 41:9 in Mark 14:18 is not. Ex. 23:20 is a clearer source than Mal. 3:1 for the first words in the citation in Mark 1:2. Words apparently taken from the Old Testament are italicized in the translation. Thus in Heb. 11:8 the single words ἐξελεῖν and ἐξῆλθεν are each rendered "set out," with a reference in the margin to Gen. 12:1-4, but there is no use of italics in Matt. 2:20, where not one but several words are borrowed from Ex. 4:19.

A source of much of Jude 16 does not appear to be Enoch 5:5, but the Assumption of Moses (Ch. 7, Charles). A marginal reference is made to Tobit 11:10-15

in the account of Saul's conversion (Acts 9), but no note is made of the more pertinent parallel in 2 Mac. 3.

Various levels of objectivity are evident in the notes. The rendering of Luke 7:47 is one of the best found in modern versions: "For this reason I tell you that her sins, her many sins, must have been forgiven her, or she would not have shown such great love." As if this were not stated clearly enough, the marginal note adds: "Not, as is usually translated, 'her many sins are forgiven her *because* she has shown such great love.' The context demands the reverse: she shows so much affection because she has had so many sins forgiven." Again, in connection with James 5:16, the margin reads: "Nothing special however may be deduced about sacramental confession." Gen. 3:15 reads correctly: "It will crush your head and you will strike its heel." Here the editors are in a dilemma. The traditional Roman Catholic interpretation renders the pronoun "it" with "she" in reference to Mary. The note, designed to satisfy the magisterium, points out that the latter "application has become current in the Church." Less satisfying is the note on Matt. 1:25 that "the gospels elsewhere suppose" Mary's "perpetual virginity." No evidence is cited for this statement, but the answer perhaps lies in the interpretation given to the word "brothers" in Matt. 12:46, interpreted as "near relatives" in the note.

#### CONCLUSION

With some discount for special pleading and inequalities due to multiple editorial activity, this version of the Scriptures merits careful attention also from Bible students outside the Roman community.

<sup>8</sup> See John Gray, p. 190.

May Paul's prayer in Eph. 3:14-21 be the prayer of every reader:

"This, then, is what I pray, kneeling before the Father, from whom every family, whether spiritual or natural, takes its name: Out of his infinite glory, may he give you the power through his Spirit for your hidden self to grow strong, so that Christ may live in your hearts through faith, and then, planted in love and built on love, you will with all the saints have

strength to grasp the breadth and the length, the height and the depth; until, knowing the love of Christ, which is beyond all knowledge, you are filled with the utter fullness of God.

"Glory be to him whose power, working in us, can do infinitely more than we can ask or imagine; glory be to him from generation to generation in the Church and in Christ Jesus for ever and ever. Amen."

St. Louis, Mo.