

J. J. Wettstein, who wrote (Amsterdam, 1751-1752) in Latin, has not been translated and is therefore not so universally accessible as Calvin, is, fortunately, a scholar's commentator. He gives materials for textual criticism, which are now out of date (though when first published they were a very notable contribution to the subject), and also a great wealth of illustrative and parallel matter, drawn from Jewish, Greek and Latin sources. Wettstein's work must be used with caution: the texts he quoted were not always reliable by modern standards, and his judgment of what was and was not relevant to the matter in hand was not infallible. But, the necessary caution being applied, his work remains invaluable, and many generations of commentators have found it so, as their writings often testify. The compilation of a 'new Wettstein' has been discussed; such a book would be of great value.

Another work now centuries old which has lost little of its value is J. Bengel's *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* (Tübingen [1742], and many subsequent editions). It is not only full of forceful epigrams (Nestle's *Greek Testament* does well to preserve Bengel's excellent counsel to the reader of the Bible: *Te totum applica ad textum: rem totam applica ad te*) but is a careful and sustained effort to explain the Greek text in the light of the best grammatical and lexical material available. In discussing Greek words Bengel regularly goes back (anticipating modern methods) to their Hebrew equivalents in the Old Testament. English translations of the *Gnomon* exist, but no one who has Latin enough to master Bengel's epigrammatic style would wish to use them.

Last, in this list of 'classical' commentaries on the whole New Testament, comes the *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Munich [1922-1928]), by H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck. Though Strack's name appears on the title page and must be given in bibliographical description, this immense work was in fact written, in twenty-six years, by Paul Billerbeck, a parish minister in Germany. Desiring to preach one Sunday on the Kingdom of God he asked himself what this expression meant to those who heard it from the lips of Jesus. He searched the commentaries in vain, and began to study the Jewish rabbinical literature. Out of this study came his book, huge (in all, 4102 pages), accurate, cautious and, to all serious students of the New Testament, quite indispensable.

(To be continued)

The Translation of the Divine Names in the Bahasa Indonesia

(Sequel to the discussions at Djakarta in May 1952)

J. L. Swellengrebel

The following remarks are based on the papers drawn up for the conference of Bible translators at Djakarta in May 1952, as well as on the discussions which were held there on the subject (see *The Bible*

Translator, Volume 3, No. 4, October 1952, pp. 171-196) and on the suggestions brought forward there. The subject was originally brought up in connection with the rendering of *JHWH* in the Bahasa Indonesia (union language of Indonesia) and other languages of the Archipelago, but it proved to be the rendering of *elohim* that caused the most difficulty. The same is true of the further examination of the suggestions: in the Bahasa Indonesia rendering of *elohim* we were compelled to make fairly important alterations, but the renderings found already for *JHWH* remained satisfactory.

I. Elohim: 'GOD' and 'god(s)'

The crux of the problem appears to be where GOD, the God of Israel, and the gods of the nations stand in a certain relationship towards each other.

1. That was the crux in the older translations and it was once more the crux in the discussions and suggestions at the conference. From a linguistic point of view, the relationship in question is made possible in the Bible by the fact that in both cases one and the same term can be used, *elohim* or its variants. This is a generic name, not a proper name. The generic character of the name is expressed in 'god(s)' in different ways, partly by using the term in places where the plural meaning is obvious, for example in 'the meeting of the gods', partly by using it in connection with a possessive suffix or a following genitive, which can never happen with a real proper name.

In all such cases — where *elohim* is a generic name, indicating both 'GOD' or 'the gods' — Leydecker has made use of the word *ilah*, which was adopted into Malayan from the Arabic. This is the Arabic word for 'god' as a generic name; *Allah* most probably is a derivation of this word which became an exclusive idea, and in this way a proper name, through the prefixing of the article *al*: *al-Ilah* became *Allah*. In this Leydecker followed unreservedly the Arabic usage in the Koran. There *ilah* can be used both for 'god(s)' of polytheists like the pre-Moslem Arabs, and for Allah himself, where He is alluded to, as it were, in general categories. For this last, see, for example, Surah 2 : 158 "your *Ilah* is an only *Ilah*, there is no *Ilah* besides him"; S. 4 : 169 "Allah, the only *Ilah*"; S. 43 : 84 sq. "He is *Ilah* in the heavens, and *Ilah* upon earth . . . blessed be Allah"; compare also the beginning of the Muslim creed, the first of 'The Two Words': "There is no other *Ilah* than Allah". In a corresponding manner Leydecker also spoke of "my *Ilah*, my *Ilah*" in Psalm 22 : 1, of "the *Ilah* of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob", "the *Ilah* of the heavens", and so on. Klinkert, however, rejected this rendering of *elohim*, when it referred to 'GOD'. He kept *ilah* as indicating 'god(s)'; only occasionally, as it were indirectly, the term is used by him also in connection with 'GOD', for example, in a sentence such as "Thou shalt have no other *ilahs* before me", where, through the use of the word "other", 'GOD' is also brought into connection with the category of the *ilahs*. Briefly we can say that wherever the Dutch or English translations use 'GOD', with a capital 'G', Klinkert uses *Allah*, and where 'god' is used, with a small 'g', he uses *ilah*.

The chief objections to Klinkert's solution which were brought forward at the conference, were:

- a) The use of *Allah* causes the generic character to be lost, because in Arabic — and certainly no less in the Bahasa Indonesia — *Allah* is now definitely a proper name, whatever its original derivation.
- b) Constructions with *Allah* and a possessive suffix or genitive such as Klinkert necessarily had to use as a result of his choice, are not very elegant in the Bahasa Indonesia, even though nowadays they are not considered so objectionable as formerly.

It is against this background (which I have summarised here as best I could, with special emphasis on what I think is most important from the points of view both of language and translation) that we must see items four and five of the suggestions which the Special Commission made to the conference in Djakarta (see *The Bible Translator*, Volume 3, No. 4, October 1952, pp. 197-199). These can be summarized as follows: back to Leydecker's use of *ilah*. After a long discussion this was accepted by the conference as a preliminary working hypothesis, to be tried out further.

2. During this further trying out of the suggestions of the conference it appeared that the most serious opposition was directed against just this use of *ilah*. Objections came from all sides. They were differently formulated and defended, but the core of all of them was that in the feeling of the churches the meaning of *Ilah* has come — or possibly always was — so close to the idea of 'idol', that it sounds like profanation when it is used for 'GOD'. The conference suggestions have become fairly widely known, but this particular suggestion seems to have been accepted by no one. With one exception — one of the lecturers of the Theological College at Djakarta once told me that in his lessons he always used the term *Ilah* for 'GOD' (thus conforming to the working hypothesis) and met with no difficulties. "But", he had to add, "in the students' papers I always have to alter their 'Allahs' into 'Ilahs'!!"

It is obvious, therefore, that in the translation commission we regularly came back to this point. Mr. Naipospos, our Indonesian colleague of Batak origin, did not approve of the use of *Ilah* either. Because of the Batak translation — which uses *Débata*, derived from Sanskrit *déwatā*, 'godhead', a generic name applicable both to 'GOD' and 'god(s)' — he was impressed, however, by the necessity of finding a word of obvious generic character that could be used in both cases. We therefore tried to make a start with a completely new term, namely *sembahan*, 'the adored', 'the one to whom homage is paid'. This word is occasionally met with in the meaning 'godhead'; in related languages, as in Batak, words of the same root have been used to render the idea 'god'. This term appealed to Mr. Naipospos and another Batak co-operator. The (Roman Catholic) author of the Indonesian Dictionary, Mr. Poerwadarminta, also found it acceptable. We have, therefore, for some time experimented with this term: *Sembahan* for 'GOD', (*para*) *sembahan* for 'god(s)'. Advantages were the obvious generic character and easily connected possessive suffixes and genitives; disadvantages were that it is not commonly used,

and easily confused with *persembahan* = 'gift, offering' (because words with *per*+root+*an* often have a corresponding form without *per*). It was these disadvantages especially that made our Advisory Committee take a strong stand against the use of *Sembahan*. Besides this negative advice, the Committee also gave us a positive one — after a long discussion we were advised to keep to the suggestions of the conference, using *Ilah* and *ilah* as Leydecker did, at least in the Indonesian translation of *Good News* which is intended as an experiment. Our translation committee tried honestly to work this out, but the hesitations and objections remained. So we made a list of a number of texts, so that the members of the Advisory Committee could try out the usage once more and could see more clearly both the advantages and the disadvantages. In the discussion this list led up to, it became obvious that the solution was not to be found in the Leydecker direction. One after the other the members of the Advisory Committee shrank back when they were given to read the texts in which 'GOD' was translated by *Ilah*. One member remarked that it was perhaps possible in the Bahasa Indonesia, but, according to his feeling, it would be impossible in his own 'regional language'!

We were strengthened in this reaction by studying the translation of the Koran by Mahmoed Joenoes (Puskata Mahmudiah, Djakarta, 4th edition, 1953). Here it appeared that *ilah* in the Arabic original had never been rendered with *ilah* in the Bahasa Indonesia. This is all the more striking as the Moslem Indonesian idiom is generally fairly lavish with borrowings from the Arabic. Both in texts where *Ilah* means Allah (see above, sub. 1) and where it indicates the heathen gods, this translation uses *Tuhan*, an old fashioned or dignified form of *tu(w)an* = 'lord'. For instance, in Surah 7 : 134, where the Israelites say to Moses, "Make us an *ilah*, like they have an *ilah*"; S. 25 : 45, "One who makes his desire his *ilah*"; S. 37 : 89-91, "Ibrahim went to their *alihat* (plural of *ilah*) and said, 'Can you not eat? Why can you not speak?' And he struck them with his right hand". Apparently, therefore, in the opinion of this translator the word *ilah* cannot be used in Indonesian for 'god' as a generic name.

Why did he reject *ilah* and also the other words for 'godhead' such as *déwa(ta)*? Presumably for this reason. Islam hardly takes the 'god(s)' seriously. Therefore the Indonesian words which were used for the gods of the polytheists (*déwa, déwata*) 'degenerated'. Later on this process of 'degeneration' also 'infected' the word *ilah*. In the case of *ilah*, however, the 'degeneration' process has not gone so far as with *déwa(ta)*. Sometimes *Ilah* can still be used for Allah, for example in the exclamation *Ja Ilahi*, 'O my God'; Muslim authors of novels or dramas in the Bahasa Indonesia can use the form *Ilahi* for 'the godhead' and thereby they obviously mean 'Allah, the true God' and not 'the idols'; in the same way *keilahian* can be used for Allah's 'godhead'. But that, apparently, does not alter the fact that the meaning of *ilah* has now come very near that of 'idol'. Our Koran translator therefore preferred not to use it and went over to the word *Tuhan*. The same can be said of the translation by H. A. Halim Hasan (Bookshop Islamijah, Medan; 1st

edition 1937, 2nd edition 1940) — judging from examples in the first part (*djuz* 1 and 2), all that I could get hold of.

By choosing *Tuhan* as translation for 'god' as a generic name, the Koran translations are completely in line with present-day Indonesian usage. If one wants a 'neutral' term, one does not use the 'degenerated' *déwa(ta)*, or the 'infected' *ilah*, or the theologically burdened *Allah*, but *Tuhan*. One can hear this word used, for instance, in a lecture on the history of religion, when the lecturer wants to speak of 'gods' or 'divine beings' in general. The abstract form of this is *ketuhanan*, used to indicate the idea of 'religiousness', 'faith in God', one of the five pillars of the Indonesian state ideology. For this idea a derivation of the word *Tuhan* was chosen, because not only Allah, but also other gods worshipped in Indonesia can be indicated by this term. For the authors of the Koran translations I mentioned, this advantage of coming into line with the general Indonesian usage apparently has outweighed the great disadvantage that in their translations two terms have now become replaced by one, namely the Arabic *rabb* ('Lord'), Indonesian *Tuhan* and the Arabic *ilah*, which in Indonesian became also *Tuhan*. Apparently they have looked upon this as a necessary evil, which is inherent to the peculiar development of the meaning of the Indonesian words for 'god' on the one hand, and of *Tuhan* on the other.

This rough sketch of the rendering of Arabic *ilah* in the Indonesian Koran translations makes the reactions within the Christian churches, as well as the problems of the Bible translators, stand out in stronger relief. Because of this state of affairs, presumably, Klinkert had already to alter Leydecker's use of *ilah*. At any rate the objections that were brought up against the suggestions of the conference, the 'Allahs' in the work of the theological students and the hesitation of our Advisory Committee will have to be understood in this light.

All this forced us to our first conclusion, unfortunately a negative one — *Ilah* cannot be used for 'GOD'.

3. It was obvious that, having reached this point, we had once more carefully to examine the renderings of Shellabear and Bode. These two translators seem to have been influenced by three lines of thought: — (a) among the Malayan words which come into account, *Allah* has completely the character of a proper name; therefore, this word is in principle the most obvious one for the translation of the name of God; (b) it is difficult to construct the word *Allah* with a following adjunct (although Klinkert did so); in such cases *Tuhan* can better be used for 'GOD', in line with the development of that word as sketched above; (c) the occasional coincidence of the ideas 'Lord' and 'God' in the one term *Tuhan* will have to be accepted as a necessary evil, just as it has been done in the Koran translations.

This led to a translation of the divine names which can be summarised as follows:

Old Testament:

JHWH

— *Allah*

Elohim ('GOD', without an adjunct)

— *Allah*

Elohim ('GOD', followed by an adjunct; also for 'god(s)' in opposition to 'GOD') — *Tuhan*

Adon(ai) — *Tuhan* (often combined with personal suffixes: 'my Lord, our Lord'. Especially the first, *Tuhanku*, has nearly become a new word — compare French *monsieur* —; such combinations are also used for *elohim*).

elohim ('god, gods', not in opposition to 'GOD') — *déwa, déwata, berhala*

New Testament:

ho Theos ('GOD', without adjunct) — *Allah*

(ho) Theos ('GOD', with adjunct or used as apposition) — *Tuhan* (or *Tuhanku*, etc.)

(ho) Theos } ('god, gods')
(hoi) theoi }

Kurios (for 'GOD' or Christ) — *Tuhan*

Kurios (for 'GOD', with an apposition) — *Allah* (for instance, 'the Lord God', *Allah Tuhan itu*; 'the Lord our God', *Allah Tuhan kita*).

Consequently:

Allah is used for: *JHWH*; *elohim/ho theos* (for 'GOD', if not followed by an adjunct); *kurios* (indicating 'GOD', if followed by an apposition).

Tuhan is used for: *adonai/kurios* (indicating 'GOD' or Christ, except in expressions such as 'the Lord our God'); *elohim/ho theos* (for 'GOD' if followed by an adjunct, for example 'my, our God', etc. = *Tuhanku, Tuhan kita*; or standing in apposition, for example *JHWH Elohim* and *kurios ho theos* = *Allah Tuhan itu*; further sometimes for 'god(s)').

We should remark, moreover, that the translators have often used the expressions *Tuhanku, Tuhan kita*, etc. as titles which can be placed both before or after a proper name. Because of this, the system often is contradictory to that of Klinkert and sometimes even seems to be in contradiction with itself. That holds true of Shellabear in the first place, but also of Bode, although the latter has tried to bring more regularity in the system of his predecessor.

The chief objections to these translations are the following:—

(a) The system lacks clarity. Once you have realised the motives and considerations of the translators, you surely can find a reason, and generally a good reason, for practically every irregularity and for almost every translation that deviates from the ordinary ones. Nevertheless it is a fact that a whole series of rules and exceptions thereon is necessary before one can understand the system. For the translation of proper names and substantives-with-only-one meaning this sort of thing is generally unnecessary and always undesirable. So the unacceptable *Ilah* for 'GOD' and the equally unacceptable, or at any rate very unattractive, genitive or possessive construction with *Allah* have disappeared, but the cost of this is rather high.

(b) The renderings of *adonai* and of *elohim*, if followed by an adjunct, coincide in the one *Tuhan*. Against this, however, the translators might point out the example of the Koran translations which dare to face the same objection. Moreover, we must admit that the traditional translations of *JHWH* with *Kurios*, LORD, etc. is just as disputable from the linguistic point of view.

(c) In my view, however, the most serious objection is to be found in the fact that the three words *JHWH*, Lord and God, when used without adjunct, are translated with one and the same term, *Allah*. One can defend this by remarking that in such a case attention is only paid to the meaning — that is, to the fact that in all three cases the same divine person is indicated by these names — and not to the form — that is, to the fact that this indication is made by three obviously different words. The tension between translating-according-to-meaning and translating-according-to-form is one of the chief problems of translating; the task of keeping the balance between these two confronts every translator with puzzles, and it is impossible to give fixed and sharply defined rules. But we must say that to go over completely to one side, either to the meaning (the so-called free translation), or to the form (the so-called literal translation), is not to be recommended, and certainly not in rendering such important ideas as we are dealing with here.

If in the present revision, therefore, we wished to follow the line of Shellabear-Bode, we had to bring about some improvement on this point. For the Old Testament, therefore, we have been considering the following series: —

<i>JHWH</i>	transliteration
<i>Elohim</i> (used without adjuncts, proper name)	<i>Allah</i>
<i>Elohim</i> (generic name, with adjuncts, for 'GOD' and 'god(s)')	<i>Tuhan</i>
<i>Adonai</i>	<i>Tuhan</i>

For the Old Testament, taken on its own, this system seemed worth trying out. After all, it is only by trying out that one can discover whether the church people will, in the long run, accept this interchange of terms well-known to them from Klinkert; also whether transliteration of *JHWH* will prove acceptable.

What I have said above I have deliberately limited to the Old Testament, and in doing so I have not taken into account the question of concordant rendering of terms in the Old Testament and New Testament. Without wishing to give this concordance such a dominant significance as the Rev. Rosin does when he wants to reject the transliteration of *JHWH* for this reason (*The Bible Translator*, Volume 3, No. 4, p. 182), I do think concordance between Old Testament and New Testament to be essential. In particular, the rendering of *elohim* and *theos* will have to be identical, just as that of *adonai* and *kurios*. Taking into consideration this point, the series which I gave above for the Old Testament would become for the New Testament:—

<i>Theos</i> (used without adjunct, proper name)	<i>Allah</i>
<i>Theos</i> (generic name, for 'GOD' and 'god(s)')	<i>Tuhan</i>
<i>Kurios</i> (indicating GOD and Christ)	<i>Tuhan</i>

Apart, of course, from the term for *JHWH*, this list has the same advantages and disadvantages as that for the Old Testament. In the case of the New Testament, however, there must yet be added one serious disadvantage. Here, namely, the fact that the generic names 'Lord' and 'God' are rendered with the one term *Tuhan* is much more objectionable than in the Old Testament. For this reason. In the New Testament God is called both *Kurios* and *Theos*; Jesus is called *Kurios* also, but never — with a very occasional exception — is the word *theos* used of Him. This typical fact would be obscured completely in a system of translations as we are considering now. Whoever would read a translation of the New Testament according to such a system, could no longer be sure whether the text is speaking of 'Lord Jesus' or of 'God Jesus'. It seems to us that this cannot be justified from the point of view of either translation or theology.

This last objection turned the scales against Shellabear-Bode and its modifications, in the first place for the New Testament, and then, in view of the necessity of a concordant rendering of the divine names, for the Old Testament also.

So we reached our second negative conclusion — The Shellabear-Bode system, even when made more consistent and clear, is also unacceptable for our purpose.

4. When, therefore, neither the working hypothesis of the translators conference, nor the Shellabear-Bode system, nor a 'new start' (*sembahan*), prove to be an obvious improvement on the existing translation, there is for a revision no other conclusion possible than to keep to the old one, with a few small improvements. This can be done fairly simply in the Old Testament since it means continuing in the direction followed by Klinkert, and thus maintaining the once established and still followed tradition — although it means risking the objection that the combination of adjuncts with *Allah* is rather inelegant. There seems, however, to be no solution without objections and risks. Having weighed the pros and cons, we decided that the best way would be to take this risk, the more so because we were assured by different Indonesians that in the modern Bahasa Indonesia this construction is possible and further because we have repeatedly found by experience that many Indonesian readers have

no objection to the form in question. The improvements will not present any great difficulties. They are two, in the rendering of 'god(s)': (a) There can be a more consistent use of *ilah*. Only occasionally the word *déwat(ta)* will have to be used. (b) The word *berhala* (idol) will be avoided completely; it is too negative to be used for *elohim*. In this way there will disappear from the translation some renderings that are absurd when one visualises the situation clearly. See, for example, I Samuel 5 : 7, where Klinkert and Shellabear let the Philistines speak of *Dagon berhala kita*, "Dagon, our idol"; or Exodus 32 : 1, where they let the Israelites ask, *Perbuatkanlah kami berhala*, "Make us idols", a mistranslation which was maintained in Bode's draft.

In the case of the New Testament the matter is more difficult. Concordance demands that there too we should follow Klinkert. But here it is not, as in the Old Testament, a question of maintaining the tradition, but a deviation from the present generally accepted rendering of Bode in order to go back to that of Klinkert, a rendering that has already been done away with. That risk, however, will have to be taken. And it can be taken, firstly because Klinkert's system is more clear and obvious and therefore presents more easily demonstrated advantages; secondly because the number of alterations is much smaller than it would be for the Old Testament if the situation were reversed.

I can imagine that many a reader who has struggled through this account as far as here will say, "Much ado about nothing". Our results are, indeed, not very imposing. We have climbed over ditches and hedges, only to end up in the well-known garden where we had been for so long, and yet did not feel quite happy at the beginning of our enquiry. Personally, however, I am not sorry I made the journey. Now we know much better what we can and cannot do, and why. And once more we have realised how difficult it is to make alterations in the well-considered solutions of our predecessors. I am, therefore, still thankful that this question has been brought up, in particular by the Rev. Rosin and the late Rev. Riedel. Our present rule is, in fact, closer to their original suggestions (see *The Bible Translator*, Volume 3, No. 4, October 1952, pp. 191-194) than was the working hypothesis which, with their co-operation, was framed at the conference.

II. JHWH

Little need be said here about the rendering of *JHWH*. Along with Klinkert-Leydecker we can continue to use *TUHAN*, and the word *HUIHUWA* will be used no longer, everything in agreement with the suggestions of the conference. The translations which were proposed there for 'Lord LORD' and 'LORD LORD' (see *The Bible Translator*, Volume 3, No. 4, October 1952, p. 196 v.) also seem to work out alright.

Nevertheless, it may be worth while to add a few words here. For, as a matter of fact, the almost unanimous agreement which was reached at the conference on the subject of the rendering of *JHWH* in the Bahasa Indonesia must not make us close our eyes to the fact that behind this agreement different views were hidden, which only in the practical choice came to the same result. To some members *TUHAN*

seemed the ideal rendering of 'LORD' (*JHWH*). But not all were of this opinion. We, members of the translation committee, certainly were not. For us the preference for *TUHAN* is based chiefly on the fact that this rendering has become current use, and that we see no urgent reason or convincing arguments to oppose that tradition. Seen from the point of view of language or translation we consider the rendering of *JHWH* with *TUHAN*, *LORD*, etc., a rather disputable one. The chief objection is that in this way its name-character is lost, for 'Lord', from a linguistic point of view, is a generic name, not a proper name. I think I can say that in Dutch, for instance, the word *HERE* ('LORD'), in spite of all typographical devices, still has that character. Thus in *de HERE God* ('the LORD God') the reader sees and, especially, the listener hears not what is meant, i.e. proper name plus apposition, but what is not meant, i.e. title plus proper name (to be precise, title plus a proper name which has developed from a generic name). I am glad that the *Rules for Translators* leave open the possibility of using the transliteration of *JHWH*, just as I have been glad that the conference in Djakarta has withstood the pressure to declare this transliteration unacceptable. For the Bahasa Indonesia, therefore, we recognise the theoretical possibility of transliteration, as was shown already in the discussion of the Shellabear-Bode system, and the modifications we considered (see sub. above I/3). There is all the more reason for this theoretical reserve in the case of *JHWH* because in other languages of the Archipelago a transliteration is actually being used, among others, in Javanese (*Jehuwah*) and in Bataks (*Djahuwa*).

Nevertheless, for the present, these considerations with regard to translation in the Bahasa Indonesia have only a theoretical value. As aforesaid, the maintenance of *TUHAN* is here, in our opinion, the best solution for the time being, considering the existing tradition in the Christian churches.

"My Father"

The Significance of the Manner in Which Jesus Refers to God as Father¹

J. Harold Greenlee

(Adapted from the author's article of the same title in the Christian Minister, VI, 5, November-December 1954.)

Easily overlooked by the casual reader of the Scriptures are many truths which are not stated in so many words but rather conveyed or implied in more subtle ways. Among the truths thus brought out are some evidences concerning the deity of Jesus. These evidences are significant for any student of the Scriptures and at times may be of particular concern to the translator of the New Testament.

The New Testament has, of course, clear statements concerning the

¹ It may be noted that the Scriptural evidence quoted in this article is drawn exclusively from the Fourth Gospel. Support from the Synoptics is based on the argument from silence. *Ed.*