上海外国语大学

硕士学位论文

论文题目 《金经》 翻译：从原作
到译文受众的焦点转移

学科专业 英语语言文学

届 别 2006届

姓 名 方逸

导 师 方永德

BIBLE TRANSLATION: A SHIFT FROM ORIGINAL ORIENTATION

TO RECEPTORS ORIENTATION

BY

FANG YI

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL AND COLLEGE OF

ENGLISH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF PROFESSOR FANG YONGDE

SHANGHAI INTERNATIONAL STUDIES UNIVERSITY

NOVEMBER 2005

声　明

　　本学位论文是我在导师的指导下取得的研究成果。在本学位论文中，除了加以标注和致谢的部分外，不包含其他人已经发表或公布过的研究成果，也不包含我为获得任何教育机构的学位或学历而使用过的材料。与我一同工作的同事对本学位论文做出的贡献均已在论文中作了明确的明说。

学位论文作者签名：　方遥

签名日期：2005 年　12 月　9 日

学位论文使用授权声明

　　上海外国语大学有权保存学位论文的电子和纸质文档，可以借阅或上网公开本学位论文的全部或部分内容，可以向有关部门或机构送交并授权其保存、借阅或上网公布本学位论文的全部或部分内容。对于保密论文，按保密的有关规定和程序处理。

学位论文作者签名：　方遥　　　　　签名日期：2005 年 12 月 9 日

导师签名：　方诗玉　　　　　　　　签名日期：2005 年 12 月 12 日

2

Acknowledgements

Abstract

As one of the two main themes in the Western translation history, Bible Translation and study of Bible Translation have its own significance.

For a long time, Bible translators seem to have been confined by the bondage of literal translation. This remained the case until Dr. Nida and his colleagues put forward the theory of Dynamic (Functional) Equivalence in the last century, which became an innovation in the translation theory and practice in Bible Translation.

The author, in this thesis, has endeavored to discuss and describe the changes that have taken place in Bible Translation theory and practice. And, through the in-depth comparisons and analyses of four representative translated English Bible versions, goes further to find out that these changes in Bible Translation theory and practice are results of a shift of focus, i.e. a shift from original orientation to receptors orientation; and such a shift of focus is again resulted from an inner and deeper shift of focus, i.e. from the outward reverence for the so-called God to the desire of God perceived by some people.

Keywords: Bible translation, literal translation, Dynamic Functional Equivalence, shift of focus

摘要

作为西方翻译史上两条主线之一,《圣经》翻译有它的特殊性和重要意义。研究《圣经》翻译也因此有特殊的意义。

长期以来,《圣经》译者们似乎都倾向直译。上世纪奈达博士等人提出的"动态（功能）对等"是对《圣经》翻译理论和原则的一个创新和突破。

本文通过从古到今四个代表性的《圣经》英语翻译文本,探讨并阐述了长期以来有关《圣经》翻译理论和原则的一些转变。并通过对不同文本的对比分析,进一步深入探讨了这些理论和原则的转变是由于译者关注焦点的转变,即从单纯对原文和原作者的关注转移到对读者的理解和反应上面。不但如此,本文还探讨了这个关注点转变是缘于内在更深层次的焦点转变,即从单纯对基督徒心目中的上帝的关注转移到对上帝心意的深层次理解上。正是这两个关注点的转变才造成《圣经》翻译理论和原则的新变化。

关键词: 《圣经》翻译,直译,动态对等,焦点转移

Contents

Bibliography

Bible Translation: A Shift from Original Orientation to Receptors' Orientation

Chapter 1. Introduction: the Nature and Origin of the Bible

The Holy Bible consists of a collection of sixty-six separate books that were chosen by the Catholic Council of Carthage in 397 A.D. This collection of books is broken into two major sections: The Old Testament, which consists of thirty-nine books, and The New Testament, which consists of twenty-seven books.

The Old Testament is mostly written in the Hebrew language with some books in Aramaic language. The earliest book in the Old Testament was written in around 1400 B.C. while the latest in around 400 B.C. The books of the Old Testament are mainly concerned with the Hebrew God, Yahweh, and the history of the Israelites.

The New Testament is done in Greek language and finished in 40-100 A.D. It is the work of early Christians and reflects their beliefs about Jesus; it purports to be a history of what Jesus taught and did, and centers around the first and second coming of Jesus Christ.

The Holy Bible is a unique book. Roughly leafing through it, many would think it is a book of the history of the Israelite nation or it is an old moral book. Indeed, it does talk about the history of the Israel, especially in the Old Testament. Even the books of the New Testament can somehow get linked to the Israelite history. It gives account of the origin, development, vicissitudes of the nation of the Israel, and the prophecy about the future of the nation. However, the Bible goes beyond that. It is not just a book of history as other historical works would be, it is more than a book of history of the Israel. It is considered to be a book of the nation of Israel and the God of that nation. The Bible in the eyes of the Israelites is a book of how their God has interfered in their and human history, revealing and realizing his plans for the nation and the world as well. And history in the Bible somehow seems to have served as an illustration that shows the opposite outcomes resulting from different relationship status between the nation and their God: if the relationship between the two is good, the nation thrives, if not, it suffers. The writers in the Bible seem to be never exhausted in telling again and again the nation's history, not for the

sake of recounting the history, but for the sake of the readers and hearers of their times—to remind them of the lessons of their history, to warn and encourage them not to turn back to their God but only be faithful to him. The writers seem to "write with the hope that the historical lessons would bring some practical change to the lives of the hearers of that time", because "to the religious end, history is not important" (The Bible as Literature, An Introduction, translation my own).

Most of the books in the New Testament are either accounts of the life and teachings of Jesus who is considered and testified by the writers of the New Testament to be the Son of God, or the letters of the early apostles of Jesus such as Peter, Paul, John, etc. The writers of the New Testament therefore seem to have set the focus of their writing on Jesus. However, their writings still bear much relation to the Old Testament, for they seem to try hard to testify that Jesus is the savior that God promised in the writings of the Old Testament. Therefore, it seems that the writers in the New Testament have detailedly and eloquently illustrated and proved the heavenly identity of Jesus, ceaselessly and vigorously exhorting their fellow countrymen as well as people of different nationality to believe in Jesus, the savior promised by God in the writings of the Old Testament. From this, we see that the Old and New Testaments are organically linked.

The Holy Bible is also unique in that it took about 1,600 years to be completed; it is one of the oldest books in history; it contains 66 books with harmonious messages that can explain each other; it has over 40 writers with some of them were only ordinary people with little or no education. But the Bible did not come into being before the history of Israel began. In fact, it came into being long after the nation of Israel had established itself. There were no written scriptures at the early stage of the Israelite national history, but there were stories orally passed down from generation to generation. It is believed that the written works of the Scriptures didn't begin to take shape until it was 1,400 BC in the early period of kingdoms of the Israelite nation. The process of selecting the original Hebrew Manuscripts which make up the 39 Books of the Old Testament was not completed until 500 BC. In the first century AD, the original Greek Manuscripts which make up the 27 books of the New Testament was completed and in 315 AD, Athenasius, the Bishop of Alexandria, identified the 27 books of the New Testament which have been recognized as the canon scripture today.

Chapter 2. Development of Bible Translation Theories

2.1 The major history of Bible translation: an overview

The Bible translation also has had a long history. It can be dated back to as early as 300 BC when many Jews at that time spread through the Alexandria, Egypt, and were beginning to lose their original Hebrew language. In order to meet the needs of those Jews who spoke Greek and were not familiar with Hebrew, during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, 70-72 Jewish Scholars were commissioned to translate the Hebrew Jewish Manuscripts which contain the 39 Old Testament Books and 14 Apocrypha Books into the vernacular Greek language. This translation was called "Septuagint", which means seventy in Latin, to the credit of these 70 scholars. The Septuagint had a great influence on Christianity. In fact, it was a sourcebook of the Old Testament for early Christians during the first few centuries AD. And it was regarded as the major source text on which many later translations were based.

In 382 AD, Saint Jerome (347-420), a prominent translator among Roman priests, translated all the 80 books of the Bible (39 Old Test.+ 14 Apocrypha + 27 New Test.) from Hebrew into Latin, the translation was called Latin Vulgate Manuscripts. Jerome's Vulgate version was at first fiercely condemned as heretical, revolutionary and impious but considered an authoritative one by Roman Catholics in later times. No other work has had such an influence on the history of the Bible. For more than a thousand years, it was the parent of other versions of the Scriptures in Western Europe, and its influence is quite perceptible even in King James Bible.

In 1384 AD, John Wycliffe was the first person to produce a (hand-written) manuscript copy of the complete Bible, all 80 books.

Many different translations were made after John, Wycliffe, to name but a few:

In 1516 AD, Erasmus produced a Greek/Latin parallel New Testament and in 1522 AD, Martin Luther produced a translation of German New Testament. In 1526 AD, William Tyndale produced the New Testament which was the first New Testament that was printed in the English language and in 1537 AD, the second Complete Bible—Tyndale-Matthews Bible was printed in English.

3

In 1611 AD, the King James Bible was printed, originally with all 80 books but the Apocrypha was officially removed in 1885, leaving only the 66 books, which became the standard books of the Holy Bible.

In 1885 AD, the English Revised Version Bible was published, it was the first major English revision of the King James Bible.

1973 AD, the New International Version (NIV) Bible was published as a modern and accurate phrase for phrase English translation of the Bible.

1976 AD, the Good News Bible (GNB) was published as a thoroughly sense-for-send English translation of the Bible.

The above undertakings and publications of the Bible translation were by no means exhaustive, of course. Here I only make a list of translations which I consider to be important and necessary in the following discussions.

2.2 The translation-concerned uniqueness of the Bible

Translation of the Bible in the translation history of the Western world has been very vigorous and important. "In fact", as Dr. Eugene A. Nida puts it, "in terms of range of literary types, varieties of language, history of translating, and use by people in diverse cultures, Bible translating exceeds all other major classes of text"(Nida, 2004, Pi). However, throughout these more than 2000 years of the Bible translation history, the debate on the proper translation methods has never been taken off the table. Quite roughly, the conflicting viewpoints on the appropriate translation principles that should be adhered to in Bible translation can be divided into two categories: literal translation and free translation. Over the centuries, the debate has been very fierce, and the advocates of both sides have vigorously put forward their arguments and reasoning. Such strong conflicting viewpoints have probably had something to do with the uniqueness of the Bible itself.

As far as the translation of the Bible is concerned, the Bible is unique because it is considered to be "God's Word in written form" (*Holy Bible*, New International Version (NIV), preface ix.). The Apostle Paul, writer of many books of the New Testament, wrote in 2 Timothy 3:16 "All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness"(NIV). The word "God-breathed" is a compound word, showing the whole of

the Bible and every part in it came into being at God's power and his creative breath. And in 2 Peter 1:21, it says, "Above all, you must understand that no prophecy of Scripture came about by the prophet's own interpretation. For prophecy never had its origin in the will of man, but men spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit"(NIV). Prophecies were the messages spoken by the prophets in the books of the Old Testament which often starts with "This is what the LORD says", claiming that the messages came from the LORD, not from the prophets who announced them. Again in 1 Corinthians 2:13, it says, "This is what we speak, not in words taught us by human wisdom but in words taught by the Spirit, expressing spiritual truths in spiritual words"(NIV). The writer believes that God's message does not only express itself in men's thoughts, but also in the way of how it gets expressed by the words. These verses show that the writers believe that the Bible is a book of God, it originated with God, and was a result of the inspiration of God through the Holy Spirit. As the translators of the King James Bible said to its readers in the preface:

"The original thereof being from heaven, not from earth; the author being God, not man; the inditer, the Holy Spirit, not the wit of the Apostles or Prophets; the penmen, such as were sanctified from the womb, and endued with a principal portion of God's Spirit; the matter, verity, piety, purity, uprightness; the form, God's word, God's testimony, God's oracles, the word of truth, the word of salvation, etc." (KJV, 1611 preface)

Because it is seen as a book of God, unlike other famous secular works and their translations, the translation of the Bible became unique. The translators of the Bible undoubtedly have had to take God into consideration. Since it is a book of God who is regarded to do nothing wrong, the book of God must be flawless and without any mistake. This view has had great impact on those who were involved in Bible translation, and we will explain it more detailedly in later parts.

On the other hand, however, even it is regarded as a book from and of God, it is also said to be a book of men, carrying not a few features that show human involvement. Most obviously, the Bible is a book of men because it was made up of the writings about 40 people who were of different times and backgrounds and it took about 1600 years to finally finish the whole Bible writing process. Apart from this, there are many places that have been branded with distinct human involvement on the part of the writers. Naming some examples, many of the writers of the books of the Bible wrote down their own experiences: The Book of Psalms is full of personal feelings and words of the writers themselves;

Deuteronomy is actually a book of reminiscences of Moses and several books of the Bible are personal letters and full of the characteristic styles and words of the writers which often reveal the personalities and characters of the writers. The feature that the Bible is also a book written by ordinary men certainly can not be ignored in the translation process, in fact, it could pose many problems to the translators and make it imperative for the translators to look carefully into the different historical settings, habits of language use, geographical culture and style of writing, etc. to find out as enough information as possible about the original writers.

These two distinctive features of the Bible, together with many other features of the Bible such as its coming into being, the content being explaining and harmonious with each other, its age of existence, its writers mostly being but "ordinary men of no education "(Acts 4:13, GNB), ect. have contributed not a little to the lasting and heated debate of the appropriate translation principles and practice of the Holy Bible.

In later parts, we will take a more detailed look at the main groups that hold different opinions respectively. We will divide them into two sections, one section will be devoted to the review of the traditional Bible translation theories and its practice while the other will be dealt with the introduction of a more recent and popular yet much debated theory, principle and practice used in Bible translation—Dr. Eugene A. Nida's dynamic equivalence translation theory. I will make my own hypothesis and findings in section four. After that, we will make some thorough and representative comparisons from different angles of the different Bible versions resulted from different translation principles at different times. And lastly, a conclusion will be made according to the illustrations.

2.3 Bible translation of the old times: *pros* and *cons*

The history of the Bible translation has been a faithfulness witness of the schools with different, sometimes very contrary opinions, and also of the developments of the Bible translation theories as a whole. In the very early stage of the translation history of the Bible, there had been a perennial question on whether the translation was possible. People of ancient times had strong religious and psychological doubts on whether there ought to be any passage that gets translated. "So far as speech is divine and numinous," as Steiner says in

his Babel, "so far as it encloses revelation, active transmission either into the vulgate or across the barrier of languages is dubious or frankly evil."(George Steiner, 2001, p.251) This is especially the case with the Bible translation since it is considered to be the holy revelation from God and have direct involvement of God. Since each and every act of translation seems to lead only downward, how much so it would be to let mere defective human beings translate God's mysterious holy words. "Translation would be blasphemy"(Ibid, p.251).

On the other side, the case *for* translation also has had its religious and mystical antecedents. When explaining their motives, Steiner relates the fall of the tower of Babel to the coming of the redemption and the scattering of tongues at Babel, and says the act of translation was "a condition of urgent moral and practical potentiality, the return to linguistic unity, the movement towards and beyond Pentecost[2]", and seen thus, translation of the Scriptures is thought to be a teleological imperative, a stubborn searching for the divided streams of human speech to return to a single sea. "Every translation...is a messianic act, which brings redemption nearer.'"(Ibid, p.257)

The last words of Jesus were recorded in Matthew 18:18-20: "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Therefore, go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age" (NIV). With the hope of God's redemption for all his chosen people and understanding and obedience to the Great Mission which Jesus passed onto his disciples in mind, the opinion *for* the translation of the Bible also has always had its intensely practical aspect. Steiner concludes that "Much of the Western theory and practice of translation stems immediately from the need to disseminate the Gospels, to speak holy writ in other tongues"(Ibid, p.257). And this of course has the Biblical support as from Acts 2:4 "All of them were filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues, as the Spirit enabled them."(NIV). The translators of the King James Bible said in the *Translators to the Reader* in the preface, "But how shall men meditate in that, which they cannot understand? How shall they understand that which is kept close in an unknown tongue? As it is written, 'If then I do not grasp the meaning of what someone is saying, I am a foreigner to the speaker, and he is a foreigner to me' (1 Corinthians 14:1, NIV)". Steiner in his book continues to say that the translation of Christ's message and ministry into the common language was a constant theme in Patristic literature and the life of the early Church, starting mainly from the

Septuagint version. It became a commonplace from Saint Jerome to Martin Luther. Those who insisted the Bible be translated held the idea that no man should be kept from salvation by mere barriers of language. The translation of the Scriptures into literally darkened tongues was urgent. And along the process, "each impulse towards reformation from inside the Church brings with it a call for more authentic, more readily intelligible versions of the holy word. There is a very real sense in which reformation can be defined as a summons to a fuller, more concrete translation of Christ's teachings both into daily speech and daily life"(Steiner, 2001, p.257-8).

In Tyndale's rendition of Erasmus's (1516-1535) *Exhortations to the Diligent Study of Scripture* of 1529, Erasmus says he desires all women should read the Gospel and Paul's epistles and have them translated into the tongues of all men, so that they might become readable and understandable to ordinary, less or little learned men and women (in Steiner, 2001, p.257-8). He had certain motivations, as was written in the *Translators to the Reader* in the preface of the KJV Bible, that those who were godly-learned were not content to have the Scriptures in a language they themselves could understand while their unlearned neighbors and countrymen who hungered and thirsted after righteousness had no access into it because of the language barriers. They were also no satisfied with the fact that their countrymen could only hear the divine news through the voice of ministers. In order to have the Book translated and make it understandable to the unlearned or less learned and that other souls be saved as well as they, what can be more available than to deliver the Bible to the people in a tongue which they understand?

These are roughly the ideas and opinions different groups have held concerning Bible translation. Even though there were voices opposing the idea and act of having the Bible translated, it seems the voices supporting translation of the Bible has prevailed. In order to well illustrate my point in this paper, that is, to illustrate the different focuses and theories concerning Bible translation between the past and the present, I will, in later parts, narrow my discussion down to the group that is *for* translation of the Bible.

2.3.1 Literal translation of the Bible: word-for-word translation vs. sense-for-sense translation

The group that is *for* translation of the Bible has been rather heterogeneous. For ease

of discussion, it might be generally divided into two sub-groups. One of them was on the side of word-for-word translation while the other was more on the side of sense-for-sense translation.

2.3.1.1 Literal translation of the Bible: word-for-word translation

In the early period of the history of the Bible translating, there was a tendency to regard the letter rather than the spirit. As has been introduced in the earlier part that the earliest translation of the scriptures is the Septuagint version, which was completed during 300-200 B.C. Even though this translation guaranteed accuracy to the most extent, it was full of rigidness because of excessive use of literal translation. "Certain sections of the Septuagint are so literal as to be stylistically very awkward, and not infrequently downright bad Greek"(Nida, 2004, p.12).

In the second century AD, Aquila made "a painfully literal translation of the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek, in an attempt to be faithful to the Hebrew original". Also in the same century, Theodotian tried to "make some major improvements in this type of translating"(Grant, 1961, p.25, cited in Nida, 2004, p.12). Despite the effort, many of the translations that employed this approach "were quite literal, and some of them apparently rather haphazard..."(Nida, 2004, p.12).

However, there are reasons for that. Since the Bible is thought to be God-breathed and God's Word in written form, when doing translation, who would not feel trembling inwards and faithfully translate out every word in the Bible, sticking strictly to the original which was being reflected in words, style, grammar, etc.? Saint Augustine's opinion was so representative as saying "whatsoever is in the Scriptures, believe me, is high and divine". Who, then, unless inspired and compelled by the Holy Spirit to do so, upon his own will, would dare enough to "add something to the ancient books, to make changes and corrections in them" (Grant, 1961, p.36, cited in Nida, 2004, p.12)? "It is a manifest falling away from the Faith," said Saint Basil, "and a fault of presumption, either to reject any of those things that are written, or to bring in (upon the head of them) any of those things that are not written"(KJV, preface). And with the involvement of God and the Holy Spirit, here comes the inspiration element. St. Augustine and many others fully believed that the translation of the Septuagint by seventy-two men (six from each of the twelve tribes) was totally inspired and controlled by the Holy Spirit since these

seventy-two scholars were said to have translated the Scriptures by the groups of two and in complete isolation from each other group, and their translations were absolutely identical in all respects. Even though St. Augustine recognized that the Greek Text of the Septuagint does not always agree with the Hebrew original, he ascribed the differences to the work of the Holy Spirit, that the Spirit with divine authority could say through the translators something different from what he had said through the original prophets. "Both the original prophets and the translators, therefore, were inspired by the Holy Spirit" (St. Augustine, *The City of God*, 1843, cited in Nida, 2004, p.26).

A translator could be called "faithful" to the original and especially to God only when he translated "faithfully", and by this "faithfully", it means, in the minds of those who were for literal translation, literal and formal correspondence. Therefore, even there had been those who wanted to make improvements toward a more intelligible translation on the base of literal translation, there were many places in their translations that "were stylistically very awkward and not infrequently downright bad Greek (or other languages) (Nida, 2004, p.12)" and the formal parallelism sometimes distorted the meaningful relationship and the message itself. But, it is probably safe to say this happened because the most important focus in those translators' minds was God. They were being faithful to God.

2.3.1.2 Literal translation of the Bible: sense-for-sense translation

The other sub-group has been more on the sense-for-sense translation side. They regarded the Bible as to be read and understood. If the Gospels were to be disseminated among every nation and to every person, if those of God's people were to be saved, then the message in the Bible must first be intelligible and could be easily understood. And if the message of the translated works was actually distorted in meaning to the original and of bad, confusing and unclear word order, structure and grammar, how could those who read it be supposed to know what it was talking about? Or despite that, if the translated works were actually only suitable for the upper, learned and cultured class of the society because of the highly complex structure, euphuistic words, how could all women, plowmen, weavers, and people who were less learned and cultured be expected to study diligently of the Scriptures as said by Erasmus in his *Exhortations to the Diligent Study of Scripture*.

How could they have the chance of accessing to the Gospels and possibly be saved? Therefore, it could be naturally concluded that the message itself, not the outward words, structures, or forms, is what of real and utmost importance. Sense and spirit of the original work should be what the translators are faithful to. Translators must truly understand the desire of God. That was most probably the reason why so many translators have insisted on translating sense for sense but not word for word and on working toward some intelligible translations.

For these reasons, many Bible translators took great pains when translating the Scriptures. Even though they had to stand up to strong criticisms and questions from others, whether translators or not, they still strived to make what they translated sense to those who were receiving it.

To name but a few:

Symmachus, toward the end of the second century AD, went somewhat further than those ahead or peers of him in the direction of intelligibility, and Jerome said of his work, "He gave the sense of the scripture, not in literal language"(Grant, 1961, in Nida, 2004, p.12). Jerome, who translated both the Old and New Testaments frankly proclaimed and defended his translations as "sense for sense and not word for word"(Nida's 2004, p.13). He claimed the support of Cicero, who, for example, had declared: "What men like you...call fidelity in translation...it is hard to preserve in a translation the charm of expressions which in another language are most felicitous...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"(Nida, 2004, p.13). Another argument Jerome used when defending his translation principles was the manner in which the New Testament writers used when they "freely quoted or adapted the Hebrew original or the Septuagint translation"(Nida, 2004, p.13).

Martin Luther, the dominant figure in the field of translation during the 16th century, who translated the entire Bible into German, sensed the importance of full intelligibility. He not only defended his principles in general terms, namely, that only in this way could people understand and meaning of the Bible, but also carefully and systematically worked out the implications of his principles of translations in matters such as shifts of word order, introduction of connectives when these were required, use of phrases where necessary to translate singe words in the original, etc. (Nida, 2004, p. 15) William Tyndale, in his

11

translation of the New Testament into modern English, was influenced greatly by Luther's principles and these principles "played a major role in the acceptance of Tyndale's work as a basis for later English translations of the New Testament" (Ibid, p. 15).

The statement of translation principles of Etienne Dolet, published in 1540, was quite representative of the opinions of those translators who were for sense-for-sense translation at that time. In this statement, Dolet summarized the fundamental principles of translation as follows:

1. The translator must understand perfectly the content and intention of the author whom he is translating.

2. The translator should have a perfect knowledge of the language from which he is translating and an equally excellent knowledge of the language into which he is translating.

3. The translator should avoid the tendency to translate word for word, for to do so is to destroy the meaning of the original and to ruin the beauty of the expression.

4. The translator should employ the forms of speech in common usage.

5. Through his choice and order of words the translator should produce a total overall effect with appropriate tone (Ibid, p.16).

William Fulke (1583), who had great influence on the translators of the King James Version, "insisted that ecclesiastical tradition must give way to common English usage...(he) contended that 'To translate precisely out of the Hebrew is not to observe the number of words, but the perfect sense and meaning, as the phrase of our tongue will serve to be understood'(Amos, 1920, p.60, in Nida, 2004, p.16)".

All these translators, together with so many others, have firmly insisted on meaningful and intelligible translations while they themselves have had worked so hard and vigorously toward such a goal. And they insisted on translating the Bible into daily, common languages of the people, so that all people might have access to the Message and the chance to get saved.

Such is a general introduction and organization of the history and tradition of the Bible translating. One can possibly note that for those who were against the translation of the Bible and those who were for word-for-word translation, their main reason for these opinions was set on God while for those who were for the translating of the Bible and for a sense-for-sense translation, their main reason was also on God, but on the true desire of God. Those who were on the word-for-word translation side focused on the original work rigidly and outwardly while those who were on the sense-for-sense translation side focused more on the elements of the understandability of the translated works to the receptors and

receivers. That is quite a big difference. However, despite some important contributions to the theories and principles of translation by those concerned with Bible translating, we may use Nida's words as a brief summary: "the actual practice of Bible translating has frequently been far less innovation and creative than, for example, many of the translations of the Greek and Latin Classics in the Loeb series"(Nida, 2001, p.115). Early translations of the Bible, whether translated word-for-word or sense-for-sense, were quite literal, since the translators mainly set their focus and attention on the side of the original.

2.4 A Modern Novel Translation Theory

Over these last forty years, there has been a much noted translation theory called "functional (or dynamic) equivalence", which appeared in the entire translation field in 1960s, having been put forward by Dr. Eugene A. Nida out of his decades of research work and practice concerning the Bible translating projects.

The "functional equivalence" theory was founded basically on a shifted focus, namely, a focus shifted from "the form of the message to the response of the receptor"(Nida and Taber, 2004, p.1). Even it is the fact that the past theories and theorists prior to Nida or his peers might have noticed the elements of the receptors of both the original and translated texts concerning the field of the Bible translation with the latter as the main focus, never has there been a person who has taken such radical and courageous steps as shifting the focus from the original to the target, and especially to the target audience of other cultures. Such a big step requires much courage, insights and conviction as well. As Nida said himself when commenting on Jerome's work, "Any departure from past tradition not only brings criticism from those who retain their preference for the old ('And no one after drinking old wine desires new; for he says, 'The old is good', Luke 5:39), but also inevitably raises questions for and from those who are justifiably confused by differences of translation"(Nida, 2004, p.13).

Nida stated functional equivalence primarily in terms of a comparison of "the way in which the original receptors understood and appreciated the text and the way in which receptors of the translated text understand and appreciate the translated text"(Nida, 2001, p.86). Nida and his supporters focused their attention on the receptors and the response of the receptors, not only of the receptors of the original texts but also, and most especially, of the translated

texts. They looked at translation problems from this perspective and worked out translation principles accordingly. And they have given many reasons for that new focus and new orientation.

Unlike those who have set their eyes and attention primarily on the holiness of the Scriptures and the original texts, Nida and his colleagues have treated the Bible more from a linguistic and cultural point. This does not necessarily mean that they are not serious about the involvement of God and the Spirit. As Nida himself puts it, "But dealing with any religious document such as the Bible, one must bear in mind that its contemporary significance is not determined merely by what it meant to those who first received it, but by what it has come to mean to people throughout the intervening years"(Nida, 2004, p.26). They talked about the significance of the Bible, which, as can be seen in their statements, lies heavily in the response of the receivers. This is their point. Since the significance of the original Bible is that it is meant for all those who hear the message, then how receivers would act is of major importance. And if how those who first received the original message was very important, so it should be equally important for contemporary readers. Their understanding rightly of the translated Bible should be the major concern of translators. And that is the standing ground and starting point. Accordingly, their focus is more on the message itself as a whole and more on the philological side of the Bible. As reflected from Nida's book *Toward a Science of Translating*, he and his colleagues seem to have treated Bible translating from a scientific way. A translation making sense is what Nida puts in the first place. Languages differing radically one from the other being the fundamental fact, and since "translating means communicating, and this process depends on what is received by persons hearing or reading a translation. Judging the validity of a translation cannot stop with a comparison of corresponding lexical meanings, grammatical classes, and rhetorical devices"(Nida, 2001, p.86). This means, "a translator must go beyond the lexical structures to consider the manner in which an intended audience is likely to understand a text, because so much depends on the underlying presuppositions of the respective source and target cultures"(Nida and Taber, 2004, preface vii).

In order to reproduce a translation that is functionally equivalent to the original text in terms of the receptors' response, it is essential that the translator or translators should reproduce "in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style"(Nida and Taber, 2004, p.12), a statement

14

describing functional equivalence from a different angle. From this statement, Nida and Taber keenly picked out some of the fundamental points and gave them further discussion and explanation. First, it is the *equivalent message* that should be aimed to achieve when reproducing. And "to reproduce the message one must make a good many grammatical and lexical adjustments"(Ibid, p.12). They used an example of the translation of a Hebrew idiom meaning "tender compassion". If literally translated, the English translation should be "bowels of mercies", a weird combination of words that actually does not exist in English language and therefore cannot convey the actual message of the original. As a result, one has to sacrifice the form of the original in order to accurately reproduce the message. Second, it is *equivalence* rather than identity one should aim to achieve when translating. This reinforces the need for sometimes rather radical alteration. Using the above example, the literal rendering of "bowels of mercies" just doesn't make much sense and quite meaningless, radical alteration is needed and justified if translators are to reproduce equivalence texts. Third, the equivalent should be natural. A qualified translation should not sound like a translation. Translators should avoid "translationese", i.e. formal fidelity, which would only result in unfaithfulness to the content and the impact of the message. Fourth, the translation should be the closest equivalent. For example, a natural equivalent in present-day English for "demon-possessed" would be "mentally distressed", but this is not the closest equivalent. One should take the cultural background of the people of Biblical times into consideration when doing translation and should seek the closest natural equivalent rather than some natural but only near equivalents. Fifth, the meaning must be given priority, "for it is the content of the message which is of prime importance for Bible translating", and "this means that certain rather radical departures from the formal structure are not only legitimate but may even be highly desirable"(Ibid, p.13). Lastly, about the significance of style, Nida and Taber also attached great importance to it. Poetry should be translated into poetry, expository material should be translated into the same. Whenever possible and feasible, by which it is meant not resulting in unequivalent, unnatural or undesirable, style and form should be taken into great care when the original texts being translated. But it is "functional equivalence which is required, whether on the level of content or on the level of style"(Ibid, p.14).

In order to help translators determine what to be done when facing these opposing sets of features, Nida and Taber also set up certain sets of fundamental priorities for

guidance in the process of translation. Namely, "(1) contextual consistency has priority over verbal consistency (or word-for-word concordance), (2) dynamic equivalence has priority over formal correspondence, (3) the aural (heard) form of language has priority over the written form, (4) forms that are used by and acceptable to the audience for which a translation is intended have priority over forms that may be traditionally more prestigious"(Ibid, p.14).

By saying contextual consistency has priority over verbal consistency, it means translators should choose the *right* word in the receptor language to translate a word in the source language rather than always translate this word in the source language into a fixed corresponding word in the receptor language. And this does not apply only to translation of words, but also of phrases, clause order, etc. The reason for such a priority is primarily that the verbal concordance would often not be able to accurately reproduce the meaning of the word, phrases, etc. in the original texts and therefore result in an unequivalent, unnatural, misleading or even wrong translation.

The second priority is based upon the reactions of the receptors. In talking about the reactions of the receptors, a translation must first be intelligible. Yet, "such intelligibility is not, however, to be measured merely in terms of whether the words are understandable and the sentences grammatically constructed, but in terms of the total impact the message has on the one who receives it"(Ibid, p.22). Dynamic equivalence is "to be defined in terms of the degree to which the receptors of the message in the receptor language respond to it in substantially the same manner as the receptors in the source language"(Ibid, p.22). Since the cultural and historical settings of both the original and the receptor languages are too different, the response of the receptors of the original and target languages can never be identical, but "there should be a high degree of equivalence of response, or the translation will have failed to accomplish its purpose"(Ibid, p.22). The measurement of the degree, as suggested by Nida and Taber, should be carried out from three major functions of a successful communication, namely, informative function, expressive function and imperative function as well, so that the receptors in the second language will not only comprehend the information of a translation, but will also feel its relevance and then respond to it in action.

The third priority is particularly important for the translations of the Bible, since the Bible is frequently read in worship services whether in public or private groups and therefore heard far more than it is read personally. Many people when studying the Bible

personally would often read out and listen to what they have said. And most importantly, "if it can be understood by the average hearer it is more likely to be fully intelligible when it is read silently"(Ibid, p.31).

The fourth priority of the needs of the audience over the forms of language means "one must attach greater importance to the forms understood and accepted by the audience for which a translation is designed than to the forms which may possess a longer linguistic tradition or have greater literary prestige"(Ibid, p.31). Combining the special evangelistic purpose of the Bible, the types of audience should be given careful and broad analysis and kept in mind before and during the process of the translating of the Bible.

These are main elements that constitute the theory of functional equivalence. From all the above points and argument, we can clearly see that Nida and his colleagues have put emphasis and concentration more on the readers' side, they compare the responses of the receptors of the original work with that of the translated work, with the latter as they main focus. It is surely safe to say that such a translation theory and practice accordingly is readers-oriented, not original-oriented as before. And based upon such translation theory of functional equivalence, and all the considerations, principles and priorities, a new English translation of the Bile—*Good News Bible, Today's English Version* was produced during 1970s.

Chapter 3. A Shift from Original Orientation to Receptors Orientation in Bible Translation: A Hypothesis

In the above chapters, I first discussed the uniqueness of the Holy Bible. Such uniqueness certainly has something to do with the various theories and practice concerning Bible translation and the much-heated debate over them. After we have taken a closer look at the traditional Bible translation theories and various viewpoints in the second part, and one of the modern theories known as Nida's functional equivalence, while taking the distinctive features of the Holy Bible closely in mind, it is not difficult to find some cause and effect inter-relations, and come to the following hypotheses:

(1) The orientation concerning the Bible translating theory and practice has quite clearly shifted from the original texts of the source language to the receptors.

(2) Such an apparent shift in orientation implies some inner, very important shifts of focuses as well. First, it is a shift from God and the sacredness of his words to his desire behind those words, and second, a shift from God alone to the focus that also takes the element of men's involvement into consideration.

The first hypothesis is the obvious shift from the original to the receptors, i.e. the original receptors' response to the original texts and that of the receptors of the language into which the translation is made, with the latter as the main focus. Naturally, the shift requires obvious, sometimes even rather radical changes in the practice of the Bible translating process. As discussed above, both the two large groups with different orientations have their arguments and reasons, and we can hardly judge which is right or which is better, since "by close attention to literal wording and formal correspondence one can be transported back to an earlier culture or off to some contemporary, but foreign one"(Nida, 2004, p.25), and sense-for-sense translation brings that earlier culture to us contemporary and foreign receptors while functional equivalent translation enables us contemporary but foreign receptors to understand, feel and respond in a high degree in the same way the original receptors have understood, felt and responded to the original message, and very importantly, in a natural and easy way. In this sense, and if seen from the communication's end as it is being so popular and important in this time, we see the new orientation and focus does have many advantages. As Nida puts it, "literalness and formal agreement do not let us feel really at home in such a strange literary land, nor do they actually help us to appreciate as we should how this same message must have impressed those who first heard it. Without some adjustments in form and content, at times even rather radical, no literary translation can fully accomplish its real purpose"(Ibid, p.26).

The two implications of the second hypothesis, even though they seem little to do with the actual translation process of the Bible, are very important, if not dominant, inner and deep-rooted incentives that urge translators to translate in certain ways and directions. Nida has fully recognized the role that new-orthodox theology has played in the ideologies of translators. He thinks that the new-orthodox theology has given a new perspective to the doctrine of divine inspiration. It perceives inspiration primarily in terms of the response of the receptor. Such a conception, in Nida's opinion, brings inevitably a shifted attention from the details of wording in the original to the means by which the same message can be

communicated effectively to present-day readers. They, therefore, tend to be freer in their translating. On the other hand, those who have combined orthodox theology with deep evangelistic or missionary convictions have been equally concerned with the need for making translations entirely meaningful (Ibid, p.27).

To disseminate the Gospels has remained an everlasting battle cry for more and more meaningful translations. If translators are more concerned with the message of salvation, which is of no doubt one of the main themes of the whole Bible and seen to be the clear desire of God, they would more naturally and easily prefer to and adopt the translation theories aimed at this end. We see that those translators who have been more concerned with the sacredness of the Bible, prefer sticking more closely to the original, and their translations would accordingly be quite close to the features and structures of the original texts. They are more concerned to faithfully translate the so-called God's sacred word, more often than not neglecting without knowing it the overall comprehensibility and the response of the receptors of the language into which the translation was being made.

The new orientation, however, focuses more on the response of the receptors of the translated texts—how they would act toward the message they received, which seems to be a manifest and real purpose in the Bible itself, since the Bible not only needs to be understood, but also to be responded in certain expected way by those who receive it. It's in this sense that I say that the translators of the new orientation and focus have grasped the true desire of God. And they hold a more objective view in understanding the Bible. They see the Bible as not only the word of God but it was also written by imperfect men. And if translators are not only focusing on God and the sacredness of his words alone, but also taking into careful consideration the human involvement in the writing of the Bible, the differences in the writers themselves, their backgrounds, times and situations when they wrote the books of the Bible, etc., they would naturally place much emphasis on those elements and work out translation principles accordingly. Therefore, they indeed have treated and translated the Bible from a more objective and scientific way. It was with such aims and considerations in mind that the translators have this new orientation, an orientation set on the receptors.

From the above discussion, it is not difficult for us to see that these hypotheses are organically related. The implications of the second hypothesis in some sense serve the

incentives and causes of the different orientations and shift from one orientation to the other. The old orientation and focus was exclusively on the side of the so-called author of the Bible—God and sought outward wording faithfulness, while the new orientation and focus has been on the perceived desire of God and the human involvement as well.

In order to well illustrate the above hypotheses, in the next chapter, we will use some of the best representative translation versions of the Holy Bible, and make some careful comparisons and illustrations.

Chapter 4. A Comparative Study across Different Translation Versions

As I have said in earlier chapters, those who are original-oriented tend to favor formal correspondence, i.e. formal equivalence that focuses attention not only on the message itself, but also on the form. "Viewed from this formal orientation, one is concerned that the message in the receptor language should match as closely as possible the different elements in the source language. This means, for example, that the message in the receptor culture is constantly compared with the message in the source culture to determine standards of accuracy and correctness"(Nida, 2004, p.159). Translations based on this orientation are often, in order to reveal as much as possible of the form and content of the original message, result in close, sometimes even rigid formal correspondences concerning not only the various layers of the languages such as sounds, lexicon, syntax, and discourse but also types and structures of discourse, and rhetorical features as well.

In contrast, those who are receptors-oriented, especially concerned with the orientation on the receivers of the receptor language, will most probably prefer dynamic equivalence, aiming at reproducing equivalent effect. "In such a translation one is not so concerned with matching the receptor-language message with the source-language message, but with the dynamic relationship, that the relationship between receptor and message should be substantially the same as that which existed between the original receptors and the message...(And it) aims at complete naturalness of expression, and tries to relate the receptor to modes of behavior relevant within the context of his own culture; it does not insist that he understand the cultural patterns of the source-language context in order to comprehend the message..."(Ibid, p.159). Such an orientation

and focus would also inevitably be reflected in the translation at the various levels and aspects of the language that is used.

Before we move on to further discussions and illustrations, we also have to make a choice amongst the vast number of different translations of the Bible. After careful study, I have selected four translated versions of the Bible, the versions that best serve our purpose and best represent the different orientations and principles employed in the process of translation: (1) King James Bible (KJV), (2) Revised Standard Version Bible (RSV), (3) the Holy Bible—New International Version and (4) Good News Bible—Today's English Version (GNB). Before we begin our discussion, a short introduction of these four versions seems quite desirable.

The King James Version Bible was made at the commission of King James I of England in 1604, given the pressing demand of a "more exact translation of the holy Scriptures into the English Tongue" (Nida, 2004, p.17) and finished in 1611. In the process of translation, the translators received many censures and imputations from Popish persons at home or abroad who "desire still to keep (ordinary people) in ignorance and darkness"(Ibid). Translators of the KJV Bible "did not develop new principles or theories of translation. Actually, they were not seeking to do something new, but rather to select the best of what had been included in previous translation, as the preface, *The Translators to the Reader*, clearly states"(Ibid). They actually did a job to "have the translations of the Bible (made in earlier times) maturely considered of and examined...and altering and amending their translations oft"(preface of KJV). As said in the preface of the RSV Bible, "The translators who made the King James Version took into account all of these preceding versions; and comparison shows that it owes something to each of them. It kept felicitous phrases and apt expressions, from whatever source, which had stood the test of public usage"(Nida, 2004, p.17). The version itself "turned out to be a remarkably fine translation, owing to the unusually good sense the translators showed in matters of exegesis and their extraordinary sensitivity to the style of speech appropriate in public reading...It served to cast a very long shadow over Bible translating in many languages for several centuries"(Ibid). However, when admitting the excellency and great improvements in the KJV Bible, it is also natural for us to say that it still belongs the literal translation side since most of the translations which served to be the sources from which the KJV translators made choices of best translations for words of the Holy Bible were literally transalted. In later discussions, we will get a closer look at that.

The Revised Standard Version of the Bible (RSV), as is stated in its preface, "is an authorized revision of the American Standard Version, published in 1901, which was a revision of the King James Version, published in 1611".

The New Testament of the Revised Standard Version was translated from the Greek, being the version set forth A.D.1611, revised A.D.1881 and A.D.1901, compared with the most ancient authorities and revised again and published in A.D.1946. The complete version was published in 1952. In overall speaking, this translation leans more toward the literal rendering side, even though not the most literal.

The Holy Bible of New International Version is a completely new translation of the Bible, translated directly from the best available original texts. It was first published in 1973, and revised in 1978 and 1984. The first concern, as is stated by its translators in the preface, was "the accuracy of the translation and its fidelity to the thought of the biblical writers." "They have weighed the significance of the lexical and grammatical details of the Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek texts. At the same time, they have striven for more than word-for-word translation. Because thought patterns and syntax differ from language to language, faithful communication of the meaning of the writers of the Bible demands frequent modifications in sentence structure and constant regard for the contextual meanings of words"(preface of NIV). Accordingly, the New International Version of the Bible turned out to be more than a word-for-word translation.

The New Testament of the Good News Bible in Today's English Version was published in 1966 by the American Bible Society (ABS) and its Old Testament was made at the request of the United Bible Societies and published in 1976. The translation was made according to functional equivalence theory and principles of translation set forth by Dr. Eugene Nida, who since 1946 had been the Executive Secretary of the ABS Translations Department. Therefore, undoubtedly, this version best reflects at least all the major thoughts, opinions, theories and principles put forward by Dr. Nida and his colleagues. The translation, according to its translators as stated in its preface, does not follow the traditional vocabulary and style of the historic English Bible versions. Instead, it attempts to present the Biblical content and message in standard, everyday and natural English. It aims at giving today's readers maximum understanding of the content of the original texts. The translators' primary concern has been to provide a faithful translation of the meaning of the original texts. Their first task, therefore, is to understand correctly the

meaning of the original. Their next task is to express that meaning in a manner and form easily understood by the readers. Since this translation is intended for all who use English as a means of communication, they have tried to avoid words and forms not in current or widespread use, making effort in using a language that is natural, clear, simple, and unambiguous. Consequently they have not attempted strictly to reproduce in English the parts of speech, sentence-structure, word-order, and grammatical devices of the original languages. Their faithfulness in translation has been a faithful representation of the cultural and historical features of the original, without any attempt to modernize the text. They, however, give certain features their modern equivalents, such as the hours of the day and the measures of weight, capacity, distance, and area and the metric system of weights and measures, since, in their minds, the information contained in those terms is of greater importance to the reader than the biblical form of those terms. The metric system of weights and measures had been adopted in the British editions. Their main purpose can be clearly seen in the preface: "The Bible is not simply great literature to be admired and revered; it is Good News for all people everywhere—a message both to be understood and to be applied in daily life"(Preface of GNB).

After the introduction of these four translated versions of the Bible, I will now move on to the comparison and illustration part. As I have said in the above that the two distinctively different orientations, i.e. orientation on the original texts and orientation on the receptors, can be well revealed in their according translations, we will illustrate these hypothetical points by picking out from the four translations of the Bible and making some comparisons. Mainly, I will set up three dimensions as measuring criteria while doing comparisons, i.e. (1) closeness of the renderings with the original texts, (2) naturalness of the translations, and (3) equivalence to the original. By these three dimensions, we, while making comparisons of the different translations of these four versions of the Bible, will get a clearer look at and deeper understanding of the hidden orientations at work in the processes of the Bible translation. Next, the following areas have been set up for making comparisons and analyses: (1) translations of certain words of the original texts, (2) translations of idioms and metaphors of the original texts, (3) translation of certain styles of the original. In the process of comparing different renderings of the same original, we will use the above-mentioned three measuring criteria to describe and analyze the

orientations and principles that are hidden behind different renderings.

Before we actually start, I think we should always bear one most important thing in mind, that is, we are doing comparisons and analysis to illustrate the point we are striving to reach and the hypotheses we are concerned to confirm, the point and hypotheses of the shift of the orientations from the original to the receptors and a hidden shift of the focus from the outward faithfulness to God to the deep faithfulness to the desire of God which is understood by many Christians. Our comparisons and analyses will be aimed at to meet this end.

4.1 A comparative analysis of lexical items in different translation versions

As I have said in earlier chapters that those who set the focus on the original would be oriented that way, they would, therefore, favor more the formal correspondence in the translating process, which means their translations often result in close sometimes even rigid matches with the elements and structures of the original texts. As far as translation of lexical items of the original is concerned, translators who are original-oriented and adopt formal correspondence theories and principles would more often than not stick to verbal consistency, i.e. "always translating one word in the source language by a corresponding word in the receptor language"(Nida and Taber, 2004, p.15). This is especially the case when translators translate certain single lexical items of the original.

4.1.1 Example: Translation of the Greek term *soma* (often spoken of as meaning "body") (from Nida and Taber, 2004, p.15)

    1). Matt. 10:28

    KJV: kill the body

    RSV: kill the body

    NIV: kill the body

    GNB: kill the body

    2). Deut. 28:4

KJV: the fruit of thy body

RSV: the fruit of thy body

NIV: the fruit of your womb

GNB: many children

3). Dan. 7:15

KJV: my spirit in the midst of my body

RSV: my spirit within me

NIV: spirit

GNB: alarmed me

4). Mark 5:29

KJV: she felt in her body

RSV: she felt in her body

NIV: she felt in her body

GNB: she had the feeling inside herself

If we arrange these key terms in the following table, the different renderings will be all the more evident:

	KJV	RSV	NIV	GMB
Matt. 10:28	body	body	body	body
Deut. 28:4	body	body	womb	children
Dan. 7:15	body	me	——	me
Mark 5:29	body	body	body	herself

Table 1

The above renderings of the same original Greek word *soma* from the left to right shows the different degree of closeness to the original on the level of lexical correspondence. We see that KJV strictly sticks to verbal consistency and always translates certain lexical items in the original with the same corresponding word in the receptor language. RSV and NIV have made some alterations in several places while GNB freely renders the same word in the source language with different, sometimes even rather radical expressions in the receptor language.

Here we see the principle different versions stick to. The KJV translators must have adhered strictly to the formal correspondence, the GNB translators to the functional

equivalence, while the RSV more toward KJV side and NIV more on GNB side. Next question we should ask is if and why such alterations and departures from verbal consistency are justified. To answer this question, we need to think whether or not the formal correspondence is fully adequate, or is it sometimes unnatural?

In Matt. 10:28, the rendering of the "body" is quite adequate and natural in the English usage, since the word "body" here is a natural equivalent to the original word. In Deut. 28:4, the literal rendering of the "body" in saying "the fruit of the body", however, seems quite unnatural, unidiomatic and misleading, for we usually say "the fruit of something (your labor, etc.)", or "the fruit of a woman's womb" in literature, indicating her children. But the combination of the words as "the fruit of the body" seems rather awkward and misleading, for it seems that fruit of one's body may refer to many things, not only children, let alone its referring to the children is quite hard to figure out. From this point, we see that NIV's rendering follows more closely the principle of naturalness and understandability. GNB has made a rather radical change in choice of words, the translation avoids literal but misleading and unnatural renderings, simply using "children" instead. Even though it may have sacrificed the flavor of the original, it seems to have rightly and clearly reproduced the meaning of the original. The third sentence, Dan. 7:15, KJV's rendering as "my spirit in the midst of my body" sounds quite weird, unnatural and redundant, since one's spirit is definitely within one's body. The short but clear-cut rendering as just the "spirit" can be justified in correctly and adequately representing the meaning of the original. The GNB rendering totally rejects the formal correspondence, it does not even translate the word "spirit" out in the receptor language. Instead, it translates out the meaning not the words of the original sentence into "the visions I saw alarmed me", instead of others' "troubled in the spirit". Clearly, such treatment is a direct result of the different orientation in translation. The fourth sentence, Mark 5:29, all the three, KJV, RSV and NIV make same renderings as "she felt in her body". However, in English, the proper way of expressing this idea would be "she feels/knows in herself". The renderings of the three are quite awkward and unnatural. The GNB renders this sentence into "she had the feeling inside herself", which sounds quite natural and idiomatic.

Now that we have made the above comparisons and analyses, we can measure these different renderings more readily and easily with the three standards, i.e. closeness to the

original, naturalness of the translation and equivalence to the original. Clearly, the KJV renderings are the closest to the original, its translators faithfully and readily translated each and every word in the source language, and always with the same corresponding equivalent in the receptor language. However, in these four sentences, three of them sound somewhat, if not quite, unnatural, unidiomatic in the receptor language. We can say that those renderings are only superficial equivalents to the original, with a result that receptors of the translated texts might find the texts quite weird and unnatural, not being able to comprehend and appreciate in nearly the same way as receptors of the original texts would do. It is, therefore, quite evident that the orientation of the KJV translators is set on the original rather than the receptors, because their main attention is focused on reproducing a formal correspondence that is as close to the original as possible. Seeing from the renderings of the RSV and NIV, it seems that translators of both versions mostly adopt the formal correspondence principle and are original oriented, but they are also somewhat concerned with the comprehensibility of their translations, and therefore, make some adjustments and alterations whenever they deem possible. The translators of the GNB Bible, however, radically depart from the original. They render more freely and readily the same word in the original with different words and phrases in the receptor language. The renderings are least close to the original, but they are quite natural and idiomatic in the receptor language. In some sense, these renderings are some "real" equivalents to the original words and language, meaning, they are not superficial equivalents, but deep, natural equivalents to the original. We also see that the translators of the GNB version are more concerned with easiness, naturalness, deep equivalence of the translation as well as the comprehensibility and response of the receptors of their translations. From this, we see that their orientation is set on the receptors, and especially receptors of the language into which the translation is being made.

If we arrange these analyses into a diagram, these different orientations can be more evident:

	KJV	RSV	NIV	GNB
Closeness to the original	Yes	Mostly Yes	Mostly Yes	Mostly Not

Naturalness of the translations	Mostly Not	Sometimes Not	Sometimes Not	Yes
Equivalence to the original	To what's superficial	Mostly superficial	Sometimes superficial	To the meaning of the original

Table 2

From the above comparisons and analysis, we can clearly see the two different orientations dominating the translation process. We see that KJV translators are strictly original oriented and follow a formal correspondence principle, those of RSV and NIV also are mostly original oriented, they stick to the formal correspondence wherever possible, making alterations only when necessary in order to make translation more natural and idiomatic in the receptor language, while translator of the GNB are quite evidently receptor oriented, aiming to reproduce a translation functionally equivalent in the response of the receptors of the receptor language with that of the original.

We will see another example to make this point even more evident.

4.1.2 Example: Translation of the Greek term *sarks*, literally means "flesh"

1). Gen. 2:21

KJV: closed up the flesh

RSV: closed up its place with flesh

NIV: closed up the place with flesh

GNB: closed up the flesh

2). Gen. 6:13

KJV: the end of all flesh

RSV: make an end of all flesh

NIV: put an end to all people

GNB: put an end to all mankind

3). 2 Cor. 7:5

KJV: our flesh had no rest

RSV: our bodies had no rest

NIV: this body of ours had no rest

GNB: we had no rest

4). Jude 1:7

KJV: going after strange flesh

RSV: indulged in unnatural lust

NIV: (gave themselves up to sexual immorality and) perversion

GNB: (indulged in sexual immorality and) perversion

The following table of arrangement of above renderings helps to see the point more clearly:

	KJV	RSV	NIV	GNB
Gen. 2:21	flesh	flesh	flesh	flesh
Gen. 6:13	flesh	flesh	people	mankind
2 Cor. 7:5	flesh	bodies	body	we
Jude 1:7	flesh	lust	perversion	perversion

Table 3

If we take a close look at these renderings, we see that the first sentence, Gen. 2:21, the renderings of the original word as the "flesh" is a natural and correct equivalent to the original word. In the second sentence of Gen.6:13, both KJV and RSV render as "all flesh" while the NIV and GNB render into "all people" and "all mankind" respectively. Clearly in modern English, the word "flesh" does not possess the definition of human beings, and the renderings of the KJV and RSV, therefore, are quite unnatural and unidiomatic. As to 2 Cor. 7:5, today's people simply don't say "the flesh has no rest", nor do they often say "the body has no rest", they naturally say that "someone has no rest", therefore, the renderings of the first three are all somewhat unnatural. The rendering of the fourth one, Jude 1:7 in KJV Bible is downright strange and awkward, while the renderings of the rest of the three are quite natural and clear.

We see that the KJV still sticks to close verbal consistency, its renderings are rigidly close and superficially equivalent to the original word, but in most cases, they were very unnatural and awkward. RSV has made some alterations on the basis of formal correspondence, its renderings are, more of than not, close matches and superficial

equivalents to the original words, but sometimes are unnatural and unidiomatic. The NIV translators have made somewhat bigger changes in making natural and idiomatic translations. The GNB, however, radically departs from the original word and structure in places 2, 3, and 4. Its renderings are least close to the original, however, it does translate out clearly the meaning of the original, and therefore, are equivalent in meaning to the original. The renderings are also very natural and idiomatic. We see that the same Table 2 can still be applicable in this example. And we also see quite clear the different orientations dominating the translations process and resulting in different translations.

The above two examples help us to see more clearly the shift of the orientation and the different translation principles adopted and translation results accordingly. We see that the translators with their orientation focused on the original often produce rigid formal correspondence and the renderings sometimes are awfully awkward and unnatural in the receptor language, but closely matched to the original, while the translators with the orientation and focus set on the receptors, and especially on the receptors of the receptor language, often reproduce natural and idiomatic translations. They may depart radically from the original, but the meanings of their translations are in accordance with that of the original in a dynamic way.

4.2 A comparative analysis of idioms in different translation versions

Phrases like idioms are commonplace in most languages. We know that the meanings of idioms are different from the meanings of the separate words from which they are formed, nor are they the same with the superficial meanings of the words combined together. And we know that translators, when coming across idioms and metaphors in the source language, need to be very careful and mindful of the real meanings that are hidden behind the words that combine together. What is worse is that, due to the gaps of different cultures and languages, sometimes, it becomes even more difficult when there are no corresponding idioms and metaphors in the receptor language that are equivalent to the original in the source language. The choices posed for translators are set but narrow. The difference in their orientation, however, often places the dominant role in the choice of translation principles and the result of the translations.

When comparing different renderings of certain idioms and metaphors of the original texts, we will, as before, still use the three measuring criteria of the closeness to the original, equivalence to the original and the naturalness of the translations to analyze the renderings of different versions of the same original, and to illustrate the different orientations and focuses behind the translations.

4.2.1 Example: Rom. 12:20

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

RSV: No, "if your enemy is hungry, feed him; if he is thirsty, give him drink; for by so doing you will heap burning coals upon his head."

NIV: On the contrary: "If your enemy is hungry, feed him; if he is thirsty, give him something to drink. In doing this, you will heap burning coals on his head."

GNB: Instead, as the scripture says: "If your enemy is hungry, feed him; if he is thirsty, give him a drink; for by doing this you will make him burn with shame."

The idiom "to heap coals on one's head" in the Greek original actually means "to make someone feel ashamed"(Nida and Taber, 2004, p.106). In the above four translations, we see that all the first three just render the idiom literally. Honestly, being a Christian myself for all these five or six years, I've always thought of the meaning of this verse is that God would take revenge for us if we were kind to our enemies when we were actually persecuted or ill-treated by them, because in the previous verses, it says "Do not take revenge, my friends, but leave room for God's wrath, for it is written: 'It is mine to avenge; I will repay,' says the Lord"(Rom. 12: 19, NIV). Even if without this previous verse, and only reading this verse 20, hardly could readers figure out the true meaning of such saying. They would only be so confused and very much in the dark about these words. This is the unsatisfactory result of translating certain idioms of the source language so literally and directly, without translating out at the same time, or at least make some explanatory notes in the margin, the real meanings of these idioms.

In his *Language and Culture: Contexts in Translating (I)*, Nida talks about the principles for producing functional equivalence that if a close, formal translation is likely

to result in a misunderstanding of the designative and/or associative meaning, then, "(a) certain changes must be introduced into the text of the translation or (b) the literal translation may be retained and a footnote explaining the likely misunderstanding must be added...In practically all circumstances the first alternative in this principle should be followed..."(p.92)

Clearly, the literal renderings of the idiom "to heap coals on one's head" of the first three translations do result in some serious misunderstanding of the real meaning the original writer intended to convey, and these literal renderings become a difficulty and obstacle in the comprehending process to the receptors of the translations.

The rendering of the GNB, however, rejects the literal rendering and gives its real meaning directly, "to make him burn with shame". One has to say that, even it is true that such rendering lost the flavor of the original, it does succeed in correctly communicating to the receptors the real meaning of the idiom and the true intention of the original writer in using this idiom, if evaluated in accordance with the principle of Functional Equivalence. Apart from that, we see that the GNB translators do have made some effort in making compensations of the lost of the original flavor. They, instead of rendering as "to make him ashamed" or phrases like that, add "burn" to the phrase indicating the kind of stuff that makes the enemies feel ashamed.

Based upon the above analysis, we can easily measure these renderings with the three criteria. We see that the KJV, RSV and NIV renderings are all very close matches to the original idiom, but they are only equivalents to the original on the surface level and quite unnatural in the English usage. And such renderings bring much difficulty to the receptors of the translations in their proper understanding of the meaning of texts. On the other hand, we see that the rendering of the GNB has properly followed the principles of Functional Equivalence and found a proper equivalent to the original idiom in the deep level. It accurately transfers the meaning of the original idiom with the words that are natural and proper in the receptor language.

Again from such comparisons, we can see the two opposing orientation dominating the process and result of translation. It is manifest that the KJV, RSV and NIV translators focus mostly on the original and are oriented that way. They are being faithful to the original, putting most of their attention to the original and somewhat neglecting the comprehensibility and naturalness of their translations, while the GNB translators are

32

clearly receptors-oriented, aiming at producing the meaning of the original texts in order that receptors might not only properly and accurately comprehend the original message, but also respond accordingly. The translators are avoiding giving much trouble to the receptors of the translation. Behind such different orientations, we can also see the inner different orientations on the proper understanding the Bible and the desire of God. The GNB translators perceive the importance of disseminating God's message contained in the Bible, they understand it as God's desire for people of different languages and cultures to hear the massage, and to respond to the message. And in order that the receptors of the different languages respond at least nearly the same with those of the source language, the meaning of the message is in the first priority and what translators have to make clear.

We may look at another example.

4.2.2 Example: Amos 4:6

KJV: And I also have given you cleanness of teeth in all your cities, and want of bread in all your places: yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the LORD.

RSV: "I gave you cleanness of teeth in all your cities, and lack of bread in all your places, yet you did not return to me," days the LORD.

NIV: "I gave you empty stomachs in every city and lack of bread in every town, yet you have not returned to me," declares the LORD. (footnote: Hebrew *you cleanness of teeth*)

GNB: "I was the one who brought famine to all your cities, yet you did not come back to me."

The Hebrew idiom "cleanness of teeth" is usually used to indicate famine and hunger in the original language. Both the KJV and RSV translators render this idiom literally. If we look only at the first part of the sentence, we would undoubtedly find it difficult to understand. Only when we look at the whole sentence together might we figure out that the writer here is indicating something like hunger or starvation. However, it would be still confusing and difficult to grasp the accurate meaning of this idiom. In the translation of the NIV, even though the translators render it in some different way, "the empty stomachs" still sounds quite unnatural and unidiomatic in English for average receptors. The GNB

rendering is very straight and simple, it replaces the idiom with the simple one word "famine". However, while we have to admit that such rendering is correct in conveying the meaning of the original idiom, it seems too direct and loses some flavor of the original. One would properly wonder if there are any other better renderings.

Again from the above analysis, we can clearly see that both the KJV and RSV renderings are close to the original but only superficial equivalents to the original, not exactly conveying the real meaning of the original, and not so natural in the receptor language. They are obviously the results from the orientation set on the original and they are only being "faithful" to God's word and God on a surface level. The GNB rendering, however, is a proper and natural equivalent to the meaning of the original idiom, even though it is far from being close to the original idiom in form. We see that such a rendering is also a direct result from the orientation set on the receptors, especially on the receptors of the language into which the translation is being made. And it is also a result from the hidden orientation which is set on the true desire of God understood by Christians, which is to bring salvation to all mankind. They know that to make people accurately understand the message is the first priority which is crucial in evoking their proper response. ·

4.3 A comparative analysis of styles in different translation versions

Even though style is considered by some translators and theorists as only secondly important compared to the meaning of the message, one has to admit that it is of great significance in many cases if translators want to reproduce an appropriate and natural translation that is equivalent to the original texts, especially to the meaning of the original. Without many doubts, each and every language has its various styles, either about formal or about lexical. Some of the stylistic features of a certain language may be common in other languages, but certainly, there are styles that belong uniquely to it. While doing translation from one language to another, translators who are on the formal correspondence side may probably think it is part of their responsibility to take great care of the original stylistic feature and make their translations of equivalent stylistic features to the original. While on the other hand, most translators who lean more toward the side of functional equivalence would regard reproducing the meaning of the original as their supreme

responsibility. And if they encounter problems and have to make a choice between meaning and style, as almost every translator would sometimes face the choice, they would probably sacrifice the style in order to correctly and appropriately render the original meaning. To Nida and his colleagues, to reproduce a translation that is the closest equivalent in meaning to the original and most natural in the language they have translated into and also of the nearly same degree in provoking receptors' response certainly exceeds the style of the original, since too much attention on stylistic features, if not every time and in every case, would certainly affect translators' logic fluency in the natural and ease flow of language they are translating into. The components of the style are just too many to exhaust. Largely, as I have said previously, they fall into two general categories. One category is formal components of styles. The other is lexical components. In the following, I will narrow our illustration by citing several examples from the above four translations of the Bible and analyzing them. With the analyses, we will see the difference in orientation behind the actual translations of the Bible and the shift of the deeper focuses that seem to be dominating translators' thoughts and opinions.

4.3.1 Example: Translation of the Semitic Greek conjunction "kai" (literally meaning "and") (from Nida and Taber, 2004, p.14)

Matt. 17:1-4

KJV: [1]And after six days Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into an high mountain apart. [2]And was transfigured before them: and his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light. [3]And, behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him. [4]Then answered Peter, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias.

RSV: [1]And after six days Jesus took with him Peter and James and John his brother, and led them up a high mountain apart. [2]And he was transfigured before them, and his face shone like the sun, and his garments became white as light. [3]And behold, there appeared to them Moses and Elijah, talking with him. [4]And Peter said to Jesus, "Lord, it is well that we are here; if you wish, I will make three booths here, one for you and one for Moses and one

for Elijah."

NIV: [1]After six days Jesus took with him Peter, James and John the brother of James, and led them up a high mountain by themselves. [2]There he was transfigured before them. His face shone like the sun, and his clothes became as white as the light. [3]Just then there appeared before them Moses and Elijah, talking with Jesus. [4]Peter said to Jesus, "Lord, it is good for us to be here. If you wish, I will put up three shelters—one for you, one for Moses and one for Elijah."

GNB: [1]Six days later Jesus took with him Peter and the brothers James and John and led them up a high mountain where they were alone. [2]As they looked on, a change came over Jesus: his face was shining like the sun, and his clothes were dazzling white. [3]Then the three disciples saw Moses and Elijah talking with Jesus. [4]So Peter spoke up and said to Jesus, "Lord, how good it is that we are here! If you wish, I will make three tents here, one for you, one for Moses, and one for Elijah."

According to the works of Nida and other scholars, it seems that using "kai" to begin sentences is a commonplace and very natural in the Semitic Greek language. Therefore, the writers who wrote in Greek would naturally and frequently use this term, since it is a stylistic feature of the Greek language. And the function scope of the term "kai" in Greek is a lot wider than "and" in English, no matter in old English or contemporary English. We see translators of both of KJV and RSV Bibles all render the verses literally and "faithfully". They translate every "kai" literally into "and" in English. On the other hand, we see that translators of both NIV and GNB either leave some of these words untranslated or render them into many conjunctional words other than "and".

A table of number of "and" of each translation will help us see more clearly:

	KJV	RSV	NIV	GNB
Matt.17:1-4	11	12	5	7

Table 4

In order to highlight the differences in treating such stylistic features, it is useful if we pick out RSV and GNB (since these two are made in the same period of time in contemporary world and therefore should be much more useful to serve our ends) and make a list of contrasts in parallel columns:

RSV	GNB
1. And after six days	1. Six days later
2. and James and John	2. and the brothers James and John
3. and led them up	3. and led them up
4. And he was	4. As they looked on
5. and his face	5. his face
6. and his garments	6. and his clothes
7.And behold	7. Then the three
8. and Elijah	8. and Elijah
9. And Peter said	9. So Peter spoke up
10. and one for Moses	10. one for Moses
11. and one for Elijah	11. and one for Elijah

Table 5

Some comment and explanation seems quite necessary:

1. The use of "and" in RSV seems quite unnatural and awkward in reading, while the translation of GNB which left the word *"kai"* untranslated is quite natural, unaffecting at all the logical flow of the information.

2. Both renderings seem quite natural and all right in the contemporary's English.

3. Both renderings are natural and good.

4. The use of "and" in RSV in the beginning of the verse seems unnatural and awkward in reading, as if one is remembering some literature. The translation of GNB changes the subject from Jesus to his disciples, the description is easy and natural.

5. The "and" here in the whole sentence in the RSV seems redundant and better left untranslated as the rendering of the GNB is.

6. The "ands" in both RSV and GNB are natural since the clause it led is following another similar one.

7. "And behold" in RSV still seems unnatural in contemporary English, and "behold" here is obsolete. The rendering of GNB as "Then the three" is in consistency with the former sentence in subject. The use of "then" is a natural conjunction here.

8. All the two "and" are necessary and natural in contemporary English.

9. The "and" in the beginning still is unnatural and award, while the use of "so" seems in a better logical sequence of the context.

10. The "and" here in RSV is quite unnecessary and unnatural, not like contemporary English.

11. Both "ands" are natural and necessary, in conformance with the contemporary English usage.

The above analysis helps us understand that sometimes, stylistic features do pose many problems for translators. The appropriate rendering of such features somehow directly or indirectly affects the final outcome of the translation. In this example, we see that the KJV and RSV translators clearly translate literally. Their orientation is on the original and so is their focus. Therefore, they are being faithful to the features of the original, sometimes regardless of whether or not their translation would be natural and easy to understand in the receptor language. And clearly, the consequence of such a literal translation approach in terms of stylistic features seems rather unsatisfactory as far as the receptors' comprehensibility and appreciation of the translation is concerned. They are being faithful to what is on the surface level. On the other hand, we see that NIV and GNB translators have made freer choices of appropriate conjunctions. In some other places, they simply leave the original conjunction untranslated. As a result, their translations are quite natural and good contemporary English. The different conjunctional words instead of the same "and" make the information flow more natural and easy, not affecting at all the comprehensibility of the message, and even enhancing the degree of comprehensibility and appreciation of the receptors. Again, we see clearly that their orientation and focus is on the receptors. Their concern is receptors' correct and appropriate understanding and appreciation of the original message. We see that they seem to have had a deeper understanding of the nature of the Bible, the various elements such as the different writers, backgrounds, historical settings and language usages and features, etc. They seem to be on a more objective perspective.

4.3.2 Example: Translation of the written and spoken styles

The written and spoken styles can also be reflected clearly in a piece of translation.

And different renderings of the style can also well demonstrate the orientation and focus translators take in the process of translation. See the following example:

1 Sam. 17:28 (a part)

KJV: ...and Eliab's anger was kindled against David, and he said, Why camest thou down hither? And with whom hast thou left those few sheep in the wilderness? I know thy pride, and the naughtiness of thine heart; for thou art come down that thou mightest see the battle.

RSV: ...and Eliab's anger was kindled against David, and he said, "Why have you come down? And with whom have you left those few sheep in the wilderness? I know your presumption, and the evil of your heart; for you have come down to see the battle."

NIV: ...he burned with anger at him and asked, "Why have you come down here? And with whom did you leave those few sheep in the desert? I know how conceited you are and how wicked your heart is; you came down only to watch the battle."

GNB: He was angry with David and said, "What are you doing here? Who is taking care of those sheep of yours out there in the wilderness? You cheeky brat, you! You just came to watch the fighting!"

We see that in the translation of both KJV and RSV, there ae several places rendered quite formally, such as "(anger) was kindled against" and "presumption". Compared with these renderings, the NIV and GNB translators do not make renderings very formal. Instead, they use common words of daily use to express the meaning of the original. The renderings of GNB are especially informal and colloquial. Expressions like "What are you doing here?" and "You cheeky brat, you!" are only common daily language used by ordinary people. Such a way of rendering, I mean using colloquial and common daily language can well demonstrate Nida and his colleagues' opinion: "The Bible translator who is working in a language with a great disparity between the written and the spoken forms must avoid usages which will stamp the message as completely unworthy; that is, he must not employ language used only in the comic strip or in vulgar writing. On the other hand, he cannot afford to use a form of language known only by the literary elite, unless, of course, he is aiming to produce a translation only for such a select group. On the whole, he does best to use a form of 'common language', which represents a satisfactory overlap, based on consumer language" (Nida and Taber, 2004, p.127).

There are many other places showing the tendency toward either written or spoken

styles: a. (1Sam.17:42) ...he disdained him (both KJV and RSV) vs. he was filled with scorn for him (GNB) and he despised him (NIV); b. (1 Sam.17:56) Inquire whose son the stripling is...vs. Find out whose son this young man is. (NIV) and ...go and find out whose son he is(GNB), etc.

Through the above different renderings of the same original verses, we can also see the orientations behind them. Both KJV and RSV translators tended to translate with formal words and expressions while translators of NIV and GNB especially depart from the original, using some colloquial and daily common language, so that there could be "a satisfactory overlap", that the translation would be understandable to the largest number of receptors of the language into which the translation was made, and so that the largest possibly number of receptors may get access to God's message, understand it and accept it as well as the perceived God's graciousness of salvation. Therefore, the choice of the style does reflect the different orientations, whether the orientation is set on the original or on the receptors. And such orientation does reflect somehow the deeper shift of orientation from being faithful to God and his sacred words to being faithful in a deep level to God's desire and the objective fact of human involvement.

Chapter 5. Conclusion

In the previous section, I have discussed at great length about how various examples have reflected the different orientations dominating translators' thoughts and choice in the process of translation. With the insights achieved from the above comparisons and illustrations, we now have a better view about the shift of orientation in translating the Holy Bible, whether theoretically or practically. It is a shift not only in the outward focus of the original or the receptors, but also a shift in a deeper sense, a shift of orientation from being superficially faithful to God and his sacred words to a deep understanding of God's true heart and desire, the case being especially true for those who believe in God, that is to make all people, whether old or young, rich or poor, educated or unlearned, etc. to hear God's message and receive the salvation. And this is exactly the motive and starting point from which translators have grasped a new orientation and worked out principles and theories accordingly.

Nevertheless, such findings and conclusions of mine are only tentative, which undoubtedly need further illustrations and proofs from many other perspectives.

Notes:

1. The story of the tower of Babel was recorded in Genesis 11:1-9: "Now the whole world had one language and a common speech. As men moved eastward, they found a plain in Shinar and settled there. They said to each other, "Come, let's make bricks and bake them thoroughly." They used brick instead of stone, and tar for mortar. Then they said, "Come, let us build ourselves a city, with a tower that reaches to the heavens, so that we may make a name for ourselves and not be scattered over the face of the whole earth." But the LORD came down to see the city and the tower that the men were building. The LORD said, "If as one people speaking the same language they have begun to do this, then nothing they plan to do will be impossible for them. Come, let us go down and confuse their language so they will not understand each other." So the LORD scattered them from there over all the earth, and they stopped building the city. That is why it was called Babel--because there the LORD confused the language of the whole world. From there the LORD scattered them over the face of the whole earth" (NIV)

2. Pentecost: the seventh Sunday after Easter in the Christian religion, here the "Pentecost" referred exclusively to the time when the Holy Spirit came upon the believers in Jerusalem after Jesus was taken up to heaven.

Bibliography:

Eugene A. Nida. *Language and Culture—Contexts in Translating*. 2001. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Eugene A. Nida. *Toward a Science of Translating*. 2004. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Eugene A. Nida and Charles R. Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. 2004. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press

George Steiner. *After Babel—Aspects of Language and Translation*. 2001. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Good News Bible—Today's English Version. 1978. United Bible Societies

Holy Bible—New International Version. 1973,1978, 1984. International Bible Society.

Holy Bible—Revised Standard Version. 1881.

Holy Bible—King James Version. 1611.

Peter Newmark. *Approaches to Translation*. 2001. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Peter Newmark. *A Textbook of Translation*. 2001. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Basil Hatim & Ian Mason. *Discourse and the Translator*. 2001. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Ernst-August Gutt. *Translation and Relevance—Cognition and Context*. 2004. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Mona Baker. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 2004. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

陈福康，《中国译学理论史稿》，2000，上海：上海外语教育出版社

亨利达·米尔斯博士，《圣经综览》，1999，上海：中国基督教协会

J.B.加百尔，C.B.威勒著，《圣经中的犹太行迹—圣经文学概论》，1991，上海：三联书店

赖若翰，《实用释经法》，2004，北京：中国文史出版社

马祖毅，《中国翻译简史》，1998，北京：中国对外翻译出版公司

申雨平编，《西方翻译理论精选》，1999，北京：外语教学与研究出版社

《圣经》—现代中文译本，1997，上海：中国基督教协会

谭载喜编译，《新编奈达论翻译》，1999，北京：中国对外翻译出版公司