

emphasized to the extent that one wonders whether the church will not simply become another social organization and lose its distinctive function and identity.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

The Translator's New Testament. London: The British and Foreign Bible Society, 1973. xi + 579 pp. \$2.75.

The United Bible Societies (UBS) published their *Greek Text* in 1966 with translators primarily in view, especially in the format of the apparatus. *The Translator's New Testament*, based on this text, has the same objective, but is for those translators who must depend on English for access into the text of the NT. To fulfill this purpose the translation must be in a universal English familiar to those who translate into languages which have no translation or only poor ones. Nevertheless, there are no arbitrarily established vocabulary limits as in some versions for people with limited English background. Instead a more practical approach based on the experience of linguists was used.

This translation is the culmination of the work of thirty-five scholars including seventeen NT specialists and eighteen missionary linguists who began their work in 1954. Among those on the committee were W. D. McHardy, A. S. Herbert, and William Barclay.

The Glossary and Notes at the end are an important part of this publication. The former explains words and expressions, indicated by asterisks, which the committee felt would be helpful for the translators; and the latter deals with problems, indicated by daggers, which constantly arise in translating the NT. To illustrate the use of these two helps, we take examples from Mt 1. The words "messiah," "angel," and "people" are explained in the Glossary, the last because the same word is used to translate the Greek "hagioi" in this version. The words dealt with in the Notes are "husband" (v. 19) and "wife" (v. 20). The choice of these is obvious in this context.

While the UBS is generally followed, there are some deviations which definitely are not improvements. Some of these which have been noted in the major variants are: the inclusion of Jn 5:3-4 and Acts 8:37 in the text, with brackets without any notes, which UBS had relegated to the apparatus; the inclusion of "Ephesus" in Eph 1:1 without brackets, which UBS had included in brackets; the placing of Jn 7:53-8:11 in the traditional location, which UBS had placed at the end of the Gospel; the placing of the shorter ending of Mk in the footnotes, which UBS included after the longer ending in the text. This version follows UBS in adding "Jesus" within brackets in Mt 27:16-17, and in the note the translators regard it as authentic.

The translation itself is simple, direct, and clear. It is not as free as Phillips' or the NEB but is not without interpretive elements. These latter will be applauded or rejected depending on whether they agree with one's own interpretation of the passage. As examples of simplification, "scribes" is translated "those who taught them the Law" (Mt 2:4), and "justifies" is rendered "puts man right with himself" (Rom 1:17). Examples of interpretation are: "as a sign of your repentance" for "unto repentance" (Mt 3:11); "shared

his nature" for "the Word was God" (Jn 1:1); "one gift of grace after another" for "grace for grace" (Jn 1:16); "who is divine, who is closest to the Father" for "God which is in the bosom of the Father" (Jn 1:18); "Mother, why are you interfering with me?" for "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" (Jn 2:4); "his people" for "saints" (Rom 1:7, which, by the way, has been placed after v. 1); "God's glorious intention for them" for "the glory of God" (Rom 3:23); "spirits of the sky nor spirits of the abyss" for "nor height nor depth" (Rom 8:39); "irreligious people" for "sinners" (Mt 9:10-11).

Some interesting translations are: "You are Peter" (meaning Rock) in Mt 16:18; "virgin companion" in 1 Cor 7:36; joining the last part of v. 3 with v. 4 in Jn 1 as in NEB; making a disjunction between Christ and God in Rom 9:5, again following NEB.

This translation with its glossary and translational notes will be a real boon to those translators for whom it is intended, yet one could have hoped that it had more faithfully followed the UBS text.

Andrews University

SAKAE KUBO

Yoder, John H. *The Politics of Jesus: Vicit Agnus Noster*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1972. 260 pp. Paperback, \$3.45.

The title of this book is misleading. Yoder's concern, in fact, is the relevance of a NT ethic of voluntary subordination for modern social ethics. Only by verbal legerdemain can one get this from the title.

Yoder has set himself an ambitious task. Utilizing the entire NT, he endeavors to establish the point that the NT sets forth a social ethic of voluntary submission. Further, he seeks to bridge the gap between the first century and ours, the second plank in his thesis being that this NT ethic merits consideration by ethicists in our time. And all this is attempted within the span of 250 pages!

Though Yoder claims to be aware of the hazards involved in his bold undertaking, it is not so clear that he has avoided them. We shall confine our remarks to a critique from the viewpoint of NT scholarship; it is likely that many more questions would be raised by students of social ethics.

It is regarding *method* that the most serious doubts are to be expressed. Yoder specifically disclaims any innovative NT interpretations. He sees his work as the gathering together of results from NT scholarship. But his approach leaves this reviewer distinctly uneasy on at least two counts: (1) He is not sufficiently aware of the difficulties involved in recovering the actual social ethic of Jesus. His case leans heavily on Jesus' preaching of the kingdom of God and the announcement of the Jubilee in the sermon at Nazareth (Lk 4). Yoder looks to Luke's account as his principal source; Matthew hardly gets a mention. His treatment justifies only a more modest claim such as "the social ethic of Luke." To emphasize continually—as he does—the social ethic of *Jesus* is a position that few NT critics will espouse. (2) His attempt to bring together the various strands of the NT into an overall synthesis is even more unsatisfactory. For instance, after considering the social ethics of "Jesus and Paul," he states: "There would be the thought of the author of Matthew or of the writer to the Hebrews; there would be the mind of Peter, of John,