

principal ones of the synagogue . . .” Clearly, the translation will depend on the text followed by the translator. Correctness in these matters must be determined by the student of the text, and there are some well-defined principles for him to follow. No key doctrines depend on these texts; and the variation is one of degree, not kind. But they account for differences in modern Bibles.

The authors sometimes write from various theological viewpoints; and that fact, unfortunately, alters their work. This is an unhappy comment on man, but it is true just the same. Some translators of Baptist persuasion have rendered the Greek word “baptidzo” as “immerse”; the usual practice has been to transliterate it as “baptize.” Others will render the term “ecclesia” as “church,” while some will insist on “assembly.” There are many more such illustrations.

28

These differences are most pronounced when the Bible is translated by a cultic body or a group of theologians with some doubts of their own about the Scriptures. So the New World translators (Jehovah’s Witnesses) show a reading of John 1:1 of “a god,” which is given only to fortify their denial of Christ’s true person. It is not a correct translation and shows the view of only the scholar. But many nonscholastic readers may not realize this. Similarly, the translators of the Revised Standard Version give the reading “kiss his feet” in Ps. 2:12 (probably due to their denial of the truly prophetic aspect of the Psalmist’s message), which leads to a reconstruction of the truth. These two examples are typical of many more in which the view of the theologian has seriously handicapped his use of God’s Word.

The above illustrations, along with the following reason, will explain why it is necessary that those who translate