

There are occasional typographical errors and there are several mistakes in the page numbers in the "Index of References."

In all Dr. Schonfield's vigorous rendition of the New Testament Greek is impressive and striking. His work is to be recommended to translators, not as a model to be copied, but as an outstanding example of freedom in rendition to be praised in putting the words of the New Testament into the words of today.

This reviewer must confess, however, that despite the author's explanation, he still does not like the sound of that word "Authentic."

Robert G. Bratcher

The Amplified New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan. (Copyright 1958 by the Lockman Foundation, La Habra, California.) 989 pp. \$3.95.

This translation, sponsored by the Lockman Foundation of California, has been made by Frances E. Siewert, B.Lit., B.D., M.A. The stated reason for this new English translation is that in ordinary translations the different shadings of meaning present in the Greek are lost, since the translators have to select one out of many possible choices. "Thus they omitted the delicate shadings of meaning contained in the other possible choices, losing these shadings through translation and depriving today's readers of much that would otherwise clarify and enrich the Word" (inside front dust jacket). By listing the various choices of meaning allowed by the Greek text, this translation claims that "the original and hidden meanings of every key word in the New Testament become the property of every Christian."

Following important words there are listed several other possible meanings as given by standard Greek lexicons and commentaries, and even, in some cases, by Webster's *Unabridged Dictionary* (cf. Mat. 6:12, 15, Acts 10:35, Eph. 6:33). So the verb "to follow" is expanded in Mk. 1:18: "And at once they left their nets and yielding up all claim to them followed (with) Him—joining Him as disciples and siding with his party" (cf. also 1:20, 2:14). In Mk. 1:4 "repentance" and "forgiveness" are expanded: "John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness (desert), preaching a baptism (obligating) repentance—(that is) a change of one's mind for the better and heartily to amend one's ways with abhorrence of his past sins—in order to obtain forgiveness of *and* release from sins." In Mk. 1:15 the verb "repent" is further amplified: "have a change of mind which issues in regret for past sins and in change of conduct for the better." The adjective *makarios* 'blessed' in Mat. 5:3 reads: "Blessed—happy, to be envied, and spiritually prosperous (that is, with life-joy and satisfaction in God's favor and salvation, regardless of their outward conditions) . . ." In 2 Peter 1:2 "peace" is expanded by quotations from Matthew Henry and Webster: "May grace (God's favor) and peace (which is perfect well-being, all necessary good, all spiritual prosperity and freedom from fears and agitating passions and moral conflicts) be multiplied to you . . ." In Mk. 6:3 "and they took offense at Him" is further explained: "*and* were hurt (that is, they disapproved of Him and it hindered them from acknowledging His authority); *and* they were caused to stumble and fall." In Gal. 2:9 "And

when they knew" continues: "(perceived, recognized, understood and acknowledged)"; *anoētoi* 'foolish' in Gal. 3:1 is rendered "poor and silly and thoughtless and unreflecting and senseless."

It is easy to see how wordy the text sometimes becomes: 1 Cor. 10:13, for example, contains 30 words in the Greek text; the RSV translation employs 44 English words; this translation has 138 words. Eph. 5:33 consists of 21 words in Greek, and the RSV has the same number of words in English; this translation uses 60 words.

The translator assumes that by the listing of various synonyms of key words and phrases more of the original meaning will be conveyed to the reader ignorant of Greek. Is this actually true? Apparently so, to judge from the enthusiastic encomiums from readers which are printed in the inside back dust jacket and in the accompanying pamphlet. One pastor is quoted as saying, "I have never read a version of the Bible which makes the meaning of every passage as clear as does the amplified version." There is no arguing against personal testimony, and if this version helps some readers, then one can only wish it well. If other readers have reacted differently, we are not told of it.

Perhaps some readers are helped by this rendering of Mk. 8:35; this reviewer, however, must confess that he has only been puzzled: For whoever wants to save his [higher, spiritual, eternal] life, will lose [the lower, natural, temporal life which is lived (only) on earth]; and whoever gives up his life [which is lived (only) on earth], for My sake and the Gospel's, will save [his higher, spiritual life in the eternal kingdom of God].

Personal opinions aside, however, there is a considerable difference between the praise of readers and the claims of the sponsor and publisher. The claim is repeatedly made, both on the dust jacket and in the accompanying pamphlet, that this translation "restores meaning to some 10,000 obscure words and expands some 575 passages." This is stated in other words: "Over 10,000 lost meanings revealed... over 575 difficult passages clarified"; again, "at least 10,000 lost meanings revealed... 578 mysterious and difficult passages expanded and simplified."

On the face of it, such claims would lead the reader to infer that the meaning of over 10,000 words or passages is now brought to light and placed before him, and that what was once lost has now been found. Even if "lost" here means merely "hidden" or "obscure," this still does not remove the implication that what former translations have left "obscure" or "hidden" is now "revealed" (to use the word of the blurb) for the first time, for one simply does not "reveal" what has already been uncovered, but only that which has heretofore remained "lost" or "hidden" or "obscure." The objection still stands, therefore, that such extravagant claims add little to the reputation of this translation.

It is claimed that the 10,000 figure is a conservative estimate: the true figure would be twice that large. There are only a few over 8,000 verses in the New Testament, and many of them are hardly obscure. How can John 11:35 ("Jesus wept.") be clarified? How can 1 Cor. 7:27, Col. 4:14, Gal. 1:2, the genealogies in Mat. 1:1-16, Lk. 3:23-38,

to cite only a few offhand, be made any clearer than they are in any translation whatever? By the time all such verses have been eliminated, therefore, something like two "clarifications" or "revelations" per verse are claimed by the sponsor and the publisher.

The "578 mysterious and difficult passages" figure is also an estimate, based on subjective value judgment; no list has been computed of 575 or 578 specific passages which bear out the claims which are being made.

This kind of advertisement ill serves the best interests of both the sponsor and the publisher of the translation. An impressive amount of time and energy has been expended in this work, and it appears to be helpful to many readers: sober and more realistic advertisement would, in this reviewer's opinion, be much more effective than the Hollywood type of propaganda which has been employed.

The footnotes carry the names of scholars whose works are most often cited: Thayer, Abbott-Smith, Moulton and Milligan, Souter, Trench, Vincent and Wuest seem to be quoted more often than others. A list of authors and books quoted or referred to is given in the back of the book; in all seven of Wuest's works are listed. "Kennedy, Benjamin H." should be "Kennedy, H. A. A."

The question of the text which is being translated is not clear. The statement is made that the text of Westcott and Hort was "pursued with meticulous care." However, it is further indicated that italics "indicate certain familiar words or passages found in the *King James Version*, but generally omitted now because they are not adequately supported by more recent scholarship." It is impossible to determine on what basis certain *Textus Receptus* (King James) readings not included in Westcott and Hort are included or omitted. In Mat. 5:22 the addition *eikê* 'without cause' is omitted, but in Mat. 6:4, 6, 18 the addition *en tô phanerô* 'openly' is included. In Eph. 5:30 the addition 'of his flesh and of his bones' is omitted; in 1 John 5:8 'the three heavenly witnesses' is included. In Mk. 9:29, 10:24, and 13:14 the *Textus Receptus* additions are included.

The footnote term "Alternate reading" is misleading. In matters of text and translation an alternate reading is another text, whether word or phrase or clause or sentence, which is found in other manuscripts and versions and which may be preferred on the basis of intrinsic or external evidence. In the *Amplified New Testament*, however, "alternate reading" means "alternate rendering," that is, another translation of the same text. So in Rom. 1:17 and Gal. 2:11 the quotation from Heb. 2:4 is translated two different ways: there is no alternative reading which is being followed. In Mat. 6:20 'worm' is not an alternative reading for 'rust'; it is another translation for the same word *brôsis*.

In Mk. 1:10 and in Mat. 3:16 a mistranslation forces these two verses to say that John the Baptist saw the Spirit descend upon Jesus, in harmony with the declaration in Jn. 1:32. In Mk. 1:10 this is done by using the lower case 'he' as reference to John the Baptist (Jesus is referred to by use of 'He' and 'Him'); in Mat. 3:16 the same result is achieved by adding "John" in brackets. This simply will not do: the plain meaning of the Greek text in both cases is that Jesus—not John—

saw the Spirit descending. No translator has the right to change the accounts so as to make them conform to a pattern of thought foreign to the original documents themselves.

In Mat. 7:14 'straightened' should be 'straitened'. In Gal. 2:9 'of the Jerusalem church' is an interpretative addition which should be in brackets: the words are not part of the text. In Mat. 3:11 *eis metanoian* is translated 'because of repentance', with a footnote referring to Dana and Mantey's *Grammar*.

To conclude: notwithstanding the obvious amount of labor and dedication that went into this translation, and the translator's laudable purpose of making the New Testament read plainly and clearly for "everyman," it seems to this reviewer that the entire work is based on a wrong concept of the very nature and purpose of language and translation. Translation is always interpretation, and it is not on this score that we would fail to recommend the *Amplified New Testament*. It is not by the piling up of words, however, that meaning is conveyed. Some readers will find this translation helpful; in this reviewer's opinion, however, what it attempts to do has already been done—and much better—by a handful of modern English translations such as those of Weymouth, Moffatt, Montgomery, Goodspeed, the two Williams, and the Revised Standard Version.

Robert G. Bratcher

The New Testament in Modern English, by J. B. Phillips. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958; pp. xiv, 575. \$6.00.

The tremendous success of Phillips' translation of the New Testament was assured by the widespread acceptance gained by his translation of the New Testament Epistles, published in 1947. The freshness of his style, the aptness of his choice of words, and the easy flow of sentences all combine to make the reading of the New Testament a richly rewarding and often exciting experience. His mastery of modern vernacular English has laid all English-speaking peoples in his debt, and all translators are urged to become well acquainted with his work.

Principles of Translation

For the translator, Phillips' "Translator's Foreword" is especially interesting, since it is here that he summarizes his guiding principles. The three tests of a good translation, he says, are these: (1) the translation should not sound like a translation at all; (2) a translator should do his work with the least possible intrusion of his own personality; (3) the translation should produce in the hearts and minds of its readers an effect equivalent to that produced by the author upon his original readers. Phillips rightly rejects the implied censure in the charge that a translation which does not consist of word-for-word equivalence of the original is interpretation and not translation. Translation is always interpretation, and the translator's task is faithfully to interpret a text for readers who do not understand the original language. Phillips also deprecates what he calls "the bogey of consistency," as though mechanical consistency were a guarantee of faithfulness in translation. Words have no meaning except in the context of the communication of