

THE BIBLE TRANSLATOR

QUARTERLY PUBLISHED BY THE UNITED BIBLE SOCIETIES

EDITOR

John J. Kijne

ASSISTANT EDITOR

David H. Wallington

EDITORIAL BOARD

Wilfred J. Bradnock

Fidel P. Galang

Åge Holter

Eugene A. Nida

VOL. 12, No. 3, JULY 1961

THE NEW ENGLISH BIBLE

NEW TESTAMENT

ROBERT G. BRATCHER

The New English Bible New Testament. Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, 1961; pp. xiv, 447. Great Britain: Library Edition, 21s.; small edition without notes, 8s. 6d. United States: edition with notes, \$4.95.

The date March 14, 1961, marks a significant event in the history of the translation of the Scriptures with the publication of *The New English Bible New Testament*. Produced by a committee of British scholars, representing all major non-Roman churches, under the chairmanship of C. H. Dodd, this translation comes as no revision of any existing version but as a completely new work. "We have conceived our task to be that of understanding the original as precisely as we could (using all available aids), and then saying again in our own native idiom what we believed the author to be saying in his."

Here is a fresh and vivid translation whose boldness, freedom and imagination enthrall and fascinate the reader. Almost at random he can dip into this version and read with pleasure and no small degree of excitement what the British translators have produced. Let him read 2 Corinthians 4:7-12:

We are no better than pots of earthenware to contain this treasure, and this proves that such transcendent power does not come from us, but is God's alone. Hard-pressed on every side, we are never hemmed in; bewildered, we are never at our wits' end; hunted, we are never abandoned to our fate; struck down, we are not left to die. Wherever we go we carry death with us in our body, the death that Jesus died, that in this body also life may reveal itself, the life that Jesus lives. For continually, while still alive, we are being surrendered into the hands of death, for Jesus' sake, so that the life of Jesus also may be revealed in this mortal body of ours. Thus death is at work in us, and life in you.

Or consider the opening verses of the Gospel of John (1:1-5):

When all things began, the Word already was. The Word dwelt with God, and what God was, the Word was. The Word, then, was with God at the beginning, and through him all things came to be; no single thing was created without him. All that came to be was alive with his life, and that life was the light of men. The light shines on in the dark, and the darkness has never quenched it.

Notice how Paul's personal instructions in 1 Timothy 6:17-19 sound relevant and pertinent to today's readers:

Instruct those who are rich in this world's goods not to be proud, and not to fix their hopes on so uncertain a thing as money, but upon God, who endows us richly with all things to enjoy. Tell them to hoard a wealth of noble actions by doing good, to be ready to give away and to share, and so acquire a treasure which will form a good foundation for the future. Thus they will grasp the life which is life indeed.

The temptation is strong to keep quoting passage after passage, but we must limit ourselves to a few that particularly impressed us: "When hope seemed hopeless" (Rom. 4:18); "son though he was, he learned obedience in the school of suffering" (Heb. 5:8); "To prove that you are sons, God has sent into our hearts the Spirit of his Son" (Gal. 4:6), while in Lk. 7:47 the similar use of *hoti* (indicating evidence or proof, not cause) is rendered "Her great love proves that her many sins have been forgiven"; "They are strangers to the high-road of peace" (Rom. 3:17); "whoever claims to be dwelling in him, binds himself to live as Christ himself lived" (1 Jn. 2:6); "Leave no claim outstanding against you, except that of mutual love" (Rom. 13:8). In Romans 5:1 the subjunctive *echōmen* is read, and translated, "let us continue at peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." All we can do is to urge every person to secure a copy of this magnificent translation and read it for himself.

One of the finest features of the book is to be found in the titles to large sections of the books, reproduced at the top of the page on the inside corner. Romans is divided into three sections: "The Gospel According to Paul" (1:1—8:39); "The Purpose of God in History" (9:1—11:36); "Christian Behaviour" (12:1—16:27). Galatians is "Faith and Freedom"; Ephesians, "The Glory of Christ in the Church," and Colossians, "The Centre of Christian Belief." 1 Peter is "The Calling of a Christian"; 2 Peter, "The Remedy for Doubt"; 1 John, "Recall to Fundamentals," and Jude, "The Danger of False Belief."

In a translation so free the question of paraphrase is inevitable: when does it cease to be a translation and become paraphrase? The committee recognized the problem and spoke to it briefly in the Introduction (p. x): "Our intention has been to offer a translation in the strict sense, and not a paraphrase... But if the best commentary is a good translation, it is also true that every intelligent translation is in a sense a paraphrase." This means, of course, elucidating the meaning of the text without taking the liberty of introducing into it something which is not there.

Every reader and translator will make his own judgment on this matter, since it is largely subjective. Most of us, I'm afraid, praise a translation as faithful, though free, if we agree with the interpretation; if we do not, it's paraphrase!

To take one specific example: the word *dikaiousunê* occurs in the Gospel of Matthew 7 times (of which 5 are in the Sermon on the Mount). In 3:15 it is translated "all that God requires"; 5:6, "right prevail" ("Or, to do what is right"); 5:10, "the cause of right"; 5:20, "show yourselves far better men" (for "your righteousness exceeds"); 6:1, "religion"; 6:33, "justice," and 21:32, "the right way to live" (for "the way of righteousness"). Here is freedom, since the word is translated in accordance with its use in each particular context, with no attempt at sterile consistency.

Where, however, should this freedom stop? How far can the translator consciously and conscientiously vary and expand in order to make his work meaningful and arresting? In Mk. 7:29 is "You may go home content" for the single imperative *hupage* "Go!" justified or not? May a translation add, without alerting the reader to the fact, the phrase "(as Scripture says)" to the use of Isaiah 6:10 after that vexsome, but intractable, *hina* in Mk. 4:12? What about "as Scripture says of Moses, 'whenever he turns to the Lord...'" in 2 Cor. 3:16? In the Epistles, of course, the question of paraphrase becomes particularly acute.

Closely related to the matter of paraphrase is the question of ambiguity. In many places the Greek text is ambiguous, which is to say, it is capable of two or more meanings, all alike satisfactory so far as context and grammar are concerned. Where the Greek is ambiguous a translation—and especially a committee translation—can take refuge in deliberate ambiguity, an ancient and honorable practice. But the N.E.B. has deliberately eschewed ambiguity, for the sake of clarity at all costs. The danger in this practice is that, unless there are alternative translations in footnote, the reader has no way of knowing that there are other just as defensible and legitimate translations of the text; the merit is that the translator has faithfully discharged his primary obligation of producing a work that is clear and meaningful.

The N.E.B. provides alternative translations in something like 357 different passages. In Lk. 17:21, for example, there are three alternative translations of *entos humôn* ("among you" in the text). The ambiguous *su eipas* and *su legeis* (and *humeis legete* in Lk. 22:70) are translated "The words are yours" (Mt. 26:25, 26:64, 27:11, Mk. 15:2, Lk. 23:3), "It is you who say" (Lk. 22:70) and "is your word" (Jn. 18:37), accompanied always by the alternative translation "It is as you say" in footnote (in Lk. 22:70 "You are right, for I am").

Not always, however, has ambiguity been avoided. The ambiguous *chairete* (either "goodbye" or "rejoice") in Philippians 3:1 and 4:4 is given both meanings: "farewell: I wish you joy"; "Farewell: I wish you all joy," and "I will say it again: all joy be yours." The ambiguous *diathêkê* in Heb. 9:15-18 is first translated "covenant or testament" and then "covenant" (v. 15); then it is "testament" (vv. 16-17) and

finally "covenant" (v. 18). In the similar Gal. 3:17 it is rendered "a testament, or covenant."

Besides the alternative translations as such, and the variant readings, the footnotes provide some other helps and aids to the reader. It is a bit strange to find in so free a translation that the translators felt the need at times of informing the reader of the "literal" meaning of the text. The denarius is thus explained in Mt. 18:28, 20:2, 9, 13, Mk. 6:37, 14:5, Jn. 6:7, 12:5 (not, however, in places where the value of the coin is of no meaning: "silver piece(s)" in Mt. 22:19, Mk. 12:15, Lk. 7:41, 10:35, 20:24); no explanation is given in Rev. 6:6, "a whole day's wage." The talent is similarly explained in Mt. 18:24 (but not in Mt. 25:15ff. where it is translated "a bag of gold"). Other coins are not given their "literal" equivalents in footnotes.

The other places where the translators felt the need of informing the reader of the "literal" equivalent of the text are: Mt. 26:64, Mk. 14:62, Lk. 22:69, "of the Power"; Lk. 1:33, "the house of Jacob"; Jn. 13:18, "has lifted his heel against me"; Acts 6:1, "the Hellenists" and "the Hebrews," and 9:29 "the Hellenists"; Acts 8:23, "gall of bitterness and a fetter of unrighteousness"; Acts 20:6, "the days of Unleavened Bread"; 2 Cor. 12:7, "a stake, or thorn, for the flesh" ("a sharp pain in my body" in the text); 1 Jn. 2:1, "an advocate," 2:20, "have an anointing (*Greek* *chrism*)," and 2:27, "the anointing." Somewhat surprisingly, there is no "literal" equivalent for "Whitsuntide" in 1 Cor. 16:8 (somewhat reminiscent of the anachronistic "Easter" in A.V. Acts 12:4).

There are six references to the Greek: Decapolis, in Mk. 5:20, 7:31; Praetorium, in Mk. 15:16, Phil. 1:13; Christ, in Rom. 9:5, and chrism in 1 Jn. 2:20. In a few places the translators feel the need of alerting the reader to the difficulty of the Greek text: Mark 14:41 (*apechei*), Acts 16:8 (*parelthontes*), and Acts 23:23 (*dexiolabous*). There are two explanations besides those already listed: phylacteries, in Mt. 23:5, and the double meaning of *pneuma* in Jn. 3:8.

All of these footnote aids and alternative translations are, of course, of interest and consistently helpful. Not always, however, has the committee been consistent: the identical saying in Mt. 23:38 and Lk. 13:35 is translated "Look, look! there is your temple, forsaken by God." In Matthew there is an alternative translation, "Or, Look, your home is desolate," but in Luke there is none.

Text

The abundance of material sometimes has proved embarrassing to the textual critics, while refined methods of textual criticism make it impossible, at present, for New Testament scholars to settle on any one textual family or tradition as being at all times superior. Each textual problem has to be judged and decided on its own merits, and no

complete consensus is possible. There is not likely to be any *textus receptus* in the foreseeable future: every Greek text will be eclectic and, consequently, the object of controversy.

The N.E.B. New Testament lists some 275 variant readings (compared with 243 in the R.S.V., and 403 in the A.S.V.). In Luke and Acts, for example, N.E.B. has 99 variant readings; R.S.V. has 64; in John N.E.B. has 33; R.S.V., 13.

The set phrase used for introducing a variant reading in N.E.B. is "Some witnesses . . ." (read, omit, insert, add); where indicated, "one witness"; "many witnesses" occurs in Lk. 12:27; "some ancient witnesses" in Lk. 14:5; "one early witness" in Mt. 1:16, and "the majority of ancient witnesses" in Lk. 1:46. A translation intended for popular usage must, of course, use simple definitions in technical matters; notwithstanding, in many places the simple phrase "some witnesses" is not enough, we feel, for the implication it carries that the majority of witnesses favor the text is not quite accurate.

In some places the text rests on quite slender support. One outstanding example is the difficult Mk. 7:3 where, on late and quite insufficient evidence (Δ *sys sa*), the text omits the unintelligible *pugmê*, relegating it to the footnote with the statement "Some witnesses insert with the fist; others insert frequently, or thoroughly." The reading *pukna* (\aleph W lat *sys*) is an obvious correction of the difficult *pugmê*, which is attested by the majority of older manuscripts and the other versions. It is not quite accurate to imply that the weight of the evidence favors the text, while part of it favors one or the other reading.

Another example is Mk. 8:26, where the text reads "Do not tell anyone in the village," with the marginal footnote, "Some witnesses read Do not go into the village." This is a peculiarly difficult passage and the original text may perhaps not have survived in any Greek manuscript. In any case, the reading adopted by N.E.B. $\text{m}^{\text{e}}\text{deni eipês eis tēn kômēn}$ does not have the support of a single Greek manuscript; true, it is found in D, but only as the second part of a longer command which includes "Go to your house" (also the Old Latin q); the only manuscript support for this reading is in the Old Latin c (*ne cui diceret in castellum*) and k (*nemini dixeris in castello*). The majority of Greek manuscripts and versions support the marginal *mêde eis tēn kômēn eiselhês*, while others support other conflate readings. There may be good and sufficient internal reasons for preferring the reading adopted in the text, but the external evidence does not support it.

In Mt. 9:34 there seems to be no manuscript, versional or patristic support for the omission of *hoi de pharisaioi elegon*; in some the whole verse is omitted (by Tat D a k *sys Hil*), but not the introductory words only. The omission of these words results in placing the statement "He casts out devils by the prince of devils" on the

lips of the onlookers, who are quoted as saying, also, "Nothing like this has even been seen in Israel."

In Jn. 3:13 "whose home is in heaven" is probably the translation of *ho ôn ek tou ouranou* (and not of the late reading *ho ôn en tô ouranô*), which enjoys quite limited support (0141 sys); the majority of older manuscripts and versions omit both readings.

In Jn. 19:29 the reading *hussô* is attested to only by the eleventh century cursive 476; all other witnesses support *hussôpô*. Only one Greek cursive is cited for the omission of *didaskonti* in Mt. 21:23; the main support for omitting it lies in various versions (it sysc arab) and some fathers (Orpt Hipp). In Mk. 12:29 "the Lord *your* God is the only Lord" probably represents *sou* (Ψ , some cursives, some Old Latin mss., vg sy co and Cy); the majority of the Greek evidence supports *hêmôn*.

The N.E.B. Greek text often favors Western readings: the omission of *kupsas* in Mk. 1:7; the omission of *tês hamartias* in Jn. 8:34; the omission of *logous* in Mk. 8:38 and Lk. 9:26; the omission of *proselthontes pharisaioi* in Mk. 10:2; the omission of *ton auton logon eipôn* in Mk. 14:39; the omission of Lk. 22:62; the omission of *epanô* in Mk. 14:5; *anthrôpinos* in 1 Tim. 3:1; the omission of *kai moichalis* in Mt. 16:4; "Doberian" in Ac. 20:4; the omission of *tou theou* in Ac. 18:26; "Jonathan" in Ac. 4:6; "twelve" in Ac. 1:26.

In most of these cases N.E.B. indicates by means of a footnote the existence of a textual problem; some of them, however, have no such indication (Mt. 16:4, 21:23, Mk. 1:7, 12:29, Jn. 8:34). Other passages which cite no textual variants are Mt. 10:19 (omission of *pôs ê*), 15:6 (*nomon* in the text instead of *logon*), and Gal. 4:25 (omission of *Hagar*). In all these cases, and others, it would seem that there should be some indication of the fact that the textual evidence is not so overwhelmingly in favor of the adopted reading as it might appear.

The better-known textual variants are duly noted: Jn. 7:53—8:11, the ending of Mark, and the "shorter" account of the Supper in Lk. 22:19-20. N.E.B. adopts the intrinsically preferable *orgistheis* in Mk. 1:41, and includes "Jesus" as the given name of Barabbas in Mt. 27:16, 17.

In all here is a New Testament Greek text (where detectable) which shows considerable freedom and independence in its decisions, as much worthy of attention on the part of students of the text as the translation.

Translation

It is not possible, of course, for anything like an adequate judgment to be passed this soon on the quality of the translation, as a whole (as distinct from the quality of the English employed). One can only take specific cases, without attempting to judge the whole.

The freedom this version displays will perhaps be impugned by some who feel that a so-called "literal" translation is the most faithful; in our opinion, however, a "literal" as over against a "free" translation is an unreal basis for judging a translation. The real question is, "Is it accurate"—and accuracy is not necessarily guaranteed by a literal word-for-word equivalence, or necessarily endangered by a so-called "free" translation.

Therefore, while registering the impression that the N.E.B. is a good and accurate translation of the Greek New Testament, there are places which may be called into question. In John 10:33, for example, one wonders whether the translation of *poieis seauton theon* by "You . . . claim to be a god" adequately conveys the meaning either in terms of its historical setting or of its use by the Evangelist. In Mt. 27:54, Mk. 15:39 the anarthrous *huios theou* is translated "a son of God"; but the same syntactical placing of this anarthrous phrase is translated "the Son of God" in Mt. 4:3, 6//Lk. 4:3, 9, Mt. 14:33, 27:40; in Mt. 27:43 it is "God's Son"; in John 10:36 it is "God's son."

For all its boldness the N.E.B. shows a curious hesitancy in translating the vocative *gunai*, feeling, perhaps, that no English word in current usage is a faithful enough equivalent of the Greek. Peter's use of it in addressing the maid servant in Lk. 22:57 is translated "Woman," as well as Jesus' use of it in speaking to the Syrophenician mother (Mt. 15:28). But N.E.B. has no equivalent in Jesus' address to the woman with the spirit of infirmity (Lk. 13:12), the Samaritan woman (Jn. 4:21), and Mary Magdalene (Jn. 20:13, 15). The two times Jesus employs it in speaking to his mother N.E.B. translates "Mother" (Jn. 2:4, 19:26).

In 1 Jn. 3:7 *ekeinos* is translated "God" and in 4:17 "he," the antecedent being "God" in v. 16. It would appear, however, that *ekeinos* in 1 John is always a reference to Christ: thus it is translated in 2:6, 3:3, 5, 16. In 3:7 to translate "it is the man who does right who is righteous, as God is righteous" seems clearly wrong, since it is Jesus Christ who is the *dikaios* in 1 John (cf. 1:9, 2:1, 29). And in 4:17 "because even in this world we are as he is," the *ekeinos* would seem to refer to Christ, not God.

In Ac. 4:17, 21 *apeileō* and *prosapeileō* are translated by "to caution" and "to repeat the caution," which seem hardly adequate (in 4:29 the noun *apeilai* is properly translated "threats").

One wonders, too, whether the preponderant use of "the Messiah" in the Gospels, instead of "the Christ," represents a step forward in clarity; the use of "devil(s)" for *daimonion*, *daimonia*, seems to us a definite loss, not gain.

It does not seem sufficient always to translate *doulos*, *douloi*, in the Synoptic Gospels by "servant(s)" (the only exception is Mt. 20:27//Mk. 10:44 where *diakonos* is "servant" and *doulos* is "willing

slave"). There are no "slaves" in the parables: they are "servants" or "men" or "men who serve"; *ponêre doule* is "you rascal" in Lk. 19:22 and "you scoundrel" in Mt. 18:32; *ponêre doule kai oknêre* in Mt. 25:26 is "you lazy rascal."

In the Epistles the word is translated "slave" where the reference is to those who are actually slaves; where, however, the word is used in the Christian sense, "slave(s)" of God, or Christ, or the Lord, it is translated "servant(s)." The only exceptions are 1 Cor. 7:22, "slave in the service of Christ"; Eph. 6:6, "slaves of Christ," and 1 Pe. 2:16, "slaves in God's service." Something has been lost, we feel, by reducing "slave" to "servant." The same is true of *sundoulos* in the Christian sense (Col. 1:7, 4:7, Rev. 6:11, 19:10, 22:9). The verb *douleuô*, followed by the dative *theô*, or *tô kuriô*, or *tô Christô*, is translated by "serve," "servant" and "service": Mt. 6:24b, Lk. 16:13b, Ac. 20:19, Rom. 12:11, 14:18, 16:18, Eph. 6:7, 1 Th. 1:9; the only exception is Col. 3:24, "Christ is the Master whose slaves you must be" (for *tô kuriô Christô douleuete*).

Ekklêsia in the New English Bible

It is in the translation of the word *ekklêsia*, however, that we feel that a pattern has been imposed on the New Testament, quite foreign to the meaning and use of the word throughout the different books.

The word occurs 114 times in the New Testament: in the places where it does not refer to the Christian church it is translated "assembly": the deliberative *ekklêsia* of Ephesus (Ac. 19:32, 39, 41); the heavenly *ekklêsia* (Heb. 12:23), and the Old Testament *ekklêsia* (Heb. 2:12, Ac. 7:38). In the latter passage a verbal phrase "when they were assembled there in the desert" translates *en tê ekklêsia en tê erêmô*.

The other 108 occurrences of the word refer to the Christian *ekklêsia*, either as (1) the Church, in its institutional or universal sense, or (2) a church, in its local application.

In Mt. 16:18 the former meaning is indicated by "my church"; in 18:17 the latter by "the congregation."

In Acts *ekklêsia* is twice something other than an individual local body: "the church of the Lord" in 20:28, and "the church throughout all Judea, Galilee, and Samaria" in 9:31. Of the remaining 17 occurrences, the Jerusalem *ekklêsia* is referred to 8 times (5:11, 8:1, 3, 11:22, 12:1, 5, 15:4, 22) and is always translated by "church"; another 8 times the local *ekklêsia* is other than the Jerusalem church, in which cases it is always translated "congregation(s)": in Antioch of Syria (11:26, 13:1, 14:27, 15:3); in Lystra and Iconium (16:5); in Lystra, Iconium and Pisidian Antioch (14:23); in Syria and Cilicia (15:41), and in Ephesus (20:17). In the debatable passage in 18:22 N.E.B. reads: "On landing at Caesarea, he went up and paid his

respects to the church, and then went down to Antioch." In light of the consistent variation between "church" and "congregation" in the other passages in Acts, we are led to infer that N.E.B. takes the word here to refer to the Jerusalem "church," not to the "congregation" in Caesarea.

In Acts, then, there is a definite ecclesiological pattern: only the Jerusalem *ekklēsia* is a "church"; all *ekklēsiai* outside Jerusalem are "congregations." This pattern comes sharply into focus in 15:3, 4 where Paul and Barnabas are sent forth by the "congregation" in Antioch to the "church" in Jerusalem. In Acts, according to N.E.B., there are (1) the Church, (2) the Jerusalem church, and (3) congregations outside Jerusalem: there are no "churches." This pattern, we feel, accords neither with the historical situation of the time, nor with the thinking of the author of the book.

In the Epistles N.E.B. has "church" 18 times, all of which designate the Church: in Ephesians (9 times) and Col. 1:18, 24; also in 1 Cor. 14:12, 15:9, and Phil. 3:6. In addition, "the church of God" occurs in 1 Cor. 10:32, 11:22, Gal. 1:13, and "the church of the living God" in 1 Tim. 3:15. In all these passages "church" is the natural translation; the only place where it is not self-evident, from the point of view of N.E.B., is in 1 Cor. 14:12, where one might expect "congregation." Here, it would seem, N.E.B. understands the word to carry its institutional, and not simply local, connotation.

Local *ekklēsiai* in the Epistles are also "congregation(s)" (42 times) or "community." Besides "congregation" as such, there are the phrases "gentile congregations" (Rom. 16:4), "Christ's congregations" (Rom. 16:16, Gal. 1:22), "congregation(s) of God's people" (1 Cor. 11:16, 14:34, 1 Tim. 3:5) and "Christian congregation" (Gal. 1:2).

"Community" occurs in the following forms: "the community" (1 Cor. 14:5), "a Christian community" (1 Cor. 14:4), and "our community" (1 Cor. 6:4, 12:28). Twice "the meeting" is used: 1 Cor. 14:28 (for *en ekklēsia*), and 14:34 (for *en tais ekklēsiais*).

A definite pattern emerges also in the Epistles: "church" refers to the Church, while a local group is a "congregation" or "community"; "the meeting" is the local body at worship. There are no "churches" in the Epistles.

In Revelation, however, the 20 occurrences of *ekklēsia(i)*, referring always to local groups, are translated "church(es)." The pattern followed in Matthew, Acts and the Epistles is here discarded.

We do not feel, then, that in Acts and the Epistles the N.E.B. is to be commended or imitated in its translation of *ekklēsia*.

Some concluding comments

The N.E.B. maintains a fairly high standard of the living language, as spoken by the British. Some expressions, of course, are

not current in American English and sound a bit strange to American ears: "So they fell foul of him" (Mk. 6:3); "Many of the people rounded on him" (Mk. 10:48; also Mt. 20:31); "spate," in the British sense (Rev. 12:15); "Shoot the net to starboard" (Jn. 21:6). Sometimes the high standard of "timeless" English does not seem to be achieved, as in "you can take it from me" (Gal. 5:3), "more than we can stomach" (Jn. 6:60). "Loose livers" (1 Cor. 5:9) is unfortunate, we feel.

We could find no typographical errors. We wonder, however, whether "Bethany" instead of "Bethphage" in Mt. 21:1 is not a mistake; nor can we account for the omission of *eulogêmenos ho erchomenos en onomati kuriou* (Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord) in Mt. 21:9, or of *tou theou* (of God) in 1 Cor. 15:9.¹ "I saw the Lord come" in Jude 14 seems wrong for *idou êlthen*, unless this is the meaning intended by the translators for the aorist "he came": is this not, however, an instance of the so-called Hebrew "prophetic perfect"?

To bring this preliminary review to a close: in our opinion the N.E.B. New Testament has blazed a new trail in the always fascinating art of translation which all succeeding translations in English must inevitably take into account. All Bible readers are heavily in debt to the British scholars who have produced so timely and eminent a work.

TEACH YOURSELF GREEK

Teach Yourself New Testament Greek, by D. F. Hudson. The English Universities Press, 7s. 6d.; New York: Association Press, \$3.75; 1960; pp. xiv, 178.

For translators (and others) who must be self-taught in Greek we warmly recommend this excellent book, with its attractive layout, competent treatment, and valuable exercises. It is, in our opinion, the best beginner's text for those who wish to learn Greek on their own. It alone will hardly convert a novice into a recognized authority; but by dint of labor and diligence the beginner will gain invaluable knowledge and be able to use with profit the lexicons and commentaries, and further pursue his studies in the standard (English) works of Moulton, Robertson, Moule and others. If (as we believe) every translator of the New Testament should know Greek, this book should be in the hands of all translators who as yet do not know the original language of the New Testament.

Robert G. Bratcher

¹ The Director of the translation has since confirmed that all three are oversights. Ed.