CHAPTER SEVEN
SEMANTIC ANALYSIS

A. PROCESSES OF SEMANTIC ANALYSIS

Regardless of whether semantics is to be treated as part of deep structure as in G-T grammar, or as the top stratum as in stratificational grammar, Nida sees the emphasis on meaning (as an integral part of language and an essential component in any analysis of structure) to be of immense importance for translation theory. In particular Componential Analysis of semantic structures, stimulated by Katz and Fodor’s application of a G-T model to the structure of meaning and by Lounsbury’s studies of kinship systems, became an essential element in his translation theory and is reflected in the chapters in TAPOT on Referential Meaning and Connotative Meaning.21

Most studies in semantics concentrate on the ambiguities of language but Nida rightly emphasises how remarkably few they are, especially on the discourse level. With a mere 25,000 or so lexical units people can communicate with each other about millions of topics. This means that these lexical units have relatively large potential domains which can be efficiently delimited by the context to signal precise meanings.

1. The Marking of Meaning

Meaning is marked by: (1) syntactic structure as in, e.g. 'She drank the water' vs 'She will water the plants' and by (2) semotactic structure as in e.g.

a. The man runs
b. The water runs into the tub
c. The motor runs well
d. The vine runs along the fence
e. The bus runs between New York and Albany

In these sentences five different meanings are marked by certain semantically definable classes of co-occurring words. Note, however, that one cannot assume the same extensions of meaning in other languages. French, for example, cannot say: 'a motor runs'. Rather 'it walks' (Le moteur marche). In Telugu (South India) 'it plays'.22

---

  E.A. Nida Exploring Semantic Structures , (Munich: Fink Verlag 1975) 1052
22 This example was supplied by my colleague Dr Vasant Kumar in 1979.
The five sentences above, all exhibit intransitive uses of 'run'. When 'run' is used as a transitive verb it is causative and Nida provides an interesting set of correspondences.23

a. He ran the animal in the last race (i.e. he caused the animal to run)
b. She ran the water into the tub (i.e. the water did the running)
c. He ran the business well (i.e. he caused the business to run efficiently)
d. He ran the vine over the trellis (i.e. he caused the vine to grow over the trellis)

If, then, these uses of 'run' are added to the original five, we introduce the syntactic structure transitive/intransitive as a marker of meaning in addition to the semotactic structure which distinguishes the meanings of the first five sentences. With regard to those five intransitive sentences Nida analyses out five different meanings of 'run':

a. pedal action of an inanimate being involving relatively fast movement in space
b. movement of a mass
c. internal action of a mechanism
d. action or position of something capable of extension
e. habitual movement

These five different meanings are marked by certain semantically definable classes of co-occurring words.

2. The Analysis of Related Meanings of Different Words
For the translator, however, the analysis of related meanings of a single term is not as important as the analysis of the meanings of words having related or competing meanings.24 The different meanings of single terms are less of a problem because they are actually further apart in semantic space, i.e. they share fewer components than do related meanings of different words. The translator must be able to distinguish between such sets as 'walk' and 'run', 'walk' and 'stroll', 'stroll' and 'amble'. They are terms which in certain of their meanings compete with each other for semantic space. Nida proposes that there are three different types of meaningful relationships: (i) contiguous, e.g. 'walk' and 'run'; (ii) included, e.g. 'walk' and 'stroll' and (iii) overlapping e.g. 'stroll' and 'amble'. A fourth structure, polar opposition, describes such series as 'good/bad', 'tall/short' and 'generous/stingy'.

---

Such sets are analysed in terms of their minimal contrasting features. An example frequently cited by Nida is the set 'chair, stool, bench, hassock', all of which share the common components—'manufactured object' and 'for sitting'. With the aid of diagnostic components it is possible to contrast essential elements of meaning in these competing terms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>chair</th>
<th>stool</th>
<th>bench</th>
<th>hassock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>with legs</td>
<td>with legs</td>
<td>with legs</td>
<td>without legs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>with back</td>
<td>without back</td>
<td>with/without back</td>
<td>without back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>for one person</td>
<td>for one person</td>
<td>for two or more persons</td>
<td>for one person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But what would be the status of a chair whose back was broken off? Would it become a stool?

3. The analysis of Related Meanings of a Single Word

Having analysed the componential structure of the related meanings of different words, Nida turns to the analysis of related meanings of a single word. Again three basic types of components are distinguished: (i) common components, (ii) diagnostic components and (iii) supplementary or optional components. An appropriate warning is given that 'what is distinctive about a particular meaning may not be one or more components which it possesses exclusively but rather the particular assortment of configurations of components'. Kinship sets with their cross-cutting components e.g. sex, lineality versus collaterality, and generations, are a good example as each term is defined by a unique combination of components.

The six techniques for determining the relevant components are:

1) Isolate and discard the universal component(s) since they are not distinctive
2) Isolate the components which occur in one or more but not all meanings
3) Arrange these components in parallel columns under each meaning making as much similarity and difference as is needed
4) Of the remaining components, reject for the moment supplementary components, i.e. those which can be excluded without destroying the meaning, and add to each column those which are necessary to define the meaning

5) Indicate the extent of parallelism or agreement between senses
6) Determine which components are distinctive, individually or collectively, for each meaning

In summary, it is claimed that this kind of componential analysis enables us to know why we can substitute certain terms in certain contexts but not in others. All can be clarified in terms of the components which the meanings share or do not share.

4. The Problem of Figurative Meaning

The figurative sense of any term rests on the fact that it has an almost distinct set of components but that it also has a link to the primary sense through some one component, usually a supplementary one. This supplementary component can be actually relevant to the referent of the primary sense or only conventionally assigned, but in either case it is not one of the essential, distinctive features by which the primary sense is distinguished from others.27

This definition seems appropriate when Nida applies it to the single figurative use of 'fox' by Jesus in Luke 13:22 with reference to King Herod. The main components present in literal usage (viz. animal, canine, genus Vulpes) are not present here. The link is through a supplementary component—'cunning'—which is arbitrary, conventional and culture specific. In non-Western cultures this trait is assigned just as arbitrarily to other animals (e.g. rabbit or spider).

However, Nida's definition does not seem equally apt for other biblical idioms to which it is applied. For instance, frequently occurring terms such as 'flesh' and 'blood' seem to have figurative extensions of more central components. To preserve these figurative uses in translation may be unnatural to the receptor language but I doubt that they would ever be incomprehensible within the context of the biblical corpus. Similarly when Nida argues that 'circumcised' and 'uncircumcised' would be better translated literally 'Jews' and 'Gentiles' in Galatians28 because the reference is to ethnic groups and not to a physical operation, he seems to miss the point that the whole letter is about circumcision. Paul is opposing those who argue that Gentile Christians need to be circumcised. 'Circumcision' like 'flesh' and 'blood' is a central concept in Scripture in both literal and figurative meanings and in that total context the meaning is never obscure.

Nida’s contention that Semitic idioms such as ‘sons of disobedience’ (meaning people who disobey god), ‘children of the bridechamber’ (the bridal party), ‘to close one’s bowels’ (to fail to be compassionate), need not be retained in translation, is unobjectionable. Unlike terms such as ‘blood’, ‘circumcision’, these idioms are incidental and do not contribute to the cohesion of the whole corpus.

5. Connotative Meaning (TAPOT Chapter 5)
The analysis of a SL text must not be limited to a study of syntactic relationships between linguistic units or to the referential (or denotative) meaning of these same units. The connotative (or emotive) values of the text must also be analysed. This is crucial because DE translation seeks to attain equivalent emotional response on the part of the receptors. Traditionally connotative meanings have been associated only with individual words or short phrases but it is pointed out that (1) pronunciation, (2) words, (3) the discourse (involving connotative reaction to the style of utterance), and (4) the themes of the message may all have associated meanings.

Nida and Taber begin by mentioning examples of negative reactions to such words as the famous four letter words in English, which refer to certain body organs and functions:

The fact that the taboo is against the word and not the referent can be seen from the fact that there are quite innocent scientific words which refer to the same things and which are perfectly acceptable. But the feeling against the words is such that even though everyone knows them, they are not used in polite society, and even many dictionaries refuse to print them. Such words are thought to defile the user.

All societies have their ‘vulgar language’ as distinct from ordinary popular language. ‘Vulgar language is a universal phenomenon.

Other examples of words with connotative meanings are given: for instance ‘toilet’ (in American English) which is replaced by euphemisms such as ‘washroom’, ‘comfort station’, ‘lounge’, ‘powder room’; or ‘garbage man’ which is replaced by ‘sanitary engineer’ and ‘undertaker’ which is replaced by ‘mortician’.

---

Connotative meaning is said to derive from three principal sources: (1) the speakers associated with the word; (2) the practical circumstances in which the word is used, and (3) the linguistic setting characteristic of the word.\(^{34}\) Firstly, words acquire a connotative meaning closely related to our attitude towards their users. Words used primarily by children or in addressing children are not appropriate for adult usage. Similarly certain words become associated with certain classes. In British English much has been made of upper class (U) and non-upper class (non-U) speech.

Educational levels may also be involved so that educated persons use what is regarded as standard speech while others use 'substandard' words, pronunciation and grammar. Some words acquire special connotations through association with members of one sex. There are also regionalisms. In the Christian community, Nida points out, expressions such as 'the blood', 'the cross of Jesus Christ' and 'in the heavens' mark particular Christian constituencies (and one might add 'born again') just as surely as terms such as 'existential', 'dialogue', 'confrontation' mark others. The attitude that one has towards the person who uses that vocabulary becomes an attitude to the vocabulary, i.e. it becomes a connotation of that word.\(^{35}\) Words such as 'bunny', 'alkaloid', 'case the joint', 'it's real cool', 'ontological', 'peekaboo', 'sublapsarian' are offered as examples of expressions that are associated with different types of people.

Secondly, words used by the same people in different circumstances carry quite different connotations (e.g. 'damn' used in a church as against in a beerhall). TAPOT treats the situational level of 'langue', e.g. technical, formal, informal, casual and intimate later.\(^{36}\) The nature of the total environment has its effect on the connotations of words too, and the example cited of the different connotations of colours in Africa, is also valid in Indonesia, where different ethnic groups have different emotional reactions to different colours. Thus Chinese in Central Java, as elsewhere, regard red as the appropriate colour for festivities as it has connotations of happiness and good luck. For the local Javanese however, red symbolizes all that is bad—anger, blood, etc.—and many would not buy Bibles with red covers.

Thirdly, the linguistic setting in which words tend to occur gives them various connotations. Writing before environmental concerns had given rise to the 'green movement' Nida suggests that 'green' in English suffers from its occurrence in 'green

---


with envy', 'green at the gills', 'a green worker' and 'green fruit'. Again one could contrast the Indonesian context where this colour, for many, arouses very favourable reactions because of the association with Islam. Linguistic setting includes the time dimension and literary setting too.\textsuperscript{37} Thus phrases such as 'Uncle Tom', 'Mary's little lamb', 'Thus saith the Lord' are inevitably associated with the literary works in which they are found. Measurement of the connotative values of words is important for Bible translators. Of all the methods tried so far the matrix of Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum is said to be the least inadequate.\textsuperscript{38}

B. SOME ISSUES

As he acknowledges in the preface to a later book,\textsuperscript{39} Nida was inspired by the structural semantic insights of the two American anthropologists, Lounsbury and Goodenough, who—inter alia through the study of American Indian kinship terms—made componental analysis of meaning on a socio-cultural basis. That Nida acknowledges his debt to these two scholars in particular is understandable when one remembers that his qualitative reference point for Bible translation is the socio-cultural differentiated 'closest natural equivalent'. The larger the socio-cultural and typological distance between the SL and the RL, the more difficult this is to attain.

Although Nida's basic theoretical orientation at this point is of the generative-semantic type, we can be grateful that he has abandoned the use of complicated tree diagrams in presenting linguistic data and has developed a descriptive relationship which guarantees comprehensibility. As always this is the strength of Nida's exposition. It lucidly presents a wealth of observational insights reflecting life-long acquaintance with a variety of practical problems that confront a director of a Society for Bible translation. But comprehensibility does not necessarily guarantee scientific stringency. Componental analysis would seem to be a potentially useful tool for defining the differences between respective meanings and Nida's treatment has much that is suggestive and valuable.

Margaret Masterman makes the interesting comment, however, that Nida's method 'does not work well for the great key words of the Bible'.\textsuperscript{40} Certainly I agree with her when she points out the inadequacy of Nida's analysis of the three sets: (a)

\textsuperscript{37} E.A. Nida and C.R. Taber, \textit{The Theory and Practice of Translation}, (Helps for Translators, No.8; Leiden: Brill, 1969) 94.
\textsuperscript{40} M. Masterman, 'Bible Translation by Kernel', \textit{Times Literary Supplement}, (19 March 1970) 301.
repentance/remorse/conversion; (b) prayer/mediation/communion/worship; and (c) holy/good/righteous,\textsuperscript{41} not however, because of any failure to recognize certain components of religious mystery as she seems to imply. My problem is rather that at this point, Nida and Taber seem to abandon their scientific approach. No linguistic context is supplied for the terms under discussion. The terms themselves are a funny hotchpotch. 'Repentance', 'remorse', 'conversion' and 'salvation' are introduced as English words and their meanings are discussed without reference to any possible sentences in which they might occur. Worse still, 'repentance' is singled out for exposition in terms of the Greek word μετανοέω that is said to be behind it.\textsuperscript{42}

In the discussion of contrast in semantic areas and levels the set: 'prayer/meditation/communion/worship' are introduced as biblical terms but no contexts are supplied to justify the analysis. In fact, 'meditation' and 'communion' are not biblical terms as any concordance of the English Bible will show and the discussion of these words is more in the nature of a theological argument than an exercise in linguistic analysis.

The next set: 'holy'/good'/righteous' (in Matthew) and 'righteous' (in Paul) is composed of biblical words which are said to share common components such as 'socially approved', 'religiously appropriate qualities' and 'characteristics of personality'. The distinctions said to be revealed by diagnostic components are quite plausible but no examples are given.\textsuperscript{43}

The discussion of overlapping semantic areas is illustrated with the series: 'grace', 'favour', 'kindness', 'mercy'. The authors apparently drift back into general English usage and the analysis is once again carried out and discussed without being anchored in linguistic contexts.\textsuperscript{44} Only in the analysis of the Greek words ἀγαπάω and φιλέω (both translated 'love') do we find a relatively scientific treatment. Many biblical scholars have seen important distinctions of meaning but Nida shows that in one key passage, John 21:15-17, there is no semantico frame to distinguish such meanings.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{44} E.A. Nida and C.R. Taber, \textit{The Theory and Practice of Translation}, (Helps for Translators, No.8; Leiden: Brill, 1969) 74.
\textsuperscript{45} E.A. Nida and C.R. Taber, \textit{The Theory and Practice of Translation}, (Helps for Translators, No.8; Leiden: Brill, 1969) 75-76.
Again, componental analysis is applied to the Greek term sw'ma (this time with reference to actual biblical contexts) and five meanings are distinguished.\textsuperscript{46} This is undoubtedly instructive for biblical interpretation and translation but raises a problem, viz. what about the 'common element' that links these five notions together in the NT documents? How does the translator do justice to the integrating factor in the SL term? In technical terminology, in particular, this could be crucial.

Some biblical references are supplied to illustrate the 'distinctions in meaning between 'god' and 'gods', a unique singular and generic plural', but the argument is unnecessarily weakened by failure to clarify whether the case is being based on the original Hebrew and Greek texts or on the English Bible usage. Hebrew terms are mixed in with English ones.\textsuperscript{47} Almost as if anticipating this objection, Nida goes on to emphasize that because a term may have a number of different meanings in Scripture it is imperative to specify the context.\textsuperscript{48}

This point has received much attention in biblical research.\textsuperscript{49} However, Nida's analysis of the two terms given as examples ('redeem' and 'God'/gods') fails at this point. Three meanings of 'redeem' are offered on the basis of Scripture uses: (1) redeem a slave, (2) redeem Israel from Egypt, (3) redeem by Jesus Christ. All these meanings include the common components of alien control and release but only the first, it is claimed, includes the notion of payment of a price. However, no linguistic contexts are supplied.

With regard to the analysis of figurative meaning summarized in part A above, we have already seen that Nida's treatment is more subjective than he would care to admit. In particular the analysis of terms like 'blood' and 'circumcision', central concepts in the biblical corpus, leaves much to be desired.

Because of the need to elicit an equivalent emotional response from receptors in DE translation, connotative meaning is extremely important, and Nida stresses this factor

\textsuperscript{46} E.A. Nida and C.R. Taber, \textit{The Theory and Practice of Translation}, (Helps for Translators, No.8; Leiden: Brill, 1969) 80.

\textsuperscript{47} E.A. Nida and C.R. Taber, \textit{The Theory and Practice of Translation}, (Helps for Translators, No.8; Leiden: Brill, 1969) 82-83.


not only in the semantic analysis of the ST but also in his later chapters on Transfer and Restructuring. His treatment is always interesting and usually convincing. We have already seen the relevance of his discussion on the connotations of colours to the Indonesian situation. Of particular interest too, is his reference to the linguistic setting, characteristic of a word, as an important source of connotation. Nida cites phrases such as: 'Uncle Tom', 'Mary's little lamb', and more importantly, 'Thus says the Lord', which are associated with the special literary setting in which they are found. One might suggest that this point has relevance for the translation of cultic words and for biblical language generally. How does one retain such associations in the RL if one's theory of translation dictates naturalness in the target language?

Nida has been criticized for his explanation of 'verbal taboos'. We read in TAPOT\(^\text{50}\) that in the case of such expressions as the four letter words 'the taboo is against the word and not the referent'. But Sierstema would seem to be correct when she says that our negative reaction is in fact to the referent. That is why euphemisms are so ephemeral and may be replaced two or three times in one lifetime. For as soon as their meaning becomes so well known that their camouflage function is lost, a new camouflage is looked for in the form of a new euphemism for the unpleasant referent. In fact 'undertaker' and 'toilet' were once euphemisms.\(^\text{51}\) Likewise, negative reactions to four letter words would seem to involve more than Nida admits. These are surely not just a matter of taboo in a certain social setting—a case of non-U language. Anthropological research would indicate that there is a unanimity in the use of widely different languages reflecting a unanimity of attitude towards the things meant.\(^\text{52}\)

In retrospect Nida and Taber's treatment of Connotative meaning, though stimulating, seems too broad and imprecise. Geoffrey Leech's *Semantics* offers sharper and more useful analysis. Leech suggests seven types of meaning. The first—Conceptual meaning—coincides with Nida's Referential Meaning. But Nida's Connotative meaning is subdivided into Connotative, Stylistic, Affective, Reflected and Collocative meaning. Leech also adds Thematic meaning—what is communicated by the way in which the message is organized.\(^\text{53}\)

We should record that Nida's thinking on semantics has continued to develop. In chapter 5 we have noted his important work, with J.P. Louw, on semantic domains.


Finally, one might add that an evaluation of Nida’s semantics will be largely dependent on our assessment of the value of componential analysis. A componential approach to semantics has been advocated not only by mentalist theorists such as Chomsky and Katz, but also by linguists of different presuppositions such as Hjelmslev and Jakobson. Lyons, who has a good discussion of the topic, describes componential analysis as ‘a technique for the economic statement of certain semantic relations between lexical items and between sentences containing them’.54 But he draws attention to a theoretical problem in the approach in so far as the semantic features themselves have the status of lexical units. This means that the analysis is dependent on features which actually should only be the result of componential analysis. Hence ‘one cannot avoid the suspicion that the semantic components are interpreted on the basis of the linguist’s intuitive understanding of the lexical items which he uses to label them.’55 Certainly, as we have seen above, Nida’s analysis is not free from subjectivism.

---

CHAPTER EIGHT
TRANSFER AND RESTRUCTURING

A. SIGNIFICANT FACTORS IN TRANSFER

Having dealt with the processes of both Grammatical and Semantic analysis Nida and Taber address the problems involved in transferring the results of the analysis from the SL to the RL. Before the actual process of transfer is discussed there are some wise words on practical problems that often arise in connection with personnel involved in that transfer, whether the translators are foreign or national. For example, theologically trained persons often have real problems learning how to translate for a level other than the one in which they habitually operate. Again, some national translators have such a deep sense of insecurity about their own language that they may feel obliged to imitate the forms of other languages which they regard as having more prestige.

The transfer is made at the near kernel level—that is at the point where the kernels have been connected in such a way as to indicate their precise relationships. Nida claims that the relationship between kernels may be of three kinds: (1) temporal, (2) spatial, and (3) logical. Transfer on this near kernel level is less likely to distort the message because relations between the linguistic units of a message are more clearly marked at this level and because languages exhibit far greater similarity of structure at the near kernel level than they do in their surface structures.

1 Semantic Adjustments

Transfer will necessitate both semantic and syntactic adjustments. If the form of the original message can be preserved, well and good. But it is the content which must be preserved at any cost; the form, except in special cases such as poetry, is largely secondary, since within each language the rules for relating content to form are highly complex, arbitrary and variable. It is a bit like packing clothing into two different pieces of luggage: the clothes remain the same, but the shape of the suitcases may vary greatly, and hence the way in which the clothes are packed must be different What

---

counts is that the clothes arrive at the destination in the best possible condition, that is, with the least damage. Nida's analogy is amazingly crude. That it is used in a translator's manual such as TAPOT is perhaps understandable. That it should be repeated in a presidential address to the Linguistic Society of America is more surprising.\footnote{E.A. Nida, \textit{Language Structure and Translation}, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975) 91.}

In any translation there will be some loss of semantic content. The commonest problems of transfer arise in the area of: (1) idioms; (2) figurative meanings; (3) shifts in central components; (4) generic and specific meanings; (5) pleonastic expressions; (6) special formulas (e.g. epistology); (7) redistribution of semantic components, and (8) provision for contextual conditioning (e.g. by adding classifiers or descriptive phrases). Helpful examples of each are provided.\footnote{E.A. Nida and C.R. Taber, \textit{The Theory and Practice of Translation}, (Helps for Translators, No.8; Leiden: Brill, 1969) 106-111.}

In the process of transferring the referential content of the message there are three different types of redistribution of the componential structures.\footnote{E.A. Nida and C.R. Taber, \textit{The Theory and Practice of Translation}, (Helps for Translators, No.8; Leiden: Brill, 1969) 109. cf. E.A. Nida, \textit{Language Structure and Translation}, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975) 92.} First, there may be a complete redistribution. This is especially true in the transfer of idioms. For example, a literal transfer of the biblical idiom 'heap coals of fire on his head' normally involves a distortion of meaning. One Congolese tribe considered that this was reference to some new method for torturing enemies to death. They had not thought of such a technique before! The meaning of this idiom—i.e. its componential structure—must be completely redistributed, so that it can be transferred in a form such as 'to be so good to one's antagonist as to make him ashamed'. Second, the process of transfer may involve an analytical redistribution of the components. This means that what is carried by one lexical unit in the source language is distributed over several terms in the receptor language. For example 'disciples' may be transferred as 'those who followed him', 'saints' may be 'the people of God', and 'phylacteries' may be rendered as 'little leather bundles with holy words in them'. Third, the process of transfer may involve a synthesis of components. An expression such as 'brother and sister' may be transferred as 'siblings'; and in the More language of the Haute Volta, what is sixteen words in English—'in the morning, a great while before day, (he) rose and went out to an uninhabited place' (Mark 1:35)—becomes only one word, for all the componential features of meaning are included in the single More term.
2. Structural Adjustments
Attempts to preserve structural form in transfer usually result in complete unintelligibility or at least awkwardness. Nida discusses those modifications dictated primarily by the obligatory contrasts in the respective near-kernel structures. The optional modifications figure at a later stage as one undertakes to restructure the message by forward transformation to the appropriate level. An important section on the provision of contextual conditioning \(^{62}\) is followed by a good discussion of the kind of structural adjustments often found necessary in the RL. These structural adjustments are classified in terms of four levels:

a. Discourse Structure: Common problems in adjustment include the handling of direct and indirect discourse, pronominal forms, identification of participants and sequence of tenses.

b. Sentence Structure: the most important problems here are: (a) word and phrase order, (b) double negatives, (c) number agreement, (d) active and passive structures, (e) co-ordination and subordination, (f) apposition, (g) ellipses, and (h) specifications of relationships.

c. Word Structure: The relationship of word structure to the problems of transfer are of two principal types. Firstly, translation often demands changes in grammatical classes (e.g. from noun to verb where the noun expresses an event). Secondly, there are numerous subtle problems of morphological categories involving, for example, aspects, tenses, inclusive and exclusive pronouns, honorifics and distinctions between people who are dead or alive.

d. Corresponding Sounds: for instance, in re-casting borrowed words, particularly proper names, the phonological structure of the RL is normally followed. But often further adjustments are necessary as, for instance, when the transferred term sounds like an indigenous word having a different association altogether. Again, in the process of transfer, first priority is given to the referential conceptual burden of the message. Next in importance is its connotation, emotional flavour and impact. Finally, if one can carry over something of the form, one should do so but not at the expense of other priorities.\(^{63}\)

---


77
B. SIGNIFICANT FACTORS IN RESTRUCTURING (TAPOT CHAPTER 7)

Having transferred the message from the SL to the RL the translator is faced with the task of restructuring. Three perspectives must be taken into account:
1. The varieties of language or styles which may be desirable
2. The essential components and characteristics of these various styles
3. The techniques which may be employed in producing the type of style desired.64

These we discuss in order:

1. Varieties of Language

Firstly, one has to determine the style at which one should aim in the process of restructuring. For within each language there are variations according to geography (dialects), time (older vs newer forms), socio-economic classes or castes, circumstances of use, oral or written usage, types of discourse and literary genres. From the standpoint of the translator, a language’s literary tradition is also very significant. Nida acknowledges that in English the KJV continues to exert significant influence providing many literary associations and well entrenched stylistic usages.65

In deciding which situational level is appropriate, the translator is confronted with three principal alternatives: technical, formal and informal. For some literary genres there are also casual and intimate levels of language. The greatest mistake is to reproduce formal or informal levels in the SL by something which is technical in the RL. Nida claims that this has happened consistently in the case of Paul’s letters which in translation turn out as highly technical treatises rather than the pastoral letters that they are.66

There is an instructive discussion of language levels and their significance for Bible translation in societies which have a literary tradition.67 Not only does a scientific orientation mean distinguishing clearly between the oral and the written language, it must also delineate the respective ranges of ‘producer language’ and ‘consumer language’. The spread of consumer language is greater than that of the producer

64 E.A. Nida and C.R. Taber, The Theory and Practice of Translation, (Helps for Translators, No.8; Leiden: Brill, 1969) 120.
language. In other words, people are able to hear and read more than they can say or write.

In the following diagram, Figure 3, X and Y represent two typical speakers, one from the higher language level and the other from the lower language level. 'Higher' and 'lower' relate to educational levels or socio-economic status. Solid lines represent the producer language (i.e. that which X and Y can produce in speech or writing). Broken lines represent the consumer language (i.e. the range of language they are able to understand). Although the total range of X's language is greater than that of Y, he does not usually understand the total range of Y's language. The extension of the written language above the oral language shows that the written language has a literary accretion coming from its historical traditions. Of particular interest to Nida is the area of the overlap represented by the lines A-B and C-D. This is the 'common language' or that part of the total resources of a given language common to the usage of both educated and uneducated people. This concept of 'common language' is crucial in understanding the rationale for the Good News Bible (TEV) and its foreign language counterparts.

![Figure 3](image)

The authors then proceed to provide another diagram (Figure 4) in order to provide an historical perspective not depicted in Figure 3. For in all languages with a literary heritage there are many documents which reflect earlier stages of the language. Thus Bible versions often reflect long established literary associations and stylistic usages.

---

"Several features of this diagram should be noted:

1. The historical depth has been indicated only for the written language. Since the oral language, though it was spoken in the past, exerts no such continuing influence upon the present.

2. We have also added a dimension of 'informal-to-formal' (I to F) going from the left to right, and thus are able to plot such divergent translations as the NEB and Phillips, which are both on a relatively high stylistic level but differ essentially in the degree of informality. The NEB is, however, somewhat higher in its literary style.

3. The King James Version is listed at the extreme of the historical dimension, even though, of course, it was preceded by others. However, it is the only translation from the early period that exerts a significant continuing influence.

4. The RSV represents a somewhat middle position between the King James Version and contemporary usage. As far as vocabulary usage is concerned, however, it is not on such a high literary level as the NEB. On the other hand, the NEB is stylistically much simpler in sentence structure, so that in some measure these two factors produce an average which makes the RSV and the NEB somewhat parallel.

5. Phillips' translation may be said to dip a little further than the NEB into the language of overlap between the upper and lower languages.

6. To avoid overburdening an already complex diagram, the bar which represents each version is in reality a composite of all linguistic features of that version, including both grammatical structure and vocabulary. But different versions may be at different levels in terms of structure and vocabulary."\(^69\)

There follows an equally interesting and convincing section on language levels and dialects in societies where the language has either no literary history or only a brief one, and the appropriate translation strategies.\(^70\) But these are not relevant to us here.

---


2. Components of style

A special problem confronted by Bible translators is the wide variety of discourse types found in the biblical text, e.g. epic poetry, proverbs, parables, exposition, historical narrative, personal letters and ritual hymns. Though languages with long literary traditions have much more highly standardized genres, even the most traditional societies can have quite elaborate forms of oral literature, involving a number of distinct types; hence there is much more likelihood of formal correspondence (FC) than most people imagine. However, the real problems are not in the existence of the corresponding literary genres, but in the manner in which such diverse forms are regarded by the people in question. For example, epic and didactic poetry are very little used in the Western world, but in many parts of Asia they are very popular and have much of the same value they possessed in biblical times. But for most persons in the Western world, the authors claim, presenting the prophetic utterance of the OT in a poetic form (as the closest formal equivalence) would be unnatural, and even at times silly.

Nida sets out to analyze the components of style by comparing selections from the Gospel of Luke and the letter to the Hebrews in three different versions viz. the RSV, a FC translation; the NEB, a modern history translation; and the TEV. On the basis of these passages he notes such features as: discourse-transition markers, discourse-type markers, elimination of pleonasm, semotactic appropriateness, intra-discourse transition, semantic simplicity, pronominal reference, subordination of clauses, connotative equivalence, length of sentences, and so on. All these are examples of formal features which combine to produce certain styles.71

The point of this analysis of formal stylistic features, however, for DE translation theory is not to reproduce such stylistic devices but to understand their function in the source text. A translation is judged to be adequate only if the response of the receptor is satisfactory. Hence Nida is concerned to analyze which features of style serve to increase efficiency in communication and which devices increase impact by enhancing interest.72

Studies in discourse structure are seen to be highly significant for translation. Accordingly, the basic techniques for analyzing discourse structure are explained with

---

examples. The eight universals of discourse are also elaborated, viz: (1) markers of the beginning and end of discourse; (2) markers for internal transition; (3) markers of temporal relationship; (4) markers of spatial relationship; (5) markers of logical relationship; (6) the identification of participants; (7) highlighting, focus, emphasis, etc; and (8) author involvement.73

The remainder of the chapter on Restructuring74 consists of practical wisdom with regard to the kind of persons who make good stylists—firstly in the case of languages with long literary tradition, and secondly in languages lacking such a tradition.

TAPOT’s final chapter (Chapter 8), Testing the Translation, includes some material one might have expected to find in the section on restructuring. For instance, we are told that there is tendency for all good translations to be somewhat longer than the originals. This is because of the necessity to make explicit in the RL what could remain implicit in the SL since the original receivers had more background information. The expansions required can be divided into syntactic and lexical categories.

In syntactic expansions the RL will often require: (a) identification of the participants in events; (b) identification of objects or events with abstracts; (c) more explicit indications or relationalis; and (d) filling out of ellipses. The most common lexical expansions on the other hand, consist of: (a) classifiers (e.g. 'city of Jerusalem', 'cloth linen', 'sect Pharisee'); (b) descriptive substitutes (e.g. synagogue may be described as 'the worship-house of the Jew'); and (c) semantic restructuring (e.g. Nida thinks that 'I am a jealous God' (Exodus 20:5) might be restructured 'I am a God who demands that my people love no one else other than me' to avoid misunderstanding). Other information regarded as necessary to an understanding of the message, e.g. from the general cultural background, can be inserted in marginal notes. This whole section is an important and helpful one even though sometimes one feels that Nida is doing a rewrite of the original text in his concern to get the message across.

While Nida claims that good translations are normally longer than the originals, he mentions seven types of expression that are often reduced in the process of transfer:
1. Doublets such as 'answering, he said' become 'he answered'
2. Repetitions in the original Greek, e.g. 'Verily, verily'

3. Specification of participants, e.g. the TEV does not reproduce many of the occurrences of 'God' so frequently subject of sentences in the original text of Genesis 1
4. Removal of conjunctions where hypotactic structures are reduced to paratactic ones
5. Reduction of formulas, e.g. TEV changes 'for his name's sake' to 'for his sake'
6. Sometimes the RL requires more extensive ellipsis than is found in the SL
7. Highly repetitive style marking, e.g. importance of the theme in SL may seem awkward in some RL.

After discussing a number of procedures for testing translation, (e.g. Cloze technique, reading aloud, publication of sample material) Nida and Taber conclude by asserting:

The ultimate test of a translation must be based upon three major factors: (1) the correctness with which the receptors understand the message of the original; (2) the ease of comprehension, and (3) the involvement a person experiences as the result of the form of translation.\(^{75}\)

C. SOME ISSUES—FORM AND MEANING

The main issue to arise from Nida's treatment concerns the significance of the form of the original message for translation. As we have noted above Nida seems to operate with a concept of disembodied meanings.

Subsequently, the translator of the German common language version explained that in the matter of relationship between content and form TAPOT was a bit one-sided. But this exaggeration is understandable if one remembers the dominance of the FC approach to Bible translation at the time. When DE theorists turned to the task of translating the OT 'it became obvious...that an understandable rendering of the information is not necessarily a satisfactory translation. The Old Testament, with its greatly differing types of literature, forces the translator to seriously consider its forms'. But then Kassuhlke goes on to explain that it is not the exact reproduction of the form used which is important but its equivalence.\(^{76}\) Another DE theorist, Jacob Loewen, has sought to define some limits and controls for adjusting the SL form in translating because some translators 'anxious to get the real message across to tribal societies, are preparing translations which treat the historico-cultural setting of the Bible as irrelevant and which recast the biblical message into the cultural framework of a contemporary aboriginal society'.\(^{77}\)

---


Others, however, are prepared to go much further than Nida himself. For instance, some of Nida’s proteges have suggested that the salutations and introductory material of the NT letters should be transposed to the end of each Epistle as is the modern custom. Thus Barclay Newman says that the Epistle is a total discourse unit and meaning has priority over form. He has also suggested that the genealogy from Abraham to Joseph in Matthew 1:2-17 be replaced by a simple list of names such as would be natural today. DE translations in some languages (e.g., Malay and Indonesian) have implemented such ideas. The problem is that such restructured translations are in danger of obliterating the real historical distance between ourselves and the original situation. The result is an artificial construction. It is unnatural to let that temporal and cultural distance fall away, a danger against which Nida himself warns.

Nida’s emphasis on utilizing the natural resources of the RL is salutary and as usual he provides a wealth of illustrative material. Nor is there virtue in retaining Semitic idioms which are peripheral to the message, e.g. ‘the fruit of his loins’ (Acts 2:20) and ‘children of the bride-chamber’ (Mark 2:19), if they are too burdensome for the reader or misleading. Thus the literal translation in Indonesian of Luke 2:23 has been abandoned in recent versions because of the misleading connotation. ‘Every male who opens his mother’s womb shall be called holy to the Lord’ has been replaced by ‘every first born son shall be dedicated to the Lord’. However, one often feels that the restructuring recommended is far more radical than is necessary, and amounts to a rewrite of the ST.

Furthermore, the treatment of the redistribution of semantic components raises the issue of the fate of technical terminology in DE translation. Many of the words chosen by Nida for analytical redistribution are arguably technical terms—‘the saints’, ‘inheritance’, ‘redemption’, ‘propitiation’, ‘justify’—which serve as important signposts to the universe of discourse of the NT writers and their original readers.

In summary, Nida’s treatment of transfer and restructuring strengthens the impression gained from the earlier chapters of TAPOT that his theory of language is unsatisfactory at two points: it underestimates the complexity of the relationship between form and

---

meaning on the one hand, and on the other, the flexibility of language systems and their users. With regard to the question of form and meaning, the translation theorist cannot think in terms of disembodied meanings. His task is to establish correspondences between expressions of different languages. He must operate with expressions, not with wordless ideas:

He is not transferring wine from one bottle to another. Language is no receptacle, and there is nothing to transfer. To produce a likeness is to follow a model’s lines. The language he works in is the translator’s clay.\(^{82}\)

The Bible translator then, must not see the RL in which he is working as a system of unbreakable rules. The KJV which is said to have had such a profound influence on the English language, has been said to be written, in Hebraicized English, as we shall see. Languages are capable of being influenced and renewed just as the humans who use them are:

Darlene Bee and Vida Chenoweth were checking their translation of the calming of the tempest in the Usarufa language. Their translation helper, Nogo, came to Mark 4:39 and read ‘..."Be quiet", he said, and right away the wind and the water obeyed and stopped raging.' Nogo stopped abruptly. 'No, No!' he exclaimed, 'Wind and water don’t obey.' Thinking that they had used the wrong term the translators went back over the account...’Now, how can we say in Usarufa that the wind and the water did what Jesus told them to do?’ they asked the tribesman. Smiling in wonder, Nogo said, ‘Oh, I see. It obeyed.’ The translators had used the right word after all. In Usarufa no one had ever said that the wind obeyed...\(^{83}\)


\(^{83}\) C. Yallop, 'The Lord is my Goatherd; I Don’t Want Him', *Interchange* No.16 (1974) 220.
III DE Theory Incarnate—The Good News Bible
CHAPTER NINE
BACKGROUND—THE BIBLE IN ENGLISH

No translation of the Bible can be undertaken or evaluated without due regard to its predecessors in the field. An Israeli linguist has commented that the translation of the Bible into English has been 'distinguished by two salient features: the constant appearance of new translations and the continuing fascination of an archaic master version'.

The history of English Bible translation is a fascinating one worthy of a volume itself. What follows is but a brief sketch; but a necessary background to any discussion of modern principles of Bible translation and to our evaluation of the Today's English Version and its influence on recent foreign versions.

Although Christianity was established in Britain by the beginning of the fourth century AD, there is no evidence of Bible translation in the two Celtic languages (British and Irish) or in Pictish. Thus the famous British biblical scholar Pelagius (370-450) wrote his works in Latin as did all the other churchmen of Western Europe. The history of the English Bible, anyway, can only begin with the arrival of the Germanic speaking Angles, Saxons and Jutes in the fifth century and their evangelization in the sixth and seventh centuries by Irish and Roman missions.

Some Old English poems presenting the Biblical narrative in metrical form have survived and these have been connected with Caedmon, the unlettered poet of Whitby, whose remarkable gifts have been recorded by Bede in his "Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation". Bede himself, who died in 735, is supposed to have completed the dictation of John's Gospel with his dying breath, but unfortunately his version has not been preserved. Kind Alfred (d. 901), of burnt cakes fame, introduced his law code with an English translation of the Ten Commandments, part of Exodus and Acts 15:23-29 and is also credited with translation of part of the Psalter. Abbot Aelfric translated much of the OT in the tenth century. Old English versions of the Gospels, Psalter, Pentateuch and historical books of the OT have come down to us.

---

Middle English, which reflects the influence of the French of the Norman invaders, begins about 1300. The Bible translations which quickly emerged are associated with the name of Wycliffe, though the tradition that Wycliffe himself translated the whole Bible rests apparently only on a statement of his famous Czech disciple, Jan Hus. There are two extant Wycliffe versions of the Bible, one literal and one idiomatic. The first, which follows the Latin very closely, was the work of Nicholas of Hereford (a follower of Wycliffe) so far as the OT is concerned; the rest is by another hand, possibly that of Wycliffe himself. The more idiomatic revision was the work of Wycliffe’s secretary, John Purvey, towards the end of the fourteenth century. Purvey’s prologue contains some interesting information on the state of Bible translations and part of it is worth quoting.

A simple creature hath translated the Bible out of Latin into English. First, this simple creature has much travail, with divers fellows and helpers, to gather many old bibles, and other doctors and common glosses, and to make one Latin Bible some deal true; and then to study it anew, the text with the gloss, and other doctors, as he might get, especially Lira on the Old Testament, that helped full much in this work; the third time to counsel with old grammarians and old divines, of hard words and hard sentences, how they might best be understood and translated; the fourth time to translate as clearly as he could to the sentence, and to have many good fellows and cunning at the correcting of the translation.

He knows that he has not attained perfection; any amendments to his work will be welcome, but let the critic:

...look that he examine truly his Latin Bible, for no doubt he shall find fully many Bibles in Latin full false, if he look many, namely new; and the common Latin Bibles have more need to be corrected, as many as I have seen in my life, than hath the English Bible late translated.

Purvey’s mention of the famous Hebrew and Greek scholar Nicholas de Lyra reminds us of the renewed interest in classical texts, including Hebrew and Greek, which preceded the Reformation and which, together with that movement, and with the invention of printing, provided the impetus for the production of Bible translation on a scale hitherto undreamed of. Nida himself has aptly summarised this ever accelerating translation activity in his introduction to The Book of a Thousand Tongues:

Though the translation of the Old Testament was undertaken some two hundred years before Christ, when the Hebrew Scriptures were rendered into Greek, extensive translation of the Bible has been a relatively recent development. In fact, even by the time printing was invented, some 500 years ago, the Bible existed in only 67 languages. During the 19th century however, more than four hundred languages received some part of the Scriptures and within the first half of the 20th century some part of the Bible was published in more than 500 languages—an almost incredible

---

undertaking and one in which the Bible Societies played a major role, having been responsible for the publication of at least some portion of the Scriptures in 1,153 languages.4

The 1,500 or so languages into which the Bible has now been translated represent 97% of the world's population.

The outstanding name in the production of the English versions is undoubtedly that of William Tyndale, scholar of Oxford and Cambridge, who eagerly pursued the new learning and set out to do for England what Luther had done for Germany and to make 'the boy who drives the plough in England know more of Scripture' than many a man of learning. However, failing to get patronage in England, he moved to the continent. There he had to move from Cologne to Worms, then to Marburg and later to Antwerp where King Henry VIII's agents finally arrested him. He was strangled and burnt at Vilvorde in 1536. Before his arrest, however, he had translated and published the Pentateuch, Jonah, a revised Genesis and a revised NT. Tyndale and his translations were vilified by authorities in church and state in England (including Sir Thomas More, then Lord Chancellor, in his Dialogue Concerning Heresies), and thousands of copies were publicly burnt. Nevertheless, when royal policy changed, and the translation of the Bible into English was finally authorized, the version which won the royal favour and was placed in every parish church in England was basically Tyndale's even though this was never acknowledged.

The years following repudiation of papal authority in England were marked by intense activity in Bible translation. Versions by Miles Coverdale and John Rogers (Matthews Bible) received royal licence in 1537. Both leaned heavily on Tyndale. Likewise the 'Great Bible' (1539) placed in every parish church was only a revised edition of Tyndale's version. The Geneva Bible (1560), dedicated to the new Protestant Queen, Elizabeth, was marked both by accurate scholarship and marginal comments expressing strong Reformed theology, as might be expected in a version produced in the city of Calvin and Beza. The Bishops Bible (1568) utilized many of the Geneva renderings but predictably removed the anti-prelate and aggressively Calvinistic glosses.

The wide circulation of other English versions provoked English Catholic scholars in France to produce the Rheims version of the NT (1582) and the Douai OT (1609). The Douai-Rheims Bible was rather literal in its translation of the Vulgate and much more

worthy of Nida’s indictment—‘Anglicized Latin’—than the KJV. The Rheims translators, however, did provide a glossary explaining fifty eight of their Latin neologisms. Catholic doctrine was safeguarded in the section headings and in the marginal notes.

The Authorized Version of 1611 (KJV)

That the non-Roman Catholic English-speaking world received one and the same English Bible as a common heritage was largely due to the sheer merit of the Authorized Version. But due credit must also be given to King James I who not only eagerly approved the idea that his accession be marked by a new translation of the Bible, but also insisted at the outset that it should be without divisive marginal notes. Very probably he was thinking not only of theological controversies within the Church of England but also of those ‘democratic’ and ‘seditious’ sentiments in the Geneva Bible. Whatever the King’s own motives, the decision to produce the Authorized Version, or the King James Version, as the Americans call it, was a felicitous one. For wherever the English language is spoken, it has proved the Bible, par excellence, for over 350 years:

No book has had an equal influence on the English people. Apart from all religious consideration, it gave to all classes alike, an idiom in which the deeper emotions of life could be recalled. It gave grace to the speech of the unlettered, and it entered into the style of the most ambitious writers. Its phrasing coloured the work of poets, and its language has so embedded itself in our national tradition that if the Bible is forgotten, a precious possession will be lost.

As a translation, the KJV has continued to be the measuring rod for aspiring rivals:

The King James Bible has been augmented but never superseded by new translations that aspire to, and undoubtedly in some measure achieve greater accuracy and readability, incorporating the insight of contemporary attitudes and scholars.

In view of the dominant role of the KJV in the history of the English Bible, a brief note on its genesis is not inappropriate. The team of 47 men included most of England’s leading biblical scholars. They were divided into six panels: three worked on the OT, two on the NT and one on the Apocrypha. When the panels had finished their task, the

---

6 F.F. Bruce provides amusing examples of glosses reflecting both Protestant and Catholic prejudice: Tyndale on 32:35 comments, ‘The Pope’s bull slayeth more than Aaron’s calf’, whereas the Rheims version heading for Acts 8 reads: ‘Simon Magus more religious than the Protestants’.
draft translations of the whole Bible were reviewed by a smaller group of twelve men, two from each panel, before the work was sent to the printer.

The rules which guided them in their work were approved, if not actually devised by James himself. The Bishop's Bible was to serve as the basis for the new translation. But in practice all the existing English versions lay before the translators, plus every available foreign version—the Latin translation, the Targums and the Syriac Peshitta—all as aids to elucidate the original Hebrew and Greek texts.

As to the principles on which they based their translation, they are well stated in the preface, 'The Translators to the Reader'. This is seldom reprinted these days and must not be confused with the brief dedication, 'To the Most High and Mighty Prince James' though even this contains interesting information. It states the translators' desired to avoid extremes represented on the one hand by 'Popish persons at home or abroad' and on the other hand by 'self-conceited Brethren' of Puritan outlook.

The Preface to the Reader sets out to justify the general principle of Bible translations in the vernacular, and this work of translation in particular. Their debt to earlier English translation is acknowledged and it is claimed that their present concern is not 'to make a new translation, nor yet to make a bad one a good one...but to make a good one better, or of our many good ones one principal good one'. But they do not mention the man whose influence can be traced throughout so much of their work—William Tyndale.

They express forcefully their preference for idiomatic rather than literal translation in a passage frequently cited by Nida in defending his own DE theory and 'common language' Bibles.9

Another thing we think good to admonish thee of, gentle Reader, that we have not tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done, because they observe, that some learned men somewhere have been as exact as they could that way. Truly, that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signified the same thing in both places (for there be some words that be not of the same sense every where), we were especially careful, and made a conscience according to our duty. But that we should express the same notion in the same particular word; for example, if we translate the Hebrew or Greek word once by purpose, never to call it intent; if onewhere journeying, never travelling; if onewhere think, never suppose; if one where pain, never ache, if one where joy, never gladness, etc., thus to mince the matter we thought to savour more of curiosity than wisdom, and that rather it would breed scorn in the atheist, than bring profit to the godly reader. For is the

---

kingdom of God become words or syllables? Why should we be in bondage to them, if we may be free? Use one precisely, when we may use another no less fit as commodiously?...We might also be charged (by scoffers) with some unequal dealing towards a great number of good English words. For as it is written of a certain great Philosopher, that he should say, that those logs were happy that were made images to be worshipped, for their fellows, as good as they, lay for blocks behind the fire: so it we should say, as it were, unto certain words, Stand up higher, have a place in the Bible always; and to others of like quality, Get you hence, be banished for ever; we might be taxed peradventure with St Jame's words, namely, 'To be partial in ourselves, and judges of evil thoughts'. Add hereunto, that niceness in words was always counted the next step to trifling; and so was to be curious about 'names' too: also that we cannot follow a better pattern for elocution than God himself; therefore he using divers words in his holy writ, and indifferently for one thing in nature: we, if we will not be superstitious, may use the same liberty in our English versions out of Hebrew and Greek, for that copy or store that he hath given us.

Thus, in the KJV rendering of Romans 5 we read 'we...rejoice in hope of the glory of God (verse 2)...we glory in tribulations (verse 3)...and we also joy in God (verse 11)' where the italicised words represent the same Greek verb. By contrast the revisers of 1881 did not share the enthusiasm for skilful use of appropriate synonyms and rendered all three occurrence by 'rejoice'. The Preface makes it clear that the translators followed a middle course in rendering technical terminology:

Lastly, we have on one side avoided the scrupulosly of the Puritans, who leave the old Ecclesiastical words, and betake them to other, as when they put washing for baptism, and congregation instead of Church; as also on the other side we have shunned the obscurity of the Papists, in their azymes, tunike, rational, holocausts, prepuce, pasche, and a number of such like, whereof their late translation is full, and that of purpose to darken the sense, that since they must needs translate the Bible, yet by the language thereof it may be kept from being understood. But we desire that the Scripture may speak like itself, as in the language of Canaan, that it may be understood even of the very vulgar.

The 'late translation' of the 'Papists' is the Rheims NT (1582) mentioned above. It is salutary to note that of the six examples of latinate vocabulary singled out for censure in the Preface, three subsequently passed into common currency (tunics, rational and holocausts). This fact needs to be remembered in assessing Nida's claim that the technical terms such as redemption and justification are merely Anglicized Latin that should have no place in a modern English translation of the Bible.

We have already noted Nida's appeal to the example of KJV whose translators affirmed that 'we have not tyed ourselves to a uniformity of phrasing, or to an identitie of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done.' This usage of a variety of synonyms undoubtedly contributed to the generally excellent style of the KJV so superior to the wooden literalism of the later Revised Version (1881). Nida is
correct in interpreting the Preface to the Reader as a plea for the twin qualities that he himself advocates: readability and accuracy. The trouble is that these terms are not self-defining. We need further criteria to give them substance. These it seems have changed over the centuries. Certainly the KJV was not a 'dynamic equivalence' translation. It was not written in the popular, simple, everyday English. We are told, for instance, that its style was already archaic, perhaps deliberately so, at the time of publication. Just as the NT itself was originally written in a Greek with many semitic features so the KJV could be said to be written in Hebraized English. It was a FC version and whatever flexibility translators displayed in rendering common or indifferent diction they still retained the images and idioms from the biblical languages, thus making English readers familiar with Oriental modes of thought which were woven into the texture of the English Bible. More especially, the KJV translators:

...were constantly aware that it was the Bible that they were translating, with a definite community of themes and vocabulary of salvation, so that it was easy for the reader to recognize the important ideas and words relating to God's character and to the continuity of the history of salvation, wherever such ideas and words occurred.

A comparison of an early edition of the KJV with those printed now, would reveal several differences. The spelling has been considerably modernized and other alterations have been introduced; all unauthorized, some intentional, some accidental, some good, some bad. Many of the early editions seem to have been very carelessly printed, the most notorious being the 'Wicked Bible' (1641) so called because of its omission of the word 'not' from the seventh commandment (for which scandalous negligence the King's printers were fined 300 pounds by Archbishop Laud). It was left for the two Cambridge editions (1629, 1638) to present accurately the text of King James's translators. With the passage of time, too the chapter summaries were abbreviated to short headings while the marginal references were expanded. In 1701 dates were introduced into the margin for the first time, largely based on the chronological works of Archbishop Ussher.

For the English speaking world, the KJV became the master translation and the subsequent attempts of other translators to improve upon it were destined to have but temporary and limited appeal. A variety of translations and paraphrases appeared in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of which the most noteworthy was John

---

11 See Chapter Twelve below on the NT Koine Greek.
Wesley's revised edition of the KJV with notes 'for plain unlettered men who understand only their Mother Tongue' (1768). Bruce cites a literary curio by the classicist Edward Harwood who produced a New Testament in the idiom of Hume and Johnson. His rendering of the opening words of the Lord's Prayer, 'Our Father who art in heaven: Hallowed be thy name', helps us to understand its speedy consignment to oblivion:

O Thou great governor and parent of universal nature—who manifests thy glory to the blessed inhabitants of heaven—may all thy rational creatures in all parts of thy boundless dominion be happy in the knowledge of thy existence and providence and celebrate thy perfections in a manner most worthy of thy nature and perfective of their own.

Despite the many excellencies of the Authorized Version, the passage of time saw increasing pressure for revision. The English language had not stood still since 1611. But the weightiest consideration of all was provided by development in the field of textual studies. A growing scholarly consensus regarded the so-called 'Textus Receptus'15 with which the KJV translators worked, as inferior. Nineteenth century textual critics concluded that it represented a 'Byzantine' text type stemming from later manuscripts which had in turn been copied inaccurately. A wealth of manuscripts discovered and researched in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has enabled scholars to trace the textual history of the NT well back into the second century. Though it must be admitted that there is still debate as to whether the Alexandrian, Western, Caesarean or old Antiochian text-types most faithfully represents the original 'autographs'.16

These considerations found expression in several distinguished private ventures such as the translations of Dean Alford, Conybeare and Howson, and J.N. Darby, and finally gave rise to the official revision of the KJV in 1881. The initiative was taken by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury in 1870 and subsequently both Anglican and Non-Conformist scholars were divided into two companies. The NT company took ten years while the OT company worked for fourteen years. Like their predecessors, the revisers of 1611, they received no remuneration for their arduous labours. The co-operation of parallel companies of American translators was arranged.

The ERV proved to be a 'schoolmaster's translation' that failed to satisfy the critics or to displace the KJV in popular affection, as we have noted. On the whole, the OT

15 The Textus Receptus—based on a twelfth-century manuscript amended by Erasmus and printed in 1515.
16 However, the distinguished editor of the RSV (1946) has claimed that 'out of the thousands of variant readings among the manuscripts there is still, as in 1881, nothing requiring a revision of Christian doctrine'. See F.C. Grant, An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament, (1946) 42.
revision, which followed the 1611 text more closely, was well received. But the NT revision was attacked on two scores—its quality as a translation, and the principles of textual criticism which it embodied. The second issue requires more attention than can be justified in this thesis. As regards the first, it is evident that the revisers' concern for formal concordance resulted in a version which knew nothing of the rhythm, cadence and euphony of good English. They were accused of ruining many of the loveliest passages in English literature. On the other hand it has been said that the stylistic elegance of the KJV is largely absent from the Greek original—a claim we shall return to in chapter twelve.

The Last Half-Century

The last hundred years have witnessed the publication of other 'revised' versions of the KJV removing what the editors regarded as obsolete usages, archaisms and Hebraisms, and taking into account the prevailing scholarship of the period. Thus the Jewish Publication Society published in 1917 The Holy Scriptures According to the Massoretic Text, whose debt to the KJV and ERV is obvious (though Christological overtones were pruned out). It remains the standard version used by Jews of all denominations. Most important of all was the Revised Standard Version (1946, 1952), produced by American scholars in fairly literary English acceptable on both sides of the Atlantic. This version made the strongest bid to replace the KJV. It is probably the most common version used in Australia and with the inclusion of the Apocryphal books it gained the approval of the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches as well as the Protestant community.

Since the publication of the RSV, over thirty more English Bibles have appeared plus an additional twenty six New Testament translations. Very few of these have self-consciously resisted the swing to dynamic equivalence principles. The New King James Versions (NKJV) and the New American Standard Bible (NASB) are notable exceptions.

Of those which make a distinctive break with the KJV-RSV tradition, the most prominent are: the New English Bible (1970) undertaken by major British Christian bodies other than Roman Catholic; the Catholic Jerusalem Bible (1966) which was very much inspired by the popular Dominican La Bible de Jerusalem (1955); the New Jewish Version intended to replace the 1917 translation; the Berkley Bible or Modern Language Bible (1959); the American Bible Society's Good News Bible (Today's English Version) (1976) of which the NT section had already become a best seller—
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Good News for Modern Man (1966); Kenneth Taylor's paraphrase, The Living Bible (1971), which was so commercially successful as to earn an article in the Wall Street Journal;\(^{18}\) the New International Version (1979) produced by the New York Bible Society and marking conservative Protestant dissatisfaction with the RSV; and finally the two most significant recent English versions the Revised English Bible (1989) and the New Revised Standard Version (1990).

Besides these products of scholarly panels working under the auspices of large organizations, mention should be made too of earlier monumental individual efforts such as those of J. Moffatt (1913, 1924), E.J. Goodspeed (1923), R.A. Knox (1949) and J.B. Phillips (1958, 1970).

It is clear from the Revised English Bible (REB) and the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) that DE theory has had a profound influence even on translators who have not formally adopted Nida's views. The REB, a radical revision of the NEB, states that 'the guiding principle has been to seek a fluent and idiomatic way of expressing biblical writing in contemporary English. Much emphasis has been laid on correctness and intelligibility'. The NRSV likewise declares that the biblical message 'must be presented in language that is direct and plain and meaningful to people today.'

In his important review of these two versions, Robert Bratcher, one of Nida's most prominent lieutenants, concludes that only the REB qualifies as a DE translation.\(^{19}\) He cites Hilaire Belloc's criterion 'What would an Englishman have said to express this?' Yet the NRSV committee adopted the maxim 'As literal as possible, as free as necessary.' True Bruce Metzger claimed plausibly in 'To the Reader' that the NRSV remains essentially a literal translation but it is much less literal and more sensitive to DE priorities than the REB when it comes to issues of inclusive language.

**Conclusion**

Our review of the history of English Bible translation has noted two salient features: the increasing proliferation of new translations on the one hand and the continuing fascination of an archaic master version in the KJV on the other.

But in the last half century a remarkable reversal has taken place. Until the 1950s, English speaking readers who did not use the KJV would most likely have used the RV or ASV and increasingly the RSV—all formal correspondence versions. A drastic change then occurred revealing an overwhelming tendency to eschew the formal register of solemn worship and recital in favour of the natural, informal style of the

---


mass media. By 1990 over 80 million copies of the *Good News Bible* (TEV) NT were sold and over 30 million TEV Bibles. Likewise more than sixty million copies of the *New International Version* were also sold. While the NIV is more conservative than the TEV its underlying philosophy of translation is not markedly different.

Clearly there has been a dramatic change both in popular expectation of what a translation should be like and in the approach of Bible translators themselves.

Our own focus is to be on the TEV not simply because of its phenomenal acceptance but because it represents the most conscious and consistent attempt to implement dynamic equivalence translation theory. Furthermore, as we shall see, the TEV has been vigorously and successfully promoted as a model for Bible translation worldwide.

---

20 These figures are supplied in J.P. Lewis, *The English Bible from KJV to NIV* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991).