

number of speakers, from ten thousand to a few hundred thousand. The medium to communicate the Good News was to be these hitherto unknown languages, not Malay alone. That was Adriani's line of thought, adopted by the NBS directors, and later by other translators. They integrated themselves with the customs and culture of the local population and so found the proper solution to the problem of communicating difficult passages. Their attitude towards the indigenous counterparts was uncommon at that time when colonial power was unquestioned. Van der Veen even fostered indigenous leadership. What Adriani and others were doing intuitively has now been given a theoretical grounding by Nida.

The author admits that in some parts the narrative resembles an autobiography. He was the leading figure in translation projects like the Balinese and Indonesian, though like Moses he saw the completion thereof only from afar.

Parts I and II together cover a span of 144 years: from Gericke (1826), the first person sent out for translation purposes by the NBS, to Grijns (1970), the last to participate in a national and ecumenical endeavour. Part II has also a survey and a map of languages in which at least a portion is translated.

O. E. CH. WOEWONGAN

Van Bruggen, Jakob: **The Future of the Bible**. Nashville and New York: Thomas Nelson Inc. 1978, 192 pp. \$3.95.

In this book van Bruggen, professor of New Testament exegesis at the Reformed Theological College in Kampen, the Netherlands, issues a call to the churches to reclaim their God-given task of Bible translation—a task which they have unfortunately let fall to the Bible societies. He urges all of the churches in any one country to use the same translation. The churches moreover should ensure that this one translation is used in the church, at informal gatherings, in the schools, and in the families. The need for church unity and correct doctrine is so great, and therefore the need for one Bible, that he even argues for use of “the national language of the liturgy, even if this national language is still a second language for some members of the church” (145–146).

What kind of translation will provide this basis for unity and sound doctrine? It must be a “reliable” translation, and that means one which will “reflect faithfulness to the form, clarity, completeness, loyalty to the text, spirituality, authoritativeness, and ecclesiastical usage” (99). The RSV, TEV, NIV, NASB, LB—all modern translations fail to measure up in one or more of the above requirements. None, for example, shows a “loyalty to the text”. Instead all err by failing to follow consistently the original text, i.e. the Masoretic text in the Old Testament and the Majority text in the New Testament. Others such as the TEV are lacking in spirituality. A reliable, spiritual translation does not reject a theology of imputed righteousness, substitutionary atonement, and reconciliation through the sacrificial blood of Christ. In the English language, the King James Version is reliable and deserves to be made completely usable again in the twentieth century by updating the language. Otherwise, the future of the Bible is threatened as readers choose modern but unreliable translations over old-fashioned but accurate translations.

Van Bruggen is clearly not pleased with certain developments in the United Bible Societies. They have gone too far from being merely "a handmaid of the churches" to being an independent "handmaid in the world". They have gone from publishing *more* than the complete Bible (including the Apocrypha, an inevitable result of cooperation with the Roman Catholic Church) to publishing *less* than the complete Bible (portions and selections are an inevitable result of the dynamic equivalence theory that a translation must be adapted to the anticipated readers). The whole dynamic equivalence approach to translation is in fact rooted in unsound theology (chapter 4) and makes a false pretence of being linguistically based when in fact "it rests on epistemological, anthropological, and theological prejudices" (168).

Van Bruggen obviously takes his subject seriously, but at times one is tempted to think that he is writing tongue in cheek after all: "Many Bible translators work daily with languages into which a translation faithful to form is still very difficult to realize. This is partially due to the structures of the receptor languages . . . and also partly a result of the fact that many of these languages . . . are still incomplete or only partially developed. . . . Biblical Christianity will affect the culture and language of any nation where it is influential and the possibilities of faithfulness to form within that language will increase with cultural development" (104). He objects to Kathleen Callow's statement that a translation will use "those forms which are appropriate to that kind of information in the RL (Receptor-language)", because, he argues, "the Bible is unique and one cannot speak of forms 'appropriate to that kind of information in the RL'. This kind of 'information' did not exist in the receptor language before the Bible arrived" (105).

This book will appeal to the fears and prejudices of many who reject all translations except the KJV. To claim that "some believe that ease of understanding would be gained if only a selection were translated . . . in a less accurate but more easily accessible way" (99) is unfairly moving from a judgment on the accuracy of a translation to a judgment on the motives of the translator. And to claim that the whole Bible will soon be lost in selections of free translations by the Bible societies (150) unless the churches accept their responsibility is nothing less than nonsense.

ROGER L. OMANSON

Sjölander, Pearl: Some Aspects of Style in Twentieth-century English Bible Translation. One-man versions of Mark and the Psalms. Umeå, Sweden 1979. 219 pp.; obtainable from the author, Box 1107, 111 81 Stockholm, Sweden, £2.50 post free.

Within its chosen limits, this book is a remarkable piece of work. It is a contribution, not to biblical studies or linguistics, but to English studies; but it is far from being just another book about the English Bible.

The author has wisely confined herself to translations by individuals, some of them women, despite the subtitle. She pays special attention to 43 versions of Mark 1.1-11, and to 35 verse translations of Psalm 23; these are reproduced at the end of the book. However, the bibliography lists 28 other individual English translations of Mark, and 35 of the Psalms, and even this list is not claimed as exhaustive.

In other respects, too, the book is a model of selection. Related but