



**THE
DUKE
DIVINITY SCHOOL
REVIEW**

Winter 1979

**THE
DUKE
DIVINITY SCHOOL
REVIEW**

Volume 44

Winter 1979

Number 1

CONTENTS

The Nature of Luther's Reform	3
<i>by David C. Steinmetz</i>	
The Foundation of Calvin's Theology: Scripture as Revealing God's Word	14
<i>by Richard A. Muller</i>	
St. Teresa of Avila: Friend of God	24
<i>by Wendy Williams</i>	
John Wesley as Revealed by the Journal of Hester Ann Rogers	33
<i>by Paul Wesley Chilcote</i>	
Known	44
<i>by Charles K. Robinson</i>	
The Lectionary: Straightjacket or Coat of Many Colors?	49
<i>by Roger R. Keller</i>	
Book Reviews	54
A Few Minutes, Please!	63

Editor: Charles Robinson: Associate Editors: Mark Allen, Lloyd Bailey, Frank Baker, Donn Michael Farris, Roland Murphy, Nancy Rosebaugh

Published three times a year (Winter, Spring, Fall)
by the Divinity School of Duke University

Postage paid at Durham, North Carolina 27706

No #

Div. Sch.
207.756
D877 3
v. 44 1979
v. 46 1981/198

The Nature of Luther's Reform

by DAVID C. STEINMETZ

Professor of Church History and Doctrine

Take me, for example. I opposed indulgences and all papists, but never by force. I simply taught, preached, wrote God's Word; otherwise I did nothing. And then while I slept or drank Wittenberg beer with my Philip and my Amsdorf, the Word so greatly weakened the papacy that never a prince or Emperor did such damage to it. I did nothing. The Word did it all.

The Protestant Reformation began, almost by accident, on October 31, 1517. By all counts the central figure of that Reformation was the professor of Old Testament at the newly established University of Wittenberg, Father Martin Luther, an ascetic and soft-spoken friar of the Reformed Congregation (Observant) of the Order of the Hermits of St. Augustine. Even though there were currents of reform in the 16th century which owed very little to Martin Luther and which were marked more by hostility to his thought than by indebtedness to him, nevertheless, the questions which prompted the schism between Protestantism and the Roman Catholic Church were in a preeminent sense Luther's questions. When Karl Holl, the famous Church historian at the University of Berlin, remarked that John Calvin was Luther's best disciple, he was underscoring a fact with which historians and theologians must come to terms. Luther marks a turning-point in the intellectual history of the West. It is impossible to understand the nature of Protestantism or of the Roman Catholic Church which redefined its borders in the light of the Protestant Revolt without understanding the genius of Luther's thought.

Luther was not a political revolutionary. Aside from an early appeal to the German princes as *Notbischöfe*, emergency bishops who ought to act to reform the Church in the face of the dilatory and half-hearted tactics of the Catholic bishops, Luther remained sceptical of the state and of the legitimacy of political means to further spiritual ends. Political power cannot compel conscience and princes make better hangmen than spiritual leaders. Therefore Luther opposed Thomas Müntzer and the Peasants' Revolt, on the one hand, and distrusted the Protestant League and the diplomatic negotiations of Melanchthon, on the other. "I did nothing," he claimed in his famous but unbelievable alibi. "The Word did it all." Nevertheless, while Luther was politically naive, his Reformation forced politicians to redraw the political map of Europe and to redefine the boundaries of the European states.

Luther was also not a Church reformer in the strict sense of the term. He did not set out to attack monasticism or abuses in the life of the Church. If Luther had shown any defects as an Augustinian friar, he was guilty of a too rigorous asceticism and indulged an excessively sensitive conscience. Luther was a conservative friar in the most traditionally Catholic state of 16th century Europe. His Reformation grew, not out of his radical tendencies, but out of his patient research as a biblical scholar. In his lectures on the Psalms and on the letter to the Romans, Luther was slowly led by his research to reconceive the center of the Christian message. This fresh conception of the message led to a new form of the Christian life and gave birth to new institutions. In his *Tabletalk*, Luther observed to his students over lunch: "Wyclif and Hus fought merely against the life of the Pope. That is why they did not attain their purpose, for they were sinners just as the papists were. But I attacked the doctrine." (*WATR I*, nr. 880).

One must also admit that Luther was not a spokesman for the economic aspirations of the rising middle classes. Luther's economic attitudes were medieval. He was opposed to all interest as usury and could never understand how it was possible to make one guilder out of another. There is little in Martin Luther which foreshadows either Adam Smith or Karl Marx. Still Luther's Reformation put an end to many Church taxes and provided the moral preconditions and incentives for the development of a powerful urban middle class. The Protestant ethic was an accidental by-product of Luther's biblical research.

The Reformation of Martin Luther was primarily a movement of doctrinal and theological reform. To say that does not exclude the fact that the reform served as a catalyst for a myriad of social, political, religious and economic aspirations of people not in sympathy with the central thrust of Luther's thought or who understood it imperfectly. Wilfrid Sheed once remarked with tongue in cheek that the staunchest defenders of the Protestant ethic in contemporary American society are first-generation Sicilian immigrants. The point is exaggerated, but not wholly false.

In spite of Luther's decisive impact on the modern world, Luther had no reform program. Indeed, if the word will not be misunderstood, one could even say that Luther had a charismatic view of reform. In Luther's view God was reforming the Church (together with all the social and political dislocation which that reform implied), while he, Martin Luther, was personally very unimportant. "While I slept or drank Wittenberg beer with my Philip or my Amsdorf, the Word so greatly weakened the papacy that never a prince or Emperor did such damage to it. I did nothing. The Word

did it all.” Luther gives the impression, in Gordon Rupp’s happy phrase, that he regarded the Reformation as a tempest in a beer mug. Yet while Luther claimed to do nothing, it would be more accurate to say that he did nothing programmatically. The still incomplete Weimar edition of his collected works now numbers over ninety volumes. Luther pursued research into the Old Testament, met his classes, wrote letters, composed polemical treatises (many of which are still hilariously funny), engaged in the pedestrian chores of academic and ecclesiastical administration. He was intensely active, but he had no unified vision of the reform of Church and state. He set in motion forces which he did not try, or only tried half-heartedly, to control.

Luther’s Reformation was connected from beginning to end with university life. The University of Wittenberg competed with its closest rival, the University of Leipzig, by putting into effect an experimental curriculum. Aristotle was deposed from his central place in the liberal arts and theological curriculum, and students were put to work studying the Bible and St. Augustine. Instead of reading the scholastic doctors (St. Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus and Gregory of Rimini had been staple items in the old curriculum), the students learned Greek and Hebrew, read the early Fathers, and listened to a dazzling array of lecturers apply the methods of the humanists to the biblical texts. The new curriculum made Wittenberg the most popular university in Germany and formed a generation in new theological ideas. The Reformation started as a movement of university reform among a collection of scholars more interested in purifying ancient texts than in reforming society. Yet, from these unlikely beginnings, the Reformation became an immensely popular movement rooted in German life. Luther was both scholar and reformer, and reformer precisely because he was a scholar. He is a symbol that the lively pursuit of the truth, rather than the breathless scramble for relevance, may prove in the long run to be the most relevant service which the university performs for the society in which it lives.

I

At the very heart of Luther’s reconception of the Christian message lies his understanding of Christian freedom. Luther sums up what is meant by Christian freedom in two short propositions:

A Christian is a perfectly free lord of all, subject to none.

A Christian is a perfectly dutiful servant of all, subject to all.

Every person stands in two fundamental relationships: in a relationship to God and in a relationship to society. Luther uses two Latin phrases to designate these two relationships: *coram Deo* (“in the presence of God”) to designate the relationship to God the Creator

and Redeemer, and *coram hominibus* (“before men”) to designate the relationship to one’s neighbor. These two relationships are distinct, though they interest in each person. Luther can also talk of an inner nature, known only to God and the self, and an outer nature which must be fed, housed, pampered, clothed, and which enters into relationship with other human beings. What he has in mind in using this language is much the same thing as when he uses the phrases *coram Deo* and *coram hominibus*. What Luther wants to prove is that a Christian is a perfectly free Lord of all *coram Deo* and a perfectly dutiful servant of all *coram hominibus*.

He first focuses on the relationship *coram Deo*. The soul, the inner nature of the human person, needs righteousness and freedom. This righteousness cannot be conferred by eating certain foods or abstaining from others. There are no ritual or liturgical acts which will grant spiritual freedom or take it away once it has been obtained. Neither hunger nor thirst nor poor health nor imprisonment nor external misfortune of any kind can damage the soul or destroy a wholesome and right relationship to God.

Righteousness and freedom are conferred on the soul by the Word of God. The Word of God which confers this proper relationship on the sinner is the good news of Jesus Christ. Luther elsewhere draws a distinction between two kinds of words in order to make clear what the Bible means when it speaks of the Word of God. There is, of course, the *Heissel-Wort*, the Call-Word, the word which we use when we apply names to things which already exist. The biblical story of Adam in the garden is a fine example of this. He names all the creatures. He does not create them; he only sorts them out and gives them labels.

But there is a second kind of word, the *Thettel-Wort* or Deed-Word, which not only names, but effects what it says. Adam looks around him and says, “There is a cow and an owl and a horse and a mosquito.” But God looks around Him and says, “Let there be light,” and there is light.

God’s Word, according to Luther, is a Deed-Word. It creates new possibilities where no possibilities existed before. The Word of God is a Word which enriches the poor, releases the captives, gives sight to the blind and sets at liberty those who are oppressed. The Word which the Church proclaims is a Deed-Word. It is a Word which meets men and women at the point of their greatest need and sets them free. A Church which has become modest about the proclamation of the gospel is not a Church which has become more relevant to the human situation, but less so.

Jesus Christ is the Deed-Word of God. It is he and no one else—certainly no program or promotional emphasis—which has been

anointed to set at liberty those who are oppressed. The Church has been commissioned, not to be original, but to witness to him. Therefore, it is a terrible catastrophe, far worse than any natural disaster, when the Church experiences a famine of the hearing of the Word of God. Christ has no other ministry than the ministry of the Word. All apostles, bishops and priests are called to that same ministry.

I refrain from saying anything about the utterly stupid and incompetent persons whom bishops and abbots nowadays promote everywhere to the pulpit. We really cannot say that they are called and sent, even if we wanted to, because in this case incompetent and unworthy men are given the call. This is the work of God's wrath, for it is he who withdraws his word from us on account of our sins and he increases the number of vacuous talkers and verbose babblers.

The appropriate response to the Word of God is faith, not works. While works have a role to play *coram hominibus*, the relationship to God (*coram Deo*) calls for a response of faith alone. Faith is not a simple human possibility. All persons are alienated from God. They have placed their ultimate trust in something which is not God, whether something crass like money and power, or something noble like human love. God must break us down in our self-trust, in our false worship of what is not ultimate, in order to teach us trust in the gospel. Only faith in the gospel can restore health and freedom to the soul and overcome the alienation from God which is the universal predicament of mankind.

Scripture has, therefore, two parts, corresponding to the double work which God must do in order to teach us faith. There are the commandments and the promises. The commandments show men and women what they ought to do, but cannot give them the power to do it. When people examine themselves in the light of the commandments or law of God, they discover that they are sinful and helpless and are reduced to humility by that discovery. God breaks the self-righteous down through the law in order to teach them what it means to trust in his promises. He does his strange work of wrath through the law in order to do his proper work of restoring life through the gospel.

The promises of God give as a free gift all that the law commands but was powerless to effect. The only response appropriate to a promise is trust. If a king promises a robber, to use an illustration which Luther employs in his early lectures on the Psalms, that he will give him a hundred dollars on the sole condition that the robber appear at a certain place on a certain day and claim it, then it is clear that the robber, if he wishes the reward, must appear at the designated place and time. He does not receive the gift because he merits it. Indeed, he is a robber and deserves punishment. The gift is given

because of the king's promise irrespective of merit or demerit. All one can do with a promise is accept it or turn it down.

God promises righteousness and freedom to sinners. That promise contradicts ordinary human expectations. Sinners ought to receive punishment, not righteousness; incarceration rather than freedom. But by the double work of his law and gospel, God teaches us to close our eyes to ordinary human expectations and the conclusions of common sense and open our ears to the promise which offers life and freedom to us. Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the Word of God. God always acts in a way which is contrary to ordinary human expectation. He vindicates his wisdom in ways which sensible people regard as foolish.

Therefore, just as the wisdom of God is hidden under the disguise of foolishness and truth under the form of a lie, so also the word of God comes, whenever it comes, in a form that is contrary to our own thinking in so far as it pretends to have the truth by and from itself.

Hence, we must do nothing else but listen to the word with all our mind and all our strength, simply keeping our eyes closed and directing all our prudence only to it. And whether it enjoins something foolish or bad, something large or small, we must do it, judging what we do in terms of the word and not the word in terms of what we do.

Luther uses three analogies to demonstrate the way in which God communicates righteousness and freedom to the soul by means of faith. The first analogy is natural. A heated iron glows because of the union of fire with it. So, too, the Word, like fire, communicates its properties to the soul. A soul united to the Word has all that God has promised to give and does not need to rely on good works in order to gain justification.

The second analogy is drawn from personal relations and was developed by Luther in his early commentary on the Psalms. God justifies us when we justify him. We justify God when we ascribe to him the honor which is due him; that is, when we regard him as truthful in his promises. Faith in God's promises is the act by which we ascribe truthfulness, justice, wisdom and fidelity to God. When we consider God truthful in his promises, God considers us righteous on account of our faith. "Those who honor me," says I Samuel 2:30 of God, "I will honor." Paul has reference to the same principle when he argues that Abraham's faith was reckoned to him for righteousness.

The final analogy is drawn from the marriage relationship and rests on a distinction drawn from Roman law between property, which implies ownership, and possession, which implies right of usage. In marriage two people who have their own property in the eyes of the law enter into the possession and use of the property of

their partner. The same phenomenon holds true in justification. The Christian's property is his sin. Christ's property is his righteousness. When the Christian is united to Christ by the wedding ring of faith, Christ's property—i.e., his righteousness—becomes the possession of the Christian. At the same time the Christian's property—i.e., his sin—becomes the possession of Christ. In one decisive act Christ takes it over and takes it away. But the benefits of the relationship are inseparable from the relationship itself. There is no exchange of possessions without faith.

II

While the Christian is justified by faith alone and apart from any reliance, however slight, on his own good works, nevertheless that faith expresses itself *coram hominibus* in good works out of spontaneous love for God and in gratitude for his gifts. Living faith toward God issues in moral activity directed toward the neighbor. These works are not reluctantly extracted from the Christian by the forceps of the law, but spontaneously overflow in unstinting measure.

Luther uses three analogies to try to explain what he means when he affirms that good works do not make a good man (righteousness is given to faith alone), but a good man does good works. The first analogy is based on the creation story in Genesis. Adam was not made righteous by tilling and planting the garden of Eden, since he was righteous already. But because he was a good and righteous man, he worked in the garden in order to please God and express his love and gratitude.

A bishop is not made a bishop by performing episcopal activities such as confirming children or dedicating churches. If an actor performed those actions in a play or if a prankster did them, they would have no validity at all. The confirmation of children does not make a person into a bishop, but because a person is a bishop by ordination he can validly confirm children as members of the Church. The office precedes the function; being precedes doing.

Similarly a tree bears apples only if it is an apple tree. One can take a botany book into the orchard and read it to the apple trees, telling them what kind of blossoms to bear and when, and what variety of apples to yield and how, but it will make no difference to the trees. If the trees are apple trees, they will bear apples apart from our exposition of their duties and even, perhaps, in spite of it. We may congratulate ourselves when the harvest comes on our eloquent exposition of the law in the orchard, but our exhortations were irrelevant. The nature of the tree dictates the kind and quantity of the fruit.

If we should try the following spring to demonstrate our rhetorical skills by reading the section on cherry trees to the apple orchard, we shall see how pointless our exposition of duties has become. No exhortation, however moving, will ever persuade a cherry tree to yield apples. Similarly, no exposition of the law will ever bring good works out of an evil man. Works do not make the man; worship does. If we love, trust and honor God above everything else, we shall express that love in good works which glorify him. If we trust as our god something which is not God, we shall bring forth works appropriate to our idolatry. What we are precedes what we do and what we do proceeds from what we are. Works are good if they are done in faith; i.e., if we fulfill the first commandment by faith alone. Works do not make one a Christian; faith does. But faith is lively and active and is endlessly busy in good works.

Luther does not reject good works, except as the basis for justification. On the contrary, Luther wishes to stress as much as possible the importance of good works in the life of faith. Christ does not free us from works, but from false opinions concerning them. Christians are called to live in Christ by faith alone and in the neighbor by works of love. I do not perform good works in order to be justified, but because I already am.

The Christian does not need good works for his own justification. Christians are justified by faith alone. Therefore, they should give their good works to their neighbor, who does in fact desperately need them. The pattern for this selfless renunciation of works and the unself-regarding bestowal of them on the neighbor is Christ. Christ put on our condition; he clothed himself in our humanity, laying aside all his privileges and prerogatives. He was rich by nature, but for our sake he became poor.

Christians, too, are rich—by faith if not by nature. All that belongs to Christ belongs to the Christian because of the spiritual marriage which has occurred in faith. We are called like Christ to empty ourselves, to put on our neighbor as Christ put on our humanity, and give ourselves as a Christ to the neighbor just as Christ offered himself freely and without reservation to us. Luther summarizes the moral goal of the Christian life in these radical words: "I will do nothing in this life except what I see is necessary, profitable and salutary to my neighbor, since through faith I have an abundance of all good things in Christ."

Luther describes the love of God as a *verlorene Liebe*, a lost love which pours itself out shamelessly on the just and the unjust alike. That is the kind and character of love which the Christian, who is justified by faith alone, freely offers to the neighbor. It is a love which takes no account of gratitude or ingratitude, worthiness or

unworthiness, friends or enemies, praise or blame, gain or loss. It does not attempt to place other people under obligation to itself or engage in any kind of subtle spiritual blackmail. It considers no good work wasted, even when it is despised by the recipient. Indeed, it is only as Christians pour out their lives in the world that their fellowship with each other is renewed. Philippians 2 contains the pattern for the renewal of the Church. It is as the rich become poor for the sake of the poor that God makes both rich.

The argument, as Luther develops it, is logical and convincing. Good works are the spontaneous response of Christians to the need of the neighbor, as perceived by those who, following the mind of Christ, have put on their neighbor's situation. Good works spring from true and genuine love. Love is true and genuine where there is faith and confidence in the promises of God. Confidence in God is created by the proclamation of the Word of God, the good news of what God has done for the salvation of men and women in Jesus Christ. It is the Word of God which is the essential foundation and precondition for an authentic moral life.

The Christian life is a life of freedom. All Christians are free from sin because they have received the righteousness of Christ through faith. Christians are free from anxiety that suffering or physical calamities of any kind will be able to destroy their relationship to God. They are free to bear the Word of God's judgment and grace to other Christians and to intercede on their behalf in prayer. They are free to identify with the situation of their neighbor and to pour out works of love on persons in need, because they know they cannot hoard those works in order to justify their lives in the presence of God. They are free from the law, whether the law of God or any prescription of merely human origin which attempts to bind the Word of God. Indeed, they are even free to chuckle with the angels over the rich joke that the commandments of God, no less than the promises of the gospel, can only be fulfilled by faith alone. Christians are free in faith and therefore free to serve. Christian ethics are grounded in faith alone. Luther is not apologetic about that fact. There is simply no place else where they can be grounded.

Luther warns against people who cannot get their minds around Christian freedom and think that Christians can never be liberated until they drive out from the Church all ceremonies, traditions and human laws. Some Protestants feel they can only be authentic Christians if they reject all ceremonies associated with the Roman Catholic Church, even though, by asserting their freedom in this respect, they harm the faith of simpler people. Luther advocates a middle ground. Christians are, of course, free to adopt habits or styles of life which are not forbidden in Scripture. But the over-

riding rule is love. Christians must have respect for the conscience of the weak, even while not letting the conscience of the weak become a law for the Church.

God makes us free in order that we may serve the neighbor. Where the gospel is preached, communities of love are created. Such communities of love, in which authentic human freedom is realized, cannot be formed or sustained in any other way. Luther sums up his teaching in these words:

We conclude, therefore, that a Christian lives not in himself but in Christ and in his neighbor. Otherwise he is not a Christian. He lives in Christ through faith, in his neighbor through love. By faith he is caught up beyond himself into God. By love he descends beneath himself into his neighbor. Yet he always remains in God and in His love. . . .

III

There are three observations about the nature of Luther's reform which are worth making, even if only very briefly:

1. In Luther's theology the vertical relationship to God and the horizontal relationship to the neighbor are so inseparably joined in the act of faith that one is unthinkable without the other. In principle, if not always in practice, there is no place in Luther's conception of the gospel for that variety of evangelical Christianity—all too common in America—which cultivates individual piety but is utterly unable to identify with the weak, the poor and the oppressed, with whom Christ is identified. On the other hand, Luther has no patience with a social gospel which lacks religious depth and which substitutes ethical analysis and moral obligation for inner liberation and joy. Freedom in faith and freedom to love can only be isolated from each other with disastrous results for both.

2. Luther administers a very useful corrective to some of the more enthusiastic theologies of liberation currently being commended to the churches. Identification with the weak and powerless is fundamental to Luther's ethics. At the same time Luther knows that there is a freedom which no oppression can ever take away from the Christian and there is a liberation which no alteration in one's social and political circumstances, however fundamental or drastic, can ever effect. One can be oppressed and free; one can be liberated and in bondage. To say that does not belittle the struggle for justice and for basic human rights, but it does keep that struggle in the proper perspective.

3. There is an irony in Luther's rather cavalier approach to reform of which United Methodists at least should be aware. Wesley divided the agenda of early Methodist conferences into three parts: what to teach, how to teach, what to do. Modern United Methodists have a

lot of time for the last question, some for the second and almost none for the first. But it was the question, what to teach, and not the question, what to do, which lay at the heart of the Reformation as Luther understood it. Luther concentrated on doctrine and shook Europe to its foundations. We concentrate on program and strategy and make almost no difference that matters to the world around us. The comparison is instructive.

The Foundation of Calvin's Theology: Scripture as Revealing God's Word

by RICHARD A. MULLER
Mellon Graduate Fellow

"Without the Word, there is nothing left for us but darkness."—from
the commentary on II Peter 1:19.

He didn't want to be a preacher, much less, a reformer. His desire in life was to be a man of letters, a scholar, whose struggles were all intellectual and all engaged in the quiet of a library. But his hope to remain at the edge of the religious conflict of the times was in vain. At the age of twenty-six he published a book, *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, that could only draw him into the fray; and the following year he met with the "thunderous voice" of William Farel:

in the name of almighty God—this Farel said—I declare to you, you make a pretext of your studies; if you refuse to devote yourself to this work of the Lord, here, with us, God will set a curse upon you, because you seek your own welfare more than the Christ.

The young John Calvin heard well. He was frightened and deeply perturbed by the voice, "not so much by the counsel and exhortation as by a terrifying adjuration, as if God had from on high set his hand upon me to detain me."

The year was 1536. John Calvin abandoned his plan to journey on to Strasbourg and scholarly quietude for an active life of preaching and teaching in Geneva. Except for a period of three years (1538-1541) during which he and Farel were exiled by a town not yet ready to become the Christian commonwealth, Calvin remained in Geneva until his death in 1564. In each aspect of his work, whether it was in the gradual development of the *Institutes* into a vast summation of his thought, in the painstaking exegetical examination of the greater part of the Bible, or in the sermons which he preached twice each Sunday and once each day of the week in alternate weeks, Calvin viewed himself as the servant of the Word of God. As the *Ordinances of the City of Geneva* (1542) declared, "The duty of pastors . . . is to announce the Word of God for instruction, admonition, exhortation, and reproof." That Word, given to man in Scripture and known to be both true and sufficient for salvation by the inward witness of the Holy Spirit, constituted for Calvin the foundation of all Christian teaching.

As a preacher Calvin continually sought to emphasize to his hearers the need for God's Word as a light to life's path. He recognized that the revelation of God embodied in Scripture was more

than a simple deposit of knowledge. In the reading and exposition of Scripture and in the hearing of the preached Word, God is daily revealed to the human heart as Creator, Ruler, Redeemer, Father. Scripture, as God's Word, is a present revelation, an effective Word directed toward the faithful: "there is nothing more notable or glorious in the church than the ministry of the gospel, since it is the administration of the Spirit and of righteousness and of eternal life" (*Institutes*, IV. iii. 2). God's Spirit is so joined to the Word that preaching becomes at once a communication of God's will and an instrument of the Spirit in working salvation. Calvin establishes the closest possible relation between the words of the preacher, the Word of God, and the work of the Spirit without exalting the human instrument beyond his station. Preaching makes the Word of God present to faith because God has so willed.

This sense of the importance of the living Word preached in conveying to Christians the saving content of revelation also lies behind Calvin's discussion of the relation of the Word to faith. God's Word is both the foundation and the source of the life and strength of the Church. Even as the Spirit testifies to the heart concerning the authority of Scripture, so does he make the Word fruitful in leading us toward Christ. The Spirit opens our eyes that we might perceive the light of the Word (III. ii. 33-34). A keen balance of these subjective and objective elements appears, therefore, both in Calvin's doctrine of Scripture and in his description of faith:

Therefore our mind must be otherwise illumined and our heart strengthened, that the Word of God may obtain full faith among us. Now we possess a right definition of faith if we call it a firm and certain knowledge of God's benevolence toward us, founded upon the truth of the freely given promise in Christ, both revealed to our minds and sealed upon our hearts through the Holy Spirit (III. ii. 7).

Calvin's sermons continually call attention to the presence and power of the Word bringing men to faith.

The necessity of an embodiment of God's revelation in the Scripture over against the inability of fallen creatures to learn rightly of God through an exercise of their own powers provides Calvin with his basic impulse to formulate a doctrine of Scripture in the *Institutes* (I. vi. 1). The sinfulness of humanity acts as an impediment even to the knowledge of God as Creator. The Word comes as a light to people who walk in darkness: "Scripture, gathering up the otherwise confused knowledge of God in our minds, having dispersed our dullness, clearly shows us the true God." Scripture, therefore, first teaches of God as Creator, only afterwards drawing our spirits onward through the law and the prophets to a knowledge of God as Redeemer. If we neglect or turn aside from this "rule of eternal truth" our attempt to know God involves us in an "inexplicable labyrinth" of error (I. vi. 1-4).

After an excursus on the authority of Scripture Calvin again takes up the theme of Scripture as revealing Word, now reflecting on the correlation between natural and scriptural knowledge of God. Both are intended to manifest God “not as he is himself, but as he is toward us: so that this recognition of him consists more in living experience than in vain and high-flown speculation” (I. x. 2). All knowledge of God should conduce first to fear and then to trust, since a proper knowledge of God must include God’s justice and judgment as well as his kindness and mercy. But natural knowledge of God is corrupted by human sin. Therefore, *only Scripture* can “direct us to the true God” and draw us away from ignorant doctrines wrought by the sinful mind’s examination of nature. Scripture reveals the error of idolatry and of the attribution of any form to God (I. xi-xii), manifesting the “infinite and spiritual essence” of God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In order to understand Calvin’s view of Scripture as a living revelation of God, we will need to take very seriously not only the development of his exposition but also its terminus in the doctrine of the Trinity.

Scholars have frequently characterized Calvin’s doctrine of Scripture in terms of two principles: first, the presence in Scripture of the Word of God as given by the *inspiration* of the Holy Spirit to the prophets and the apostles and, second, the recognition of Scripture as the Word of God by reason of the *testimony* of the Spirit to the faithful heart.

There is, however, disagreement over the exact import of Calvin’s statements and over the way in which these two principles relate to one another. Many have viewed Calvin as the proponent of a rigid doctrine of verbal inspiration and of the inerrancy of the text, while others have tried to find in Calvin’s doctrine a distinction between Christ as Word and the word of Scripture as an imperfect witness to Christ effective only through the work of the Spirit.

The first interpretation was held by Reinhold Seeberg and is also associated with the orthodox “Calvinist” reading of Calvin in the writings of A. Mitchell Hunter, John Murray, and Benjamin B. Warfield. The second interpretation is the “neo-orthodox” line of Wilhelm Niesel and R.S. Wallace, who emphasize the Christocentricity of Calvin’s entire system. These last call into question the presence of a rigid theory of inspiration in Calvin’s theology by stressing the Reformer’s awareness of minor inaccuracies in the Scriptures and his sense of the limitation of human language in describing God. Niesel also makes much of the subjective tendency in Calvin’s thought, chiefly by bringing Calvin’s discussion of the relation of Word and Spirit to faith to bear upon his discussion of Scripture as Word.

All of the above writers fail to draw out the relationship of these issues to the analysis of Word and Spirit which appears in Calvin's doctrine of the *Trinity* in which the objective and subjective elements of Calvin's view of Scripture are reconciled.

The two principles—*inspiration of the Scripture* and the *testimony of the Spirit to its authority*—around which the debate turns occur at opposite ends of the *Institutes*. Calvin speaks of the testimony of the Spirit in a digression (I. vii-ix) from his main exposition of the content of scriptural revelation, while he reserves consideration of the inspiration of the text to Book IV, chapter viii where he pits Scripture as revelation given by the Spirit against the Roman Church's claim of magisterial authority. In both places he joins Word and Spirit closely together and opposes the elevation of Church above Scripture. This means that the two issues are intimately related despite their formal separation. They are also related by the categorical statement of Calvin in the earlier discussion of the testimony of the Spirit:

When that which is set forth is acknowledged to be the Word of God, there is no one so deplorably insolent—unless devoid also both of common sense and of humanity itself—as to dare impugn the credibility of Him who speaks. . . . Hence the Scriptures obtain full authority among believers only when men regard them as sprung from heaven, as if there the living words of God were heard (I. vii. 1).

Calvin's writings bear ample testimony to his conviction that not simply the motivation of the prophets and apostles to witness but also the words of their written testimony derive from the ministry of the Spirit. Commenting on I Peter 1:10-12 he remarks that the continuity and consistency of the testaments rests upon the Spirit who speaks both in the prophetic and in the apostolic writings. Both the ancient prophesies and the Gospel were given by the "dictation and guidance" of the Spirit. The word "dictated" also appears in the comment on II Timothy 3:16, where Calvin argues that "the prophets did not speak of themselves, but as organs of the Holy Spirit" and that "we owe to the Scripture the same reverence that we owe to God, since it has its only sources in him and has nothing of human origin mixed with it."

This high doctrine of inspiration must not be separated from Calvin's equally strong emphasis on the accommodated character of God's revelation. Scripture reveals only what serves to advance piety and its revelation is couched in terms accessible to the human intellect. Accommodation of the message to the situation and needs of the recipients accounts for differences between the Old and New Testaments. In the "childhood" of the Church, God clothed his heavenly promises in the form of earthly blessings and reserved the fulness of his revelation for a later time (II. xi. 2,5). Similarly Calvin

allows for a certain imprecision in usage and description within Scripture as an accommodation to the capacity of the “unlearned” reader. He also recognized and dealt with a wide variety of variant texts, emendations, and scribal errors in the conviction that the underlying inviolability and coherence of God’s Word enabled the faithful exegete to penetrate to the meaning of the passages in question.

The divine origin of Scripture appears clearly in the examination of the text. In the rather rustic language of “Amos the herdsman, Jeremiah, and Zechariah,” as much as in the refined writings of David and Isaiah, the “majesty of the Spirit” is evident. Miracles and the fulfillment of prophecies also testify to the divine hand at work, as does the providential preservation of the text throughout history. Even more, the simplicity of style and spirituality of the content of the New Testament require assent to the origin of Scripture in the instruction of the Spirit. All these evidences are confirmed by the “unvarying testimony of the Church” and the willingness of the martyrs to die for the doctrines of Scripture (I. viii).

Nevertheless, no amount of argument or human testimony will be sufficient “to prove that Scripture is the Word of God . . . for only by faith can this be known. . . . Scripture will ultimately suffice for a saving knowledge of God only when its certainty is founded upon the inward persuasion of the Holy Spirit” (I. viii. 13). The Church, therefore, cannot be the guarantor of Scripture: rather the Church itself rests on “the writings of the prophets and the preaching of the apostles.”

Scripture, writes Calvin, is “self-authenticating” (*autopiston*), not subject to “proof and reasoning” and having no authority beyond its Word to which we might turn for validation. Scripture, as “unasailable truth” itself provides the norm for our judgment:

it is sealed upon our hearts through the Spirit. Therefore, illuminated by his power, we believe neither by our own nor by anyone else’s judgment that Scripture is from God; but above human judgment we affirm with utter certainty (just as if we were gazing upon the majesty of God himself) that it has flowed to us from the very mouth of God by the ministry of men (I. vii. 5).

Scripture can be called “self-authenticating” and “sealed through the Spirit” only because the Spirit is not external to Scripture. The testimony of the Spirit occurs not in isolation or in some mystic experience but in the reading, hearing, and searching of the Scriptures. The testimony of the Spirit to us concerning the authority of Scripture belongs to the same doctrine as the idea of the inspiration of the human authors precisely because the Spirit who “dictates” to his “amanuenses” is the same Spirit who testifies to the heart. Speaking objectively of the authority of Scripture, Calvin can say of Paul’s words in II Timothy 3:16, “To assert its authority he teaches that it is

inspired of God . . . dictated by the Holy Spirit." But he quickly adds, "If anyone ask how this can be known, my reply is that it is by the revelation of the same Spirit both to learners and to teachers that God is made known as its author."

Rather than deriving the authority of Scripture from a formal doctrine of inspiration, Calvin employs the concepts of inspiration and testimony as correlative aspects of the work of the Spirit mediating in and through Scripture the saving knowledge of God. Scripture is the Word of God because the Spirit of Christ imparted to the ancient authors the wisdom of God directly from its source, the eternal Wisdom or Word which resides in God: "we see the Word understood as the order or mandate of the Son, who is himself the essential Word of the Father" in the Scriptures given by the "Spirit of the Word" (I. xiii. 7).

We begin to sense an intimate relationship between the epistemological and the Christological (or Trinitarian), the noetic and the ontic, the subjective and the objective elements of Calvin's thought. Calvin's discussion of Scripture as saving revelation begins in a manner structurally parallel to the beginning of his presentation of Christ's saving work. In the former place, a sense of man's inability to find the true God through natural revelation leads to a statement of the necessity of special revelation given in Scripture: in the latter, the unfulfilled prophecies of the Old Testament and man's inability to come to God of his own will lead to a statement of the necessity of mediation between God and man by Christ. The necessity of Scripture is grounded in the necessity of the mediated Word of God as the basis of right knowledge of God. And the Scripture, once given, reveals the further necessity of a mediated salvation. Scripture, the written Word of God, directs us to the Christ, the essential Word of God manifest in the flesh as Mediator.

Calvin's view of Scripture and doctrine, which was designed to cut through a mass of medieval speculations, will support none of Niesel's neo-orthodox conundrums in driving a wedge between Christ as Word of God and Scripture as Word in the sense of witness. Since Christ as the Word or Wisdom of God is the source "from which both all oracles and all prophecies go forth" (I. xiii. 7), the whole of Scripture must be directed toward Christ. For Scripture is the Word spoken by him who is the Word of God in order that God might be known. By reason of the work of the Spirit, Scripture perfectly reveals Christ and is truly his Word. There we learn of Christ, and through Christ of God the Father. Christ rules his kingdom by the scepter of his scriptural Word (IV, ii, 4).

Calvin nevertheless acknowledges an explicit distinction between the essential Word of God, the Word spoken, and the Word written.

The Scripture is God's Word, but it is not the Christ—rather it “clothes” Christ and communicates Christ's promise to us in a form accommodated to our understanding. Christ as the eternal and essential Word of God is the ground and foundation, the “scope” and meaning of the Scriptures (II. vi. 2-4; II. x. 4). The entire revelation of God in the Old Testament depended on the mediation of Christ as Word of God, first in the form of “secret revelations” and oracles given to the patriarchs, later in the written law which came from the “mouth of God,” and then in the Word which came to the prophets and was recorded by them (IV. viii. 5-6). Finally, in confirmation and conclusion of all previous revelation, “the Wisdom of God was at length revealed in the flesh.” This revelation of the “perfect radiance of divine truth” as preserved in the writings of the Apostles, completes the scriptural Word of God and provides the Church with its norm of doctrine, beyond which there can be no authority. God “has so fulfilled all functions of teaching in his Son that we must regard this as the final and eternal testimony of him” (IV. viii. 7).

This concept of a *progressive* revelation, culminating in the Word made flesh, unites several of the elements in Calvin's doctrine of Scripture. Here, as in his Christology, Calvin binds the form taken by the Word to the issue of knowledge. Like Luther, though not in as paradoxical a manner, Calvin holds that God is both hidden and revealed in his self-manifestation. Human forms of expression and, indeed, the human nature of Christ both reveal to us what is necessary for our salvation and hide from us the awesome and incomprehensible majesty of God. The words bearing the revelation of the law and the prophets prepared the mind and heart of the Church for the coming of the Word in the flesh. In Scripture and even in the culmination of the revelatory process, the incarnation, God cannot be contained, even though he gives himself wholly. Infinite God *cannot be encapsulated* in finite human forms.

The continuity between the progress of revelation in Scripture and the work of the Son of God incarnate is nowhere more apparent than in Calvin's doctrine of the prophetic office of Christ. In his teaching Christ reveals clearly what the prophets had only shadowed forth. The prophets themselves recognized that they only prepared the way for a fuller revelation of God's will. Citing Isaiah 61:1-2, Calvin argues that the anointing of Christ by the Spirit parallels the anointing of the ancient prophets to their teaching office. Calvin even describes the anointing of the Mediator to his prophetic office in a manner that reflects his concept of the inspiration of the prophets to write and that explains why the Spirit of the Word also

testifies to the heart in confirmation of the message of Scripture: "he received anointing not only for himself that he might carry out the office of teaching, but for his whole body that the power of the Spirit might be present in the continuing preaching of the gospel" (II. xv. 2). Christ completes the process of revelation not only because he reveals a fuller knowledge of God but also because he makes possible the reception of the truth of Scripture by his body, the Church, through the work of the Spirit.

Thus, the underlying verity of Christian doctrine appears throughout the written Word, in the form of a divine promise given both by Christ and in Christ. God's promise, like the divine origin of the Scripture, must be regarded by faith as an objective fact as sure as the existence of God. (Calvin, unlike the medieval scholastics, did not see the necessity of including proofs of God's existence in his system of doctrine. He so joined self-knowledge to knowledge of God, that he denied the possibility of outright ignorance or doubt of God's existence. A fundamental sense of the divine exists in all men.) Even so, the truths of God's existence and of his promises are conveyed not as a dead letter but as a living experience of God. This living experience occurs in the encounter of every believer with Scripture as the revealing Word of God. Calvin's firm distinction, here, between the Scripture as revelation present and active among us and the Christ as the one who reveals himself in Scripture both affirms the objectivity of revelation and obviates the difficulty, sometimes alleged against his thought, of a discrepancy between faith as the acceptance of an objective revelation given in Scripture and faith as the personal acceptance of Christ. In the former the believer approaches Christ through a true knowledge of God and his work of salvation; in the latter the believer receives the Christ to whom he has been led by Scripture (III. ii. 6).

If Calvin refuses to allow the Scripture to become a static, rationalizing norm divorced from personal acceptance of the living Christ and from the active presence of Christ's Spirit, he also refuses to let the Spirit become a norm of faith apart from the unchanging rule of Scripture. The Spirit has a genuine "teaching office" in the Church, as promised by Christ in the Gospel of John. This office consists "not in inventing new and unheard-of revelations, or . . . forging a new kind of doctrine" but in "sealing our minds with that very doctrine which is commended by the Gospel" (I. ix. 1). The testimony of the Spirit can only confirm the Gospel, since "He is the Author of the Scriptures: he cannot vary and differ from himself." The Holy Spirit "inheres" in the truth of Scripture. Scripture, therefore, cannot be a temporary mode of revelation, nor can it be equated with the killing letter and contrasted with the living Spirit. Calvin denies successive

dispensations, one of Word, a second of Spirit. After Pentecost, God “sent down the same Spirit by whose power he had dispensed the Word, to complete his work by the efficacious confirmation of the Word” (I. ix. 3). This means that Word and Spirit are joined by a “mutual bond” to the end that the Word is confirmed by the Spirit and the Spirit “shows forth his Power” when the Word receives his due recognition.

These themes—the epistemological and the soteriological—coalesce around Calvin’s delicately balanced Trinitarian exposition. We recall the distinctive Western and Augustinian doctrine of the Trinity, which Calvin accepted and utilized fully, with its concept of the double procession of the Spirit. The Father manifests himself through the Son, while the Father and the Son together work by the Spirit who proceeds from them. Calvin’s doctrine of Scripture mirrors exactly this operation: Scripture is produced by the inspiration of the Spirit who testifies to our hearts of the truth and authority of his words. By the Spirit we recognize Scripture to be the Word and Wisdom of God the Father given *to us* in a form that we can apprehend; and by the Spirit we are drawn to find in Scripture the Gospel of Christ, the essential Word of the Father given *for us*. Then in Christ we learn of God as Father and see the “heart of God poured out in love”: and “since he is the eternal wisdom of the Father, his unchangeable truth, his firm counsel, we ought not to be afraid of what he tells us in his Word varying in the slightest from that will of the Father which we seek” (III. xxiv. 5).

I am tempted to say in conclusion that Calvin would have agreed with later doctrines of verbal inspiration but would have questioned the advisability of grounding the authority of Scripture solely on an objective statement of its divine origin which must remain forever external to the believer. Calvin’s doctrine attempts to tread a fine line, balancing the objective and the subjectice, following an “order of faith” rather than an order of logical or causal priorities. We are led from a subjective apprehension of the verity of Scripture to the affirmation of its objective truth. This is precisely the order followed by Calvin in discussing predestination after faith, justification, and the Christian life. His approach served to emphasize the purpose of Scripture and the manner in which its message of salvation becomes effective: through the reading, preaching, and faithful hearing of the Word.

The contemporary preacher or theologian will not want to adopt wholesale the language and thought of Calvin. The sixteenth century cannot provide exhaustive guidelines for the present. Yet Calvin, as one of the very few theologians who have not only spoken to their own time but also have left an indelible imprint on the course of

Christian thought and piety, does have something to teach us—not so much in terms of the language of theology as in terms of the foundation of his thought and the way in which that intellectual underpinning bound theology to preaching, doctrine to practice. Today, when it is not altogether clear whether the up-to-date scholasticism of a Pannenberg or a Moltmann can be taken out of the schools and into the pulpit—and when it is sometimes doubtful whether our exegesis can lead either to Christian doctrine or to Christian preaching—the thoroughly integrated Scriptural theology of Calvin prods us in our inability and, to use a phrase of Calvin's own, “leaves us without excuse.”

Without attempting to analyze Calvin's exegetical method, we should recognize that the doctrine of Scripture outlined above has a powerful and positive impact on hermeneutics. Calvin did not practice an uncritical proof-texting of established doctrines, but he did believe that Scripture, as a present Word of God spoken to the Church, does demand the formulation of doctrine. There was no problem of finding a method for applying the results of exegesis to the needs of the day. Scripture, for Calvin, spoke directly, not to the long-irrelevant life-situation of a dead prophet, but to the needs of God's people in all times. In the words of a Reformed successor of Calvin, God spoke *by* the prophets *unto* us. In exegesis, Calvin utilized the best available texts and tried to let the text speak for itself. He recognized the importance of context, both textual and historical, to the meaning of a passage. And, far more than most modern exegetes, he moved freely from the examination of minutiae to the placement of a verse within the over-all pattern of meaning of God's scriptural revelation.

Calvin's doctrine of Scripture was in fact a finely-tuned theological epistemology which affirmed the common work of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in producing the scriptural Word, which accepted the continuity of the divine promises in their various dispensations, and which drew doctrinal and practical theology into a more intimate relationship with biblical study. Letting the text speak for itself brought the voice of God directly into the Church to address and grasp the believer as firmly as the prophets and apostles had been grasped, as firmly as Calvin had been grasped and held “as if . . . from on high.” Both in preaching and in doctrinal statement that Word would be the one criterion. With such an approach to the Word of God, the Christian community in any age—even in the present—might be led to reject elements of its tradition, to throw over doctrinal formulae not in accord with Scripture, or even to effect a monumental reform of doctrine and practice. “Without the Word,” wrote Calvin, “there is nothing left but darkness.”

St. Teresa of Avila: Friend of God

by WENDY WILLIAMS

M. Div. Senior

Teresa of Avila was known to her contemporaries as “Teresa of Jesus,” and was canonized within a generation after her death. Official recognition of her stature as a theologian was longer in coming. But in 1970 she was declared a Doctor of the Church, one of two women to receive that distinction. She was also the foundress of the reform of the Carmelite order in Spain, reintroducing the primitive and austere Rule of her order in the seventeen convents she helped found in Spain.

From her writings emerges the portrait of a lively, charming, humorous, straightforward, strong, soaring, down-to-earth woman. A perhaps apocryphal story about her on one of her innumerable travels around Spain illustrates the winsome paradox of Teresa. After several days on the road, Teresa started complaining to God about the cold and the rain and the mud that their cart kept getting stuck in. Finally God said to her: “But Teresa, I treat all my friends this way.” To which she replied: “No wonder you have so few of them!”¹ It is this easy and intimate relationship with God that is so characteristic of her life and writing, and so attractive.

All of the books and prayers she wrote witness to the depth and passion of her relationship with God. She was a soul aflame with love, and the desire to share that love with her spiritual sisters and daughters. Her motive in writing was to inspire them, and indeed all souls, to a similar passionate embrace of the Godhead. But always she remained accessible as a person, recounting her own experience, failings, thoughts, feelings, as she grew in the knowledge and love of God, and offering encouragement—or a scolding—as seemed appropriate. Her manner and words won friends both for her and for God during her lifetime. In this brief introduction to St. Teresa’s life and thought, her own words will be used as much as possible for the purpose.

Teresa de Cepeda y Ahumada was born in Avila, Spain on March 28, 1515. She was the third of nine children born to her father’s second wife. The family was comfortable, though not wealthy, and devout. And all the children were educated at least to read. Teresa’s mother died when she was thirteen, and she was left somewhat on her own. She says in her autobiography that she took up with some frivolous companions, and suspects it was for this reason that she was sent to be a boarder at an Augustinian convent in Avila in 1531. She stayed there for eighteen months, and gradually began to

consider the possibility of becoming a nun. However, she also felt reluctant to leave the world of pleasure and self-pleasing. The result was that she had no peace of mind or enjoyment either at home or in the convent. After three months of intense struggle, she made her decision.

Though I could not bend my will to be a nun, I saw that the religious state was the best and safest. And thus, by little and little, I resolved to force myself into it. . . . when I left my father's house my distress was so great that I do not think it will be greater when I die. It seemed to me as if every bone in my body were being wrenched asunder; for, as I had no love of God to subdue my love for my father and kinsfolk, everything was such a strain to me that, if the Lord had not helped me, no reflections of my own would have sufficed to keep me true to my purpose. But the Lord gave me courage to fight against myself and so I carried out my intention.²

Hardly an auspicious beginning, one might think; yet it also reveals Teresa's strength of character and purpose in the pursuit of what she believed to be her soul's best good, even though it was contrary to her purely natural inclinations. This struggle continued unabated even after she was professed at the Carmelite Convent of the Incarnation in Avila: "during eight and twenty years of prayer, I spent more than eighteen in that strife and contention which arose out of my attempts to reconcile God and the world."³ For almost twenty years she lived the religious life, yet felt in herself that she had not even begun to love and serve God. She suspected that the mitigated Rule, observed at her convent, allowed her too much freedom and comfort—ample food, gracious living quarters, visits to and from family and friends. She received little help or support from her confessors, who did not take her scruples seriously. "When my confessors saw that I had good desires and was spending my time in prayer, they thought I was doing a great deal. But in my heart of hearts I knew I was not doing what I was bound to do for Him to Whom I owed so much."⁴

St. Teresa speaks often of how she was hindered by confessors who did not understand her or the type of prayer life she was being led to follow. Some of them even told her that what she was experiencing came from the devil and not God, and that she should give up her practice of prayer. (She later came to believe that she had been given such trials to enable her to be of more help to others in similar circumstances.) Out of these trials came her admonition always to seek a learned and *prayerful* confessor. She finally found such in the Jesuit Fathers who recognized God's actions in her soul. It was at this point, twenty years after her profession as a religious, that her prayer life really began to develop. She experienced visions, "locutions" or words spoken to her by God, and raptures or trance-like states of intense and complete union with God. All of these

experiences infused her with an even greater love of God and the desire to be with Him and serve Him. In practical terms, she realized that a different type of religious house and Rule would be necessary to facilitate this kind of contemplative life and divine service of neighbor-love. It was thus out of her contemplative life and her desire for oneness with God that the Discalced Reform of her order first began.

“I desired to make the foundation [of a convent with the primitive Rule] so that I could withdraw more completely from everything and fulfil my profession and vocation with greater perfection in conditions of stricter enclosure . . .”⁵ The religious constitutions she desired were to ensure a life of poverty and separation from the world. She made it a condition of all the houses she founded that they have no fixed income; they were to be maintained on whatever charitable gifts they received, doing with as few material things as possible. “It would hardly look well if the house of thirteen poor women made a great noise when it fell, for those who are really poor make no noise . . . I should wish on the day when you build such edifices [large, ornate convents], they may fall down and kill you all.”⁶ The nuns would have strict enclosure; they would be veiled, and permitted to have visitors only if they conversed on spiritual matters. Silence was to be the way of life. What inspired this austerity was not hatred of the body or the world, but love of God and the desire to remove everything from life that blocks or hinders growth of the soul’s love for God, which is also, Teresa though, inseparable from a truly Christian love for others. “Let us realize, my daughters, that true perfection consists in the love of God and our neighbor . . . Our entire Rule and Constitutions are nothing but means which enable us to do this more perfectly.”⁷

A foundation of this type was not easily won, however. Teresa and like-minded religious saw their plans opposed by civil and religious authorities who feared that a community of this type would be a financial burden, since it would have no income, and might create religious controversy and questions of jurisdiction and control—which in fact did happen. St. Teresa was attacked as being a troublemaker and glory seeker; she even had to defend herself to her sisters at the Incarnation. But Teresa was not perturbed because she knew she was acting in accordance with what God wished her to do, and that the final outcome was God’s responsibility, not hers. She knew that if God desired this new work to start, He would see that it did. After several years of disputes and difficulties, the new house was established. But it was several more years before Teresa was allowed to go there, to St. Joseph’s of Avila, the first of the seventeen

convents of the Discalced Reform that would be founded during Teresa's lifetime.

In the *Book of the Foundations* St. Teresa detailed her work of establishing the new convents. She lived the enclosed life as she desired from 1562 until 1567 at St. Joseph's. "The most restful years of my life," she called them. The next fifteen years of her life, until her death in 1582, Teresa spent at least part of every year on the road establishing new convents or visiting the existing ones. The trips were always arduous and often plagued by illness, but Teresa kept everyone in good spirits, and saw to it that they had Mass and recited their Offices. As her fame and reputation for sanctity spread, she would be mobbed by all classes of people in the towns they passed through—which caused her no little embarrassment. Once a noblewoman sent a carriage to bring Teresa to be present as a blessing on the birth of her first grandchild. When they got word before reaching the castle that the child had already been born, Teresa's response was: "Thank God! The 'saint' won't be wanted now!"⁸ She was also elected Prioress at the Convent of the Incarnation by the sisters during these years, because of their felt need for the kind of reform Teresa was instituting. Almost invariably there were civil or ecclesiastical difficulties over the founding of each new convent, yet one by one they were established. Eventually bishops and archbishops, as well as papal visitors, were won to the cause of the reform.

During these years of intense activity, Teresa continued to advance in her prayer life, and found time to write as well. She experienced distinguishable types and levels of prayer, which she described in slightly different ways in her *Life, Way of Perfection, Interior Castle*, and other shorter works. All of her books were written at the behest of her confessors. Her intent was to describe her experiences as clearly and vividly as possible, so that her books could serve as guides or helps to souls who were searching, or discouraged and perplexed by what was already happening to them. In the *Life* Teresa describes four degrees of prayer, comparing and explaining them as four ways of watering a garden. The plants in the garden represent the virtues or qualities the individual soul is striving to attain. One way of watering the garden is to fetch the water with buckets from a well, which is a very laborious process. Teresa compares this to someone just starting on their prayer life—every act of prayer or recollection is "work," as the mind and will must constantly be brought back to God and not allowed to wander. In this stage prayer is mostly vocal or mental—the reciting of written prayers or meditation, especially on the human Jesus and events of his life: "knowing what we are saying, understanding it, and realizing Whom

we are addressing.”⁹ In both these types of prayer the person is actively involved, collecting all the soul’s faculties and entering with them deep into itself to be with its God.

The second degree of prayer is compared to collecting water from a windlass-powered pump. There is still some human effort involved: the soul is actively involved in preparing and recollecting itself, but God gives it joy and consolation. This is the beginning of the “prayer of quiet.”

The third degree of prayer is compared to a stream watering the garden. In this stage, the soul is no longer active on its own initiative. This is “contemplation” in which God directs or suspends all the usual activities of the soul—the understanding, thought, memory—and the soul rejoices in God without conscious effort. “It is as though food has been introduced into the stomach, without our having eaten it or knowing how it got there.”¹⁰ One cannot initiate or control the frequency or length of these divine visitations. At the end of this kind of prayer, the soul feels pain and loss at being separated from God. Teresa likens it to two candles burning together: they give one light, yet they can be separated as each retains its identity.

The fourth degree of prayer is compared to rain watering the garden—it is entirely a gift of God. This is the “prayer of union”: the soul is wholly absorbed in God as though in a trance. The soul is so immersed in the Divine there is no longer any way to separate them.

But here it is like rain falling from the heavens into a river or spring; there is nothing but water there and it is impossible to divide or separate the water belonging to the river from that which fell from the heavens. Or it is as if a tiny streamlet enters the sea, from which it will find no way of separating itself, or as if in a room there where two large windows through which the light streamed in: it enters in different places but it all becomes one.¹¹

In this state the soul no longer experiences separation from God: since there is no more pain of separation from God there is no longing to leave this life in order to be with God. There are no more periods of aridity or desolation, only tranquillity and the awareness of the nearness of God, even in and through all “worldly” experiences.

In the *Interior Castle* Teresa developed another schema; she likened the different stages of prayer to rooms or suites in a castle. The common element in each of her systems of prayer is the experienced movement from the soul as primary initiator and actor to God as the giver of all prayer, the center, beginning and ending of all being. It is the progressive fulfillment of an utterly God-oriented desire to surpass the limits of what the mind can think or imagine of God and directly to apprehend who and “what” God is.

And we creatures go about like silly little shepherd-boys, thinking we are learning to know something of Thee when the very most we can know amounts to nothing at all, for even in ourselves there are deep secrets which we cannot fathom.¹²

The goal, the end to which this life of prayer is directed, is not consolations and sweetness or good feelings, but increased love of God: “the important thing is not to think much, but to love much; do then, whatever arouses you to love . . . for love consists not in the extent of our happiness, but in the firmness of our determination to please God in everything . . .”¹³ For Teresa this meant actions, not just words or prayer. “Do not let us suppose that if we weep a great deal we have done everything that matters; let us also set to and work hard, and practise the virtues, for these are what we need most.”¹⁴ Love is active, moving and growing and expressing itself in deeds. Teresa defines Christian love as a measure of the soul’s ability to bear crosses. Without this love, “They do not embrace the Cross, but drag it after them, and so it distresses them and wearies them and wears them to pieces.”¹⁵

The first step on the road to this perfection of love is knowing oneself.

Would it not be a sign of great ignorance, my daughters, if a person were asked who he was and could not say, and had no idea who his father or mother was, or from what country he came? Though that is great stupidity, our own is incomparably greater if we make no attempt to discover what we are, and only know we are living in these bodies, and have a vague idea . . . that we possess souls.¹⁶

She compared this process of becoming acquainted with our own souls to exploring the many rooms and apartments in a large castle. The end that is sought is the center room in which the Bridegroom dwells, waiting for the soul. Teresa is saying that at the very center and core of our being is God, and the meaning of our spiritual pilgrimage is to discover this indwelling of God and become united to God. The result is the union Paul spoke of: “No longer do I live, but Christ in me.”

Teresa intimates that this kind of union or “Spiritual Marriage” is possible for all souls. However, it is acquired only at the cost of continual self-sacrifice and self-conquest. Most people get discouraged and give up long before reaching the Union of which Teresa speaks. She continually exhorts the reader to persevere, not to give in to feelings of failure or discouragement. She warns again and again against giving up prayer out of a feeling that one’s sins have made the soul unworthy of God’s time or attention. Teresa labels this “false humility”; it is really a kind of inverted pride, a centering on the self instead of God.

Let it [the soul] trust in the goodness of God, which is greater than all the evil we can do. When, with full knowledge of ourselves, we desire to return to friendship with Him, He remembers neither our ingratitude nor our misuse of the favors He has granted us. . . . Let them remember His words and consider what He has done to me, who wearied of offending His Majesty before He ceased forgiving me. Never does He weary of giving and never can His mercies be exhausted: let us, then, not grow weary of receiving.¹⁷

It was in the midst of her own experience of discouragement and fear that Teresa came to an understanding of profound religious truth: the only things a soul has to offer God are its own poverty and its desire for God. Everything a person possesses—whether talents, intellect, strength, goodness—is a gift of God, given for the soul to use to glorify God. When a soul offers up its successes, triumphs, achievements without acknowledging God as the source, then it is only offering up its pride in itself. Only as the soul is stripped of everything is it able to approach God with real self-knowledge of its own brokenness and poverty. Once a person realizes this, she/he has attained the kind of self-emptying that Jesus perfectly exemplified, and the soul's desire for God is answered and enlarged in its capacity to receive the fullness of the divine life. This is the beginning of Life: "I have not yet begun to serve Him, and I am nothing but imperfection except in desire and love, with regard to which I know well the Lord has helped me so that I may render Him some service."¹⁸

As important as self-knowledge and humility are, boldness and courage are equally important in the pursuit of the spiritual life. Teresa exhorted her nuns repeatedly to be "manly" and not "effeminate." She warned them against typical kinds of behaviors that were identified as "female" in her day—excesses of tears, melancholy, transient emotional flights, timidity—and unworthy of so great a Lord as they were serving. But she did not mean to imply that women were inferior because they were women.

. . . for when Thou wert in the world, Lord, Thou didst not despise women, but didst always help them and show them great compassion. Thou didst find more faith and no less love in them than in men . . .¹⁹

Teresa was also aware that more women than men were drawn to the life of prayer and union that she experienced. When she asked God about it, she was given this answer: "Theologians will do nothing to enter into personal communication with me. Repulsed by them, I must choose women to open to them My heart and speak of My affairs."²⁰ She knew, however, that the society of her time did have an antifeminine bias—and it understandably chafed her to be kept from a fully public ministry.

. . . a woman in this state will be distressed at being prevented from doing so by the obstacle of sex and very envious of those who are free to cry aloud and proclaim abroad Who is this great God of Hosts.²¹

Nevertheless, what Teresa seemed to be calling for in her nuns was a kind of androgynous being, the development of the best human qualities—whether they are labelled “feminine” or “masculine.”

Not surprisingly, the God she adores was similarly not limited by sexual stereotypes. Teresa used male and female imagery in her desire to encompass the Divine All, to reveal the richness, depth and breadth of the God she experienced. She called God by many names: Father, Mother, Lord, Spouse, Child, Friend, Brother, King, Lover—no single symbol sufficed, and she would use several in the same breath. Perhaps most striking, because unfamiliar, is her use of female imagery for God, which gave an added richness and dimension to human understanding of God’s love.

It [the soul] has been strengthened in the virtues and comforted by Him Who so well knows how to comfort it and has also the power to do so. With what to compare this it knows not, save to the caress of a mother who so dearly loves her child and feeds and caresses it.²²

O life of my life, and sustenance that sustaineth me! . . . For from those Divine breasts, where it seems that God is ever sustaining the soul, flow streams of milk, which solace all who dwell in the Castle . . .²³

Always one is struck by the immediacy and intimacy of her colloquies with God, and her absolute certainty of the relationship.

Yet for Teresa the most important thing was not just the enjoyment of the experience of God, but the results, the effects that experience has on a life. One cannot profess to love God, and hate the creatures God has created. Teresa enjoined her nuns to practice this virtue most especially with each other, to learn to bear each other’s faults and failings with humility. “It is a good proof and test of our love if we can bear with such faults of others and not be shocked by them. Others, in their turn, will bear your faults . . .”²⁴ The following is perhaps the best statement of Teresa’s continuing emphasis on the need for balance in one’s life between action and contemplation, faith and works:

When I see people very diligently trying to discover what kind of prayer they are experiencing and so completely wrapt up in their prayers that they seem afraid to stir, or to indulge in a moment’s thought, lest they should lose the slightest degree of the tenderness and devotion which they have been feeling, I realize how little they understand of the road to the attainment of union. They think the whole thing consists in this. But, no, sisters, no; what the Lord desires is works. If you see a sick woman to whom you can give help, never be affected by the fear that your devotion will suffer, but take pity on her: if she is in pain, you should feel pain too; if necessary, fast so that she may have your food, not so much for her sake as because you know it to be your Lord’s will. That is true union with His will.²⁵

What then is the spiritual heritage of this sixteenth-century saint? The religious reform she started in her order influenced religious orders across Europe. She delineated the life of prayer and union

with God, offering her life as proof of God's love and mercy for all souls who seek Him. She achieved a balance of action and contemplation in her life which could be a model for effective, authentically Christian social action. Out of her life of intense activity and the absolute stillness of contemplation mysteriously emerges the image of the life of Jesus. The perfection of life is a life of absolute givenness; it is a realization of the soul's emptiness and God's fullness; it is a revelation of God's being—love alive and active in the world.

ENDNOTES

1. I cannot cite the source of this story; it is from a book about St. Teresa I read years ago.
2. St. Teresa, *The Life of Teresa of Jesus*, trans. and ed. E. Allison Peers (New York: Image Books, 1960), pp. 75, 77.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 109.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 113f.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 341.
6. St. Teresa, *Complete Works*, Vols. 1-3, trans. and ed. E. Allison Peers (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1946), p. 98.
7. St. Teresa. "Interior Castle" in *Complete Works*, II, 212.
8. St. Teresa, *Minor Works*, (London: Thomas Baker, 1939), p. 166.
9. St. Teresa, "Way of Perfection" in *Complete Works*, II, 104.
10. St. Teresa, *Life*, p. 251.
11. St. Teresa, "Interior Castle," p. 335.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 237.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 233.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 300.
15. St. Teresa, "Conceptions of the Love of God," in *Complete Works*, II, 375.
16. St. Teresa, "Interior Castle," p. 202.
17. St. Teresa, *Life*, p. 189.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 285.
19. St. Teresa, "Way of Perfection," p. 13.
20. St. Teresa, "Spiritual Relations," in *Complete Works*, I, 344.
21. St. Teresa, "Interior Castle," p. 298.
22. St. Teresa, "Conceptions of Love," p. 385.
23. St. Teresa, "Interior Castle," p. 337.
24. St. Teresa, "Way of Perfection," p. 35.
25. St. Teresa, "Interior Castle," p. 263.

John Wesley as Revealed by the Journal of Hester Ann Rogers

by PAUL WESLEY CHILCOTE

M. Div. Senior

John Wesley and Hester Ann Rogers had a most remarkable relationship. In spite of the fact that Wesley was Hester's senior by more than half a century, they seemed to establish an immediate rapport from the moment of their first meeting. The Rev. Mr. Wesley and "Hetty" were truly kindred spirits. It is not surprising that Wesley soon became her personal friend, devoted correspondent, and spiritual mentor. Hester faithfully kept a Journal during the last quarter of the eighteenth century. In the pages of this record one can trace her brief but fruitful relationship with John Wesley. Her Journal not only provides countless insights regarding the nature of the Methodist Movement and the organization of the Societies during those crucial years, but also affords a glimpse of the mature Wesley as viewed through the eyes of this sensitive Methodist laywoman.

Hester Ann (Roe) Rogers was famous among the Methodists for her eminent holiness, zeal, and Christian influence. This fame was due in large measure to the publication of extracts from her Journal following her death. First published by R. Edwards of Bristol in 1796, *The Experience of Mrs. Hester Ann Rogers* became an extremely popular devotional tract which went through many subsequent printings during the nineteenth century. Unfortunately, almost all of the material dealing with Hester's relationship with Wesley, from their first meeting in 1776 to her marriage to one of Wesley's itinerants, James Rogers, in 1784, was deleted from the original and all subsequent editions. In fact, only one Journal entry dealing with their relationship during this eight year period has been retained, namely, the brief account of their first encounter.

Therefore, in order to discover the details concerning this amazing relationship, it is necessary to turn to the pages of Hester Ann Rogers' original papers. Of her manuscript Journal three volumes are available which cover the period between July 30, 1775 and October 21, 1784.¹ Reading and studying these volumes is an exercise in stepping through their pages into the world of late eighteenth-century England. Hester's Journal affords information regarding her developing relationship with John Wesley, nurtured particularly by Wesley's recurrent visits to her native town of Macclesfield; it reveals several facets of the life and work of that master-

craftsman of Methodism; and finally, it provides a personal portrait of a man, as “Hetty” remembers “Dear Mr. Wesley.”

I

Methodism in England was little more than a “new sect” by the middle of the eighteenth century. It was only in 1739 that John Wesley “submitted to be more vile” and began to proclaim the message of salvation in the open fields of the English countryside. Eight years later, on a spring afternoon in 1747, it was probably curiosity more than anything else that drew the people of Macclesfield to a vale called the Waters. For it was there that the ringleader of the people called “Methodists” made his first appearance to them and preached following Morning Prayer at the local Anglican church. The situation was somewhat altered when Wesley made his second visit to Macclesfield, twelve years later, in April 1759. According to a long-standing tradition, on this occasion Wesley was struck in the face with a stone. He again tasted the lash of persecution.

It is doubtful whether little Hetty Roe, the daughter of the vicar of Macclesfield, remembered this incident at the rare age of three. Indeed, such a violent attack upon the Methodists was an exception and not the rule in that Cheshire village. Their comparative exemption from overt persecution was owing in small part to Hester’s father. He was a very strict and pious clergyman, very reminiscent of the rector of Epworth, Samuel Wesley. But the tranquility was due in large measure to the Rev. Charles Roe, brother and successor of the vicar of earlier years, and uncle of Hester. He had married a London Methodist, Miss Stockdale, and was known to be a great lover of evangelical preaching.

The story of Hester’s early years is well known from the extracts of her Journal in *The Experience of Mrs. Hester Ann Rogers*: the cataclysmic impact of her father’s death when she was nine, the damaging effects of her “worldly” godmother, the spiritual turmoil of her quest for peace and assurance, and the ultimate “conversion” she experienced through the evangelistic preaching of David Simpson and the Methodist, Samuel Bardsley. Her wholehearted involvement with the Methodists led to harsh persecution and ostracism from family and friends. It was her reading, in part, that enabled Hester to persevere during those troubled times. And it was in the reading of Wesley’s sermons and treatises that Hester encountered her future spiritual mentor in a preliminary way. Unwittingly, Wesley had become an influential figure in Hester’s life, as this entry (p. 26), made only several months before their first meeting, confirms:

Mr. Wesley's *Plain Account of Christian Perfection* was this day a greater blessing than before: O how very ignorant, how stupid have I been, respecting this great salvation; and even yet I seem to know nothing. Lord, teach me, and save me fully.

It was on Monday, April 1, 1776 that the youthful twenty year old and the energetic septuagenarian met for the first time. And what an encounter it was. Wesley's two day visit to Macclesfield was a whirlwind of activity. Between his arrival on Monday and his departure early Wednesday morning Wesley preached three times, met with the Bands and the Select Band, and celebrated the Love-Feast. Hester was initially impressed with Wesley's "parental tenderness" towards her and the wisdom of his spiritual counsel. To her great delight she was able to spend an hour alone with him after breakfast on Wednesday immediately before he left for Manchester. "What a wonder," she wrote, "is that dear saint of God? how above 70 years of age.—how healthy and strong?—how chearful in piety?—how active and laborious in the work of God? May a tenfold blessing descend this day upon his hoary hairs." (I, 72) The remarkable relationship had begun.

Between the years 1776 and 1784 (the years encompassed in Hester's Journal) Wesley never missed his annual visit to Macclesfield. He made only one additional trip to Macclesfield in the fall of 1783. This visit was in conjunction with the convening of the yearly Conference at Manchester but was specifically precipitated by internal problems concerning the Macclesfield and Congleton Circuits. Including this special trip of 1783, Wesley therefore made a total of ten visits to Macclesfield during that nine year period. Hester recorded six of these encounters with Wesley in her Journal.

A typical record of Hester's encounter with Wesley is composed of several elements. Hester usually recorded geographical and temporal information concerning these meetings. The location of their visits, for instance, was often the home of "old Mr. Ryles," a pillar of the Macclesfield Society. Another consistent element is Hester's careful recording of Wesley's sermons. Not only did she include the text of the sermon and the time of the preaching, but often provided outlines, extensive commentaries, and verbatim accounts. She recorded Wesley's visits with the Bands, Classes, and individual members of the Society. Occasionally she afforded verbatim accounts of personal conversations with her mentor, indicating Wesley's health and spiritual state. From these records of Hester Ann Rogers' encounters with John Wesley at least three aspects of his life and work come into focus: John Wesley as caretaker of his Societies; John Wesley as caretaker of souls; and John Wesley as caretaker of the *paradosis*, the tradition which was entrusted to his care.

The first aspect of John Wesley's life and work which is revealed by the Journal of Hester Ann Rogers is his activity as director of the Methodist Societies. That Wesley was an organizational genius is hardly a new insight. Of this there is no question. Many ingredients combined in Wesley to produce such a unique gift.

In the organization of the Societies we witness the slow result achieved by his common sense, his perception of the practical value of suggested arrangements, his appreciation of the views of other people, his love of conference and counsel, his willingness always 'to be wiser to-day than the day before.'²

It is interesting to note that at the time of Hester's first meeting with Wesley in 1776 all of the characteristic methods and facets of the Methodist Society had been operative for over three decades. The local Societies had their "Bands" and "Classes," their Rules and discipline, and their methods of social service. Preaching-houses, itinerant lay preachers, assistants, helpers, stewards, local and circuit administration, and yearly Conference were all cherished Methodist "institutions" by then. Hester's Journal reveals Wesley's ability to keep this vast institutional machine in good repair by means of visitation, participation, and discipline.

We have already seen that Wesley made annual visitations of his Societies in the Manchester area. He was aware of the perils of numerical success and was determined to know his people, such as Hester, individually. This emphasis on the importance of visitation and the development of personal relationships was reflected in the lives of his workers. "I went," wrote Hester, "with Mr. Rogers to visit many families as he is following Mr. Wesley's rule—and intended to visit all in Society and some others" (III, 45).

During these visits Wesley participated fully in the ongoing life of the Societies. He met with Bands and Select Bands and visited the sick. While these periodic visits were necessary in terms of administrative function and oversight, they were also opportunities for spiritual renewal and direction, and Hester remembered:

Dear Mr. Wesley—met Select Band—and called upon some who had formerly enjoyed sanctification to speak and exhorted them to seek afresh—I believe there was a great revival in many hearts—several were lost in tears—and a little few testified they loved God with all their heart. (I. 72)

The Love-Feast in particular afforded Wesley the perfect opportunity to become involved in the lives of his people. Hester relished the memory of such an occasion on Easter evening in 1782 when "he was very short [in preaching] because of the love feast afterwards, which was a season of peculiar grace. About 40 made a noble confession, and above one half of these testified." (II, 178)

Wesley's visits, however, were not always characterized by such joy and spiritual fervor. One particular incident involving the assistant of the Congleton Circuit, James Rogers, later to become Hester's

husband, illustrates Wesley's abilities as a reconciler, a quality of extreme importance in the administration of the Societies. And it also demonstrates that the key to Wesley's success as director of the Societies was discipline. A dispute arose concerning the division of the unwieldy Macclesfield Circuit. The Conference directive to create two Circuits was carried out by Mr. Rogers and his colleagues. The problems created by this arrangement became so disruptive that they necessitated Wesley's arbitration. After an impartial hearing of a group within the Society on the one side, and Mr. Rogers and his colleagues on the other, Wesley attempted to reconcile their differences. In her Journal Hester recorded what transpired following the long period of debate:

Mr. Rogers said—All I desire is a reconciliation and I appeal to all present if I have not sought it various ways for months past—Mr. Johnson said—I never would nor I never will be reconciled—the rest seemed more flexible—At last Mr. Wesley got up in much warmth and said—you are of your father the Devil—a murderer—and no more in Connection with me.— I will have none connected with *me* who can deliberately tell me, I never will forgive, etc.—this had the desired effect, Robert Johnson fell on his knees—JL—was near fainting so was J Roe and Mr. Ryle and I wept.—Gods dear servant then proposed—"let all henceforth die in oblivion." *All now* agreed to it, and shook hands with Mr. Rogers who wept tears of joy. (III, 88)

Wesley would have nothing to do with prejudice, anger, and bitterness within his Societies, for these groups were designed for the purpose of nurturing faith and love. In order to assure the attainment of that goal it was necessary for Wesley to visit, participate in, and discipline the ever-growing chain of connectional Societies scattered throughout the British Isles.

Secondly, Hester's Journal reveals John Wesley as a man of profound pastoral concern. In a letter to his brother Charles, written during a visit to Congleton in 1772, Wesley confided:

O what a thing it is to have a *curam animarum!* You and I are called to this; to save souls from death; to watch over them as those that must give account! If our office implied no more than preaching a few times in a week, I could play with it: so might you. . . . God says to you as well as me, "*Do all thou canst*, be it more or less, to save the souls for whom My Son has died."³

The very nature of the Societies made them tremendous aids for the care of souls, and Wesley, as we have seen, certainly used them as such. In addition to this role of the Societies in general, those particular facets of pastoral care which are reflected in Hester's Journal include Wesley's use of letters, conversation, and the worship, liturgy, and sacraments of the Church of England.

Correspondence is often neglected as a means of pastoral care. In the case of John Wesley, to overlook this aspect of the curacy would be a gross mistake. Of the Hester Ann Rogers/John Wesley cor-

respondence only 23 letters have survived, 15 of which were penned by Wesley and 8 by “Hetty.” She often recorded having been blessed by receiving a letter from her “Dear Mr. Wesley.” Wesley’s letters to “Hetty” form a picture of counseling by moral exhortation at its best.⁴

Hester’s appreciation for the spiritual encouragement Wesley provided her in private conversation during his visits to Macclesfield permeates the pages of her record of those encounters. She recorded spiritual renewal occasioned by “comfortable conversation with him alone” during a visit in April 1777 (I, 120). On March 29, 1781 she “spent an hour with his dear servant alone and his fatherly affections and advice and sympathy was a blessing indeed” (II, 92). She was able to bare her soul to Wesley concerning the persecution she experienced from her relatives, her relationships with people, her plans and goals, and most particularly, her quest for holiness.

A little after 7 I went again to Mr. Ryles and sat half an hour with Dear Mr. Wesley alone—and spoke freely to him on many things—Glory be to God it was a time I hope ever to remember—A time of the Lords felt presence and overwhelming grace—especially while his dear servant prayed with a wrestling spirit, that I might endure to the end, and be filled with all the fullness of God. (II, 94)

The Methodists of Macclesfield, as elsewhere, by the direction of John Wesley, abstained from holding any religious service during the regular church hours. And so, the rich liturgical and sacramental heritage of the Church of England must be included as a very important aspect of Wesley’s care of his people. Wesley never failed to appreciate the value of worship, liturgy, and the sacraments, in the nurture of souls. The members of the Macclesfield Society had been accustomed to attending Anglican services at the local parish church, St. Michael’s, where Hester’s uncle was vicar. But after the completion of the “new church,” Christ Church, most of the Methodists flocked there to hear the “evangelical preaching” of its curate, David Simpson. It was in this episcopally consecrated church that Wesley was often invited to preach and assist in services. Since Wesley’s visits were customarily in March and April, they occasionally corresponded with the celebrations of Holy Week and Easter. Such was the case in 1782. During Good Friday, Holy Saturday, and Easter, Wesley preached no less than nine times and assisted Mr. Simpson in administering the sacrament to about thirteen hundred communicants on Good Friday and eight hundred on Easter. The Wesley revealed in the pages of Hester’s Journal is a true “Church of England man.” But he was also a curate of souls, called by God for the special task of renewing a vital “evangelical” faith within that Church he loved. Toward this end he employed many means. He

utilized correspondence, conversation, and the liturgical and sacramental tradition of the Church of England.

A third and final aspect of Wesley's life and work revealed in Hester's Journal proved to be a great channel of God's grace, namely, the preaching of the Word. Wesley's own words concerning pastors are strikingly consonant with the image of Wesley portrayed in Hester's Journal:

They are supposed to go before the flock (as in the manner of the eastern shepherds to this day), and to guide them in all the ways of truth and holiness; they are to 'nourish them with words of eternal life'; to feed them with the 'pure milk of the word': applying it continually 'for doctrine', teaching them all the essential doctrines contained therein . . . training them up to outward holiness.⁵

Like Timothy in the Pastoral Epistles, Wesley was entrusted to care for the *paradosis*, the Tradition of Christian faith. He was called to proclaim the pure Word of God. Whereas the Methodist Movement, from its very inception in the quadrangles of Oxford, had been dominated by a concern for personal pastoral care, it first came into the public eye as a preaching movement. Most Methodists today are, or at least should be, aware of Wesley's *Sermons* as we have inherited them in "sermonic essay" form. But Wesley hardly preached the way he wrote the *Sermons* we possess today (excepting those preached at Oxford). Hester's Journal, therefore, affords a glimpse of Wesley as the vivacious preacher of the fields, at the "new church," and in the Macclesfield Preaching-House. The study of her record of Wesley's sermons, their theological and doctrinal content, and the effect that Wesley's preaching had on his audience, brings to life this final facet of the life and work of John Wesley.

Hester was assiduous in her recording of Wesley's sermons. She was careful to include the text of every sermon she heard him preach. She often commented on his discourse, provided an outline of its contents, and described her impression and personal appropriation of the message. Most importantly, however, she occasionally recorded portions of the sermon verbatim. These records contain not only the "bare facts" concerning Wesley's preaching but actually bring them to life, revealing the spirit, the mood, and the excitement of the event.

Between April 1776 and August 1783 Hester was witness to twenty-five sermons preached by John Wesley, twenty of them in her native Macclesfield, two at the sister Circuit of Congleton, one at neighboring Leek, and two at Newcastle, where Hester had journeyed to accompany the preacher. Twelve of these sermons were preached in the morning (generally at 5:00!), ten in the evening, and three in the afternoon. In her record of these twenty-five sermons, thirteen entries contain barely the text and the time of preaching.

Nine of her records include brief commentary on the sermon, an outline of its contents, and/or a personal comment concerning the sermon and its effect. For example, after she heard Wesley expound the text, "Jesus increased in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and man," during the "wee hours" of April 10, 1777, she recorded in her Journal:

O My God—if *he* in whom there was never spot of sin, could grow in wisdom and Thy favour—Well mayest Thou exhort Thy saints to grow in grace.—Lord help *me!*—O may I increase in *every* grace—and deeper sink and higher rise till Thou transport me to the skies. (II, 120)

Of special interest, however, are the remaining three records which contain verbatim, or at least partially verbatim, accounts of the sermons. One of the characteristics of these sermons is a real sense of urgency and of the possibility of *instantaneous salvation*. In his sermon preached at Leek, Wesley proclaimed:

Art thou willing to know Jesus as thy Savior? and art thou afraid to come?—fear not. look up. he is nigh thee—dost thou want a pardon for all thy sins?—Shall I tell thee thou mayest have it next year—next month—next week?—Nay, I *dare* not.—I am not sure thou canst. Tomorrow is none of thy own.—But thou mayest have it *today*—It is at hand—I am sent to offer it—look up *now* even this moment. "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." (II, 174)

Coupled with this aspect of urgency is the Wesleyan emphasis on the personalization of faith, reminiscent of Wesley's Aldersgate experience and illustrated in the same sermon. "Art thou a child of God—a believer, and feelest his Kingdom in a measure set up in thy heart—dost thou know, he hath loved *me* and given himself for *me*?" (II, 174)

Hester's Journal reveals that Wesley was a thoroughly doctrinal preacher. In *The Principles of a Methodist Farther Explained* Wesley spoke of repentance as the porch of religion, of faith as the door, and of holiness as religion itself. These three pillars of Wesleyan theology, a true self-knowledge which issues in *repentance*, the Reformation doctrine of salvation through *justification by faith*, and Wesley's peculiar emphasis on *Christian perfection* are all reflected in his sermons preached in and about Macclesfield.

John Wesley believed that there is a radical universal flaw in humankind that separates us from our Creator. The only hope for salvation is our turning to and relying upon God alone. The acknowledgment of sin, or true self-knowledge, and the necessity of repentance were central to his preaching. In his sermon on the "Kingdom of God" Wesley, according to Hester, demonstrated the universal applicability of repentance.

He addressed himself to all sorts of people, states, and conditions, old and young, yea to children 6 or 7 years old—drunkards, swearers—Sabbath breakers, thieves, lyars and lewd persons and told them you may *now* be

delivered from the power of your most besetting sins—even this day—this moment. . . . Yeild now to him who loveth you, who died for you, who will save you from all your sins. (II, 173-74)

Later in that same sermon Wesley exhorted his hearers to an immediate repentance of sin and the reception of justification.

It is true that in *general* the work of repentance is carried on by very slow degrees—most people are a long time after they are convinced of sin, before they are justified.—But why is it?—Even because of unbelief.—The word of faith is nigh thee—fear not—only believe. (II, 174)

The second doctrinal pillar reflected in his sermons is justification by faith. On the afternoon of Easter Day 1782 Wesley took as his text “The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” According to Hester, in his exposition:

He insisted strongly on this eternal life being the free gift of God, not obtained by works in whole or in part, but alone through Jesus Christ our Lord and through faith in him—that this eternal life is *Love* begun when being justified by faith we have peace with God and his love is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost so that we love him *because* he hath 1st loved us. (II, 92)

Earlier that morning, in his sermon based on “Christ is risen indeed,” Wesley demonstrated how an experimental evidence of the resurrection is one of the fruits of justification. For, as Hester remembered his words, “. . . the moment any vile polluted sinner believes on Christ and is justified . . . he receives the spirit of adoption whereby he can in that moment cry Aba Father, *My Lord* and *My God*” (II, 177). The central affirmation for Wesley was faith in Christ. He believed and taught that “if any individual embraces Christ and the glad tidings of salvation by faith—the Kingdom of God is set up in that heart” (II, 173).

But Wesley was not satisfied with the tendency of some of the Reformers to neglect the doctrine of sanctification in the effort to rediscover faith. If faith is the door to religion, then according to Wesley, holiness is religion itself. The importance of this doctrine, for the Methodists in particular, he made abundantly clear in the early hours of Friday, March 30, 1781:

He showed what were the things committed to Timothy and then confined his discourse to the particular doctrines committed to the Methodists—and proved the doctrine of Christian perfection was the one *peculiar point*—they were called to preach and practice, and that no other people under heaven did clearly insist on this, as a present and an instantaneous salvation.—that they who did not preach it—or believe it were *no* Methodists—neither they who were not *now* preachers, and *now* hearers.—And who were not *now* preachers he said, were the Devils preachers, and not sent of God, and he would have no such in Connection. (II, 93)

The influence of the early Church Fathers, particularly Gregory of

Nyssa via Macarius, and their conception of holiness as a dynamic process rather than a static state, may be discerned in a sermon based on Ephesians 3:14-20. Addressing the people of Macclesfield he “insisted chiefly on Christian holiness, as implied in being *rooted* and *grounded in Love*. . . . yea and a *growing* in grace till filled with *all* the fullness of God” (II, 92). Wesley insisted that holiness or Christian perfection, like justification, was also a free gift of God. On Easter morning 1782 he proclaimed that the “indwelling of God as our sanctifier is the privilege of all believers, and is received by faith as well as justification” (II, 177).

The effects of Wesley’s preaching varied from place to place and certainly depended greatly on the recipients of his message. For those who were “in Connection,” Wesley’s preaching often brought comfort and renewed strength for their spiritual quest and temporal battles. On one occasion Hester reported that “many hearts were comforted and the hands of all who love holiness hereby strengthened” (II, 93). Likewise, in 1782 during the Easter series, “one woman was set at full liberty and many were comforted and established” (II, 173). The effects of Wesley’s sermons and prayers at Leek were especially dramatic, and Hester went to great lengths to describe the power of that occasion.

He was full of life and love and power and wept several times while he prayed. All the congregation were in tears and a young man who walked from Macclesfield and came to hear him in great distress of soul was set at liberty and met us praising God who he knew had forgiven all his sins.—A young boy about 10 years old wept aloud and was crying for mercy and several more appeared cut to the heart. (II, 176)

Wesley especially took delight in the testimony of children. One evening at the home of Mr. Ryles, Wesley confided to Hester, “I was much pleased with that little maid of ten years old—continued he who said—When I felt my sins were all forgiven and I could love God,—it overjoyed me!” (II, 180-81) Wesley’s preaching was not in vain!

III

Hester Ann Rogers remembered John Wesley as leader, as pastor, and as preacher. But most importantly, she remembered him as her “Dear Mr. Wesley.” Perhaps what captivated her more than anything else was Wesley the man. Her reminiscences of this personal friend reveal yet another facet of his fascinating character. On their return trip from Leek, while riding in the chaise, “Wesley said, I never saw a more lovely congregation Hetty—they were like melting wax just fit for divine impressions—But *God* was with us, there’s the secret—tears filling his eyes.” (II, 176) Before Wesley departed from Macclesfield in the spring of 1781 he visited a dear and dying

friend, David Pickford. "It was indeed a solemn scene," Hester recalled, "to see that venerable, happy, dying Christian, with clasped hands, and streaming eyes, call for blessings on God's dear aged messenger, and overwhelmed in holy rapture at the thought of meeting him above" (II, 94). Such were the men and women John Wesley called friend. Hester revealed Wesley as a man radiant with the love of God in his heart. It is little wonder that later in the day she confided to her Journal, "I never saw him more filled with the love and presence of his dear Master than this morning" (II, 94).

The Journal of Hester Ann Rogers reveals John Wesley as the indefatigable director of the Methodist Societies, as a priest of the Church of England charged with the care of the souls of his flock, and as a man called by God to proclaim the message of salvation to his world parish. In Hester's Journal we catch but a glimpse of John Wesley the saint.

ENDNOTES

1. The first volume (188 pp.) of these manuscript journals is entitled *A Short Account of Ye Experience of H A R Written by Herself, Cork, August 30, 1789* and covers the period July 30, 1775 to May 19, 1780. The second volume (188 pp.) is entitled the *Continuation of Ye Journal of H A R Written by Herself* with entries from May 21, 1780 to April 18, 1782. The third volume (199 pp.), *Continuation of H A R's Journal*, includes entries from April 20, 1782 to October 21, 1784. The original manuscripts belong to the Methodist Archives in the John Rylands Library, Manchester University. References to these volumes are hereafter presented by volume number and page in parentheses. Quotations which include abbreviation are fully transcribed, and frequent capitalization is modernized. Hester's spelling, however, has been retained throughout.

2. John S. Simon, *John Wesley and the Methodist Societies* (London: Epworth Press, 1923), p. 50.

3. John Wesley, *The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.*, ed. John Telford, vol. 5 (London: Epworth Press, 1931), p. 314.

4. This subject deserves more attention than can be given at this time. Since this paper is concerned particularly with Mrs. Rogers' Journal, and since the correspondence has been published in several forms, acknowledgment of this fact must suffice here.

5. John Wesley, *The Works of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A.*, ed. Thomas Jackson, vol. 7 (London: Mason, 1831), p. 110. From Sermon XCVII, "On Obedience to Pastors."

Known

by CHARLES K. ROBINSON

Associate Professor of Philosophical Theology

I know you. I created you. I am creating you.
 I have loved you from your mother's womb.
 You have fled—as you now know—from my love.
 But I love you nevertheless and not-the-less
 and, however far you flee,
 it is I who sustain your very power of fleeing,
 and I will never finally let you go.
 I accept you as you are. You are forgiven.
 I know all your sufferings. I have always known them.
 For beyond your understanding, when you suffer, I suffer.
 I also know all the little tricks by which you try to hide
 the ugliness you have made of your life from yourself and others.

But you are beautiful.
 You are beautiful more deeply within than you can see.
 You are beautiful because you yourself,
 in the unique one that only you are,
 reflect already something of the beauty of my holiness
 in a way which shall never end.
 You are beautiful also because I, and I alone,
 see the beauty you shall become.
 Through the transforming power of my love
 you shall become perfectly beautiful.
 You shall become perfectly beautiful
 in a uniquely irreplaceable way,
 which neither you nor I will work out alone.
 For we shall work it out together.

Your life from now on will be neither simple nor easy.
 I will give you moments of abundant goodness and joy;
 moments when you will be lifted very high;
 moments when, even in the midst of chaotic noise,
 you will begin to hear my symphony playing;
 moments of meaning when you will suddenly find yourself
 on a mountain where the distant bits and pieces
 suddenly come together in the worthwhileness of the whole.

The abundant goodness of the moment of meaning
 will be crisis for you, though it may not seem so.
 For then you must decide
 whether you will in forgetful pride grasp the moment to yourself
 as though it were your own possession
 or whether you will simply open yourself to the moment
 receiving it in grateful humility as a gift,
 remembering the Giver
 and sharing the abundance of your blessing with others in need.

I will to give you Paradise.
 But you will only become finally ready for it
 when you have learned how to live in Heaven
 and not wreck it through the self-surgings of ungrateful pride.
 When you are exalted with abundant goodness,
 do not forget to remember,
 remember who you are,
 remember who I am,
 and remember your neighbor in need.

Remember my Son,
 who took upon himself the Servant life
 and, though he is exalted now, remains the Servant still.
 His earthly life was lived
 not upon the smooth plateau of high abundance.
 Jesus also suffered and you will suffer too.
 Do not ask yourself whether you deserve to suffer.
 That is not the point. Jesus did not deserve to suffer.
 But he suffered and was cast down,
 and you will also suffer and be cast down.
 Only when you have learned how
 to be grateful in memory and hope even in Hell
 will you be able to be steadfastly grateful in Heaven.
 In the mystery of my working with you
 I must sometimes appear cruel in order to be kind.
 I will give you a foretaste of Heaven.
 But I must also give you—strange gift—a foretaste of Hell.
 I will not drop you all the way
 down to the bottom of the Abyss—though you may think I have.
 Only One has been to the bottommost depths.
 He passed through the extremity of suffering
 and conquered the final temptation
 so that none other need ever go to the limit of agony.

But as you must be tried by joy
 so must you also be tried by sorrow.
 You will awake on some morrow to find
 that you no longer find me.
 Instead of fulfillment there will be a void.
 Instead of my Presence there will be my Absence.
 From my side I shall still be present with you,
 but you will not perceive our relation that way.
 You will perceive only my Absence.
 That will be crisis in trial of temptation
 and you will have to choose.

If you choose wrongly,
 that will delay the business to be transacted between us.
 But, even so, your choice will not be the last word between us.
 I must have the last word, for your sake.
 For I am the last Word, as the First,
 for your sake and for all.
 If you choose rightly,
 that will facilitate matters between us,
 speeding up the process
 of perfecting your faith, purifying your love.

For I am like a refiner's Fire.
 The fire is the fire of my Holy Love.
 The flame will not be pleasant,
 but the outcome will be worth it.
 For I am holy in a way you can not-now understand,
 and the last distortion of unlove must finally yield.
 I sovereignly will to give you—and all—eternal Life.
 But the Life I will to give you
 can be joy and blessing for you
 only through your being-perfected in unswerving worship,
 faith and love, obedience and trust, under any circumstance.

When you perceive only my Absence, then you must choose.
 One choice would be to get along without me.
 You can do that.
 You can do that because, if that is what you opt for,
 I shall empower you, for a while, to do just that,
 though you will scarcely realize that it is I
 who empower your "autonomy."
 The other choice would be to hold on to me
 even when I am no longer "there" to be held on to.

If in the darkness,
 when you are all alone and I am gone,
 and there is only anguish and Forsakenness,
 you will not let me go,
 but continue to wrestle with my unperceived Presence
 even in my palpable Absence;
 if you continue to call me "my God"
 when breathing will not come and you are wracked with pain;
 if you will not give up and simply call it quits;
 if you will not let yourself off the hook
 by letting me off the hook;
 if you steadfastly insist upon remembering
 our former communion;
 if you remain unswervingly faithful
 to the vision of my Presence which I give you now;
 if you remain relentlessly obedient
 to the commissioning obligation which I lay upon you now;
 if you continue to trust me despite all temptation
 to take the easier "out" of radical despair;
 if you just go on loving me when you cannot have me
 and loving your fellow sufferers
 when you cannot sense my compassion;
 if you go on stubbornly worshiping me
 in the night when there is no light to behold my face;
 if you wordlessly say,

Though I have the world and have not Thee,
 I have nothing,
 yet if I have nothing in the world and still have Thee,
 I have All:

then, having been willing to learn—
 through my power made perfect in weakness—
 what it means to be crucified with my Messiah,
 you shall learn also what it means to be raised with Him.
 For He is the Pioneer and Perfector of faith whose victory
 was once-for-all perfected through suffering temptation.

As the One goes
 so may the many come.
 You are one of the many.
 Come unto me.

I know you. I created you. I am creating you.
I have loved you from your mother's womb.
You have fled—as you know now—from my love.
But I have loved you with an everlasting love,
and I will never finally let you go.
I accept you as you are: you are forgiven.
I know all your sufferings. I have always known them.
Beyond your understanding I have always shared them.
Though you are naked before me, do not fear.
As a mother loves her newborn, so love I you.
Even now—yes, even now—you are beautiful.
And I shall gently lead you
into a beauty that shall be unending:
beheld by joy, in joy beholding
Jesu, Joy of all desiring.

The Lectionary: Straightjacket or Coat of Many Colors?

by ROGER R. KELLER

Chairperson, Division of Humanities

Minister of the College

Pikeville College, Pikeville Kentucky

Another week! Another sermon! On what am I going to preach? Each pastor meets the weekly responsibility to preach in different ways, and each probably has some method by which he or she plans ahead. For example, a pastor may plan his preaching schedule a year in advance; he may preach in six to eight week series; he may preach on topics suggested by his congregation; or he may deal with various themes. Whatever method a pastor uses, the ideas for preaching do not always come easily, the relation of a sermon to a specific biblical text is often tenuous, variety in preaching may not be forthcoming, and the needs of the congregation may not be met. Such are the hurdles that every parish preacher must face, and the present article seeks to suggest a way of dealing with some of these issues by examining the vital role that preaching based on lectionary texts can play in the life of any parish.

Presuppositions

Certain presuppositions lie behind the suggestion that the lectionary serve as the framework for planning one's preaching. The first assumption is that God actively and continually makes himself known through Jesus Christ, and that the way the Church has with certainty encountered this incarnate God in the past, and the way the Church can expect to encounter him with certainty in the future, is as witness is borne to him by the writers of Holy Scripture.

The second assumption is that the witness of scripture is not merely a past witness, but an ever new witness made in the power of the Holy Spirit, thus providing a *contemporary* witness and encounter with the Risen Christ. Consequently, a biblical text can be the only true "listening post" for the pastor who seeks to proclaim God's Word in the contemporary world, for it is only within the pages of the Bible that a Christian is assured of encountering an authoritative witness to the Word of God.

Any sermon that does not grow primarily from a struggle with a biblical text runs the risk of being nothing but a conversation between the preacher and himself. It is not enough to say that the Christian pastor is rooted and steeped by his training in scripture, and thus any message he proclaims will have biblical authority. It is

easy to twist scripture to one's own ends, and the only way to provide some check on this manipulative process is to open oneself continually and prayerfully to the probing, questioning examination of the biblical texts prior to preaching. Every preacher, every week, needs to rediscover what Karl Barth called "the strange new world of the Bible." This means that a pastor must set aside time for study, time for exegesis, time for conversation with the text upon which he plans to preach, and time for conversation with contemporary issues that the *text* raises. Sermons, that is, good thoughtful sermons, simply do not come into existence overnight. Only after a long struggle do they come to full flower in the pulpit.

A Biblical Environment

If the Church truly believes that the Bible in its wholeness and its *diversity* bears witness to Jesus Christ, then it becomes imperative that the preacher not utilize texts randomly. Rather, there needs to be some sort of systematic hearing and struggle with the Bible in its entirety over a period of time. The lectionary provides a disciplined approach to the scriptures.

From the preacher's perspective there are two primary benefits to be found in using the lectionary. The first is that as a preacher one is forced to struggle with texts that might not otherwise be utilized. We all have favorite scriptures. We all have our favorite theological hobbyhorses which need to be questioned by an authority outside ourselves. The variety within the scriptures calls into question any constant emphasis upon such themes as justification by faith alone, grace without works, works without verbal witness, the work of the Holy Spirit, or the social gospel. None of these is wrong, but no *one* is the total gospel. Only as the pastor is forced to hear those texts which run counter to his or her basic theological interests, will the gospel in its wholeness be preached. The task of preaching the whole gospel is too important to be left to individual pastors, for few of us call ourselves and our theological perspectives into question with any regularity. The lectionary stimulates such a critical process.

The second major benefit is that a pastor inevitably preaches from both testaments as the lectionary is used. Some pastors preach almost exclusively from the New Testament, feeling that God's Word is most fully revealed there, and that to depart from the New Testament is to preach only a partial word. Others, on the other hand, feel that the New Testament points beyond the realities of everyday life to an existence in the future, and consequently they turn to the Old Testament for reference to social justice, personal morality, etc. But the Church through the centuries has continually asserted that witness is borne to God's purposes for, and ways with, human beings in both Testaments. To root preaching primarily in

one testament or the other is to fail to recognize that God bore witness to his self-revelation in Jesus Christ through both testaments. Neither testament is more important than the other. Neither can stand by itself. The Old Testament bears witness to Jesus Christ in *expectation*, while the New Testament bears witness to him in *recollection*. Both are God's Word as they are oriented toward and bear witness to Jesus Christ. Neither is God's Word when treated in isolation from its witness to the Christ who raises issues and who provides the basis for a response to those issues. Few modes of sermon planning other than the lectionary provide this varied biblical atmosphere which immerses the preacher in the biblical witness.

Lectionary preaching also provides benefits for the congregation. They too become steeped in the Bible, hearing texts which call their lives into question or which provide them with hope, while at the same time exposing them to unknown and unexplored portions of the Bible. Therefore, lectionary preaching becomes in part a tool in the overall program of Christian education of young and old alike.

Topical Variety

Not only is there biblical variety in lectionary preaching, there is also an incredible richness in the subjects that a pastor will address. I am not totally convinced that preaching in series is a particularly helpful mode of planning over the long term. Series preaching may become somewhat abstracted from the present, because it looks too far ahead. Also a series too often demands that one *find* texts which he believes address a given subject, rather than permitting texts to raise subjects. Lectionary texts are called upon to raise the topics for consideration in preaching, and there is a freshness to topics newly raised from scripture at the beginning of a week's sermon preparation that I personally do not find when preaching in series or preaching topically.

A real strength of the lectionary's variety is that all topics arise in a *specific* context, a context with two poles. The first pole, as already suggested, is biblical. The situations addressed by the biblical literature, the situations which raise questions about people's relation to God, to the created world, and to other people, are timeless situations, because they are rooted in real human, historical existence and experience. Thus, the first specific context is that of a biblical writer's witness to God's activity in *human history*, a writer who was a real person and who had to struggle with himself and with his God.

The other specific context with which the lectionary texts force us to deal, as they raise their historically rooted questions, is that of the

concrete present. To hear the Bible only in its past historical situation or to repeat only its words is to do nothing but adorn oneself with the feathers of the past. There must be a meeting of the past and present, and it is the responsibility of the preacher after prayerful biblical exegesis and a consideration of the present situation, to suggest ways in which the text at hand addresses the concrete realities of today's world and needs. Thus, preaching becomes the process of dialogue between past human witness to God's varied activity in history, and the present human need to perceive and respond to God's working in *our* history in all its multiplicity. Therefore, a sermon whose fountainhead is a biblical text, is a sermon in context, the context of the past and the present.

Meets Human Needs

It is often said, however, that lectionary preaching, for all its variety, may not meet parish needs as they arise. Yet, those who use the lectionary discover that the prescribed texts have an uncanny ability to appear at the right moments, addressing precisely the correct issues. Each week a pastor may choose to base his or her sermon on one of three prescribed passages. One of these will usually reach out and take hold of the preacher, demanding to be heard, demanding the right to address the present in the name of Jesus Christ. If we listen to a text's cry for a hearing we will probably find ourselves preaching about topics which we might never have considered or about topics that we would perhaps have chosen to avoid. Somehow these topics turn out to be right, by the grace of God.

In the course of a year far more human joys and sorrows, hopes and fears, problems and situations are dealt with through lectionary preaching than are likely to be addressed by any other method of sermon planning. If there is a real dialogue between a biblical text in its historical reality and the contemporary world in which a congregation lives, parishioners with their many needs will be confronted with the risen Christ through the pulpit ministry.

A pastor who uses the lectionary also has the freedom to address difficult and potentially explosive subjects, because the lectionary is *structured*. If a congregation knows that their pastor uses the lectionary, and if a pastor publishes in the weekly bulletin the next Sunday's lectionary texts, the congregation begins to understand that the topics which the preacher addresses are raised by the *Bible*. The topics are not the result of a counseling session during the week, of a rumor, or of the pastor's personal difficulties. Thus, when the lectionary text deals with adultery, so can the pastor, even though he

may know of persons in his congregation who are being unfaithful to their spouses. His sermon arises not out of his pastoral knowledge, but out of a text which demands that the subject be addressed. Similarly, topics such as race, social justice, and political honesty can be raised *because the texts demand it*. This implies, of course, that the pastor is willing to do the exegetical work to check his own personal biases on a subject, and perhaps even to have his own mind changed by a text of scripture. The Word of God, Jesus Christ, challenges all persons, including ministers, to look anew at situations in the light of scripture, and to have their "pre-understandings" shattered on the basis of that Word.

In addition to the variety that the lectionary provides, there is also a control exercised in one's preaching. Often when a problem arises in the parish, the community, the nation, or the world, our initial reaction as preachers is to jump into the middle of the problem with both feet as soon as it surfaces. There *may* be instances of such earth-shaking significance that it is necessary to abandon the lectionary for a Sunday and to address such a need. But I would contend that such situations are relatively rare. Rather, by following the lectionary one discovers that in two or three weeks the opportunity comes to address the problem, and the lapse of time has perhaps permitted some reflection and the cooling of emotions (the pastor's included).

Preaching is not a bucket brigade operation designed to extinguish weekly brush fires. If it becomes this, then the congregation, the pastor, and weekly situations control the preaching, rather than permitting the Word of God as witnessed to in scripture to control. The lectionary assures, as nearly as possible, a biblical basis for preaching. As pastors we are called not to preach our own presuppositions, but rather to permit them to founder on the shoals of scripture so that we preach God's Word to ourselves, as well as to our congregations. The lectionary is no straitjacket, but rather a many-colored, multifaceted resource and source that will never run dry. It continually draws us into the "strange new world of the Bible," which God by his Holy Spirit opens again and again to his Church.

Book Reviews

John Wesley: His Life and Theology. Robert Tuttle, Jr. Zondervan. 1978. 368 pp. \$9.95.

Unfortunately this book has been promoted as the "definitive biography" of John Wesley. But apart from this misrepresentation the work is a significant treatment of John Wesley. It comes at a time when many are rediscovering Wesley as a serious theologian and an important resource for church renewal. And judged by estimated sales of 50,000 in the first six months of its existence, this book is likely to make an impact on current Wesley studies.

It is helpful to see Dr. Tuttle's purposes in writing this book. First, he sought to present an interesting and readable biography which struggles with a man of history and emotion. In doing this he wanted to demonstrate an appreciation for Wesley's Diaries, Journal, and Letters. Second, he wished to present a fairly comprehensive theological analysis of Wesley and his interest in practical theology. Third, he hoped to motivate people to read primary Wesley material for themselves. And fourth, he desired to inspire. Judged on these points alone, Dr. Tuttle does well.

Worthy of further mention is the unique organization and approach of the book. Dr. Tuttle presents both biographical and analytical chapters, and by doing so he desired to keep distinct the factual and analytical material in his work. Further, through the use of first-person style he sought to give the reader the impression of actually conversing with Wesley. This, however, is no mere popularized version of

Wesley's life and thought. By including numerous footnotes and much bibliographical information, the author enables the reader to confirm statements which he makes. And the inclusion of an index makes it possible to trace important people and ideas through the book.

It is this reviewer's opinion that the book makes three significant contributions. The first is its presentation of John Wesley as a real man, not a folk-hero. Some other biographies of Wesley have tended to paint him in an unreal light. Tuttle, however, treats Wesley as a real person, complete with struggles and even apparent inconsistencies. This treatment helps the reader remember that the genius of Wesley was not Wesley himself, but rather his willingness to be used of God. This is an important perspective in our day when we are tempted to focus on the charismatic personality rather than the Spirit who gives the charismata.

The second significant contribution is that the book provides the reader with a new understanding of the role of mysticism in Wesley's life. Older biographies have either ignored this fact or presented general, sweeping condemnations of mystical influence. Both Tyerman and Telford, for example, seek to show Wesley's escape from mysticism's snare. But in doing so they make the very mistake Wesley made around 1736, i.e. they condemn mysticism "in a lump." More recent Wesley scholarship has correctly shown that a distinction must be made between Germanic and Roman Catholic mysticism in the life of Wesley. After 1738 he did leave behind much in the German mystics with their emphasis on

stillness and the extreme interior life. But he continued to utilize the Roman Catholic mystics (e.g. a Kempis, de Renty, Lopez) who kept a balance between holiness of heart and life. Dr. Tuttle makes a significant contribution in showing this influence upon Wesley's spiritual development.

Thirdly, the book struggles with the period between 1725 and 1738. Dr. Tuttle admits that equally competent Wesley scholars have differed on their interpretations of this period, but he believes there is a fresh approach which will shed further light on this important time in Wesley's life.

No doubt, some will find Tuttle's struggle no more satisfying than previous attempts, but any reader of this work should give careful attention to this analysis. Basically, Dr. Tuttle describes the problem as an impasse created by conflicting philosophies contained in Anglicanism and mysticism. Anglicanism affirmed the Aristotelian principle of reason seeking faith. Mysticism affirmed the Platonic principle of faith seeking reason. This mixture of philosophies blocked the one thing Wesley needed most, assurance. Using the mystical notion of faith as quest instead of the evangelical notion of faith as trust, Wesley misunderstood holiness as the producer of faith rather than the product of faith. And, says Tuttle, it took him thirteen years to sort out this problem and resolve it.

When was Wesley converted? Dr. Tuttle uses Wesley to shed light on this question. In reflecting upon this period in his life, Wesley distinguished between the "faith of a servant" and the "faith of a son." Between 1725 and 1738 Wesley says he had the "faith of a servant," and after 1738 he had the "faith of a son." While Wesley never doubted that vital faith was that of a son, he nevertheless came to believe that the "faith of a servant," though young and immature, was acceptable to God for salvation. The result of all this

is that in speaking of bare salvation one must look to 1725, but in speaking of personally assured faith and the resulting spiritual dynamic of such faith, one must look to 1738. In a sense the whole period can be seen as Wesley's "conversion."

In addition to these three highly significant contributions, there are five other contributions to be briefly noted. First, the author shows that Wesley was willing throughout his lifetime to be open to new light and new truth. This gave him a vitality and dynamism that kept his life and theology from becoming brittle. Second, Dr. Tuttle notes the importance of the period at Wroot in Wesley's spiritual development. Some may disagree with the emphasis on solitude which Tuttle makes here, but all may affirm the need to study more carefully this period and not overlook it. Third, the Society structure is described. For the person coming to Wesley for the first time, this information will be quite helpful; and it is an important point to refer to in contemporary discussions of church renewal and small group movements. Fourth, the influence of the Moravians is noted, both positively and negatively. Fifth, the personal spiritual life of Wesley is shown. Not only is he a priest, evangelist, theologian, and leader of a movement, he is also a fellow pilgrim in the faith who must cultivate the same spiritual disciplines we do.

Despite these positive features, there are some weaknesses to note. The first is minimal treatment of certain segments of Wesley's theology, e.g., prevenient grace and repentance in believers. It is this reviewer's opinion that Dr. Tuttle's book is more a theological analysis of John Wesley than it is a presentation of his theology. The reader should not look for a systematic or comprehensive treatment of Wesley's theology in this book.

Second, several key events and issues are overlooked. Wesley's ongoing relation to Anglicanism is passed over.

The Calvinistic controversy is ignored. While information about the Societies is present, the Conference system which tied it together is not dealt with. Missing also is attention to the use of lay preachers.

Third, the years after 1738 are minimally treated in comparison with the years before then. This is often the case in biographies of Wesley, but it is still a weakness. Dr. Frank Baker has noted that half of Wesley's letters were written after 1770, and certainly the development of Wesley as a person and revival leader comes after 1738. Although it may be said that nearly one-third of the book covers the years after 1738, the fact is that much of that material deals with matters between 1738 and 1750. The last forty-one years of Wesley's life are treated minimally and generally. Less historical material is given and much is left out. Nothing is said about Wesley's ordinations or the Deed of Declaration of 1784.

Fourth, the book ignores some of Wesley's social ministries. It could have been enhanced had Dr. Tuttle included such things as the Kingswood School, Wesley's concern for the poor, and his stands on various socio-political issues.

No single volume can be free from weaknesses and omissions. Dr. Tuttle's book is no exception. The serious Wesley scholar needs complementary volumes in order to complete the picture which is begun in this work. But even for the less serious reader it is unfortunate that some major events and issues are left out.

In concluding this review, several summary statements are in order. First, despite its weaknesses, this is a work worth reading. It stands somewhere between a mere popular work and a thorough scholarly treatment. Second, if rightly used it will lead the reader to the primary material and to other secondary sources such as Frank Baker's *John Wesley and the Church of England*, Martin Schmidt's *John Wesley: A Theological Biography*, and Albert Outler's *John Wesley*. And third, this

volume points to the need for a definitive work on John Wesley. Until that is written we may be thankful for works such as Robert Tuttle's which continue to hold before us the importance of John Wesley and the need to know him better.

—Steve Harper

Learning Through Liturgy. Gwen Kennedy Neville and John Westerhoff, III. Seabury. 1978. 189 pp. \$8.95.

A few years ago, John Westerhoff of Duke and Gwen Kennedy Neville, a cultural anthropologist from Emory, combined insights from their respective fields in *Generation to Generation*, a book which explored the processes of religious socialization. Now, in *Learning Through Liturgy*, Westerhoff and Neville focus on one key aspect of religious socialization, ritual and ceremonial, in a discussion of the interplay between liturgy and religious education.

The first half of *Learning Through Liturgy* is devoted to a set of essays by Neville in which she examines the structure and function of certain informal, recurrent community celebrations which have not been previously identified as liturgy. Her "Outdoor Worship as a Liturgical Form" uncovers the ancient Celtic roots of such American Protestant liturgical forms as the camp meeting and the frontier revival. This essay suggests that our concepts of what constitutes the "church's liturgy" may be too narrow, too limited to certain establishment or "high church" definitions of liturgy. By showing that such apparently "non-liturgical" gatherings as camp meetings and church homecomings have ancient roots in the dissent from the Established Church, and that they have a carefully patterned, ritualized focus and theological function; Neville expands our awareness of these "folk

liturgies" as significant liturgical forms. No Protestant pastor in the Southeast should miss her "Folk Liturgies in the American South," an essay which examines such familiar rites as "dinner on the grounds," "homecoming," "family reunions," and "camp meetings" as liturgical expressions of what she calls "religious familialism." It occurred to me, in reading this chapter, that one reason many Protestant pastors either ignore or run rough-shod through such persistent "folk liturgies" as the church "homecoming" is that pastors do not adequately understand the socio-psychological function of these phenomena. They erroneously assume that these events are quaint, meaningless holdovers from the past which are little more than nuisances in the present.

By using the tools of cultural anthropology, Neville helps us to see that these "folk liturgies" reveal the essential elements of a given culture (something a pastor, particularly a new pastor, should want to know) and the essential learnings which are being passed down from one generation to the next. The pastor may question whether the learning which comes from these informal liturgies is *Christian* learning, or whether the "liturgies" need to be modified in order to function more effectively for the participants, but those questions come only after one has carefully examined what happens in the liturgies and how they function. In "Anthropology and Liturgy," Neville gives some specific suggestions for how we can utilize the methods and insights of cultural anthropology in analyzing liturgical forms, particularly the liturgical forms of Anglo-Saxon Protestantism, in order better to understand and possibly to change those forms. Liturgical study has too often limited itself to historical and theological inquiry, inquiring mainly into the liturgical tradition of the Roman Catholic church and its

immediate offspring. Neville breaks new ground in suggesting a perspective and some methods for research which can enable us to understand the liturgical life of "free church" Protestantism.

Understanding is primary. For too long the American church, particularly American Protestantism, has acted as if ritual were optional and even unessential to Christian discipleship. But I think we must give credit to anthropologists like Neville and educators like Westerhoff for reminding us that, in any culture worthy of the name, whether it be secular or sacred culture, ritual is persistent, unavoidable, pervasive, and powerful. In the opening essay to his half of the book, "Liturgy and Catechesis: A Christian Marriage," John Westerhoff admits, "Our rituals can be dangerous." Rituals can bless and sustain the status quo and thus frustrate the Gospel call to conversion and change. But our rituals can also be agents of personal and social conversion. They need not simply make us comfortable in the world as it is but can also give us a vision and a commitment to the new world which God is creating. Therefore Westerhoff calls for an integration of the church's worship, education, fellowship, and service with worship as the center. Rather than conceive of Christian education as some separate, classroom-oriented activity, Westerhoff says that all Christian education should be part of worship. The proper task of Christian education is to prepare us to worship, to judge and improve our worship life, to reflect upon what we do when we worship, and to question where we are to move after we have worshipped. Continuing his attack upon recent Christian education based upon a secular schooling model (which he began in *Will Our Children Have Faith?*), Westerhoff proposes a restored "marriage" between liturgy and education in the church.

In his next two chapters, Dr.

Westerhoff further explains why and how this can be done. His last chapter, "Identity and the Pilgrimage of Faith," is an exposition of Westerhoff's intriguing proposal for a new or, for most of us, a radically changed plan for initiating people into the Christian faith. His advocacy of Confirmation as an adult rite which is "ordination of the laity for ministry" and the establishment of a new adolescent "rite of responsibility" which he calls "A Covenant of Discipleship" should set our imaginations in motion as we wrestle with the problem of liturgy's relationship to the formation of Christian maturity.

For some readers, *Liturgy and Education* may appear disjointed at times, with little relationship between one essay and the next. This is often the problem with a book of essays, particularly essays by two people. There is little connection between Neville's opening observations of informal rites within American Protestantism and Westerhoff's later proposals for liturgical change unless it is the implicit assumption that change should be done only after careful analysis of a given faith-community's rituals. But some of Dr. Westerhoff's proposals, if implemented in most quarters of the American church, Protestant or Catholic, would be a radical and possibly painful departure from the previous liturgical patterns of the community. Such change may be exactly what we need. But it would have been interesting to know what Dr. Neville thinks about the desirability as well as the possibly negative effects of these changes. I also think there are historical and theological questions which are avoided in the discussion of future liturgical trends. The proposals for change suggest that sometimes educational assumptions about what people want or need should outweigh some traditional theological concerns. Such assumptions are often the result of dialogue with one of the social sciences. But these are minor objections and they

must not obscure the contribution of this book.

It is gratifying to have so competent an anthropologist as Gwen Kennedy Neville turning her attentions toward so neglected an area of Protestant church life. It is exciting for those of us at Duke to have so competent a Christian educator as John Westerhoff boldly beckoning us forward into what he believes will be an invigorating future for the life of faith.

—William H. Willimon

The Eighth-Century Prophets: Amos · Hosea · Isaiah · Micah. Bernhard W. Anderson. Fortress. 1978. 111 pp. \$3.50.

For those persons who are acquainted with the Proclamation Commentary Series, the content and structure of this volume could very easily be anticipated. This series is designed basically for pastors to assist in interpreting the texts for the Church year and to present the results of contemporary scholarship on the various parts of the Bible. This particular volume is concerned with the eighth-century prophets.

One usually anticipates with eagerness the reading of a book by B.W. Anderson. His style is clear, and the content of his writing is sound. These characteristics are present in this book as well. But the overall arrangement of the book and the organizational structure of the presentation of the material somehow do not make this one of Anderson's better products. This may be the result of the "Proclamation" format which one could argue against as much as for.

After a *brief* introduction dealing with the nature of prophecy, Anderson moves on to talk about the background for the eighth-century prophetic message, linking it quite closely to the political and social situations of the time. God, according to Anderson, is like a "roaring lion," which indicates that God is present in

the world and that "God's prey is his own people" (p. 9). This chapter is followed by a discussion of how the prophets viewed the future, especially how the present is linked to the future, which in turn is followed by a discussion of repentance, or "Turning Away and Turning Around."

The three chapters which immediately follow are based in turn on the three admonitions described in Micah 6:8. What does the LORD require of you but, ". . . to act justly, to love loyalty (*hesed*), and to walk wisely before your God." (NEB) In these chapters several texts from the prophets under consideration are examined basically from the form-critical viewpoint to illustrate the points being emphasized.

The work concludes with two chapters entitled "God Who Cares" and "Waiting For God." The first argues for a God who is "passionately concerned and involved" with the people on earth, while the second argues that the prophets were "optimists" even in the midst of all their negativities, looking forward to a new beginning. The book also includes a brief bibliography and two indices, the second of which sets out "prophetic preaching themes."

The response of this reviewer to the book under consideration is frankly mixed. On the one hand, there are some very positive portions of this work and, as is usually the case with Professor Anderson's writing, some very quotable quotes. On the other hand, however, there are some aspects of the work which detract from its overall strength. One problem is that of arrangement, which has already been mentioned. A second, which the present reviewer found somewhat distressing, concerned the quite frequent references to Jeremiah, a seventh-century prophet. There is no objection to Jeremiah's teaching or that it was ill-used by the author; but with all the rich material from the four prophets under consideration, it

would seem more logical to stay more closely with them and therefore within the purpose of the book.

Finally, there is one other distraction which may not bother anyone except the present reviewer. But the question may well be asked about the necessity of introducing references to the New Testament at every opportunity. Cannot these great inspired prophets of God have their messages understood and appreciated on their own? Apart from any other "validating" collection of writings or later theology? They certainly can. The problem here is not that this is an illegitimate undertaking, to link the Old Testament and the New Testament together, but that in such a short amount of space the attempt to do that detracts both from the great message of the prophetic books and the connection and relationship of these messages to the New Testament writings and thought. But again this may be the fault of the "Proclamation" format more than it is of Professor Anderson.

—James M. Efrid

Isaiah: Scroll of a Prophetic Heritage.
William L. Holladay. Eerdmans.
1978. 270 pp. \$6.95.

Professor William L. Holladay of Andover Newton Theological School is perhaps one of the best interpreters of the Bible for pastors and lay persons who is writing today. Many have already read and profited from one of his other works, *Jeremiah—Spokesman Out Of Time*. The present book on Isaiah is designed as a companion volume to that work. It is intended for lay persons who have not had formal training in Biblical interpretation.

The author's thesis is that the book of Isaiah as it now exists is the final product of a long period of time during which a "single prophetic viewpoint" was "remembered, preserved, compiled, and copied" by a prophetic community which also produced

additional prophetic oracles which "were authentic to that tradition." (p. 18) Holladay likes to refer to the different blocks of tradition within the sixty-six chapters of Isaiah as it now stands as a "whole array of voices." He finds, as most Old Testament scholars do, several "Isaiahs" within the collection that bears that name.

The first chapter deals with these problems concerning unity, and the author attempts to demonstrate that modern concern for common source (*i. e.*, one Isaiah) was not important to the ancients. "They did not ask, Who spoke these words, and when? But rather, their question was, What words were to be spoken, and what is God doing, according to his spokesman? . . . Many of the voices . . . must remain anonymous, but what the voices have to say does come through loud and clear. . . Multiplicity does not seem to have bothered the Old Testament community which brought these collections together, and multiplicity should not bother us." (p. 21)

After the initial "orientation" chapter, the author develops the remainder of the work under the broader headings: The First Isaiah; "Second Isaiah"; "Third Isaiah"; Other "Isaiahs"; and a "Summation" in which he examines the Isaiah tradition and suggests ways that the tradition can have meaning for us.

It would not be appropriate in such a short review as this to discuss the points of agreement and disagreement which the reviewer has with the author. The comments, therefore, will be confined to an evaluation of whether Professor Holladay has, in fact, done what he intended to do, namely to write a book on Isaiah suitable for the lay person without formal Biblical training. The answer to that question is not without certain ambiguities.

The present reviewer respects the work of Professor Holladay immensely, feeling that he is one of the best interpreters of the Bible for lay persons of this generation. More work like his

needs to be made available to the laity because there is a real need and a demand for such material presently. Whether Holladay has "hit the mark" with this book on Isaiah is debatable, however. On the one hand, the book is well written, clearly stated, and quite balanced in the use of scholarly data put in simpler language for the uninitiated reader. On the other hand, the technical complexities of the situation all too often appear in the text of the book, perhaps because the entire undertaking is so complex and bulky. But the result is that it is difficult, if not impossible, for uninitiated lay persons to follow some of the discussion, especially where so much emphasis is placed on how the text was finally edited—a highly speculative study. This kind of presentation will simply confuse the lay person, and the *overemphasis* on this topic will cause the reader to lose sight of the message being presented.

Having said this, however, let it be emphasized that while the book probably is too complex at certain points for lay persons, this is an excellent resource for the pastor both in terms of one's own understanding of the book of Isaiah and in the preparation to explain that book to one's parishioners. The book can be of great value for the purpose for which it was intended, *i. e.*, to help the lay person understand the book of Isaiah. But it will do that best if it is further simplified for the laity *by the teacher*. The book is simply too complex, and at times too difficult to follow, to place it directly in the hands of a lay person without some supervision. The book is, however, highly recommended for all pastors.

—James M. Efrid

And Sarah Laughed. The Status of Women in the Old Testament. John H. Otwell. Westminster. 1977. 222 pp. \$7.95.

In contrast to a traditional understanding that the status of woman (her relative standing in the family and

community) in ancient Israel was rather low, and in a radical departure from much recent writing (especially by women) which claims that the Bible is partly (or even largely) to blame for the inequality of women in present Western societies, the author argues that the status of Israelite woman was admirably high. Although this position has been argued before, it has seldom been done with such length and detail as undertaken here. And since the author is an established scholar (Professor of Old Testament at the Pacific School of Religion and the Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, California), it is proper that his analysis be taken seriously.

He examines hundreds of passages dealing with the status of woman (the Scripture index contains approximately 1,000 entries), some of them standard in discussion of this topic (e.g., Gen. 3:16, "He [the husband] shall rule over you"), and others which have been conveniently or imperceptively ignored. He does this under such headings as the creation of woman, sexual attraction, marriage, motherhood, subservience of women, subservience to women (a rarely discussed topic, indeed!), sisters, divorcees, widows, freedom of action (within and without the family), cultic activity, and personifications (e.g., wisdom as a woman, Zion as a daughter).

He argues that, since God has made promises concerning Israel's future which are dependent upon offspring, "the divine presence and activity which guaranteed the progeny was resident in the woman. Her fecundity was the most crucial and clearest proof of God's presence in the midst of the people" (p. 61); that woman's status as a "helpmeet" (Gen. 2:18) and her creation from the man's rib (2:21-22) have no implications of inferiority, contrary to popular assumption (p. 17); that a father's right to contract a marriage for his daughter was by no means absolute (p. 33); that many passages taken to indicate the subservience of women have been misunderstood, e.g., the

giving of the patriarchal wives into the harem of a foreigner, as in Gen. 12 (p. 79); that women regularly wielded great authority in domestic and political spheres, and indeed that "The wife was not inferior to the husband" (p. 101); that, contrary to popular modern belief that only the husband had the right to initiate divorce proceedings, the wife's right to such initiation is even more explicitly spelled out (p. 121); and that women exercised wide leadership in the cultic sphere, with only the priesthood forbidden them (p. 155).

The volume is written in non-technical language, footnotes are almost non-existent, there is a basic bibliography and full index, and it is noticeably well bound for a paperback. Each chapter concludes with a brief summary of the material covered and the conclusions which may be drawn from it.

There are a number of peripheral points at which one might argue with the author: e.g., that the actors in the Song of Solomon are "bride and groom" (p. 25); that the Hebrew word *bethulah* means "virgin" (p. 183). And some of his interpretations seem a bit forced: e.g., that Saul's ability to give his daughter Michael to someone else in marriage after her first husband David had become an outlaw is an indication of the high status of woman (the family protects her from an unsuitable marriage) rather than an illustration of parental power over daughters (p. 75).

However, the volume provides a useful counterbalance to the earlier opposite extreme in interpretation. The truth lies somewhere in between.

—Lloyd Bailey

The Men, The Meaning, The Message of The New Testament Books. William Barclay. Westminster. 1976. 149 pp. \$3.95.

This book is the result of a collecting together of a series of articles which first appeared in the magazine of the

Church of Scotland. They are designed to give a "quick but comprehensive view of the whole New Testament" (p. vii). The method used by Dr. Barclay is one wherein one special theme or aspect of each New Testament book is singled out and each book is then explicated according to that theme.

The book proceeds to examine each New Testament writing in the manner described, and the order of presentation is basically that of the order of the New Testament canon with few exceptions. At the conclusion of each chapter there are some questions for further discussion and suggestions for further reading.

As usual Barclay's book is clearly written and does what he intends for it to do. This work introduces the books of the New Testament for lay persons and can be used with some success by laity. The basic problem with the book is that it is probably too simplistic even for laity. There is very little reference to problems involved in the dating and interpretation of the New Testament literature. While there definitely is a place for this kind of approach to the literature of the New Testament, the present reviewer feels that the prevailing mood among laity today is for some study material which challenges their thinking and understanding while still being readable and understandable to them. Barclay's book here discussed does the latter but not the former.

—James M. Efrid

A Few Minutes, Please!

The Editorial Committee wants to serve the interests and needs of its readership. This questionnaire may help us to do this better if (and *only if*) a large number of *you*, readers, will take time to fill it out carefully and return it to Editor, *The Duke Divinity School Review*, Duke University, Durham, N.C. 27706. *Please respond* to those items (and only those items) on which you have a definite opinion. Reverse side may be used for additional comment.

Publication of the *Review* costs the School between \$6000 and \$8000 per year. In an increasingly stringent financial situation, do you regard this as a worthwhile expenditure? _____ Would you be willing to pay \$2 per year for your subscription? _____

Check *any* of the following types of material (some categories overlap) which *you* would *prefer* to have *increased* (+) or *decreased* (-) or *eliminated* (0): scholarly (), popularized (), biblical (), theological (), historical (), practical (), devotional (), book reviews (), bibliography (), issues of the *Review* in which all (or most) articles relate to a common theme ().

How long have you been receiving the *Review*? _____
From your perspective which of the *issues* you have received were *most* beneficial?

least beneficial?

Which individual *articles* were *most* beneficial?

least beneficial?

If there are any specific topics, themes or types of material which you would like to *suggest* for possible inclusion in future issues of the *Review*, please list:

name

present position



**THE
DUKE
DIVINITY SCHOOL
REVIEW**

Spring 1979

US ISSN 0012-7078

**THE
DUKE
DIVINITY SCHOOL
REVIEW**

Volume 44

Spring 1979

Number 2

CONTENTS

Recent English Versions of the Bible: Editor's Preface	67
<i>by Lloyd R. Bailey</i>	
The Contributors	68
The Revised Standard Version	70
<i>by Bruce M. Metzger</i>	
The Jerusalem Bible	88
<i>by Bruce Vawter, C.M.</i>	
The New English Bible	104
<i>by Roger A. Bullard</i>	
The New American Bible	124
<i>by Walter Harrelson</i>	
The Living Bible	137
<i>by James D. Smart</i>	
Today's English Version or The Good News Bible	142
<i>by W.F. Stinespring</i>	
The New International Version	164
<i>by Robert G. Bratcher</i>	
The New Jewish Version	180
<i>by Keith R. Crim</i>	
Annotated Bibliography	192

Editor: Charles Robinson; Associate Editors: Mark Allen, Lloyd Bailey, Frank Baker, Donn Michael Farris, Roland Murphy, Nancy Rosebaugh

Editor for this issue: Lloyd R. Bailey
copyright © 1979 by Lloyd R. Bailey

Published three times a year (Winter, Spring, Fall)
by the Divinity School of Duke University
Postage paid at Durham, North Carolina 27706

PREFACE

Now that a number of English Bible translation projects undertaken over the last several decades have been completed (RSV, JB, NEB, NAB, TEV, NIV) or are nearing completion (NJV, revised RSV), it is an opportune time to consider the current situation in retrospect and prospect. While there have been, to date, a multitude of brief reviews of individual versions (including LB) and even an occasional comparison of two of them (see the Annotated Bibliography), there has seldom been a sustained discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of each.

In response to repeated requests from students, pastors, and members of various congregations for guidance in deciding "Which Bible is best?" it occurred to me that *The Duke Divinity School Review* could perform a significant service by preparing the present volume. Consequently, I have chosen the major versions which have appeared since the time of the RSV (realizing that perhaps not everyone will agree with my choice of "major") and have asked scholars and translators of national reputation to evaluate them in terms of the criteria which they held to be appropriate. In each case the potential author responded positively to my invitation, even when faced with prior heavy commitments to other projects. This I take to indicate agreement that the present volume is needed and I wish to express my gratitude to each of them for the care with which they have fulfilled their obligation to our readership.

Professor James Smart's article on the Living Bible (LB) was originally published under the title "The Invented Bible," in *The Presbyterian Record* (July-August, 1976), pp. 6-7, 32, and is reprinted here with the permission of the Editor. The *Record* is the national magazine of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

Lloyd R. Bailey, Editor
Duke University
June 4, 1979

THE CONTRIBUTORS

- Robert G. Bratcher is a member of the Translations Department, American Bible Society. He was the translator of the Good News New Testament and Chairman of the Old Testament translation panel for Today's English Version.
- Roger A. Bullard is Professor of Religion and Philosophy at Atlantic Christian College. He served on the Old Testament and Apocrypha translation panels for Today's English Version.
- Keith R. Crim is Professor of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Virginia Commonwealth University. He served on the Old Testament translation panel for Today's English Version.
- Walter J. Harrelson is Professor of Old Testament at the Divinity School, Vanderbilt University. He is a member of the Revised Standard Version Bible Committee.
- Bruce M. Metzger is George L. Collord Professor of New Testament Language and Literature at Princeton Theological Seminary. He is Chairman of the Revised Standard Version Bible Committee.
- James D. Smart is Emeritus Professor of Bible Interpretation at Union Theological Seminary, New York. He is a Presbyterian minister and now resides in Toronto.
- William F. Stinespring is Emeritus Professor of Old Testament and Semitics, the Divinity School, Duke University.
- Bruce Vawter is Chairman of the Department of Religious Studies, DePaul University. He was a member of the New American Bible translation panel.

ABBREVIATIONS

- ABS: The American Bible Society
- ASV: the American Standard Version (the U.S. edition of RV) [1901]
- AT: *The Complete Bible: An American Translation* (commonly called "The Chicago Bible") [1939]
- AV: Authorized Version, a common designation for KJV, based upon the statement in its preface. (Other versions may legitimately claim that status, however. See H.G. May, "Authorized Versions," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Supplementary Volume.)
- ERV: the English Revised Version (the British edition of RV) [1885]
- JB: the Jerusalem Bible [1966]
- JPS: see NJV
- KJV: the King James Version [1611]
- LB: the Living Bible [1971]
- NAB: the New American Bible [1970]
- NEB: the New English Bible [1970]
- NIV: the New International Version [1978]
- NJV: the New Jewish Version [1962, 1978, 19--], issued by the Jewish Publication Society (and thus sometimes called the JPS Version)
- RSV: the Revised Standard Version [1952]
- RV: the Revised Version (of KJV); see ERV and ASV
- TEV: Today's English Version [1976]. The New Testament was published first, as Good News for Modern Man. TEV is commonly called "The Good News Bible."

* * * * *

- LXX: the Septuagint Version, an ancient Greek translation from Hebrew (and Aramaic) produced by Jewish scribes for Greek-speaking Jews (and later used by Greek-speaking Christians)
- MT: the Masoretic Text, a medieval Hebrew (and Aramaic) text produced by Jewish scribes as a "standard" text, which included insertion of vowels (pointing) lacking in earlier Hebrew (and Aramaic) manuscripts

The Revised Standard Version

by BRUCE M. METZGER

The New Testament of the Revised Standard Version (RSV) was published in 1946; the Old Testament in 1952; the books of the Apocrypha in 1957; the second edition of the New Testament in 1971; and the expanded edition with the Apocrypha in 1977. The Revised Standard Version is, in fact, still in the making, for the RSV Bible Committee is an on-going committee, and its annual meetings are devoted to taking into account the discovery and publication of still more ancient manuscripts of the Old and New Testaments as well as the refining of the English expressions chosen to render the original text. At the moment the Committee is also giving attention to the presence of masculine-oriented phraseology imposed in the Bible by earlier translators (see below, section 6). The most noteworthy new development was the publication in 1977 of the first truly ecumenical edition of the Bible in English, suited for use by members of all three principal branches of the Christian Church—Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Eastern Orthodox (see below, section 5).

In what follows attention is given to the historical background of the RSV Bible, including earlier revisions of the King James Version culminating in the American Standard Version (1901) and the subsequent formation of the RSV Bible Committee. This is followed by consideration of certain problems, old and new, in Bible translating, and the on-going work of the RSV Committee in preparation of the forth-coming revision of the RSV text.

1. Earlier Revisions of the King James Version

When King James I of England assembled about fifty scholars in the early seventeenth century, it was not to make an entirely new translation of the Bible, but to revise the English version of 1568 called the Bishops' Bible. Let it be said with all due emphasis that these learned men produced, from a purely literary point of view, a classic rendering of the Scriptures, and the 1611 Bible has deserved the acclaim that it eventually won for itself.

Despite the wide acceptance which the 1611 Bible eventually attained, in subsequent generations occasional proposals were voiced as to the desirability of introducing here and there various corrections and other alterations of phraseology. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries several dozen private ventures in Bible translating were undertaken in England and in America. Some of these were merely revisions of the King James

version; others were more independent paraphrases. An example of the former type was John Wesley's revised edition of the Authorized Version of the New Testament, published in 1768 with some 12,000 alterations in all, but none of them, the reader is assured, for altering's sake. The same year saw the publication of a quite paraphrastic rendering in the stilted, verbose style of eighteenth-century English popular in the time of Samuel Johnson. Made by the bibliographer Edward Harwood, an ordained Presbyterian minister, its style can be seen from the grandiose manner in which Harwood renders Jesus' Parable of the Prodigal Son:

A Gentleman of a splendid family and opulent fortune had two sons. One day the younger approached his father, and begged him in the most importunate and soothing terms to make a partition of his effects betwixt himself and his elder brother—The indulgent father, overcome by his blandishments, immediately divided all his fortunes betwixt them, etc. (Luke 15:11ff.)

Harwood's elaboration of the familiar text of John 3:16 is as follows:

For the supreme God was affected with such immense compassion and love for the human race, that he deputed his son from heaven to instruct them—in order that everyone who embraces and obeys his religion might not finally perish, but secure everlasting happiness.

In America Noah Webster, the lexicographer, prepared a revision of the King James Version which was published in New Haven in 1833. A Congressional layman who had been admitted to the bar, Webster's purpose was, as he says, to remove obsolete phrases, to remove grammatical infelicities,¹ and to correct mistranslations. To this he added one thing more, which he considered of very grave importance. In his own words:

To these may be added many words and phrases very offensive to delicacy, and even to decency. In the opinion of all persons with whom I have conversed on the subject, such words and phrases ought not to be retained in the version. Language which cannot be uttered in company without a violation of decorum, or the rules of good breeding, exposes the Scriptures to the scoffs of unbelievers, impairs their authority, and multiplies or confirms the enemies of our holy religion. (Preface to Webster's Bible)

Another American production, similar to Harwood's British monstrosity, was *A New and Corrected Version of the New Testament*, prepared by Rodolphus Dickinson, an Episcopalian rector, and published at Boston in 1833. The preface to this volume is an astonishing exhibition of conceit. The author condemns the "quaint monotony and affected solemnity" of the King James version, with its "frequently rude and occasionally barbarous attire," and he declares his purpose to adorn the Scriptures with "a splendid and sweetly flowing diction" suited to the use of

“accomplished and refined persons.” Here are Mr. Dickinson’s renderings of three well-known passages:

And it happened, that when Elizabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the embryo was joyfully agitated (Luke 1:41).

His master said to him, Well-done, good and provident servant! you was² faithful in a limited sphere, I will give you a more extensive superintendence; participate in the happiness of your master (Matthew 25:21).

Festus declared with a loud voice, Paul, you are insane! Multiplied research drives you to distraction (Acts 26:24).

One of the curiosities in the history of the English Bible is the translation of the Scriptures made by Julia E. Smith, the Women’s Suffragist of the past century. Published in 1876 at Hartford at her own expense, this version is excessively wooden, using throughout the same English word for the same Hebrew or Greek word. She thought that, as she says in the Preface, this would give “much clearer understanding of the text.” The end result, however, of such a policy of mechanical translation was much nonsense and, in some passages, almost complete mistranslation. In historical narratives she rendered Hebrew verbs in the future tense, giving the reader the impression that everything in those narratives, including the acts of creation in Genesis, chapter 1, was yet to happen. The extent of the obscurity is suggested by Jer. 22:23, presented as a complete sentence and reading: “Thou dwelling in Lebanon, building a nest in the cedars, how being compassionated in pangs coming to thee the pain as of her bringing forth.”

Miss Smith illustrates dramatically a fact which some persons do not appreciate, namely, that most words have more than one meaning, and in translation the more specific meaning of a word in a particular context has to be determined from that context. Perhaps her initial mistake was to seek no help or advice in her venture, as she naively discloses to the reader: “It may be thought by the public in general that I have great confidence in myself in not conferring with the learned in so great a work, but as there is but one book in the Hebrew tongue, and I have defined it word for word, I do not see how anybody can know more about it than I do”!

2. The Revised Version in England and the Standard Version in America

As time went on, an ever greater need was felt for a thorough revision of the 1611 Bible to be made by a committee comprising representatives of diverse ecclesiastical affiliations. In 1870 both Houses of Convocation of the Anglican Church in England

adopted a recommendation which led to the preparation of an "official" revision. A committee of British scholars and divines, numbering at various times twenty-four to twenty-eight, labored for ten and a half years to produce the Revised Version of the New Testament and fourteen years to produce the Old Testament. Soon after work on the revision had begun, an invitation was extended to American scholars to co-operate with the British in this work of common interest. Thereupon an American committee, comprising about thirty members (of which only about twenty members were active), was appointed from nine different denominations, with the eminent church historian Philip Schaff acting as chairman.

The Revised Version of the Bible was published and copyrighted by the University Presses of Cambridge and Oxford, the New Testament appearing in 1881, the Old Testament in 1885, and the Apocrypha in 1895. Readings which the American Committee preferred but which the British Committee rejected were printed in an Appendix (for example, the Americans preferred "Jehovah" to represent the Hebrew divine name [tetragrammaton] instead of the traditional word "LORD" printed with a capital and small capitals).³ The agreement was that after fourteen years the Americans would be allowed to publish an edition of the Revised Version that incorporated into the text itself the several preferences previously listed in the Appendix. Accordingly, in 1901 the American Committee issued through Thomas Nelson and Sons the Standard American Edition of the Revised Version of the Bible (the Apocryphal books were not included). In order to protect the integrity of the version, which came to be called the American Standard Version, its text was copyrighted by the publisher.

The fate of the Revised Version in Great Britain was disappointing. Complaints about its English style began to be made as soon as it appeared. Charles Hadden Spurgeon, the great English preacher at the close of the nineteenth century, put it tersely when he remarked that the Revised New Testament was "strong in Greek, weak in English." The Revisers were often woodenly literal, inverting the natural order of words in English to represent the Greek order; and they carried the translation of the article, and of the tenses, beyond their legitimate limits. An example of rather tortuous order in English in the Revision is Luke 9:17, "And they did eat, and were all filled; and there was taken up that which remained over to them of broken pieces, twelve baskets." These criticisms apply as well to the American Standard Version.

In the United States the work of the Revisers was somewhat more widely adopted than in Britain. But in both countries the Revision failed to supplant the King James Version in popular favor. Furthermore, proponents of other versions in a more modern idiom deprecated the Revisers' continued use of archaic speech.

The need, then, for a generally acceptable revision continued, and was accentuated during the twentieth century by the discovery of new evidence for the text and its meaning. Many private translations appeared, representing various interests and emphases. Three widely used modern speech renderings were those of R.F. Weymouth, James Moffatt,⁴ and E.J. Goodspeed. More idiosyncratic were the "immersionist" Bible, which uses "immerse" in place of "baptize," and the Jehovah's Witnesses' *New World Translation*, which introduces the word "Jehovah" 237 times into the New Testament.

3. *The Revised Standard Version*

Steps to produce a suitable revision of the American Standard Version were undertaken in 1928 when the copyright of that version was acquired by the International Council of Religious Education. In the same year the American Standard Bible Committee was appointed, with an original membership of fifteen scholars, to have charge of the text of the American Standard Version and to make further revision of the text should it be deemed necessary. The chairman of the Committee was Luther A. Weigle, Dean of Yale Divinity School and Chairman of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ.

For two years the Committee wrestled with the question whether or not a revision should be undertaken; and if so, what should be its nature and extent. At one extreme stood James Hardy Ropes of Harvard, who held that the revisions of the King James Version published in 1881 and 1901 ought not to have been made, and opposed any further revision.⁵ At the other extreme was Edgar J. Goodspeed of Chicago, who advocated a new version in present-day colloquial English. Finally, after revisions of representative chapters of the Bible had been made and discussed, a majority of the Committee decided that there should be a thorough revision of the American Standard Version of 1901, which would stay as close to the King James tradition as it could in the light of present knowledge of the Greek text and its meaning on the one hand, and present usage of English on the other.

In 1930 the nation and the churches were going through a serious economic depression and it was not until 1936 that funds

could be secured and the work of revision could begin in earnest. A contract was negotiated with Thomas Nelson and Sons, publishers of the American Standard Version, to finance the work of revision by advance royalties, in return for which Nelsons were granted the exclusive right to publish the Revised Standard Version for a period of ten years. Thereafter it was to be open to other publishers under specific conditions.

With the financial undergirding thus provided, it was possible to schedule regular sessions of both the Old Testament and the New Testament Sections. Travel expenses and lodging and meals for the members were provided. No stipends or honoraria, however, have been given to RSV Committee members, who contribute their time and energies for the good of the cause.

After serious work had begun, a hope was expressed that cooperation of British scholars might be obtained, thus making the version an international translation. The war years of 1939–1945, however, made such collaboration impossible. In the summer of 1946, after the war was over, an effort was made to secure at least a token of international collaboration in the work on the Old Testament, the RSV New Testament having been published in February, 1946. Such partial collaboration was not to be forthcoming, for in that same year delegates of several Protestant Churches in Britain decided that they should begin work on a wholly new translation, one which made no attempt to stand within the tradition of the 1611 Bible. The outcome of this effort was the New English Bible published in 1970.

Meanwhile, work continued on the RSV Old Testament. After 81 separate meetings, totalling 450 days of work, the complete Bible was published September 30, 1952, the festival day, appropriately enough, of St. Jerome.⁶ The new version was launched with an unprecedented publicity campaign. On the evening of the day of publication, in the United States, in Canada, and in many other places, 3418 community observances were held with over one and a half million persons attending.

The fanfare, however, did not protect the version from adverse criticism. Pamphlets appeared bearing such titles as *The Bible of Antichrist*, *The New Blasphemous Bible*, and *Whose Unclean Fingers Have Been Tampering with the Holy Bible, God's Pure, Infallible, Verbally Inspired Word?* The last named pamphlet opens with the sentence: "Every informed and intelligent person knows that our government is crawling with communists, or those who sanction and encourage communism"—which indicates the line along which the version was attacked. In fact, those who were looking for an opportunity to calumniate the National Council of

Churches, under whose auspices the RSV had been produced, managed to influence Senator Joseph McCarthy's investigative committee to bring insidious and absurd charges against several members of the RSV Committee, to the effect that they were either communists or were hospitable to communist ideas—allegations that were eventually printed, of all places, in the United States Air Force Training Manual! As the result of a thorough investigation conducted by non-partisan authorities, this entirely unsupported charge was rebutted on the floor of the House of Representatives in Washington.⁷

Despite these and other criticisms during succeeding years, the RSV made its way in the United States and in other countries where the English language is used. It is a testimony to its qualities that in Great Britain, where it has not enjoyed the intensive "promotion" which it was given in North America, it has made steady headway on the ground of its intrinsic merit.

4. The Revised Standard Version, Catholic Edition

A new and unexpected development came in the autumn of 1953 when the Chairman of the Standard Bible Committee received a letter from the Catholic Biblical Association of Great Britain, asking whether there would be any disposition to confer with them about certain emendations in the RSV which they had in mind, with an eye to the possibility of issuing an adaptation for Roman Catholic readers. After consultation with members of the RSV Committee, Dean Weigle and Dr. Gerald E. Knoff, who was then the General Secretary of the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches, began conversations with representatives of the Catholic Biblical Association. By 1956 most of the desired New Testament changes were reviewed, a draft of a Foreword was discussed, and the exact wording on the title page was approved. All seemed to be going well—but the uncertainties of human life interposed a delay. Cardinal Griffin of London, who had written a Foreword for the RSV New Testament, Catholic Edition, died suddenly.

The promoters of the edition in England were faced with a quandary. Did the Cardinal's authorization for the edition still hold? And if technically legal, was it wise and prudent to proceed? As it turned out, Cardinal Griffin's successor, Archbishop William Godfrey, declared in 1958 that he could not sanction the venture, that it would cause a scandal to the faithful to receive a translation of the New Testament that had been made originally by a committee of Protestant scholars.

In the course of time, however, in view of the new climate that began to pervade the Roman Catholic Church after Vatican Council II, negotiations were resumed, and finally in the spring of 1965 the Catholic Edition of the RSV New Testament was published by the two branches of Thomas Nelson and Sons, in Edinburgh and in New York. An appendix in the volume lists the 93 verses involving 67 slight changes in the wording required by the Catholic Biblical scholars. (The list includes also the original RSV wording.)

The next stage began when consideration was given to a Catholic Edition of the RSV Old Testament. As is generally known, the Old Testament in Catholic Bibles includes more than the thirty-nine books of the Hebrew Scriptures. These additional books and parts of books, accepted as Deuterocanonical by Catholics, are regarded by Protestants (with several other books) as Apocryphal. The Apocrypha, originally included in the King James Bible of 1611, were translated by a panel of the RSV Committee (working from 1953 to 1956) and published by Nelsons in 1957.

Surprisingly enough, the scholars of the Catholic Biblical Association decided to ask for no changes whatever in the RSV Old Testament (including even the rendering of Isaiah 7:14, "Behold, a young woman shall conceive and bear a son. . ."), or in the RSV Deuterocanonical books, which were placed throughout the Old Testament in accord with their position in the Latin Vulgate Bible. In 1966 the RSV Catholic Edition of the entire Bible was published, with a brief Foreword by Cardinal Heenan in the British edition and one by Cardinal Cushing in the American printing. Catholic notes, as at that time required, were included, but Protestant nomenclature in the titles of the Biblical books was adopted.

The Catholic Edition of the RSV was just that—a special edition of the RSV text adapted for Roman Catholic readers. The notes as well as the expanded form of the Old Testament made it unsuited as a common or ecumenical Bible. The steps which led to making such an edition, however, were taken during the following decade.

5. *The First Truly Ecumenical Bible*

The first step in the production of a truly ecumenical Bible was taken in 1966 when Richard Cardinal Cushing, Archbishop of Boston, gave his imprimatur to the *Oxford Annotated Bible, with the Apocrypha*. This edition, prepared by Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger, contained the original RSV text, not the text as modi-

fied for the Catholic Edition. The books of the Apocrypha were segregated and stood after the New Testament.

The next step was taken in 1971 when the second edition of the RSV New Testament was issued. This incorporated a number of changes that reflect the Greek text as adopted for the third edition of the United Bible Societies' *Greek New Testament*, which serves throughout the world as a standard text for translations and revisions made by Protestants and Catholics alike. Among such changes was the transfer of the ending of the Gospel of Mark and of the *pericope de adultera* (John 7:53–8:12) from the RSV footnotes into the text, though the passages continue to be separated from the context by a blank space to show that they were not part of the original text.

Soon afterward a significant step was taken by scholars of the Catholic Biblical Association of Great Britain. Under the leadership of Dom Bernard Orchard, O.S.B., and Dr. Reginald C. Fuller, a plan was evolved to divide the books of the Apocrypha into two sections, those which the Catholic Church regards as Deuterocanonical and those which are not so regarded. In an edition issued by Collins Press in 1973 these two sections were bound separately between the Old and New Testaments. The volume, therefore, had four sections: the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament; the twelve Deuterocanonical books; the First and Second Books of Esdras and the Prayer of Manasseh (three books which are part of the traditional Apocrypha but are not included among the Deuterocanonical books); and the twenty-seven books of the New Testament. No Catholic notes were included, since this Bible was to be "common," for use by Roman Catholics and Protestants alike.

It should be noted that in such an arrangement Catholics made a significant departure from the accepted practice of their long history. The separation of the Deuterocanonical books from their places throughout the Old Testament is essentially an accommodation to the Protestant arrangement of the books of the Bible.

In May of 1973 a specially bound copy of the Collins RSV "Common Bible" was presented to Pope Paul. In a private audience granted to a small group comprising the Greek Orthodox Archbishop Athenagoras of London, Lady Priscilla and Sir William Collins, Herbert G. May, and the present writer, Pope Paul accepted the copy as a significant step in furthering ecumenical relations among the churches.

Worthy as the "Common Bible" is, however, it fails to live up to its name, for it lacks the full canon of books recognized as authoritative by Eastern Orthodox Churches. The Greek, the Russian,

the Ukrainian, the Bulgarian, the Serbian, the Armenian, and other Eastern Churches accept not only the traditional Deuterocanonical books received by the Roman Catholic Church, but also the Third Book of Maccabees. Furthermore, in Greek Bibles Psalm 151 stands at the close of the Psalter, and the Fourth Book of Maccabees is printed as an Appendix to the Old Testament. Inasmuch as these texts were lacking in the "Common Bible" presented to Pope Paul, on that occasion Archbishop Athenagoras expressed to the present writer the hope that steps might be taken to produce a truly ecumenical edition of the Holy Scriptures.

Actually, in 1972 a subcommittee of the RSV Bible Committee had already been commissioned to prepare a translation of III and IV Maccabees and Psalm 151. The members of the subcommittee were Demetrios J. Constantelos, Sherman E. Johnson, Robert A. Kraft, Allen Wikgren, and the writer. In 1976 the completed translation of the three additional texts was made available to the five publishers licensed to issue the RSV Bible. Oxford University Press took steps immediately to produce an expanded form of *The New Oxford Annotated Bible, with the Apocrypha*, the edition of the RSV which had earlier received the imprimatur of Cardinal Cushing.

This expanded edition⁹ was published by the Oxford University Press on May 19, 1977. A special pre-publication copy was presented by the present writer to His All Holiness Demetrios I, the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople and titular head of the several Orthodox Churches. In accepting the gift, the Ecumenical Patriarch expressed satisfaction at the availability of an edition of the sacred Scriptures which English readers in all branches of the Christian Church can use.

Thus, the story of the making of the Revised Standard Version of the Bible with the expanded Apocrypha is an account of the slow but steady triumph of ecumenical concern over more limited sectarian interests. For the first time since the Reformation one edition of the Bible has the blessings of leaders of the Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Eastern Orthodox Churches alike.

6. *The Next Stages*

As was mentioned earlier, the RSV Bible Committee is an ongoing committee that meets annually. Like Luther, who in repeated revisions continually sought to refine and polish his German translation of the Scriptures, the RSV Committee has not hesitated "to bring backe to the anuill [anvil] that which we had

already hammered”—to quote an expression used in the preface of the King James Bible.

By the mid-1980s it is expected that the second edition of the RSV Old Testament will be finished. A certain number of changes will also be introduced into the current second edition of the New Testament. Among significant changes will be the dropping of the archaic second person singular pronouns from the Psalms and other prayers in the Bible. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it was customary to use “thou,” “thee,” and “thine” in ordinary speech. Twenty-five years ago the RSV Committee abandoned this usage except for the Psalms and other prayers in the Bible. Today the archaic pronouns are being used less and less frequently in contemporary liturgy and public prayers, and the Committee has decided that future editions of the RSV will employ the same forms in addressing the Deity as are used for individuals. Such a step will, in fact, reproduce more accurately the usage of the Hebrew and Greek texts themselves, which make no linguistic differentiation between address to God and to a person.

In another area of English usage the RSV Bible Committee has become sensitive to what is termed masculine-oriented language. Increasing numbers of persons are becoming dissatisfied with the generic use of the word “man” or “men,” which traditionally has referred to both men and women. In fact, for some persons such language has become highly offensive, and during the past several years a wide variety of steps have been taken to introduce what is called “inclusive” language. Instead of saying, for example, “The West was settled by the pioneers who, with their wives and children, overcame many difficulties,” it is obviously fairer to phrase the statement, “The West was settled by pioneer families, who overcame many difficulties.” Several major publishers (including Ginn; Holt, Rinehart and Winston; Houghton Mifflin; McGraw-Hill; Macmillan; Random House; Scott, Foresman and Co.)¹⁰ have prepared guidelines concerning the use of inclusive language for authors who plan to submit manuscripts for consideration. The State of Connecticut has revised its constitution to make equal reference to men and women. Several Protestant denominations, as well as groups within Roman Catholic orders and within Reformed Judaism, have undertaken to rephrase their psalter, liturgy, hymns, and a variety of church standards and constitutional documents.

Now, in earlier versions of the Bible, one finds that translators more than once inserted the word “man” where it is lacking in the

original text. In many other passages where the original text permits the rendering "any one" or "no one," the King James translators chose to say "any man" or "no man." This practice limits many statements unduly, and results in occasional infelicities. For example, the original printing of the King James Version of Mark 10:18 read: "And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? There is no man good, but one, *that is* God." Since this implies that God is a man, the unfortunate rendering was soon altered to read, ". . . there is none good but one, *that is* God." Rev. 3:20 in the King James Version reads, "Behold I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and sup with him, and he with me." Here the Greek text has no word for "man" and in 1946 the RSV correctly rendered it, ". . . if any one hears my voice . . ." In Luke 17:34 the King James translators inserted the word "men," contrary to the Greek text, so as to read, "I tell you, in that night there shall be two *men* in one bed; the one shall be taken, and the other shall be left." In the second edition of the RSV (1971) the Committee, for obvious reasons, removed the intrusive word, thus returning more closely to the Greek and, incidentally, to all English translations of the verse in pre-1611 Bibles.

At its annual meetings in recent years the RSV Committee has been giving attention to instances where the traditional English rendering has inserted "man" or "men" without support from the Hebrew or the Greek. For example, in Psalm 54:3 "insolent men" and "ruthless men" will become "the insolent" and "the ruthless"; Psalm 66:6 "men passed through the river on foot" will become "they passed through . . ."; and similarly in 106:16; 119:136; 141:5; 142:4; 143:2.

In John 2:10, the Committee has proposed to change "Every man serves the good wine first; and when men have drunk freely, then the poor wine" to "Everyone serves the good wine first, and then the inferior wine after the guests have become drunk"; in Rom. 1:17, "He who through faith is righteous . . ." to "The one who . . ."; and in Rom 2:6, "He will render to every man according to his works" to "He will repay according to each one's works."

Besides passages such as these where earlier translators have inserted the word "man" or "men," though it is lacking in the original text, the RSV Committee is giving attention to instances where it may be possible, without producing contrived English, to render the Hebrew word *'ish* and the Greek word *anthropos* in an inclusive sense. For example, in the first Psalm, the Committee, taking *'ish* as a collective term, has replaced "Blessed is the man

who walks not in the counsel of the wicked," with "Blessed are those who do not walk . . ." The frequently occurring expression, "children of men" or "sons of men" (Psalm 11:4; 12:1, 8; 14:2; 21:10; 31:14; 33:13; 36:7; etc.) has been replaced by a variety of expressions, including "all people," "everyone," and "humankind."

In the Letter to the Romans the RSV Committee has proposed to make the following changes: "wickedness of men who . . . suppress the truth" to "wickedness of people who . . ." (1:18); "exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man" to ". . . glory of the imperishable God for images resembling perishable humanity" (1:32); "God judges the secrets of men" to ". . . secrets of human beings" (2:16); "His praise is not from men but from God" to ". . . from human beings . . ." (2:29).

Much more perplexing is the problem of what should be done and what can be done with passages that use the third person singular pronoun "he," "him," and "his." The RSV Committee is not prepared to use contrived English or such expressions as "he/she" or "s/he." In its deliberations consideration has been given to the possibility of replacing the third person imperative with the second person imperative; for example, changing "He who has an ear let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches" (Rev. 3:22) to "If you have an ear, listen to what . . ." Similarly, in Rev. 3:20, to which reference was made earlier, it is currently proposed to read, "Listen! I am standing at the door and knocking; if any of you hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to you and sup with you."

7. Revision after Revision

If, as Qoheleth says, "of making many books there is no end" (Eccl. 12:12), one can also add, nor is there an end of making revisions and new translations of the Scriptures. Some of these seek to attain still greater accuracy and felicity of expression; others are prepared for special groups of readers. Among the latter are a rendering of the Gospels, by Frank Shaw (a customs officer) and the Reverend Dick Williams, in "Scouse," the dialect used by dock-workers in Liverpool, and Dr. Kenneth Jordan's Cotton-Patch Version in the idiom current among laborers in rural Georgia.

While an individual's free-lance translation of the Bible is entirely legitimate—in spite of a phrase in the New Testament itself about "private interpretation"—there are precedents and reasons for having successive revisions undertaken by a committee. The compromises which the individual makes unconsciously

when working alone become more conscious when committee members differ in opinion and votes. There is some safety in numbers, since in a discussion more aspects of a problem are presented than any individual would have considered. The substantial unanimity resulting in most cases is reassuring to the translators, though not easily or accurately transmitted to the public. The latter may not understand that every word has to be weighed, even if it is left just as it was translated before, and that the easy flowing wording of a single verse represents at times long and repeated debate, sometimes ending in unity and sometimes in a well-justified difference of judgment. These less-favored alternatives constitute the bulk of the few marginal notes which modern revisers have allowed themselves.

Whatever the scholarly advantages of translations by groups of workers, the process involved provides many pleasant social compensations to those who are thus engaged. Intimate and prolonged sessions of discussion, held annually over a period of years, are conducive to a spirit of camaraderie among the members of the committee. Indeed, the sense of fellowship extends in each generation back over the years to earlier revisers and to the many scholars in many lands.

Other men and women have labored, and we have entered into their labors. This process cannot stop in 1611 or in 1952 or in 1979. Slowly, not spectacularly, knowledge of Hebrew and Greek text and language may be expected to grow, and the English language to change. At some future date a new set of revisers will again echo the words in Preface to the King James Bible of 1611:

. . . as nothing is begun and perfited at the same time, and the later thoughts are thought to be the wiser: so, if we building upon their foundation that went before us, and being holpen by their labours, doe endeouour to make that better which they left so good; no man, we are sure, hath cause to mislike us; they, we perswade our selues, if they were aliuie, would thanke us.

NOTES

1. The King James Version contains more bad grammar than is commonly realized. Much of it is failure to observe agreement in singular and plural number, the rule for which was very loosely observed in the sixteenth and seventeenth century. In Luke 9:17 we read that "there was taken up . . . twelve baskets." Peter was astonished at the miraculous draught of fish "and so was also James and John" (Luke 5:10). Jesus is reported as saying, "This is an evil generation; they seek a sign, and there shall no sign be given it" (Luke 11:29). Likewise "Whom do men say that I am?" (Matt. 16:13) should be "who."

2. The use of "was" with the second person singular pronoun occurs occasionally in authors of earlier centuries.

3. An example of a much less important difference between the two committees is the following. The King James reading in Gen. 22:23, "These eight Milkah did bear to Nahor," was changed by the English Revisers to "these eight did Milkah bear to Nahor," despite the American's objections that, when read aloud, this sounded like "did milk a bear"!

4. This was Moffatt's second translation of the New Testament. In 1901 he had issued a modern speech version with the books arranged in the sequence in which many scholars think they had been written.

5. Professor Ropes resigned from the Committee in 1932.

6. At the time of publication of the RSV Old Testament a limited number of changes were introduced into the RSV New Testament. For example, because of euphony the translation of Acts 17:28 "In him we live and move and are" was changed back to the King James phraseology "we live and move and have our being." Of more consequence was the restoration of the words "sanctify" and "sanctification" to certain passages, in order to preclude mistaken inferences that had been drawn from their replacement by "consecrate" and "consecration" and to agree with the Committee's retention of the term "sanctify" in the Old Testament.

In 1959 the Committee authorized a number of changes, chiefly in connection with matters of punctuation, capitalization, and footnotes. Some examples of such changes are "without" changed to "from," Job 19:26; "loaf" to "bread," Matt. 7:9 and I Cor. 10:17; "be he" to "is he," Matt. 21:9 and parallels; "the son" to "the Son," Matt. 27:54 and Mark 15:39; "married only once" to "the husband of one wife," I Tim. 3:2, 12; 5:9 and Titus 1:6.

7. See the *Congressional Record*, vol. 106, part 6 (April 19, 1960), pp. 8247-8284.

8. The third edition, prepared in 1969 by K. Aland, M. Black, C.M. Martini, S.J., B.M. Metzger, and A. Wikgren, was finally published in 1975, but the changes from previous editions were known in 1971 through the publication of Metzger's *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London, 1971).

9. Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger, editors, *The New Oxford Annotated Bible, with the Apocrypha*, Expanded Edition, Revised Standard Version (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977).

10. See Ginn and Company, "Treatment of Minority Groups and Women"; Holt, Rinehart and Winston, "Guidelines for the Development of Elementary and Secondary Instructional Materials: The Treatment of Sex Roles"; Houghton Mifflin Co., "Avoiding Stereotypes"; McGraw-Hill Book Co., "Guidelines for Equal Treatment of the Sexes in McGraw-Hill Book Company Publications"; Macmillan Publishing Co., "Guidelines for Creating Positive Sexual and Racial Images in Educational Materials"; Random House, "Guidelines for Multi-Ethnic/Nonsexist Survey"; and Scott, Foresman and Co., "Guidelines for Improving the Image of Women in Textbooks."

One can also call attention to *Sexism and Language*, by Alleen P. Nilsen, Haig Bosmajian, H. Lee Gershuny, and Julia P. Stanley, and published by the National Council of Teachers of English, Urbana, Illinois, 1977.

Appendix

List of Members of RSV Bible Committee (1929–1979)

An asterisk before a name signifies that the person has been chosen for competence in English literature, the conduct of public worship, or Christian education. The abbreviation "Apoc." following a name indicates that the person was a member of the subcommittee (1952–57) that produced the RSV translation of the traditional books of the Apocrypha; the abbreviation "Ap." indicates membership on the subcommittee (1972–76) that produced the RSV translation of III and IV Maccabees and Psalm 151, included in the *New Oxford Annotated Bible, with the Apocrypha*, Expanded Edition (1977). The abbreviations OT and NT are self-explanatory.

<i>Name</i>	<i>Institution</i>	<i>Joined</i>	<i>Corresp. Member</i>	<i>(Resigned)/ Deceased</i>
Albright, William F. OT	John Hopkins Univ.	1945	1954	1970
Armstrong, William P. NT	Princeton Theol. Sem.	1930		(1937)
*Beardslee, William NT	Emory Univ.	1972		—
Beare, Frank W. NT	Trinity Coll., Toronto	1960		—
Bewer, Julius A. OT	Union Theol. Sem., NYC	1930		1951
Blenkinsopp, Joseph OT	Univ. of Notre Dame	1978		—
*Bowic, Walter R. NT	Union Theol. Sem., NYC	1937		1969
Bowman, Raymond A. OT	Univ. of Chicago	1960		—
Burrows, Millar OT; NT; Apoc.	Yale Univ.	1938	1972	
Cadbury, Henry J. NT; Apoc.	Harvard Univ.	1930	1972	1975
Constantelos, Demetrios NT; Ap.	Stockton College, NJ	1972		—
Craig, Clarence T. NT; Apoc.	Oberlin; Yale Univ.; Drew Th. Sem.	1938		1953
Cross, Frank M. OT	Harvard Univ.	1960	1972	
Dahl, George OT	Yale Univ.	1937		1962
Dentan, Robert C. OT	General Theol. Sem., NYC	1960		—
Eiselen, Federal C. OT	Garrett Biblical Institute	1929		1937

<i>Name</i>	<i>Institution</i>	<i>Joined</i>	<i>Corresp. Member</i>	<i>(Resigned)/ Deceased</i> (1978)
Ellis, E. Earle NT	New Brunswick Theol. Sem.	1974		
Filson, Floyd V. NT; Apoc.	McCormick Theol. Sem.	1953	1972	
Fitzmyer, Joseph A. NT	Catholic Univ. of America	1969	1974	
Fuller, Reginald C. NT	165 Copenhagen St., London N1 OSR	1969		
Goodspeed, Edgar J. NT	Univ. of Chicago	1930		1962
Gordon, Alexander R. OT	United Theol. Coll., Montreal	1930		(1930)
Grant, Frederick C. NT; Apoc.	Seabury-Western; Union Th. Sem., NYC	1937	1968	1972
*Greer, Rowan NT	Yale Univ.	1972		(1974)
Hanson, Paul D. OT	Harvard Divinity School	1978		
Harrelson, Walter OT	Vanderbilt Div. Sch.	1976		
Holladay, William OT	Andover-Newton	1972		
Hyatt, J. Philip OT	Vanderbilt Univ.	1945		1972
Irwin, William A. OT	Univ. of Chicago	1937		1967
James, Fleming OT	Univ. of South; Berkeley Div. Sch.	1947		1954
Johnson, Sherman E. NT; Apoc.; Ap.	Church Div. Sch. of Pacific	1960		
Knox, John NT	Union Theol. Sem., NYC; Epis. Th. Sem.	1960	1972	
Kraft, Robert NT; Ap.	Univ. of Pennsylvania	1972		
Landes, George M. OT	Union Theol. Sem., NYC	1978		
MacRae, George NT	Harvard Univ.	1972		
Maly, Eugene H. OT	Mt. St. Mary's, Ohio	1969	1975	1977
May, Herbert G. OT	Oberlin; Vanderbilt	1945		
McBride, S. Dean OT	Garrett-Evangelical Theol. Sem.	1978		
McKenzie, John L. OT	Notre Dame; DePaul Univ.	1969		(1977)
Meeks, Wayne NT	Yale Univ.	1972		(1974)
Metzger, Bruce M. NT; Apoc.; Ap.	Princeton Theol. Sem.	1953		
Miller, Patrick OT	Union Theol. Sem., Va.	1974		
Minear, Paul S. NT; Apoc.	Yale Univ.	1966		
Moffatt, James OT; NT	Union Theol. Sem., NYC	1930		1944

<i>Name</i>	<i>Institution</i>	<i>Joined</i>	<i>Corresp. Member</i>	<i>(Resigned)/ Deceased</i>
Montgomery, James A. OT	Univ. of Pennsylvania	1930		1937
*Mowry, Lucetta NT	Wellesley Coll.	1974		
Muilenburg, James OT	Union Th. Sem., NYC; S.F. Th. Sem.	1945	1972	1974
Murphy, Roland OT	Duke Univ.	1976		
*Orchard, Bernard NT	Ealing Abbey, London, England	1969	1979	
Orlinsky, Harry M. OT	Jewish Inst. Rel.-Heb. Union Coll.	1945		
Pfeiffer, Robert H. OT; Apoc.	Harvard Univ.	1953		1958
Pope, Marvin H. OT	Yale Univ.	1960		
Roberts, J.J.M. OT	Princeton Theol. Sem.	1978		
Robertson, A.T. NT	Southern Bapt. Theol. Sem.	1930		1934
Ropes, James H. NT	Harvard Univ.	1930		(1932)
Sampey, John R. OT	Southern Bapt. Theol. Sem.	1929		1938
Sauer, Alfred von Rohr OT	Concordia; Seminex	1960		
Sledd, Andrew NT	Emory Univ.	1930		1937
Smith, J.M. Powis OT	Univ. of Chicago	1930		1932
*Sperry, Willard L. NT	Harvard Univ.	1937		1959
Stanley, David M. NT	Regis Coll., Ontario	1969	1972	
Swaim, J. Carter NT	Church of Covenant, NYC	1954	1966	
Taylor, William R. OT	Univ. of Toronto	1931		1951
Torrey, Charles C. OT	Yale Univ.	1930		1937
Vawter, Bruce OT	DePaul Univ.	1972		
Waterman, Leroy OT	Univ. of Michigan	1937	1954	
*Wedel, Theodore O. NT	Coll. of Preachers, Wash., D.C.	1960		1972
*Weigle, Luther A. OT; NT; Apoc.	Yale Univ.	1929		1970
*Wentz, Abdel Ross NT	Lutheran Theol. Sem., Gettysburg	1938	1966	1976
Wikgren, Allen P. NT; Apoc.; Ap.	Univ. of Chicago	1953		
*Wilder, Amos N. NT	Harvard Univ.	1960		
Yates, Kyle OT	Southern Bapt. Theol. Sem.	1939	1974	1975
			1954	

The Jerusalem Bible

by BRUCE VAWTER, C.M.

To understand the considerable success, as well as the virtues and shortcomings of The Jerusalem Bible, one must make the effort to recall, or to learn for the first time, as the case may be, what was the situation facing English-speaking Roman Catholics a quarter-century ago when they wanted to read the Bible. I speak of making an effort, for in these relaxed and ecumenical days it is hard to conjure up that quarter-century ago from the ashes of the past. It is worth the effort, though, and not only for English-speaking Roman Catholics. I intend to make critical remarks about that unecumenical and unrelaxed time in respect to my own church (Roman Catholic), since it is of course the one I know best. If I might venture one fascinating speculation, it would be to wonder about what additional travails might have been experienced by a Revised Standard Version then being burnt in fundamentalist pulpits and raising questions on the floor of a McCarthyite Congress, had Catholics been sitting on its board of editors and translators as they do now.

What was the situation that confronted Roman Catholics in their access to a vernacular Bible? First of all, at least officially they were forbidden any translation (or, for that matter, edition of the biblical text in the original languages) that had been brought out under non-Catholic auspices. That was, and is, the provision of canon 1399, 1° of the Code of Canon Law.¹ It is true, canon 1400 effectively nullified this proscription by permitting the use of such books “only to those who are engaged *quovis modo* (= in any manner whatever) in theological or biblical studies.”² This is an instance of that built-in dispensational characteristic of Roman law that is often bewildering to people accustomed to a common law that does not take into account privilege. The purpose of these seemingly conflicting laws was to allow relatively free access to the Bible, but only after it had been asserted in uncompromising language that its publication and divulgation were regarded as an exclusive prerogative of the Roman church. Judged in this light the law of the Code was, in fact, quite liberal: at least a reversal of purely negative legislation inherited from pre-Reformation heresy-hunting in the late Middle Ages.³ On the other hand, as anyone who was teaching Scripture in Catholic schools at that time can readily testify, when the law came to be implemented on the level that affected most people, it was often enforced by those who knew all about canon

1399, 1°, but had never heard of canon 1400 or did not understand it, and this despite the fact that in the Roman as well as in other systems of law, doubtful laws are no laws at all and the presumption of the law is supposed to favor freedom from the law.

Secondly, another canon, no. 1391, managed by its negative phraseology to give the impression that access to the Bible should be made difficult rather than easy. Translations were forbidden, said the canon, "unless they be approved by the Apostolic See, or unless they be published under the bishops' supervision and with notes taken principally from the holy Fathers of the Church and from learned and catholic writers." Quite properly, of course, a Latinate and Italianate Holy See had not to that point, and has not subsequently, "approved" any translation of the Bible into English, French, German, Flemish, or Choctaw. The "bishops' supervision" of which the canon spoke probably envisaged nothing more complex than the imprimatur of a local ordinary (such as took place, for example, in 1965 when Cardinal Cushing of Boston authorized a "Catholic edition" of the RSV New Testament). It was popularly assumed, however, that such translations could be approved only for "private devotion," and that any "official" version would require a more general approbation of the church. Specifically, it would have to be in conformity with the Bible used in the church's liturgy which, by and large and with slight differences, was the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate of 1592. (It must be remembered that at this time the liturgy of the church was in Latin and that the reading of the scriptural word in the vernacular—usually made from the altar and not from a pulpit—was a dispensable concession to the better understanding of the Latin liturgy, simply translating the pericopes in the Roman Missal.) As for the requirement that a translation have notes, the intention of course was to safeguard orthodoxy from the perilous possibility of "private interpretation" which would arise from study of the unadorned word of God. In these days and times, however, there is hardly need to argue the merits of an annotated Bible, when even the Bible Societies have recognized their "without note or comment" formula to be sadly unreal.*

Finally, as has already been suggested, there was a persuasion that to be really serviceable in the church and not merely a scholarly curiosity or private source of study, a biblical translation had to be

*Article I of the Constitution of the American Bible Society, established in 1816, states that the sole object of the Society shall be "circulation of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment." See Creighton Lacy, *The Word Carrying Giant* (South Pasadena: William Carey Library, 1977), pp. 10, 16–17, 84–95, 252–253, 256, 259–260, 262, 288.—Ed.

based upon the Vulgate, which the Council of Trent⁴ had declared “authentic for public lectures, disputations, preaching, and explanation, so that no one should dare or presume to reject it under any pretext.” There is no doubt that this persuasion was very well founded in the letter of the law, which continued to emerge from Rome from time to time almost till the eve of *l’encyclique libératrice* of Pope Pius XII, the *Divino afflante Spiritu* of 1943. It was only then that Catholics of the Anglo-Saxon world discovered that a revisionism had been going on in the law of the church on whose intellectual and ideological periphery they had long been habituated to dwell. Suddenly it was revealed to them that the intention of Trent had been to confer on the Vulgate only a “juridic,” not a critical, authority, so that the Vulgate might be textually corrected with impunity, and that even “official” national or regional vernacular translations could and should be made from the original biblical texts without respect to the Vulgate.⁵ The Catholic Biblical Association of America, founded in 1937 with one of its principal aims to provide the English-speaking Catholic world with a more serviceable Bible than it then possessed, was at that moment (1943) in process of biblical translation—from the Vulgate, of course. Immediately after *Divino afflante Spiritu* came a shifting of the Association’s gears, and a decade later would see the emergence of the beginning of what would eventually become the New American Bible, translated completely from the original biblical languages. Apace, however, in more fruitful and sensitive soil, had already been sown the seeds of The Jerusalem Bible.

Besides the law concerning it, the actuality of Catholic biblical publication must also be known in order to appreciate properly what The Jerusalem Bible brought in its time. The Bible used by English-speaking Roman Catholics then was variously called the Douay Version, the Douay-Rheims, or the Challoner-Rheims. None of these titles was especially accurate. What had happened was that English Catholics in exile under Queen Elizabeth I, Oxford scholars all, had produced at Rheims in 1582 an English translation of the New Testament, and again at Douai in 1609 a translation of the Old Testament. Both of these had been made from the Vulgate—out of principle and not because texts in the biblical languages were unavailable, as in the case of the old Wycliffite versions. The translators of the Authorised (King James) Version of 1611 make reference to the Douay-Rheims version disparagingly in their famous preface, neglecting to note how much they had profited from its precedents, especially from its rendering of the Greek definite article that lay behind the anarthrous Latin of the Vulgate by means of the English definite and indefinite articles.

(This was a petty conceit on their part, to be sure, since every translation of the Scripture has been in debt to its predecessors, at least from the time of the Targumists and the Septuagint onward.)

The “Douay Bible” that was in the possession of Catholic families in our generation, however, was actually largely the product of Bishop Richard Challoner (1691–1781). Challoner, who was innocent of the biblical languages, “revised” this version in 1749, again in 1750, drastically in 1752, and later as well. His aim was to make the language more readable which, generally speaking, meant that he adjusted it to that of the Authorised Version. Subsequent to his time the text entered upon a recensional history of its own, picking up variants from the carelessness of printers and the deliberate changes introduced by copy-editors. In England the text tended to be printed as a blend of the first two Challoner revisions, while in America more of the changes from the third revision were included. Probably no two publishers ever produced precisely the same “Douay Bible.”⁶

So at length we come to 1966 and the appearance in England and America of The Jerusalem Bible, the realization of an idea whose time most everyone probably agreed had come. There was officially available for the Catholic reader only the Challoner mishmash just described, filled with childish apologetic footnotes, and hardly the work of “learned and catholic writers.” Efforts to replace it had been unsuccessful, and alternatives to it were still aborning. To be sure, at least in the United States, a better edition of the New Testament was available. In 1941 members of the Catholic Biblical Association under the patronage of the episcopal committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine had published a revision of the Challoner-Rheims which was, in effect, a new translation, still officially of the Vulgate (but of critical editions, this time) but with consultation of the Greek so that all major variants between Greek and Latin were noted. Various American publishers of the “Douay Bible” printed this revision for their New Testament. There was also, from England, the version of the entire Bible, made from the (Sixto-Clementine) Vulgate by Monsignor Ronald Knox, the New Testament first published in 1945 and the Old Testament in 1949. The Knox Bible was adopted by the Catholic hierarchy of England and Wales as an official version and also enjoyed considerable success in America. But there was no version done from the original texts. What would eventually become the New American Bible (then known as the CCD or Confraternity Version, begun in 1943) was appearing part by provisional part, but the *editio princeps* of that completed Bible would not be published until 1970. Other “private” translations of the original Greek or Hebrew—such as

the New Testament of Aloysius Spencer, O.P., posthumously published in 1936, the New Testament of James Kleist, S.J., and Joseph Lilly, C.M., published in 1954, the Westminster Version of the entire Bible begun in 1913 and never completed—enjoyed limited circulation and were mainly regarded as curiosities, though each had its own merits.

What The Jerusalem Bible did, therefore, was, precisely at the right time, to present the English-speaking Catholic world with a version of the Scripture done from the original texts, turned into a dignified and highly readable form of our mother tongue, under impeccable Roman Catholic auspices (including, therefore, those Old Testament books and parts of books traditional in the Catholic canon and excluded from the “Protestant” and the Jewish). The introductions and annotations were both critical and scholarly, rarely apologetic. Its success was immediately assured.

The Jerusalem Bible also wisely chose to guarantee its ecumenical acceptance by eschewing the parochial “Catholic” spelling of proper names that had long challenged the good will of non-Catholics seeking to make use of scholarly articles and reference works done by Roman Catholics. The spelling of the biblical names of people and places is, of course, purely conventional. Hardly any normal reader would recognize who is meant by names like Yirmēyahu or Yesha’yahu, which is the way they read in the Masoretic (Hebrew) text. The Septuagint had rendered them as Ieremias and Isaias (the final *s* to make them declinable) and thus they passed into the Vulgate. Thus they passed also into most modern languages. The early English translators, however, restored to them a bogus Hebrew flavor by substituting an *h* for the final *s*. The spelling of the names was already too well established for more to be done than this. For less well established names, however, more could be done, and generally it was to turn them into a rough-and-ready equivalent of the Masoretic spellings, using some equivalences that were probably lost on even their first readers, such as the *z* which was to stand for the Hebrew *šādê* (a Yiddishism). (Though even in the Authorised Version, in the New Testament at least, such forms remain as Elias in Mk 9:5 [RSV, Elijah] and Zacharias in Lk 1:5 [RSV, Zechariah].) Now in many cases the Vulgate, following the Septuagint, had preserved more authentic pronunciations than those devised by the Masoretes. Nabuchodonosor, for example, is certainly closer to the Babylonian Nabukudurušūr than is the Nebuchadnezzar or even the Nebuchadrezzar of our English versions. On the other hand, many of the Vulgate spellings simply reflected the inadequacies of Latin or Greek to reproduce Hebrew aspirate sounds. When such forms were then mechanically

“Englished,” this resulted in sounds not originally intended—Lachis, Ezechias, Osee [Hosea]. Other spellings had become transmogrified into bizarre forms with no etymological justification in any language, such as Aggaeus [Haggai] and Eliseus [Elisha]. Compounding these confusions in Catholic biblical language were others inherited from the Septuagint which were not really the fault of the Vulgate: Paralipomenon, for example (a Greek genitive plural for works Jerome had called the books of Chronicles), and I–IV Kings (the Septuagint actually had “Kingdoms”) for the books Jerome had distinguished as I–II Samuel and I–II Kings.

All academic questions aside, the point was that a conventional English rendering of biblical terminology had been arrived at over a period of some centuries, and the alternate “Catholic” usages could only co-exist with it as some kind of ghetto dialect. The Jerusalem Bible led the way in producing a Catholic version of the Bible, English in its spelling as in all else. The Confraternity Version did not adopt this principle until 1969 (at the publication of its final portion of the Old Testament, the historical books from Samuel through Maccabees), one year before the *editio princeps* of the New American Bible which would extend the principle to the Bible throughout. Up to this point only half-hearted gestures in this direction had been made, resulting in such anomalous forms as Isaia, Jeremia, Abdia (from Abdias=Obadiah), Sophonia (from Sophonias=Zephaniah in conventional English), etc. It was with these anomalous forms that the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* was caught when it appeared in 1967, and thus it is locked in with an English biblical vocabulary that is now gone forever.

What primarily made the Jerusalem Bible possible, however, was nothing English at all, but something quintessentially French.

During the late '40s and early '50s there appeared in 43 separate fascicles what was originally conceived and was eventually accomplished as an entirely new, highly critical, translation into French of the complete Bible from the original languages. Each fascicle was the work of at least one internationally recognized biblical scholar. Hardly at that time could any other part of the Catholic world than the francophone have gathered such a cadre as that which produced this Bible. Some of the fascicles were eventually to go through as many as two subsequent revisions, revisions which would be substantive and by no means confined to mere stylistic niceties. Style was, it is true, very important, as one would expect in a French publication, and each fascicle had passed the test of good language as well as good scholarship. What made this Bible of such import in the Catholic world outside of France, however, were the extensive introductions and notes that accompanied each biblical work,

amounting in effect to a series of biblical commentaries. (Indeed, for many of the biblical books the best commentary available at that time produced under Catholic auspices was to be found in these fascicules.) In 1956 a one-volume edition was published, understandably with highly compressed introductions and notes, but also with the addition of an admirable system of marginal cross-referencing. This was *La Sainte Bible traduite en français sous la direction de l'École Biblique de Jérusalem*. The title recognized the great part played in this production by members of the Dominican biblical school in Jerusalem, a part that was proportionately even greater in the publication of the one-volume edition than in the fascicules, which represented the collaboration of some forty translators and editors. It is this Bible, of course, that is the basis of what was published in English in 1966 under the title *The Jerusalem Bible*. It is not to denigrate the qualities of the twenty-eight "principal collaborators" named in the credits of this latter publication to add that a comparable version in English would have been impossible without dependence on the French. English-speaking Roman Catholicism simply had not yet had the time to gather the resources which had been longer possessed by their numerically superior Continental coreligionists. The necessary dependence is, therefore, clear and undisputed. What is not altogether clear is the degree of dependence, acknowledged or unacknowledged.

An unsigned note following the imprimatur of Cardinal Heenan in the first edition of *The Jerusalem Bible* states that

The introduction and notes of this Bible are, with minor variations and revisions a translation of those which appear in *La Bible de Jérusalem* [actually this was not, as yet, an official title] published by Les Editions du Cerf, Paris, (one volume edition, 1961) [actually, as we have seen, 1956] under the general editorship of Père Roland de Vaux, O.P. [The 1956 French Bible lists a far more complex Comité de revision.] The English text of the Bible itself, though translated from the ancient texts, owes a large debt to the work of the many scholars who collaborated to produce *La Bible de Jérusalem*, a debt which the publishers of this English Bible gratefully acknowledge.

In the Foreword by Alexander Jones, General Editor of the *Jerusalem Bible*, the source of which "this present volume is the English equivalent" is correctly identified as the one-volume 1956 French version "known popularly as *La Bible de Jérusalem*." The introduction and notes are acknowledged to be "a direct translation from the French, though revised and brought up to date in some places—account being taken of the decisions and general implications of the Second Vatican Council." [No explanation has ever been given of the meaning of the last clause.] The Foreword continues:

The translation of the biblical text itself could clearly not be made from the French. In the case of a few books the initial draft was made from the French and was then compared word for word with the Hebrew or Aramaic [we are therefore speaking of at least the books of Daniel and Ezra?] by the General Editor and amended where necessary to ensure complete conformity with the ancient text. [Amending an incorrect translation of the French? Or a translation of the French that had incorrectly rendered the originals?] For the much greater part, the initial drafts were made from the Hebrew or Greek and simultaneously compared with the French when questions of variant reading or interpretation arose. Whichever system was used, therefore, the same intended result was achieved, that is, an entirely faithful version of the ancient texts which, in doubtful points, preserves the text established and (for the most part) the interpretation adopted by the French scholars in the light of the most recent researches in the fields of history, archaeology and literary criticism.

There follow some rather sensible words on the Englishing of the Bible in general and the defense of an editorial decision to reproduce the tetragrammaton throughout as “Yahweh,” even in the Psalms which were translated with an eye to Catholic liturgical use. It might be noted, incidentally, that only in this respect did The Jerusalem Bible depart from its sensible decision to stick to the proper names that had become conventional in English. In contrast, in the French original “traditional” French forms like Sédécias, Josias, and Nabuchodonosor rub shoulders with exotica like Hil-qiyياهو, Miçrayim, Çeboyim, and Shéneaççar, which must be as perplexing to a French reader as they are to any other.

What is not clear from the unsigned note combined with Alexander Jones’ Foreword is the extent to which The Jerusalem Bible admits to being a translation of the 1956 French archetype and where it claims to have depended on an improved text. Much more controllable in this regard are the pretensions of another satellite of the French text, the so-called Jerusalem Bible in German.⁷ In this case there was an already existing German translation for most of the biblical books (the translation for the Herders Bibelkommentar plus the Beuron translation of the Psalter); only the books of Joshua, Judges, and Ruth were done afresh by the German translators. The translation was simply changed, where necessary, to conform with the reconstruction of the text presupposed by the French notes and introductions, which were reproduced quite faithfully.

The question of the independence of the English Jerusalem Bible from the French translation is, of course, very important, as is the question of the extent to which the English translators “revised and brought up to date” and otherwise improved on the French of 1956. As has already been mentioned, the fascicule edition of the French Bible continued in multiple revisions after 1956, culminating in another one-volume *nouvelle édition revue et augmentée* in 1974, by

which time *La Bible de Jérusalem* was at last accepted as the official and not merely the popular title of the translation. The 1974 one-volume edition not only incorporated but went beyond the fascicule editions subsequent to 1956 and therefore there is no point in comparing its text with that of The Jerusalem Bible of 1966 as a standard of the improvements that should have been registered by the English. Nevertheless, there were fascicule changes, sometimes in rather important areas, which were in existence when The Jerusalem Bible was being prepared, and which it obviously chose to ignore in favor of sticking to the 1956 version.

Thus, for example, the fascicule of Matthew's Gospel had passed through two subsequent revisions in French before The Jerusalem Bible appeared. "Je ne parle pas de la fornication" was the way the "Matthean exception" had first appeared in the translation of Matt. 19:9, and "I am not speaking of fornication" is the way it runs in The Jerusalem Bible (along with a note to match, which is a verbatim translation of the French). Meanwhile a second edition of the French had substituted "concubinage" for "fornication," and in turn this yielded to "prostitution," which also is the reading of the 1974 version—"pas pour prostitution"—along with a new note that reflects a quite different interpretation of the text. The 1968 German "Jerusalem Bible" also has a form of the 1956 French ("ausser wegen Unzucht") and the same note. Other random examples where both English and German have followed the 1956 text without regard to second thoughts which had been already expressed in the fascicules are the episode which begins with Josh. 7:2 and the translation of I Sam. 1:23. In the first instance, beginning the narrative of the conquest of Ai, the two derived versions reproduce the footnote of 1956 acknowledging that the site was uninhabited in the time of Joshua but suggesting that it could have served as a refuge for the people of the Bethel region. As early as 1958, however, this attempt to salvage history from the story had been abandoned by *La Bible de Jérusalem* and the note had been radically altered. I Sam. 1:23 in the French of 1956, the German, and the English has the possessive pronoun in the second person, justified by "versions" (the German also noted the agreement of 4QSam^a). But the later editions of the French have restored to the text the third person pronoun of the Masoretic Text.

It is instructive to compare Isa. 2:2–3, first in the French of 1956 and 1974, and then with the English of 1966.

1956

Il adviendra dans l'avenir
que le mont du Temple de Yahvé

1974

Il arrivera dans la suite des temps
que la montagne de la maison de
Yahvé

sera établi au sommet des
montagnes
et s'élèvera plus haut que les
collines.
Toutes les nations y afflueront,
des peuples nombreux s'y
rendront et diront:
"Venez, montons à la montagne de
Yahvé,
allons au Temple du Dieu de
Jacob,
pour qu'il nous enseigne ses voies
et que nous suivions ses sentiers.
Car de Sion viendra la Loi
et de Jérusalem l'oracle de Yahvé."

sera établie en tête des montagnes
et s'élèvera au-dessus des collines.
Alors toutes les nations afflueront
vers elle,
alors viendront des peuples
nombreux qui diront:
"Venez, montons à la montagne de
Yahvé,
à la maison du Dieu de Jacob,
qu'il nous enseigne ses voies
et que nous suivions ses sentiers."
Car de Sion vient la Loi
et de Jérusalem la parole de Yahvé.

These are, rather obviously, different translations of Isa 2:2–3. The 1974 *Bible de Jérusalem* acknowledges that its translation of Isaiah has been "entièrement retraduit." More precisely, there has been an effort to make the translations of Isa. 2:2–3 and Mic. 4:1–2, which differ very little in the Masoretic text, agree correspondingly in the French, though there remain some subtle differences even in the 1974 version which could be of interest to us if we were concerned with the French rather than the English. We are concerned with the French only to point out that both in words and in punctuation the translations represent separate interpretations of the original text. Only to this extent are we involved with the French text, not to suggest in any way that the English Jerusalem Bible should have anticipated a revision of the *Bible de Jérusalem* that did not then exist.

What the Jerusalem Bible has, however, for Isa. 2:2–3 is this:

In the days to come
the mountain of the Temple of Yahweh
shall tower above the mountains
and be lifted higher than the hills.
All the nations will stream to it,
peoples without number will come to it; and they will say:
'Come, let us go up to the mountain of Yahweh,
to the Temple of the God of Jacob
that he may teach us his ways
so that we may walk in his paths;
since the Law will go out from Zion,
and the oracle of Yahweh from Jerusalem.'

It would be difficult, I think, to conclude that the Jerusalem Bible here is anything other than a translation—admittedly a translation into very idiomatic English—of the French of 1956. Word

choices, verb tenses, punctuational and other interpretations, all agree, far and beyond the need to adjust the translation to any significant footnote, which in this instance does not exist. The German *Jerusalem Bible* can serve as a control, providing a translation of its own for the same commentary:

In der Folge der Tage wird es geschehen: Da wird der Berg des Hauses Jahwes festgegründet stehen an der Spitze der Berge und erhaben sein über die Hügel. Zu ihm strömen alle Völker. Dorthin pilgern viele Nationen und sprechen:

“Auf, lasst uns hinaufziehen zum Berge Jahwes, zum Hause des Gottes Jakobs! Er lehre uns seine Wege, und wir wollen auf seinen Pfaden wandeln. Denn von Zion wird ausgehen das Gesetz und das Wort Jahwes von Jerusalem.”

Here is where The Jerusalem Bible is most vulnerable from the critical standpoint. There is no doubt that an exhaustive investigation would show that it has gone its own way in various instances independently of the French. (An example is present in this very passage, as a matter of fact, since it chose to harmonize its translation of Isa. 2:2–3 with Mic. 4:1–2 by reading *dēbar Yhwh* in both cases as “the oracle of Yahweh,” whereas the latter text in the 1956 French had “la parole de Yahvé”—the formula which of course was chosen for Isaiah and Micah in 1974.) For the most part, however, and quite understandably in view of the limitations imposed by its times, it has reproduced accurately and in creditable English a work of French scholarship of the middle ‘50s. And while the French scholarship of the middle ‘50s, particularly the French Catholic scholarship represented by the *École Biblique*, was as critical as any that then existed, it continued to develop not only from its association with other scholarly groups but also from its own internal development and growth.⁸ To take another random example: The initial note on Genesis 14 in the English Jerusalem Bible, acknowledging that it “does not belong to any of the three great sources of Genesis,” maintains that “behind it lies a document of great age” and that “all we can say is that the narrative finds its most natural setting in the conditions of the 19th century B.C.” This is a faithful translation of the note in the 1956 French Bible. In the 1974 *Bible de Jérusalem*, however, all that is left of the note is the negative part: the passage is neither J, E, nor P. Further, it seems to be “a late composition making a pastiche of ancient material”—much of which is “historically impossible.” While the earlier judgment in this matter might be held equally as respectable as the later, that is hardly the point. The point is that The Jerusalem Bible has frozen *La Bible de Jérusalem* at a stage of its development which did not represent the maturest thinking of those responsible for it.

Both the actual translation as well as the annotation given it differ from 1956 to 1974, as we have seen. Nor do these, of course, affect only matters of detail. In Gen. 1:2 "God's spirit hovered over the water" according to The Jerusalem Bible, here faithfully echoing the French of 1956 and translating the note referring to Deut. 32:11 to justify this understanding of the verb *mēraḥēpet*. But by 1974 the *Bible de Jérusalem* was expressing what is probably the prevailing interpretation today: "un vent de Dieu tournoyait sur les eaux" ("a wind of God was swirling over the waters") and in a footnote explicitly denied that there is any mention here of the "spirit" of God. The French of Gen. 3:22 is the same in 1956 and 1974 and is faithfully rendered in English by The Jerusalem Bible. But while the note in 1956 had it that "immortality was a pure gift of God which man's disobedience forfeited," the 1974 note says no such thing, rather that the earthly paradise is an image of the immortality to which man aspires. The difference is considerable. The earlier edition reflects a period of apologetics in Catholic biblical studies when there was still a felt obligation to defend a traditional exegesis that had gone into dogmatics regarding the "preternatural gifts" possessed by our "first parents" prior to their fall from grace. In the later edition the attempt has been abandoned in favor of a more relaxed and objective exegesis.⁹

Although the explanatory notes and introduction were a decisive factor in the initial acceptance and success of The Jerusalem Bible, it is undoubtedly in its status as a good readable version of the Scripture that its continuing reputation stands. This is apparently the status on which the editors themselves wished their version to stand or fall. In 1968 a "Reader's Edition" was published, doubtless the edition now known to most of those who use it in this country. The notes and introductions were reduced to a bare minimum, in view of an announced intention to impede the ordinary reader with as little as possible of the marginalia that are of interest to the more professional student. At the same time, in this edition, the spelling was Americanized: "honour," "labour," "favourable," and the like, became "honor," "labor," and "favorable"; "gaol" and "gaoler" became "jail" and "jailer." However, whatever was the grain (*bar* or *sēber*) that Joseph's brethren brought from Egypt to Canaan, this edition is more British than American when it has them bring it in "corn-sacks" (Gen. 42:28).

Among the collaborators acknowledged in the original edition of The Jerusalem Bible are several whose area of competence was obviously that of sensitivity to the best resonances of the English language, such as Robert Speaight and J.R.R. Tolkien. There is

no doubt that they and the rest of the editors and translators in this respect performed their task with distinction. The Jerusalem Bible is in English what *La Sainte Bible de Jérusalem* is in French, a credit to the challenging capabilities of the language. It is particularly good in its narrative passages and reporting of familiar dialogue: stories are told the way good stories should be, and conversations sound like real people talking together. "Today God has put your enemy in your power," says Abishai to David. "So now let me pin him to the ground with his own spear. Just one stroke! I will not need to strike him twice" (I Sam. 26:8). "To Job they spoke never a word," goes the old folktale about Job's friends in 2:13, "so sad a sight he made." The Jerusalem Bible has made a clean break with "Bible English" while at the same time avoiding folksiness and respecting the genre of the text it is translating. "Better a poor man living an honest life than the adept at double-talk who is a fool" (Prov. 19:1). This is not only better than other English versions earlier and later, it is also superior, to the extent that I can judge, to its French prototype. "In fact, this seems to be the rule, that every single time I want to do good it is something evil that comes to hand. In my inmost self I dearly love God's Law, but I can see that my body follows a different law that battles against the law which my reason dictates. This is what makes me a prisoner of that law of sin which lives inside my body" (Rom. 7:21-23). There is a temptation to multiply the examples of translations which are just right. Nor is it necessary to temper this praise by acknowledging the presence here and there, as in any other version of the Bible, of the odd word or phrase or idiom that could have been better handled.

We have already noted the excellent cross-referencing system reproduced in the margins (omitted, however, in the "Reader's Edition"). This, together with the system of headings, subheadings, and paragraphing—an important interpretive device, surely—has been borrowed from the French along with the other more overt notations. A further decision of format marked a definite improvement on the French, namely the relegation of verse numbers to the unobtrusive inside margins (when the division falls within a printed line it is marked in the text by a large dot). While chapter numbers are noted, they are also similarly set apart as the items of convenience they were originally meant to be and not hindrances to the sequence of the text. Also, perhaps alone of modern English versions, The Jerusalem Bible notes marginally the variant chapter-and-verse indications that occasionally occur among the versions ancient and modern (in Job 39-40, for example, or in Hosea 1-3, in much of Ecclesiasticus, etc.), which can easily con-

fuse the reader attempting to consult more than one translation at a time. The only serious exception to this rule—and here there has been a noteworthy deviation from the French—has been the decision to follow in the Psalms the verse enumeration as it occurs in what is called “the English Bible.” In this acceptance “the English Bible,” I suppose, means what simply “the Bible” meant to Henry Higgins when he counted it along with Shakespeare as one of the noblest products of the English tongue, that is to say therefore, the King James Version. It seems that practically every modern English version of the Bible, even those which have consciously broken with the Authorised Version translation-tradition (such as the New English Bible and Today’s English Version, both of which omit the Psalm titles in the bargain), have elected to perpetuate this eccentric system which can hardly matter much to the casual reader but which continually frustrates anyone trying to follow a commentary or work of reference written in any other language than English. One must always remember that the English text is one verse out of kilter, even as Roman Catholic commentaries on the Psalms in a bygone age were usually a whole Psalm out of kilter when they followed the Septuagint/Vulgate enumeration rather than that of the Hebrew. Only the New American Bible in recent days has refused to perpetuate this parochial “English” enumeration of Psalm verses.

In his *Trials of a Translator* Ronald Knox insisted that good translation required a better knowledge of the receptor than of the donor language, and he confessed to having had more recourse in his own work to Fowler and the Oxford Dictionary than to the standard lexica and concordances of the biblical languages. He was probably right in every respect. The Jerusalem Bible, by this test, needs no apology. No one would want to take from it the credit that is its due for having so capably filled a void that then existed in 1966 in the English-speaking Catholic world, hungry for reasonable access to the word of God. It is a monument.

As long, however, as it bears the name The Jerusalem Bible, explicitly borrowed from *La Bible de Jérusalem*, it is a monument to a biblical tradition that no longer exists. That biblical tradition has been done away with effectively through the later development of *La Bible de Jérusalem* in fascicule and in the one-volume edition of 1974, a Bible which is in many essentials altogether different from the French archetype of 1956.

If, on the other hand, The Jerusalem Bible wishes to declare itself free of the French archetype and to persist in its own right as an English version on the plane of the New English Bible, the

New American Bible, the Revised Standard Version, or the like, then it seems that something must be done for which there is no evidence that anything has been done. That is to say, there is no possibility of achieving ever what a publisher's blurb in 1966 claimed for The Jerusalem Bible: "This is *the* Bible for the twentieth century." Ronald Knox insisted, again quite correctly, that the Bible should be translated afresh for every succeeding generation—and in these days of geometric evolution we know that generations overtake one another with increasing frequency in even the small portion of the twentieth century we are destined to experience. There is no such thing as a perfect translation of the Bible in any language that is destined to have a responsible life for more than a decade or so. Every existing version that has a claim to responsibility has already built into itself the machinery of future revision. Is there such a machinery built into the continuing existence of The Jerusalem Bible? If there is not—and all the indications are that there is not—then The Jerusalem Bible is destined to remain the monument that it is, a faithful reproduction of some of the best biblical scholarship of the late 1950s. It would be doubly unfortunate if the casual reader, invited to adopt the Jerusalem Bible, were led to believe that nothing of significance had occurred in the past generation to constitute it a less acceptable option in response to the perennial question, "Which Bible is best?"

NOTES

1. The *Codex Iuris Canonici*, a codification in 2414 separate *canones* of centuries of ecclesiastical legislation, took effect in the Latin church May 19, 1918, a year following its promulgation. Theoretically it is still in effect, subject to subsequent specific revisions (such as those which have virtually abolished the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* and seriously modified the *censura praevia* of books and other writings), pending an overhaul that may or may not come to fruition in our times.

2. A commentary on the Code, much used in Catholic seminaries at the time, further made it quite clear that the provision applied to anybody: "omnes, tam sacerdotes *quam* *tirones* [my emphasis] et alumnos, qui habitualiter studia biblica et theologica, sive in scholis *sive* *privatum* [again my emphasis], seria mente excolere et augere nituntur." See Uldaricus Beste, *Introductio in Codicem* (Collegeville: St. John's Abbey Press, 1946) on can. 1400.

3. An interesting example typical of many others was recently called to mind by the 500th anniversary of the Bible in Catalan, printed at Valencia in 1478 (and translated a long generation before). Though proclaimed in its colophon to be "the most true and Catholic Bible" and published with the highest available ecclesiastical approbation, it fell prey to the Spanish Inquisition which was extended to Valencia in 1484 and which consigned to the flames vernacular Bibles

along with Jewish Talmuds and Arabic works of alchemy. Cf. Guiu Camps, "Cinc-cents anys de la primera edició catalana de la Bíblia," *Revista Catalana de Teologia*, 3 (1978), 3–16.

4. In its Fourth Session, April 8, 1546. Cf. Denzinger-Schönmetzer, *Enchiridion Symbolorum* (34th ed.; Freiburg: Herder, 1967), §§ 1504, 1506.

5. *Divino afflante Spiritu* in Denzinger-Schönmetzer, § 3825.

6. More particulars than the reader may be interested in knowing about this history can be found in Hugh Pope, O.P., *English Versions of the Bible* (2d ed.; St. Louis: Herder, 1952), 355–378, 386–441, 464–496.

7. *Die Bibel. Die Heilige Schrift des Alten und Neuen Bundes. Deutsche Ausgabe mit den Erläuterungen der Jerusalemer Bibel* (Freiburg: Herder, 1968).

8. In *Bibel und Kirche* 32 (1978), 135, Anton Steiner, responding to the familiar question "welche Bibel kaufen," also chides the "Jerusalemer Bibel" for having acquiesced in introductory material and annotation that was already outdated in 1968.

9. Cf. Herbet Haag, *Biblische Schöpfungslehre und Kirchliche Erbsündenlehre* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 10; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966), 49–54, referring also to pp. 13–37. There is an English translation, *Is Original Sin in Scripture?* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1969), but in the substitution of English for German sources the force of the contrast has largely disappeared.

APPENDIX

Participants in the Jerusalem Bible Translation Project

GENERAL EDITOR: Alexander Jones

PRINCIPAL COLLABORATORS IN TRANSLATION AND LITERARY REVISION: Joseph Leo Alston, Florence M. Bennett, Joseph Blenkinsopp, David Joseph Bourke, Douglas Carter, Aldhelm Dean, Illtud Evans, Kenelm Foster, Ernest Graf, Prospero Grech, Edmund Hill, Sylvester Houédard, Leonard Johnston, Anthony J. Kenny, D.O. Lloyd James, James McAuley, Hubert Richards, Edward Sackville-West, Ronald Senator, Walter Shewring, Robert Speaight, J.R.R. Tolkien, R.F. Trevett, Thomas Worden, John Wright, Basil Wrighton

The New English Bible

by ROGER A. BULLARD

It may seem today that the New English Bible was given a rather unfortunate name; after all, newness is a quality that does not last, whether applied to dishwashing detergents or to Bibles. Still, there is some appropriateness to the title, and it is best appreciated against its background.

The New Testament of the NEB appeared March 14, 1961. At the time, the Revised Standard Version was less than ten years old; its NT was of course some years older, but most people were unaware of it until the appearance of the whole Bible, accompanied as it was by a furor born of the McCarthy era. In 1961 the book store shelves were not crowded with new translations, so that the RSV and the NEB had it pretty much to themselves. In that context, the New English Bible was indeed something new. As stunningly different from the familiar King James Version as the RSV had seemed in 1952, increasing exposure had made the literary lineage of the latter version more apparent. The NEB brought into focus the similarities of the RSV to the KJV; it thus stood virtually alone as a genuinely new attempt to put the Scriptures into English.

By the time the Old Testament and the Apocrypha appeared on March 16, 1970, that quality of newness was no longer quite so apparent, at least to readers who kept abreast of developments in translation activity. The Jerusalem Bible had already made its appearance, and the NT of Today's English Version had become popular. From Roman Catholic circles, the New American Bible was published the same year as the NEB.

Yet, against the background of the centuries, the claim to newness was still valid. From 1525, when William Tyndale's NT in English first appeared, until 1961, when the NEB NT was published, there really had been no major effort by Protestants at a fresh translation of the Bible into English. Rather, there had been a long series of successive revisions: Tyndale was revised by Coverdale (1535); this was revised by John Rogers (Tyndale's literary executor) as "Matthew's Bible" (1537), which was revised under Coverdale's editorship as the Great Bible (1539), in turn revised as the Bishops' Bible (1568), which was revised by King James' learned men (1611). This was revised as the (English) Revised Version of 1881-85, further developed as the American Standard Version of 1901, revised in turn as the Revised Standard Version of 1946-52. Even such a major translation as the

Geneva Bible (1560) draws from this tradition. Seen against this backdrop, the newness of the NEB is apparent; it was the first completely fresh major Protestant translation in almost 450 years.

Similarly, the appearance of the NEB fairly soon after the RSV was not a detraction from its newness, for the beginnings of the NEB date from before the publication of the RSV, which was essentially an American undertaking. The NEB was never conceived as competition for the RSV.

The story of the NEB begins in May 1946, when Dr. G.S. Hendry, representing the Presbytery of Stirling and Dunblane, presented to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland a proposal that a new translation of the Bible be undertaken, "in the language of the present day." This phrase was probably designed to underscore the Assembly's intent that the new effort not be another exercise in neo-archaism, as was the English Revised Version (1885), then the only viable alternative to the KJV. In October of 1946, a conference was held of representatives of the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, and of the Congregationalist, Methodist, and Baptist Churches of Britain. Here the participating churches gave approval to the project, laying down the specific principle that a completely new translation was envisioned, not a revision of any existing version.

A second conference was held in January 1947, this time including, along with representatives of the churches, representatives of the university presses of Oxford and Cambridge. At this time a Joint Committee on the New Translation of the Bible was appointed, to be chaired by J.W. Hunkin, Bishop of Truro. After Hunkin's death in 1950, the post was taken by Alwyn P.T. Williams, Bishop of Durham, later of Winchester. He was succeeded, after his death in 1968, by Donald Coggan, Archbishop of York, later of Canterbury.

This Joint Committee held its first meeting in July of 1947. Membership was expanded by the third meeting in January 1948, when invitations to participate had been accepted by the Presbyterian Church of England, the Society of Friends, the Churches in Wales, the Churches in Ireland, the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the National Bible Society of Scotland. At a later stage of the work, the Roman Catholic Church in England and Scotland sent observers.

The Joint Committee began organizing the work by appointing four panels: three of translators (for the OT, NT, and Apocrypha), and one panel of literary advisors. The translators were selected with no regard for denominational affiliation; competence in biblical scholarship was the criterion. Dr. C.H. Dodd was made Convener of the NT Panel as well as Vice-Chairman of the Joint Committee. Dr. T.H. Robinson, until his death in 1957,

served as Convener of the OT Panel; he was followed by Dr. G.R. Driver. Dr. W.D. McHardy served as Convener of the Apocrypha Panel.

Dividing the work of translating among specialized committees was nothing new; it was at least as old as the KJV, although the committee method had always been used for revisions, not new translations. Appreciating the importance of literary style as well as of accurate scholarship, the KJV translators had had a sub-committee review the whole by reading it aloud. The KJV succeeded so well in establishing itself as a model of English style that the NEB translators heard, as Brahms said of Beethoven, the footsteps of a giant behind them. With a view then to watching for values literary as well as scholarly, the Literary Panel was appointed. Its members were not scholars of the ancient languages, but recognized masters of current English. While the interpretive decisions of the translators were to be regarded as final, the Literary Panel was to review the text with an eye toward polishing the style into a dignified vehicle. Dr. Alwyn Williams, later also Chairman of the Joint Committee, was Convener of this panel.

The work was not long underway when, in November 1949, Dr. Dodd assumed the additional task of General Director, an office created in an attempt better to coordinate the work of the four panels. Dodd became an *ex officio* member of each. In July 1965 G.R. Driver of the OT Panel became Joint Director with Dodd. McHardy was made Deputy Director in December 1968.

Thus the initials of these three gentlemen, Dodd, Driver, and McHardy, appear at the end of the introductions to the NT, OT, and Apocrypha, respectively. The chairmen of the Joint Committee, Alwyn Williams and Donald Coggan, affixed their signatures to the prefaces of the NT (1961) and the whole Bible (1970), respectively. These signatures deserve some explanation, since reputable writers have been mistaking them.¹ Williams' signature appears as "Alwyn Winton," i.e., *Alwyn Wintoniensis*, or Alwyn, (Bishop) of Winchester. Coggan's signature is "Donald Ebor," i.e., *Donald Eboracensis*, or Donald, (Archbishop) of York. This is the customary form for signatures of bishops of the Church of England.

A plan was soon agreed upon for the work to follow. For each book of the Bible, a draft translator was assigned. These were almost always members of the relevant panels, although there were a few exceptions. When the draft translation was ready, it was sent to other members of the panel. When the panel met, the draft was discussed in exhaustive detail. Differences of opinion

were resolved either by the panel's reaching a consensus, or in serious cases of disagreement, by the adoption of alternate translations to be published as footnotes to the NEB text. When the translating panel had finished with a book, it was sent on to the literary panel, where it was subjected to a different type of scrutiny. Here the discussion was not about the authenticity of the text translated, or the meaning of some word in the original, or of some ancient grammatical device. The members of this panel concerned themselves only with the level of English employed in the translation. It was their aim to make it consistently dignified, yet appropriate to the genre being translated: poetry, law, narrative, etc. After this analysis, the modified draft went back to the translators, as a guarantee that the intent of the original had not been lost in the process. We are told that especially difficult passages made several trips back and forth between the panels.

These peregrinations completed, the text went to the Joint Committee, with whom lay final responsibility for the project, and who were called on by translators and literary advisors alike for clarifications of policy. Under Dr. Dodd's direction, some papers were circulated to the four panels early in the work, indicating some of the general policy regarding the nature of the translation. Dodd himself indicated the purpose of the translation in terms of its intended readership. The new version was not intended primarily to be read in church. Rather, three groups of potential readers were being addressed: those who have little contact with the church, for whom the versions in use were unintelligible; young people, for whom the Bible must be contemporary if it is to mean anything; and intelligent churchgoers for whom the language of the Bible is so familiar that it carries little meaning. It was to be plain enough that any "reasonably intelligent person" could understand it, without its being pedestrian. One should be able to read it aloud with dignity, and it might be hoped that, within these restrictions, the version could produce some "arresting and memorable renderings."²

It is convenient, in evaluating the NEB, to consider each of the two testaments and the Apocrypha separately, since observations applying to one part do not necessarily apply to the others.

The textual basis of the NEB New Testament is eclectic. This is a fair representation of the state of NT textual studies today, which, as Dodd's preface to the NT explains, is commanded by no single theory, such as held sway at the time of the RV/ASV revisers. Each reading³ has been judged on its individual merits, and not in the frame of an overarching theory of textual development and transmission. It may be useful here to record the NEB's decisions on some of the standard problems.

The pericope of the adulteress, John 7:53–8:11, appears as a separate section at the end of the Gospel, where a concise but thorough note explains the problems in placing the narrative.

A change has taken place in the handling of the ending to Mark between the publication of the Bible in 1970 and the appearance of the Oxford Study Edition of 1976. In earlier editions there was a space in the middle of 16:8, separating the text from the so-called “shorter ending.” Another space divided this from the so-called “longer ending” (familiar from the KJV), at which point the versification resumed. All but one of the manuscripts which give the shorter ending follow it with the longer, so that the early editions of the NEB reflect the ordering of the relevant manuscripts. In the 1976 edition, the longer ending precedes the shorter, again divided from the text and from each other by spaces. Presumably this is to bring the traditional v. 8 into juxtaposition with the traditional v. 9. The placement of the endings is a matter of small concern, but the student of the text would feel more comfortable had both the endings been separated from the main text by some device more arresting to the eye than a space. For some reason, the “Amen” at the close of the shorter ending in virtually all its witnesses is not translated in either edition. The ending to Mark given in the Freer Gospel manuscript is not translated.

At Mark 1:41 the translators have followed compelling logic and adopted the reading *orgistheis*, though they have drawn back from the full force of the word. Rather than have Jesus “angrily” stretch out his hand, they have him do it “with warm indignation.” The more familiar reading, translated “Jesus was sorry for him,” is given in a footnote.

Matthew 27:17 gives Bar-Abbas’ name as Jesus Bar-Abbas.

Matthew 9:34 is omitted, on Western textual evidence.

Mark 8:26 represents a bold decision; Jesus’ saying here, “Do not tell anyone in the village,” translates the reading of one Old Latin manuscript. There is no Greek evidence for it at all, but it was thought to explain most satisfactorily the numerous other readings found for this passage.

Luke 22:19b–20 is omitted.

John 19:29 resorts to what is essentially a conjecture (exceptionally rare in NT critical study), although the adopted reading “javelin” is found in one Greek minuscule. All others read “hysop,” which the NEB renders in a footnote as “marjoram.” The NEB NT consistently renders this word “marjoram,” as does the OT in most cases. Sometimes the OT notes tell us, “*or*, hysop,” and sometimes we are left without this alternative. One suspects

the composition of the translating panel differed on the days these passages were discussed. Someone must have held out strongly for “hyssop” and when present was assuaged with a footnote. Psalm 51:7 [Hebrew:9], however, reads “hyssop” in the text, with “*or, marjoram*” as its note. Maybe this was in deference to the familiarity of the passage, to prevent its sounding silly to those who know what marjoram is: “Take majoram, and sprinkle me.” (It is safe to say that many readers will understand hyssop in that verse as a liquid.) Maybe, on the other hand, on the day that Psalm 51 was discussed, the hyssop faction had a better breakfast than the marjoram faction; personal dynamics play a huge role in this kind of committee work.

For those with a knowledge of Greek, an extremely useful guide exists to the textual decisions behind the NEB NT. R.V.G. Tasker published in 1964, under the title *The Greek New Testament* (Oxford and Cambridge), the complete Greek text as translated in the NEB, placing on the page not only the readings adopted, but also the punctuation, capitalization, and versification used by the panel. These 408 pages of legible Greek text are handy, although any second-year Greek student would have little difficulty reconstructing the Greek from the English and a critical apparatus. The real usefulness of the book is in the 35 page appendix, where Tasker gives not only the evidence for certain readings adopted by the translators, but their reasons for doing so. It is a very useful compendium of critical reasoning. Teachers of the Greek NT are overlooking a splendid resource if they do not use it from time to time.

For the most part, the explanations given satisfy, even in cases where one disagrees with the conclusion. An example of an especially good discussion is found on Luke 1:46. (Who sings the Magnificat? Mary or Elizabeth?). Occasionally we do catch some strange reasoning behind the NEB text, however. At Mark 7:3, we are told that the widely attested reading *pugmē* (“fist”) and a variant *pukna* (“often”) yield no satisfactory sense. Fair enough. In translation, the word is not represented. But we are told in Tasker that the panel decided to relegate both readings to a footnote on the grounds that neither appear in the Sinaitic Syriac or the Sahidic Coptic. It would seem better to attribute the omission to the Committee’s uncertainty about intelligible meaning than to blame it on an absence in two obscure versional traditions.

At I Corinthians 13:3, the usual reading *kauthēsomai* (“to be burnt”) is adopted, but Tasker’s explanation seems to give more compelling reasons for the alternate reading *kauchēsomai* (“seek glory by self-sacrifice”).

In a note to I Corinthians 14:38, Tasker points out an error in the wording of an NEB footnote, where an alternative *translation* is adopted, but introduced by the words "Some witnesses read," misleadingly suggesting an alternative *reading*. Tasker is right: there *is* a textual problem in the verse. But the discussion in the note has to do with the interpretation of a single reading. This was cleaned up in the 1970 edition, where the note does recognize a variant reading, but where the translation of the earlier note has found its way into the text, and *vice versa*.

In Ephesians 1:1 the NEB text includes the highly doubtful phrase "at Ephesus," but only on the very dubious grounds that the book is traditionally known as the Epistle "to the Ephesians." The commentators, we are told, are left to struggle with the problem of destination. The translators seem to have abandoned their responsibility here. The problem of destination is one thing; the authenticity of the reading is another.

Study of Tasker's notes underscores the eclectic methodology explained in Dodd's preface. Though the method is eclectic, it is not erratic. For the most part, ample evidence lies behind the translated text, as well as sound logic. The textual decisions are essentially conservative, though a bit more daring than those of the RSV.

Leaving aside questions of accuracy of text and interpretation, we find that it is in the Englishing that the NEB contributes most to our understanding of the NT. It has succeeded admirably in its goal to avoid traditional renderings, and though there are some serious lapses, it has more than fulfilled Dodd's hope that it might produce "arresting and memorable renderings."

By freeing themselves from the restraints of reproducing Greek structures in English, the translators have provided themselves with increased opportunity to convey the connotative as well as the denotative force of the original. See, for instance, what happens to the present infinitive in Acts 2:1: "While the day of Pentecost was running its course . . ." Or to the present participle in Acts 4:1, where it is subordinate to an aorist verb: "They were still addressing the people when the chief priests came upon them . . ." By transforming the Greek participle into an English main verb, and the Greek main verb into the verb of a subordinate clause, the translators have accented the durative force of the present participle, the punctiliar force of the aorist verb, preserved the relation between them, and quickened the progress of the narrative.

Notice how the simple device of moving to an English past perfect in Luke 6:6 preserves the functions of aorist and present

tenses: "On another Sabbath he had gone to synagogue and was teaching." Rendering the aorist infinitive by a past perfect, and the present by a present progressive, serves the narrative function of placing the reader immediately in the synagogue rather than putting him through a two-step narrative. Such a device sharpens the movement of the story. Two other points about that sentence can be noted. An *egeneto de* is unrepresented in translation. Since there is no English equivalent, there is no point in trying to invent one. Further, there is no article with "synagogue." Compare our phrase, "went to church." There is great deftness shown in dealing with such fine details.

Consider Luke 5:29. "Afterwards Levi held a big reception in his house for Jesus." Admirable skill lies behind that simple statement. First, note the introductory adverb, which represents *kai*. "Afterwards" is less used than "and"; hence it carries more "information." It makes an immediate impact, binding coherently the paragraph which it opens to the preceding account of the call of Levi. Then, Levi "held" a reception. The verb is *epoiēsen*. It is hard even for seasoned translators to break the habit carried over from "baby Greek" of rendering that word "make," as does the RSV. But in English one does not "make" a feast or reception; we "hold" one. Hence the NEB is translating the sense, not just the word. Further, it is a "reception" that is held, not a "feast" (*douchēn*). Now I suppose one might quibble over whether or not this is an anachronism, suggesting white gloves, punch bowl, and reception line. But on the other hand, Levi is holding this event in Jesus' honor (*autō*), and "reception" is the name we give a social event in which guests are invited in to meet an honored person. It is certainly a word more meaningful to our experience than "feast," which has today inappropriate connotations. Now watch this bold stroke. It is a "big" reception. "Big" is one of those perfectly good words which we avoid in writing, preferring "large" or "great." After all, who ever learned in "baby Greek" that *meγas* means "big"? But there are occasions when it is appropriate, and here it contributes to the well-chosen phrase describing the scene. But there is more. Jesus is named, whereas the Greek uses a pronoun. But why not name him? This is a new paragraph, a new topic, and Jesus has not been named since v. 22. This gives immediate clarity to a passage that otherwise would be getting murky with pronouns (cf. RSV). This clarity is also furthered by another deft stroke. Word order is reversed, so that the phrase "in his house" comes before the mention of Jesus. This avoids obscuring the antecedent. A stranger to the story could really not tell from the RSV, for instance, in whose house the feast is being held, Jesus' or Levi's.

As the verse continues, the next *kai* is represented simply by a semi-colon. Initial conjunctions are not a feature of modern English; we do not belabor connections that are quite clear. The Greek text goes on to say "there was a large crowd of tax-collectors and others who were reclining with them." Here the reference is to an unfamiliar social custom which can hardly be brought over literally. The RSV renders by the anachronism "sitting at table." The NEB has simply "among the guests was . . ." which completely avoids the problem, while sacrificing nothing; the context makes it clear that food and drink are involved.

Other examples of small but inspired touches: at Luke 1:1-4, the phrase *kratiste Theophile* has been removed from the end of verse 3, and its semantic components redistributed. Theophilus is named at the beginning ("The author to Theophilus"), and the force of *kratiste* is conveyed by the phrase "Your Excellency," placed in a natural position at the beginning of verse 3.

Acts 1:1 has no "O" before the name Theophilus.

Acts 1:20: "'The text I have in mind,' Peter continued, 'is in the book of Psalms.'" Using "the text" for the formula "it is written" is brilliant, and the insertion of "Peter continued," representing nothing in Greek, helps resume Peter's speech, which in the preceding verse was badly interrupted by a long parenthetical remark of the author's.

Acts 8:1: "This was the beginning of a time of violent persecution for the church in Jerusalem." This strikingly marks a transition in the narrative. Notice "violent." There is *me-gas* again, but "violent" is surely a more appropriate modifier for "persecution" than the pale "great."

Use of modern punctuation devices allows the translators increased flexibility, but also commits them to some problems. In John 3, where do Jesus' words to Nicodemus end? The RSV closes the quotation at v. 12 (though I have seen red-letter editions that completely ignore the quotation marks and go rosilily on through v. 21); NEB closes at 21. There is no formal marker in Greek, and one opinion is pretty much as good as another.

But consider the problem in I Corinthians. In 6:12, most interpreters agree that Paul is quoting his opponents: "I am free to do anything." NEB makes the quotation clear, not only by the punctuation, but also by inserting after the quote the phrase "you say." The reader or the hearer then knows that Paul is playing with a phrase bandied about in Corinth. The same holds at 8:1: "Of course we all 'have knowledge,' as you say." But what of 7:1? Personally, I feel that much mischief has been done by failure to recognize that Paul is quoting his Gnostic opponents when he

says, "It is a good thing for a man to have nothing to do with women." But this point is still debated, and the NEB opts for putting this interpretation, with the clarifying "you say," in the footnote.

Strange things and unexpected do lurk in the NEB NT. It is startling to find Paul, in I Corinthians 16:8, speaking of staying at Ephesus until Whitsuntide. (Was Paul Anglican?) And it is a little disappointing to find that later editions have not winnowed out two infelicitous remarks long noted, I Corinthians 5:9: "You must have nothing to do with loose livers," and Revelation 16:16: "thou hast given them blood to drink. They have their deserts!" By and large, however, the NT is free from this sort of thing.

Turning to the Old Testament, we must take immediate note that the textual terrain here is quite different from that of the New. Virtually none of the OT books are invested with the same degree of textual certainty that is characteristic of the NT as a whole; some of the books (e.g., Samuel, Hosea) are in a fairly bad state of disrepair. It is standard operating procedure for modern translations to resort to versional evidence and to conjectural emendations to produce meaningful readings in places where the Masoretic Text (a highly standardized Hebrew text of early medieval origin, almost universally used as a basis for OT study and translation) is obscure; there are a great many such places.

The NEB OT panel has obviously devoted intense thought to these textual matters, and has been remarkably bold about resorting to emendation, whether supported by evidence or not, when this was felt to be the proper route. Footnotes alert the reader to the presence of problems—*sometimes*. Here is one of the difficulties the user of the NEB OT faces. There are two sets of notes. The "Library Edition" of 1970 has a full panoply of notes, but most editions, including, most surprisingly, the "Oxford Study Edition" of 1976, have an abbreviated set. Since the complete notes would not occupy an untoward amount of space, it is somewhat mystifying that there is not one set only, and that in every edition. The difference is that only the Library Edition indicates where the text is based on the reading of other Hebrew manuscripts or of the versions. The Library Edition also has notes giving a literal rendering of the Hebrew at places where it was felt that the chosen translation was so different as to merit a comment.

Not having these notational references to the versions in the other NEB editions deprives most users of helpful information, especially where one might wonder about insertions into or omissions from the familiar text. Genesis 2:2 tells us, "On the sixth day

God completed all the work he had been doing," but most versions will say that this was on the seventh day. Genesis 4:8 has Cain say to Abel, "Let us go into the open country," a phrase not found in the Hebrew. One has to consult the Library Edition to discover that the change to "sixth" and the inclusion of Cain's words are based on the Samaritan Pentateuch.

One can quibble with the wording of these notes. Where an emendation is made, the Masoretic Text is translated in the notes, unless the panel thought the Hebrew hopeless. In these instances, the Hebrew is said to be either "obscure" or "unintelligible." I assume it is simply a subjective value judgment which is used. However, the reading in the NEB text is termed in the note the "probable reading," even in places where the most dubious conjectures have been made. In Proverbs 12:12 we find a Hebrew text that is just about as obscure as one is apt to find (the note translates it, however). The note refers only to the first line of the verse translated, "The stronghold of the wicked crumbles like clay," which is called the "probable reading." Now this reading must be arrived at by repointing at least one word, rearranging the order of three words, and giving one word the meaning of a cognate root in Arabic. The proposal goes back to Hitzig (1858), and it is certainly one way to force sense from a difficult line, but it is by no stretch of the imagination "probable." The second line is also obscure, but the repointing of the verb and its investment with an Arabic meaning apparently made it clear to the panel.

The reference to Arabic brings up one of the most notorious features of the NEB OT, a trait which puts it in sharp contrast to every other mainline translation, and which more than any other single feature has made scholars wary of it.

In the past decades, great strides have been made in our understanding of the classical Hebrew lexicon. Largely this has been due to the exacting labors that have been expended on languages cognate with Hebrew, such as Ugaritic, Akkadian, and Arabic. Meanings can now be suggested, with some confidence, for words that have long been obscure in meaning. Many such have found their way into Koehler-Baumgartner's *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*. A large number of others have been, until the NEB, lying dormant in the scholarly literature. The basic assumption of this philology is that a Hebrew word may have had a meaning in biblical times which was later forgotten—thus distorting the sense of the passages where it was used—but which may be recovered by examining the meaning of a cognate root in a related language. For instance, one familiar with only the modern sense of the English "ghost" might well wonder about religious usage of the term "Holy Ghost." Modern English would not illumine the

phrase at all, but reference to the cognate German “Geist” would. Now the course that semantic change has taken in the European languages in modern times is well documented, but for the ancient Semitic tongues it is not. If any generalization can be made from the observed phenomena of semantic change, it is that it is completely unpredictable. There is absolutely no guarantee that a root in Ugaritic (*pace* Dahood) would have the same meaning in Hebrew, or that a root in Arabic (*pace* Driver, Reider, et al.) would have the same meaning in Hebrew. They well might. But they might not. (English “worm” and German *Wurst*, “sausage,” are derived from a common Indo-European root.) In the nature of the case, hypotheses of common meaning in two ancient languages for the same root must remain speculations. James Barr, in his *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1968), which was published after the work on the NEB had been done, offers a detailed and well-reasoned criticism of this methodology, which should make us highly skeptical of its results.

The relevance of all this lies in the fact that the NEB OT reflects on virtually every page (it seems) these studies in comparative philology. By now the most famous such instance is Judges 1:14 (parallel in Joshua 15:18), where the main verb (*ṣānah*) in the sentence, “As she sat on the ass, she broke wind,” carries a meaning teased out of Arabic. (Not to make it sound any worse than it is, the ass is an animal, although it has not been mentioned in the story previously.) In the Oxford Study Edition of 1976 this has been toned down a bit to “she made a noise,” which, though less blatant, renders the English almost as obscure as the Hebrew. (In Job 32:18ff we come across an unexpected attack of gas in a fairly familiar passage, where the sufferer seeks relief by talking.) The only other time the word is used is Judges 4:21, where the translators have apparently given it a different meaning. (I don’t know this; they may well be letting the hypothetical root-meaning of the Arabic root color this rendering as well.) It is a graphic picture they paint, “his brains oozed out (*ṣānah*) on the ground.” In the first place, it is not clear how they have determined the subject of this verb, since it is not expressed; Sisera’s previously-mentioned “skull” is a possibility, I suppose, although this would force them to give the one occurrence of the word (*raqqāh*) two different meanings (“skull” and “brains”). Besides, brains don’t ooze. What the panel has done with this word is a mystery to me, and this is only one example of something frequently recurring.

In all honesty, the verb used in those passages is obscure (though to my knowledge no one has ever suggested the meaning “break wind”). More unsettling is the constant use of this meth-

odology to discover new meanings in quite familiar Hebrew words. As an example, in the familiar opening lines of Moses' victory song in Exodus 15:2, there occur three common Hebrew words, translated in the RSV "The LORD is my strength and my song." NEB renders this "The LORD⁴ is my refuge and my defence." How do we get from "song" to "defence"? Not by any conventional emendation or objective versional evidence, but by assuming that the root has the same meaning as a cognate Arabic root.

I keep talking about Arabic here, but other Semitic languages are drawn on as well. I believe it fair to say that the general stream of OT scholarship today has been far more receptive to illumination on Hebrew from Ugaritic than from any other related language—certainly more so than from Arabic. (There are of course historical and geographical reasons for this.) Now I cannot claim to have fully researched the matter, but in the work I have done it surely seems to me that in the NEB Arabic is resorted to much more often for new meanings for Hebrew words than any other ancient language. One finds it very difficult to believe that it is only a coincidence that Sir Godfrey Driver, Convener of the OT panel, is a renowned Arabist, many of whose published researches are reflected in the renderings of the NEB. If it is not a coincidence, one is driven to speculate, perhaps unfairly, that the chair was overly insistent on its own way.⁵

Now the legitimacy of this type of philological research is not in question. Further, when the NEB panel adopts a suggestion from this realm, its relevance to the context in question is usually apparent. It is the canonizing of large numbers of such newfound meanings in the text of a major translation of the Bible that is unnerving. Some of these are bound to be right, just as some of the noncanonical sayings of Jesus that survive from antiquity are bound to be genuine. The problem in each instance is that we have no way of telling which ones these are. The consistent application of this philological method, based itself on dubious assumptions, and the acceptance of so many of its results do not represent the mainstream of current OT scholarship. This has unfortunately given the NEB OT an element of eccentricity not characteristic of the NT or of the Apocrypha.

Of particular concern is that there is no system of footnoting in any edition to inform either the curious reader or the professional scholar about the sources of these often remarkable translations. Consequently, scholarship eagerly awaited the publication of the textual decisions of the panel. This was provided in *The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament*, prepared by L.H. Brockington

(Oxford and Cambridge, 1973). Now in all fairness, Brockington was surely providing exactly the kind of material he was commissioned to prepare, but the book proved to be a stupendous disappointment. It is simply a listing of reconstructed Hebrew readings adopted, on whatever evidence, by the OT panel for those passages where they chose not to read the Masoretic Text. There is no explanation whatever for any of these readings; most of them are the kind of thing that can be dug out of the apparatus in Kittel's Hebrew Bible. Most distressing of all is the fact that the book is not concerned at all with the philological work of the panel. A persistent scholar can find explanations for the peculiar renderings of the NEB OT if he plows through enough journals and *Festschriften*, but some of these problems are enveloped in considerable obscurity.⁶

There are certainly things that evade my understanding. Maybe I have missed something very obvious, but I am at an utter loss to know whence came the line in Hosea 9:6, "the sands of Syrtes shall wreck them." Neither the Library Edition nor Brockington offer any help. A number of years ago a student asked me to explain to him why the NEB in II Samuel 15:30 has David bare-headed, when every other version has his head covered. I couldn't explain it then and I can't explain it now.

Regarding the English style of the OT, it is on the whole impressively vigorous, vibrant, and muscular, with touches of translational excellence, though I must confess sensing a bit of stodginess in the prose and a bit of preciousness in the poetry on occasions—qualities I do not find in the NT or Apocrypha. But I hasten to add these are occasional lapses and not characteristic of the OT as a whole.⁷

Consider a few examples out of many that could be mentioned: Amos' condemnatory refrain in the first chapter reads, "For crime after crime of Damascus (Gaza, Tyre, etc.) . . ." This accomplishes its purpose of expressing a crescendo of guilt without leaving the reader wondering about what the literal "three or four" things are. The introduction to the Babel story in Genesis 11:1, "Once upon a time," is bold and brilliant. A panel that produced Jeremiah 46:17, "Give Pharaoh of Egypt the title King Bombast, the man who missed his moment," cannot be accused of lack of imagination and inspiration. Referring to a pigeon rather than a dove in Hosea 7:11, "Ephraim is a silly senseless pigeon," shows a real appreciation of connotative values.

Although the poetry of the NEB is usually compelling and resonant, graceful but sturdy, its appearance on the printed page is awkward and mystifying. As is the usual practice with modern

translations, Hebrew poetry is translated as poetry, but a strange criterion indeed has been adopted to determine indentation of lines—a device intrinsic to the English, that properly has nothing to do with the Hebrew at all. The indentation reflects the number of beats in the Hebrew meter; the more beats to the line, the farther to the left the English line extends. Clever, but it gives the poetry a weird appearance, and gives the reader no useful information or insight at all. In the Oxford Study Edition it is mangled even further by a two-column arrangement of the text on the page. For some reason, Job and Proverbs are set up with an even margin.

The quest for accuracy becomes a bit amusing at times. The rose in Sharon (Song of Songs 2:1) has become—are you ready?—an asphodel. It doesn't bother me particularly to learn that the flower in question is not a rose, but at least “rose” carries the freight of centuries of connotative imagery. Before reading the NEB, had someone asked me what an asphodel was, I might have answered with anything from a chemical to a surgical instrument. From reading the list of unclean birds in Leviticus 11:13ff, you would think we had a pretty good idea of what these birds were: griffon-vultures, fisher-owls and hoopoes are pretty specific. But we don't know all that. The notes to the passage do reveal some lack of certainty; there is a series of them reading, “*or eagle, or ossifrage, or raven, or heron . . .*” The next one is “*or whatever,*” which may seem suggestively appropriate, even if unrelated to the previous list. (Would you believe the next note is “*or weasel?*”)

Certainly, no great effort was expended in keeping the vocabulary level within a reasonable range. At least, I found I needed a dictionary at hand to discover meanings of unfamiliar English words: felloe, stook, reck, distraint, keen (verb), etc.

As expected, archaisms are not in evidence, but I wonder if “Hark” is much of an improvement over “Behold.” There are anachronisms; the “castles” that occasionally appear have a medieval ring, and the “shirt collar” of Job 30:18 sounds rather modern. In Prov. 18:10 we discover the Bible quoting Shakespeare (Richard III, act 4, scene 3). For all I know, there is good reason for it, but I must say it sounds odd to have buffaloes (I Kings 1:19, 25) sacrificed on the altar. It has a kind of Wild West ring to it; but then, we read that Abram “journeyed by stages” (Genesis 12:9). Later on, we get more modern: Isaiah cries out for us to “clear the track” (Isaiah 57:14), one might suppose for the “baggage-trains” of Isaiah 29:7, or the “trolleys” of I Kings 7:27–37.

All of this I say in affectionate fun, but there are, unfortunately, a great many passages that sound funny to the point of being

ludicrous. Proverbs 5:4, "For though the lips of an adulteress drip honey . . . in the end she is more bitter than wormwood." Jeremiah 20:7, "O LORD, thou hast duped me, and I have been thy dupe." Job 7:20, "Why hast thou made me thy butt?" Jeremiah 51:20, "You are my battle-ax." Deuteronomy 25:17-18, "Remember what the Amalekites did to you . . . how they met you on the road when you were faint and weary and cut off your rear." Genesis 43:18, "He means to trump up some charge against us and victimize us, seize our asses and make us his slaves." Proverbs 19:29, "There is a rod in pickle for the arrogant." Jeremiah 38:6, "So they took Jeremiah and threw him into the pit . . . letting him down with ropes." One who reads the NEB in public would be well advised to look it over beforehand, lest a passage like Job 18:11 provide an embarrassing surprise.

The titles of the psalms are omitted, on the grounds that they are not original. No great loss, but in the light of that reasoning, one wonders why we find rubrics inserted for the Song of Songs. In most cases, of course, the speakers are clear enough in Hebrew, where gender of speaker and addressee can be indicated by grammatical inflection; since it is clear in Hebrew, it is quite legitimate to indicate the speakers in English as NEB has done. But there is no particular virtue in referring to LXX manuscripts as some kind of authority for these rubrics of dialogue (1:1, note).

A feature that will be particularly bothering to many people is the panel's readiness to transpose rather sizable chunks of material, interrupting the traditional verse numbering. If the translators really feel that they are reconstructing the original order of the book, they are to be commended for their boldness. Kindness to the reader, however, would have dictated some kind of typographical device more eye-catching than an inconspicuous footnote to call attention to what is happening. In Job, a book suspected to have undergone considerable textual displacement, there are 23 transpositions of material from the "canonical" place to some other.

For better or worse, the book of Job has come down to us as Scripture in a certain form. However it was originally written, it was canonized in the order of verses with which we are familiar. Just how far can we feel justified in allowing our scholarly instincts to reconstruct hypothetical originals? Surely we are not going to try to dissect the Pentateuchal strands in translation, or isolate the genuine memoirs of Nehemiah, or push Psalm 29 all the way back to a hypothetical Canaanite original. Nonetheless, questions of canonical criticism and architectural analysis have much to say to translators. This is one of the frontiers on which future trans-

lational activity will take place. Meanwhile we will have to be content with the subjective eclecticism evident in the NEB and virtually every other translation around today.⁸

The question of the original meaning, as well as arrangement, often plagues the conscientious translator. In Genesis 1:2, it is a "mighty wind" rather than the "Spirit of God" that is over the waters of chaos. This has been debated for some time, and it may well be true that at some early stage of the development of the material, the phrase was indeed understood as "mighty wind." One wonders if it really meant this by Exilic times, however. I do not quarrel with the translation—indeed, I rather like it—but I use it to point out a problem. Here the translators have used linguistic archeology to bring to light a new sense for the familiar phrase. But they have failed to do so when the body of water, *yam suph*, is called the "Red Sea" even when it clearly refers to the Gulf of Elath (I Kings 9:26)—bowing to what is obviously a later interpretation of the Hebrew phrase.

Reviews of the NEB, including this one, have given pretty short shrift to the Apocrypha; this is too bad, for there is some good stuff here. Those interested in the difficult textual problems should consult McHardy's introduction. For our purposes here, it may suffice to say that Ecclesiasticus (the name unfortunately used for "Sirach" in the NEB) has been translated from the Greek text of Vaticanus (found in Swete's LXX) "with constant reference . . . to the various forms of the Hebrew text." In fact, the Hebrew readings have not been used a great deal, far less than in the New American Bible or Today's English Version. (In this book, the use of Hebrew at all raises serious canonical questions for those who accept Ecclesiasticus as canonical.) Most conveniently, the entirety of the Greek Esther is provided.

The translators have succeeded brilliantly in their endeavor "to convey the meaning of the original in language which will be the closest natural equivalent." A touch such as found in Ecclesiasticus 46:11, "Then there are the judges, name after famous name . . ." leaves one with some translating experience breathless with admiration. Or consider 31:12, "If you are sitting at a grand table, do not lick your lips and exclaim, 'What a spread.'" One may well cower at the slow measured threat of 18:24, laden with doom: "Think of the wrath you must face in the hour of death, when the time of reckoning comes and he (the Lord) turns away his face." And we may marvel at the psychological insight of the Wisdom of

Solomon, as mediated to us by the NEB panel at 17:12–13: “Fear is nothing but an abandonment of the aid that comes from reason; and hope, defeated by this inward weakness, capitulates before ignorance of the cause by which the torment comes.”

Future translators of this material will hear the footsteps of a giant behind them, as the TEV panel already has. For sheer translational deftness, dexterity, and brilliance, the NEB Apocrypha is one of the finest achievements in the history of the English Bible.

One comment about policy, as it applies to the entire NEB. The archaic second person pronoun and verb forms have been retained in address to God. This is unfortunate, and out of keeping with the thrust of the translation. It is perhaps understandable, though, bearing in mind that its genesis was in 1946, before the RSV was available, let alone the more adventuresome translations following it. It is interesting, however, that Adam addresses God as “you” before the fall, and that Satan in Job 1 addresses God as “you.”

The appearance of commentaries and other study helps based on the NEB is a good indication of its acceptance, as well as incentive for increased use. The Oxford Study Edition (counterpart to the Oxford Annotated of the RSV) is an American production offering brief but expert notes and introductory statements. Its essay on “Literary Forms of the Bible” is masterfully done. Cambridge, for its part, is publishing, as the New Cambridge Bible, a series of commentaries based on the NEB text. A.E. Harvey’s *Companion to the New Testament of the New English Bible* (Oxford and Cambridge, 1970) is a useful one-volume commentary.

In spite of the misgivings I have expressed about some aspects of the OT, I am basically an admirer of both the scholarship and the English expression of the New English Bible. Pedantry is not much in evidence, and the whole of it is free of the musty smell of a translation. It does not read like a translation; that in itself is a splendid accomplishment, but its marshalling of the vigorous resources of contemporary English idiom into such forceful array makes it a triumph.

NOTES

1. Such as Leo Rosten, *Treasury of Jewish Quotations* (New York: Bantam Books edition, 1977), p. 75, where one Donald Ebor is cited as Chairman of the Joint Committee. Of course, there is no reason in the world for Rosten to have been aware of the problem.

2. Information on the background and policy of the NEB is drawn from Coggan's preface, from a small leaflet, *The Story of the New English Bible* (Oxford and Cambridge, 1970), published in conjunction with the issuance of the Bible, and from F.F. Bruce, *History of the Bible in English* (New York: Oxford, 1978).

3. The term "reading" is used in the technical sense of a variant in the manuscript tradition, either of the original or of an ancient translation. It is to be distinguished from "translation," "version," or "rendering," which refer to differences in translation of a given text.

4. The NEB follows the tradition of the KJV and RSV in representing the Hebrew name of God, Yahweh, by the word "LORD," capitalized. On the few occasions where the name is really crucial to the passage, e.g., Exodus 6:3, the Anglicized form JEHOVAH is used, again capitalized.

5. Interestingly, a noted Arabist was among the translators of the KJV. Perhaps there is a Ph.D. dissertation here somewhere.

6. On this matter one should consult the important article by James Barr, "After Five Years: a Retrospect on Two Major Translations of the Bible," *The Heythrop Journal* XV (1974), 381-405. The other major translation is the New American Bible.

7. On matters of English style, the most informed review I have seen, though not especially appreciative, is that of David Daiches, "Translating the Bible," *Commentary*, May 1970, pp. 59-68.

8. On this question, see the review article by J.A. Sanders, "The New English Bible: A Comparison," *Christian Century*, March 18, 1970, pp. 326-328.

APPENDIX

Officers, Committee Members, and Panel Members for the New English Bible Translation Project

OFFICERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE—*Chairman*: J.W. Hunkin (1947-50), A.T.P. Williams (1950-68), Donald Coggan (from 1968); *Vice-Chairman*: C.H. Dodd; *General Director* (1947-65): C.H. Dodd; *Joint Directors* (from 1965): C.H. Dodd, G.R. Driver; *Deputy Director* (from 1968): W.D. McHardy; *Secretary*: G.S. Hendry (1947-49), J.K.S. Reid (from 1949)

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE: George Boobyer (Society of Friends), John Brown (Oxford Univ. Press), R.L. Child (Baptist Union), R.W. David (Cambridge Univ. Press), C.F. Eccleshare (Cambridge Univ. Press), J.L.M. Haire (Churches in Ireland), Thomas Hanlon (Roman Catholic Observer), C.L. Mitton (Methodist Church), H.K. Moulton (British and Foreign Bible Society), D.E. Nineham (Church of England), J.C. O'Neill (Presbyterian Church of England), E.A. Payne (Baptist Union), N.W. Porteous (Church of Scotland), C.H. Roberts (Oxford Univ. Press), C.J. Stranks (Church of England)

THE OLD TESTAMENT PANEL: T.H. Robinson (*Convener* until his death in 1957), G.R. Driver (second *Convener*), L.H. Brockington, J.A. Emerton, A.R. Johnson, W.D. McHardy, N.W. Porteous, B.J. Roberts, H.H. Rowley, C.A. Simpson, N.H. Snaith

THE APOCRYPHA PANEL: W.D. McHardy (*Convener*), W. Barclay, W.H. Cadman, G.B. Caird, C.F.D. Moule, J.R. Porter, G.M. Styler

THE NEW TESTAMENT PANEL: C.H. Dodd (*Convener*), G.S. Duncan, W.F. Howard, G.D. Kilpatrick, T.W. Manson, C.F.D. Moule, J.A.T. Robinson, G.M. Styler, R.V.G. Tasker

OTHER CONTRIBUTING TRANSLATORS: G.W. Anderson, Matthew Black, J.Y. Campbell, J.A.F. Gregg, H.St.J. Hart, F.S. Marsh, John Mauchline, H.G. Meecham, C.R. North, O.S. Rankin, Nigel Turner

THE LITERARY PANEL: A.T.P. Williams (*Convener*), John Carey, Adam Fox, Herbert Grierson, F.H. Kendon, E. Milner-White, Roger Mynors, Arthur Norrington, W.F. Oakeshott, Anne Ridler, Basil Willey

(Information above found in Geoffrey Hunt, *About the New English Bible* [Oxford Univ. Press, 1970], pp. 79-82)

The New American Bible*

by WALTER HARRELSON

The New American Bible (NAB) has already found its place in pulpit, liturgy, study, and classroom. Within the nine-year period of its life it has achieved remarkable success and received very wide commendation. Various study editions of the translations have been printed, some without the textual notes (regrettably), but none, I believe, without the notes at the bottom of the pages or without the introductions to the biblical books. The NAB is clearly a splendid achievement in modern English versions of the Bible.

1. History

This English version had its origins in the decision taken in the 1930's to do a fresh English translation of the Latin Vulgate, one that would not be bound to the English edition of Rheims-Douay. The New Testament appeared in 1941, and much work had by then also been done on the Old Testament (including what Protestants call the Apocrypha, except for I and II Esdras and the Prayer of Manasseh). However, the papal encyclical of Pius XII *Divino Afflante Spiritu* of 1943, and the Second Vatican Council that began in 1962, brought about massive changes in the Roman Catholic world. These events also led to authorization of a direct translation from the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek rather than from the Latin Vulgate version, and to the choice of a vernacular style of English—a style intended to be suitable at once for liturgy and pulpit, for scholarly study by clergy and laity, and for reading of the Bible in the home.

The changes from the original plans were thus considerable, and they took place over a rather long period of time. Portions of the Old Testament had in fact been issued in the translation initially made from the Vulgate. These were bound for a time with portions made directly from the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. Eventually, however, the Bishops' Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (which holds the copyright) entrusted the Catholic Biblical Association of America with the task of doing the entire Bible into a vernacular English that was

**The New American Bible, Translated from the Original Languages with Critical Use of All the Ancient Sources by Members of the Catholic Biblical Association of America: With Textual Notes on Old Testament Readings.* Paterson, N.J.: St. Anthony Guild, 1970.

translated from the original languages, on the basis of the best texts available and with the help of the ablest scholars who could be enlisted.

Joining the largely Catholic team were four non-Catholics: Frank M. Cross, Jr., David Noel Freedman, John Knox, and James A. Sanders. Forty-six other editors and translators are listed as having been involved in the work, along with quite a few others who assisted with study helps, illustrations, and the like. The first edition of the completed work appeared in 1970.

2. Character of the Translation

As noted above, the translation aims to be inclusive in use. It is intended to serve liturgical and pulpit uses as well as be a study Bible and a translation suitable for devotional use and for reading in the home. The recent revolutionary steps taken to encourage the reading and study of the Bible on the part of lay members of the Roman Catholic Church, along with massive reforms in liturgical life, provided the appropriate context for such an all-inclusive effort in Bible translation.

The NAB translators were able to work with great freedom. They had no English language tradition to uphold, such as the RSV translators have had. They did not work as closely with colleagues from the field of English letters as did the translators of the NEB. And they did not, apparently, work quite so closely together as a team as have some of the other translation committees. There appears to have been, at any rate, a good deal of freedom provided the translators in their individual or small-group work on particular portions of the Bible.

Some real gains result from these dimensions of freedom. It may also be the case that some of the flaws that one finds in the translation owe something to these aspects of freedom. For example, I find that the translation seems not to have a standard on the matter of word-order; that it has not successfully eliminated English words or expressions that lack a fairly widespread currency; and that it seems to follow somewhat different approaches to reliance upon the ancient versions in the different portions of the translation. The use of the LXX in the books of Samuel, for example, is remarkably large. These are, however, the kinds of matters that can easily enough be handled in revisions to come.

The NAB in most respects seems to me to resemble the RSV more than it resembles the NEB or the JB, the other two translations with which it has great affinity. It is a fresh translation marked by restraint in the use of conjecture or in departures

from the Masoretic Hebrew text. While there are some instances of resort to conjecture, the translators have been conservative in this regard. They have shown much interest in calling attention to peculiarities of word-order in English when (often) the Hebrew order is not the normal one. Although not a literal or word-for-word translation by any means, the NAB still strives for the flavor of the order and the style of the ancient languages. It certainly does not operate on the principle of finding the "dynamic equivalent" of the ancient language in the "target" language.

3. The Form of the Edition

The NAB edition with which I am working is an inexpensive one, published with several mistakes in the introductions to the biblical books and in the notes, showing occasional indications of carelessness in the proof-reading of the text itself, and lacking the textual notes on the Old Testament and Apocrypha. Despite the fact that it is an inexpensive edition and produced without adequate care, it is a superb example of readability. The more carefully published editions, on better paper, are even more easily read. Editors and technical staff are to be praised for this achievement.

The type is clear, the ink dark enough for very easy reading, and the layout of the publication is done with great care. Chapter headings are placed in the center of the columns. Subject headings are brief, lucid, and printed in heavy type and placed at the left margin. Poetry is printed as poetry, as is some rhythmic prose that may not be poetry at all. The verse numbers normally appear at the far left margin of the column, with space between them and the beginning of the text. An asterisk calls attention to the first set of notes at the bottom of the pages, which are cross-references to appropriate biblical passages. A dagger in the text indicates the presence, in the lower section at the bottom of the pages, of an explanatory note. The asterisks and daggers do not intrude badly upon the vision of the reader.

The fact that the editors have chosen not to include footnote indications of textual variations or corruptions makes the text all the more readable, of course. Whether the decision to collect all such textual notes into a single appendix has been a good thing will require further reflection, perhaps, but it certainly contributes to easy reading of the biblical translation itself.

Regarding punctuation, the translators have wisely eliminated one set of quotation marks by the decision to use a colon, rather than to enclose a following speech in quotation marks. In this way they are able to be much more sparing in the use of quotation marks within quotation marks. The result is very satisfactory,

since more is gained in ease of reading than is lost in terms of possible confusion. Indeed, it may well be the case that the reader will be able the better to know who is speaking at a given time by this reduction of the frequency of use of quotation marks.

In the way that colons, semicolons, and commas are used, as well as by fairly frequent use of the dash, the translators have contributed clarity to the text and made it read easily. An example from Isaiah 3:12 will indicate this point.

My people—a babe in arms will be their tyrant,
and women will rule them!

O my people, your leaders mislead,
they destroy the paths you should follow.

Many other examples could be given, and will be reflected in materials quoted below for other purposes.

Attention is called in the notes to differences between the Hebrew versification and chapter enumerations and that of the other ancient versions. Normally, the Hebrew versification is followed, in contrast to most English versions. Occasionally there are transpositions of verses or sections, with explanations given in the notes for such relocations. For example, the translators have seen fit to relocate Hosea 1:10–2:1 [Hebrew and NAB 2:1–3] after chapter 3.

The spelling of place names and proper names breaks with the Vulgate and Rheims-Douay and follows the system found in modern English versions.

4. *Deficiencies of Style*

There is one major difficulty with the NAB, in my judgment. There are too many instances of infelicity of style, awkwardness in word order, and use of unsatisfactory or uncommon words or terms. Certainly, such matters are often ones of personal taste, and thus my own sensibilities may be of little weight. Not all of the examples given below, however, are likely to be due merely to differences between the reviewer's taste and that of the translators.

In Exodus 20:26 we read: "You must not go up by steps to my altar, on which you must not be indecently uncovered." The sense is plain, but the translators have not given enough attention to just how that expression reads or sounds.

Beginning in Genesis 8:20, the translators use "holocaust" for the Hebrew term *'ōlāh*. This Greek term has just the right meaning for the Hebrew one, of course, but to the modern English reader "holocaust" can only call to mind the horrors of Nazi Germany. The decision to employ "holocaust" seems in every way unfortunate.

In Psalm 139:1, 23 the translators have chosen to translate: "O LORD, you have probed me . . ." and "Probe me, O God. . . ." "Probe" is a good term, carrying with it the connotation of a searching out, an investigation in depth. That surely is what the Hebrew verb means. And yet, the translation grates and seems stylistically unsatisfactory. It seems to me much better to stay with "search" or "examine," which one finds in the other recent English versions.

In Ecclesiastes 12:13 NAB has: "Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is man's all." "Man's all" is too laconic and unfelicitous. Surely, a better reading is "the whole duty of man," the customary rendering, or the NEB's "there is no more to man than this."

In Psalm 46:5 [v. 4 in most other English editions] the translators decided to handle the matter of a river whose streams make glad the city of God by translating: "There is a stream whose runlets gladden the city of God." That may be fine, but must it not be insisted that very few English readers will ever before have read or heard the word "runlet"? In the same psalm, at verse 10 [v. 9], NAB translates: "He has stopped wars to the end of the earth." That is certainly accurate, but it feels a bit unsatisfactory. If one is to get away from "makes war cease" it might be better to translate: "He has brought war to an end throughout the earth."

Once more in the same psalm we have an uncommon use. In verse 11 [v. 10] we have "Desist! and confess that I am God." I like the punctuation that leaves the "and" uncapitalized. But the use of "desist" seems to me unwise from the point of view of style and of English usage. "Be still!" or "Silence!" would work very well.

A few mistranslations occur, at least in my judgment. In Psalm 73:15 the translators have rendered: "Had I thought, 'I will speak as they do.'" It seems to me virtually certain that the poet is *not* referring to the scoffing comments of the wicked as found in verses 10 and 11. He is rather referring to the temptation he himself had faced, and overcome, of making public the sentiment found in verses 13 and 14.

Another mistranslation, much more understandable, is the rendering of Exodus 20:2 as follows: "I, the LORD, am your God." In my view, the other alternative is so much the better that it must be followed: "I am the LORD your God." Yahweh is presenting himself; the term the LORD is not simply in apposition with the personal pronoun.

In Exodus 20:17 my edition of NAB does not include the clause "You shall not covet your neighbor's house(hold)." It may be that a simple printer's error has occurred, for the textual notes do not

point to a decision on the part of the translators to eliminate this opening clause. In any event, my NAB now reads for Exodus 20:17: "You shall not covet your neighbor's wife, nor his male or female slave, nor his ox or ass, nor anything else that belongs to him." It is an excellent translation, and the elimination of the opening clause may well be justified on the basis of Deuteronomy 5:21 and the judgment that Exodus' reference to "household" is well covered in the following enumeration. But some reference to this decision ought to appear in the textual notes or in the explanatory notes at the bottom of the page.

Psalm 104:26 also contains a faulty translation, I believe. We have the following translation:

And where ships move about
with Leviathan, which you formed to
make sport of it.

The much more natural translation is: "and Leviathan, whom you formed to sport in it [namely, the sea]." The NEB and JB both understand Leviathan to have been created as Yahweh's plaything. That seems to me to be unlikely enough. But that Leviathan should have been formed by Yahweh in order to make sport of it or to taunt it seems to me highly implausible as a sentiment of this poet.

Several occurrences of unusual word order apparently appear because of the translators' decision to call attention to an unusual word order in the original by a similar device in English even where the resultant expression is jarringly infelicitous. This seems to me to be unnecessary and unwise. I have noted many occurrences of unusual English word order that I think are excellent. But some are poor, among them the following:

Psalm 73:23	Yet with you I shall always be.
Psalm 44:6 [v. 5]	Our foes through you we struck down.
Psalm 48:11 [v. 10]	Of justice your right hand is full.

In a subsequent revision it will be possible to eliminate such instances, if they should be eliminated. I do know how difficult this matter is for translators. Once again, I may be expressing only my own personal taste.

5. Excellent Translations

But by far the larger space belongs in this review to those instances in which the NAB has come up with memorable and apt translations. Among the many in my notes let me mention the following ones.

In Genesis 1:1 we find: "In the beginning, when God created the heavens and the earth. . . ." This translation keeps the definiteness and once-for-all character of the Hebrew word (*bere'shith*) with which the Bible opens. At the same time, it expresses the temporal dimension that opening lines of creation stories, including the ones with which the Bible opens, surely contain. It is an exactly correct solution to a problem that has troubled translators through the centuries. And it is better, I think, than the very good translation of NEB: "In the beginning of creation, when God made heaven and earth. . . ."

Another right rendering is the inclusion in Genesis 3:6 of the Hebrew expression *'immāh* which often has been omitted by translators. The NAB has: "And she gave some [of the fruit] to her husband, who was with her, and he ate." The omission of "who was with her" in RSV and NEB is a serious matter, for it eliminates clear evidence that *the narrator* understood that the man was present with the woman during the entire conversation with the snake. Both the man and the woman share, and share equally, in the act of disobedience; that is what the narrator knows and says. The traditional elimination of the preposition with its pronominal suffix has been of no small negative consequence in the history of exegesis down to the present.

Since we have criticized the use of a somewhat unusual English word order above, we should give an example of a very effective use. In Numbers 12:6–8 we have the following speech of Yahweh set out as poetry:

Should there be a prophet among you,
 in visions will I reveal myself to him,
 in dreams will I speak to him;
 Not so with my servant Moses!
 Throughout my house he bears my trust;
 face to face I speak to him,
 plainly and not in riddles.
 The presence of the LORD he beholds.

That is a splendid translation of a quite complex set of Hebrew lines. And in the same chapter, a few verses along, we have in vss. 10–14 a fine example of the translators' skill in handling a conversation between God and the people. It is clear, the punctuation does not get out of hand, and it reads very well:

When Aaron turned and saw her [Miriam] a leper, ¹¹"Ah, my lord!" he said to Moses, "please do not charge us with the sin that we have foolishly committed! ¹²Let her not thus be like the stillborn babe that comes forth from its mother's womb with its flesh half consumed." ¹³Then Moses cried to the LORD, "Please, not this! Pray, heal her!" ¹⁴But the LORD answered Moses, "Suppose her father had spit in her face, would she not hide in shame for

seven days? Let her be confined outside the camp for seven days; only then may she be brought back."

In II Samuel 1:21 we have a fine line from a good translation of David's lament over the death of Saul and Jonathan: "Upon you [the mountains] lie begrimed the warriors' shields." While the Hebrew simply has "for there upon the mountains was the shield of the mighty defiled," it seems entirely appropriate for the mountains to continue to be addressed in the second person, as NAB's translation assumes.

In the same poem, NAB translates in 1:19: "How can the warriors have fallen!" That too is an excellent translation: in my view, it is better than the customary apostrophe: "How are the mighty fallen!"

In a number of instances the NAB translators use colloquial English to excellent effect. In Judith 14:18 Bagoas is made to say when he sees the headless Holofernes in the tent, "The slaves have duped us!" There is frequent use of this term for deception or tricking.

In the legal materials we also find masterfully clear English translations of several of the complex laws. One that I like very much is the rendering of Exodus 21:35: "When one man's ox hurts another's ox so badly that it dies, they shall sell the live ox and divide this money as well as the dead animal equally between them." Another is the law concerning the female slave in Exodus 21:7-11:

"When a man sells his daughter as a slave, she shall not go free as male slaves do. ⁸But if her master, who had destined her for himself, dislikes her, he shall let her be redeemed. He has no right to sell her to a foreigner, since he has broken faith with her.

⁹If he destines her for his son, he shall treat her like a daughter. ¹⁰If he takes another wife, he shall not withhold her food, her clothing, or her conjugal rights. ¹¹If he does not grant her these three things, she shall be given her freedom absolutely, without cost to her."

It is difficult to imagine how such a circumstantial, lucid, and still literal translation could be made better.

Scholars have recognized in recent years that the messianic oracle on Bethlehem-Ephratha found in Micah 5:1-4 probably comes to an end with the Hebrew expression *w^ehāyāh zeh shālôm*. The question is how best to translate the clause. NAB has a good translation: "He shall be peace." I would prefer "And he shall be (or shall be called) Peace," capitalizing the last term as a kind of parallel to the messianic titles of Isaiah 9:1-7. But the NAB closes the oracle with the reference to the one who shall be peace, rightly identifying the remainder of verse 4 as a part of the following oracle.

This list of good translations could continue, but we will break off at this point and look at the question of how the NAB translators have made use of new textual materials and how they have informed readers of such use.

6. Use of the Ancient Texts and Versions

In the 124 pages of textual notes that are found at the end of some editions of the NAB, a massive amount of up-to-date textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible and the Apocryphal books is to be found. I have used these materials extensively in working on proposed revisions of the RSV translation of the books of I and II Samuel. The notes are very succinct, perhaps too succinct. They are transliterated according to a familiar and quite usable scheme. It is regrettable that the printing of the notes did not include identification, at the top of each page, of the biblical book to which the notes pertain. In later editions that might be done. Indeed, it might be wise to refer to the page numbers of the Bible to which the notes pertain, thereby facilitating the reader's use of these notes.

It might also be the case that the holders of the copyright would want to refuse to let publishers print the NAB without these notes. My own inexpensive copy of NAB lacks them. They are published separately by the St. Anthony's Guild, Paterson, N.J., but that hardly suffices. In my judgment the NAB should not exist without these notes, since the translators have seen fit to make no reference in the text itself to any of the textual problems treated in the notes.

Textual notes on the books of the Protestant Apocrypha are particularly welcome, since they reflect a great deal of fresh textual study and sum up in very brief form the results of textual scholarship on these books.

The textual materials available to the translators were rich indeed. Some of the translators were in possession of unpublished materials that could be put to use in a modern English translation for the first time. Happily, most of this material is now available to the scholarly world, as for example in the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (1967/77).

A few examples of good usage of the materials available now follow. In II Samuel 23:1 NAB reads: "The utterance of the man God raised up." The Masoretic text has "The utterance of the one who was raised on high," or the like. The Hebrew is *huqam 'āl*. One of the Qumran manuscripts reads *hēqîm 'ēl*, "the one God raised up." That text seems to be exactly right.

We have an excellent translation in II Samuel 6:6: "When they came to the threshing floor of Nodan, Uzzah reached out his

hand to the ark of God and steadied it, for the oxen were making it tip." The reading "Nodan" for "Nacon" is supported by the Qumran materials and by some LXX manuscripts. The reading "for the oxen were making it tip" is a fine translation based on a repointing of the Hebrew *shāmeṭû* to *shemāṭô*. The verb thus refers to the sliding ark, not to the stumbling oxen.

The NAB encloses in brackets one expression that I would have preferred to see in the text. In II Samuel 11:3 we have a text that, on the basis of Qumran and Josephus would read as follows: "She is Bathsheba, daughter of Eliam, and wife of Joab's armor-bearer Uriah the Hittite." That is NAB's translation except for the fact that the words "Joab's armor-bearer," which are found in the Qumran text and in Josephus, are placed in brackets.

7. Missed Opportunities

Every translator has a set of favorite renderings that have not as yet found their way into the accepted translations. I have some too. One of these occurs in Psalm 8. The NAB has an excellent translation of this hymn of praise to God the Creator. It handles the opening part of the poem perfectly, I believe:

- ¹[1] O LORD, our LORD,
 how glorious is your name over all the earth!
 You have exalted your majesty above the heavens.
- ²[2] Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings
 you have fashioned praise because of your foes,
 to silence the hostile and the vengeful.

I remain convinced that what comes from the mouth of babes and infants both praises God and silences God's enemies.

But in verse nine [eight], where we have the reference to the sea monster who moves along on the paths or passages of the seas, the NAB has remained with the limp translation "whatever." The appearance of the Hebrew term *'ōbhēr* at the beginning of this laconic half-line seems to me much too weighty to justify or allow such a tame translation. I would like to read "the One who passes along the paths of the seas," thus making the reference to the sea monster, or Leviathan, the more unmistakable. Psalm 104:26 has the creature created to sport and cavort in the sea; that is its proper work. Psalm 8:9 identifies the creature as under the sway of human authority, just as are all other creatures called into being by God. And Genesis 1:21 underscores the fact that God himself created these monsters (the verb used is the special one for divine creation, *bārā*).

In II Samuel 23:7 NAB follows the lead of most translations in dropping the closing Hebrew word in the poem identified as David's last words. I regret that decision. It is true that the text is

difficult, but I think that the translators stopped too soon in their rendering: "He who wishes to touch them [the thorns, a simile for the wicked] must arm himself with iron and the shaft of a spear, and they must be consumed by fire." The last line is the problem. The poet, I believe, is drawing the analogy to the wicked as thorns, somewhat in the manner of Jotham in the fable of Judges 9:15. He had pointed out that one is wise to touch the wicked only with care, as one touches thorns with an iron instrument or the shaft of a spear. But the poet does not say, I believe, that they must be consumed by fire. He rather stresses how quickly thorns are consumed by fire after having been gathered up with such great difficulty. I would translate the last line as follows: "and they will be consumed by the fire in a single sitting." This is a possible rendering of the Hebrew *bashshābheth*, and it fits the customs of the ancient East very well: the use of brambles and thorns for warming oneself and for cooking when other fuel is not available, even though such fuel is very quickly consumed and hardly repays all the effort expended in gathering it.

8. *The Explanatory Notes*

At the beginning of each book and at the bottom of each page the reader finds helps to understanding the text. They are very good. Occasionally readers may be put off by the explicit assertions that the faith of ancient Israel remained imperfect, finding its completion in Christ, and by the way in which this claim is supported. But I find a remarkably sensitive treatment of theological issues in these notes. The writers frequently observe that not all Catholic scholars accept the position being presented.

In the introductory notes to the individual books or to sections of the Bible a great deal of information is packed into brief paragraphs: information on the contents of the book, the types of literature found, the argument of the book, including summaries of the thought of the writer or writers in question. Theological questions are not at all ignored, but (as noted above) the authors usually avoid any suggestion of a dogmatic understanding that must be accepted.

The same kind of treatment is found in the explanatory notes. In the notes on the Psalms, which I have examined with some care, the authors identify the uses of particular psalms in the worship of the Church, call attention to the ways in which certain psalms have been understood to find fulfillment in the Christian revelation, and also show the importance for certain basic theological understandings that a given psalm or passage has. These notes are far from a commentary on the Bible, of course. Space

allows for only the briefest of comments. Yet, the translation would be the poorer without these fine notes.

The cross-references to other biblical passages seem to strike the right balance between reference to all possible passages that might be of interest and value and reference only to those unmistakably akin to the one in question. I find the list an excellent one, and also find that it is very easy to use.

9. Male-oriented Language

The translators seem to have made no attempt to reduce the dominance of masculine-oriented language in the Bible. The translators of the RSV are currently making such an attempt and have gained some experience in doing so. I suspect that in a forthcoming edition of the NAB a similar attempt will be made. I see much to be gained and little to be lost in this kind of an effort.

It is certainly the case that some passages are the product of a male-dominated society and that it would be wrong to change the language. But in many instances it is also the case that the reference is to the human being, not to a man or to men. In those instances it is worthwhile to strain the English language to find a way of showing that such references are not male-oriented. One of the most difficult examples I know is Psalm 8. If the NAB were to be changed in such a way as to avoid using masculine language when the whole human community is clearly intended, it might have to read somewhat as follows (I change only the terms required to effect this change):

²O LORD, our LORD,

how glorious is your name over all the earth!

You have exalted your majesty above the heavens.

³Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings

you have fashioned praise because of your foes,
to silence the hostile and the vengeful.

⁴When I behold your heavens, the work of your fingers,
the moon and the stars which you set in place—

⁵What are human beings that you should be mindful of them,
or mortals that you should care for them?

⁶You have made them little less than the angels,
and crowned them with glory and honor.

⁷You have given them rule over the works of your hands,
putting all things under their feet:

⁸All sheep and oxen,
yes, and the beasts of the field,

⁹The birds of the air, the fishes of the sea,
and whatever swims the paths of the seas.

¹⁰O LORD, our LORD,

how glorious is your name over all the earth!

I find such a translation to be both faithful to the Hebrew text and a better rendition of what the contemporary Christian community should wish to say, given the unmistakable distortions of language that have done harm to both men and women over the centuries. It is worth our while, therefore, to find ways to remove the masculine-dominated language that should and can be eliminated.

The NAB is in some respects the best available English translation of the Bible. I have sought to show some ways in which that is true, and some ways in which a revised edition might give it even greater right to such designation.

APPENDIX

Participants in the New American Bible Translation Project

BISHOPS' COMMITTEE OF THE CONFRATERNITY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE: Charles P. Greco (Chairman), Joseph T. McGucken, Vincent S. Waters, Romeo Blanchette, Christopher J. Weldon.

EDITORIAL BOARD: Louis F. Hartman [†1970] (Chairman for the Old Testament), Myles M. Bourke (Chairman for the New Testament), Patrick W. Skehan (Vice-Chairman), Stephen J. Hartdegen (Secretary), Gerard S. Sloyan (English Editor for the New Testament)

ASSOCIATE EDITORS AND TRANSLATORS: Edward P. Arbez [†1967], Edward J. Byrne [†1952], Edward A. Cerny [†1962], Christian P. Ceroke, John J. Collins, M. Emmanuel Collins, Frank M. Cross, Jr., Patrick Cummins [†1968], Antonine A. DeGuglielmo, Alexander A. Di Lella, John J. Dougherty, William A. Dowd, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, David Noel Freedman, Michael J. Gruenthaner [†1962], Thomas P. Halton, Hilary Hayden, Maurice A. Hofer, John Knox, Justin Trelner [†1949], Richard Kugelman, Joseph L. Lilly [†1952], Roderick F. MacKenzie, Edward A. Mangan [†1955], Daniel W. Martin, William H. McClellan [†1951], James M. McGlinchey [†1961], Frederick Moriarty, Richard T. Murphy, Roland E. Murphy, William L. Newton, Eberhard Olinger [†1967], Charles H. Pickar, Jerome D. Quinn, Christopher Rehwinkel, John F. Rowan [†1953], James A. Sanders, Raymond Schoeder, Edward F. Siegman [†1967], David M. Stanley, Matthew P. Stapleton, John E. Steinmueller, John Ujlaki [†1964], Bruce Vawter, John P. Weisengoff

The Living Bible*

by JAMES D. SMART

The *May Record* contained an elaborate two-page advertisement for a book which calls itself *The Living Bible*. Also, the board of congregational life in its material for Family Sunday suggested readings from this book which would require purchase of it and would imply that a board of our church was recommending public use of it as a valid substitute for authentic scholarly translations of the Bible. Even the promoters of this book do not dare to call it a translation of the Bible. They call it a "paraphrase" by which they can only mean that from time to time they put into the text phrases which have no equivalents in the original text but which they think make better and easier reading. Ninety-eight percent of the time the book proceeds as though it were just another translation of the Bible in modern language.

Enthusiasts for it use it as though it were the most up-to-date version of the Bible. Recently when I was addressing a conference of Mennonite ministers and students in Indiana, the ministers complained that their people who were wedded to the King James version until just yesterday were now carrying this book to church and demanding that readings in the service of worship should be from it. Presbyterians—and others—will do well to examine it with some care before they invest in it.

First, let us look at two passages in John's Gospel. We are all familiar with the great opening verses: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God; all things were made through him and without him was not anything made that was made." (RSV) The author of the Gospel had an important reason for beginning in this way. He wished to make clear to the church, a church in which there were serious differences about what to do with the Old Testament, that the word of God in creation, the word of God to which Israel's prophets, psalmists, wise men and historians had long borne witness and the word incarnate in Jesus Christ were one and the same word. But what words does *The Living Bible* put into the mouth of the author of this Gospel? "Before anything else existed, there was Christ, with God. He has always

*The reader is again reminded (see Preface) that this article first appeared under the title "The Invented Bible" in *The Presbyterian Record* (July-Aug. 1976) and is reproduced here by permission of the Editor. Several small changes have been made in punctuation and wording.—Ed.

been alive and is himself God. He created everything there is—nothing exists that he didn't make." The purpose of the author in beginning as he did is completely frustrated.

In John 1:17 we read in RSV "For the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ." The word "law" translating the Greek *nomos* has behind it the Hebrew word *Torah*, which was the name used by the Jews for the Pentateuch and often signified the whole Old Testament. "Law" suggests "laws" to us, but *Torah* was much more than laws. Before all else it was the story of God's loving care for Israel and for mankind. A glance at John 5:46 makes clear that for the author of this Gospel the *Torah* of Moses was primarily witness to the same Word that in the fulness of time was incarnate in Jesus. But how does *The Living Bible* give us John 1:17? "For Moses gave us only the Law with its rigid demands and merciless justice, while Jesus Christ brought us loving forgiveness as well." Not only is this *not* what the author wrote but it promotes the false conception of the Old Testament as "rigid" and "merciless" in its enforcement of a legal kind of justice in contrast to a New Testament that knows only loving forgiveness. Justice in the Old Testament is never merciless. How can anyone forget that the God of the Old Testament is a God who deals with his people in love and asks of them that they should respond to him and to their fellows with a love like his?

It is startling to read in Luke 1 that this evangelist began his Gospel "Dear friend who loves God." This is not a translation—or a paraphrase of anything Luke wrote—but a fanciful playing with the name of the patron, Theophilus, to whom Luke addressed his Gospel. Even more startling is it to find the words put in Luke's mouth: "Several biographies of Christ have already been written." No reputable New Testament scholar would ever make the mistake of calling the four Gospels "biographies." That misconception makes impossible an intelligent reading of them. They have not in them the first elements of either an ancient or a modern biography—which is why attempts to write a biography of Jesus are so invariably unsuccessful and have to resort so largely to imaginative reconstruction. The Gospels are not biographies but are testimonies to the decisive revelation of God in Jesus Christ.

In Luke 7:37, where Jesus is being entertained in the house of Simon the Pharisee, the RSV tells how "a woman of the city who was a sinner" precipitated a highly dramatic confrontation between Jesus and his host. But in *The Living Bible* this becomes "a woman of the streets who was a prostitute." Admittedly many preachers assume that this woman was a prostitute. But nothing in the story

validates that assumption. A “sinner” in first century Judaism was anyone who for any reason refused conformity to the 621 laws which defined and guarded the life of the righteous Jew. All Gentiles were sinners. All nonconformists were sinners. Youths attracted by Greek sports or drama or philosophy were sinners. And all such sinners were excluded from the synagogue community and were treated as unbelievers. Therefore *The Living Bible* is injecting into Luke’s story an interpretation for which the text itself provides no support. Another instance of this playing fast and loose with the text is the transformation of Jesus’ words “the Son of Man” in Luke 9:22 and 26 into “I, the Messiah.” It does not occur to the perpetrator of this folly that Jesus had his own very special reason for using the term “Son of Man.” Not everyone would dare to correct Jesus!

The treatment of Mark provides further instances of this disrespect for the original text and confident attempts to improve it. Mark 1:2 in *The Living Bible* reads: “In the book written by the prophet Isaiah God announced that he would send his Son to earth.” A note confesses this is only “implied” but one searches in vain in the original text of verse 2 for any trace of it. In verse 4 John the Baptist “preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins” becomes “taught that all should be baptized as a public announcement of their decision to turn their backs on sin, so that God could forgive them.” But repentance even for John is primarily a turning round to *God* and not just a turning of one’s back on sin. In verse 10 “like a dove” becomes “in the form of a dove” which seems to suggest that God the Holy Spirit took the form of a bird, a dove, at Jesus’ baptism! God incarnate in a bird? In Mark 6:2 the astonishment of Jesus’ fellow townsmen at his embarkation on a prophetic mission which made them say, “Is not this the carpenter?” finds a more abusive expression: “He’s no better than we are. He’s just a carpenter.”

More serious is the attempt to improve Paul in the letter to the Galatians. Paul in the midst of a serious controversy chose his words with extreme care. Each one has to be weighed. Here in chapter 1 *The Living Bible* insists on translating Paul’s word “gospel” as “way to heaven.” It occurs in verse 6 and then in the crucial verse 11. Paul here is defending his gospel as a revelation of God to him in his confrontation with the risen Lord, not something taught him by the Jerusalem apostles. His own status as an apostle equal in authority with Peter and James is at stake. What was revealed to him when (verse 16) Christ was revealed *in* him and he began his lifelong life *in Christ* was the life of the new age, the life of the new creation, which began now and would come to its fulfill-

ment in eternity. Paul's focus was not on heaven but on a kingdom of heaven that he saw breaking into time now and transforming human life.

Nothing has brought more reproach on Christianity in the past century than the representation of it as primarily "a way to heaven" that encourages people in a passivity toward the injustices and miseries of the present world. It is sad to see it at this date foisted on Paul as his Gospel—pie in the sky by and by. There is also an unfortunate version of verse 15 which completely conceals the assertion of Paul that before ever he became a Christian he knew himself marked out from before his birth and called to perform some special service for God.

There is space only for a glance at the Old Testament. In Isaiah's account of his visionary experience of God his confession "I am a man of unclean lips and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips" becomes in *The Living Bible*, "I am a foul-mouthed sinner, a member of a sinful, foul-mouthed race," which gives a totally false conception of Isaiah's concern. Bad language was not the problem but a total corruption of life which was poisoning the Judean community. The sin was social, economic and political.

The treatment of Isaiah 40 ff. is especially bad. 40:2 "she has received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins" becomes "the Lord will give her twice as many blessings as he gave her punishment before." This simply is not what the prophet wrote. In 40:21 the prophet's magnificent arraignment of a people careless of the great traditions of its faith: "Have you not known? Have you not heard? Has it not been told you from the beginning? Have you not understood from the foundations of the earth?" becomes tamely and inaccurately: "Are you so ignorant? Are you so deaf to the words of God—the words he gave before the worlds began?" Why would the prophet point to words "before the worlds began" rather than to words that had been crucial in the history of Israel? 40:26 has to be prettied up by likening God's control of the procession of the stars to a shepherd leading his sheep, calling each by its pet name and counting them to see that none is lost or strayed!

The boldest insertions begin in chapter 41. In verse 5 we are told: "The lands beyond the sea watch in fear and wait for word of Cyrus' new campaigns." No issue in the interpretation of these chapters is more hotly debated by scholars than the identity of the mysterious figure who is to win victories for God. Some say it is the Israel of the future. Calvin saw it as Abraham. Others identify it as Cyrus who is mentioned only in 44:28 and 45:1. Still others hold those two mentions of Cyrus to be clearly later editorial

intrusions into the text. *The Living Bible* settles the matter once and for all. It inserts the name of Cyrus into eight verses where it does not occur at all in the biblical text and invents whole sentences to describe his conquest of Babylon. In 43:14 where the text is so broken that no scholar can do more than speculate about the original meaning, *The Living Bible*, untouched by knowledge of the Hebrew, proceeds boldly: "I will send an invading army against Babylon that will walk in almost unscathed. The boasts of the Babylonians will turn to cries of fear." A verse such as this can only make one wonder whether the producers of this "Bible" have any knowledge of the original languages.

What is astonishing about the circulation of this book is that it is being bought mainly by people who in the past have been concerned that they should have an "infallible" Bible. The King James version had their confidence for long years and they rejected all the modern translations which were produced by competent scholars. But now they have recognized that the language of a 17th-century version is a barrier to 20th-century understanding. Exposed by the Tyndale Press to a Bible in modern language, they have embraced it enthusiastically. Some seem almost inclined to make this their "infallible" Bible of today!! But surely Presbyterians, with their tradition of respect for sound scholarship, and their sense of awe before the testimony of prophets and apostles, will look carefully before they make this specious volume a substitute for those translations of the Bible that by their integrity have won the approval of the major churches of the world.

Today's English Version or The Good News Bible

by W. F. STINESPRING

It was with considerable pleasure that I received the offer to contribute to this symposium on new English versions of the Bible, since I have had a strong interest in this subject for many years, and have expressed this interest in writing on several occasions.¹ It is especially gratifying to be able to comment on TEV (GNB) since I have not hitherto had that opportunity.

Already in my hands as I begin to write are two copies of TEV: the regular edition, a gift of Keith Crim, a participant in this symposium; and a "Giant Print" edition, a gracious gift from my wife to aid my declining eyesight, and without which I might not have been able to undertake this assignment. These two editions are much the same, except that the regular edition is decorated here and there with some intriguing pen sketches of the events and characters in the text nearby, while the very useful Subject Index at the end of the book is omitted from the Giant Print edition, and the latter has the "Words of Christ in Red" (like some of the older editions of KJV, though this principle is not applied to the Old Testament as it was in the older so-called red-letter Bibles).

This translation was produced by the American Bible Society in 1976 at the request of the United Bible Societies and with the help of a consultant from the British and Foreign Bible Society. A British edition is being prepared to take account of the differences in spelling and vocabulary on the two sides of the Atlantic. Perhaps this is the more necessary, since the language in the edition which is being considered here might perhaps be characterized as American colloquial, called in the Foreword a "standard, everyday, natural form of English."

Not only is the language innovative, but other features also. Formerly, the ABS (and its affiliated societies) were so conservative that they would publish in English only the KJV, and that "without note or comment." But when RSV was completed in 1952, ABS began to publish portions of it. Then in 1962 came the Oxford Annotated Bible, using the text of RSV, with notes, comments, introductions, and explanations galore. This was a great success. The addition of the Apocrypha came in 1965, and a whole new edition in 1973. In the meantime came JB in 1966 with

numerous notes, comments, and other explanatory material. Being of Roman Catholic origin, it also of course included the Apocrypha. JB sold well and was read by many American Protestants. In 1970 NEB came, with introductions to the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, and the New Testament, plus a considerable number of footnotes. Though British Protestant in origin it has sold well in the U.S.A. Recently an American Study Edition has appeared, with many more notes and comments. Shortly after NEB came NAB, an American Catholic version, containing not only the Apocrypha but also an introduction to each book, many explanatory footnotes, and a section at the end on Biblical theology and geography with a set of maps. About the same time there appeared the so-called Living Bible, a paraphrased version with footnotes on nearly every page in addition to explanatory expansions in the text itself. Though this version emanated from conservative circles, perhaps as a foil to the supposed radicalism of such Bibles as RSV and NEB, it sold and was read widely. Finally, there is NIV, of which I have no knowledge, though it is included in this symposium.

Great changes have taken place in the last quarter of a century. More ministers have been going to seminaries and more church members have been going to college. To more and more Bible-reading people, even the most devout, the KJV was becoming more and more unintelligible, though still revered as a precious monument of English literature, like the works of Chaucer and Shakespeare. But because the Bible is also the basic document of their religion, its readers wanted easier access to its meaning and message. Thus they welcomed new translations with notes, comments, introductions, explanatory articles, maps, and the like. Such translations began to flood the market and were bought in millions of copies, with consequent decline in sales of ABS offerings.

This of course is not the full story, but it will give an idea of what was happening. Another point to be kept in mind is that KJV is not only obsolete in its English idiom, but also obsolete in scholarship. The translators of 1611 did a remarkably good job in their day, but the fact remains that the greatest advances in archaeological discovery in the Near and Middle East and in scholarly understandings of the ancient Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic languages have taken place during the present century, and indeed one might say, in the last half-century. These discoveries have provided scholars and publishers with strong motivation to produce new translations and new commentaries in the field of Biblical studies.

At any rate, ABS came out in 1966 with its TEV of the New Testament, as a sort of trial balloon, like RSV in 1946 and NEB in 1961. This New Testament was a great success, and so it was decided to undertake the much more difficult task of producing a new Old Testament. The task took ten years, and the product is now before us.

So we begin by looking at the format. There is a Foreword, a Preface, a table of Contents, and an Abbreviations List. Every book has an Introduction; there are chapter headings, section headings, and footnotes, with various comments. At the end we find a Word List (a lexicon of words and phrases not easily understood), a list of New Testament Passages Quoted or Paraphrased from the Septuagint (to aid readers who try to look up an Old Testament passage quoted in the New Testament and find that the passage in their Old Testament, translated from the Hebrew, does not agree with the New Testament passage taken from the Septuagint or Greek Old Testament; no other Bible has this commendable feature), a table of the Chronology of the Bible (replacing Archbishop Ussher's ridiculous chronology found in some old Bibles), several pages of Maps, a Map Index, and a useful Subject Index (omitted in the Giant Print edition as noted above).

We turn now to the translation itself, beginning with the Old Testament. It so happened that I was preparing a lecture on the Book of Ecclesiastes for a literary club when the first copy of TEV came into my hands. I was using as a text the Anchor Bible edition of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes prepared by my old friend R.B.Y. Scott of Princeton University.² Scott's translation, I thought, had gone about as far as possible in freedom of translation and modernity of idiom, with the possible exception of James Moffatt.³

Somewhat to my surprise, TEV on Ecclesiastes turned out to be a very free translation—freer than RSV, NEB, or even Moffatt or Scott. In fact, it seemed almost as free as LB, which claims only to be a paraphrase, not a translation in the strict sense of the word. Indeed, it reminded me of LB's flippant rendering of Ch. 5, vs. 1: "As you enter the Temple, keep your ears open and your mouth shut! Don't be a fool who doesn't even realize it is sinful to make rash promises to God." So perhaps here is a clue to the literary style of TEV: use a colloquial, conversational idiom, but offer a real translation rather than a paraphrase, by avoiding excessive expansions; if something more is needed to make the meaning clear, put it into a footnote. The most literal modern translation of this verse is in RSV, as follows: "Guard your steps when you go to the house of God; to draw near to listen is better than to offer

the sacrifice of fools; for they do not know that they are doing evil." TEV renders thus: "Be careful about going to the Temple. It is better to go there to learn than to offer sacrifices like foolish people who don't know right from wrong." We note immediately that TEV uses less words than the other versions: "Be careful" instead of "Guard your steps"; "Temple" instead of "house of God"; "who don't know right from wrong" instead of "for they do not know right from wrong." We also note the colloquial form "don't," reducing two words to one and creating a sort of folksy atmosphere, as also in LB.

Before passing to other Biblical books, let us look at the beginning and end of Ecclesiastes. Vs. 1: KJV and RSV have "The words of the Preacher, the son of David, king in Jerusalem." The problem is how to translate the Hebrew word *Qoheleth*, rendered in Greek *Ecclesiastes* and traditionally in English "the Preacher." Scott⁴ in his introduction says the word means "schoolmaster," or "teacher," definitely not "preacher" in the modern sense of that word. Scott also says that this book "is primarily a philosophical work rather than a book of religion." He also has a section on "Qoheleth's Philosophy," yet he refrains from using the word "philosopher" or any other translation, simply transliterating the Hebrew, *Qoheleth*, all the way. Moffatt and NEB avoid the erroneous "the Preacher" by substituting "the Speaker," as though the writer of our book presided over an assembly, which he probably did not. So what did the TEV translator do? He apparently read Scott, took to heart the hints that had been thrown out, and translated *Qoheleth* into "the Philosopher." After all, had not Scott said that the book was a "philosophical work"? So why exercise Scott's caution about using a word that most ordinary people could easily understand in a popular sense?

Well, what about vs. 2, in RSV: "Vanity of vanities, says the Preacher, vanity of vanities! All is vanity." Of course the translators have tried to avoid this "vain" repetition and we have had "utterly vain is everything," "futility of futilities," "vapor of vapors," "thinnest of vapors," "nothing is worthwhile," etc., etc. TEV puts it thus: "It is useless, useless, said the Philosopher. Life is useless, all useless." You can pay your money and take your choice. I want simply to say that I think TEV is right in using the past tense in the phrase "said the Philosopher" instead of "says the Preacher" as in KJV and RSV. It is not a great point, but it does indicate that the translator was looking carefully at his Hebrew text.

Perhaps another example of careful attention to the Hebrew may be found at 3:2 in the famous "time-to" passage. Practically every previous version had said: "a time to be born, and a time to

die,” yet the Hebrew verb *YLD* is not passive, but active, meaning “to bear.” In other words, the implication is that there is a time for your mother to bear you and another time for you to die. Scott acknowledges this in an explanatory note, but lets the traditional translation stand. TEV cleverly changes the construction from infinitive to noun and so avoids the problem of the active verb, thus: “He [meaning God] sets the time for birth and the time for death.” But notice that “He sets” is an expansion, as is the article “the,” in the fashion of LB.

In this connection notice also the radical rewriting of the preceding verse (3:1). The very literal RSV renders thus:

For everything there is a season,
And a time for every matter under heaven.

This is of course in Hebrew poetic style, with chiasmic synonymous parallelism (repeating the thought in different words and in reverse order). TEV renders it in prose, eliminates the parallelism, and gratuitously adds a reference to God: “Everything that happens in this world happens at the time God chooses.” This of course is paraphrase—saying what you think is or ought to be the general meaning without much regard for the style of the original, or for any style at all.

Turning now to the end of the book, we fix our attention on 10:20. This is a beautifully poetic verse consisting of two pairs of lines, each pair in parallelism. RSV translates quite literally, thus:

Even in your thought do not curse the king,
nor in your bedchamber curse the rich;
for a bird of the air will carry your voice,
or some winged creature tell the matter.

TEV puts the whole verse into prose thus: “Don’t criticize the king, even silently, and don’t criticize the rich, even in the privacy of your bedroom. A bird might carry the message and tell them what you said.” Here we see something that is too frequently done by TEV, namely two lines of poetic parallelism turned into a single prosy sentence.

11:1 goes this way in TEV: “Invest your money in foreign trade, and one of these days you will make a profit.” This sounds a bit like an enterprising twentieth-century stockbroker, somewhat more colloquial than *The Wall Street Journal*. Traditional Bible readers will hardly recognize that they are dealing with a favorite verse, beautifully poetic, yet somewhat obscure in meaning, as translated in RSV:

Cast your bread upon the waters,
for you will find it after many days.

Actually, the “foreign-trade” interpretation is not new. Moffatt had it in 1925, but managed to keep his translation somewhat poetic, thus:

Trust your goods far and wide at sea,
till you get good returns after a while.

Other translators have been more cautious, though some have suggested a reference to foreign trade in a footnote. Much depends on one’s interpretation of the following verse (11:2), which reads in RSV thus:

Give a portion to seven or even to eight,
for you know not what evil may happen on earth.

Since this verse begins with the word “give,” many exegetes take both verses as references to the desirability of giving charity lavishly. Not so the TEV translators. They come right out and have “the Philosopher” tell us how to play the stock market, thus:

Put your investments in several places—many
places even—because you never know what kind
of bad luck you are going to have in this world.

Perhaps the translators of TEV were warned by the conservative management of the ABS to avoid the implications of higher criticism. This may be the reason why the last sentence of 11:9, “But remember that God is going to judge you for whatever you do,” is not enclosed in brackets or provided with a footnote to say that it is an editorial addition. It is completely out of harmony with Qoheleth’s repeated insistence that often good men suffer while evil men prosper (e.g., 8:11-14), and most modern editions take note of this.

By contrast, notice the treatment of the familiar line, “Remember also your Creator in the days of your youth,” in 12:1. TEV renders thus, quite accurately: “So remember your Creator while you are still young.” It also has this note on the word “Creator”: “The Hebrew expression for ‘your Creator’ sounds like the Hebrew for ‘your grave.’” The TEV translator did not substitute “your grave” for “your Creator,” as Scott did, but he was able and willing to alert the reader to this possibility, perhaps because such a change would be a matter only of textual or lower criticism, which is more tolerated by conservative exegetes.

The first eight verses of Chapter 12 constitute a poetic meditation on aging; it is a pity that here there is no attempt to indicate this poetic structure in the phrasing and the printing, as most translators are now doing. It is very obvious that the words of Qoheleth end with vs. 8 and that the final verses (9 to 14) are by another person, who was a friendly critic, but more more on the

orthodox side. He also may have inserted 11:9, mentioned above; compare 11:9 and 12:14. Again, it is a pity that this possibility could not have been pointed out in a brief footnote, since at least some readers will be puzzled by the lack of literary skill and greater conformity to tradition in this addition, in contrast to nearly all that precedes.

Finally, in the last sentence of vs. 11, something has been put into the text that should have been relegated to a footnote. In Hebrew this sentence simply says, "They have been given by one shepherd." TEV has expanded it, thus: "They have been given by God, the one Shepherd of us all." The identity of this shepherd is much in debate, with many interpreters against the idea that God is meant. The translator should have expressed his or her preference in a footnote instead of creating a paraphrase in the style of LB.

In my opinion, the outstanding recent event in Biblical publication is the Anchor Bible edition of the Song of Songs (Song of Solomon) by Marvin H. Pope,⁵ a native of Durham, alumnus of Duke University, and former instructor in Bible there, now Professor of Northwest Semitic Languages at Yale University. Pope has produced a very large commentary (743 pp.) on a very small Biblical book, because that small book is one of the most difficult in the entire Bible to understand and interpret. Even after Pope's Herculean effort there still remain for him and for others many unsolved problems and questions. Even Pope's translation, undoubtedly the most accurate yet produced, is not easy reading, and requires constant reference to the extensive commentary that follows.

By contrast, TEV on Song of Songs is about the easiest reading in the entire work. It is just a simple, clear, straightforward, sweet little love story. True, eight times the notes tell us that the Hebrew is unclear, but the English is abundantly clear and the story flows on without interruption. In other words, one gets the impression that the translator substituted for the unclear Hebrew what he would have liked the text to say and what he knew the readers would like to read. So, good friends, pay your money (TEV is cheap, AB is not) and take your choice. If you want it cheap and easy and pleasant, take TEV; if you want it costly and difficult and deep and serious, take Pope, for that is the real Song of Songs.

Now, we should have a look at Genesis. The very first verse presents a problem, for the conventional translation, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," assumes *creatio ex nihilo* (creation out of nothing), a theological doctrine dear to many conservatives. Most modern translations, however, includ-

ing even LB, with greater regard for Hebrew grammar, render essentially thus: "When God began to create the heavens and the earth, the earth was without form and void," adding the first clause of vs. 2 to make a complete sentence. According to this translation, the earth was already there, but in a formless condition when God began to work on it, and readers can choose or guess for themselves how it got there. TEV seems to try to straddle the fence between these two interpretations by beginning in the traditional manner, then putting the "when" in the wrong place, thus: "In the beginning, when God created the universe, the earth was formless and desolate." From this, it would be difficult to say whether creation was *ex nihilo* or not. Fortunately, a footnote gives the reader the choice of either of the other two translations.

At the end of vs. 2, what is traditionally called "the Spirit of God" is rendered as "the power of God," with a footnote giving "the spirit of God" or "a wind from God" or "an awesome wind" as alternatives. The last alternative may be the best, since the phrase "of God" or "to God" is sometimes used in Hebrew merely as an intensifying adverb; e.g., in Jonah 3:3 "a city great to God" is properly translated "an exceedingly great city." In the present instance, NEB's "a mighty wind" is an excellent choice of wording. In the same verse, TEV renders "and darkness was upon the face of the deep" with this imaginative overtranslation in the style of LB: "The raging ocean that covered everything was engulfed in total darkness." TEV and LB dislike leaving anything to the imagination, and that may be why they sometimes spoil poetical passages.

But we must hurry on to the Garden of Eden story. TEV makes the proper division in the middle of verse 4 of Chapter 2 without explaining why (that would be to confess the use of higher criticism), but does begin the second story of creation with a new heading, "The Garden of Eden." Whenever there is a paronomasia (play on words), it is indicated in a footnote; e.g., in vs. 7, when man is made from soil of the ground, the note reads: "MAN: The Hebrew words for 'man' and 'ground' have rather similar sounds." In vs. 17, God's ban on the tree of knowledge is expressed thus: "You must not eat the fruit of that tree; if you do, you will die the same day." Now everybody knows that they did eat the fruit of the tree, and did not die that very day, but much later (Gen. 5:5). So what is wrong here? Once again we must invoke Hebrew grammar (semantics, really).

Frequently in Hebrew, the idiom *b'eyom . . .*, "on the day that . . .," followed by an infinitive does not mean exactly twenty-four hours

or the daylight hours, as in English, but simply means an indefinite period of time. Since there is no specific word for "when" in Hebrew, the expression "on the day that" is often used. This is usually best translated as "when." E.g., the very beginning of this story (vs. 4b) says literally, "On the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens," etc. TEV translates correctly thus: "When the Lord God made the universe," etc. Likewise the passage which we are considering, the end of vs. 17, has the same idiom, saying literally: "for on the day that you eat of it you will surely die," but more correctly, "when you eat of it you will surely die." "When" is very close here to meaning "if"; hence "if you eat of it you will surely die" is probably the best rendering. Actually TEV did use "if"—"if you do [eat], you will die the same day." TEV had a good translation, but added the three fatal words, "the same day," and thus made God out to be a liar, agreeing with "the snake" in 3:4. This may be the worst blunder in the entire work.

The tendency to oversimplification may be seen in the blessing on Abraham in 12:3:

I will bless those who bless you,
But I will curse those who curse you.
And through you I will bless all the nations.

The first two lines are clear enough in the Hebrew and in the various versions, though TEV spurns the chiasmic arrangement that puts the object first in the second line in the Hebrew and in practically all other translations. The third line, however, is different; translated literally as a passive, it says:

And through you all the families of the earth will be blessed.

By use of the passive voice, God seems to avoid saying that he will do the blessing. A very similar statement occurs in 18:18. There is considerable controversy about the interpretation. Some consider the verb a reflexive and read in effect: "Through you all the families of the earth shall (or will) bless themselves," as in NJV. Others (e.g., NEB) suggest a reciprocal sense, such as "all the families of the earth will ask to be blessed like you." In other words, in the Hebrew the third line is not so simple, clear, or easy as is the TEV rendering. Recognizing this, the TEV translator put in a footnote suggesting at least the possibility of the reciprocal interpretation. But the question arises: Should the Bible in English be made so simple and easy even where it is not simple and easy in the original?

A surprising oversight occurs in Chap. 38, in the story of Judah's affair with his daughter-in-law Tamar. In vs. 15 it is said that when Judah saw Tamar in disguise by the wayside, he

thought she was a *zonah*, meaning a common prostitute or whore. TEV translates simply “a prostitute.” But when Judah sent his friend Hirah to find the supposed prostitute and pay her off, Hirah, no doubt at the suggestion of Judah, inquires about the *qedeshah* who had been at that place; but nobody knows anything about such a person. In Hebrew *qedeshah* means temple prostitute, and in the Canaanite area where Judah was living at that time it was quite respectable to visit a temple prostitute. TEV uses the single word prostitute both times, and thus obscures Judah’s little trick to save his reputation, although most translators, beginning with Moffatt in 1924, have made the distinction.

It is not surprising to see the ease with which the very enigmatic verse, 49:10, is treated by TEV. This verse is a stanza or strophe, consisting of four lines from that part of the Blessing of Jacob addressed to Judah. Somewhat literally translated it goes as follows:

The sceptre shall not turn away from Judah,
Nor the ruler’s staff from between his feet,
Until Shiloh comes [or, until he comes to Shiloh],
And to him [shall be] the obedience of peoples.

It is the third line which has caused so much argument and conjecture. “Shiloh” makes no sense as the name of a person, and the city could hardly be meant, since it was located in the territory of Ephraim. Some interpreters have tried to give it a messianic meaning (“until the Messiah comes and all peoples or nations obey him and pay him homage,” etc.). In 1962 NJV interpreted “Shiloh” as *shai loh*, meaning “tribute to him” and translated the last two lines thus:

So that tribute shall come to him
And the homage of peoples be his.

In 1970 NEB adopted this idea thus:

so long as tribute is brought to him
and the obedience of the nations is his.

And now TEV (1976) has fallen in line, rendering the whole verse very freely, thus:

Judah will hold the royal sceptre,
And his descendants will always rule.
Nations will bring him tribute
And bow in obedience before him.

Of course TEV in the second line should not have used the word “always,” since it is not in the Hebrew. Incidentally, the interpretation of “between his feet” as “his descendants” also probably came from NEB. It is correct. My former students in Hebrew

know that in the Old Testament the word “feet” is sometimes a euphemism for sex organs. And of course from sex organs come descendants.

Coming to the book of Exodus, we recall that the unfortunate term “the Red Sea” first occurs in that book in various English versions, but never in the Hebrew anywhere. The Hebrew term is *yam suph*, meaning literally “sea of reeds,” which is the translation used by NJV throughout. Moffatt used “Reed Sea,” which is clever, since it sounds good in English and is so similar in sound and sight to the familiar “Red Sea” that readers will recognize it as a substitute.

The term “Red Sea” got into English Bibles because KJV and other early English versions followed in this instance the Septuagint or Greek version instead of the Hebrew. Apparently, to the Greek-speaking Egyptians of about 200 B.C. “Red Sea” was a rather indefinite term for any body of water, large or small, east of Egypt; hence the Septuagint translators used that term to translate *yam suph*. In modern cartography, however, the Red Sea is a clearly defined entity, nearly three hundred miles south of Lower Egypt (where the Hebrews were), more than twelve hundred miles long, about 125 miles wide, and nearly a mile and a half deep. To be sure, the whole story of the Exodus is in a miraculous context, but there are limitations, and even Yahweh might hesitate to lead his small band of people through such a tremendous body of water.

Leaving the Red Sea aside, let us see what *yam suph* or the Reed Sea or the Sea of Reeds, or the Reedy Swamp really seems to mean when we look at a map while examining the passages containing this term. The answer seems to be threefold: (1) any one of a series of small lakes and marshes along the route of the present-day Suez Canal between the Gulf of Suez and the Mediterranean Sea; (2) the Gulf of Suez; (3) the Gulf of Aqaba. This series of meanings was adopted by TEV translators in their Word List under the heading “Red Sea,” where they refer to (1) as “the region generally regarded as the site of the events described in Exodus 13.” They also say that “Red Sea” is “in Hebrew literally ‘Sea of Reeds.’” Unfortunately, they add to their three definitions a fourth, “the Red Sea proper,” which is completely wrong.

Still, progress has been made. Hitherto, new translators have been content to find one new rendering of *yam suph*, such as “Reed Sea” or “Sea of Reeds” and to use it in all occurrences. Now it would appear that TEV is about to use different translations for the different meanings of *yam suph* to make the puzzling moves in Exodus and Numbers more understandable. But let us see what actually appears.

The first occurrence is in Exodus 10:19, translated in TEV as follows:

And the LORD changed the east wind into a very strong west wind, which picked up the locusts and blew them into the Gulf of Suez. Not one locust was left in all of Egypt.

If the locusts were blown from “all of Egypt,” most of them indeed would have gone into the Gulf of Suez, though some of them from Lower Egypt (where the Israelites and the king were) would have gone into “the Sea of Reeds” north of the Gulf of Suez, where the Suez Canal now is. But this translation is more than half right and it should be rated “Good.”

The verse has a footnote referring to the next occurrence of *yam suph* in 13:18. I was hoping that this verse would have the translation “the Sea of Reeds,” with a footnote to the effect that meaning (1) should be taken. Alas and alack! the translation in the text is “the Red Sea”—not really a translation of the Hebrew at all—with a footnote repeating the four meanings of “Red Sea” as given in the Word List. In effect, this is putting a wrong translation in the text, then adding a footnote saying that the translation is wrong. NAB did precisely the same thing with the very same text. So hard does the Red Sea blunder die! It is the same story in 15:4 and 22, but this time there is no footnote to warn the hapless reader.

The next three occurrences in Exodus 23:31; Numbers 14:25; and Numbers 21:4 all use meaning (3), the Gulf of Aqaba, probably correctly. In Numbers 33:8, 10, 11 the situation is very confused even in the Hebrew text, and even more so in TEV. It seems to me that the place of crossing is meant in all three verses; hence the translation should be “the Sea of Reeds.” But TEV has “the Red Sea” in vs. 8, “the Gulf of Suez” in vs. 10, and vs. 11 simply omits the first clause, which reads: “and they departed from the Sea of Reeds.” Thus is confusion worse compounded. The first two occurrences in Deuteronomy, 1:40 and 2:1, are translated correctly as “the Gulf of Aqaba.” But in 11:4 the reference is to the place of crossing in Egypt; again the translation is “the Red Sea,” with a footnote referring to the Word List, which ambiguously explains that this translation is wrong. The same is true of the three occurrences in Joshua, 2:10; 4:23; and 24:6; but no warning footnote is given in these instances. In Judges 11:16 we have “the Gulf of Aqaba,” correctly; likewise in I Kings 9:26. In Nehemiah 9:9 and Psalms 106:7, 9, 22; 136:13, the reference is to the miraculous crossing and the translation is “the Red Sea,” wrongly and with no footnotes. In Psalms 136:15 the phrase “in the Sea of Reeds” is simply omitted. Finally, in Jeremiah 49:21,

where it says, "When Edom falls, . . . the cries of alarm will be heard as far away as the Gulf of Aqaba," the translation is obviously correct.

TEV's handling of this problem represents a good beginning and a missed opportunity. No other translation that I know of has attempted to work out all the meanings of *yam suph* and then use each meaning in its proper context, though several have rid themselves of "the Red Sea." TEV failed to do this, and also failed to capitalize on its own realization that *yam suph* means "the Sea of Reeds," which primarily refers to "a series of lakes and marshes between the Gulf of Suez and the Mediterranean." So I must rate this effort at about a D.

With a comparable geographic problem, I feel that TEV had better success. The words *Cush* and/or *Cushi* occur nearly thirty times in the Hebrew text. Formerly, these words have been translated "Ethiopia" and "Ethiopian" respectively, or in a few cases simply transliterated when the reference was uncertain or *Cushi* appeared to be a personal name. Modern historical research has discovered that there were two areas called *Cush* in ancient times, one in Africa, formerly called Ethiopia, the other in Mesopotamia, where the Kassites (or Cushites) lived.

Two problems then arise for the modern translator: (1) to distinguish between the two areas called Cush; (2) to deal with the change in meaning of the geographical term *Ethiopia*, which in ancient times meant the territory immediately south of Egypt, sometimes even including Nubia or Upper Egypt, whereas now Ethiopia is used as a synonym for Abyssinia, far to the south of Egypt, with the huge territory of Sudan in between. So, the only thing to do in most of these cases is to translate *Cush* as "Sudan" and *Cushi* as "Sudanese," and TEV has done it correctly, with perhaps two exceptions.

Genesis 2:13 is translated thus: "The second river is the Gihon; it flows around the country of Cush." This is an accurate rendering; but there is a footnote saying: "Cush (of Mesopotamia); or Sudan." Since this passage is in the Garden of Eden story and the Garden of Eden is by common consent depicted in Mesopotamia, this Cush must be the Mesopotamian one. The second part of the note is erroneous and should be dropped. The second instance is in Genesis 10, the so-called Table of Nations. It seems to me that we are dealing with the two Cushes in this chapter. In vs. 6 and 7 Cush is connected with Egypt, Libya, Canaan, and South Arabia; in vs. 8 to 12 Cush is connected with Nimrod, a heroic figure of Babylonia and Assyria. Surely the former is the African Cush, the latter the Mesopotamian. A footnote to this effect would have been helpful.

It will now be apparent to the reader that the present writer feels that the term "Red Sea" should not appear anywhere in an English Old Testament. The same is true of such phrases as "the daughter of Zion," "the daughter of Jerusalem," "the daughter of Judah," "the virgin daughter of Zion," "the daughter of Egypt," "the daughter of Babylon," "the daughter of my people," etc., occurring about fifty times, mostly in the books of the prophets. All of these phrases are wrong on two counts: (1) the Hebrew word *bath* in these contexts does not mean "daughter" but "girl" or "maiden," with an affectionate coloring; (2) the following word is not a possessive genitive but an appositional genitive, like "the city of *Durham*" or "she goes by the name of *Mary*" in English; in other words, Jerusalem did not *have* a daughter, Jerusalem *was* a maiden loved by Yahweh.

Thus we can translate "the daughter of Zion" literally as "maiden Zion," but the affectionate coloring is still not there; it would be better to say something like "dear Zion" or "beloved Zion." Likewise, in the book of Ruth, when Naomi calls Ruth *bitti*, the proper translation is "my daughter"; but when Boaz in 2:8 uses the same expression, it obviously does not mean "my daughter"; something like "my dear" would be closer to the mark.

In my article "Zion, Daughter of" in IDBS,⁶ TEV is listed as one of the few English versions that have got rid of the nonexistent Daughter of Zion. Let us see how TEV has done this, and observe the affectionate coloring if any.

The book of Lamentations has the largest number of occurrences of this idiom, seven. The first is in 1:6a, literally translated by KJV thus: "And from the daughter of Zion all her beauty is departed." TEV renders: "The splendor of Jerusalem is a thing of the past." Alas, here we have only the single word "Jerusalem," a prosaic substitute for something laden with pathos, such as "ravished maiden Zion." And why not say "Zion" when the Hebrew says "Zion" and "Jerusalem" when the Hebrew says "Jerusalem"?

Passing on to 1:15c we find the same idiom with the word "virgin" prefixed. RSV translates:

the Lord has trodden as in a wine press the virgin daughter of Judah.

The meaning: the Lord has trodden the poor little ravished maiden Judah like a wine press. TEV has it this way:

He crushed my people
like grapes in a wine press.

The verse began in the first person, with Jerusalem speaking. In the last third of the verse, which we are considering, the Hebrew changes to the third person, such a change being characteristic of Hebrew poetry. TEV erases this change and translates "maiden Judah" as

“my people,” thus doing away with the poetic change of person and the even more poetic picture of Judah as a ravished maiden. Are such drastic changes really necessary to make the Bible more understandable to less sophisticated readers?

Anyhow, they are there: plain place names without overtones of affection, omissions of whole lines, combinations of two poetic lines into one. The daughter of Zion is gone completely, and that is good riddance; but there is nothing to take her place, and that is bad. All of which, widely applied, leads to intriguing poetry turned into dull prose. Is this new Biblical prose sufficiently intriguing in its own way? Perhaps the years ahead will answer that question.

Before we pass on, another complaint must be registered. The traditional (KJV) translation of Isaiah 1:18 is dead wrong when it says:

Though your sins be as scarlet,
they shall be as white as snow;
though they be red like crimson,
they shall be as wool.

This unconditional promise of salvation is of course theologically, exegetically, and historically wrong, as the very next two verses so plainly show:

If ye be willing and obedient,
ye shall eat the good of the land;
but if ye refuse and rebel,
ye shall be devoured with the sword.

Everyone knows that in the teaching of the prophets there is no forgiveness or salvation without repentance. So, beginning with Moffatt in 1924 most modern translations (but not RSV) have made sense out of nonsense by simply substituting a modal auxiliary, such as “may,” “can,” “might,” or “could” for the emphatic future form “shall” in the two lines “they shall be as white as snow” and “they shall be as wool.” The *American Translation* (AT) put these two lines in the form of a question. All this is not only in accord with sensible theology but also with Hebrew grammar; for the so-called imperfect form in Hebrew functions not only as a future indicative tense, but as a mood of uncertainty, corresponding to the subjunctive in Latin and Greek. This usage is called “the modal imperfect,” and thus appropriately calls for a modal auxiliary in English.

So how do the TEV translators deal with this rather important matter? First of all, they introduce the first person (God speaking) and the verb “wash,” neither of which is in the Hebrew. Then they proceed to translate wrongly, making the promise of forgiveness and reconciliation unconditional and also turning poetry into prose

thus: "You are stained red with sin, but I will wash you as clean as snow.^a Although your stains are deep red, you will be as white as wool.^b" Having realized that something was not quite right here, they added note *a*, which suggests that the second clause of the first sentence may be read: "do you think I will wash you as clean as snow?" and note *b*, which suggests that the whole second sentence may be read: "Although your stains are deep red, do you think you will be as white as wool?" Not only is this a confused and awkward translation, but it seems to go to the other theological extreme by implying utter damnation without hope of reconciliation.

Perhaps all this is a bit confusing, and it may be well to translate in the simplest, yet poetic, terms what the Lord said through Isaiah on this occasion:

Though your sins be as scarlet,
 they could be as white as snow.
 Though they be red like crimson,
 they could be like wool.
 If you become willing and obedient,
 you shall eat the good of the land.
 But if you refuse and rebel,
 you shall be devoured by the sword.

In concluding my review of the Old Testament, let me mention some instances in which TEV has done well. First, there is the 23rd psalm. This psalm, as most people have heard it from KJV and RSV, is mainly an affirmation of immortality or at least some meaningful existence after death—ideas that did not come into Judaism until the Greek period, beginning about 300 B.C., and the psalm was written long before that. So somewhere along the way, the psalm came to be interpreted as support for such ideas as immortality, resurrection, and everlasting life, and thus became a favorite piece to be read at funeral services. Really, the first four verses give a picture of God as a shepherd leading his people or an individual worshiper through perilous ways and times, while the last two verses show God prospering his true worshiper at the expense of his enemies for a whole lifetime. There is nothing about a future life; in fact, there is very little about that anywhere in the Old Testament. Christians can look for that in the New Testament.

How was this change brought about? Simply by misinterpreting and mistranslating two tiny phrases, one near the beginning of vs. 4 and the other at the end of vs. 6. Practically every modern translation except RSV has made the necessary correction. RSV has the old, incorrect readings in the text and the correct readings in the footnotes, thus: vs. 4 "the valley of the shadow of death," note, "Or, *the valley of deep darkness*"; vs. 6 "for ever," note, "Or *as long as I live*." Probably RSV put the wrong readings in the text to give the average

readers what they want to hear, and put the right readings in the footnotes to throw a sop to the scholars. But the RSV Committee continues to meet to make further “improvements,” and who knows what might come forth?

Pardon the long preamble merely to give TEV a pat on the back, but it seemed necessary. TEV in some other spots seemed to be relegating the right reading to mere “footnote status” (e.g., “Sea of Reeds” for “Red Sea”) out of deference to traditionalism. But not in the 23rd Psalm!

- vs. 4, Even if I go through *the deepest darkness*,
I will not be afraid, Lord, for you are with me.
- vs. 6, I know that your goodness and love
will be with me all my life;
and your house will be my home
as long as I live.

Good! Now I wish to commend TEV for following Moffatt, AT, RSV, JB, and NAB (not NEB) for retaining the word “again” in that line in Hosea 11:9 which properly reads, “I will not *again* destroy Ephraim.” The “again” is there in the Hebrew, but some exegetes try to get rid of it because it makes plain that Ephraim (i.e., Israel) will be or has been destroyed once. These exegetes try to make out Hosea to be such a prophet of love that he believed God would never punish Israel, regardless of her sins. Nonsense! There is no such prophet or God in the Old Testament.

Also to be commended is TEV’s rendering of Isaiah 40:9:

- Jerusalem, go up on a high mountain
and proclaim the good news!
Call out with a loud voice, Zion;
announce the good news!

This translation is free, but it does preserve the idea that Jerusalem is in this instance proclaiming the good news. Unfortunately there is a footnote saying that another possibility is to say that someone, presumably the prophet, is to rise up and proclaim the good news *to* Jerusalem. This is contrary to the Hebrew and would necessitate about nine alterations of the text. KJV has the right reading. RSV follows suit, but also adds the erroneous footnote. Moffat has it wrong; NEB has it wrong; with a footnote giving the right reading. AT was wrong in its first edition (1927), but changed in a later edition (1948). This drastic change in the text was probably due to a mistaken sense of consistency. In 41:27 and 52:7 the good news is indeed being given *to* Jerusalem. But according to the Second Isaiah Jerusalem was both a transmitter and a receiver of the good news. So I give credit to TEV for giving preference to the correct reading.

Finally, a few words should be said about two tricky passages in the Book of Job. In KJV, Job 13:15 reads thus: "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him: but I will maintain mine own ways before him." A glance at the Hebrew will show that something is wrong here. Not only so, but the whole context shows Job doubting, questioning, and complaining against God's treatment of him. RSV turns full circle, translating the first sentence flatly thus: "Behold, he will slay me; I have no hope." Actually, this is a little too strong. It would have been better to take the first verb as a present subjunctive (modal imperfect as described above) and say, "Behold, he *may* slay me," as does Pope in AB.⁷ TEV gets the sense very well by inverting the sentence and turning it into a question: "I've lost all hope, so what if God kills me?" TEV does equally well in the next verse (16), where again KJV has managed to turn doubt into a nonexistent faith.

Perhaps the most difficult passage in the Old Testament is Job 19:25-27. All are familiar with vs. 25 in KJV: "For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth." The big problem is the identity of the person called *goli* in Hebrew, perhaps best translated "my defender." Here in KJV the translation, "Redeemer" with a capital R, implies that it is God, and some Christians even see a prediction of Jesus Christ (as in Handel's oratorio, "The Messiah"). But most modern interpreters, noting that throughout the dialogue God is the adversary and not the defender, take *goli* to be a human defender. TEV compounds the ambiguity by translating, "But I know there is someone in heaven who will come at last to my defense." There is no reference to heaven in the original, and we are left in doubt by the TEV translator as to the identity of this heavenly figure and where his defending will be done. The expression "upon the earth" in KJV really says in Hebrew "upon the dust." "Dust" in Hebrew is often used as a characteristic of Sheol, the place of the dead under the earth; hence it can be argued that the defending will be done in the underworld after Job's death.

The problem of where or when Job will be exonerated becomes more acute in the very problematical vs. 26. No one claims to be able to render this verse as it stands, but RSV has tried to follow the Hebrew as closely as possible:

"and after my skin has been thus destroyed, then from my flesh [note: or "without my flesh"] I shall see God."

The main difficulty here is the Hebrew expression "from my flesh," i.e., before death, or "without my flesh," i.e., after death. TEV sees the difficulty clearly thus:

Even after my skin is eaten by disease, while still in this body [note: or "although not in this body"] I will see God.

A further note states truly: "Verse 26 in Hebrew is unclear."

Vs. 27 attempts to show how or under what conditions Job will see God. It says, not too clearly, "whom [i.e., God] I shall see for myself, and my eyes shall behold, and not a stranger [or, "but not as a stranger (or adversary)"]." The ambiguity here is whether Job and not a stranger will see God, or whether Job will see God as no longer a stranger or adversary. TEV opts for the latter, correctly, I think:

I will see him with my own eyes,
and he will not be a stranger.

To summarize, here is one man's opinion. Job in 19:25-27 does not suddenly change from doubt and resentment to conventional faith in a conventional God. Rather, he reasserts his faith in his own innocence, and believes that eventually, perhaps after his own death, he will find a strong human (or angelic?) defender who will prove his innocence so clearly that even God will acknowledge it and cease to be his enemy.

To be sure, at the end of the book as it now stands, God personally rebukes Job, Job recants, and his health and prosperity are restored with interest right here on earth, in agreement with the conventional theology of that day. But the Job of the Dialogue has no inkling of such an outcome.

The Books of the Apocrypha have recently been translated and are now available in an edition of TEV. The ABS is to be warmly commended for this change in policy.

As was mentioned near the beginning of this paper, the TEV New Testament appeared in 1966 and was widely read. It was also reviewed and commented on in many places, and hence there is no need to spend much time and space on it here. In general it seems to read more smoothly and be more accurate than its Old Testament counterpart. After all, Greek is easier and better understood than the Semitic languages, Hebrew and Aramaic, while the textual basis of the New Testament is incomparably richer and fuller than in the case of the Old Testament.

Even so, I cannot resist the temptation to make a few remarks on a few passages. In Matthew 1:21 an angel speaks to Joseph about Mary thus, according to TEV: "She will have a son, and you will name him Jesus—because he will save his people from their sins." To be sure, this is exactly what the Greek and all the translations say. But more is needed; a play on words is involved, though it is completely lost in English as also in Greek. An explanatory footnote

is needed, thus: "The Aramaic form of the name Jesus (Yeshua) sounds like the Aramaic verb meaning 'he will save.'" This is properly done in the Oxford Annotated Bible at this point, as well as many times in the Old Testament of TEV (e.g., in Gen. 32:28-30).

In Matthew 5:6 we have the famous beatitude, "Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be satisfied" (RSV). TEV renders thus: "Happy are those whose greatest desire is to do what God requires; God will satisfy them fully!" In spite of the fact that TEV prints the Beatitudes in poetic lines, this one has been reduced to very ordinary prose by eliminating the metaphorical "hunger and thirst." Here again, as in parts of the Old Testament, inspiring poetry has been reduced to uninspiring prose in a futile attempt to make the reading of the Bible "easier."

In the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:9-13; Luke 11:2-4) the most difficult line for me is the one that says: "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one." It seems to me to be bad theology to assume that God might deliberately lead us into temptation, or "hard testing" as TEV puts it. Temptation or hard testing is inevitable in this world. What we need is help from God to withstand the temptation. It seems to me that the Syriac versions may be translated: "Let us not succumb to temptation, but deliver us from the evil one." This is to me a sensible petition, which is at least worthy of a commendatory footnote.

In Matthew 6:19 there should have been a footnote giving the possibility that it is moths and worms that destroy rather than moths and rust. Putting together two disparate things like moths and rust is not characteristic of Semitic thought, as combining moths and worms would be. The Greek word *brosis* can be taken either way, as the Arndt and Gingrich lexicon makes clear. Some other versions definitely favor "worms."

It has always seemed to me that the saying in Matt. 8:22 and Luke 9:60, "let the dead bury their dead," is not a very sensible thought, and that there may have been a confusion between the active and passive voices of the verb and hence that the original saying may have been "the dead will be buried," i.e., somebody will take care of that. TEV gives no help on this. But the volume on Matthew in the Anchor Bible series by W.F. Albright and C.S. Mann⁸ does help. They translate: "Follow me, and let the dying bury their dead," explaining that "in several Semitic languages, including Hebrew/Aramaic, the word for *dead* can also mean *dying*" (p. 96). The word "dying" can then be taken literally, or metaphorically, referring to those who have not chosen to follow Jesus and hence belong to a dying cause, with no important or pressing work to do. This is a

clever suggestion and should be seriously considered.

And finally, a few words about a favorite text of mine, because it is so utterly absurd and difficult as it stands. It is Mark 9:49, which reads as follows in KJV: "For every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt." The second clause is not in all the best manuscripts, and is now generally regarded as a later addition from Leviticus 2:13 with intent to improve the sense. Most modern translations omit it.

Moffatt made excellent sense, as usual: "Everyone has to be consecrated by the fire of discipline," but he had to change "salted" to "consecrated" and add "discipline." Goodspeed says: "Everyone must be seasoned with fire," a very small and cautious change.⁹ RSV, JB, NEB, and NAB just take the Greek straight without trying to make sense. Only C.C. Torrey in *The Four Gospels* shows a plausible way to recover the original meaning.¹⁰ In his time Torrey was the greatest living authority on Aramaic, the language of Jesus. He put this verse (without the addition from Leviticus) back into Aramaic, found that what appears in Greek as "with fire" was in Aramaic "is going to spoil." He also knew that the word for "all" in Aramaic could mean "everything" as well as "everyone." So he read the verse as a common-sense rule in ancient living: "Everything that is going to spoil should be salted." This fits in perfectly with the following verse on the virtues of salt, literal and figurative. The fire came in erroneously from the preceding verse, with which vs. 49 has no connection.

Now what does TEV do? Not much. They take both clauses from KJV, scramble them together, and come out thus: "Everyone will be purified by fire as a sacrifice is purified by salt." They got rid of some of the salt, but the troublesome fire is still there. There is not much connection between what fire will do to people and what salt will do to sacrifices. Torrey's suggestion, which changes only one vowel in one small word, is much less radical than many of the changes made throughout the Bible by TEV in trying to make sense out of difficult passages.

However, let it be said to the credit of the TEV translators that they usually add those warning footnotes: "Hebrew unclear," "Aramaic has two additional words, the meaning of which is unclear," "Some manuscripts do not have verses 43-44," "Some manuscripts add verse 17," etc., etc. The reader should be careful to read all these footnotes, for they are TEV's way of admitting that the Bible is not so simple and easy to understand after all, especially in passages where the manuscript evidence is ambiguous.

But there is no cause for despair, for in recent times much progress has been made in clarifying difficult passages. However, there are some whose original meaning may never be recovered.

NOTES

1. See the four relevant items in the bibliography under "Zion, Daughter of," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Supplementary Volume, p. 985; also W.F. Stinespring, "The Trials of Translation: Modern English Versions of the Bible," *St. Andrews Review*, Vol. 1, No. 4 (1972), pp. 65-69.
2. Anchor Bible, *Proverbs and Ecclesiastes*, by R.B.Y. Scott, Doubleday & Co., New York, 1965.
3. *The Old Testament, A New Translation*, Vol. I, 1924, Vol. II, 1925, *The New Testament, A New Translation*, New Edition Revised, 1925, by James Moffatt, George H. Doran Co., New York; all later issued in one volume as *The Bible, A New Translation*.
4. *Op. cit.*, pp. 192-193.
5. Doubleday & Co., New York, 1977.
6. See Note 1, above.
7. Anchor Bible, *Job*, by Marvin H. Pope, 3rd edition, Doubleday & Co., New York, 1973.
8. Doubleday & Co., New York, 1971.
9. *The New Testament, An American Translation* by Edgar J. Goodspeed, University of Chicago Press, 1923. Included in *The Complete Bible, An American Translation*, Chicago, 1939.
10. Harper and Brothers, Publishers, New York and London, 1933, pp. 90, 302.

APPENDIX: *Today's English Version Translators*

NEW TESTAMENT: Robert G. Bratcher

OLD TESTAMENT: Robert G. Bratcher, Chairman; Roger A. Bullard, Keith Crim, Herbert Grether, Barclay M. Newman, Heber F. Peacock, John A. Thompson

APOCRYPHA: Heber F. Peacock, Chairman; Roger A. Bullard, Barclay M. Newman

The New International Version

by ROBERT G. BRATCHER

The publication of the New International Version of the Bible in October 1978 was the culmination of a process that began in the 50's, after the publication of the Revised Standard Version in 1952. At this late date it is hard to remember the abusive and arrogant language that was heaped on the RSV. It was denounced as "liberal," "modernistic," "blasphemous," and "communist-inspired." It was repudiated by nearly all conservatives and fundamentalists as a perversion of the Word of God, which was, of course, taken to be the King James Version.

In 1956 the Christian Reformed Church appointed a committee to study the possibility of a new translation, and the National Association of Evangelicals did the same in 1957. In 1967 the New York Bible Society assumed responsibility for the project and appointed a committee of fifteen scholars to direct it. In 1968 Dr. Edwin H. Palmer became the fulltime Executive Secretary of the project, and work on the new translation began. The Gospel of John was published in 1969 and the entire New Testament appeared in 1973. Isaiah was published in 1975, Daniel in 1976, and Proverbs and Ecclesiastes in 1977.

During this time other Bibles were appearing, sponsored or published by conservative groups. *The Amplified Bible* was published in 1965, *The Modern Language Bible* in 1969, and the *New American Standard Version* in 1971. Kenneth Taylor's paraphrase, *The Living Bible* (1971), outdid them all in popular favor. Although these versions enjoyed, and still enjoy, varying degrees of popularity, none of them has succeeded in becoming *the* Bible of conservative Protestants in this country.

The NIV bids fair to establish itself as the Bible for evangelicals. Its reception has been nothing short of spectacular. By December 1978 over 1,200,000 copies had been sold, and it seems reasonable to assume that in time this translation will replace the King James Bible in private and church usage among evangelical conservatives.

The total cost of the NIV has been reported at two and a quarter million dollars. One hundred and fifteen scholars from more than a dozen evangelical denominations took part in the work (see the Preface, p. vii, and the Appendix at the end of this article). They were divided into twenty teams composed of four or five persons on each team: two co-translators, two consultants, and one English stylist. Each team's work was submitted to an

Intermediate Editorial Committee (either of the Old Testament or of the New Testament), and then went on to the General Editorial Committee and finally to the fifteen-member Committee on Bible Translation. It is reported that 200,000 man-hours were spent on the preparation of this translation.

The publicity released with the publication of the NIV stresses the interdenominational and international character of the work. The Preface (p. vii) names thirteen different denominations represented, in addition to "other churches," not named. This interdenominational aspect of the work "helped to safeguard the translation from sectarian bias" (p. vii). As for the countries represented, a pamphlet entitled "The Version of Our Time" gives a "partial list" of 97 scholars, of whom 87 are Americans. The other ten include three each from Canada and England, and two each from Australia and New Zealand. Evangelical seminaries were strongly represented; seven scholars are listed from the Trinity Evangelical Divinity School of Chicago.

Heavy emphasis is placed on the translators' "high view of Scripture." The Preface to the New Testament (1973) states that they were all committed to "the full authority and complete trustworthiness of the Scriptures, which they believe is God's Word in written form." The Preface to the Bible includes the following statement: "The translators were united in their commitment to the authority and infallibility of the Bible as God's Word in written form." And, as quoted by the publisher, Zondervan, the translators believe that "the Bible alone, in its entirety, is the Word of God written and is therefore inerrant in the autographs."

The following principles guided the translators in their work:

1. Begin with and be faithful to the original text in Hebrew, Greek and Aramaic languages.
2. Clearly reflect the unity and harmony of the Spirit-inspired Writings.
3. Retain only what the original languages say—not inject additional elements of unwarranted paraphrasing.
4. Communicate God's revelation in the language of the people—to do for our time what the King James Version did for its day.
5. Be equally effective for public worship (pulpit and pew), for private study and devotional reading.
6. Establish universal acceptance by creating an ecclesiastical team of 100 scholars who hold to a high view of Scripture as set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Belgic Confession, and the Statement of Faith of the National Association of Evangelicals.

All these principles are commendable and, by and large, unexceptionable. Some comments may, however, be appropriate.

Principle number 1 states what every translation of the Bible claims to do. In addition it characterizes this Bible as a fresh translation of the original texts and not a revision of any existing translation. The translators were conscious, however, of the force of tradition, and they reveal this awareness in the statement in the Preface (p. viii): “The Committee also sought to preserve some measure of continuity with the long tradition of translating the Scriptures into English.”

Principle number 2 assumes that “the unity and harmony” of the Biblical books is a given fact. However, any straightforward reading of the texts shows that complete unity and harmony do not exist. Hence, no translation which actually followed principle number 1 could hope to exhibit a complete “unity and harmony” that does not exist. For example, the Bible opens with two different creation accounts (Gen. 1:1–2:4a and 2:4b–25), which cannot be harmonized in any honest representation of available scholarly knowledge. (Contrary to the weight of previous commentary, the NIV includes 2:4a in the second account, not the first one.) Again, the writer of II Sam. 24:1 says that Yahweh incited David to take a census of the people; the writer of I Chr. 21:1 says that Satan incited David to take the census. In I Sam. 17:1–51 we read the account of how David killed Goliath; II Sam. 21:19 says that Elhanan killed Goliath. Matt. 8:5–13 says that the Roman centurion in Capernaum personally requested Jesus to heal his servant; Luke 7:1–10 says that the centurion sent Jewish elders and friends, but never spoke personally to Jesus. Genuine Biblical scholarship, which pays attention to the clear evidence of the Biblical texts, has long known of these and many other examples of disharmony. A faithful translation (principle number 1) would not try to camouflage these differences. It would reflect the unity and harmony of the Biblical books wherever they really exist, and disunity and disharmony wherever they exist.

Has the NIV attempted to impose an artificial unity and harmony upon the Biblical text? Certainly it has not done so in any of the passages cited above. But the translation of Isa. 7:14 may be considered an exception to the rule. The NIV text reads: “Therefore the Lord himself will give you^a a sign: The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and^b will call him Immanuel.^c” The footnotes read: *a* “The Hebrew is plural.” *b* “Masoretic Text; Dead Sea Scrolls *and he* or *and they*.” *c* “*Immanuel* means *God with us*.” (It is difficult to see how the NIV translators can say that the Dead Sea Scrolls text can be understood as “and they.” The reading of IQIsa^a means either “and he will call” or else—if vocalized as a *pu’al*—“and his name will be called.” There is no Hebrew or Versional text which has “and they will call,” as in Matt. 1:23.)

The quotation of this verse in Matt. 1:23 reads as follows: "The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and they will call him Immanuel." In an interview printed in the Houghton College Bulletin (*Milieu*, December 1978), Dr. Stephen W. Paine, retired president of Houghton College and one of the members of The Committee on Bible Translation, made some comments about the work: "We said we must all believe in the inerrancy of Scripture. This was a lifesaver because it wiped out a lot of nit-picking." He then referred specifically to the translation of *hā-'almāh* in Isa. 7:14, saying that the Hebrew word itself may be understood to mean "young woman" or "virgin." But when this passage is quoted in Matt. 1:23, he said, "if you believe in the inerrancy of Scripture, you have to believe that Matthew correctly reproduced Isaiah and came out with the Greek word which means only virgin." So if the translator really believes that "Matthew is inerrant as well as Isaiah . . . there's only one way the translation can come out to make them both correct."

The same kind of reasoning seems to have been operative in the translation of Ps. 16:10 and Acts 2:27. In the Acts passage Peter quotes Ps. 16:8–11 and says that David was talking about Christ (v. 31). So v. 27 reads: "because you will not abandon me to the grave, / nor will you let your Holy One see decay." This is *ipsis litteris* the NIV translation of Ps. 16:10: "because you will not abandon me to the grave,^b / nor will you let your Holy One^c see decay." (The footnotes read: *b* "Hebrew *Sheol*." *c* "Or *your faithful one*.") The use of the capital letters in "your Holy One" indicates that the NIV translators believe that the Hebrew psalmist was talking about the resurrection of Jesus Christ. And it should be noted that although "your holy one" qualifies as a defensible translation of the Greek text of Acts 2:27, it would hardly seem to qualify as a good translation of the Hebrew text of Ps. 16:10; the alternative "your faithful one" is much better.

Such a criterion for translating OT passages quoted by NT writers is impossible to apply. Of the (more or less) 275 direct quotations of OT passages in the NT, there are almost 100 which agree neither with the Masoretic Text nor with the present Septuagint. Where is the "inerrant" New Testament (or Old Testament) writer to be found?

Principle number 3 accords quite well with number 1. There may be differences of opinion, however, as to what constitutes "unwarranted paraphrasing." Would "We're going to drown" in Matt. 8:25 be considered an unwarranted paraphrasing of *apol-lumetha*? Or "will take their places at the feast" in Matt. 8:11 be thought an unwarranted paraphrasing of *anaklithēsontai*? Not in this reviewer's opinion, but others might want to differ.

Principle number 4 reflects the idea that the King James Version of 1611 was written in the language of the people. However, the language of the King James Version was not the popular language of the day. It already had some archaic and obsolete expressions, as a carry-over from the Bishops' Bible (and even from Tyndale), which it was intended to replace. And the language of the NIV can hardly qualify in every place as being "the language of the people," as will be seen below.

Principle number 5 is ambitious, and indeed expresses the goal of every serious attempt at translating the Bible.

It is to be doubted that the aim of principle number 6 ("universal acceptance") could ever be reached. No one translation will ever again become the *textus receptus* of the English-speaking world, as did the King James Version in its long and illustrious reign.

The reference to the various Confessions is worth examining. The Westminster Confession of Faith (1647), in article IV of Chapter I declares that God is the Author of holy Scripture "and therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God." Article VIII states that the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament "being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentical." The Belgic Confession of Faith (1561; revised 1619) declares in article III that God commanded the prophets and apostles "to commit his revealed Word to writing; and he himself wrote with his own finger the two tables of the law. Therefore we call such writings holy and divine Scriptures." And article I of the Statement of Faith of the National Association of Evangelicals states: "We believe the Bible to be the inspired, the only infallible authoritative Word of God."

Principle number 6, then, declares that all the scholars who worked on this translation subscribe to the statements made in these Confessions.

It is to be assumed that the Apocrypha will not be translated, if the NIV translators adhere to the spirit and the letter of the Confessions cited.

The mechanical part has been superbly executed. The book is a manageable 4 cms. thick (15.5 cms. wide, 23 cms. long), the paper is of top quality, thin enough to make for a reasonably sized book yet opaque enough to keep the print from showing through to the opposite side of the leaf. The text is printed in one column, and the use of poetic structure is frequent and effective. The text is divided into sections, with brief section headings. The psalms do not have headings. In Job the speakers are identified in the mar-

gin, as are the speakers in the Song of Songs. Meticulous attention has been paid to punctuation: compare Matt. 21:16: “praise^{d?}”; Mark 4:12: “forgiven!^a”; Luke 20:17: “capstone^{c?}” I have caught only one typographical error: Ps. 40:5e [Hebrew: 40:6e]: “were I to speak and tell f them.”

At the end of the volume there is a page-long Table of Weights and Measures, followed by fourteen maps (eight for the Old Testament and six for the New Testament); the color of the maps may not command universal approval.

The Preface provides useful information on several aspects of the work, and should be carefully read by all who intend to use this Bible.

Text

In making textual decisions the translators were guided by standard textual principles. For the Old Testament their basic text was “the standard Hebrew text, the Masoretic Text as published in the latest editions of *Biblia Hebraica*” (Preface p. viii). Use was made of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Samaritan Pentateuch, “and the ancient scribal traditions relating to textual changes.” The ancient Versions were also pressed into use. Standard procedures are followed throughout, and frequently the NIV departs from the Masoretic Text where Hebrew manuscripts, the Samaritan Pentateuch, or the Versions preserve what seemed to be a preferable reading. In Gen. 4:8, for example, with the Samaritan Pentateuch and some of the Versions, NIV adds “Let’s go out to the field,” which is lacking in the MT. In Gen. 4:15, where the MT reads *lākēn* (“thus, therefore”), some of the Versions read the equivalent of *lō’ kēn* “Not so,” which NIV follows. In Ps. 19:4 [Hebrew: v.5] MT has *qawwām* “their line”; some of the Versions attest “their voice,” which seems preferable, and which NIV adopts. In Ps. 49:11a [Hebrew: v. 12a] MT has “their thoughts (*qirbām*) are their homes forever”; the reading of Septuagint and Syriac seems preferable, “their tombs (*qibrām*) are their homes forever.” See also Ps. 22:16 [Hebrew: v. 17]; 24:6b.

But one looks in vain for anything that is *labeled* a conjecture. I Sam. 13:1, for example, appears as follows:

Saul was ₁thirty^a years old when he became king, and he reigned over Israel ₁forty-₂two years.

^{a1} A few late manuscripts of the Septuagint; Hebrew does not have *thirty*.

^{b1} See the round number in Acts 13:21; Hebrew does not have *forty*-.

In this passage the Hebrew text is defective; MT says that Saul was one year old when he became king and he ruled over Israel two years. The Targum explains: “Saul was innocent as a child a

year old when he began to reign.” The Hebrew text says that Saul reigned two years; the NIV text “forty-two years” is clearly a conjecture, and the reference to the “forty years” in Acts 13:21 as a “round number” is curious.

The use of lower half-brackets is explained in the Preface (p. x): “To achieve clarity the translators supplied words not in the original texts but required by the context. If there was uncertainty about such material, it is enclosed in brackets.” But this definition does not square with the use of the half-brackets in I Sam. 13:1.

Another such example is to be found in II Kgs. 6:33, where the MT reads “the messenger arrived and said”; the words that follow, however, are manifestly spoken by the king of Israel, not by the messenger himself. NIV has “. . . the messenger came down to him [that is, Elijah]. And ₁the king₁ said . . .”

In most instances the half-brackets seem quite unnecessary. Some examples may be given: “the wings of ₁my₁ dove” (Ps. 68:13 [Hebrew: v. 14]); “will possess ₁the land₁ as far as Zarephath” (Ob. 20); “I will not turn back ₁my wrath₁” (Amos 2:3,6,9,11,13; 2:1,4,6); “to alienate you ₁from us₁” (Gal. 4:17); “for ₁that day will not come₁ until” (II Th. 2:3); “₁This matter arose₁ because” (Gal. 2:4). This is a needless and distracting device, of interest only to scholars, who by definition are able to assess such matters on their own. It resembles the King James Version habit of printing in italics the words for which there were no lexical equivalents in the original text.

In some places the NIV takes into account the *tiqqune sopherim** (“corrections of the scribes”). In Job 32:3, for example, the MT is translated in the NIV text: “they had found no way to refute Job, and yet they had condemned him”; the footnote reads: “Masoretic Text; an ancient Hebrew scribal tradition, *Job, and so had condemned God.*” According to an ancient scribal tradition Gen. 18:22 had once read “Yahweh remained standing before Abraham.” This was changed by the Masoretic scribes (a *tiqqun*) to “Abraham remained standing before Yahweh.” NIV translates the MT, which reflects the scribal change, and cites the tradition of an earlier reading in a footnote, again as “an ancient Hebrew scribal tradition.” In Hos. 4:7 the earlier text had read according to tradition, “they changed my glory into shame”; this was changed by the Masoretic scribes to “I will change their glory into shame.” Here NIV retains “they exchanged” from the uncorrected

*Reliable information concerning this phenomenon can be found in Carmel McCarthy’s article, “Emendations of the Scribes,” in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, Supplementary Volume, pp. 263–264.—Ed.

pre-Masoretic text but combines this phrase with “their glory” from the scribally corrected MT.

The translators’ Greek text of the New Testament was an eclectic one, and the Preface (p. ix) states that they used “the best current printed texts of the Greek New Testament.” Mark 16:9–20 is separated from 16:8 by a space and a line, with the information: “The two most reliable early manuscripts do not have Mark 16:9–20.” John 7:53–8:11 is set off from the rest of the text by a space and a line, with a note at the top: “The earliest and most reliable manuscripts do not have John 7:53–8:11.” John 5:3b–4 is omitted from the text, as are most other *Textus Receptus* scribal additions, even where complete verses are involved (see Luke 23:16; Acts 8:36). The doxology of the Lord’s prayer (Matt. 6:13) is given in a footnote (identified as being in “some late manuscripts”). The *Textus Receptus* addition in I John 5:7–8 is given in a footnote as appearing in “late manuscripts of the Vulgate.”

In John 7:8 the NIV translators prefer the easier reading *oupō* “not yet,” instead of the harder reading *ouk* “not,” assigning the latter to a footnote. In Matt. 27:16–17 not even in footnote does the NIV indicate that according to some witnesses Barabbas’ given name was Jesus. And in Luke 10:1,17 the number 72 is preferred, with the number 70 appearing in footnote as an alternate reading.

Exegesis

The exegesis of the text is essentially conservative, that is, there is no determined attempt to break new ground in understanding and representing the meaning of the original text. The beginning of the Bible reads in a familiar fashion (in contrast to other recent translations such as NJV):

In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. ²Now the earth was^a formless and empty, darkness was over the surface of the deep, and the Spirit of God was hovering over the waters.

^{a2} Or possibly *became*

Genesis 3:15 differs little from what has become traditional (in contrast to other recent translations such as NEB):

And I will put enmity
between you and the woman,
and between your offspring^a and hers;
he will crush^b your head,
and you will strike his heel.

^{a15} Or *seed* ^{b15} Or *strike*

Ps. 2:12 is translated: "Kiss the Son, lest he be angry / and you be destroyed in your way, / for his wrath can flare up in a moment. / Blessed are all who take refuge in him." The use of initial capital letters in "the Son," "his Anointed One" (v. 2), "my King" (v. 6), and "my Son" (v. 7), clearly reflect Christian bias in the interpretation of this Hebrew psalm, as also "your Holy One" in Ps. 16:10, seen above.

The problematic third line in Gen. 49:10 is not translated according to traditional exegesis. NIV has "until he comes to whom it belongs," with the traditional "until Shiloh comes" in a footnote. In Ps. 105:28b the MT reads "for they did not rebel against his words." This is difficult to understand, since the subject of the verb is the Egyptians. Some have conjectured that instead of *mārû* "rebelled," *shām^erû* should be read: "they did not keep his commands." But there is no manuscript witness for this reading. The Versions offer a different text: Septuagint and Syriac omit the negative *lō'*, which results in "for they rebelled against his words," the text favored by the majority of modern translations (e.g., RSV). NIV stays with the MT, but interprets it as a rhetorical question: "for had they not rebelled against his words?" This may be possible, but seems highly unlikely. This is also how the New Jewish Version translates this passage, but it does add in a footnote: "Meaning of Hebrew uncertain."

Where the meaning of the text was considered uncertain, a footnote may indicate this: "The meaning of the Hebrew for this word [or "sentence" or "phrase"] is uncertain" (see, for example, Eccl. 2:5; Jer. 8:13,18; Amos 3:12; 9:6).

In the genealogical list from Shem to Abraham, in Gen. 11:10–27, NIV suggests that the Hebrew "father" in vv. 10–25 may be understood to mean "ancestor." But it seems highly unlikely that men at the age of 35, 34, 32, 30, and 29 years could have been ancestors; perhaps grandfathers, but hardly ancestors.

In the New Testament the problems of determining the meaning of the original text are not nearly so great as they are in the Old Testament. The Greek *sarx* in Romans 7–8 and Galatians 5–6 is translated "sinful nature," with "flesh" as an alternative in footnotes. Glossolalia in I Corinthians 12–14 is represented by "speak in (a) tongue(s)" in the text, with footnotes giving the alternative "other/another language(s)." The same is done for the manifestation of the Spirit at Pentecost, in Acts 2:4: "speak in other tongues" appears in the text, with a footnote: "Or *languages*."

The family of words *hilasmos*, *hilaskomai*, and *hilastērion* (Rom. 3:25; I John 2:2; 4:10; Heb. 2:17) is translated "an atoning sacri-

fice,” with an alternative in footnote, “turn aside God’s wrath, taking away our sins.”

When applied to Christ, *monogenēs* is translated “one and only Son,” with a footnote: “only begotten Son” (John 1:14; 3:16,18; I John 4:9). In the case of Isaac (Heb. 11:17), he is Abraham’s “one and only son,” with no alternative in a footnote.

One rather unusual device is the use of quotation marks to set off a word or phrase which the translators judge is being used in a sense different from the normal one. In Matt. 9:10,11 (and parallels) the text reads:

¹⁰While Jesus was having dinner at Matthew’s house, many tax collectors and “sinners” came and ate with him and his disciples. ¹¹When the Pharisees saw this, they asked his disciples, “Why does your teacher eat with tax collectors and ‘sinners?’”

Surely a footnote is required explaining what is meant by “sinners” in quotation marks, since, in English, the use of such marks indicates either that the writer is being facetious, not really meaning what he writes, or else that the word so marked is regularly used in a different sense. If the Greek *hamartōloi* does not mean what the English word *sinners* means, then a faithful translation should use another word.

Similarly Matt. 6:1 has: “Be careful not to do your ‘acts of righteousness’ before men, to be seen by them.” In the same way “gods” appears in quotation marks in Ps. 82:1,6 as well as in the quotation of Ps. 82:6 in John 10:34. One curious instance is the use of quotation marks with “seven(s)” in Dan. 9:24–27. In Rev. 1:13; 14:14 “like a son of man” appears within quotation marks.

Cultural Features

For terms of distances and measures, NIV sometimes provides the American equivalent in the text and in a footnote gives the Hebrew or Greek form and the metric equivalent. This is done in Gen. 6:15–16 for measurements of Noah’s ark. In Luke 24:13 the text has “about seven miles” as the distance from Jerusalem to Emmaus; the footnote reads: “Greek *sixty stadia* (about 11 kilometers).” John 2:5 has “from twenty to thirty gallons” in the text, and the footnote has “Greek *two to three metretes* (probably about 75 to 115 liters).”

But sometimes the Greek or Hebrew term is given in the text, with the modern equivalents appearing in footnotes. Acts 1:12 gives the distance from the Mount of Olives to Jerusalem as “a

Sabbath day's walk," with the modern equivalent in a footnote. In Rev. 14:20; 21:16,17 the text has the Greek terms: 1,600 stadia, 12,000 stadia, and 144 cubits. The measurements for the tabernacle, the ark of the covenant, and the furnishings for the tabernacle in Exod. 25–27, 36–38 are all given in terms of cubits, as are the measurements for Solomon's temple and palace in I Kings 6–7 (and parallel II Chr. 3–4) and the measurements of the new Temple and land in Ezekiel 40–48.

In the New Testament, except for the passages noted above, measurements of length, distance, capacity and weight are all given their modern equivalents in the text. Modern equivalents, however, are not used for hours of the day or days of the week. The days always appear in the New Testament as "Preparation day," "Sabbath," and "the first day of the week." And the hours are always in terms of the Greek divisions: "tenth hour" (John 1:39), "third hour," "sixth hour," and "ninth hour" (Mark 15: 25,33,34). The same is done in the parable of the workers in the vineyard (Matt. 20:1–16).

In some instances modern names are given for areas and countries, but this is not consistently done. "Cush" appears in the OT with a footnote: "the upper Nile region" (and see Acts 8:27); in Gen. 2:13, however, the footnote reads "Possibly southeast Mesopotamia." In the NT the traditional "the Sea of Galilee" is used as a name, but when that body of water is referred to it is called a lake.

Yam suph in the OT is always translated "the Red Sea," accompanied by a footnote: "Hebrew *Yam Suph*; that is, Sea of Reeds" (and see also Acts 7:36; Heb. 11:29).

The use of the nonce word "kinsman-redeemer" to translate *gō'el* in Ruth (see 2:20; 3:8,12; 4:1,3,8) does not seem a happy decision. In Job 19:25 it is translated "my Redeemer." (Cf. the discussion of "your Holy One" in Ps. 16:10, above.) The sacrifices known as *sh'elāmîm* are translated "fellowship offerings," with the traditional term "peace offerings" given in footnote (see I Kgs. 8:63,64). The Hebrew *herem* is translated "devoted thing(s)," accompanied by a good explanatory footnote (see Josh. 7:1; 8:26).

It would seem that "prayer shawls" in Matt. 23:5 is an anachronism. For some reason "Mary Magdalene" is used in the Synoptics, but in John she appears as "Mary of Magdala."

Translation

The NIV translators did not see their task as that of trying to reproduce the Hebrew (and Aramaic) and Greek texts by a literal rendition. "They have striven for more than word-for-word translation. Because thought patterns and syntax differ from lan-

guage to language, faithful communication of the meaning of the writers of the Bible demands frequent modifications in sentence structure and constant regard for the contextual meaning of words" (Preface, p. viii).

The NIV is certainly less literal than the RSV. A comparison of the translation of Gal. 3:2–5 in both versions will make this evident:

RSV

Let me ask you only this: Did you receive the Spirit by works of the law, or by hearing with faith? Are you so foolish? Having begun with the Spirit, are you now ending with the flesh? Did you experience so many things in vain?—if it really is in vain? Does he who supplies the Spirit to you and works miracles among you do so by works of the law, or by hearing with faith?

NIV

I would like to learn just one thing from you: Did you receive the Spirit by observing the law, or by believing what you heard? Are you so foolish? After beginning with the Spirit, are you trying to attain your goal by human effort? Have you suffered so much for nothing—if it really was for nothing? Does God give you his Spirit and work miracles among you because you observe the law, or because you believe what you heard?

But literalism still appears in the NIV, such as the titles "Daughter of Tarshish" (Isa. 23:10), "Virgin Daughter of Sidon" (Isa. 23:12), "The Daughter of Tyre" (Ps. 45:12 [Hebrew: v. 13]), "Daughter of the Babylonians" (Isa. 47:1). The literal "horn" continues to show up: "by your favor exalt our horn" (Ps. 89:17 [Hebrew: v. 18]; see also 89:24 [Hebrew: v. 25]; 112:9; 132:17; 148:14; Luke 1:69). This translation gets rid of "gird up your loins" (see II Kgs. 4:29, "Tuck your cloak into your belt"; see also I Kgs. 18:46), for which it is to be congratulated. Surely it would have been advisable to get rid also of "horn(s)." "Anointing you with the oil of joy" (Ps. 45:7 [Hebrew: v. 8]; Heb. 1:8) is translationese, as is "the firstfruits of all their manhood" in Ps. 105:36.

Some passages are painfully literal. Rom. 3:18 (quoting Ps. 36:1 [Hebrew: v.2]) reads, "There is no fear of God before their eyes." The structure and form of the underlying Hebrew appear quite plainly. Eph. 1:18 has "the riches of his glorious inheritance in the saints." Rom. 3:25 reads: "God presented him as a sacrifice of atonement, through faith in his blood." The structure of the English sentence misleadingly requires that "faith" have God as subject. Luke 9:55–56 translates the Greek literally: "But Jesus turned and rebuked them, and they went to another village." In English this can only mean that "they" are the same ones referred to by "them," that is, James and John; the meaning that comes

from the English text is that Jesus rebuked James and John and so only these two went off to another village.

Ps. 147:10 is needlessly literal: "His pleasure is not in the strength of the horse, / nor his delight in the legs of a man." The chiasmus in Matt. 7:6 is disregarded, so that pigs continue to attack people and tear them to pieces.

I Samuel 14 reports a battle that the Israelites, under the command of Saul, waged against the Philistines. In v. 3 we read that the priest Ahijah was wearing (or carrying) an ephod—the means for obtaining an oracle from Yahweh. At the appropriate time (v. 18) Saul told Ahijah to bring it to him. (There the MT has "the ark of God" instead of "ephod." There are various explanations for the change in vocabulary; LXX has "ephod.") Just as Ahijah was preparing to seek divine direction by means of the Urim and Thummim, the noise from the Philistine camp indicated that they were ready to attack. So Saul told Ahijah to desist from seeking the divine guidance. In the Hebrew text Saul's words are, "Take away your hand." The literal translation in the NIV will leave all readers, except scholars, quite perplexed. "While Saul was talking to the priest, the tumult in the Philistine camp increased more and more. So Saul said to the priest, 'Withdraw your hand.'" The reader is left to wonder what Ahijah was grabbing at. This is a literal translation that conveys no meaning to the modern reader.

Galatians 3:16,29 speak of Abraham's "seed" (and "the Seed" in 3:19), but in the OT passages the Hebrew word is translated "offspring" (see Gen. 12:7; 13:15; 24:7).

As is to be expected, the translation represents a conservative point of view. Few passages will cause much difficulty with conservatives, and in some instances it appears that a special effort has been made to avoid any controversy. Such seems the case in Isa. 7:14 and Ps. 16:10, seen above. But not always does NIV represent such a tendency. The quotation of (part of) Micah 5:2 in Matt. 2:6 as a messianic prophecy has led many to read Micah 5:2 as a specific reference to Christ, so that the last two lines (not quoted in Matt.) of the verse are read in that light. The King James Version translates: "whose goings forth *have been* from of old, from everlasting," and this has been taken to refer to the eternal preexistence of Christ. The RSV was strongly criticized for translating "whose origin is from of old, from ancient days." NIV has translated, "whose origins^d are from of old, from ancient times.^e" (Footnotes: *d* "Hebrew *goings out*." *e* "Or *from days of eternity*.")

It is rather surprising that the NIV, at this late date, is apparently quite insensitive to the change that has been taking place in

American English concerning what some choose to call male-oriented language. No longer are "man" and "men" seen by many persons to be generic terms, including people of both sexes, but as referring exclusively to people of the male sex. The same is true of "he" and "him." At times the NIV seems to be aware of the changed situation, but in too many places "man" and "men" occur where it would have been a more faithful translation to use expressions and terms which include both sexes. Ps. 1:1 begins "Blessed is the man who . . ." and Isa. 40:6 reads "All men are like grass . . ." In the Sermon on the Mount the disciples are enjoined, "let your light shine before men" (Matt. 5:16); see also "trampled by men" (5:13); "do your 'acts of righteousness' before men" (6:1); "honored by men" (6:2); "to be seen by men" (6:5); "if you forgive men" (6:14); "if you do not forgive men" (6:15); "to show men they are fasting" (6:16); "it will not be obvious to men" (6:18); "all men will hate you" (10:22); "acknowledges me before men" (10:32); "disowns me before men" (10:33).

It is significant that the RSV committee has already announced it will attempt to eliminate all unnecessary male-oriented language in the forthcoming revision of the text. Surely the NIV committee should resolve to do the same.

Style

The translators stated that in matters of style their purpose was that the English should be "clear and natural . . . idiomatic but not idiosyncratic, contemporary but not dated." The archaic "thou," "thee" and "thine" have been discarded, along with corresponding archaic forms of the verbs. Given the differences between American and British English, a British edition has been prepared which "reflects the comparatively few differences of significant idiom and spelling" (Preface, p. viii).

The language is not always today's English, and the style is not always that of current usage, and presumably the translators were aware of this. But in general the language is appropriate to the kind of translation aimed at, that is, a translation that seeks to preserve "some measure of continuity with the long tradition of translating the Scriptures into English." For those who are used to the Bible in the King James Version or the Revised Standard Version, this translation sounds like the Bible.

The NIV is closer in style and form to the RSV than to any other English version. It is an irony worth pondering: this Bible came into being as the result of the repudiation of the RSV by the majority of conservative Protestants in this country, and now that

it has appeared it closely resembles the RSV. The principles that guided it in textual, exegetical, linguistic and stylistic matters are hardly distinguishable from those which guided the RSV. The average Bible reader, hearing the reading of Psalm 46, would not be able to tell whether it was the RSV or the NIV he was listening to, so much alike are the two. And except for the "thous" and "thys" in vv. 4-5, Psalm 23 is practically the same in the two versions.

To sum up one's impression after spending some time with this translation: The NIV is the product of careful and conscientious scholarship; while still too closely tied in form to the underlying Hebrew and Greek structures, it is nonetheless a significant achievement, and its appearance is an occasion for rejoicing. It is to be hoped that at long last the NIV will once and for all lay to final rest the still widespread belief that the King James Version is the original Word of God and that any translation that differs from it is a perversion, a devil's masterpiece produced by people with a low view of Scripture.

APPENDIX

Participants in the New International Version Translation Project

Edwin H. Palmer, Executive Secretary and Coordinator

COMMITTEE ON BIBLE TRANSLATION: Kenneth L. Barker (Dallas Theol. Sem.), Ralph Earle (Nazarene Theol. Sem.), Burton L. Goddard (Gordon-Conwell Theol. Sem.), R. Laird Harris (Covenant Theol. Sem.), Earl S. Kalland (Conserv. Bapt. Theol. Sem.), Youngve R. Kindberg (President, New York International Bible Society), Richard N. Longenecker (Wycliffe Coll., Univ. of Toronto), William J. Martin (Regent Coll., Vancouver), Stephen W. Paine (Houghton Coll.), Robert Preus (Concordia Theol. Sem.), John H. Stek (Calvin Theol. Sem.), Larry L. Walker (Southw. Bapt. Theol. Sem.), J.C. Wenger (Goshen Bibl. Sem.), Marten H. Woudstra (Calvin Theol. Sem.)

OTHER TRANSLATORS AND EDITORS: Robert L. Alden (Conserv. Bapt. Theol. Sem.), Gleason L. Archer (Trin. Evangel. Div. Sch.), Glenn W. Barker (Fuller Theol. Sem.), James Battenfield (Grace Theol. Sem.), S. Herbert Bess (Grace Theol. Sem.), Harvey J.S. Blaney (Asbury Theol. Sem.), W. Gordon Brown (Central Bapt. Sem., Toronto), Donald W. Burdick (Conserv. Bapt. Theol. Sem.), Frederic W. Bush (Fuller Theol. Sem.), E. Leslie Carlson* (Southw. Bapt. Theol. Sem.), Philip S. Clapp (West. Evangel. Sem.), Edmund Clowney (Westmin. Theol. Sem.), Ralph R. Covell (Conserv. Bapt. Theol. Sem.), John J. Davis (Grace Theol. Sem.), Wilber T. Dayton (Wesley Bibl. Sem.), Raymond Dillard (Westmin. Theol. Sem.), David Englehard (Calvin Theol. Sem.), Milton Fisher (Ref. Episc. Sem.), Lewis A. Foster (Cincinnati Bible Sem.), Francis Foulkes (Bible Coll. of New Zealand), Richard B. Gaffin (Westmin. Theol. Sem.), Wesley L. Gerig (Fort

Wayne Bible Coll.), Donald Glenn (Dallas Theol. Sem.), Louis Goldberg (Moody Bible Inst.), David Gooding (Queens Coll., Belfast, Ire.), Clarence B. Hale (Wheaton Coll.), Murray J. Harris (Trin. Evangel. Div. Sch.), Everett Harrison (Fuller Theol. Sem.), Roland K. Harrison (Wycliffe Coll., Toronto), Gerald F. Hawthorne (Wheaton Coll.), Roy E. Hayden (Oral Roberts Univ.), William Hendriksen (Boca Raton, Fla.), D. Edmond Hiebert (Mennonite Brethren Bibl. Sem.), Mark E. Hillmer (Northw. Luth. Theol. Sem.), F.B. Huey (Southw. Bapt. Theol. Sem.), John C. Jeske (Wis. Luth. Sem.), S. Lewis Johnson (Dallas, Tex.), Walter C. Kaiser (Trin. Evangel. Div. Sch.), Kenneth S. Kantzer (Trin. Evangel. Div. Sch.), Homer A. Kent (Grace Theol. Sem.), F. Derek Kidner (Tyndale House, Cambridge, Eng.), Simon Kistemaker (Ref. Theol. Sem.), Meredith G. Kline (Gordon-Conwell Theol. Sem.), Fred C. Kuehner* (Ref. Episc. Sem.), William L. Lane (West. Ky. Univ.), G. Irvin Lehman (East. Mennonite Coll.), Paul E. Leonard (Trin. Evangel. Div. Sch.), Arthur H. Lewis (Bethel Theol. Sem.), Jack P. Lewis (Harding Grad. Sch. of Relig.), Walter L. Liefeld (Trin. Evangel. Div. Sch.), G. Herbert Livingston (Asbury Theol. Sem.), Allan A. MacRae (Bibl. Sch. of Theol.), Donald H. Madvig (Bethel Theol. Sem.), W. Harold Mare (Covenant Theol. Sem.), Thomas E. McComiskey (Trin. Evangel. Div. Sch.), J. Ramsey Michaels (Gordon-Conwell Theol. Sem.), A.R. Millard (Univ. of Liverpool, Eng.), Leon Morris (Ridley Coll., Melbourne, Aus.), Robert Mounce (West. Ky. Univ.), Roger Nicole (Gordon-Conwell Theol. Sem.), John Oswalt (Asbury Theol. Sem.), J. Barton Payne (Covenant Theol. Sem.), Stephen Reynolds (Glenside, Pa.), Charles Pfeiffer* (Central Mich. Univ.), Robert P. Roth (Northw. Luth. Sem.), Charles Ryrie (Dallas Theol. Sem.), Jack B. Scott (Ref. Theol. Sem.), Elmer B. Smick (Gordon-Conwell Theol. Sem.), Francis Steele (Upper Darby, Pa.), Harold G. Stigers (Covenant Theol. Sem.), Marvin E. Tate (South. Bapt. Theol. Sem.), G. Aiken Taylor (Asheville, N.C.), Merrill C. Tenney (Wheaton Coll.), Gerard Van Groningen (Ref. Theol. Sem.), Wilbur B. Wallis (Covenant Theol. Sem.), Bruce K. Waltke (Regent Coll., Vancouver), Rowland Ward (Australia), G. Henry Waterman* (Wheaton Coll.), John Werner (International Linguistics Center), Walter W. Wessel (Bethel Coll.), David J. Williams (South Calif. Coll.), Marvin R. Wilson (Gordon Coll.), Donald J. Wiseman (Univ. of London, Eng.), Herbert M. Wolf (Wheaton Coll.), Leon J. Wood* (Grand Rapids Bapt. Bible Sem.), Ronald Youngblood (Bethel Theol. Sem.), John M. Zinkand (Dordt Coll.).

*deceased

LITERARY CRITICS AND OTHER CONSULTANTS: Edward M. Blaiklock (Univ. of Auckland, New Zealand), Frank E. Gaebelain (Headmaster Emeritus, The Stony Brook School), Charles Hummel (Intervarsity Christian Fellowship), Dennis F. Kinlaw (Asbury Theol. Sem.), Elisabeth E. Leith (South Hamilton, Mass.), Calvin Linton (George Wash. Univ.), Kathryn Ludwigson (Grand Rapids Bapt. Bible Coll.), Alvin Martin (Fuller Theol. Sem.), Virginia Mollenkott (William Patterson Coll.), W.T. Purkiser (Kansas City, Mo.), Palmer Robertson (Westmin. Theol. Sem.), Walter R. Roehrs (Concordia Theol. Sem.), Samuel J. Schultz (Wheaton Coll.), Margaret Nicholson Smith (Editor, *American-English Usage*), John J. Timmerman (Calvin Coll.), Richard F. Wevers (Calvin Coll.)

(Information above provided by the New York International Bible Society)

The New Jewish Version

by KEITH R. CRIM

When the Jewish Publication Society (JPS) decided to prepare a new English translation of the Hebrew Scriptures they were breaking with an old tradition and joining the main stream of a new tradition. The old was reliance on existing Christian translations as the standard for style and diction. This is evident in the 1917 translation which JPS produced and distributed. The new tradition is that of using fully contemporary language and avoiding wooden, literal phrases and sentences, as other recent English translations have also done. But this is not simply another version; it is a fresh translation produced by some of the leading contemporary Jewish scholars, who have made outstanding contributions to biblical scholarship. In addition they have brought to their work a familiarity with the Bible in life and worship and a knowledge of centuries of scholarship in the Jewish community.

1. Publication to Date

The NJV has been appearing piecemeal since 1962, when *The Torah* was published. Jewish attitudes toward the Scripture and the liturgical need of the Jewish community are reflected in the choice of the first five books of the Bible to launch the new version. Basic to the Jewish view of life, Torah was the obvious choice. The prescribed readings for the year carry the community through the Torah from autumn to autumn.

Then in 1969 we were given *The Five Megilloth and Jonah*, the six smaller books of the Bible that are used on the various holy days. (*Megilloth* ["Scrolls"] is a designation for the books of Esther, Lamentations, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Solomon.) This is the only NJV portion to appear in a diglot, with Hebrew and English in parallel columns. In Hebrew book tradition, this volume starts from what would be the back of an English book, and unlike *The Torah* is illustrated with striking line drawings.

Publication of "The Writings," third division of the Hebrew Canon, which was begun with *The Five Megilloth*, took a step forward with *The Book of Psalms* in 1973. Although it contains no pictures, the typography is attractive and the modern Hebrew typeface used on the title page and to identify the letters of the Hebrew alphabet in the acrostic Psalms is particularly pleasing to the eye.

Isaiah appeared in 1973 in a coffee table edition, with drawings on green pages that contrast with the white pages of the text.

Simultaneously it appeared in a less expensive and smaller version. Later the same year *Jeremiah* was issued in a coffee table edition with woodcuts, in my estimate, the most pleasing illustrations of any of the separate editions. Both Isaiah and Jeremiah were included in the completed *The Prophets—Nevi'im* in 1978. This volume is identical in format to *The Torah* and completes the second division of the Hebrew canon. ("Former Prophets": Joshua, Judges, I and II Samuel, I and II Kings; and "Latter Prophets": Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and "The Twelve" [Minor Prophets])

2. Orlinsky's *Notes on the New Translation of the Torah*

Each separate volume has an introduction that tells something of the nature of the translation project. But the most detailed account is given by Dr. Harry M. Orlinsky, Editor-in-Chief of the NJV, in the introduction to his *Notes* (1969). In the remainder of this invaluable volume he gives specific explanations of the reasoning behind the translation of key passages. The notes are fullest for Genesis, but he carries them through all five books of the Pentateuch.

He tells also about the organization of the work. It was begun with a committee of seven: three biblical scholars, the editor of the Jewish Publication Society, and one representative of each of the three sections of organized religious Jewish life in America—Conservative, Reform, and Orthodox. In order to expedite the work an additional committee was created in 1966 to translate the third division of the Hebrew canon, the *Kethubim*, or "Writings."

The procedures followed represent standard practices for such a translation. One person (for the *Torah*, the Editor-in-Chief) prepared a draft translation which was circulated to the other members, along with comments and explanations of the reasons for particular readings. The other members sent in their comments, and on the average of once every two weeks the entire committee met for a full day. Most decisions were made by consensus, but whenever a vote was necessary, a majority of those voting decided the issue.

3. *How to Study the NJV*

NJV has a great deal to offer the non-Jewish reader. It can be read systematically or selectively as an alternative to other English versions. It can be read for pleasure or spiritual benefit. It is also a good Bible for scholarly study, and its differences from other versions will stimulate you to explore the differences and try to understand the reasons for them.

The place to begin for scholarly study is with the footnotes in NJV. These are essentially translator's notes, explaining to the reader what the translators have done. The detailed comments later on in this article give guidance in how to use the notes. But in addition to the notes, the text itself is waiting to yield up new insights. Almost any familiar translation can serve as a starting point, and comparing the familiar with the unfamiliar will throw new light on both.

Not that I am suggesting a search for wording that confirms what you already believe. A preacher once told me that he had had to consult eight different translations of his text before he found one that supported what he had already decided to say in his sermon. I am suggesting a search for ways to let the text speak for itself. It can be done by taking a specific passage as a whole, examining its parts in each translation you are using, and seeing the role each phrase, sentence, and paragraph plays in the total meaning of the passage.

Another basis for comparison is the rendering of special terminology. Take a word like "righteousness" and with the help of a concordance locate a number of representative passages in the RSV which use the word. (Note, however, that while the RSV is often quite literal, it does at times vary the translation of a word to fit a particular context.) Then look at the way NJV renders that term in each passage. Does NJV's term fit the context better? Is it more natural English usage? Does it suggest some aspect of the concept that a more literal, woodenly consistent rendering might miss? Is the word that is appropriate in one context slightly misleading in another? Some concrete examples are given below.

One word of caution. NJV follows the verse and chapter divisions of the Hebrew text, and these are often different from the English Bible. RSV usually points out such differences in a footnote, e.g. Mal. 4:1-6. In the Hebrew Bible the Psalm titles have verse numbers, so that sometimes there may be as much as two verses difference between Hebrew and English. For example in Psalms 19, 20, 21, 22 verse 1 is the title so that the English verse 1 is Hebrew verse 2. In Ps. 51 English verse 1 is Hebrew verse 3.

4. The Steps in Translation

Any translator of an ancient document must raise three questions, representing three stages of the translation process. First is the question of the text itself. Where the Hebrew text is unclear, scholars may turn to various ancient translations or they may make more or less informed guesses based on modern knowledge of biblical backgrounds or linguistic processes. And sometimes

recently discovered manuscripts give what appears to be a clearer, more accurate text. So decisions must be made. Second, the translator must ask what the text means. This includes not just individual words but the larger units in which the words occur. A translator may get words right, but have wrong reference of pronouns, incorrect transitions, and word order that misplaces the emphasis. Third, the translator must find a natural, easily understood way of expressing the meaning in English. Involved here is the level of usage, which may range from colloquial speech to highly formal language. Since the NJV is intended for liturgical usage, it tends to move on a fairly formal level. We shall now examine these three stages of the translation process as evidenced in NJV.

a. Determining the text

The answer to the *first*, textual, question is clear. Both *The Torah* and *The Prophets* say on the title page, "A new translation of the Holy Scriptures according to the Masoretic text." This claim is borne out by examination of the translation. The translators have endeavored to bring over into English the meaning of the traditional Masoretic text (produced by the labors of medieval Jewish scholars to agree upon a "standard" text). In so doing, they have chosen not to employ more recently discovered pre-Masoretic Hebrew manuscripts or to engage in a hypothetical reconstruction of the received text based on ancient translations or in subjective "corrections" based on a feeling that the traditional text was "somehow" wrong. Nevertheless, there are many places where there are genuine difficulties in this procedure. Let us look at the ways NJV dealt with some problem passages.

The simplest way is to recognize that there is a difficulty and translate as best one can, then add a footnote acknowledging what has been done. NJV has notes such as "Heb. obscure," "Meaning of Heb. uncertain," "Exact force of Heb. uncertain," etc. The book of Ezekiel presents many difficulties of this sort. Ezek. 19:10 reads in NJV "Your mother was like a vine *b*-in your blood,- *b*" with the note "Meaning of Heb. uncertain; emendation yields 'in a vineyard.'" Certainly the Hebrew text is puzzling and the emendation (followed also by RSV) makes more sense. But perhaps such a correction is too easy, and to make it gives the modern reader more certainty about the verse than is justified.

Emendation, then, is a second solution, but one that NJV consistently avoids. The notes "emendation yields" are frequent, but angel-like, the translators feared to tread on this ground. A careful comparison of these rejected emendations in NJV with what

was done in the same passages in RSV and other versions will bring into focus the implications of emending the text. Can modern scholars solve these ancient problems? What authority, then, does an emended text have compared to a text that leaves the problem unresolved?

The translator, if not on firm ground, is at least on less mirey clay when following the ancient versions, especially the Septuagint (LXX) in Greek, and the Targums in Aramaic. Jer. 12:4b reads in NJV, "Must beasts and birds perish, / because of the evil of its inhabitants / Who say, 'He will not look upon our future'?^b" The note says "^bSeptuagint reads 'ways.'" RSV takes no notice of this problem, and TEV follows LXX. "He will not look upon our future" seems to imply that God may not survive as long as we do. "Ways" implies that God is indifferent to what we do. Certainly there is a problem here, and NJV may have chosen the best way by leaving the question open.

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls provided the oldest Hebrew manuscript evidence available and NJV takes note of this, especially in Isaiah. At Isa. 11:6 NJV notes that the Isaiah scroll from Qumran (IQIs^a) and the LXX agree, but still the traditional Masoretic reading is kept in the text.

Yet another approach is to assign a new meaning to a Hebrew word in light of usage elsewhere in the Bible (see Ps. 39:2 [Hebrew:3]) or in view of the context (Ps. 99:11 [Hebrew: 12]). Being alert to this type of procedure, always marked by a footnote, can provide helpful comparisons to other versions.

Isa. 13:8e reads, "Their faces livid with fright." The reason for departing from the usual translation is given in a note: "Taking the root *lhb* as a variant of *bhl*: others 'shall be faces of flame.'" This presupposes a reversal of consonants in the Hebrew, a common enough occurrence in language. If the reversal took place in the copying of a text, it is an error. If it took place in the spoken language often enough that a native speaker would regard the two forms as simple variants of each other, then NJV is justified in translating as it did without saying this is an emendation. Whatever the nature of the change, it does make sense.

All translators encounter problems with the text of Samuel. NJV was able to consult an ancient manuscript (4QSam^a) that is in private hands and has not been published or made available to the scholarly world. It is therefore impossible to evaluate its usefulness, but NJV often refers to it in footnotes, especially when it agrees with the LXX. In this connection the footnote at I Sam. 1:23 seems unprecedented in modern Bible translations: "The translators herewith express their thanks to Professor Frank M.

Cross, Jr., for graciously making available to them copies of his unpublished Samuel fragments.”

Sometimes part of the Hebrew text seems to be out of order, and some translations shift verses to a place where they seem to fit better. Isa. 38:21–22 seems to fit better between vss. 6 and 7, the place where they are found in the parallel passage in II Kings 20:9–11. NJV does not make this move, although it does rearrange verses elsewhere. In Isa. 10, part of vs. 18 is moved to the end of vs. 16 “for clarity” and in Isa. 9, part of vs. 16 is placed after vs. 17.

NJV gives the overall impression of a respectful attitude toward the traditional text, recognizing that there are insoluble problems and alerting the reader to their presence.

b. Establishing the meaning

In examining the *second* stage of the translation process, the footnotes help us see what the translators have done, and Orlinsky's *Notes* give explanations of some of the most consistent changes, especially the free rendering of idioms. Orlinsky gives several examples of the idiomatic “take in one's hand,” which means simply “take along,” “take with.” This is beautifully illustrated in Isa. 6:6. RSV says that one of the seraphim flew down to Isaiah, “having in his hand a burning coal which he had taken with tongs from the altar.” If he could hold it in his hands, he didn't need tongs in the first place. NJV gives the correct picture: “one of the seraphs flew over to me with a live coal, which he had taken from the altar with a pair of tongs.” By recognizing Hebrew idioms as idioms (often, as in this case, they are dead or atrophied metaphors), NJV has given the meaning accurately. No note was deemed necessary.

Other metaphors are more striking, and NJV has preserved them, while giving an explanation in the margin, e.g., Isa. 37:3: “The babes have reached the birthstool, but the strength to give birth is lacking.” The footnote explains: “I.e. the situation is desperate, and we are at a loss.” Could the idiom have been retained in a somewhat less literal form? As NJV now stands, the concrete object “birthstool” represents the event of birth, but the reader's initial impression may be that the babes are already born, although this is contradicted by the second clause. RSV by slight departures from literalism has a better reading. Still better is NEB, which makes the comparison explicit and the whole sentence clear English: “We are like a woman who has no strength to bear the child who is coming to birth.” Note, however, that the two subordinate clauses starting with “who” made the sentence

more complicated than necessary. TEV goes a step further and uses coordinate clauses: "We are like a woman who is ready to give birth, but is too weak to do it." As a result the structure of the sentence reflects the natural order of thought in the entire figure of speech.

The study of comparatively easy problems like this will give increasing skill in the use of several modern versions to cast light on a given passage, skill that will come in handy in the study of more difficult problems in the Bible.

Where the metaphor is not so striking, NJV puts the natural English equivalent in the text (e.g., "grant me relief," Ps. 31:9 [English: 8]), and the literal translation in the margin ("make my feet stand in a broad place"). It may be asking too much to wonder whether there was a principle at work here, or whether each time there was an *ad hoc* decision as to what went into the margin and what into the text.

In many passages there are legitimate differences of opinion, which NJV identifies in the footnote as being held by "others." In Exod. 1:10, NJV interprets Pharaoh's fear as being that the Israelites will "gain ascendancy over the country." RSV is among the "others" who see it as a fear that the Israelites will "get them up out of the country," i.e., escape. At Exod. 21:6 a slave is to be taken "before God" in a certain situation. The alternate interpretation given in the note is that the Hebrew word *elohim* (God) refers to human judges. This is probably another metaphor familiar in the language of devotion, when a worshiper in a sanctuary feels he or she is in the "presence of God," whoever the officiating human being may be. From the human point of view, one is taken before a judge, but the important participant, though unseen, is God himself. Each translation must decide which differences of interpretation are important enough to merit mention in a footnote.

Sometimes the meaning depends on knowledge of ancient customs, knowledge shared by the original readers or hearers, but which we lack. Jer. 32:7 deals with the right of a near kinsman to repurchase land that might otherwise be lost to the extended family. NJV has a clear statement in the text and the literal rendering in a note. In some passages this procedure may result in loss of poetic quality, as it clearly does in Ps. 78:63. "And their maidens remained unwed" is prose, while NJV's note on that passage "had no nuptial song" retains the pathos of poetry.

Especially high marks are due to NJV for dealing creatively with the idiomatic meaning of "kidneys," called "reins" in King James English. While it sounds dignified for God to "try the

reins,” it doesn’t sound right to say he “tries the kidneys.” We assign psychological functions to the heart, but not to the kidneys in our society. NJV has identified the kidneys as the seat of the conscience and abandoned the metaphorical use of the organ. Note how well this fits the context of Pss. 7:10 [English: 9]; 16:7. We also no longer have “bowels of compassion,” but we have “gut feelings,” something rather different. Now the “bowels” of Jer. 31:20 have become a yearning heart in NJV, and most other modern translations (although NEB could not resist saying in a note that it literally is “bowels rumble”!).

Rather different problems confront the translator when dealing with abstract terminology. The Hebrew word *ṣedhāqāh* has usually been translated as “righteousness” or “justice.” NJV gave a number of different equivalents in the attempt to express the proper shade of meaning in each context. In Ps. 106:3 the activity of Phineas “was reckoned to his merit.” In Pss. 22:32 [English: 31]; 69:28 [English: 27] God’s attitude toward his people is in focus, so a good equivalent is “beneficence.” The reader might object to the word as unpoetic and a bit high flown, but it is in the proper area of meaning. In Ps. 24:5 it is “a just reward from God,” and in Ps. 98:2, “triumph,” that is, God’s having overcome his enemies. “Triumph” is also the translation in Isa. 51:6; in Isa. 46:12 we find “victory.” Yet another meaning is disclosed in Isa. 45:23, where it is the “truth” of what God proclaims which is in focus.

Here in these few passages is illustrated the important point that there is great gain in distinguishing the significance of some terms in each specific context, and not mechanically translating them the same way every time they occur. When the quality of *ṣedhāqāh* is accorded to a person for some deed performed, it is “merit” or “reward.” When it is God’s attitude toward humans it is “beneficence,” and when it is the quality of God’s statements it is “truth.” As the culmination of God’s successful activity, it is “triumph” or “victory.” These examples ought to arouse the curiosity of a serious student of English versions to go on to examine other passages and compare the way translators have tried to bring out the meaning of this term, so rich in nuances in Hebrew, and so flexible in fitting such varied contexts.

Again and again NJV has succeeded in finding the most appropriate English idiom for expressing the meaning of the Hebrew, but the translators were not consistent in calling attention to the so-called literal equivalents. A word may be the literal equivalent of one segment of meaning of a term it is chosen to translate, but by omitting other, equally important elements of meaning it may

be a serious distortion. This can be seen in some instances where square brackets are used to mark departures from literalism. In Judg. 1:2 it is obvious that it is not the then long-dead individual Judah who is to attack the Canaanites, but the tribe that claimed descent from him. So it is correct to say, "Let the tribe of Judah go up." But NJV encloses "the tribe of" in brackets. In the very next verse we have "Judah then said to their brother-tribe Simeon," and "tribe" is not marked by brackets. It is implicit in the text that two tribes are meant, not two individuals, so it is semantically appropriate to identify the two entities as tribes. No brackets are needed, but if brackets are used in vs. 2 they are also called for in vs. 3.

Another type of example is provided by Josh. 7:5, "And the heart of the troops sank in utter dismay." A footnote gives the literal equivalent as "melted and turned to water." Clearly the reading in the text is superior to that in the note, which is of help only to someone comparing the English and the Hebrew. But only three verses later the text reads, "Israel has turned tail before its enemies," a good vigorous idiom, but not a literal translation. Yet the translators did not feel obligated to provide a note saying, "lit. 'turned the back of their necks.'"

c. Finding the best way to say it in English

The question of meaning as discussed above merges almost imperceptibly with the *third* question of how to say it in the target language, in this case, English. Three dimensions of this question call for particular attention: archaic language or contemporary language; simple style or more formal style; and appropriateness of literary genre, e.g., prose or poetry.

Any ancient book will sound as if it came from another era. The customs are different from ours, the world-view is quaint, the means of transportation, communication, and warfare are out-moded. There is no need to resort to archaic language, as the RSV does, to make the Bible sound venerable. NJV wisely opted for contemporary usage, most conspicuously in the abandonment of archaic pronouns and verb forms, as all other truly contemporary translations have done. Being modern, however, is not always easy, and the NJV uses such archaic words as "lest," "lo," "hark, hearken," and "of yore." As a result there are numerous passages that lose something of the immediacy they should have if they are to confront the reader in everyday life at the end of the twentieth century. A living language changes fast enough as it is without encumbering a translation with words that have already passed out of common usage.

As for stylistic level, NJV in general chose the elegant and the formal rather than the simple. This choice accords with the purpose of the translation to be suitable for use in worship and to appeal to a well-educated audience. The vocabulary is rich and varied, and I have not found any passages where I thought a word was avoided simply because it was rare. The effect of this is most apparent when extended passages are read and the majesty of the Bible is underlined by the cumulative effect of the vocabulary and the manner in which sentences and paragraphs are structured.

There is, however, at least one conspicuous instance in which NJV chose a term that is not only unusual but also imprecise and inadequate. The RSV uses the phrase "utterly destroyed" to describe the process (*herem*) whereby Canaanite towns were not looted, but all valuable material items and persons found there were destroyed (Judg. 1:17 *et passim*). NJV chose the rare word "proscribe," which in addition to being rare is usually used in the sense of "banish," "prohibit," or "condemn." This seems to be a case where the search for the *mot juste* went astray. If the reader does not know the practice that lies behind the word, there is no way to understand the English term in this context by looking it up in a dictionary.

Perhaps no category can contain or account for one distinctive decision of the NJV translators, although it is appropriate in the Jewish tradition. The divine name YHWH, which is by long tradition not pronounced, is a perennial problem for the translator. Most English versions follow the custom of using "Lord" as the best equivalent and, to distinguish it from the translation of the Hebrew *adonai* as "Lord," print it in small capitals: "LORD." NJV does this in every instance except Exod. 6:3, where God reveals this sacred name to Moses. Instead of translating it, NJV simply prints the four Hebrew letters יהוה (YHWH)! Alas for the reader who knows no Hebrew.

NJV is sensitive to problems of sentence structure. Biblical Hebrew uses comparatively few subordinate clauses, and coordination is the normal means of bringing thought together. One of the definite aims of the NJV was to avoid translating every "and" in the Hebrew Bible, and by doing so they have produced a much more readable translation. Orlinksy (*Notes*, p. 20) points to Gen. 31:54–32:1 [English: 32:54–55] as a good example of the way NJV used subordination. In passages such as this, NJV uses many types of transitional words and phrases to help the story flow smoothly.

It is often hard to bring out the emotional tone of a particular passage. Note, however, the highly successful way in which the NJV expresses biting sarcasm in Isa. 10:15, "As though the rod swung him who lifts it, / As though the staff lifted the man!" As you read NJV be alert for ways in which irony, grief, joy, anger are highlighted by the choice of vocabulary and by sentence structure.

One of the great treasures of the Hebrew Scriptures is the variety of literary genres. In Jeremiah the contrast of prose sermons (e.g., ch. 7), biographical narrative (e.g., chs. 26–29), poetic oracles (e.g., ch. 2) and passionate "confessions" in verse (e.g., 15:15–18) can be readily seen in NJV. As has become customary in modern translations, NJV distinguishes passages that are in Hebrew verse by printing them as English verse. In many instances a genuinely poetic quality is achieved, but this is not always maintained consistently. Ecclesiastes 1:6 is beautiful. "Southward blowing, / Turning northward, / Ever turning blows the wind; / On its rounds the wind returns." But the verses before and after it are less successful. The quality of *The Song of Songs* is generally high, preserving a sensuous quality of the poetry and marking most transitions well. The reader would be able to follow it better, however, if there were indication in the margin to identify the speakers and mark the alternation between the man and the woman. In the Hebrew original grammatical gender gives many clues that cannot readily be brought over into English without notational indications.

Job and *Proverbs* have not yet been published. It will be interesting to see how the lengthy, intense poetry of *Job* is handled, and whether the different types of poetry in *Proverbs* are translated in ways appropriate to each type. The quality of the work now available indicates that the remaining books will be translated well and beautifully.

Considering all the problems that are involved in finding the best way to phrase a translation in English, it is inevitable that any translation makes many compromises in style, sometimes under the pressure of striving for precision and accuracy, sometimes under the pressure of the needs of the community that will use the translation. After all, not only are the Hebrew Scriptures the sacred book of on-going communities of faith, but its parts are highly diverse in content and style. The NJV teams of translators have, by their skill and diligence, given the world a work that repays all efforts devoted to its study and, in addition, stimulates further study, thought, and mediation. The words come alive, the

meaning challenges us to respond, the purpose of the whole of Scripture, which is to give glory to God, becomes part of our lives.

APPENDIX

Editors and Translators for the New Jewish Version

Torah (Law), Nevi'im (Prophets), and the Five Megilloth (Scrolls): Editor-in-Chief, Harry M. Orlinsky (Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion), H.L. Ginsberg (Jewish Theological Seminary), Ephraim A. Speiser (University of Pennsylvania), Rabbi Max Arzt (Rabbinical Assembly [Conservative]), Rabbi Bernard J. Bamberger (Central Conference of American Rabbis [Reform]), Rabbi Harry Freedman (Rabbinical Council of America [Orthodox]), Solomon Grayzel (Editor of the Jewish Publication Society)

Kethubim (Writings): Moshe Greenberg (Hebrew University), Jonas C. Greenfield (Hebrew University), Nahum M. Sarna (Brandeis University), Rabbi Saul Leeman (Conservative), Rabbi Martin S. Rozenburg (Reform), Rabbi David Shapiro (Orthodox), Chaim Potok (Editor of the Jewish Publication Society)

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. General

Beegle, Dewey M. *God's Word Into English*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1960. Deals primarily with translation problems and with the history of English versions since Wyclif. Appendix F deals with "More Recent Translations," a section that is now out-dated.

Branton, J.R. "Versions, English," in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (hereafter: *IDB*), IV, 760–771. Good though brief treatment to the time of the RSV.

Bratcher, Robert G. "One Bible in Many Translations," in *Interpretation*, XXXII (1978), 115–129. Insightful but unsystematic comments on most recent important translations (does not include the NJV).

Brown, Raymond E. "Recent Roman Catholic Translations of the Bible," in *McCormick Quarterly*, XIX (May 1966), 283–292.

Bruce, F.F. *The English Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2nd ed., 1970. A helpful discussion of versions from the Old English Period through the NEB, concerned primarily with historical background and matters of style. The discussion of KJV is particularly helpful. However, so many versions are covered that little detail can be given to them, and the author's allocation of space is sometimes curious: NAB is given but 2 pages; TEV less than a single page; NJV but 6 lines. On the other extreme, such less important works as the "Berkeley Version" are given 4 pages! Often there is no discussion of textual base or accuracy of translation, and the author's "evangelical" stance sometimes is evident in his evaluations.

Crim, Keith R. "Versions, English," in *IDB*, Supplementary Volume, pp. 933–938. Good format; brief discussion of major recent versions (NEB, NAB, NJV, TEV, JB, NIB, and LB). Tends to avoid justifiable negative evaluation.

———. "Old Testament Translations and Interpretation," in *Interpretation*, XXXII (1978), 144–157. More a discussion of a few translation-problems (and how they are handled by the major recent versions) than of translations as a whole.

Davies, Paul E. "A Descriptive List of Bible Translations Since 1901," in *McCormick Quarterly*, XIX (May 1966), 309–325.

Greenslade, S.L., ed. *The Cambridge History of the Bible, III*. Cambridge: University Press, 1963. See esp. pp. 141–174 ("English Versions of the Bible, 1525–1611") and 361–382 ("English Versions Since 1611"). Deals primarily and excellently with historical background.

May, Herbert G. "Authorized Versions," in *IDB*, Suppl. Vol. A good discussion of this term, which is often mistakenly limited in application to KJV.

Williamson, Lamar, Jr. "Translation and Interpretation: New Testament," in *Interpretation*, XXXII (1978), 158–170. (See the previous remarks concerning Crim's article in the same issue.)

2. The Jerusalem Bible (JB)

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. Review of JB in *Theological Studies*, XXVII (1967), 129–131. Commends the version for "over-all excellence."

Grant, Frederick C. Review of JB in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXVI (1967), 91–93.

de Lella, Alexander. Review of JB in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XXIX (1967), 148–151. Regards the version as "a good annotated Bible" with "adequate introductions." The review focuses upon a number of problems, usually in relation to an over-reliance upon the French edition.

Rhodes, Erroll F. "Text of NT in Jerusalem and New English Bibles," in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XXXII (1970), 41–57. Discusses the two versions in relation to their

nearest relatives (e.g., for NEB: KJV, RV, and RSV) in terms of agreements and deviations; then compares the two as to their use of the Greek text.

Vawter, Bruce. Review of the French edition (*La Sainte Bible*) in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XVIII (1956), 315–317. As of the date of the article, the author remarks that this is “the most authoritative and respected Bible translation in existence today.”

3. The Living Bible (LB)

Bowman, Robert C. “The Living Bible—a Critique,” in *Brethren Life and Thought*, XVIII (Summer 1973), 137–142. Lists a number of passages where the evangelical theology of the paraphraser (Kenneth N. Taylor) “has been imposed upon scriptures at the cost of accuracy.” Indeed, it is remarked that this version attempts to “correct” the scriptures! (There is a response by Kenneth Taylor at pp. 143–144.)

Crim, Keith R. Review of LB, in *The Bible Translator*, XXIII (July 1972), 340–344. Concludes that, overall, this is a “responsible work.”

Ellington, John. “The Living Bible Examined,” in *Presbyterian Survey*, Oct. 1978, pp. 9–11. Applies three criteria for an adequate version of the Bible: readability, textual basis, and accuracy of interpretation. The author gives high marks (generally) for the first criterion as applied to LB, but failing marks for the other two.

Smart, James D. “The Invented Bible,” in *Presbyterian Record*, July–Aug. 1976. The article has been reprinted in its entirety in the present volume.

4. The New American Bible (NAB)

Arbez, Edward P. “The New Catholic Translation of the Old Testament,” in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XIV (1952), 237–254.

Barr, James. “After Five Years: A Retrospect on Two Major Translations of the Bible,” in *The Heythrop Journal*, XV (Oct. 1974), 381–405. One of the best comparisons, by a scholar of the first rank, concentrating primarily upon the NEB from the point of view of excessive use of comparative philology in deriving new semantic possibilities. He finds the NAB to be more cautious in this and in textual matters, and properly so.

Danker, Frederick W. Review of NAB in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XXXIII (1971), 405–409. Generally high praise, including the judgment that the version deserves, for the present, the designation “the American Bible.”

Metzger, Bruce M. “The New American Bible, 1970,” in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LXIV (March 1971), 90–99.

Peifer, Claude J. “The New American Bible,” in *Worship*, XLV (Feb. 1971), 102–113. After a number of minor criticisms, the author agrees with “objective critics” that the NAB is “a competent and reliable rendering in good contemporary English.”

Reumann, John. Review of NAB in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XCII (1973), 275–278.

5. The New English Bible (NEB)

Barr, James, “After Five Years: A Retrospect on two Major Translations of the Bible,” in *The Heythrop Journal*, XV (Oct. 1974), 381–405. (For a summary, see under NAB.)

Bratcher, Robert. Review of NEB, in *The Bible Translator*, XII (July 1961), 97–106.

Brockington, L.H. *The Hebrew Text of the OT: The Readings Adopted by the Translators of the NEB*. Oxford: University Press, 1973. Gives the emendations of the Masoretic Text, which the translators accepted, without explanation (a great pity).

Burrows, Millar. Review of NEB, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXXIX (1970), 220–222.

Daiches, David. “Translating the Bible,” in *Commentary*, May 1970, pp. 59–68.

Hunt, Geoffrey. *About the New English Bible*. Oxford: University Press, 1970. Con-

centrates upon the work of the committees which produced this version, as well as upon the format of the version.

Macintosh, A.A., Graham Stanton, and David L. Frost. "The 'New English Bible' Reviewed," in *Theology*, LXXIV (April 1971), 154–166. A substantial analysis of the accuracy and literary quality of this version.

Metzger, Bruce M. "The New English Bible, 1970," in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LXIII (1970), 99–104.

Rhodes, Erroll F. "Text of NT in Jerusalem and New English Bibles," in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XXXII (1970), 41–57. (For a description, see under JB.)

Sanders, James A. Review of NEB, in the *Christian Century*, March 18, 1970, pp. 326–328.

Tasker, R.V.G. *The Greek New Testament*. Oxford: University Press, 1964. The Greek text upon which the NEB is based.

Taylor, Charles L. "The New English Bible Translation of Psalms," in *Anglican Theological Review*, LIV (July 1972), 194–205.

Terrien, Samuel. Review of NEB, in *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, XXV (1970), 549–555.

Van Ness Goetchius, Eugene. Review of NEB, in *Anglican Theological Review*, LII (July 1970), 167–176. Compares NEB with RSV and JB, giving higher marks to NEB on the basis of several criteria.

See also *The Journal of Jewish Studies*, XXIV (1973) for a review (nv).

6. The New International Version (NIV)

Deboer, Willis P. Review of NIV, in *Calvin Theological Journal*, X (April 1975), 66–78. Covers the New Testament portion of the version only. Finds the differences from RSV not very significant.

Lasor, William Sanford. "What Kind of Version is the New International?" in *Christianity Today*, Oct. 20, 1978, pp. 78–80. The author finds the NIV "not . . . measurably superior to the RSV" in readability, and that the accuracy of translation is generally reliable.

Ryken, Leland. "The Literary Merit of the New International Version," in *Christianity Today*, Oct. 20, 1978, pp. 76–77. Gives generally low marks to the translation, and prefers the RSV.

7. The New Jewish Version (NJV)

Crim, Keith R. "The New Jewish Version of the Scriptures," in *The Bible Translator*, XXVI (Jan. 1975), 148–152.

Orlinsky, Harry M. *Notes on the New Translation of the Torah*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1969. Discussion of some of the translation problems, by a member of the committee.

———. "Some Recent Jewish Translations of the Bible," in *McCormick Quarterly*, XIX (May 1966), 293–300.

Sanders, James A. "Textual Criticism and the NJV Torah," in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, XXXIX (1971), 193–197. Basically a review of Orlinsky's *Notes* (above), focused upon the stage of textual development which a particular translation attempts to recover (e.g., Urtext vs. Masoretic Text).

8. The Revised Standard Version (RSV)

Ackroyd, Peter R. "An Authoritative Version of the Bible," in *Expository Times*, LXXXV (Sept. 1974), 374–377. Discusses the goals and durability of the RSV "Common Bible" against the background of the diversity of readings to be found in ancient manuscripts and versions.

Burrows, Millar. "The Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament," in *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*, VII. Oxford: University Press, 1960, pp. 206-221. A general discussion of the differences between the RSV and its parent-versions (KJV and ERV/ASV): removal of archaic language, clarification of ambiguities, up-dated lexicography, footnotes to indicate when the ancient versions are being followed, etc.

May, Herbert G. "The Revised Standard Version after Twenty Years," in *McCormick Quarterly*, XIX (May 1966), 301-308.

———. "The Revised Standard Version Bible," in *Vetus Testamentum*, XXIV (1974), 238-240. Reviews the on-going work of the RSV Bible Committee.

Metzger, Bruce M. "The RSV—Ecumenical Edition," in *Theology Today*, XXXIV (Oct. 1977), 315-317.

———. "The Story Behind the Making of the Revised Standard Version of the Bible," in *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, N.S., I (1978), 189-200.

9. Today's English Version (TEV)

Bullard, Roger A. "Sex-Oriented Language in TEV Proverbs," in *The Bible Translator*, XXVIII (April 1977), 243-245.

May, Herbert G. Review of TEV, in *Interpretation*, XXXII (1978), 187-190.

