two speakers, they were also encouraged to read their work aloud to each other, and try to hear it from the point of view of a non-reader.

One conclusion that arose from the workshop sessions was that a clear distinction should be made between a text intended for publication for New Readers in English, and a text intended as a translation base for New Reader Scriptures in other languages. Neither the TEV nor the UBS New Reader selections proved suitable as a translation base as they stand. Where the selections chosen by the Bible Society of India were among the second language English texts prepared by Dr. E. R. Hope, the latter were used as the starting point. Half of the BSI selections, however, were from the Passion story, for which no New Reader texts were available. As these were worked over, a translation base was produced in which many alternatives and many possible restructurings were included. Suggestions from the participants were often incorporated and this helped to orient the translation towards the Indian context which gave birth to it. In any future workshops it would probably be an advantage to prepare such a translation base beforehand. And where a continuous narrative, such as that of the Passion, is intended for publication as a booklet, a careful study of the transitions between sections could also be done in advance.

Rajpur was a "guinea-pig" Institute, and experience had to be gained the hard way. At least the participants felt the experiment was a success. As one of them put it, "I have smelt the hand of God here".

A NOTE ABOUT CONTRIBUTIONS

The Editor invites Bible translators and other readers of *Practical Papers for the Bible Translator* to submit contributions for publication. There is a continuing need for articles and notes which are of interest and relevance to translators in their work. In particular short articles by translators about aspects of their own work and experience will be welcome.

Contributions may be of any length up to a maximum of 5000 words, and should be sent to The Editor, *Practical Papers for the Bible Translator*, United Bible Societies, 146 Queen Victoria Street, London, EC4V 4BX, England.

BOOK REVIEW

The Translator's New Testament. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1973.

As the name suggests, this new translation is a text of the New Testament for translators. Its introduction begins with this explanation of its purpose:

> The primary purpose of this book is to make available, to those translators of the New Testament into their own mother tongue who depend on English for access to the sources of biblical scholarship, such help as is necessary for the making of effective translations in the languages of today.

How can this book help translators? It is intended to provide help in two ways:

Firstly, the text can serve as a reliable version of the New Testament in English, which can be used by the translator along with other versions. It has been produced from the United Bible Societies Greek Text (1966), and expresses the meaning of that text in direct, uncomplicated English.

Secondly, it contains in addition to the text other material which can help the translator to understand and translate the text. This other material comes in the form of translational notes and a glossary, which are found at the back of the book.

The *translational notes* are not as extensive as the notes which may be found in volumes of the Translator's Handbook series, but they are mostly directed to the needs of translators, and they cover quite well the range of difficulties found in the New Testament. A star (*) placed in the text refers the translator to a note at the back of the book.

In those places where the Greek text can be translated in more than one way the translational notes usually set out clearly the alternative translations possible. However, there is one place where this has not been done, in John 3.3. Here the translators have included both alternatives, *reborn* and *born from above*, in the text, and there is no translational note. The Greek word *anōthen* could have either meaning, but not both meanings, and the translators should have decided on the meaning which is more appropriate in the context here. (In the light of Nicodemus' question which follows, most versions favour *reborn*.)

The *glossary* contains notes on some 150 important terms which occur throughout the New Testament. These are similar in some ways to the notes found in *A New Testament Wordbook for Translators*. They are brief and clear, and are easy to refer to as a dagger (†) is placed in the text against each word which is explained in the glossary.

Additional helps consist of a table of money, weights and measures, and two maps.

What about the language and style of the new translation?

The claim is made in the introduction that "Its language . . . is simple, its style direct and its form uncomplicated". This seems to be a true estimate of the language and style used. The text usually keeps quite close in form to a simple expression of the basic meaning, and this factor makes it a good version for the translator to work with. In comparison with *Today's English Version* the simple expression of meaning in this translation reflects more closely the structure of the original Greek text, and for the translator this may be seen as an advantage too. It is an advantage because the meaning of the text will have to be expressed in different ways in different languages, and so it is best to start to translate from the basic meaning in a form which is as close as possible to that of the original.

For translators who have English as their second language this translation will be more likely than TEV to use words and expressions they are not familiar with. (Some of these may be explained in the notes or the glossary.) The English style used should be no more difficult than that of TEV, although it is a bit more formal.

This brings me to discuss the translation from another point of view, that of the person who comes to it as a reader. To assess it as a text to read I used it for daily reading over a period of some weeks. I was quite disappointed at the end, because I found that for me it could not compare with TEV in its ability to communicate its meaning instantly and effectively. What I found was a somewhat formal level of language, and quite a bit which I felt was not really the way I hear people speak English today. I also found that the constant reference to notes and glossary was irritating—the stars and daggers distracted me, and in a number of places where notes were provided at the back of the book to make the meaning clearer I found the text itself too literal or difficult.

In view of the primary intention of the translation, all this is not too serious a criticism, but it needs to be kept in mind. What the translator has in the new book is a basic working text, and a tool to help him get to the meaning of the New Testament and express it. He should not try to use the text as a model to copy when he is producing his own translation.

EUAN FRY

NOTES

1 Thessalonians 3.13

I have read with interest Paul Ellingworth's article on "bringing" in the October 1974 issue of *The Bible Translator* (pages 426-431), and find his argument convincing except for the reference to 1 Thess. 3.13 on page 428. The natural translation of this is "at the time when our Lord Jesus comes (from heaven) with all his holy ones". The *parousia* ("coming") is a technical term in the New Testament for the return of the Lord to earth from heaven. The Greek preposition *meta* cannot mean "to be with"; if that had been intended a different preposition would have been used. The only way to avoid an apparent conflict with 4.14–17 would be to enclose in brackets the words meaning "at the appearing of our Lord Jesus", so that the text could be translated "to strengthen your hearts . . . with (those of) all Christians, at the appearing of our Lord Jesus".

This order is rather unnatural, and it is not necessary to force the text in this way because there is no real conflict with 4.14–17. The allusion in 3.13 is to the current Jewish belief, based on Zech. 14.5, that at the end of the age the Messiah would come to earth accompanied by a host of angels. In the New Testament this is referred to also at Matt. 8.38, 25.31; 2 Thess. 1.7; and Jude 14. The "holy ones" (*hagioi*) of 1 Thess. 3.13 are beings of a different order from the Christians mentioned in 4.14–17, whether "those who have fallen asleep" or "we who are living". I suspect that the traditional "bring" arose from confusion between these two kinds of beings. The confusion arose quite early, because when the early Christian writing called the *Didache* quotes Zech. 14.5 it does so in the context not of a host of angels but of the resurrection of the dead.

J. M. ROSS