

# Two Recent New Testament Texts and Translations\*

CHARLES H. H. SCOBIE

NEW TESTAMENT scholarship has many and diverse tasks, but among them two must certainly be acknowledged to be of basic importance. The first is the study of *text*—the constant striving to reconstruct with greater accuracy the original texts of the New Testament. The second is the work of *translation*—of understanding what the original writers were saying, and of rendering their words into language which will convey the original meaning as accurately and effectively as possible to people today.

Towards the end of 1966 the latest in the long series of “modern” versions of the New Testament appeared in the shape of two “new” New Testaments. These reflect current approaches to the problems of text and translation, and also to a wider variety of theological concerns. They reflect the work of contemporary *Protestant* scholarship, on the one hand, and *Roman Catholic* scholarship on the other. One emanates from the *English-speaking* world, the other came originally from the *French-speaking* world. The purpose of this paper is to review these works and comment, at least briefly, on some of the trends in contemporary New Testament scholarship which they reflect.

## I. INTRODUCTORY SURVEY

The first translation is entitled *Good News for Modern Man: The New Testament in Today's English Version*,<sup>1</sup> and we should therefore add TEV (= *Today's English Version*) to our already long list of abbreviations. The translation is the work of Robert G. Bratcher, Research Associate of the Translations Department of the American Bible Society. Bratcher originally made a translation of Mark's Gospel under the title, “The Right Time,” and then undertook the translation of the whole New Testament at the request of the American Bible Society, as part of a series of translations into various languages, designed “to serve the needs primarily of people who have little formal education or who speak the language as foreigners.”<sup>2</sup> TEV is published in Canada by the Canadian Bible Society in attractive paperback form. At 75 cents a copy, its 600 pages surely represent one of the best book bargains available at the present time.

\*A paper read to the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies at McGill University, Montreal, May 1967.

1. New York: American Bible Society (Toronto: Canadian Bible Society), 1966.

2. R. G. Bratcher, “Good News for Modern Man,” *Bible Translator*, 17 (1966), 159.

According to the translator, "as a distinctly new translation, it does not conform to traditional vocabulary or style, but seeks to express the meaning of the Greek text in words and forms accepted as standard by people everywhere who employ English as a means of communication."<sup>3</sup> Elsewhere the translator has claimed: "It is . . . a translation into standard 'common' English—by which is meant that form of literary English that is common to all those who speak the language, native and non-native speakers, of a high or low level of education."<sup>4</sup> In point of fact, this new translation has already proved to have a very widespread appeal, and in the first four months of publication over one million copies were sold.<sup>5</sup> Mention ought to be made of the illustrations in this volume—ink drawings done in a modern idiom, with great economy of line, which constitute an extremely effective means of communication. They are the work of Mlle. Annie Vallotton, a Swiss-born artist living in Paris.

The second translation is the English edition of *The Jerusalem Bible*. This work originated within French-speaking Roman Catholicism after the second world war, in the new atmosphere of biblical studies encouraged by the papal encyclical of 1943, *Divino Afflante Spiritu*. Dissatisfaction with existing French translations was felt, and a new work was proposed which would be representative of the best contemporary Roman Catholic biblical scholarship, and which would appeal not just to scholars but also to the general public.<sup>6</sup>

The project was edited by Père Roland de Vaux of the Ecole biblique, Jerusalem, with the assistance of a directing committee and the collaboration of a team of scholars. The Jerusalem Bible, as it came to be known, was originally published in some thirty-five to forty small volumes, each dealing with one book or group of books of the Bible. A set of three volumes was then issued, and finally in 1956 the standard one-volume edition appeared. The original notes were revised and reduced in size with the production of the one-volume edition.<sup>7</sup>

At the end of 1966 an English edition of *The Jerusalem Bible* was published, prepared under the editorship of Alexander Jones, of Christ's College, Liverpool.<sup>8</sup> This is a most handsome volume, running to over 2,000 pages, though the price (\$18.75) hardly puts it in the "popular" class. (The French version sells for \$6.50.) Though basically a translation and not a commentary, *The Jerusalem Bible* is furnished with introductions to the various books, marginal cross-references, footnotes (which at times approach commentary proportions), various tables and maps, and an "Index of Biblical Themes."

3. *Today's English Version*, p. iv.

4. Bratcher, "Good News for Modern Man," 159.

5. The latest figures available from the Bible societies indicate a sale of 9,000,000 copies.

6. Cf. review by H. Cazelles, *Bible Translator*, 9 (1958), 153–55.

7. *La Sainte Bible, traduite en français sous la direction de L'École biblique de Jérusalem* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1961).

8. *The Jerusalem Bible* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966).

The following comments will be restricted to the New Testament portion of the Jerusalem Bible. Although the French volume has been consulted, it is the English version which is primarily being dealt with here. I suggest JBE and JBF as appropriate abbreviations for the English and French versions respectively.

## II. TEXT

The question of what Greek text a translation is based on is of course an extremely important one. TEV was prepared from a brand new text, which was also published in 1966 by five leading Bible societies in America and on the Continent.<sup>9</sup> (The abbreviation BSG may stand for *Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*.) There are already a considerable number of Greek New Testaments in circulation, but it was felt that all of these have certain defects and limitations. The project for this new text was initiated and organized, on behalf of the Bible societies, by Eugene A. Nida (Secretary for Translations, American Bible Society), and as finally published it is the work of an international committee of scholars, consisting of Kurt Aland (Münster, West Germany), Matthew Black (St. Andrews, Scotland), Bruce M. Metzger (Princeton), and Allen Wikgren (Chicago). It should be noted that the text was prepared to certain definite specifications; in particular, the critical apparatus was "restricted for the most part to variant readings significant for translators or necessary for the establishing of the text."<sup>10</sup>

It is true that the number of variants cited is small—about 1,500 as compared with Nestlé-Aland's 10,000. On the other hand, the evidence cited for each variant is given at length and is greatly superior to that supplied by any other modern text in common use. All 76 known papyri are used, as are 169 uncials. While Nestlé-Aland lists 260 minuscules, only 26 are actually cited more than a dozen times. The BSG lists 266 minuscules, of which 62 are cited consistently.<sup>11</sup> A great deal of new data has been collected and collated for this edition; special mention should be made of the work done on lectionaries.

A unique feature of BSG is the evaluation of the textual evidence, in the apparatus, in terms of four "grades," A, B, C and D, so as to indicate the varying degrees of probability attaching to each reading.<sup>12</sup> New also is a separate apparatus giving variants in punctuation from the main editions of the Greek text, as well as leading English, German and French versions (including JBF).<sup>13</sup>

In the light of the new evidence assembled and the work done on the text, the BSG can fairly claim to be a genuinely new critical text of the New

9. *The Greek New Testament* (New York: American Bible Society, 1966).

10. *Ibid.*, p. v.

11. Cf. R. P. Markham, "The Bible Societies' Greek Testament: The End of a Decade or Beginning of an Era?" *Bible Translator*, 17 (1966), 110.

12. Cf. *The Greek New Testament*, pp. xf.

13. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. xxxv-xxxix.

Testament. On the other hand, it still stands very much within the tradition stemming from Westcott and Hort, and in general is not strikingly different from the Nestlé-Aland type of text.

A supplementary volume is being prepared by Bruce Metzger, discussing and giving reasons for the readings adopted by the committee. When published, this will greatly assist a fuller assessment of the new text.

The BSG is a fine piece of work, and a word of praise for the type used may not be out of place. It was designed "to encourage ease of reading even under adverse lighting conditions."<sup>14</sup> Bruce Metzger reports that the Bishop of Woolwich told him that, when he was working on *The New English Bible*, he did not use the Nestlé text (as the other translators did) because he did not like the type.<sup>15</sup> (The Nestlé type is in fact hard on the eyes, though this is not the most scientific reason for discarding it!) Even though designed primarily for translators, the BSG could well be recommended as a standard working text for theological students.

TEV is based on this text, but has not followed it slavishly in every case. The translator has listed a dozen or so of his most important departures from the text,<sup>16</sup> and other minor variations can be detected. TEV, it should be noted, does not itself give any variant readings.

In the case of *The Jerusalem Bible*, we do not possess the actual text on which it was based. The English version is, of course, based on the French, and one is somewhat taken aback to discover that initially the first draft of the translation "was made from the French and then compared word for word with the Hebrew or Aramaic by the General Editor and emended where necessary to ensure complete conformity with the ancient text."<sup>17</sup> Apparently, however, this procedure was followed only in the case of a few books of the Old Testament; the greater part of the translation was made on the much sounder principle of direct translation from Hebrew or Greek, the drafts being "simultaneously compared with the French when questions of variant reading or interpretation arose."

The principles on which the problems of text were dealt with are unfortunately not discussed, beyond the simple statement that the translation was made directly from the Greek. It is an interesting sign of the times that in the Foreword the Vulgate is not even mentioned. Apparently no one edition of the text was followed, and the impression is given that the team of scholars treated important variants on their own merits, in the light of the most recent discoveries and studies. The footnotes cite many variants, occasionally referring to Greek manuscripts, and quite frequently noting variations from the Vulgate.

The work on the text underlying the JB demonstrates the extent of

14. Markham, "The Bible Societies' Greek Testament," 113.

15. Cf. B. M. Metzger, "New Testament Manuscript Study," *Anglican Theological Review*, 48 (1966), 352.

16. Cf. Bratcher, "Good News for Modern Man," 160 f.

17. *The Jerusalem Bible*, p. v.

Roman Catholic acceptance of the results of modern textual criticism. Indeed, in the field of text there is little that separates these two versions. For example, in the case of the ending of Mark, TEV prints both the longer and shorter endings, in brackets but in full size type, under the headings, "An Old Ending to the Gospel," and "Another Old Ending." The JB prints the longer ending as part of the text and the footnote describes it as "included in the canonically accepted body of inspired scripture." However, the note refers to the manuscript evidence and difference in style, leaves the Marcan authorship open to question, and quotes the shorter ending.

Both TEV and the JB omit the ascription at the end of the Lord's Prayer in Matthew 6:13. John 5:4 (the reference to the angel troubling the water) appears in brackets in TEV (though the BSG does not read it). The JB prints the verse in the text, but the footnote states that "the best witnesses omit 'waiting for the water to move' and the whole of v.4." TEV prints the incident of the Woman taken in Adultery in its usual place (John 7:53-8:11) within brackets, though the BSG relegates it to the end of the Gospel. The JB prints it in the text, but the footnote declares that the author of the passage is not John, though claiming that "there are no grounds for regarding it as unhistorical." Like TEV, the JB omits 1 John 5:7 f. (the *Comma Johanneum*), commenting in the note that these words "are probably a gloss that has crept into the text." These judgments reflect the change in Roman Catholic attitudes to the text.

Generally speaking, both texts reflect the trend away from an excessive reliance on the Sinaiticus-Vaticanus "Neutral" text in favour of "eclecticism." This is seen perhaps more clearly in the JB than in the BSG. For example, the introduction to Acts in the JB mentions the many variants in that book presented by the Western text, which "contains many corrupt readings," but also acknowledges that "many of its concrete and vivid details, absent from the other texts, could be authentic." The notes frequently cite Western variants (about 35 in Acts). Moreover, a check on the Book of Acts revealed some fifteen places where the JB *adopts* Western readings.<sup>18</sup> In not one of these fifteen cases does it have the support of TEV or the BSG, or of the RSV; in only one of the fifteen cases does the NEB adopt the Western reading. It is interesting to see how the Roman Catholic scholars, having cut loose from the Vulgate, seem in some respects to be freer in their approach, in this case not rejecting all Western readings, but adopting quite a number on their intrinsic merits.

Just to show, however, that the trend is not all in one direction, an example may be cited of a more conservative reading in the JB. In Matthew 27:16 f., TEV reads "Jesus Barabbas" (as do, e.g. Moffatt, NEB). The BSG prints *Iēsoun* in the text, but in brackets, which indicates doubt. The JB does not read "Jesus," but notes the variant, commenting that it "would give peculiar point to Pilate's question but appears to have its origin in an

18. Acts 1:11; 1:26; 2:17 (*bis*); 2:18; 2:19; 2:20; 2:24; 4:10; 4:12; 9:31; 10:11; 13:27; 13:33; 27:5.

apocryphal tradition." This seems to be a rather unfair assessment, for a very strong case can be made out for reading "Jesus Barabbas."

### III. TRANSLATION

On the subject of the actual translations, perhaps the first comment suggested by a reading of these two new versions is that it is amazing how they can follow such a long list of modern translations and still come up with something new and fresh. TEV and the JB both represent the type of translation which is more and more coming to hold the field. They are genuinely new translations, not revisions in the RV and RSV tradition. They do not feel bound to an exact-as-possible, word-for-word rendering, but seek rather to convey the total meaning of the original text. They do not go as far as J. B. Phillips, who borders on paraphrase, but belong to the same general category as the NEB.

Probably it is true to say that TEV tends to be freer than the JB. For example, the JB renders *metanoēō* by "repent," while TEV has "turn away from your sins." Again, in Luke 11:20 the JB reads, "But if it is through the finger of God that I cast out devils . . .," where TEV interprets, "It is rather by means of God's power that I drive out demons . . ." In the case of a Semitism like "a son of peace" (Luke 10:6), the JB renders "a man of peace," while TEV goes the whole way and makes it "a peace-loving man."

These versions, however, have much in common. Both finally break the "Thou" barrier. Even the NEB failed to do this; for example in Mark 14:36 it reads, "All things are possible to *thee*. . . Yet not what I will, but what *thou wilt*." TEV, however, has, "All things are possible for *you*. . . But not what I want, but what *you want*." And the JB reads, "Everything is possible for *you*. . . But let it be as *you*, not I, would have it." Surely this is the only possible way to translate the Greek into *modern* English.

Again, while the RSV and the NEB, for example, still retain "gospel" for *euangelion*, both TEV and the JB use "Good News." In Mark 1:1, where the JB translates with an objective genitive, "the Good News about Jesus Christ," the footnote comments: "The word is used in the New Testament to mean, not a book, but the Good News of salvation, Jesus himself being both its messenger and its message." The versions of the Lord's Prayer are quite similar; both read "save us" (or "keep us safe") from "the Evil One." Both use "happy" for the *makarioi* of the Beatitudes, where the RSV kept "blessed," and the NEB read "blest."

Both these translations, generally speaking, show a sturdy independence of previous English versions. For example, the narrative of the storm in Acts 27 is superbly done in the NEB, with a fine feeling for the correct nautical terms. Neither TEV nor the JB, however, seem to depend on the NEB at all; rather, they attempt a fresh translation. Thus the JB, in Acts 27:17, renders *chalasantes to skeuos* as "they floated out the sea anchor," whereas

other English versions have "lowered the gear" (RSV), or "lowered the mainsail" (NEB). (TEV has "lowered the sail.") The JB rendering is quite possible and has the support, for example, of Arndt and Gingrich.<sup>19</sup>

Again, the JB translates the "stone" testimony (Mark 12:10 and parallels; Acts 4:11; 1 Peter 2:7); "It was the stone rejected by the builders that became the keystone"—interpreting *kephalēn gōnias*, not as the chief cornerstone, a stone low down on the outside corner of the building, but as the keystone (JBF, "pierre de façade"), high up, which crowns and holds together the structure. This reading is not found in any other modern version (to the best of my knowledge), but it has found champions notably Jeremias in the relevant article in Kittel's *Wörterbuch*.<sup>20</sup>

Here we could note that where the Roman Catholic edition of the Revised Standard Version<sup>21</sup> insisted on changing Luke 1:28, "O favoured one," to the liturgically more familiar "full of grace," the JB is quite happy to read "so highly favoured."

As regards the style of the translations, while TEV quite uniformly produces its own brand of common, standard English, the JB claims, especially in the Gospels, "as far as possible" to "preserve stylistic nuances."<sup>22</sup> The JB succeeds here up to a point, though it is extremely difficult to assess such a claim. What can be said is that both these translations reflect the modern tendency to recognize the poetic quality of many New Testament passages. TEV prints in lines, in poetic form, many Old Testament quotations, the Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer, the *Magnificat*, *Benedictus* and *Nunc Dimittis*, the Christ-hymn of Philippians 2, 1 Timothy 3:16, 2 Timothy 2:11-13, and some passages in Revelation. The JB adds certain other passages: for example Ephesians 1:3-14, Colossians 1:15-20 and 1 Timothy 6:14-16. Furthermore, the whole of 1 John is printed in short lines as a poem, as are considerable portions of the Fourth Gospel. In spite of these attempts, however, to reproduce the original style, both translations recognize the need to break up long sentences into shorter ones, in keeping with modern English usage. For example, the long sentence, which in the Greek extends from Ephesians 1:3 to 1:14, is broken into six sentences by the JB. The NEB breaks it into eight sentences, while TEV actually breaks it into fourteen separate sentences.

In the case of a Roman Catholic version, we have to ask whether dogmatic considerations have influenced the translation. An obvious case would be the reference to Jesus' brothers. Fortunately, the JB does not follow the rather ridiculous procedure of the RSV (Catholic Edition) in using the archaic "brethren" whenever Jesus' brothers are referred to.<sup>23</sup> *Adelphoi* can

19. Cf. W. F. Arndt and J. W. Gingrich (eds.) *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 761.

20. Cf. J. Jeremias in G. Kittel (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, translated and edited by G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), pp. 781-93.

21. *The New Testament, Revised Standard Version, Catholic Edition* (London: Nelson, 1965).

22. *The Jerusalem Bible, New Testament*, p. 14.

23. Cf. *The New Testament, RSV, Catholic Edition*, p. 254.

only be translated as "brothers"—and that is how both TEV and the JB translate it. On the other hand, the footnote in the JB runs: "Not Mary's children but near relations, cousins perhaps, which both Hebrew and Aramaic style 'brothers.'" This is unacceptable to Protestants, but at least it is in the footnote and not in the translation.

In 1 Cor. 9:5, admittedly a difficult text in some ways, TEV seems to get the true meaning of *adelphēn gunaika*: "Don't I have the right to do what the other apostles do, and the Lord's brothers, and Peter, and take a *Christian wife* with me on my trips?" The JB has a rather odd translation: "Have we not every right . . . to take a Christian woman round with us . . ."—which does seem to reflect the reluctance of a celibate clergy to admit that all or most of the apostles were married. (This is pointless, in any case, as Mark 1:30 clearly shows that Peter was married.)

A question would have to be raised also, for example, in the case of the saying on divorce in Matthew 5:32. However, to pick out a few texts like this would be most unfair. Such cases could virtually be counted on the fingers of one hand, and as a whole the JB provides a very fair translation. Translators encounter a host of problems, and the differences and agreements between these two versions in tackling such problems cut completely across denominational lines.

One last critical note may be added to this section on translation. There are four texts in the Fourth Gospel in which *ho prophētēs* occurs, twice in reference to John the Baptist (John 1:21, "Are you the Prophet?"; 1:25), and twice in reference to Jesus (John 6:14, "Surely this is the Prophet who was to come into the world"; John 7:40, "This man is really the Prophet"). Recent discoveries and studies have suggested that in these four texts *ho prophētēs* is used as a title, in a quite specific sense, denoting a figure of Jewish eschatological expectation, namely, the Moses-like prophet.<sup>24</sup> The idea of the eschatological prophet as Elijah *redivivus* is most familiar to us from the New Testament, but in John 1:21 *ho prophētēs* is clearly not Elijah, since the Baptist is asked, "Are you Elijah?", and when he replies, "I am not," he is then asked, "Are you the Prophet?" Moreover, the Dead Sea Scrolls have contributed definite evidence of pre-Christian Jewish expectation of the Moses-like prophet, on the basis of Deuteronomy 18:15f. In John 6:14, it is because Jesus has just repeated the miracle of the manna that the people exclaim: "This is indeed the Prophet who is to come into the world!"

Since, therefore, *ho prophētēs* is used as a title in this definite sense, it should be translated as "the Prophet" with a capital "P," just as we write "the Messiah" with a capital "M." This is in fact done by TEV in these four texts (though it is not the first English version to do this, having been anticipated, for instance, by Moffatt and Phillips). The JBE uses a capital "P" for "the Prophet" at John 1:21, but then inconsistently reverts to a

24. Cf. O. Cullmann, *Christology of the New Testament*, rev. ed. (London: S.C.M. Press, 1963), pp. 14-23; C. H. H. Scobie, *John the Baptist* (London: S.C.M. Press, 1964), pp. 121-23.



small letter in the other three texts. (The JBF uses small letters in all four texts.)

The JB does have a note at John 1:21, referring quite correctly to Deuteronomy 18:15, and saying: "The Jews argued that the expected Messiah would be another Moses (the prophet *par excellence* . . .) who would repeat on a grand scale the prodigies of the Exodus." The Moses-like prophet, however, as John 1:21 and 7:40 suggest, and as the reference in the *Manual of Discipline* to "the coming of a Prophet *and* the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" confirms (I QS 9:10, 11), does not seem to have been identified with the Messiah in Jewish expectation. This note in the JB is not therefore strictly accurate.

We could add here that Papyrus 66 (= Papyrus Bodmer II) must surely have a strong claim to preserve the original reading at John 7:52, where the usual reading is: "Search and you will see that no prophet is to rise from Galilee (*ek tēs Galilaias prophētēs ouk egeiretai*). The difficulty of this text is well known, since it contradicts the Old Testament and Rabbinic evidence. P<sup>66</sup>, however, reads the definite article *ho* before *prophētēs*, to give the rendering: "Search and you will see that *the Prophet* is not to rise from Galilee." No longer is this a generalized statement applying to all prophets; it refers only to this one figure, the Moses-like prophet. Unfortunately, this significant variant is not reflected in TEV or the JB, nor is it cited in the BSG.

#### IV. AIDS TO UNDERSTANDING

Both these volumes—the JB more than TEV—contain certain aids to studying and understanding the New Testament. Unlike TEV, the JB has a series of introductions to the various books of the New Testament. These are well-written and, in addition to brief treatments of authorship, date, and so on, give helpful summaries of the thought of each book. The introduction to the Synoptics feels obliged to adhere to the priority of Matthew by positing an Aramaic Matthew, later translated into Greek, then abbreviated by Mark, and followed finally by our Greek Matthew (produced by an unknown author, drawing on Mark, a Greek version of Aramaic Matthew, and a separate Logia source). On the other hand, the introduction is willing to allow a date around A.D. 80 for Luke.

The Fourth Gospel is divided up into sections, mainly on the basis of the Jewish feasts mentioned in the Gospel. Thus it is suggested "that Christ not only fulfilled the Jewish liturgy but by doing so brought it to an end." The treatment of authorship, however, is very conservative and quite inadequate, failing to deal with either the very real difficulties of, or the possible alternatives to, authorship by John, son of Zebedee.

The introduction to Paul's letters gives us both a biography and a chronology which is rather more assured than the evidence warrants. The North Galatian theory is favoured, and Galatians is dated about A.D. 57. The introduction to Philippians favours Ephesus as the place of writing, and A.D. 56–57 as the date. Colossians and Ephesians are accepted as Pauline,

though doubts about authorship are briefly discussed. The Pastorals are also said to be by Paul, perhaps helped by a disciple or secretary; the discussion here is rather weak. (There is no mention of computers!) Hebrews is definitely not by Paul, and Apollos is the likeliest candidate. This judgment in particular represents a significant change in Roman Catholic opinion.

The Catholic Epistles are grouped under the title "The Letters to all Christians." Traditional authorships tend to be favoured, though 2 Peter is admitted to be definitely non-Petrine. Revelation is not by the apostle John, though it came from his "immediate circle." The introduction suggests that chapters 4–22 consist of two separate apocalypses "written by the same author at different times and later fused into one by the same author." The introductions give a good summary of current Roman Catholic thinking on the New Testament. Though Protestant scholars cannot agree with everything set forth here, there is a great deal on which we can agree and for which we can be very thankful.

The use of various aids to understanding in these two translations prompts a further observation. It has long been the policy of the Protestant Bible Societies, while promoting Bible reading as widely as possible, to avoid any kind of notes or comments and to print "the text, the whole text, and nothing but the text." Roman Catholics, on the other hand, have often shown reluctance to allow the laity free access to the Scriptures, and have insisted on notes and comments to safeguard their interpretation, especially of certain disputed texts. Both these translations, however, are designed for general use, and both include aids to understanding.

TEV marks a notable new trend, in that it not only makes liberal use of paragraph headings and Synoptic cross-references, but also includes at the end a "Word List" which explains technical terms, rarely used words, places, and persons as well as an "Index," which lists persons, places, events, and subjects such as "baptism," "forgiveness," "resurrection," etc. This index comes very close to the JB's "Index of Biblical Themes," though the latter is considerably longer. We can see here a convergence of the Protestant and Roman Catholic approaches to New Testament translations.

Indeed, one of the conclusions suggested by a comparison of these two volumes is that, in the light of recent scholarship, and especially in the light of Vatican II, there is nothing to hinder the production of a joint Bible for Protestants and Roman Catholics, which would include, not merely a translation, but also notes, tables, maps, a biblical index, and similar aids. At certain points, the notes would have to present divergent interpretations, but these points would be very few indeed.

At the same time, if a joint Bible is produced, it must not be allowed to delude people concerning the state of Protestant-Roman Catholic dialogue. For all the recent changes of attitude, there are still serious—even basic—theological differences which separate us. What is becoming clearer is that hardly any of these relate to the translation of Scripture or to work on the text. They have to do rather with questions of the interpretation of Scripture and of the authority of the Word of God.