

摘要

《圣经》是“一部奇书，具有多方面的珍贵价值和重要意义。神学家视之为无与伦比的宗教经典，史学家视之为世上稀有的历史文献，文学家视之为不可多得的文学总集”（张朝柯 2003: 1），全世界大约有“十亿以上的人把《圣经》当作他们的精神食粮”（梁工 1990: 序），它是世界上译本最多、销路最广（梁工 1990: 序）、读者最多的一本书。

中文《圣经》经历了一段漫长的翻译史。最早的《圣经》中译可追溯至唐朝，有“大秦景教流行中国碑”为证。综观唐朝以降的 40 多种《圣经》中译本，有节译本、编译本和全译本；有天主教译本，有基督教译本；有文言文译本、浅文理译本、官话译本；有个人译本，有集体合作译本；有外国传教士译本，也有华人译本。众多译本的出现为《圣经》在中国的传播奠定了坚实的基础，为中国读者接近《圣经》、阅读和理解《圣经》提供了更多的范本。然而，在选择一本适合个人阅读的《圣经》译本时，面对众多的《圣经》译本，读者却感到不知所措。

本文以众多的《圣经》译本为史料，对《圣经》的英译史和中译史进行了历史性回顾，对《圣经》英译和中译原则进行了描述性研究，并进而指出《圣经》在英译和中译上的直译和意译倾向。为探本究源，本文初次尝试将目的论应用于《圣经》中译研究，从目的论的角度出发，以《圣经》的两个重要中译本（《国语和合本》和《现代中文译本》）为参照，通过对比两个译本对习语及隐喻等的处理，揭示了《圣经》中译的目的性倾向。

从曲高和寡的《和合本》（Net 1）到通顺的《现代中文译本》，从独白的清高到对话的亲和，《圣经》中译显示了它明显的目的读者选择倾向。

读者是目的论中的决定性因素。目的论认为，任何人类行为，包括翻译行为都是有目的的。目的论的首要原则是目的原则。这里说的目的指的是译文的目的。任何译文皆因一定的

目的产生，在一定的读者接受环境中运作。读者因而起着决定性的作用，这一点在首先作为宗教文本的《圣经》翻译中得到强化。《圣经》文本，不同于世俗文本，要传播它所承载的教义，它必须拥有庞大的读者群，它需要稳定的甚至不断扩大的信仰者。

基于此，正如前所述，出现了大量适应不同目的的《圣经》中译本。《国语和合本》和《现代中文译本》正是在不同的历史背景下针对不同读者而产生的两大中文译本。正如任东升指出，“《圣经》翻译具有明显的目的性”（任东升 2001：12）。这一点在本文对《圣经》的英译史和中译史及相关翻译原则的回顾中已经初见一斑，更被目的论所证实。它的目的性在两个译本的对比中得到了进一步的验证。

关键词：《圣经》中译，目的论，读者

Abstract

The Bible, the most translated work in the history in terms of the number of people engaged in this work and the number of the languages into which it has been translated, has been rendered into various versions by different translators who are guided by different principles.

By comparing the two popular modern Chinese Bible versions, Chinese Union Version (CUV), a literal translation and Today's Chinese Version (TCV), the most popular present day Chinese version translated under the principle of dynamic equivalence, the paper suggests that in spite of the apparent differences between these two versions, the two versions complement each other in that they are produced for their defined readers.

By outlining the traditional debate on 'literal' and 'free', the paper initially employs the Skopostheorie, which places the utmost importance to readership, to discuss the reasons why in the fields of translating, the traditional deep-rooted emphasis on the form in the history of Bible translation has gradually given way to the priority of smoothness. A more practical and detailed discussion is arranged to analyze the various differences between the two versions of the Bible. Through this analysis, it concludes that readership justifies the two versions with which the CUV is more suitable for the theologians, Bible students and some serious Christians who have more knowledge of the Hebrew, Latin and Greek language, for it enables them to better appreciate the style of the original text, while the TCV the common readers.

The discussion contributes to the conclusion that in order to function well among more readers, the Bible translation employs different principles to meet their needs. This leads to the coexistence of Chinese Bible versions in China and versions in other languages in the world as well.

Key Words: Chinese Bible translation, Skopostheorie, readership

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The paper is developed from my three years of study at the English Department of Northwest University. Upon the completion of the present thesis, I'd like to take this chance to express my gratitude to all the people who help me considerably with my study and my writings of the thesis by their unselfish instructions and great kindness.

First of all, I wish to extend my sincere appreciation to Professor Hu Zongfeng, my academic supervisor, for his brilliant guidance and invaluable inspiration without which the paper wouldn't have got a chance to get started. And he brought me from the States kinds of Bible versions and reference books unavailable in the mainland China which contribute greatly to the present form of the thesis.

My gratitude also goes to Professor Ban Rongxue whose profound knowledge and enlightening academic achievements have greatly benefited me.

I am also deeply grateful to teachers at the English Department of Northwest University. During the three years of study, I benefited a great deal from their enlightened lectures.

Finally, special thanks are due to the members of my oral defense committee who took a lot of time from their/ busy schedule to examine the paper, offer their insightful criticism and attend the defense. Their time and effort are greatly appreciated.

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Study

The paper is meant to ascertain the purposeful quality of the Chinese Bible translation by analyzing the main translation principles employed in the two Chinese versions of the Bible: Chinese Union Version (CUV) and Today's Chinese Version (TCV) from the perspective of Skopostheorie Theory.

Both the CUV and the TCV are Chinese versions of the Bible and win respectively great popularity as soon as they rolled off the presses among different readers. The former was born in the closing years of 1910s rendered by foreign missionaries, whereas the later was translated by solely Chinese scholars in the late 1970s. The two versions have been chosen as the comparative objects of the analysis for the following reasons:

- A. The CUV represents the peak of foreign missionaries' translation of the Bible into Chinese. After the CUV, Chinese got to start trying their hands in the Bible translation.
- B. The Chinese Church adopts the CUV as the authorized version, though other translations sometimes may be referred to.
- C. The CUV takes the Revised Version of the King James Version as its base, which is available everywhere now in China. This makes the study possible, for the original Bible is in Hebrew and Greek, a student of English-Chinese translation could do nothing for the lack of the knowledge of the original languages.
- D. The TCV is the first Chinese Bible version cooperatively rendered by only Chinese scholars.

E. The TCV wins great popularity among Chinese nowadays than the CUV.

When translating the Bible, the translators obviously follow certain principles in their work, whether they consciously realize this or not. The special interest of the study focuses on the translation principles employed in the two versions. Then a closely comparative study is arranged in Chapter four in accordance with three principles of Skopostheorie to make them justified: Skopos rule, intratextual coherence and intertextual coherence. Of course, examples are extracted from the two versions to make the analysis more clear.

1.2 Theoretical Reference

Every translating action has its purpose, so does the Bible translation. That's the reason why the Skopostheorie with the "Skopos rule" as its prime principle is chosen as the theory reference of the study.

Skopostheorie views translation as a purposeful activity. Vermeer, one of its founders once defines human action as intentional purposeful behavior that takes place in a given situation. In this light, translation cannot be considered as one-to-one transfer between languages, it is a translation action based on source text. This is made clear in an illustration given by Vermeer himself:

Any form of translational action, including therefore translation itself, may be conceived as an action, as the name implies. Any action has an aim, a purpose...The word *Skopos*, then, is a technical term for the aim or purpose of a translation...Further, an action leads to a result, a new situation or event, and possibly to a new object (Vermeer 1989: 173).

That's why Vermeer calls his theory Skopostheorie, a theory of purposeful action. In the framework of this theory, one of the most important factors determining the purpose of a translation is the addressee, who is the intended readers of the target text with their

culture-specific world-knowledge, their expectations and their communicative needs. Every translation is directed at intended readers, since to translate means 'to produce a text in a target setting for a target purpose and target addressees in target circumstances (Vermeer 1989: 29).

Skopostheorie has a considerable impact on translation field. From the very beginning of translation, translation theorist has been engaged on arguing the two translation methods: literal vs. liberal. Which is better in translation/ literal or liberal? The ever lasting debate has not been settled until the Skopostheorie is found. But in the framework of Skopostheorie, we just hear the voices of readers. No matter what translation method is adopted, the reader should be placed in the center, which makes a text meaningful. In this sense, what the translator can do, and should do, is to produce a text that is at least likely to be meaningful to target-culture readers.

Basically, Bible is always rendered for missionary purposes when it is first translated into a language; different versions can be taken as the best examples in the regard. The many kinds of Bible translation versions provide examples of how the purpose of a translation affects translations. To fulfill its missionary purposes, Bible translators made great efforts in their translation. For example, When the CUV is first listed on the schedule of translation; there was a heated discussion on the translation of the word 'God'. Some translated it into "Shen" in Chinese; others insisted on "Shangdi". "Shen" edition and "Shangdi" edition were the solution with which different edition serves different readers.

Note that the CUV and the TCV are both greatly circulated in China, but why they are in different flavor, with the CUV obscure in language but the TCV clear? The readership in the framework of Skopostheorie justifies the both.

Besides, Chinese Bible translation represents an aspect of the meeting between western

culture and that of China. The foreign missionaries and later Chinese Bible translators have contributed a lot to establishing the conditions for such a meeting by the main guidelines for translation they adopted. The study of these guidelines will help to reveal the fact that even prior to the translation process, Bible translators has done a lot of accommodation in order to fulfill the translation skopos,

1.3 Significance of the Study

Bible, the Christian canon and literature canon as well, plays a very important role in world history, especially in world literature history. It exerts great influence on most of the western writers, as John Banyan, John Milton etc. In the respect of daily life, Bible actually overwhelmingly penetrates almost everybody's life in the western cultures.

Since the day it was translated from Hebrew to other languages, as Greek, Latin, English, Chinese, etc, enormous versions of Bible in various languages coexisted in the world, as the Greek *Septuagint*, the *Latin Vulgate*, *Wycliffe Bible*, *Tyndale's Bible*, the *King James Version* and many modern Bible versions. They function seemingly very well the same as the right original in spreading God's message to people all over the world on one hand, among which the English versions rank the first in the reputation. On the other hand, when being regarded as a literature text, Bible, especially the English Bible virtually inspires a great number of western writers the interests in Literature. It is proved to be the fact that the biggest influence exerted by English Bible created by one English Bible, King James Version (Authorized Version) of the Bible in 1660, which was regarded by H. L. Mencken, American literary critic, as "the most beautiful piece of writing in all the literature of the world", "the most beautiful of all the translations of the Bible" (Sightler 2002), which was later in the closing years of Chinese Qing dynasty taken as the text

base of Chinese Bible translation and devoted to the publication of the CUV, the most influential Chinese Bible version, in 1919 and afterwards.

The CUV kept popular in China for almost 100 year for its accuracy and elegance commented by the critics. It helped a lot to cease the chaos caused by the coexisting of enormous Bible versions in China. It was jointly translated by a committee made up of 47 foreign missionaries, which was the last Chinese Bible version produced by foreigners. From that moment on, Chinese got started to try their hands on Bible translation, as Lu Zhenzhong, Chow Lien-Hwa and others.

Western history tells us that every translation of the Bible has been condemned by someone as soon as it rolled off the press. So no other complete Chinese Bible versions were made after CUV's birth for decades. This did not change until 1979. This year witnessed the publication of a modern Chinese Bible version, Today's Chinese Version (TCV), which is a major departure from that of the CUV. It is a lucid translation in wonderful Chinese and therefore wins great popularity among Chinese people. This version has a great significance in the history of Chinese Bible translation, for it was first and solely translated by only "Chinese scholars Moses Hsu, I-Jin Loh and Chow Lien-Hwa" (Ma Huijuan 2003: 126), who spent eight years to complete their translation.

The study probably serving as a pioneer attempts to ascertain the different translation principles adopted in the two versions from the perspective of Skopostheorie and the background situation about it.

Although similar attempts have been made by others to analyze some selected Chinese versions, the authors have mainly been foreigners or scholars in Taiwan or Hong Kong, as Zhunag

Rouyu's study on the CUV. Very few scholars or students from the mainland China have approached this topic (Net 2).

In addition, there are a great number of copies getting into mainland China from Hong Kong, Taiwan and foreign countries, readers of Bible, therefore, are increasing rapidly, which are not limited to Christians, many scholars of philosophy, aesthetics and students of western culture and literature, even common Chinese people come to the Bible for reference. The large circulation and variety of readership makes it worthy study.

To temporarily surprise many Chinese people in 2000, Bible has been listed in the after-class booklist for Shanghai Middle School Students (Net. 8). This, in a way, shows us the importance of the Bible culture in today's open China. We sometimes need to understand foreign culture in order to value our own.

The study attempts to sketch the picture of Chinese Bible translation on the basis of comparison aiming to provide valuable suggestions for the future Chinese Bible translation Study.

1.4 Structure of the Thesis

The part of Introduction includes the necessary information of the study. A panoramic introduction of the Bible is arranged in Chapter two. Followed that is a detailed introduction about the CUV and the TCW. The first three combined to function well to serve the basis for the discussion of the chapter four. A conclusion is arrived at in the last part.

2. The Bible and Chinese Bible Translation

2.1 Basic Knowledge of the Bible

2.1.1 The Content of the Bible

The word “Bible” derives from the Greek word *biblia*, literally “the books”, which derived from a more ancient word “biblos”, the inner bark enclosing the pitch of the papyrus from which paper was made in ancient times. The plural form of “biblion” is “biblia” meaning “books” and this has become the word for what we call “the Bible”, which tells us that the Bible is a collection of special books, namely The Book. Now it is the sacred scripture of Judaism and Christianity. The Jewish Bible includes only the books known to Protestants as the Old Testament—*old* because Christians view it as the indispensable prologue to the New. The Christian Bible consists of the Old Testament and the New Testament, with the Roman Catholic Version of the Old Testament being slightly larger because of Roman Catholic acceptance of certain books and parts of books excluded by Protestants. Here in the study, two of the Chinese translations of the Protestant Bible—the Chinese Union Version (CUV) and the Today’s Chinese Version (TCV)—are to be examined, so “the Bible” means the Protestant Bible.

The Old Testament traditionally has been divided into three collections: the Law, or Pentateuch, the Prophets, and the Writings. The Hebrew names of these collections are Torah, Nevi'im, and Ketuvim. The Pentateuch, together with the book of Joshua (hence the name Hexateuch) can be seen as the account of how Israel became a nation and of how it possessed the Promised Land. The division designed as the “Prophets” continues the story of Israel in the Promised Land, describing the establishment and development of the monarchy and presenting the messages of the prophets to the people. The “Writings” include speculation on the place of evil

and death in the scheme of life, the poetical works, and some additional historical books.

The New Testament is much shorter than the old one, but along with its associations with the spread of Christianity, it has yielded an influence far out of proportion to its modest size. Like the Old Testament, the New Testament is a collection of books, including a variety of early Christian literature, the four Gospels deal with the life, the person, and the teachings of Jesus, as the first Christianity remembered him. The book of Acts carries the story of Christianity from the resurrection of Jesus to the end of the career of Paul. The letters, or epistles, are correspondence by various leaders of the early Christian church with the chief writer the apostle Paul, applying the message of the sundry needs and problems of early Christian congregations. The book of revelation is the only canonical representation of a large genre of apocalyptic literature that appeared in the early Christian movement (Ma Lemei 2001: 8).

2.1.2 Languages, Early Manuscripts and Early Translations

Languages

The Old Testament was written almost entirely in Hebrew. Hebrew is a Semitic dialect akin to Phoenician and Ugaritic. Portions of Ezra, Daniel and Jeremiah were written in Aramaic.

The New Testament was written entirely in Greek. This was the common, everyday language of the contemporary Graeco-Roman world.

Manuscripts: Because the books were written in different times and by different authors, it is understandable that originally in ancient times there was not the completed book known as what we now know as the Bible. There were only copied manuscripts made by hand by ancient scribes. Some of the important manuscripts are:

1. Masorites Scrolls handed down by the masorites, also known as traditional text or majority

text.

2. Codex Sinaiticus (Aleph) discovered in 1844 in the monastery of St. Catherine in the Sinai Peninsula by Tischendorf. 4th century.
3. Codex Vaticanus kept in Pope's library in Vatican. 4th century.
4. Codex Alexandrinus named after the archbishop who presented it to the king of the England. 5th century
5. The NT Papyri, a series of fragments discovered in Egypt in 1895.
6. Dead Sea Scrolls Between 1947 and 1956 thousands of fragments of biblical documents were discovered in eleven caves near the site of Qumran on the shores of the Dead Sea. Portions of almost every book of the Old Testament were found hundreds of years older than any previous manuscripts. They strongly confirmed the authenticity of the Hebrew text. These important texts have revolutionized our understanding of the way the Bible was transmitted, and have illuminated the general cultural and religious background of ancient Palestine.

Translations: The oldest and most important translation of the Hebrew Old Testament is the *Septuagint*. It translated the Hebrew into Greek in the third century BC in Alexandria, Egypt. The Letter to Aristide tells the story how the Egyptian king Ptolemy II (285-247 BC) ordered his librarian, Demetrius to collect all the books of the world. Demetrius thought there should be a Greek translation of the Torah, so 72 Jews, six from each tribe, were sent to translate the Torah into Greek. The Syrian Old Testament translations were the second oldest translations only next to the *Septuagint*. But the New Testament translations were the oldest. Finally, the spread of Christian necessitated further translations into Coptic, Ethiopian, and Gothic. St. Jerome in about 405 completed translating a Latin version based in part on the *Septuagint*, hence the version of

Latin Vulgate. It was the official Bible in Western Europe from the late fourth century on and in terms of longevity, the Latin Vulgate is the most influential translation of the Bible in history.

Since Greek had begun to die out in Western Europe after Constantine moved the capital to the east, Latin naturally became the language of the people in the west. By the middle ages, Greek was completely unknown in Western Europe. All the clergy in the west for a thousand years had to learn Latin, but not Greek or Hebrew. Latin became the language only of the highly educated. Common people could no longer understand the church's liturgy or scripture reading. John Wycliffe, the "Morningstar of the reform", risked translating the complete Bible in English, *Wycliffe's Bible*, but ended up with his body burned by the church.

No new English translations occurred between *Wycliffe's Bible* and *William Tyndale's*. A part of the reason was no doubt that the 1408 British law against any Bible in English was still in effect. It would be risky enough just to make a copy of *Wycliffe's Bible*. Encouraged by Wycliffe's pioneering efforts, William Tyndale, a scholar fluent in six or seven languages left England to work on the first English translation based on the original Hebrew and Greek with the help of rabbis . By 1525 he had completed his first translation of the New Testament, but it would not get printed until 1526. Tyndale's Old and New Testaments were the first English translation of the scriptures taken directly from the original Hebrew and Greek languages. They remain, as the *Times of London* put it, "the basis of all English language Bibles until the recent fiascos. Its phrases and cadences, both homely and pungent, are so woven into the language as to be rarely recognized as the work of an individual author." Tyndale's 1526 New Testament was the first ever printed in English. In the 1530's he also translated the first fourteen books of the Old Testament. He thus became the first man to translate anything from Hebrew into English—as Hebrew was

virtually unknown in England at that time. Unfortunately, he was kidnapped in 1535 in Antwerp, and burned the next year for heresy. His dying words were “Lord, open the King of England’s eyes!”

Martin Luther in 1534 published his German translation of the Bible, by which he brought the teaching and example of Christ and the Apostles to the mind and heart of the Germans in life-like reproduction. He made the Bible the people's book in church, school, and house. His version was followed by Protestant versions in other languages, especially the French, Dutch, and English. Hereafter the Bible ceased to be a foreign book in a foreign tongue, and became naturalized, and hence far more clear and dear to the common people.

James I, King of England commissioned a group of forty-seven biblical scholars to produce a translation of the Bible as consonant as can be to the original Hebrew and Greek. The year 1611 saw the publication of the King James Version (The Authorized Version) which has endured the test of time. It has been called “the single greatest monument to the English language”. Linguist Mario Pei observed, “The King James Bible and Shakespeare together are responsible for well over of half of all our language clichés and stock phrases” (Wallace 2003). H. I. Mencken declared that the KJV was “unquestionably the most beautiful book in the world”.

This version greatly influenced scores of English authors. It was later revised by some British and American scholars according to the newly discovered manuscripts and the resulting version—the *Revised Version*, the *American Standard Version* and the *Revised Standard Version*—have been the most popular version in English speaking countries.

The Bible, however, was virtually a European book since majority of scripture translations were done in languages spoken only in Europe. But missionaries changed that. By 1800 there

were 66 languages with some portion of scripture, 40 with the whole Bible. In 19th century, Bible was translated into Chinese (Morrison's Version). Now almost every nation has the Bible in its own language.

2.2 Historical Review of Chinese Bible Translation

2.2.1 In the Tang Dynasty

The earliest record about Chinese Bible translation is found on a stone stele dating backing to 781C. E. The stele was excavated in the city of Xi'an in 1626. The stele was erected by Nestorian Christians (a school of Christianity), who started to live and develop in China's capital Chang'an (Today's Xi'an) in 635 c. E. 1756 Chinese characters were found on the stele, together with 70 Syriac words. The Chinese name of the stele is formally translated as "The Memorial of the Propagation in China of the Luminous Religion from Daqin". Among the characters on the stele, we find Chinese expressions such as "real canon" and "translating the Bible." So far, however, no preserved Bible translations of this period as mentioned in the stele are to be found. Based on the information found in a Nestorian Church canon Zunjing discovered at Dunhuang in 1907-08, translated books from the Hebrew Bible were Genesis, Exodus, the Book of Psalms, the book of Zechariah, the book of Hosea and others.

Unfortunately the entrance of the Christianity into China in Tang Dynasty was not good timing when Buddhism was dominant. And the translators unwisely adopted adaptation as their chief translating method. They borrowed a lot of Buddhist terms as Buddha to translate God, which not only confused the readers but also made Christianity lose its own identity. People viewed them as another school of Buddhism. The unwise translating principles they employed finally led to the doom of the Nestorian Christianity in the Tang Dynasty. During the reign of Emperor Wu Zong,

Nestorian Christianity was banished officially.

2.2.2 In the Yuan Dynasty

The second earliest recorded translation of the Hebrew Bible in China, to be dated to late thirteenth century to early fourteenth century, was by Father John of Montecorvino. The information was gained from his own letters written in Latin, and the target language of translation is Mongolian, the language of the ruling people of China at that time, not exactly Chinese. No actual copies of this translation were found.

2.2.3 In the Ming and Qing Dynasty

In the late Ming and Qing, Catholicism once again came into China with the Jesuits. In order to have a stand in China dominated by the Buddhism together with Confucianism and Taoism, the Jesuits adopted accommodation as their missionary method. It greatly affected their translating. First I have to point out that the Catholics didn't at that time pay enough attention and energy to Bible translation. They still believed that Bible was not necessary for common believers, who only needed to listen to the Fathers' teaching. Therefore the outcome of their Bible translation was not impressive. The Bible translations of this period mainly fell into three categories: (1) the explanation of Bible verses such as *The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven* in 1595 by Matteo Ricci; (2) History recorded in the Bible, such as *The Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ* in 1635 by Julius Aleni; (3) some fragments of the Bible, such as *Literary Translation of Bible* in 1636 by Manoel Dias.

What is mentioned above can not be said to be the Bible translation. But there were some attempts in translating the Bible. In 1700, J. Basset translated from *the Vulgate* most of the New Testament into Chinese. The manuscripts of these translations were kept in the British Museum

known as Sloan Manuscript (Liang Gong 2003: 191), which contributed a lot to the first Protestant Chinese Bible translation — Morrison's Version. In 1800, Jesuit Louis de Poirot translated almost all the books of the Hebrew Bible to Chinese. However, the translation was based on the Vulgate. It never got published. The manuscript is preserved in the Beitang Library in Beijing (Yang Senfu 1984: 366).

2.2.3.1 Morrison's Version

In 1807, Robert Morrison cooperated with W. C. Milne, both from London, finished translating several books of the Hebrew Bible into Chinese; in 1819, Morrison finished the rest of the Hebrew Bible by himself. The translation was published in 1823 at Malacca, Malaysia.

2.2.3.2 Marshman's Version

The English Baptist missionary Joshua Marshman translated the book of Genesis into Chinese, together with several New Testament books. These were published in 1822.

2.2.3.3 Four peoples' Version

In 1840, a group of four people (Walter Henry Medhurst, Charles Gutzlaff, E. C. Bridgman, and John R. Morrison) cooperated to translate the Bible. The translation of the Hebrew part was done mostly by Gutzlaff from the Netherlands Missionary Society, with the exception that the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua were done by the group collectively. This translation is very famous due to its adoption by the revolutionary peasant leader Hong Xiuquan of the Taipingtianguo movement as the doctrines of the organization. Hong renamed the book slightly and added notations in many places to fit the needs of the movement.

2.2.3.4 The Delegate's Version

In 1852, a new translation of the Hebrew Bible, prepared by Walter Henry Medhurst with the

help of the Sinologist James Legge, was published. The translation was initiated by a missionary commission yet turned out to be a translation by a few people, due to separation into different sections because of theological differences. The translation was considered excellent Chinese writing, and it used plenty of Chinese philosophical terms, sacrificing accuracy based on the original Hebrew texts.

2.2.3.5 Bridgman's Version

In 1862, the American Protestant missionary E. C. Bridgman (1801-1861) published a translation of the Hebrew Bible, characterized by the accuracy of the translation and its loyalty to the original Hebrew texts.

2.2.3.6 Goddard's Version

J. T. Goddard published his re-edited and re-translated Hebrew Bible in Chinese in 1868. It is considered an excellent combination and compromise in style between Bridgman's and Medhurst's translations: it is both elegant from the perspective of Chinese readers and accurate with respect to the original texts.

2.2.3.7 "Two Fingers' Version

The Jewish Episcopal Bishop S. I. J. Schereschewsky (1831-1906) published a northern vernacular Chinese translation of the Hebrew Bible in 1875, and later a second edition in 1902.

The second edition was written with only two fingers due to his illness and thus known as the "two finger edition". Schereschewsky's translation was the most popular translation for over 20 years, before the Union Version was published.

2.2.3.8 Griffith's Version

Griffith John (1831-1912) of the Scotland Bible Society at Hankou started to publish Chinese

translations of several books from the Hebrew Bible (Genesis, Exodus, Psalms, and Proverbs), beginning in 1889. Later, in 1905, he published a collection of his Chinese translation of the Hebrew Bible through the Song of Songs.

2.2.3.9 Chinese Union Version

The most famous Chinese translation of the Hebrew Bible is the Chinese Union Version (Ho-ho version). It was so named as a reflection of the fact that translators from all the denominations of the time came together and worked in co-operation with each other in order to produce the finished work. This translation was commissioned by the Shanghai Missionary Society in 1890 and completed in 1919 by a sixteen-member committee of foreign missionaries, with the aid of several Chinese believers to check the accuracy of the language used.

The Chinese Union Version is a great success since its publication and has been the best selling Chinese Bible ever since. It has been considered not only a popular book for believers and non-believers alike, but also an outstanding scholarly work.

2.2.3.10 Sigao Version

An Italian Franciscan Friar, Gabriele Allegra, who died in 1876, began a Chinese Bible translation in 1935 and later founded the Studium Biblicum (Sigao Bible Society) to accomplish his work. This translation was done directly from the original Hebrew, and the process was well documented. It was published in 1954 in Hong Kong. In 1968, a revised version of the Chinese translation was published in combination with the recently finished New Testament translation. In 1992, this version was once again published, but for the first time in Mainland China.

The translation emphasizes accuracy over elegance. It made every effort to convey the original meanings of the scripture, and the translators had received the most advanced biblical

scholarship training of the time. Another outstanding feature of this translation is the introduction added in front of every book and the detailed summary and endnotes added after each book. It attempts not only to reflect the latest scholarship of biblical studies of the time in its notes and introductions, but also adds explanatory notes and quotation from traditional Chinese sources in order to elucidate the Hebrew texts. Every introduction by itself is a valuable scholarly article about the book. Due to the large amount of information added to the translation of the original texts, single volumes of each book with full notations targeting advanced readers were published, in addition to the one volume edition with abridged notations. The appendices of the single volume copies are also very useful.

This Chinese Bible has become the standard text for Chinese Catholics worldwide, including those within China.

2.2.3.11 Lu Zhenzhong's Version

Another translation done by one person, by the name of Lu Zhenzhong, was published in 1970. He began his work as a scholar at Yanjing University in 1940 and completed the full translation 30 years later. Working only from original Hebrew texts, this translation uses the so-called "direct translation" method, with exact one-to-one correspondences to the original Hebrew, reflecting the original meaning and content of each word and even keeping to the original grammar and structures. In this way, some problems that are faced in the Union Version are avoided in Lu's translation.

2.2.3.12 Today's Chinese Version

The center of Christianity's development moved from the mainland to Taiwan after the communist party gained control over Mainland China in 1949. Therefore, Taiwan's effort in

translating the Bible into Chinese reflects the best level of translating in China. Under the guidelines of the United Societies, translation started at Taiwan in 1971. It took the Today's English Version as its blueprint and was accordingly named Today's Chinese Version (TCV). The TCV was published by the United Bible Societies in 1979. "During translation, reference was made to around 70 of the best translations of the Bible since the 1950's, ensuring that this version of the Bible contains all the advances in biblical scholarship and translation of recent times" (Net 3).

A second edition of the TCV came out in 1984, and was reprinted twenty times. A revised version appeared in 1995, making reference to original Hebrew and Greek texts during the revision.

2.2.3.13 New Chinese Version and Others

In 1976, with the sponsorship of the Lockman Foundation from California, U. S. A, an initiative to produce a so-called "New Chinese Translation" was announced. The Hebrew Bible part of the "New Chinese Translation" started in the same year. The effort lasted over ten years and did not turn out to be very successful due to the quality of the translation or lack of propaganda or both.

In 1987, the Commission for Chinese Bible Translation Cooperation was established in order to translate the Bible from Hebrew directly to Chinese. The translation is to be named the "New Union Bible Translation". The Hebrew text to be based is *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. So far, this effort has produced no result. One of the main reasons for the slow progress are the internal conflicts between Catholic and other Christian translators on the commission regarding the religious terms to be used in the new translation.

2.3 Bible Translation Principles

2.3.1 English Bible Translating Principles (c.f. Nida 1964, chapter 2)

Bible translation has had a long history with its translating principles having been evolving. Bible translating had a tendency to regard the letter rather than the spirit with lamentable results sometimes. A case in point is Aquila (126 AD)'s translation of the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek, which was proved to be of harsh literalness. By the time Jerome was commissioned in 384 A. D. by Pope Damasus to produce a text of the New Testament in Latin, he stated quite frankly that he gave "the sense of the scripture, not in literal language, as Aquila did" (Nida 1964: 12).

During the Middle Ages in Western Europe, translating was confined primarily to religious essays rendered into stiff, ecclesiastical Latin.

At the time of Renaissance, there, figuratively speaking was a flood of translations in Western Europe. The spirit of Renaissance inspired many persons to engage in translating enterprises. That's why the general level of such translators of secular works was not high, just as Amos put it "In contrast to translators of secular works, Bible translators labored long and carefully" (Nida 1964: 14).

Undoubtedly the dominant figure in the field of translation during the 16th century was Martin Luther, the "father of the modern German language". He translated the Bible into High German and used it as an ideological weapon of the Protestant movement against the Roman church. Luther not only defended his principles in general terms, namely, that only in this way could people understand the meaning of the Holy Scriptures; he also carefully and systematically worked out his principles of meaning-oriented translation: (1) shifts of word order; (2) employment of model auxiliaries; (3) introduction of connectives when required; (4) suppression

of Greek or Hebrew terms which had no acceptable equivalent in German; (5) use of phrases where necessary to translate single words in the original; (6) shifts of metaphors to non-metaphors and vice versa; and (7) careful attention to exegetical accuracy and textual variant (Nida 1964: 15).

Of course, there was some disagreement with Luther's translating principle demonstrated in his Bible translation. They held that the authority of the Church Fathers came before the results of contemporary scholarship. But William Fulke, who had considerable influence on the translators of the King James Version, insisted that ecclesiastical tradition, must give way to common English usage. He continued to contend that to translate precisely out of the Hebrew is not to observe the number of words, but the perfect sense and meaning.

The translators commissioned by King James 1 of England in the 17th century to produce a text of the Bible did not develop new principles or theories of translation. They just selected the best of what had been included in previous translations but ended up to produce at last a remarkable fine translation, which ended all translations temporarily at that time.

Three principles of good translating of the Scriptures found their way in George Campbell's work in 1789: (1) to give a just representation of the sense of the original; (2) to convey into his version, as much as possible, in a consistency with the genius of the language which he writes, the author's spirit and manner; (3) to take care that the version have, "at least so far the quality of an original performance, as to appear natural and easy" (Nida 1964: 19). Using these three fundamental principles, Campbell proceeded to point out their full implications that the Bible should be translated into contemporary English.

There have been two great periods of English Bible translation in history—the sixteen

century and the twentieth century. In many respects, they are mirror images of each other. Each began with a certain kind of translation that was then followed for many generations. The Tyndale is the template for almost all 16th century Bible; the Revised Version (RV) set the pattern for most modern translations.

In the sixteenth century, the predominant concern in Bible translation was beauty; in the twentieth century, it was truth. No single translation at any time has captured all that the original text has to offer. For the translation of the Revised Version of the King James Version in 1881 and 1885, the scholars who produced it were far more interested in a literal translation than in a beautiful translation. In spite of the entire scholarly clamor for this new translation, most people still preferred the King James.

Another version turned out in the very beginning of the 20th century was the American Standard Version in 1901, which was regarded significantly better English than the Revised Version. It was proved to be quite stilted and the most literal translation ever done in English. It became a great study Bible, though it is now outdated by new discoveries.

The first half of the 20th century saw two new major translations—the ASV and the RSV, a product of American scholarship in the spirit of the KJV. But the second half of the 20th has seen a multitude of new translations. The first completely new English Bible since Tyndale was the *New English Bible* in 1970. It is a very fresh and very readable translation, which is a great departure from the older school that all translation needs to be as literal as possible, or word-for-word. Another case in point is the *New International Version* which gave a high priority to readability than anything else. Formal equivalent translations never stopped to come out in the 20th century, such as the *New King James Bible* (1979, 1983), the *New Revised Standard Version* (1989), the

Holman Christian Standard Version (2000, 2001) and the *English Standard Version* (2001).

A new era in Bible translating began with the New English Bible (NET) Bible. What makes this translation unique is that it is not in the King James translation, which makes it the first completely new major translation in a quarter of a century. We are in a situation in which pastors are using a different translation from their congregations. Pastors, especially evangelical pastors, tend to prefer more formal equivalent translations such as RSV or NASB. But laypeople tend to prefer more readable translation, especially those as NIV. The NET Bible bridged the gap, and it has been adopted as its official translation by a few churches.

The former discussion and review help us to divide the history into three periods: the period of elegance, period of accuracy, period of readability which reveal the two main tendency of English Bible translation: Literal and free translation. Some holds that the Bible translation should be word-for-word because the original is the words of God; some argues that it should convey the sense of the original.

2.3.2 Chinese Bible Translating Principles

Chinese Bible translation is more complicated than that of English Bible translation. What makes it worse is the factor of language. When doing Chinese Bible translation, the source language English belongs to Indo-European Language which the target language Sino-Tibetan language school. What's more, Chinese culture is totally different with western culture, which is different in nature with that of the Bible. To spread God's message in such new soil, translators of different sects of Christianity adopted different translation principles with great efforts.

In the Tang dynasty, the dominant religion in China is Buddhism, which was strongly supported by the Tang emperor. Persecuted at home by East Rome, Nestorian Christianity set their

feet on China in the 7th century. In order to be accepted by Chinese people, the translators of Nestorian Christianity made great efforts to make their scripture as identical as possible with that of Buddhism, which had already been deep-rooted in Chinese people's life, for instance, when translating the Bible, they borrowed many words from Buddhism, “大施主”, “救渡”, “普度”, “功德”, “僧” (Ma Zuyi 1998: 146), etc. This, in a sense, was so confused the readers at that time that many viewed Christianity as a sect of Buddhism, which led the doom of the Nestorian Christianity in Tang Dynasty when Buddhism was banished officially in the reign of Emperor Wu Zong.

Although the translation principle, adaptation, adopted by the translators of the Nestorian Christianity made Christianity was sometimes less welcomed by the critics, for this principle made the source text lose its own identity in the target culture. But, viewing this from the perspective of readers, it seems justified. For Chinese readers who have been deeply influenced by Buddhism for years, it was very difficult to let them understand a new doctrine. The translators had no choice.

It was recorded that China had the Bible in “Tartar's language” in the Yuan dynasty which can be seen from J. de Monte Corvino in his writings

《一百五十章之祈祷文》及《圣歌》三十首、《圣务日课》二篇，余皆已译成其地方言。

鞑靼人最通用之语言文字，余已通晓。《新约》及《一百五十章之祈祷文》皆已译成其文，使人以最佳书法缮写完毕矣 (Ma Zuyi 1998: 236)。

From the writings, we can see that Monte Corvino translated the some of the Bible into “Tartar's language”. Unfortunately the translation was lost so we are not sure what language it was like and what translation principles it employed. But one thing is evident, the language of the translation the language commonly used by Tartar people.

That is to say, the translation has its intended readers, Tartar people.

In the late Ming and early Qing dynasty, Catholicism came into China again with Jesuits, who adopted “Policy of Accommodation” (Yan Jianqiang 2002: 72) as their missionary method aiming at having a stand in the situation dominated by Buddhism, Confucianism and Daoism. This greatly affected their translating. A case in point is Matteo Ricci, who is regarded as the milestone in Chinese Bible translation, for he and his coworkers introduced the Bible idea into China, and opened the door of communication between China and the world. In order to fulfill his mission to spread the Bible culture, at first he dressed himself like a Buddhist which he found unsuitable and later dressed like Confucian scholar to show that he came among them in a friendly way instead of being felt like “giving them a teaching”; he brought their advanced science and technology to show that he came for the culture exchanges instead of being felt like a serious religious teaching (c.f. Ma Zuyi 1999: 237). Then in accordance with Chinese culture, Confucianism, he compiled a book names *The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven* (c.f. Ma Zuyi 1999: 237) talking about the teaching from the Bible. The book provided necessary information for the target culture, and had caused the effect that the Bible culture began to find its way in China instead of being rejected totally later caused by the “Chinese Rites Controversy” (Yan Jianqiang 2002: 72).

The most significance of the book is that it has provided a wonderful solution for the translation of the word “Deus”. In the first piece of the book, the “Deus” in the Bible equals to the “shangdi” or “Heaven” is mentioned. Based on the knowledge of the Chinese classics, Matteo Ricci found the words referring to “Deus” like “shangdi” or “Heaven”: shangtian, huangtian, cangtian, di, tianzi and shangdi, which give him the inspiration of the translation of “Deus” into

“shangdi”. Though it was later changed into “tianzhu” in the reason of preventing the confusion of the Bible teaching with the Chinese culture, the “Deus” in the Bible found the trace from the Chinese traditional culture at last (Yan Jianqiang 2002: 72), thus paved the way for the Bible culture leaking in.

Note that the Catholics didn't at that time pay enough attention and energy to Bible translation, for they believed that the Bible was not necessary for common believers, who only need to listen to the Fathers' teaching. Therefore the outcome of their Bible translation was not impressive.

This was greatly changed in the late Qing dynasty by the Protestants, who held that every person could come to God by reading the Bible. Therefore, they paid much more attention to the Bible translating, which led to a surge of translating the Bible into Chinese. Within less than 100 years, more than 63 Chinese versions of Bible appeared, for instance, Morrison and William Milne's version named *Divine Heaven Holy Book*, which was regarded as the first complete Chinese Bible in Chinese Bible history, Hoshua Marshman and Joannes Laeear's version in 1823, Four People's Version, etc.

It is worth noting that the Four People's Version is the first “group work” in Bible translation in history, which is proved to a more successful way than that of single work. One of their translation principles needs heir translation principles could fall into four catalogues;

- (1) Not word-to-word translation as the traditional one, but more paraphrasing for easy understanding. For example, when translating the metaphors, they would use similes.
- (2) More phrases were used instead of monosyllables.

- (3) The concept of translation got changed; in other words, they began to pay attention to the texture in the target culture.

The New Testament of the “four people’s version” was completed in 1835, and renamed “the New Testament of Jesus Christ”; The Old Testament was published in 1840. The Bible had great influence upon Taipingtianguo movement.

In 1842, the Nanjing Treaty between the Qing Government and Britain came out, thus the missionaries to China began to grow. In this situation, the Bible acceptable to the Chinese and by all the different missionary societies in China was urgently needed. Thus began the union Bible translation. In 1843, the assembly consisting of different missionaries was set up in Hong Kong, and the decision that the New Testament should be revised and the Old Testament retranslated was made. Some translation principles need a second attention.

- (1) The translation should be faithful to the original Greek and Hebrew versions with the Chinese idioms and style retained.
- (2) The units of weight, measurement, etc. should be changed into their Chinese counterparts.
- (3) The euphemisms of the original version should be changed into their Chinese counterparts

After the general principle was made, every society was assigned their tasks. This translation was still noted by its “term controversy” as the word “God”. The translation of the word was divided into two groups, the Britain and American teams. The Britain team held the idea that the word “God” should be translated into “shen”, while the American insisted that it should be rendered into “shangdi”. The Britain team thought that in the history of China’s religion, there was

no concept similar to “God”, so translating it into “shen” meant telling the Chinese a totally new “God”, while the American team insisted that the Chinese more or less know something about God, so translating it into “shen” could awaken them to the idea of “Christianity God”. The delegate’s version ended up to be a free translation with its principle against the traditional one. As to style, they were still influenced by the Jesuits’ way, which was intended to please the scholars.

With the deeper opening of the northern China, the missionaries began to realize the importance of the Mandarin, for most of the Chinese readers at that time were illiterate, and could not read the Bible but only listen to it., the classical Chinese versions which took scholars as their readers, therefore, failed to meet the needs of the common Chinese readers. Hence, Mandarin was the only choice for the Bible translation. May Mandarin versions appeared under this circumstances, as Nanjing Mandarin Version, the first Mandarin version in history; Beijing Mandarin Version, which turned out to be very successful and popular with the Chinese readers.

There were still many Chinese versions before the CUV came forth during the period, the Goddard Version, Thomas Hall Hudson Version, lower wenli versions as Griffith John Version, and others.

Obviously before the birth of the CUV, Chinese Bible versions were numerous in number but in the same language, Chinese. Theoretically, they adopted different translation principles which were made before their translating action and with different translation purposes. But almost all of the versions has one feature in common, readers’ concern, which more or less revealed in their translations or in their translation principles. This issue will be discussed in the later chapter.

3. The CUV and the TCV

3.1 Introduction to the CUV and the TCV

3.1.1 Historical Settings

CUV

The late half of the 19th century in China is characterized by great missionary activity. The centenary Conference Historical Volume records some of 70 societies registered as being active in the 1905s. This is only the Protestant missionaries. There were also some Catholic missionaries active in China. The increased missionary activity resulted in the formation of Chinese churches with Chinese leadership. But the initiative and coordination of the work lay primarily in the hands of foreign missionary workers. In this context “foreign” means predominantly Anglo-American because the missionary societies mainly were from U. S. A. and U. K. In Chinese Bible translating this foreign dominance is evident during the 19th century. That is why the CUV was translated by foreigners.

Another thing worth noting is that Mandarin Chinese was gaining its popularity in the 19th century, and in 1905 the old system of state examinations was abolished. Language reforms followed. The state examinations had been an effective institutional protector of literary Chinese. Now spoken Chinese gradually became the standard by which literature in its broad sense was measured.

We have already known the fact from the former introduction that by the end of 19th century, there were many versions of Chinese Bible, which were in various dialects and in different levels of literacy. With the growth of the Chinese church and Christians, more and more people thought it necessary to publish a union version. “Union version” referred to commonly accepted Protestant

versions and was an expression of the desire among the missionaries to prepare Bible translation for each linguistic group, acceptable to and used by all the Protestants, thereby making it unnecessary for different denominations or mission groups to produce and use different versions.

The CUV came out as a result of decision made by the Protestant missionary conferences held in Shanghai in 1890 and 1907. At the conference held in 1890 it was decided to initiate work on three union versions of the Chinese Bible: High Wenli, Easy Wenli and Mandarin, which is called "one Bible in three versions".

The most characterized feature of this decision resulted in the publication of union Mandarin version, which is called Chinese Union Version (CUV), in 1919. It became more popular and more widely distributed. In ten years it was used throughout China, and its circulation surpassed all the other Chinese versions. In 1980, in order to meet the need of the Chinese Christians, the China Christian Council reprinted the Union Version. Now, this is the most used and printed version in China.

TCV

The version of CUV enjoyed a very highly authorized position in China since its publication in 1919, which was regarded as the perfect rendering by the Church and the Christians at that time. Readers may assume that no translations would appear under this circumstance. But the situation was just the opposite. After the CUV, Bible translation never stopped to make any new versions. The diagram below illustrates the proliferations of the Chinese Bible versions after the CUV.

New Testament Versions

Translators	Versions	Time
A. Sydenstriker, 朱宝惠	《新译新约全书》	1922
王宣忱	《新约全书》	1933

朱宝惠	《重译新约全书》	1936
Heinrich Ruck, 郑寿麟	《国语新旧库译本：新约全书》	1939
萧铁笛	《新译新约全集》	1967
	《当代福音》	1974
李常受	《新约圣经：恢复本》	1987

Old Testament and New Testament Versions

吕振中	新约：1946； 旧约：1970
《当代圣经》（新力版）	新约：1974； 旧约：1979
《当代圣经》（亚协版）	1979
《当代圣经》（国际版）	1992
《现代中文译本》	新约：1975； 旧约：1979
《现代中文译本》（修订版）	1995
《新标点和合本圣经》	1988
《圣经新译本》	1992
《圣经新译本》（跨世纪版）	2001

The lists above illustrate the proliferation of Chinese versions of Bible after the CUV. Chinese Christians and scholars began to try their hands on Bible translation and produced eventually various version of the Bible, among which Today's Chinese Version stands most eye-catching.

Today's Chinese Version (TCV) published in 1979, has had the widest distribution and circulation. In 1984 a second edition came out, and by 1994 it had been reprinted 20 times. This version has a great significance in the history of Chinese Bible translation. It serves an extraordinary landmark in the history of Chinese Bible Translation, for it is the first time when Chinese Christians and scholars tried their hands in this field to produce a complete Chinese version of the Bible.

The TCV was published sixty years later when the CUV first appeared. Undoubtedly language developed rapidly in this span of time (TCV 1979: preface). The language used in the CUV was regarded obscure and outdated. Meanwhile new discoveries continued to strengthen

people's mind to further improve the old version. Readers and non-believers, on the other hand, attempted to have access to this literary jewelry in the world literary history. In this situation, a more readable version was brought into birth, the TCV version.

3.1 2 Textual Basis

I have read some articles on the translation of the CUV. But I am still puzzled that whether it is translated from the original Hebrew Bible or from other English versions of it? (Xu Xiwu 1926: 2)

As early as in 1926, just seven years after the publication of CUV, such questions arose: what was the textual basis of CUV?

The Revised Version was used as reference when the 1890 missionary conference determined the textual basis for the three Union Versions (Strandedaes 1987: 80).

We have for the most part taken the text of the revised, and in comparatively few cases, in which we have, for what seemed to us good and sufficient reasons; revised text has been put in margin (CUV 1907: preface).

It is reasonable to say the Revised Version of the KJV and some Hebrew and Greek editions underlying the RV were all used as the basis in translating. The conclusion is also well grounded after comparing the text of the CUV with that of RV.

People may wonder why the translator did not turn to the original text of the Bible for reference since they knew the original language and why they take the latest translation of the time as guidance and basis.

Note that Bible was finished by different writers in different time; this led to the fact that there is no "complete original compilation in the common sense, namely, there has not been a

whole Bible in its original language. What we now have are some manuscripts, which are uncompleted and lack of consistency with one another or with newly discovered fragments. This formed a conflict in content between the established Bible and the new discoveries. But, the role of translator can change the picture, for translators could take the new discoveries into their consideration when translating. Hence, the translations might be better and comprehensive in content than each of the original manuscripts. In this light, translators or retranslators of the Bible have good reasons to start with the preceding translations rather than the original. This is also well-documented in the history of English Bible translation.

TCV

The textual basis of the TCV is Today's English Version (TEV) which is commonly known as Good News Bible. The TEV is also called by some translation theorists as a "Common Language" version. "Common Language" is defined as the language which is "common to the usage of both educated and uneducated" in any given language, or put it more bluntly, it is the level of language used by uneducated people and children. The translator of the New Testament of it, Dr. Robert G. Bratcher, says that the version was originally conceived as one which would be suitable for people who speak English as a second language. The idea has been in line with that expressed in the preface of the TCV as follows:

着重口语化和诵读上的流畅。对于字词的运用……大约以初中学生的中文程度为标准，好使广大读者在阅读时不感觉困难。

It is, to some extent, the same intentions and purposes that help the TCV translator to choose in a sea of English Bible version the TCV as its basis.

3.1.3 Translators

CUV

Translator's name could be found in the preface of the CUV. They are Henry Boodget, Thos Bramfitt, J. L. Nevius, Henry M. Woods, S. R. Claree. Chauncey Goodrich, Geeorge Owen, F. W. Baller, Spencer Lewis, C. W. Mateer (Broomhall 2000: 119) and others. There were more than sixteen translators involved in the translating work. But most are done by the last five persons. They spent 27 years on it. When the translation was finished in 1919, only Chauncey Good rich lived to see the completion of it. Document says that there were in fact some Chinese secretaries and languages teachers assisted the translators in every stage of the work, but unfortunately none of them were recorded in any document.

Among the translators, C. W. Mateer was from the Presbyterian Church in U.S.A., G. Owen and S. Lewis from the American Methodist Episcopal Church, C. Goodrich from the American Congregationalist, and F.W. Baller from the China Inland Mission.

It is noteworthy that Anglo-Americans dominated the translating work. The translators were all pious Christians; they were scholars of the highest order. Few- if any-of today's scholars reached anywhere near them in their understanding of the original languages; let alone their faith, piety and commitment to their work; They were all native speakers of English language; They were all missionaries living in China for many years with good command of Chinese.

TCV

Led by I-Jin Loh, the translation of the TCV was conducted by a committee of 8 members, including Moses Hsu, Chow lien-Hwa, Fang Zhirong, and others, who spent eight years to complete their work.

We should point out that the version of TCV is translated solely by Chinese scholars. This

changed the situation that only foreign missionaries translate the Bible. From the former discussion we know that in the history of Chinese Bible translation from Tang Dynasty until 1919, those who translated the Bible were all foreigners, though with the aid of Chinese scholars to polish the language. Though before TCV, some Chinese scholars began to translate the Bible by themselves, such as Xiao Jingshan, Wu Jingxiong, and others, but none of them translated a complete version. So, we can conclude that the TCV translators changed the Bible translation situation dominated by foreigners by producing a Chinese Bible, TCV.

3.1.4 Translating Process

CUV

The first meeting of the translating committee was held in November 1891. It was decided that the translating should undergo the following processes.

The committee divided the Bible into several sections, and each translator was responsible for one section. When they finishing, they exchanged their manuscripts, checked others' carefully and critically, and gave advice and comments. Then the manuscripts as well as the comments and advice would return back to the original translator, who would consider the advice carefully and make reasonable and necessary changes. After that the revised manuscripts would be handed to the committee to be discussed. The agreement they reached at the meetings would be the final version.

But actually the final version underwent at least three revisions, during which the translation was examined for its harmony with other sections, its faithfulness to the original languages and for its Chinese style.

TCV

Before the TCV project was launched in the 1960s, the translation principles of the version have been set up by the Bible society in Hong Kong and the Bible Society in Taiwan, which is somewhat similar with that situation of the CUV. Following the principles, the Chinese scholars began to translate the Bible based on *Today's English Version*. After the translation, the drafts were required to be checked by a committee. The checked versions thereafter were given back to the translators for further improvement.

3.1.5 Financial Sponsor

CUV

At the protestant Missionary Conferences held in 1890 when the decision to start the translation of the CUV was made, the US Bible Society, the Great Britain Bible Society and the Scotland Bible Society offered to sport it (Net 4).

TCV

The translation of the TCV was financed by the Bible Society in Hong Kong and the Bible Society in Taiwan

From the sponsors of the respective translation, we see the Anglo-American domination in the CUV's translation and the domination of Chinese Christianity on the TCV. The influence from sponsors to the translation is discussed in Chapter 4.

3.1.6 Translation Principles

CUV

In 1891, some translation principles of CUV were suggested at a meeting held in Shanghai, which were stated in the preface of CUV 1907:

1. The translation should be in Mandarin that would be understood throughout the nation, and

localism and book forms should be avoided.

2. The translation must be easy to understand when read in the hearing of intelligent people of all walks of life.

3. The translation must be very faithful to the original literally, at the same time the translation must have the style and tone of the Chinese language.

4. The translation must retain metaphors and similes as far as possible.

Note that among the four guidelines, the third one is the most important, which reveals the CUV's tendency to literalness. This will be illustrated by examples in the later part. Intended readers of "intelligent people" are also an important concern in the principle. So are the translation of metaphors and similes.

Nida once in his *Toward a Science of Translating* expressed two sets of conflicting "poles" in translation theory this way:

... two sets of conflicting "poets": (1) literal vs. free translating, and (2) emphasis of form vs. concentration on content. These two sets of differences are closely related, but not identical, for tension between literal and free can apply equally well to both form and content.

Since the CUV proclaimed its literalness, but how literal is it? The question is answered by

C. W. Mteer in the English preface to NT 1907:

There was considerable difference of opinion in the committee as to the degree of literalness to be aimed at. The result is a translation that must be regarded as distinctly literal and faithful to the original. As a necessary consequence, smoothness of style has been more or less sacrificed.

TCV

Before the TCV project was launched in the 1960s, Nida had conducted seminars in Taiwan

and Hong Kong (Strandenaes 1987: 123). In 1971 the Bible Society in Hong Kong and the Bible Society in Taiwan set up *Principles 1971*, which the TCV translators should adopt in their work.

These translation principles are very much the same as those adopted by the TEV.

(1) Meaning has been given priority over form, as *Principles 1971* states, "... complete freedom is to be granted the translator to change the form of the source language in the interest of reproducing the meaning in the receptor language" (Strandenaes 1987: 131).

(2) "Functional equivalence" has priority over "Formal correspondence".

Moses Hsu, one of the TCV translators, summarizes the theory of translating the TCV as "corresponding meaning and equal effect" and "faithful to the original and faithful to the reader".

Readership is a great concern in the TCV translation. It used the principle of so called "dynamic equivalence" during the translation. It endeavored to convey the Chinese readers what the Hebrew author originally intended to express to the original Hebrew readers or listeners. In order to achieve this, free translations were used more extensively. The translations had in mind average people who had junior middle school education as the majority of the readers. "It avoids using any theological jargon, and the translation does not have an exact word-to-word correspondence with the original texts. Nevertheless, the basic meaning is the same, but in a much more natural and easier-to-follow style" (Net 3)

3.2 Translation Analysis in Comparison

It is acknowledged that there are two poles in translation theory, as stated by Nida, and others in this field, in his *Toward a science of Translating*: literal vs. free translating; emphasis on form vs. concentration on content. Bible translations fail to be free from this limitation. But where is the position between the two poles? Detailed analysis is arranged in the following part to see how the

CUV and TCV embody the official guidelines in terms of (1) translating idioms, (2) reconstructing formal structures, (3) translating figurative expressions. Of course, many aspects can be chosen here to illustrate the point. The three aspects listed above are therefore selected, for on one hand they have been mentioned in both the two versions' translation principles and for testify the respective principle on the other.

3.2.1 Translating idioms

An idiom is a phrase or sentence whose meaning is not implicit through knowledge of the individual meanings of the constituent words but must be learnt as a whole. Idioms are the essence of the language, but they are hard to learn and master, but the advantage achieved by idioms, brevity and conciseness deserves this trouble. Idiom translating is always a hard nut for translators. The translators always intend to keep the balance between the style and the meaning but end up to lose either the style on one hand or the meaning on the other.

The Bible translation definitely involves the translation of idioms, for there are many idioms in the Scriptures. When reading the CUV and the TCV, one gets the impression that the two versions, to some extent, fall conspicuously into two extremes, with the CUV prefers the style (brevity and image) of the idioms translated and the TCV to the meaning as illustrated by the following examples:

E. g. 1

KJV: Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed them; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. (Romans 12:20)

TEV: Instead, as the scripture says: "if your enemy is hungry, feed them; if he is thirsty, give him a drink; for by doing this, you will make him burn with shame." (Romans 12:20)

CUV: 你的仇敌若饿了，就给他吃；若渴了，就给他喝；因为你这样行，就是把炭火堆在他的头上（《罗马书》，12：20）。

TCV: 如果你的仇敌饿了，就给他吃；渴了，就给他喝；你这样做会使他羞愧交加（《罗马书》，12：20）。

The expression “heap coals of fire on his head” in the KJV is a literal rendering of Semitic idiom, which means “to overwhelm somebody with one’s kindness and warmth. The CUV translators render literally the Semitic idiom as “把炭火堆在他的头上”，retaining the form of the original; while the TCV translators just put it as “使他羞愧交加”，making its meaning clear to the Chinese reader.

E. g. 2

KJV: And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure. (2 Corinthians 12:7)

TEV: But to keep me from being puffed up with pride because of the many wonderful things I saw, I was given a painful physical ailment, which acts as Satan’s messenger to beat me and keep me from being proud. (2 Corinthians 12:7)

CUV: 又恐怕我因所得的启示甚大，就过于自高，所以有一根刺加在我肉体上，就是撒旦的差役要攻击我，免得我过于自高（《哥林多后书》12：7）。

TCV: 为了使我不至于因得到许多奇特的启示而趾高气扬，有一种病痛像刺纠缠在我身上，如同撒旦的使者刺痛我，使我不敢骄傲（《哥林多后书》12：7）。

The phrase “a thorn in the flesh” is originally used by the speaker Paul to describe an infirmity of his. The CUV literally puts it as “有一根刺加在我肉体上”，which may make the reader believe

that there is a real thorn in Paul's body, while the TCV rendering “有一种病痛像刺纠缠在我身上” avoids such misunderstanding.

E. g. 3

JJV: And I also have given you cleanness of teeth in all your cities, and want of bread in all your places... (Amos 4: 6)

TEV: I was the one who brought famine to all your cities... (Amos 4: 6)

CUV: 我使你们在一切城中牙齿干净，在你们各处粮食缺乏……（《阿摩斯书》4： 6）

TCV: 是的，是我把饥荒降到你们的城里，使你们绝粮的（《阿摩斯书》4： 6）。

The literal rendering “cleanness of teeth” in the KJV means “famine”. The UV puts it literally as “使……牙齿干净”，and such a translation is default for the average reader to understand. The TCV translators render the sense rather than the word of this Semitic idiom, thus avoiding ambiguity and misunderstanding.

From the discussion it is easy to find both the CUV and the TCV translate idioms into non-idioms. But the results are different. The CUV's translation is more literal to reserve the image of the original language, while the TCV pay more attention to convey the sense of the original. When we find obscurity in the CUV, the corresponding simplicity is waiting somewhere in the TCV.

3.2.2 Reconstructing Formal Structure

Language structure is also worthy of noting. The CUV's translators try every means to retain the form or the structure, while the TCV's translators are ready to make some formal adjustment when necessary in order to produce a natural Chinese rendering. The following examples reveal their intention clearly:

E. g. 4

KJV: And Joseph was brought down to Egypt; and Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, captain of the guard, an Egyptian, brought him of the hands of the Ishmaelites, which had brought him down thither. (Genesis 39:1)

TEV: Now the Ishmaelites had taken Joseph to Egypt and sold him to Potiphar, one of the king's officers, who was the captain of the palace guard. (Genesis 39:1)

CUV: 约瑟被带下埃及去。有一个埃及人，是法老的内臣，护卫长波提乏，从那些带下他来的以实玛利人手下买了他去（《创世纪》39：1）。

TCV: 以实玛利人把约瑟带到埃及，卖给埃及王的一个臣僚——侍卫长波提乏（《创世纪》39：1）。

Comparing the versions above, we can see that the CUV is a literal rendering which uses the passive voice as the English sentence did and keeps the English word order as much as possible, while the TCV translators make their version very natural by using active voice, omitting the redundancy “从那些带下他来的”，and rearranging the word order of the original. Clearly, the latter translation is more coherent and reasonable.

The following example is also a good illustration of the different tendency in dealing with the sentence structure in the respective versions.

E. g. 5

KJV: A continual dropping in a very rainy day and a contentious women are alike, whosever hideth her hideth the wind, and the ointment of his right hand, which bewrayeth itself. (Proverb: 27: 15-16)

TEV: A nagging wife is like water going drip-drip-drip on a rainy day. How can you keep her quiet?

Have you ever tried to stop the wind or ever tried to hold a handful of oil? (Proverb: 27: 15-16)

CUV: 大雨之日连连滴漏, 和争吵的妇人一样; 想拦阻她的, 便是阻拦风, 也是右手抓油 (《箴言》 27: 15-16) 。

TCV: 爱唠叨的妻子像霪雨滴滴答答; 要她安静犹如拦阻狂风, 或用手抓一把油。

3.2.3 Translating Metaphors

The three features of the Bible language, analogical, metaphoric and accommodating which is discussed in Chapter 2, make the Bible full of metaphors. So the solution to the metaphors will greatly affect the quality of the translation. According to the guidelines of the CUV's translation, the translation must retain metaphors as far as possible; while the *Principles 1971* of the TCV state that figurative usage cannot be rendered literally "unless the exact meaning is clearly preserved with nothing added or lost" (Strandenaes 1987: 133). Whether the two version adopted the principles in their translation and how well? It will illustrated by the following examples.

E. g. 6

KJV: It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to

Enter into the kingdom of God. (Matthew 19: 23)

TEV: It will be very hard for rich people to enter the kingdom of heaven. (Matthew 19: 23)

CUV: 骆驼穿过针眼, 比财主进上帝的国还容易呢 (《马太福音》 19: 23)。

TCV: 有钱人要成为天国的子民多难哪! (《马太福音》 19: 23)

E. g. 7

KJV: They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; and his enemies shall lick the dust.

(Psalms 72: 9)

TEV: The peoples of the desert will bow down before him; his enemies will throw themselves to

the ground. (Psalms 72: 9)

CUV: 住在旷野的，必在他面前下拜。他的仇敌，必要舔土（《诗篇》72: 9）。

TCV: 旷野的居民要在他面前叩头；他的仇敌要仆倒向他下拜（《诗篇》72: 9）。

E. g. 8

KJV: I said to the arrogant, deal not arrogantly; and to the wicked, lift not up the horn: lift not up your horn on high; speak not with a stiff neck. (Psalms 75: 4-5)

TEV: I tell the wicked not to be arrogant; I tell them to stop their boasting. (Psalms 75: 4-5)

CUV: 我对狂傲的人说，不要行事狂傲；对凶恶的人说，不要举角；不要把你们的角高举，不要挺着颈项说话（《诗篇》75: 4-5）。

TCV: 我叫骄傲的人不要狂妄；我叫邪恶的人不要傲慢；我叫他们不要夸张，不要再狂妄自大（《诗篇》75: 4-5）。

E. g. 9

KJV: Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves. (Matthew 7: 15)

TEV: "Be on your guard against false prophets; they come to you looking like sheep on the outside, but on the inside they are really like wild wolves. (Matthew 3: 7)

CUV: 你们要防备假先知，他们到你们这里来，外面披着羊皮，里面却是残暴的狼（《马太福音》7: 15）。

TCV: 你们要提防假先知。他们来到你们面前，外表看来像绵羊，里面却是凶狠的豺狼（《马太福音》7: 15）。

E. g. 10

KJV: ...Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone. (Ephesians 2:20)

TEV: ...the cornerstone being Christ Jesus himself. (Ephesians 2:20)

CUV: 有基督耶稣自己为房角石（《以弗所书》2：20）。

TCV: 而基督耶稣自己是这家的基石（《以弗所书》2：20）。

E. g. 11

KJV: Keep me as the apple of the eye; hide me under the shadow of thy wings. (Psalms 17:8)

TEV: Protect me as you would your very eyes; hide me in the shadow of your wings (Psalms 17:8)

CUV: 求你保护我，如同保护眼中瞳仁，将我隐藏在的翅膀荫下（《诗篇》75:4-5）。

TCV: 求你保护我，像保护自己的眼睛；让我躲藏在你的翅膀下（《诗篇》75:4-5）。

E. g. 12

KJV: But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming to his baptism, he said unto them, You offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? (Matthew 3: 7)

TEV: When John saw many Pharisees and Sadducees coming to him to be baptized, he said to them, "You snakes-who told you that you could escape from the punishment God is about to send? (Matthew 3: 7)

CUV: 约翰看见许多法利赛人和撒都该人也来受洗，就对他们说：“毒蛇的种类！谁指示你们逃避将来的忿怒呢？”（《马太福音》3：7）

TCV: 约翰看见许多法利赛人和撒都该人也来要求受洗，就对他们说：“你们这些毒蛇！上帝的审判快要到了，你们以为能够逃避吗？”（《马太福音》3：7）

Metaphors used in the above examples can be divided into there categories according to their acceptability in Chinese context.

- (1) The associations between the tenors and vehicles are commonly used in Chinese language as e.g. 12, “the offspring of vipers” is used to describe wicked people, which have the same association in Chinese as in “狠毒得象蛇一样”。 Another example is e. g. 9, in which “false prophets” are compared to “in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. In fact, we have “披着羊皮的狼” in Chinese. So in E-C translation, these metaphors should be translated literally.
- (2) Both the tenors and vehicles of the metaphors are familiar to the Chinese readers with the associations between them are intelligible though originally we don’t have them in Chinese language. The difference of this category with that of the first one lies in the fact that both the English and Chinese metaphors in the first category are parts of their own language; while those in the second category originally do not exist in the Chinese language but later gradually find their ways into the Chinese language. As in e.g. 11 “the apple of the eye” (眼中瞳仁). So, literal translation is advisable in their translation.
- (3) As for the metaphors in the third category neither the vehicles nor the associations between the tenors and vehicles are familiar to Chinese readers, as in e.g. 6, 7, 8 and 10. Some of these metaphors are contradictory to or not in line with the Chinese culture; therefore, two ways of renderings are found here in the respective translation.

When translating those metaphors in the first two categories, generally the CUV and the TCV show the same tendency in their translation to literalness. But their differences are revealed in dealing with those in the third category when translating “(not) to lift up one’s horn on high” to “(不要) 举角” in the CUV and “(不要) 傲慢” in the TCV; “a camel goes through a needle’s eye” to “骆驼穿过针眼” in the CUV and “有钱人要成为天国的子民” in the TCV.

Undoubtedly, the CUV's literal treatment of the metaphors introduces some novel comparisons and therefore enriches the target language and at the same time conveys the culture, as Lu Xun, one of the distinguished Chinese writers, put it, “不但在输入新的内容, 也在输入新的表现法 (Xie Tianzhen: 204). In this way providing the readers opportunities to understand the original text and communicate with the original culture. However, the difficulties caused by the literalness cannot be denied. A Chinese reader without necessary training in the relevant culture will find difficult to understand the metaphors translated this way.

This is completely another picture in the TCV, which focuses on conveying the message of the original. In order to facilitate the intelligibility of the intended reader, the TCV is more concerned about breaking down cultural barriers and sacrifices certain cultural elements in their translations, as in e.g. 6, 7, 8, and 10. This, in a sense, shows us the fact that they are governed by a missionary zeal of communicating the message of God to the people. Viewed the matter in terms of literary translation, transference of stylistic form contributes very significant to the success of the translated text. Therefore, in some cases, it is not appropriate to give meaning priority over form possessing aesthetic value. Nevertheless, the TCV to some extent achieves the goal of “functional equivalence” as the examples mentioned above have proved and gets widely circulated among its readers, non-believers.

4. Skopostheorie—A Way Out

4.1 The Eternal Dilemmas

It is acknowledged that the Bible is the most translated book in the world, which has been translated into many languages. Its entirety or in part has been translated 2,355 of the approximately 6,500 languages that exist. The Bible is now available in 665 languages in Africa, followed by 585 in Asia, 414 in Oceania, 404 in Latin America and the Caribbean, 209 in Europe, and 75 in North America. The Bible is available in whole or in part to some 98% of the world's population (Net 5).

Statistics above show us the fact that we now have many Bible translations numerous in number. But after the elaborate discussion in Chapter 2, we can arrive at the conclusion that, to some extent, all the Bible translations fall into two categories: versions in literal translation and free translations.

Throughout the Bible history we find Bible translators observing that different situations call for different renderings. However, “translation is frequently associated with word-for-word fidelity to the source text, even though the result may not be considered appropriate for the intended purpose (Nord 2001: 4). Cicero (106-43 B.C.), the founder of Western translation theory, described the dilemma as follows:

If I render word for word, the result will sound uncouth, and if compelled by necessity I alter anything in the order or wording, I shall seem to have departed from the function of a translator (Nord, 2001:4).

Friedrich Schleiermacher also suggested the same thought in 1823: either the translator leaves the author in peace, as much as possible, and moves the reader towards him; or leaves the

reader in peace, as much as possible, and moves the author towards him. (Li Heqing, 2005:11)

In a similar vein, Eugene A. Nida regarded the dilemma as two conflicts:

Despite major shifts of viewpoints on translation during different epochs and in different countries, two basic conflicts ... have remained. These fundamental differences in translation theory may be stated in terms of two sets of conflicting "poles": (1) literal vs. free translating, and (2) emphasis on form vs. concentration on content.

Yes, when translators translate the Bible, some of them literally translated it focusing on the form of the original text; some translated it liberally focusing on its sense. In the history before 1950s or so, the former method is preferred to the latter. That's why we say the Bible translation has a tendency to word-for- word tradition, especially in ancient western world, when some were burned for violating this authority rule.

The differences between literal and free translation are a polar distinction with many grades between them. The grades may be well illustrated by its numerous versions both in English and in Chinese, and others. This may temporarily answer people's wonder: Why do we have so many Bible translations. To answer the question satisfactorily, we have to have a close look at the Skopostheorie in the following part.

In fact, many Bible translators have felt that the process of translating should involve both procedures: a faithful reproduction of formal source text in one situation and adjustment to the target audience in another. Jerome (348-420) and Martin Luther (1483-1546) held the view that there are passages in the Bible where the translator must reproduce "even the word-order" or keep "to the letter"; in other passages they believed it was more important "to render the sense" or to adjust the text to the target audience's needs and expectations. Nida also pointed that by close attention to literal wording and formal correspondence one can be transported back to an earlier

culture. However without some adjustments in form and content, at times even rather radical, no literal translation can fully accomplish its real goal.

But why do we literally translate this but freely translate that? Does a translator do translations according to his own will? How does he work in this dilemma? Let's probe into the Skopostheorie to find the answer.

4.2 Skopostheories

4.2.1 Introduction to Skopostheorie

Skopostheorie, the theory that applies the notion of Skopos to translation, was developed in Germany in the late 1970s (Vermeer, 1978), and which reflects a general shift from predominantly linguistic and rather formal translation theories to a more functional and sociocultural oriented concept of translation.

Skopos is a Greek word for 'purpose' and was introduced into translation theory in the 1970s by Hans J. Vermeer. This approach to translation stresses the purpose of the translation, which determines the translation principles to be adopted. The major work on skopos theory is *Groundwork for a General Theory of Translation*, a book Vermeer co-authored with Katharina Reiss in 1984. Apart from Vermeer, other scholars working in the paradigm include Margaret Ammann, Hans Honig and Paul Kussmaul and so on.

4.2.1.1 Three Rules of Skopostheorie

4.2.1.1.1 Skopos Rule

In his *Framework for a general Translation Theory* (1978), Vermeer postulates that as a general rule it must be the intended purpose of the target text that determines translation methods and principles. The top-ranking rule for any translation is thus the "Skopos rule", which says that a

translation action is determined by its “Skopos rule”; that is, the end justifies the means. Vermeer explains the Skopos rule in the following way:

Each is produced for a given purpose and should serve this purpose. The Skopos rule thus reads as follows: translate/interpreter/speak/write in a way that enables your text/translation to function in the situation in which it is used and with the people who want to use it and precisely in the way they want it to function (Vermeer 1989: 20) .

This rule is intended to solve the eternal dilemmas of free vs. free translation, dynamic vs. formal equivalence. It means that the skopos of a particular translation task may require a “literal” or a “free” translation, or anything between these two extremes, depending on the purpose for which the translation is needed. From this postulate, he derives the skopos rule, the prime principle determining any translation process: Human action, including translation, is determined by its purpose (skopos).

We can distinguish between three possible kinds of purpose in the field of translation: the general purpose aimed at by the translator in the translation process (perhaps ‘to earn a living’), the communicative purpose aimed at by the target text in the target situation (perhaps ‘to instruct the reader’) and the purpose aimed at by a particular translation strategy or procedure (for example, ‘to translate literally in order to show the structural particularities of the source language’) (cf. Vermeer 1989a: 100). Nevertheless, the term skopos usually refers to the purpose of the target text.

The main point of this functional approach is the following: it is not the source text, or its effects on the source text recipient, or the function assigned to it by the author, that determines the translation process, but the prospective function or skopos of the target text as determined by the

initiator's, i. e. client's, needs. Consequently, the skopos is largely constrained by the target text user and his/her situation and cultural background.

4.2.1.1.2 Intratextual and Intertextual Coherence

Two further general rules stipulated by Vermeer are the intratextual coherence and the intertextual coherence (the fidelity rule). The intratextual coherence stipulates that the target text must be sufficiently coherent to allow the intended readers to comprehend it. This means the reader should be able to understand it; it should make sense in the communicative situation and culture in which it is received and it should be acceptable in a sense that it is coherent with the receiver's situation.

The intertextual coherence concerns the coherence between the target text and the source text, and stipulates merely that some relationship must remain between the two once the overriding principle of skopos and the rule of intratextual coherence have been satisfied. As in the case of the skopos rule, the intertextual coherence should exist between source and target text, while the form it takes depends both on the translator's interpretation of the source text and on the translation skopos.

In order for the translational action to be appropriate for the specific case, the skopos needs to be stated explicitly or implicitly in the commission. Vermeer describes the commission as comprising a goal and the conditions under which that goal should be achieved, both of which should be negotiated between the commissioner and the translator. In this way, the translator, as the expert, should be able to advise the commissioner/client on the feasibility of the goal.

An important advantage of skopostheorie is that it allows the possibility of the same text being translated in different ways according to the purpose of the target text and the commission

which is given to the translator. Objections to skopos theory mainly concern the definition of translating and the relationship between the source text and target text.

4.2.1.2 Roles Involved

4.2.1.2.1 Translation Skopos

According to Skopostheorie, “Each text is produced for a given purpose” (Vermeer 1989:20, my translation), the prime principle determining any translation process is the purpose (Skopos) of the overall translational action. The term Skopos usually refers to the purpose of the target text.

4.2.1.2.2 Readers—a Decisive Factor

In the framework of Skopostheorie, one of the most important factors determining the purpose of a translation is the addressee, who is the intended receiver of the target text with their culture-specific world-knowledge, their expectations and their communicative needs. Every translation is directed at an intended audience, since to translate means “to produce a text in a target setting for a target purpose and target addressees in target circumstances (Vermeer 1989: 29). So information about the target text receiver is of crucial importance for the translator, who should insist on receiving as many details as possible from the commissioner.

It is important to note that in the traditional translation theory, east or west, readership is always inferior to other factors involved, who are only a receiver, a basket to hold anything no matter it likes or not. Readership has been always stand far away from the central power. In the traditional context in which equivalence to the original text is highly concerned, when evaluating a translation, attention is always focused on how faithful it is to the original text, which determines the nature of translation. This situation doesn't make any change until the cultural turn in the 1970s when the traditional stiff head began to turn its head to pay more attention to other factors

involved in translation process. This is a new life for readership which finally stand out in the Skopostheorie.

4.2.1.2.3 Source Text—“Offer of Information”

The status of source text is much lower in Skopostheorie than in equivalence-based theories. Vermeer regards it as an “offer of information” that is partly or wholly turned into an “offer of information” for the target audience (cf. Vermeer 1982).

4.3 The CUV and the TCV Explained

4.3.1 Skopos Rule

In the framework of Skopostheorie, the skopos of the target text is the decisive role that affects the whole translating process. It is fully proved in Bible translation.

In Chinese Bible translation history, Bible translation is conducted with very clear purposes of many kinds.

1. Bible in various Chinese

a. Classical Chinese Bible: High Wenli Version, Easy Wenli Version, Marshman’s Version, Morrison’s Version

b. Mandarin Bible: Nanking Mandarin Version, Peking mandarin, CUV.

c. Modern Chinese Bible: TCV.

d. Colloquial Bible: Shanghai Colloquial Version, Hakka Dialect Version (Net 4).

2. Bible in complete version and Bibles in part: Bible versions before Morrison’s version are all that in parts.

3. Bibles in “shen” edition and Bibles in “God” edition

Different purposes can be detected from the above categories: In order to degrade the difficulty

both in Bible translation (c.f. Mao Fasheng 2004:7) and in circulation, they selected some parts of great significance to translate; in order to please the Chinese scholars and officials, they chose classical Chinese as their target language style; to meet the needs of common readers most of whom are lack of education, there have mandarin versions. Directed by purposes in Bible translation, today we have many complete Chinese Bible versions, among which out stand two versions, the CUV and the TCV.

4.3.1.1 The CUV's Skopos

Before the birth of the CUV, in the end of the 1880s, there had had many Chinese Bible existed with different characteristics. The chaos caused by different versions was complained by many Churches and believers who were eager to have a union Chinese Bible.

现在在同一种语言上，竟出版了几种不同的译本，其祸害之大而且多，想非人人和基督徒所能漠视（赵维本 1993：33）。

A change is therefore needed, and by the end of 1880s, it had become the focus among those who concerned with Bible translation. As a solution, the union Bible, one Bible in three versions, is arranged on the schedule. Again the solution is made reader-oriented, which is betrayed by “one Bible in three versions”. Since the Union Bible is made attempting to cease the chaos, why do we again produce multi-versions?

We know the fact that the dominant language in the closing years of the Qing dynasty is still ancient Chinese which was used by Chinese Scholars and officials. The High Wenli Version is therefore designed to meet their needs of this group of readers, which is stereotyped in the previous translation. Although the ancient Chinese still cast shadows on people's daily life, the fresh change cannot be denied, mandarin has fought its way into people's daily life. So to let

God's message known by more and more people of all walks of life, they produce the CUV.

History repeated itself many times in Bible translation. Whenever the Bible is brought to a new land, it is translated into the relevant vernacular language. Once again it shows the fact that the translation of the Bible cannot be separated from the mission of the Bible, to spread God's message to the world.

According to Austin's Speech Act Theory, any Speech act possesses three features: (1) Locutionary, the act of the utterance of a sentence, (2) illocutionary, to perform the act to show the intention of the utterance, (3) perlocutionary, the act performed as the result of the utterance (c.f. Han Ziran 2002: 181). In this light, Bible translation does not aim at nothing. The translators, instructed by the sponsors, hope to see the perlocutionary result that more and more people begin to believe in God after reading their Bible. So they took the majority of readers into consideration by choosing mandarin as their target language.

Several pages have been used for discussing the language style choosing of the CUV by their translators, for it has always been the highlighting points recognized by others.

The purpose of the CUV is very clear now, after the discussion, to attract, catch and remain more readers, the future believers. A question in point is how it is realized in the process of translation. As discussed in Chapter 3, the CUV has a tendency to literalness in rendering. People is accustomed to believe that only those free translation can satisfy readers, how does a literal one as the CUV do this way? Three explanations employed here to account for the reason.

4.3.1.1.1 Viewing from Readers Reception Theory

Reading experiences always reveal readers preference in choosing reading materials. Personal entertainment is always amplified in reading process. Therefore those works involving

sex, murdering and other amazing matters, which are easy to evoke some imagination, tend to fire people's interests. It is similar in foreign films' translation. A case in point is the Chinese translation of the film *American Beauty*, 《美国美人/丽人/甜心》. Some believe that the translation is somewhat tricky because the "American Beauty" is actually a name of rose (Net, 6). Nevertheless, it won great success in marketing.

This, to some extent, shows readers' reading preference. As for Bible translation, the canon of Christianity of text dignity, it cannot follow the translation of light literature, for it has its own identity and particularity, the words of God, to attract and please its readers. It is the words of God, not others. When facing translation works, especially the Bible translations, most people, believers, would like to have a look at those faithful translations. Therefore, trying every means to keep the original form of the Bible in translation is of the greatest importance. As exemplified in the CUV'S translation on idioms in Chapter 3. Comparing the idioms "骆驼穿过针眼" with "有钱人要成为天国的子民", the former is of more literalness which can attract readers long.

4.3.1.1.2 Viewing from Russian Formalism

Formalism holds that "The process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself and must be prolonged" (Zhu Gang 2002: 2). This is said to the appreciation of literature works. But it is still shed some light to that of the Bible. The way they adopted to prolong the reading appreciation process is "defamiliarization" (Ibid), which "makes familiar objects be as if they were not familiar".

For example, in Romans 12:20, we have "to heap coals of fire on his head". Readers may not like it as the plain "使他羞愧交加" but "把碳火堆在他的头上", which is novel and foreign to readers, and in a way to enrich their reading and language as well.

4.3.1.1.3 “Resistancy” Translation (c.f. Guo Jianzhong 1999: 193)

The CUV rolled from the press in 1919 whose completion take the translators 27 years from the late 1890s. Before that, Chinese people “一直徘徊于大国沙文主义和民族自卑情绪之间” (Han Ziman 2005:113). Reflecting on translation, most Chinese translators at that time show no respect to original text. This leads to the fact that free translations overwhelmed the whole country. A case in point is Lin Shu, Who translated 245 (Fang Huawen 2005: 23) novels in his whole life. The surprising point lies in he was blind to English. The degree of faithfulness is then worthy twice thinking.

But for foreign translators, it is another picture. It is to be noted that in the 1890s, foreign powers seized the throat of China. A feature of the CUV is very prominent that all the translators are foreigners of Anglo-American tradition. As Lawrence Venuti pointed out, Anglo-American translators got used to domesticate foreign works in translation according to their own norms. It is called by him cultural hegemony. But when translating their works to foreign countries, they keep the flavor of the original Bible culture all the way to resist being domesticated by Chinese culture, which will be risky in losing its cultural identity. This is proved by the literal translation of the CUV

4.3.1.2 The TCV’s Skopos

At the moment when the CUV rolled from the press in 1919, it wins great success among readers and be regarded as the authority version at that time church in the following decades. Its influence still can be felt today. Anyway, great changes have taken place in the following years since its publication, especially the quality of readers.

Readers, which deeply influence the translation, are still the foremost reason that leads to the

translation of the TCV. But this “readers” is different with that “readers” of the CUV. It is the fact that modern readers always find it hard to read the CUV, since language changed a lot after its publication. Words and grammar understandable in the CUV are found obscure and strange for readers in the 1960s.

E.g. 13

KJV: And I also have given you cleanness of teeth in all your cities, and want of bread in all your places (Amos 4:6)

CUV: 我使你们在一切城中牙齿干净，在你们各处粮食缺乏（阿摩斯书 4：6）。。

E.g. 14

When the keepers of the house shall tremble, and the strong men shall bow themselves, and the grinders cease because they are few, and those that look out of the windows be darkened...

(Ecclesiastes 12: 3-5)

CUV: 看守房屋的发颤，有力的屈身，推磨的稀少就止息，从窗户望外看的也都昏暗...

TCV: 你的手臂要发抖，强健的腿无力。你的牙齿只剩几颗，难以咀嚼。你的眼睛昏花，视线模糊。

E.g. 15

KJV: How could we sing the LORD'S song

in a foreign land?

If I forget you, O Jerusalem,

Let my right hand wither!

Let my tongue cling to the roof of my mouth,

If I do not remember you,

If I do not set Jerusalem

Above my highest joy.

CUV: 我们怎能在外邦唱耶和華的歌呢？

耶路撒冷啊，我若忘记你，

情愿我的右手忘记技巧。

我若不纪念你，若不看耶路撒冷过于我所喜乐的，

情愿我的舌头贴于上膛。

TCV: ……愿我的右手枯萎，再也不能弹琴！

愿我的舌头僵硬，再也不能唱歌！

No more examples are needed to prove the CUV's obscurity in language. It is the fact that in the CUV, there are plenty of images. Each image has its metaphorical meaning, but it is hard for the average reader to understand it. Only when comparing it with the TCV can we understand that the so-called “看守房屋的”，“有力的屈身”，“推磨的”，“从窗户望外看的” in e.g. 14 refer to one's “arms”，“legs”，“teeth” and “eyes”. The CUV translates, “Let my right hand wither! Let my tongue cling to the roof of my mouth” in e.g. 15 into “情愿我的右手忘记技巧”，“情愿我的舌头贴于上膛”。Such expressions are unnatural Chinese, and their meanings are obscure as well. To meet the need of readers, the TCV adopted free translation as their translation method to translate the Bible in the 1970s. This choice can be explained from the following aspects:

4.3.1.2.1 Readers' Aesthetic Taste

When saying “This ‘readers’ is different from that readers of the CUV” I mean the quality of readers changed. Modern readers' aesthetic tastes tend to approach those works easy to understand. This is caused by the historical background in the periods. from 1930s to 1960s. It is true that many wars took place during that period, which to some extent damage people's interest in

reading. Also, readers' circle enlarged with the increasing translation of foreign works. Bible readers were not mainly believers but non-believers as well, who prefer simple and clear style of language.

读者方面，当时人们普遍对西方缺乏了解。首先文艺大众化运动的影响，翻译文学的读者中，工农大众所占的比例明显上升。这就使读者总体上的文化水平有所下降，对西方文化的了解程度也随之下降……读者对于西方的语言、文化也没有很大的兴趣。他们所期望的是通顺流畅、浅显易懂的译文(Han Ziman 2005:119)。

4.3.1.2.2 Power Element

Translations are not made in a vacuum (Lefevere 2004: 14). Chinese Bible translation does not have the exception. It, to some extent, reflects the corresponding social reality. It is the fact that began from the 1950s or so, China was overwhelmed by the trend learning from the previous Soviet Union. But the majority does not therefore admit that Chinese Culture is inferior to others, they called for utilizing the foreign culture to serve the Chinese culture by getting rid of disadvantages but taking the essence of it. An article in *People's Daily* in 1951 (Ibid 121) revealed the facts that literal translations, which prove to be helpful to reserve the feature of the original texts, lost its day.

4.3.1.2.3 Translators

Translator is another reason. It is worthy noting that all the translators of the TCV are Chinese. This is the first time in Chinese Bible translation that a complete Chinese Bible is produced solely by Chinese scholars. A bold hypothesis can be drawn from Vernuti's theory that when native translators translate foreign works, they tend to use free translation method. Two examples in history contribute to this hypothesis, one is Fu Donghua's translation of *Gone with the Wind*, and another case is Lin Shu's translation.

4.3.2 Intratextual Coherence

The intratextual coherence stipulates that the target text must be sufficiently coherent to allow the intended readers to comprehend it. This means the reader should be able to understand it; it should make sense in the communicative situation and culture in which it is received and it should be acceptable in a sense that it is coherent with the receiver's situation.

The key point of the rule, in fact, is still readers. It concerns that the target text, the translation must make sense and be comprehended by the readers. Once again, readers stand out to measure the translation. As made clear early, readers concern is the *skopos* in Bible translation. Bible translation, not like other works, has definitely clear purpose (Ren Dongsheng 2001: 12) to maintain as more readers, future believers, as possible. We find that the CUV and the TCV possesses different degree of intelligibility, with the former hard and the latter easy. This can be justified by their respective readers.

4.3.3 Intertextual Coherence

The intertextual coherence concerns the coherence between the target text and the source text, and stipulates merely that some relationship must remain between the two once the overriding principle of *skopos* and the rule of (intratextual) coherence have been satisfied.

As mentioned earlier in 4.2.1.2.3 that the status of source text is much lower in *Skopostheorie* than in equivalence-based theories. Though it is regarded by Vermeer as an "offer of information" (cf. Vermeer 1989), it is still the textual basis of translation which hold the nature of translation.

As for Chinese Bible translation, the CUV and the TCV both are faithful renders to their original texts. But why are they so different in style? Their textual Basis should be the answer, with the KJV literal and TEV free. It is to say, the style of the CUV and the TCV are determined

by their respective source texts. Yes, it is. But why different source texts are chosen again show the purpose orientation in translation.

4.3.4 The Power of Patronage

As discussed in 3.1.5, the translation of the CUV is sponsored by US Bible Society, the Great Britain Bible Society and the Scotland Bible Society, while the TCV is sponsored by the Bible Society in Hong Kong and Taiwan. Sponsors can encourage the publication of translations they consider acceptable and they can also quite effectively prevent the publication of translations they do not consider so (Lefevere 2004: 19). The financial dominance on the CUV and the TCV in a way shows the nature of the translation. The translation is of religion, not secular. It also contributes to their purposes orientation discussed in 4.3.

5. Conclusion

*He who reads the Bible in translation is like a man who kisses his bride
through a veil*

—Hayyim Nachman Bialik

The Bible is not only the canon of Christianity but also arguably the most influential collection of books in human history. More copies of the Bible have been distributed than of any other book. The Bible has also been translated more times and into more languages than any other book. It is estimated that approximately 60 million copies of the complete Bible or significant portions thereof are distributed annually.

The Bible has had a tremendous influence not only on religion, but on language, and culture as well, particularly in Europe and North America. Nowadays, many people around the world, whether they are believers or not, all know about the Bible. Apart from the believers, there are also a lot of people who would like to read the Bible on account of their own interests, for the Bible is not only a collection of books which reveals the history of how God interacted with his people, but also a great literature appreciated by people who learn history, culture, even language from it.

Bible is introduced into China by way of translation. Many translators contribute for the proliferation of Chinese Bible. From the first complete Chinese Bible, Morrison's Version in 1823, till the New Version of the Bible in 2001, we have one Bible in many versions. Why is the Bible so translated? What's the relationship between each other? Taking the CUV and the TCV as examples, the paper finds explanations in the framework of Skopostheorie.

Skopostheorie holds that human action, including translation, is determined by its purpose

Skopostheorie holds that human action, including translation, is determined by its purpose

(skopos). Therefore the skopos rule is the prime rule of the theory that determining the whole process. The skopos here means the purpose of the target text.

In the framework of Skopostheorie, one of the most important factors determining the purpose of a translation is the addressee, who is the intended receiver of the target text with their culture-specific world-knowledge, their expectations and their communicative needs. Every translation is directed at an intended audience, since to translate means “to produce a text in a target setting for a target purpose and target addressees in target circumstances (Vermeer 1989: 29).

As for Chinese Bible translation, which has clear purpose orientation similar with that of English Bible translation, readership is the foremost consideration in the translation process. To meet the demands of readers of different appreciation degree in different purposes to approach the Bible, different Bible versions are made. For example, the CUV is made for believers or those who study the Bible, while the TCV for common readers, non-believers or beginners. To fulfill the purpose, different translation principles employed in the translation with the CUV strictly focusing on the form and latter on function to convey the sense in the TCV.

The theory is intended to solve the eternal dilemmas of literal vs. free translation, dynamic vs. formal equivalence and so on. It means that the Skopos of a particular translation task may require a ‘free’ or a ‘faithful’ translation, or anything between these two extremes, depending on the purpose for which the translation is needed.

Some criticizes that the Skopostheorie allows too much freedom for translators, which may lead to departure from the nature of translation. This is actually restrained by the intertextual coherence which emphasizes the fidelity between source text and target text. Source text is still the

source though it is only an “information offer”. It coincides with some Bible translators that the Bible aims to provide message from God, not what He specifically said. Anyway, it is still in argument.

The Jewish poet Hayyim Nachman Bialik once said, “He who reads the Bible in translation is like a man who kisses his bride through a veil.” Yes, the veil enhances the mystery of the bride, especially when the bride is said to be so by different people. So does the Bible translation. Versions of different purposes proliferated contribute to the authority of the Bible, which uncompetitive by any other works in the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

WORKS IN ENGLISH

- [1] American Bible Society, *Good News Bible (Today's English Version)*. New York: American Bible Society, 1976.
- [2] American Bible Society. *The Holy Bible (King James Version)*. New York: American Bible Society, 1999.
- [3] Andre Lefevere. *Translation/History/Culture: a sourcebook*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2004
- [4] Broom Marshall. *The Bible in China*. San Francisco: Reprinted by Chinese Materials Center INC. 1977.
- [5] Chen Jinmei. *A Study on Bible Translation in China*. Fujian Normal University, 2005
- [6] China Christianity Societies. *Holy Bible (Today's Chinese Version)*. Nanjing: China Christianity Societies, 1997
- [7] China Christianity Societies. *Holy Bible (Chinese Union Version)*. Nanjing: (China Christianity Societies, 1984.
- [8] Christiane Nord. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: functionalist Approaches Explained*, Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001
- [9] Eugene A. Nida. *Towards a Science of Translating: with Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2004.
- [10] Hans Vermeer. *Skopos and Commission in Translational Action*, John Benjamin Publishing

Company, 1989.

- [11] Hickey Dennis. *The First Christians of China: an Outline history and Some Considerations Concerning the Nestorians in China during the Tang Dynasty*, China Study Project, London, 1980
- [12] James H. Slightler. *On the KJV*, Slightler Publications, 2002.
- [13] Li Heqing, *Methodology of Western Translation Studies Since the 1970s*, Beijing: Beijing University Press, 2005.
- [14] Ma Huijuan. *A Study on Nida's Translation Theory*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2003
- [15] Ma Lemei. *A Study on the Translating Principles of the CUV*, Shaanxi Normal University, 2001.
- [16] Morrison E. A. *A Memories of the life and Labors of Robert Morrison*. Vo.. I. London, 1839.
- [17] S. Greenslade, F. B. A., ed., *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- [18] Strandenaes, Thor. *Principles of Chinese Bible Translation as expressed in Five Selected Versions of the New Testament and Exemplified by Mt. 5:1-12 and CO. 1*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell Intenational, 1987.
- [19] Zhu Gang. *Twentieth Century Western Critical Theories*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2001.

WORKS IN CHINESE

- [20] 陈惠康. 中文圣经翻译小史[M]. 香港: 香港中文圣经新译会, 1986.
- [21] 马祖毅. 中国翻译史[M]. 西安: 西北大学出版社, 2005.

- [22] 顾长声. 传教士与近代中国[M]. 上海:上海人民出版社, 2004.
- [23] 郭著章. 当代美国翻译理论[M]. 武汉:湖北教育出版社, 1999.
- [24] 海恩波著, 蔡锦图译. 道在神州—圣经在中国的翻译与流传. 香港: 国际圣经协会, 2000.
- [25] 韩子满. 文学翻译杂合研究[M]. 上海:上海译文出版社, 2005
- [26] 何自然. 语用学概论[M]. 长沙: 湖南教育出版社, 2002.
- [27] 贾保罗. 圣经汉译论文集[Z]. 香港: 基督教辅侨出版社, 1965.
- [28] 李传龙. 圣经文学词典[Z]. 北京:北京大学出版社, 1997
- [29] 李志刚. 基督教早期来华传教史[M]. 台北;台湾商务印书馆, 1985.
- [30] 梁工. 圣经解读[M]. 北京:宗教文化出版社, 2003
- [31] 梁工. 圣经百科词典[Z]. 沈阳: 辽宁人民出版社, 1990.
- [32] 刘意青. 圣经的文学阐释—理论与实践[M]. 北京:北京大学出版社, 2004.
- [33] 林草原. 忠信与操纵—当代基督教<圣经>中文译本研究. 岭南大学, 2003.
- [34] 马祖毅. 中国翻译史(上卷) [M]. 武汉: 湖北教育出版社, 1999.
- [35] 马祖毅. 中国翻译简史:“五四”以前部分[M]. 北京:中国对外翻译出版公司, 1998.
- [36] 毛发生, 马礼逊与圣经汉译[J]. 中国翻译, 2004 (7)
- [37] 任东升. 中国翻译家与圣经翻译[J]. 四川外院学报, 2002(4).
- [38] 任东升. 圣经中文译者对翻译理论的探讨[J]. 外语与外语教学, 2001 (12).
- [39] 许锡五. 文社月刊. 1926(2).
- [40] 谢天振. 译介学[M]. 上海: 上海外语教育出版社, 2000.
- [41] 杨森富. 中国基督教史[M]. 台北:商务印书馆, 1984.
- [42] 严建强. 十八世纪中国文化在西欧的传播及其反应[M]. 杭州: 中国美术学院出版社,

2002.

- [43] 尤思德著, 蔡锦图译. 和合本与中文圣经翻译. 香港: 国际圣经协会, 1999.
- [44] 张朝柯. 圣经与希伯来文学. 北京: 东方出版社, 2003.
- [45] 张美芳. 译有所为一功能翻译理论阐释[M]. 北京: 外语教学与研究出版社, 2005.
- [46] 赵维本. 译经溯源—现代五大中文圣经翻译史. 香港: 中神, 1993.
- [47] 庄柔玉. 基督教圣经译本权威现象研究[M]. 香港: 国际圣经协会, 2000.
- [48] 卓新平. 圣经鉴赏. 中国社会科学出版社, 1992.

WEBSITES

- [1]. <http://www.godoor.com/article>.
- [2]. <http://www.cass.net.cn>
- [3]. <http://www.amityfoundation.org/ANS/Articles>.
- [4]. <http://www.cclaa.org/bbs>.
- [5]. http://en.Wikipedia.Org/wiki/Bible_translation.
- [6]. <http://www.xici.net>
- [7]. <http://spaces.msn.com>
- [8]. <http://www.Nanfangdaily.com.cn>