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Introduction to Translation

- **Goals for my time here**
  - Gain awareness of Bible translation needs
  - Gain a greater passion and burden for bibleless peoples
  - A better understanding of translation philosophy
  - A greater appreciation for Bible translation
  - A better understanding of the process of translation
  - Obtain better translation skills
  - Gain awareness for further study in linguistics and translation

What is translation?

- **Questions:**
  - Do authors communicate in order to be understood?
  - Does God communicate in order to be understood?
  - Is Scripture impossible to understand?
  - Is Scripture intentionally obscure?
  - Is Scripture translatable?
  - How should we translate Scripture?
  - Is meaning invariably lost in translation? Can meaning never be completely transferred?

- **Definitions of translation** - what exactly is translation? There are different ways translation can be defined. The definition of translation can be extraordinarily broad and include many different notions. It can be defined from the perspective of object, character, purpose, role, etc. Different definitions are given depending upon whether the background is linguistic, cultural, literary, social, or psychological.
  - A basic definition - to give the exact meaning of a message from one language to another… The process of reproducing a written/spoken/signed message into a different language, while retaining the original meaning.
  - One may talk of translation as a process or a product, and identify such sub-types as literary translation, technical translation, subtitling and machine translation; moreover, while more typically it just refers to the transfer of written texts, the term sometimes also includes interpreting (Dictionary or Translation Studies)
  - I would therefor describe a good translation to be, that in which the merit of the original work is so completely transfused into another language as to be as distinctly apprehended, and as strongly felt, by a native of the country what that language belongs as it is by those who speak the language of the original work. -Alexander Fraser Tytler
  - Translation is an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another. Clearly, then, any theory of translation must draw upon a theory of language—a general linguistic theory.” (John hCatford, 1965, p.1)
• “the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style” (Nida, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*)
• often, though not by any means always, it is rendering the meaning of a text into another language in the way that the author intended the text” (Peter Newmark, 1988, 2001, p.5).
• “translation is, of course, a rewriting of an original text” (Andre Lefevere, 1992, 2004a, p.xii).
• “the relation of the letter to the spirit, of the body of literalness to the ideal interiority of sense is also the site of the passage of translation, of this conversion that is called translation” (Jacques Derrida, 2001, p.184; Tr. Venuti)

• **RT definitions**
  • “an act of ostensive-inferential intralingual or interlingual interpretation of a source text” Zhao (1999).
  • “a clues-based interpretive use of language across language boundaries” Zhonggang (2006).

• **Initial requirements of translation**
  • A translator must always discover the exact meaning of the source text.
  • A translator must always ask: What did the original audience understand when they read this text? Then he must translate in a way for the reader in the receptor language to understand this same message.
  • A translator cannot simply translate word for word. A translator must understand the meaning of the message, then render the meaning in way that is clear and understandable.
  • Translation must be concerned in not just communicating the meaning, but also the dynamics of the source text and receptor language (naturalness/accessibility)
  • The original authors wrote in such a way that their readers would understand them. Modern translators must also translate in a way that readers of the receptor language understand the translation.

• **Exercise** - Compare the following translations:
  • bear fruits in keeping with repentance (ESV/NASB)
  • produce fruit in keeping with repentance. (NIV)
  • produce fruit consistent with repentance (HCSB)
  • produce fruit that proves your repentance, (NET)
  • Prove by the way you live that you have repented of your sins and turned to God (NLT)
  • Do something to show that you really have given up your sins (CEV)
  • Do the things that show you really have changed your hearts and lives (NCV)
  • Do those things that will show that you have turned from your sin (TEV)
  • Do those things that prove that you have turned to God and have changed the way you think and act. (GW)

• **Exercise 2** - (background - Are there any advantages in being a Jew/what advantages are there in being a Jew?) - πολὺ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον
  • Yes, there are great benefits! (NLT)
  • Great in every respect. (NASB)
  • Actually, there are many advantages (NET)
  • Considerable in every way. (HCSB)
  • Much in every way. (ESV)
• Much in every way! (NIV)
• Much, indeed, in every way! (TEV)
• It is good in a lot of ways! (CEV)
• There are all kinds of advantages. (GW)
• Yes, of course, there is in every way. (NCV)

Questions
• Can each of these examples be described as translation?
• What do the above difference in translation demonstrate?

Important - Finding the true meaning is not always easy. However, this is necessary to produce a good translation. Otherwise, readers will not be able to understand what is translated either. If you don’t understand the ST you cannot translate into the RL.

Quotes about Translation
• traduttore-traditore ‘translator-traitor’ -Italian pun
• Translation is like a woman: if she is faithful, she is not beautiful; if she is beautiful, she is not faithful. -Russian proverb
• The difference between the right word and the almost right word is really a large matter—it’s the difference between lightning and lightning bug. -Mark Twain
• In translation language facility is not enough; blood and sweat are the secret. - Samuel Putnam
• “Not everyone who knows how to write can be a writer. Not everyone who knows two languages can be a translator.” — Nataly Kelly
• He who translates a verse literally is a liar, and he who paraphrases is a blasphemer. (Babylonian Talmud, Seder Nashim 8)
• I see translation as the attempt to produce a text so transparent that it does not seem to be translated. A good translation is like a pane of glass. You only notice that it’s there when there are little imperfections—scratches, bubbles. Ideally, there shouldn’t be any. It should never call attention to itself. -Norman Shapiro
• The common saying that a translation should not read like a translation has two senses. In the first, one suffers the illusion of transparency, of passive ideological writing and cultural translation, accompanied by its own misrecognition. In the second, one produces an original text in the target language, a homologue of the source-language text. There is a general confusion between these two senses, so that, pointing out the second, one practices the first. The first is dominant, since it transposes the so-called dominant ideology into a practice of annexation. (Henri Meschonnic)
• The fundamental error of the translator is that he stabilizes the state in which his own language happens to find itself instead of allowing his language to be powerfully jolted by the foreign language. -Rudolf Pannwitz
• “It is normally supposed that something always gets lost in translation; I cling, obstinately to the notion that something can also be gained.” — Salman Rushdie
• The translator is the secret master of the difference of languages, a difference he is not out to abolish, but rather one he puts to use as he brings violent or subtle changes to bear on his own language, thus awakening within it the presence of that which is at origin different in the original - Maurice Blanchot
  • Blanchot inverts the conventional hierarchy wherein the original is superior to the translation
• The original is unfaithful to the translation. -Leonardo Sciascia
• From my youth up I have always aimed at rendering sense not words...A literal translation from one language to another obscures the sense...My version always preserves the sense although it does not invariably keep the words of the original... in translating from the Greek I render sense for sense and not word for word—except in the case of the Holy Scriptures where even the order of the words is a mystery - Jerome, Letter to Pammachius
• Do not trouble yourself to render word for word with the faithfulness of a translator. - Horace
• You see, I want to speak German, not Latin or Greek, since German was the language I was translating into...his is the kind of ordinary phrasing that I've always striven for, but alas, haven't always managed to find. The letters of the Latin alphabet make it pretty hard to speak good German... On the other hand I have not just gone ahead and disregarded altogether the exact wording in the original. Rather, with my helpers I have been very careful to see that where everything depends upon a single passage, I have kept to the original quite literally and have not parted lightly from it. - Martin Luther, Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen
• Translation it is that openeth the window, to let in the light; that breaketh the shell, that we may eat the kernel; that putteth aside the curtain, that we may look into the most Holy Place; that removeth the cover of the well, that we may come by the water, even as Jacob rolled away the stone from the mouth of the well, by which means the flocks of Laban were watered (The Translators to the Reader, Preface to the King James Version 1611, ed. Edgar J. Goodspeed (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935), 21.
• I believe there are only two [ways of translating]. The translator either (1) disturbs the writer as little as possible and moves the reader in his direction, or (2) disturbs the reader as little as possible and moves the writer in his direction. -Friedrich Schleiermacher
• A translator ought to endeavor not only to say what his author has said, but to say it as he has said it. - John Conington
• All translation is a compromise—the effort to be literal and the effort to be idiomatic. - Benjamin Jowett
• There can never be an absolutely final translation. - Robert M. Grant
• All translating seems to me to be simply an attempt to accomplish an impossible task. - Wilhel von Humboldt
• Translation is a struggle with the text—a struggle to preserve the soul of meaning while embodying it anew. Vanhoozer (388)
• The translator is one who preserves the efficacy of past communicative action. Vanhoozer (392)
• Fidelity to meaning in translation is a kind of betrayal. - Paul Valery
• The translator who attaches himself closely to his original more or less abandons the originality of his nation, and so a third [nation] comes into existence, and the taste of the multitude must be shaped towards it. - Johann Wolfgang von Goethe
• The translation called good has original value as a work of art. - Benedetto Croce
• En définitive, comme traducteur, j’espère seulement ne pas être trop réducteur. When all is said and done, I only hope that, as a translator, I have not been too reductionistic. - Alain Gignac
• To translate is to deliver the reader a living organism. - Alain Gignac
• Translation is an impossible task: it requires rendering, with clarity, an original text written in another language, while still paying homage to its obscurities. -Alain Gignac

Importance of Bible translation

• Question - Why do Bible translation?
• Topics
  • Translation in minority language vs. majority language translation
  • Translation for small language populations
  • Translation for unreached people groups
  • Translation and dialectal situation
  • Distribution of translation during the process of translation
• Biblical texts that support the need for Bible translation
  • Neh 8:8 - They read out of the book of the law of God, translating and giving the meaning so that the people could understand what was read. (HCSB)
    • ultimate translation verse
    • מֶפְרַשׁ - arguments that this means translation. (The Expositor’s Bible commentary gives good note on why this should be translated as “translated”, because it may be similar to an Aramaic term in Ezra 4:18, a Pael participle for the verb paarash.)
  • Acts 2:4 - Then they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in different languages, as the Spirit gave them ability for speech. (HCSB)
  • 2 Tim 3:15 - you have known the sacred Scriptures, which are able to give you wisdom for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus (HCSB)
  • 1 Pet 1:23 - You have been born anew, not from perishable but from imperishable seed, through the living and enduring word of God. (NET)
  • James 1:18 - By his sovereign plan he gave us birth through the message of truth (NET)
  • Rom 10:17 - Consequently faith comes from what is heard, and what is heard comes through the preached word of Christ. (NET)
  • Heb 4:12 - For the word of God is living and active and sharper than any double-edged sword, piercing even to the point of dividing soul from spirit, and joints from marrow; it is able to judge the desires and thoughts of the heart. (NET)
• Essential for evangelism - The Word of God translated into the language of a people group is the most effective means for communicating the Gospel of Jesus Christ and thereby bringing people to faith in Christ. Salvation is brought by the Holy Spirit by means of the word
  • Rom 10:14-17; Eph 5:26,27; 1 Peter 1:23-25
  • Missionaries and believers from a people group can most effectively and consistently proclaim the Gospel of Jesus Christ and teach the full council of God when it is available in the form of an approved and accepted translation.
  • The Holy Spirit may even bring the lost to repentance and faith in Christ through the reading of the Word, apart from the physical presence of any believers.
• Essential for church planting - The Word of God in the language of a people group is essential for the spiritual life of the church among that group.
  • Acts 20:32 - it is the Word of God that is “able to build you up.”
  • "The greatest missionary is the Bible in the mother tongue. It needs no furlough and is never considered a foreigner." - William Cameron Townsend
• Historical example - Churches do not remain over the years where there is no
translation in the local language.
• The Word of God is not only the instrument of salvation, it is also the instrument of
spiritual growth, sanctification.
• **1 Pet 2:2** - Like newborn infants, desire the pure spiritual milk, a so that you may grow
by it for your salvation, (HCSB)
• **Acts 6:7** - The word of God continued to spread (NET) - equivalent to church growth
is word of God growth.
• The Word of God brings about growth as it convicts the believer of sin and turns him to
a life of righteousness.
  • **2 Tim 3:16** - All Scripture is inspired by God, and is profitable for teaching, for
rebuking, for correcting, for training in righteousness, (HCSB)

**Summary - Purposes of Bible Translation**

• 1) for the conversion of the people
  • a desire to reach out to people who live in other cultures and who speak other
  languages
• 2) For the sanctification of believers
  • a need to get back to the roots of the Christian faith,
• 3) For the equipping of the church

**Characteristics of a good translation**

A good translation is:

• **Accurate**
  • Does a translation give the same meaning as the original?
  • A translation whose form is as close as possible to the form of the source text is not
  necessarily an accurate translation.
  • Meaning must *always* be considered.
  • A translator must re-express the meaning of the original message as exactly as
  possible in the language into which he is translating.
  • A translation is inaccurate if it:
    • omits meaning
    • adds meaning
    • modifies meaning

• **Clear**
  • Accuracy is not the only qualification of a good translation!
  • Is the meaning of the translation easily understood?
  • Do people easily understand the translation?
  • However, it must also be recognized that certain biblical passages are hard to
    understand because of the content of the message. Spiritual insight through the Holy
    Spirit is also needed. Some passages will need further teaching and background
    knowledge before the message can be fully understood.

• **Natural**
  • Do people talk that way?
  • Is the style of the translation lively and interesting?
  • A translation should not sound foreign.
• Care must also be taken that natural expressions in one language are simply translated into the receptor text without much care or thought.
• "We do not have to inquire of the literal Latin, how we are to speak German... Rather we must inquire about this of the mother in the home, the children on the street, the common man in the marketplace. We must be guided by their language, the way they speak, and do our translating accordingly. That way they will understand it and recognize that we are speaking German to them." - Martin Luther

• Acceptable
  • Do people like the translation?
  • Do people use the translation?
  • What script should be used?
  • What good is a translation if people do not read it?
  • The true value of a translation is only seen in how it is used.
  • A translation can be completely correct and perfectly follow all the principles of translation, but it is not accepted by the population.
  • But care must still be taken that acceptance in the RL does not compromise the fidelity to the SL
    • Ex: Son of God
    • Ex: Bibles printed for a Muslim context

Disciplines of Translation

• A translation must be done with a solid foundation of both the source text/culture and receptor language/culture.
  • Biblical studies (SL studies)
    • Biblical theology
    • Systematic theology
    • Original languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek)
    • OT background
    • NT background
    • Textual criticism
    • Exegesis
    • Historical theology
  • Linguistic studies (RL studies)
    • Phonetics
    • Phonology
    • Morphology
    • Syntax
    • Semantics
    • Pragmatics
    • Discourse analysis
    • Typology
    • Translation theory
    • Sociolinguistics
    • Anthropology
    • Cultural studies
    • Orthography
    • Literacy
  • A good translation will be informed in all the above areas.
• Note - The required RL studies varies depending upon the development of the RL.
• (Fortunately) It is not necessary for one single person or translator to have a comprehensive of all the above disciplines
  • Different people play different roles in a translation project
  • Different people specialize in different disciplines

**Overview of linguistics**
• Linguistics is concerned with the formal study of human language. The Bible is written in human languages. So linguistics as a discipline should be relevant to everyone who is trying to understand and interpret it.
• Linguistics is not just concerned with the study of individual languages, but of the phenomenon of language itself.
• **Why study linguistics?**
  • Linguistics can greatly help both our study of the Bible in general and our translation of Scripture.
  • “Even though the prophets were unaware of modern literary theory, we can still use that framework to help us understand what the prophets were doing and how they wrote. For that matter, they may not even have known about the rhetorical devices they used in the poetry, but we can nonetheless use our modern understanding to understand their ancient work. (Hoffman 4-5)
  • Linguistic does more than alter our attitude to the study of the biblical languages. It formulates principles and provides techniques for the analysis of written and oral communication… if we ignore the character of human language, we will likely misunderstand Scripture. (Silva, foundations of contemporary inter. 25, 203)
  • Because of linguistic typology, differences and similarities across languages can help us understand the Bible.

**Translation Theory Overview**

• To understand translation you must also grapple with the theory of language and the theory of communication
• principles which govern translation, delineating and defining a successful strategy for rendering a text in a different language

• **Question** - what is a theory?
  • Essentially, a theory is a system of beliefs about reality
  • The better our theories, the better adjusted we shall be to the universe in which we live.
  • It is important to distinguish a theory (descriptive) of translation from a method (prescriptive) of translation. Theory must guide method.

• **Question** - What role should theory play in translation?
  • Theories provide a framework for thinking about a domain and they provide a vocabulary with which to discuss it. A theory shapes how people think about the domain. (Weber: 2005, 36)
  • Even knowing both languages really well, that does not automatically make someone a good translator. Though knowing both languages deeper does help tremendously and puts someone at a greater advantage.
• The fields of Bible study and translation theory have historically been kept separate, with Bible scholars often only partially aware of research into translation and, similarly, translation experts unwilling to turn their attention to the Bible. (Hoffman xvi)

• Our assumptions about language will clearly influence our approach to word meanings, sentence meanings, exegesis, and Bible translation. If we have an impoverished view of language, we are likely to have an impoverished view of the Bible as well. For example, if we think that language is designed only to communicate literal propositions, we will probably end up minimizing the functions of metaphor and allusions. If we think that language is designed only to talk about Ais world, we wiU be suspicious of Godtalk as an allegedly improper use (poythress, truth and fulness 211-212)

• **Question** - Is translation an art or a science?
  • Translation of the Bible is not just a transference of words. Rather, it is both a science, with all the expertise, diligence, and care required in a science, and an art, with all of the intuitive, visionary, and expresional factors expected of an artist. (Silva, 344)

• **Caution** - Every theory is inadequate
  • “Scientific rigor is possible in linguistics and in translation when we isolate a sufficiently small piece of language, or one dimension of language, and temporality ignore the residue that not cleanly fit into a formalized model. Such models do offer insights, but they can be misused in a clumsy or arrogant manner…
  • Technical tools are properly used only as one dimension in the process of trying to do justice to total meaning.

• **Summary** - Language comes from being made in the image of God
  • Linguistics is useful in analyzing speech, because it does make evident some of the structural regularities belonging to language. But any particular approach within linguistics will have limitations because it is selective in its focus.
  • Knowing how languages and translation works will give better tools to produce better translations.

• **Summary** - Any theory of translation must also draw upon a theory of language, whether implicitly or explicitly.

**Literal vs Dynamic Translation**

• It is important to understand that the typical debate over literal vs dynamic translation is more about methodology and not about theory. However, understanding the theory behind these two different approaches will help guide the discussion and ultimately develop better translations.

• **Literal** - translations that try to keep as close as possible to the form (words, grammar, expressions)

• **Dynamic** - Translations that try to express the meaning of a passage, even if the form is changed

• It is not a question of whether on translation is accurate and another is not. Dynamic and literal translations are both accurate. The value of translation is different depending upon who reads it.

• This is not to promote one way of translation over another. Both literal and dynamic translations have advantages and disadvantages.

• Bible translations that follow either approach are still faithful translations, they are both the Word of God.

• Biblical examples of dynamic translation
Ex. Mk 5:41 - Taking her by the hand he said to her, “Talitha cumi,” which means, “Little girl, I say to you, arise.”
- This is not a literal translation
- cf. Lk 8:54; Lk 7:14

Differences in literal vs. dynamic

What is the task of translation?
- Literal - The process of reproducing a linguistic form in a different language while placing the receptor language meaning as a lower-level criteria
- Dynamic - The process of reproducing a linguistic meaning in a different language while placing form of the source text as a lower-level criteria

What is the goal of translation?
- Literal - The translation should accurately convey the meaning and the form of the source language, to the extent that the form of the source does not violate the grammatical requirements of the receptor language.
- Dynamic - The translation should accurately convey the meaning of the source language in a natural linguistic form for the receptor language which clearly conveys the meaning.

What is the importance of naturalness?
- Literal - Naturalness is desirable, but not at the expense of consistently reflecting the linguistic form of the source language in the receptor.
- Dynamic - Naturalness in the form of the receptor language is more important than reflecting the linguistic form of the source language.

What is the importance of accuracy?
- Literal - Accuracy is important; it is viewed in terms of accuracy in rendering consistently the linguistic form of the source language into the receptor language.
- Dynamic - Accuracy is important; it is viewed in terms of conveying the same meaning as expressed in the source language.

What is the importance of clarity?
- Literal - Clarity is important, but not at the expense of rendering consistently the form. In cases where there is a lack of clarity, readers are expected to refer to footnotes, appendices, or other helps in the translation itself; they may be expected to turn to works other than the translation to learn more in depth.
- Dynamic - Clarity is important, even to the point of making implicit information explicit in the receptor language. There tend to be fewer footnotes and appendices for readers. Readers are not assumed to have access to reference works.

What is a faithful translation?
- Literal - A faithful translation transfers the meaning and form of the source text
- Dynamic - A faithful translation transfers the meaning and dynamics of the source text.

Degree of literalness in English Bible translations
- Highly literal - Young’s Literal Translation
- Modified literal - RSV, NRSV, NASB, ESV
- Middle ground - NIV, HCSB, NEB, Jerusalem Bible
- Idiomatic - Good News Bibles, New Living Translation, Phillips
- Unduly Free - The Living Bible, The Message

Overview of formal equivalence (literal translation)
• Wherever possible it attempts to retain the formal features of the original language in the translation. The rationale behind this is that “the meaning of the original is best communicated by translating it into a linguistic form which closely parallels that of the original language” (Beekman and Callow 1974:20).

• **Corresponds to form in three ways**
  - Genre
  - Grammar
    - parts of speech, word order, punctuation, voice, rhetorical devices
  - Lexical
    - nothing is left untranslated, phrases are avoided to translate a single word
    - Strives to achieve word-for-word lexical correspondence by translating word-for-word and avoiding rendering a word in the ST as a phrase in the RL.

• **source context oriented** - Fee (1985:33) describes it as keeping “the historical distance intact.” Nida (1964:159) means the same thing when he says, A gloss translation of this type is designed to permit the reader to identify himself as fully as possible with a person in the source-language context, and to understand as much as he can of the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression. Example: gird up the loins of your mind (1 Pet 1:13 NKJV).

• **Retains ambiguities** - Wherever the source text can be interpreted in more than one way, formally equivalent translations try to find a literal rendering that allows readers to recover each of the interpretations that a reader of the original could have recovered. If a source text can be interpreted in more than one way, this method translates in a way to allow the reader to recover each of the interpretations.

• **Positives of formal equivalence**
  - Keeps interpretative bias at a minimum
  - Produces a good study Bible (allows the reader to retrieve many of the nuances of the original—Greek words, idioms, figures of speech, grammatical elements

• **Negatives of formal equivalence**
  - Places an enormous interpretative burden on readers
    - Translations are difficult to read
    - Catholic church kept Bible in Latin, strong proponents want to keep the Bible in Greek,
  - Makes only enough changes in RL to make it barely intelligible (1885 Spurgeon “The revision is strong in Greek but weak in English” (Metzger 1993:a:147, RT 28)
  - Formal equivalence minimizes the need for interpretation by concentrating solely on the original’s linguistic properties, resulting in a mechanical translation methodology that does not demand in depth exegesis of the source text. (RT diss 62)
  - Emphasizes word order to its detriment
    - But does word order have the same pragmatic effect in other languages as it does in Greek, or Hebrew? Word order is much more language-specific. Keeping the word order as much possible makes a text much more unnatural and is another example of an inadequate understanding of communication.
• Introduces new ambiguities that arise from unnatural phraseology in the receptor language
• Illogical ideology
  • Strict and absolute literalness is attempted to preserve the sacred quality of the original. Unwilling to take risk!
• Inconsistent in applying its principles of translation
  • does not always translate word for word, even when word-for-word is feasible in RL.
  • Does not consistently follow its own method
  • a theory or method with abundant exceptions shows it is inadequate
• More of a method, does not supply much of a theoretical framework, ignores linguistic insights, can be based more on ideologies rather than genuine facts or linguistic understanding
• Translators are frequently tempted to mimic as much as possible. “Just because English has something that looks like the original Hebrew doesn’t mean that superficially identical English works the same was as the Hebrew. Frequently it does not. (Hoffman, 67)
• The notion of form thus designates a more difficult and added-on mode of decodability if an identical meaning is to be sought. It things were really so, the ‘artistic' mode of communication, having become semiotically useless, would have disappeared long ago. Lotman, in The Structure of the Artistic Text, has demonstrated the theoretical non-pertinence of the notion of form. (Henri Meschonnic)
• Formal equivalence is also based on code model
• Focuses on English translation. Does not provide a comprehensive methodology for all languages. The method may work well in most Indo-European languages, but not in other language families
• More is needed than simple modernization or unfamiliar phrases
  • Translators and publishers tend to emphasize that, in line with modern translation theory, the translation employs the natural structures and idiom of the target language, that uncommon expressions have been replaced by contemporary ones, etc. It is then claimed that, because of these linguistic adjustments, the meaning of the original is now easy to understand for the modern reader. The fact that differences in background knowledge are likely to cause major comprehension problems for the modern reader are rarely mentioned.... This practice is unhelpful, to say the very least. It creates the misleading impression that the linguistic adjustments now give easy access to the accurate meaning of the text. It does not usually take long before readers find these promises broken because of significant differences in their cognitive environment. (Gutt RT 12, 13)

• Overview of functional equivalence/dynamic equivalent translation
  • Emphasizes meaning over form. Form is viewed as language-particular. Sees retaining form as possibly distorting meaning.
  • The central concern is how well the translation communicates with the reader, how easily and accurately the average prospective reader will be able to retrieve the originally intended meaning. For functional equivalence, to convey the same meaning, a translator must produce a text that is equivalent to the original in two respects: (a) naturalness of expression and (b) ease of understanding. (RT diss 29)
• It follows logically that functional equivalence is receptor-(language and context) oriented rather than source-oriented. Unlike formal equivalence, which is concerned with retaining every detail of the source text (including unhelpful forms), functional equivalence is concerned with communicating effectively with the receptor.
  • It “keeps historical distance on all historical and some factual matters, but ‘updates’ matters of language, grammar, and style” (Fee 1985:33).
  • It is most efficient for us to develop an approach to translation which takes these facts fully into consideration. Instead of attempting to set up transfers from one language to another by working out long series of equivalent formal structures which are presumably adequate to “translate” from one language into another, it is both scientifically and practically more efficient (1) to reduce the source text to its structurally simplest and most semantically evident kernels, (2) to transfer the meaning from source language to receptor language on a structurally simple level, and (3) to generate the stylistically and semantically equivalent expression in the receptor language. (Nida, Toward a Science, 68)
• Makes figurative language more understandable to a modern reader
  • ex. gird up the loins of your mind (NKJV), prepare your minds for actions (NIV)
• Makes interpretive decisions on ambiguous passages
  • ex. 1 Cor 7:1 It is good for a man not to touch a woman (NASB)
  • it is good for a man not to marry (NIV)
  • it is god for a man not to have relations with a woman (HCSB)
• Theoretical basis of functional equivalence
  • provides more of a theory of translation than functional equivalence
  • Still based off of the code model
  • Is able to more broadly apply principles across the world’s languages
• **Positives of functional equivalence**
  • Communicates much more clearly
  • Provides a more comprehensive framework for translation
  • Helpful in translating languages around the world. Has greatly helped, influenced, sped up, and advanced Bible translation
• **Negatives of functional equivalence**
  • based on an inadequate linguistics and theoretical premise (code model)
  • Lacks literary depth, poetic and profound statements are flattened
  • more susceptible to inaccurate and wrong interpretive decisions, yet what is gained in terms of ease of comprehension compensates for the danger that the translator may make poor interpretative decisions
• **Summary/comparison of formal and functional equivalence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal equivalence</th>
<th>Functional equivalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>focuses on form</td>
<td>focuses on meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasizes source language</td>
<td>emphasizes receptor language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translates what was said</td>
<td>translates what was meant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presumes original context</td>
<td>presumes contemporary context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retains ambiguities</td>
<td>removes ambiguities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimizes interpretative bias</td>
<td>allows for interpretative bias</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some words about English Bible translation differences

- Debate over English Bible translations is like debating which restaurant has the best steak. We debate over the countless English versions while at the same time, at least 2,393 languages have no translation work at all, another 1,168 need the Old Testament translated, and another 1,998 languages need a complete NT (as well as the OT). Where is this kind of fervor for pioneer translations?

- Arguing against a certain translation or style is basically arguing against the Word of God. I can confidently hold up the ESV, NASB, or the NIV, NLT and say that they are all the Word of God, that they are profitable for teaching, reproof, correction, and training in righteousness (aka to teach us what is true and to make us realize what is wrong in our lives. It corrects us when we are wrong and teaches us to do what is right). So to try and discredit these translations, so would a book that tries to put down other more "literal" translations (you would miss the whole point of this if you think I'm just arguing for the NIV or NLT).

Arguments and responses for a more literal approach to translation

- A formal equivalency approach is concern with faithfulness to the original text. It seeks as close a match as possible between the form of the original language and the form of the receptor language. “Its reader can thus identify himself as fully as possible with someone in the source-language context and more fully comprehend the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression connected with the original setting. To accomplish this goal, the literal translation preserves as much of the source-language grammatical structures and word usages as the boundaries of proper English will allow. (Thomas, ch 3, 89)
- But does closeness in form really mean closeness in meaning?
- Is that really the standard by which to test faithfulness and accuracy?
- If a reader has to identify himself more with the source language, is that really an indication of an accurate translation?
- There might be a closeness to the form of the original language but that does mean there is a closeness in meaning.

- The more remote a translation is from the original in form, the less it reflects the precise meaning of the original and the more it reflects the interpretations of the translator
  - this is a faulty understanding of meaning, based on the code model
  - all translation is interpretation. Literal translation is not excluded
  - Meaning is more complex than a lexical entry

- The ideal English Bible retains as much of the original text as the process of translation allows, including fullness of language, fullness of interpretive meanings, and fullness of theological vocabulary.
- But does this mean there are multiple meanings within a text?

- Transparency to the original text
  - One person remarked that he could see the Greek that lied behind the translation. But this is not a good evaluation. Tis produces unnatural, foreign, unclear, unintelligible translation, where Greek almost becomes a prerequisite for being able to read the translation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>valuable for serious Bible study</th>
<th>valuable for missionary use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>awkward RL style</td>
<td>natural RL style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• … closeness to the original must be the prime consideration, because God’s seal of approval rests on that inspired text. If a literal translation is in reasonably smooth English, even though it may not be the most appealing in style, the loss in communicative effectiveness is less than it would be through failing to have a translation that reflects the original text fully and accurately. (Thomas)
  • But is God’s seal of approval on the linguistic form of the source, but not on the meaning of the source?
  • If we translate form over meaning are we guaranteed that it will be a better translation?
  • The dangers of being unclear or read inaccurately are prevalent in a more literal approach.
• A form-based literal approach is based off of English
  • A theory should be comprehensive. This theory is more adequate to English and languages similar to English, but it is a very unconventional and inadequate theory for other languages.
• Question - What are the dangers of being too literal?
• Unnatural languaug
  • Psalm 140:3 e
    • They have sharpened their tongue like a serpent; Adders' poison is under their lips. Selah (ASV)
    • They make their tongues as sharp as a serpent's; the poison of vipers is on their lips. Selah (NIV)
    • Their tongues sting like a snake; the poison of a viper drips from their lips. Interlude (NLT)
  • Ex 6:12
    • how then shall Pharaoh hear me, who am of uncircumcised lips? (ASV)
    • How then shall Pharaoh listen to me, for I am of uncircumcised lips?" (ESV)
    • why would Pharaoh listen to me, since I speak with faltering lips?" (NIV)
    • How can I expect Pharaoh to listen? I'm no orator!" (NLT)
• Unclear meaning
  • Judges 3:6
    • and they took their daughters to be their wives, and gave their own daughters to their sons and served their gods. (ASV)
    • And their daughters they took to themselves for wives, and their own daughters they gave to their sons, and they served their gods.(ESV)
    • They took their daughters in marriage and gave their own daughters to their sons, and served their gods.(NIV)
    • and they intermarried with them. Israelite sons married their daughters, and Israelite daughters were given in marriage to their sons. And the Israelites worshiped their gods. (NLT)
• Question - what are the dangers of being unduly free?
  • Inaccurate, distortion of content, saying what the original neither says nor implies.examples??
• Quotes
  • Woe to the makers of literal translations, who by rendering every word weaken the meaning! It is indeed by so doing that we can say the letter kills and the spirit gives life. -Voltaire
• Even the simplest word can never be rendered with its exact equivalent into another language. -Kimon Friar

• A good translation is neither too much nor too little. It is neither too slavish a reproduction of the Greek [and Hebrew], nor is it too free in its handling of the original. It is neither too modern and casual, nor is it too stilted and formal. It is not too much like the KJV, nor does it depart too far from the time-honored beauty and dignity of that seventeenth-century classic. In short, the best translation is one that has avoided the extremes and has achieved instead the balance that will appeal to the most people for the longest period of time. Donald Burdick, The Challenge of BT p 62

• Examples

• There are numerous instances where a literal translation can be less accurate or inaccurate than a dynamic translation.

• French
  • fais attention = be careful
  • merci = thank you
  • de rei = you’re welcome
  • enchant = nice to meet you
  • all the president’s men - les hommes du president

• Spanish
  • como agua para chocolate - like water for chocolate
  • to the boiling point
  • lleuve
  • it’s raining
  • tengo frio en los pies - my feet are cold

• Mubi
  • sugay - come here - ta’al

• Hebrew
  • leimor - saying or just direct quotes

• Bible translation examples

• Huave and Aquacatec — proninal grammar makes the literal translation of “These men are not drunk, as you suppose” (Acts 2:15) could be inferred as “Though the others are not drunk, I certainly am” (Fortosis: 16). cf Beekman and Callow: 47)

• Mixe — speaking of oneself in the third person is shameful. When Jesus says, “Foxes have holes…but the Son of Man has no place…” (Lk 9:58) or when John identifies himself as “the disciple whom Jesus loved” (Jn 13:23; 19:26; 21:7, 20) they are assumed to be doing so out of guilt or shame (Fortosis 17) cf (Beekman and Callow, 114).

• Che

• Hiligaynon (Philippines) - “Truly, truly” does not emphasize but lowers the emphasis to mean “perhaps.” (Fortosis: 19) cf (Nida, Language Structure and Translation) 87.

• Balineses - “brood of vipers” (Mt 3:7; Lk 3:7) is viewed as a compliment since the viper is regarded as a snake of paradise. The term for “vermin” was proposed instead. (Fortosis: 27) (Nida and Reyburn, 54) Cheyenne also, used coyotes instead of vipers since vipers have no meaning of danger.

• Huichol language translated this as “brothers to scorpions” easier understood (Fortosis: 28-29)
• Other cultures limit rhetorical questions only to ridicule. So should rhetorical questions be kept in a translation in these languages? (Fortosis: 18)
  • Trique - “Who then is Paul” (1 Cor 3:5) the translator asked if Paul know he was. It was translated “Paul is not important.” It was understood. (Hefley: 150).
• English Bible examples
  • Gen 40:13
    • ESV- yet in three days Pharaoh will lift up your head
    • lift your head is not a metaphor that works in English.
    • NLT - Pharaoh will take you out of prison
    • JPS - Pharaoh will pardon you
    • Gen 40:19 - Pharaoh will lift up your head
  • Suggestions
    • Pharaoh thinks you have a head on your shoulders and he’ll bring you back to the court… Pharaoh thinks you should have your head taken off your shoulders and he’ll hang you from a tree
    • But which is better? Capturing the meaning and missing the point or capturing the point and missing the meaning?
    • Pharaoh will befriend you… Pharaoh will behead you...
    • Pharaoh will have you brought to the palace… Pharaoh will have you brought to the palace gallows...
    • Pharaoh wants you to hang around the palace
• notes on paraphrases
  • Paraphrases (including the Message) can be helpful!
  • Your study of Scripture should lead you to be able to do your own paraphrase.
• final summary
  • the litera/dynamic debate does not look the same in other languages
  • the literal/dynamic debate is outdated, based on old, inadequate models of communication
  • The polarities of formal versus functional equivalence, though perhaps useful in their day, do not do justice to how language works and how translations accurately communicate the meaning of the source text into a language whose grammatical and syntactical structures differ from those of the source text. The fidelity of a translation to the original language cannot be adequately evaluated by pitting formal and functional equivalence against each other.

Levels of Analysis

• The literal vs. dynamic approach to translation is not the only two ways to view translation method and theory. One way to categorize translation methodologies/theories is by the level of analysis considered in the translation:
  • Morphology
  • Word
  • Word group
    • (minimal rank of meaningful structure)
  • Literal/Formal Equivalence translation
    • Emphasizes
  • Clause
• **Dynamic Equivalence**
  - Has many features in common with literalistic translation
    - parabolic markers
    - impersonal constructions
    - feel of traditional translation
  - similar theory as formal equivalence translation
  - kernel and transformation, based off of generative grammar (evolved from grammar, not semantics/pragmatics)
    - “It is scientifically and practically more efficient (1) to reduce the source text to its structurally simplest and most semantically evident kernels, (2) to transfer the meaning from source language to receptor language on a structurally simple level, and (3) to generate the stylistically and semantically equivalent expression in the receptor language. (Nida, *Toward a Science*, 68)
    - ex. “he hit the man with the stick” - ambiguous, break it up into kernels
    - emphasize language and meaning of source language over receptor language
    - reductionist approach to meaning

• **Clause complex**
  - **Functionalist Translation**
    - Draws heavily on Hallidayan linguistics
    - Addresses the context of situation
    - Limited to the linking of individual clauses
    - Emphasizes pragmatics
    - analyzes levels of language usage and the difference between form and substance
      - grammatical/lexical form
      - medium form - phonology/graphology
      - medium substance -
    - Meaning is larger than the contextual situation
    - Meaning is determined in situation and context
    - Linguistic relevance is not the same as functional relevance
    - Instead of formal equivalence, textual equivalence is necessary, focusing on the target language with the goal that the target language form is equivalent to the source language form
    - Grammatical form may not be equivalent
      - Greek vs English usage of masculine singular pronoun
      - Tense(verb aspect) / Causality (Voice)

• **Paragraph**
• **Sub-discourse unit**
• **Discourse**
  - **Discourse analysis**
    - Importance has only recently been realized
    - Treats lower elements as well as higher discourse elements
    - Studies how discourse considerations affect translational practices.
      - Concerned with elements beyond the sentence
      - Also influenced by Hallidayan linguistics
Focuses on the communicative dimensions of translation

- **Context of situation**
  - **Relevance Theory**
    - In itself, it is not a theory of translation, but a theory of cognition.
    - Language evokes more than the words themselves, looks to cognitive model of communication and studies implicatures of conversation “ostensive-inferential communication”
    - Concerned with amount of information explicated and implicit
    - Gutt has developed implications of RT on translation
    - Communication creates an expectation of optimal relevance, interpretation should yield adequate contextual effects at minimal processing effort—maximal understanding with minimal effort.
    - (We will discuss RT in more detail later)
  - **Descriptivist Approach**
    - concerned with describing the specific cultural context of a translation, rather than prescribing what such a translation should be like.
    - typical views of translation are prescriptive, concerned with formulating rules and guidelines.
    - some ways dependent upon a systemic-functional model of linguistics
    - concerned with the general principles that govern translation and how these general principles are manifested.
    - Concerned more with the product rather than the process of translation.
    - Values translation on its literary function in the receptor culture.
    - Less of an approach of translation, more of an attempt to describe the context in which translation occurs.

- **Context of culture**
  - **Cultural Theory**
    - Criticizes the imposition of cultural hegemony of the receptor language
    - Argus that the difference in language and culture that separate the two (SL, RL) are overcome by forcing the one to submit to the other.
    - Apparent transparency in translation hides partial interpretation
    - Propose foreignizing translation, which resist dominant target-language cultural values so as to signify the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text.

- **Summary**
  - There is need for further research in translation theory.
  - Each theory has its own downfalls/criticisms as well as value/benefits
  - We must move beyond the simple disjunction between literalistic and dynamic equivalence translation.
  - More needs to be done to move beyond the clause to the full discourse (esp. pragmatic theory). All of the above elements must be considered in composing a translation theory.
  - The fundamental issue is that accuracy isn’t the only criterion of successful translation, because language does more than convey information. (Hoffman, 86) (ex. The store is 6.2137 miles away” for “the store is 10 km away”
  - “we return to the question of what a good translation should be. And the answer is that in addition to being accurate, the ideal translation will work at ever level—from sounds, through words, and up to concepts and effect. But because this is seldom possible, the translator must choose which levels
should be given priority. Most people are of the mistaken opinion that the words should always be given priority, that as long as the words are translated correctly, everything else falls into place. But this is not usually true. In fact, there are very few times when the words themselves are the most important part of a text, just as there are very few times when the sounds are the most important. While it's hard to understand the text as a whole without knowing what the words mean, just knowing the meaning of the words is not nearly enough to understand the text. More generally, a 'literal' translation is almost always just a 'bad' or 'wrong' translation, inasmuch as it fails to give a reader of the translation an accurate understanding or appreciation of the original. (Hoffman, 1010)

- To translate under the government of the sign induces a schizophrenia of translating. A pseudo-realism demands that the meaning alone be translated—although the meaning is never alone. It demands the illusion of the natural—self-effacing translation. It confines poetry and indeed the entire literary act to a notion of form as residue of what one believes meaning to be, generally taking the word as the unit. The reply of poetics is that the unit of language is not the word, and can thus not be word meaning. Targeters are looking at the wrong target. Because they only know the sign. But the unit is discourse. The system of discourse. (Henri Meschonnic, 2)


- Question - What is the reason for looking at these different methodologies
  - Have a mature awareness of a more realistic, broader understanding of what translation really is
  - move beyond the old debates between literal and free translation
  - understand communication in a much broader sense

**Communication Models**

- Before looking at certain translation theories, it is helpful to first look at theories of communication, which reside behind a theory of translation.
- Communication is part of the world we live in, and a very important part at that; hence what we believe about communication matters. The better our beliefs agree with reality, the more successful our efforts in communication are likely to be…The more adequate our beliefs about communication, the more successful we are likely to be in handling translations. (Gutt, 1)
- If translation does fall within the domain of human communication, as many translation theorists contend, then different models of communication will approach translation differently. Any advances in communication theory have far reaching implications for translation theory.
- Question - How does communication happen? What is involved in communication?
- **Code model**
  - **Definition** - (communication happens when…) the speaker encodes the meaning to be communicated into a linguistic form (sound, sign, writing) using his or her lexicon and grammar. The form is transmitted over some channel such as speech or writing to the hearer, who then recovers the meaning by decoding the form, using his or her lexicon and grammar.
  - **Example**: MEANINGspeaker > encode > FORM > decode > MEANINGhearer
• Every act of verbal communication involves (a) a code, (b) a source (c) a message (d) a receptor (e) a channel (f) a setting and (g) a noise factor (De Waard and Nida (1986). (noise = anything that distorts the message between the source and the receptor)
• Semiotics and semiology were also developed out of this model of communication.
• CM has been the dominant theory of communication in modern linguistics.

• **Code model and semantics**
  - CM tends to promote the definitions theory—to give the meaning of linguistic expressions we should establish definitions of the meanings of words. Thus a sentence composed of defined words could then be combined and give the meaning of an expression.
  - But definitions of words are with other words (circularity), you can never step outside of language to define words
  - Meanings can never be comprehensive and precise, there are always differences among speakers (no one has the exact same meaning)
  - Meaning is also context-driven (more on that later) same words in different context mean different things
    • If features of context are part of an utterance’s meaning then how can we include them in our definitions?
  • Semantic analysis is more than attaching definitions to linguistic expressions
  • **Question** - how much knowledge is necessary to use a word
    • note also, our mental lexicon is never static (always learning and forgetting information)
  • Tends to promote the literal language theory
    • According to CM, metaphors and other non-literal uses of language require a different processing strategy than literal language.

• **Inadequacies of Code Model**
  • **Language is viewed as a machine.** It is primarily structural (grammar and lexicon). But language is much more complex
  • **Communication is also viewed as mechanical.** But communication is much more complex. And much more human. Modern developments in communication have greatly helped. The role of grammar has been vastly overestimated. The leixon is only the tip of the iceberg, which includes the context, encyclopedic knowledge, worldview, attitudes, etc.
  • **Meaning is viewed as encoded within the linguistic form.** But meaning is much more complex. What is meaning? More to follow. Meaning does not reside in a text. Meaning is in the mind of the communicator.
  • **Interpretation is viewed as decoding, unpacking a container.** But interpretation is much more complex
  • **Context is not incorporated.** It does not show how context can influence the form and meaning of an utterance. The same utterance can have vastly different meanings and interpretations depending upon the context it was given. CM proposes that the same input should yield the same output, but that is not true.
  • **Misunderstanding of connectives -**
    • there is no appreciation for inference. Connectives ca be overused, they can be redundant and unnecessary.
  • **Has no way of explaining meaning in silence**
• If nothing is encoded, why does silence often have very profound meaning? Other forms of non-vocal communication could be included here as well.

• **Inadequate understanding of elipsis**
  • CM purports that meaning should result from the decoding form, not from the absence of a form. But often the absence of a form can be inferred.

• **No appreciation for repetition**
  • If meaning is simply encoded, there is no need to repeat. But often repetition adds and colors meaning.

• **Inadequate understanding of nonliteral meaning**
  • CM assumes that a literal meaning is primary, and if it does not fit a nonliteral meaning is then applied. But figurative language is understood just as easily as non-figurative.

• **Source-Meaning-Receptor theory**
  • Very similar to Code model. Developed from the Code Model
  • “dynamic equivalence” (Eugene Nida) and “meaning-based” of theories (Beekman & Callow) would fall under this category.
  • Shifted focus from the equivalence of form to the equivalence of meaning.
  • But still assumes a text is an encoded meaning.
  • A translation is deemed faithful to the extent that its meaning decodes to the same meaning in the source text.
  • Would add an additional empirical output filter to allow for context and other interpretive helps.

• **Problems with the SMR model**
  • Misconception about the text
  • Often more explicit than necessary
  • Does not have a good procedure for when to explicate implicatures.
  • A mechanical image of how texts communicate meanings based on encoding and decoding

• **Relevance Theory**
  • Until 1957 the code model was the only theory of communication.
  • Paul Grice (1957 and 1968) was the first to propose that an inferential model of communication could be more comprehensive than a code model. According to the inferential model, communication is achieved by producing and interpreting evidence.
  • “To grasp the words on a page we have to know a lot of information that isn’t set down on the page” (ED Hirsch 1987)
  • Relevance theory (RT) was later developed, primarily by Sperber and Wilson.
  • RT is a rich theory of communication that grapples with the role of context in interpretation. RT is pragmatic-heavy in understanding meaning and communication.
  • In many ways, RT is an entire paradigm shift in understanding translation and communication.
  • Communication is the sharing of thoughts. But how can thoughts be shared. They are not public. Thus in RT, this need is met through ostensive stimulus. But at the same time, even the most explicit and sophisticated ostensive stimuli do not give direct access to the thoughts themselves. The thoughts are thus inferred by the recipient of the communication.
  • “The explicit meanings of a piece of writing are the tip of an iceberg of meaning: the larger part lies below the surface of the text and is composed of the reader’s own
relevant knowledge.” (1987:33-34). In relevance theory, this has become known as the hypothesis of the "radical underdeterminacy of linguistic meaning” (Carston 2002).

- **What is the meaning of ‘meaning’?**
  - Meaning is not simply just “in the words.”
  - “The procedure is actually quite simple. First you arrange the items in different groups. Of course one pile may be sufficient depending on how much there is to do. If you have to go somewhere else due to lack of facilities that is the next step; otherwise you are pretty well set.” (Gutt, RT 12, 2)
  - Is this understandable on its own? What if there is a title of ‘washing clothes’?

- **examples**
  - Do not boil a kid in its mother’s milk (Ex 23:19). - prohibition of cooking a baby goat in milk of its mother. This is the meaning from understanding the lexical and grammatical function of the phrase. Yet the meaning can also be understood as ‘do not practice magic’ this meaning is from the context-driven inferences.
  - A dog runs and places a ball at the feet of his owner and nudges it towards him.
  - A child lifts his hands in front of their parent, showing (ostensifying) that the wish to be picked up.
  - A baby drops a spoon on the floor and looks at it. What does the father do?
  - he slipped on the floor and dropped the glass pitcher
    - implicature - the pitcher broke
      - This point is inferred from encyclopedic knowledge that dropping an object means subjecting it to a gravitational acceleration downward terminated by an impact (a universal schema in Feldman's paradigm). The further encyclopedic knowledge gained from life experience that glass usually shatters on impact completes the inferential process needed to comprehend by inference the unstated, but intended, communication. The proposition that the pitcher broke is what relevance theory calls an implicature of the words actually said. Now, if the speaker did not mean to communicate that the pitcher broke, she would have to go on to say, "And amazingly the pitcher didn't break," to disconfirm the strongly associated inference.” *what is implied by language is just as much a part of the meaning communicated as what is explicitly said.*
  - Your 10'o'clock is in the lobby
  - Q - Can we meet tomorrow? R - I have to be at school all day.
  - Mother - What’s your new teacher like? Daughter - He rides to school on a motorcycle
    - possible implicatures - she likes the teacher, she likes him because he rides a motorcycle. she finds the teacher odd.
  - Do you want coffee? Coffee would keep me awake.
    - interpretation and meaning is dependent on the context of whether person thinks he wants to stay awake
  - Meaning resides in the interaction between stimulus and context. (RT diss 44)
• The meaning of a word or utterance is not in some mysterious way contained in the black ink on the paper nor in the sound waves of the utterance, but in the minds of the people using them (gutt, 5).

• **What is communication?** - Communication is a text+context-mediated relation between a speaker's meaning (intention) and a hearer's meaning (an interpretive resemblance to the speaker's intention)—speaker is ostensive and recipient is inferential.

• The communicator's intended meaning consists of the sum of the explicatures and implicatures conveyed by his/her utterance.
  - This is the difference between what can be inferred from the linguistic content of an utterance (its explicatures) and what can be inferred only from the external context (its implicatures).

• **Examples**
  - India is a beehive
  - Chad being Chad

• **Explicature** - direct or explicit speech act

• **Implicature** - an assumption that is communicated, but not explicitly

• The same sentence, used to express the same thought, may sometimes be used to present this thought as true, sometimes to suggest that it is not, sometimes to wonder whether it is true, sometimes to ask the hearer to make it true, and so on. Utterances are used not only to convey thoughts but to reveal the speaker's attitude to, or relation to, the thought expressed; in other words, they express 'propositional attitudes', perform 'speech-acts', or carry 'illocutionary force'. (Sperber and Wilson, 11)

  - ex. (a) you're leaving
  - ex. (b) what an honest fellow Joe is.

  - (a) can express informing the hearer that he must leave, or that he is going to leave, making a guess to confirm or deny, expressing outrage/discontent/happiness that he is leaving

• RT helps to show the importance of context and pragmatic effect
  - the farmer fed the sheep
  - the sheep fed the farmer and is family for three weeks
  - this recipe feeds five people

• Humans tend to pay attention to the most relevant phenomena available (Wilson and Sperber 1987:10). Thus relevance is the key to interpreting utterances.

• Information is considered relevant when "it interacts in a certain way with your existing assumptions about the world" (Wilson and Sperber 1987:11) by (a) strengthening (b) weakening (c) building upon assumptions. When new information alters assumption it is said to produce contextual effects.

• **Principle of Relevance** - Information is considered most relevant with the least processing effort.
  - adequate interpretive benefit for the minimal processing effort. ex: a tuna sandwich is on the table and your friend says "the cat just came in."
  - b other things being equal, the greater the contextual effects, the greater the relevance.
  - ‘every act of ostensive communication communicates the presumption of its own optimal relevance’ (Sperber and Wilson, 1986)

• What is said does not and rarely is identical to the full interpretation it causes a hearer to arrive at (Malmkjaer, 26),

• RT has major implications for semantics and pragmatics
• **Semantics** - the study of meaning of linguistic expression apart from the consideration of the effect that pragmatic factors have on the meaning of language.
  - the study of meaning communicated through language, the task is to investigate how people communicate meaning with pieces of language. Semantics (meaning) in a sense is a product of all linguistic levels (Saaeed 3) (phonetics>phonology>morphology>syntax) - semantics
  
• **Pragmatics** - the study of the aspects of meaning and language use that are dependent on the speaker, the addressee and other features of the context of utterance (the effect that context, goals, communication principles) have on speaker’s choice of expression. Pragmatic concerns with treatment of given vs new information, speech acts (illocutionary acts, implicatures) meaning in light of both speakers and hearers, semantics - just speech acts, away from users
  
• There is a gap between the semantic representation of sentences and the thoughts communicated by the utterances—the meaning conceived by an utterance is not identical to what is linguistically encoded in the utterance itself. The context factors fill the gap.
  
• Gives inference a valid role in communication
  
• RT shifts focus from meaning (largely an ill-defined semantic notion) to the pragmatic/rhetorical dimensions of the text
  
• RT understands communication to be ostensive-inferential—the recipient infers the clues of the speaker.
  
• RT has a broader understanding of meaning, utilizing semantics and pragmatics.
  
• Every utterance is a clue from which the hearer must infer what the speaker intends to communicate.
  
• **Descriptive use and interpretive use of language** - In descriptive use, (a) the thought belongs to the speaker and (b) the speaker intends it to accurately represent reality. In interpretive use, (a) the thought belongs (originally) to someone other than the speaker and (b) the speaker intends his/her utterance to accurately represent the original thought. (RT diss 39)
  
• Relevance theory also allows for a simple explanation of figurative language (cf. Sperber and Wilson 1986:231-237).
  
• the propositional form of an utterance is not identical with the thought it conveys; it merely interpretively resembles that thought.
  
• literal and figurative language only differ by the degree to which the propositional form of an utterance resembles the speaker’s thought.
  
• Some metaphors may only convey a single implicature, others may convey a wider range of implicatures.
  
• According to Sperber and Wilson (1986:86), the human mind stores three different types of information with reference to every concept it holds. These are viewed as three entries: (a) the logical entry, (b) the encyclopedic entry, and (c) the lexical entry.
  
• a - logical: mother = female, parent
  
• b - encyclopedic - mother = self-sacrificing love, cooking, sewing, cleaning house
  
• c - lexical = mother = amm, moeder, mere, hin
  
• Thus the distinction between logical and encyclopedic entries corresponds roughly to the traditional distinction between the denotative and connotative meanings of words and to “the distinction between the content and context of an utterance” (Gutt 2000:142). This distinction is significant for translation because it has implications for the way words function in a discourse. A given
word may evoke a whole assumption schema within the original context; often the receptor language has a word with an equivalent logical entry, but none with an equivalent encyclopedic one. (RT diss 42)

- A big advantage of RT over CM is that it incorporates context within the theory since inferencing that produces explicatures and implicatures depends crucially on context.
- RT still states coding and decoding take place, they only make up one aspect of the inferential communication. "A coding-decoding process is subservient to an inferential process" (Sperber and Wilson 1986:27).
- We make frequent use of inferential processes in daily life
- We use inference to interpret verbal communication as well as other experiences
- Does not claim that there is no coding in communication, but that communication consist in the encoding and decoding of messages.
- The overall picture of interpretation is that grammatical-internal principles articulate both syntactic and semantic structure for sentences, a semantic structure for a sentence being an incomplete specification of how it is understood. Pragmatic theory explains how such incomplete specifications are enriched in context to yield the full communicative effect of an uttered sentence, whether metaphorical, ironical, and so on. This is the view adopted by relevance theory (Sperber and Wilson, 1995). (Kempson 2011:399-400).
- "Interpretive resemblance" “interpretive use" - Just as drawings, such as cartoons, may "resemble" a person without depicting them at all accurately, so propositions can be used to resemble thoughts they convey, a use of language which is called "interpretive use." Metaphorical uses of language, like other rhetorical effects, are said to constitute the proposition expresse by the utterance and the thought (it is intended to convey. (Kempson 2001:414)
- Shows that much can be inferred in a communication through implicature, which do not necessarily need to be made explicit in translation. Relevance is the over-arching principle for making implicit information explicit. Helps to show that understanding implicatures is done by the recipient inferring from the communication.
- Information can be richly communicated with limited explicatures.
- Translation principle - keep weak communication weak. Authors do not communicate simply and clearly. “I am the light of the world” “you must be born again”
- Questions - How much interpretation should be left to the readers and how much should be done by translators?
- Communication involves risk, translation involves twice as much.
- explication often narrows the range of information conveyed and misrepresents the strength with which it was intended to be communicated.
- Repetition -
  - “My childhood days are gone, gone”
  - The effort involved in reconstructing the same propositional form leads to greater activation of assumptions stored in encyclopedic entries attached to the constituent concepts, in particular here to the concept CHILDHOOD.... [2000:126 What occurs is an increase in the salience of a wide range of assumptions. CHILDHOOD is a rich concept, with a wealth of assumptions stored in its encyclopedic entry. This information consists, to a large extent, of beliefs about childhood that belong to a particular cultural viewpoint. (Pilkington 2000:124).
  - Jeremiah 22:29 “O land, land, land, hear the word of the Lord: …”
  - Numbers 7 (where the official record of gifts is fully repeated twelve times)
• Haggai 2:4–9 “...declares the Lord...declares the Lord...declares the Lord Almighty. This is what the Lord Almighty says...says the Lord Almighty...declares the Lord Almighty...says the Lord Almighty...declares the Lord Almighty.”

• **Impact of RT on BT**
  * While RT
    • RT shows that plugging in the equivalent words more often than not will fail to preserve the implicatures intended by the original language to the extent that the cultural frames of the original audience differ from those of the target audience.
    • The most explicit accounts of translation that we have had so far rely on the code model of communication—either explicitly or implicitly. To the degree that the code model is inadequate, we can also expect code-model-based views of translation to be inadequate. Or, to express things more positively, to the degree that the inferential theory of communication overcomes inadequacies in the code model of communication, we can also expect better insights into the nature of translation. (Gutt, 1.4)
  • since coding-decoding are only part of the communication act, any attempt convey the entire message of the Bible by means of linguistic coding is doomed to failure… descriptive-classificatory methods of analyzing codes continue to have value for translators, but mainly as guides to exegesis and not translation, helping translators analyse the meaning of the source text, but not telling them how to render the text (RT diss 38)
  • shows the foundational assumptions of functional equivalence are false. ie, a given message can be communicated successfully given the correct form of expression.
  • Even if a translation reproduces the original stimulus perfectly, its readers may not interpret it the same way because they use different contextual information to derive their interpretation. The meaning of an utterance—the set of assumptions (explicatures plus implicatures) it communicates—is highly context-dependent. (RT diss 44)
  • If communication were merely a matter of coding and decoding messages, functional equivalence would rest on a sound theoretical foundation

• **Types/methods of translation theories within RT**
  * RT developed as a theory of communication. However, it has also further been developed to include theories of translation. Gutt has been a major thinker in developing a translation theory from RT.
    • “His objective is thus broader than that of Nida. Whereas Nida set out to prescribe a method of translation, Gutt tried to formulate a comprehensive theory of translation. Gutt’s account of translation certainly has far-reaching implications for the development of approaches to translation, but these are incidental to his main objective.” (RT diss, 14)
  • Within RT, translation is analyzed as a special kind of interpretive use (interlingual interpretive use), the translators present a faithful representation of another text.
    • Gutt (Translation and Relevance 1991, 200) develops theories of translation from RT. Presents three methods of translation
  • **Covert translation**
    • ex. pamphlets, instruction manuals
• not intended to be understood as a translation

**Direct translation**

• Just as previous speech acts can be quoted directly or indirectly, so can translation be done directly or indirectly.
• Ex. someone wants to know about a sermon you heard. The analogy for direct translation is that you would quote the sermon in its entirety directly.
• Focuses on translating the SL clues
• Translation as an exact reproduction of the very words of the source
• A receptor-language utterance is a direct translation of a source-language utterance if, and only if, it presumes to interpretively resemble the original completely (in the context envisaged for the original).
• we want to produce a stimulus in the target language that will communicate to the target audience the full interpretation of the original, that is, that it will share with the original all implications the original author intended to communicate.
• It simulates a “direct quotation” across languages in that it allows the receptors access to the originally intended interpretation. But it does so only under the condition that the receptors use the contextual assumptions envisaged by the original communicator.
• ... stimuli can be looked at from two different points of view. They can be looked at from the point of view of the cognitive effects they have—for example, what explicatures and/or implicatures they convey—but they can also be looked at from the point of view of the intrinsic properties they have as phenomena, and this is the perspective that seems relevant to direct quotation, for, as Wilson and Sperber (1988:137) state, “Direct quotations are chosen not for their propositional form but for their superficial linguistic properties.” (Gutt 1991:126)
• A receptor language utterance is a direct translation of a source language if and only if it purports to interpretively resemble the original completely in the context envisaged for the original (Gutt 2000:177)
• Emphasizes receptor language’s need to familiarize with the cognitive environment of the original.
• Typically excludes the explication of implicit information or summarizing.
• a direct translation does not aim to produce immediate cognitive effects, but to produce a text that will yield the same interpretation as the original if interpreted using the same contextual assumptions as the original.
• But no two languages have the same linguistic properties, and it is a big assumption that readers will use the contextual assumptions assumed of the original
• Direct translation shows that linguistic features themselves do not have intrinsic value (contra formal equivalence), but are only useful in the **communicative clues** they provide. This is a great advancement since grammatical structures do not have to be stringently followed since linguistic structures do not need to be followed if they are meaningless in RL.
• **comparison with indirect translation** - linguistic properties are kept over cognitive effect, and linguistic properties are treated functionally rather than formally.

• Due to the mechanical nature of making gloss translations, those who prepare formally equivalent translations can get away with only a working knowledge of biblical Hebrew or Greek. All they need to do is match the linguistic form of the source text with the literal English construction suggested in introductory Hebrew or Greek grammars. For example, they may routinely render the Greek aorist participle with the English form *having ...* or the Greek genitive with English preposition *of*. When the translators’ job shifts from matching linguistic forms to identifying communicative clues, a much deeper grasp of the source language is needed. (RT diss 63)

### Indirect translation

• Translation is presented as an approximation of what the source said; a faithful representation of the original act of communication

• ex. someone wants to know about a sermon you heard and you give an indirect summary of the translation.

• Indirect translation is a receptor language text which the translator intends to be interpreted in the context envisaged (by him) *for the receptor language audience*, and his informative intention in making it is to communicate to the receptor language audience *as many as possible* of the assumptions communicated by the original in the originally envisaged context. Winckler and Van der Merwe (1993:53) -= An indirect translation can now be defined as a translation that purports to interpretively resemble the original in relevant respects in the receptor-language context.

• Direct translation is committed to complete interpretive resemblance while indirect translation presumes only adequate resemblance in relevant respect.

• Purports to remain faithful to the essence of the original without making any claim to adhering to the form.

• Can come across as a paraphrase, as long as it is faithful to the meaning of the source in respect to relevant needs or interests of the hearer.

• An indirect translation interpretively resembles the original

• a translation can use language descriptively or interpretively.

• both the ST and RL would have the interpretation, recovering the same set of assumptions; the implicatures and explications of the RT communicate and correspond to those of the original

• It does not have to convey all original assumptions (impossible), but it what it does convey is true to the meaning of the original.

• The degree of resemblance will be determined by considerations of relevance, and specifically by the communicator’s assumptions about what the RL might find optimally relevant (Gutt 2000:106).

• ex. summarizes a sermon for someone

• indirect translation is not free to change, add to, or subtract from the macro-level content of the original. But changing, adding, and subtracting is acceptable on the micro-level of formal elements,
permitted that these changes still allow the whole message to be faithful to the meaning of the ST.

- “the sum total of the explicatures and implicatures of the translation must equal the sum total of the explicatures and implicatures of the original” (Gutt 1991:95).
- Must lead to the same interpretation as the ST.
- Indirect translation strives to produce immediate contextual effects (to make the message spontaneously intelligible to the receptors). Effective of a translation is based “on the comparison of interpretations” (Gutt 2000:233) rather than on relationship between source and translated text (Gutt 1996:252)
- The question that should guide translators is “will readers be able to derive from the translation the same interpretation that we were able to derive from the original?” (RT diss 50)
- Emphasizes principles of relevance. To produce an adequate range of contextual effect with the minimal justifiable processing effort (Wilson and Sperber 1987:14), thus indirect translation tries to make the meaning of the text as spontaneous and clear as possible.
- RL readers should have as their first and immediate interpretation is in fact the author’s intended meaning. (original author’s set of assumptions as understood by the translator). - this is interesting
- There is both objectivity and subjectivity involved. when not all explicatures and implicature as able to be communicated, rt guides what is most relevant to readers (Gutt 2000:105-107).
- translators must accept responsibility for the bulk of the “communicative labour” (Winckler and Van der Merwe 1993:53). They must do everything possible to word the translation so as “to compensate for the shift in sociocultural setting from that of the original audience to that of the receptor (or target) audience.”

**Positives of indirect translation**

- eliminates the need to depend upon complex descriptive-classificatory schemes to guide translation decisions. But sometimes problems do not just fall into one category. principles of relevance serve as the overarching translation principle that direct the use and application of classificatory schemes
- functional equivalence has a higher, broader, unattainable goal of producing . Indirect says it should resemble the original in relevant respects.
- forces translators to take the problem of communicability seriously by consciously realizing when a switch to direct translation is necessary (RT diss 56)

**Summary**

- the choice of a particular approach to translation, such as direct or indirect translation, is not theoretically significant; both kinds of translations are processed by the same principles of communication, the distinction between the two approaches is purely theory internal.
This implies that there is no theoretical necessity for a translator to follow either of the two approaches consistently (Gutt 2000:200).

- **Comparing indirect translation and functional equivalence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional equivalence</th>
<th>Indirect translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>based on code model</td>
<td>based on inferential model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumes communicability</td>
<td>determines communicability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses descriptive-classificatory systems</td>
<td>uses principles of relevance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values naturalnes of expression</td>
<td>values naturalness of expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses various criteria for resemblance</td>
<td>uses only relevance for resemblance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assumes RL context whenever possible</td>
<td>assumes RL context whenever possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>places interpretive burden on translator</td>
<td>places interpretive burden on translator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluated by comparing text</td>
<td>evaluated by comparing interpretation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **successful communication principles for translation**

  - (1) There are general laws of communication that relate stimulus, context, and interpretation in a cause-effect relation. A translation can achieve its objectives only to the degree that it is in agreement with these laws of communication.
  
  - (2) This cause-effect nature of communication means that the first question in translation is not what we want to communicate by our translation but what we reasonably can communicate. In other words, translators need to address the issue of communicability squarely, which has been largely ignored. Normative statements about the objective of translation made in ignorance of this condition are not helpful and only create frustration.
  
  - (3) Communicability is crucially dependent on context. What a translation can achieve is only partially determined by what is expressed in the text. *A large part, and indeed often the larger part, of the meaning is dependent on the contextual knowledge (or otherwise) of the receptors.*
  
  - (4) In concrete terms, a translation can communicate the full intended meaning of the original only if the receptor audience has access to the full context envisaged by the original communicator. Any approach to translation that believes the communication of the full meaning can be achieved by a good translation alone, regardless of receptor context, is doomed to failure.
  
  - (5) The converse of the last statement is also true. The less the context available to the receptors resembles the context assumed by the original communicator, the less the meaning conveyed by the translation will resemble the original. This limitation holds true regardless of whether the translation is literal, idiomatic, or dynamically equivalent.
• (6) Translations that do not fulfill the requirement of communicability, that is, that prove to be inconsistent with the principle of relevance for the receptors, run a great risk of remaining unread.
• (7) It must be clearly recognized that the final objectives of Scripture translation cannot be realized by translation alone.
• (8) Translation projects need to be seen in the wider context of communication, rather than book production. In particular, they need to provide strategies that will enable the audience to eventually bridge the contextual gap.
• (9) Before starting their work, translators need to ensure that what they intend to communicate by the translation matches what the receptors expect from it. These intentions and expectations are an important part of the context in which the communication takes place, and their agreement is crucial for the success of the translation. (This does not prejudge the issue as to whose views should prevail!)
• (10) By a careful study and comparison of original and receptor context, translators can predict and anticipate areas of both overlap and mismatch between original context and receptor context. This comparative study of context should ideally involve representatives of the anticipated receptor audience. It may be carried out both intuitively and analytically.
• (11) Recognition of areas of overlap in contextual knowledge can be used to optimize the impact of the translation program.
• (12) Recognition of contextual gaps can be used to develop appropriate bridging strategies: explication in the text, study notes, separate background materials, etc. It is not necessarily the translator’s task to implement these strategies; however, for the sake of successful communication, someone needs to take care of this. Translators do need to be involved to some extent, not only because they are in a unique position to do so, but also because the way they translate will be directly affected.
• (13) In view of the inspired nature of the biblical texts, there seems to be little disagreement that the aim of Bible translation is, ultimately, to communicate the full intended interpretation of the original, as far as we have access to it.
  • “full intended interpretation”, i.e., complete interpretive resemblance, is not limited to the semantic contents, but includes what other approaches have divided into “emotional meaning,” “connotative meaning,” “illocutionary force,”
• (14) Translators should have a firm grasp of hitherto neglected aspects of meaning. In particular, they should understand that there are important differences between expressing and implicating information, between strong and weak communication. They should understand the importance of open-endedness in communication, especially for figurative language and poetic effects, and the danger of limitation and distortion that can arise from explication. Such awareness will provide much
sharper tools for discovering the intended meaning of the original in their exegesis and for decision-making in the translation work.

- (15) When dealing with translation problems, translators should be encouraged to ensure that they have a clear understanding of the nature and causes of any particular problem. Then they should look for an acceptable solution in line with the agreed translation guidelines and, if necessary, in consultation with the receptor audience.
  - distinguish between genuine translation problems, due to mismatches in the linguistic resources of the two languages, and communication problems due to the mismatches in contextual assumptions between the original audience and the target audience. This distinction is important because the inclusion or explication of contextual information in the text has always a distorting influence, sometimes bigger, sometimes smaller.
  - people called Pharisees
- (16) Translators should understand that unnaturalness arises from inconsistencies with the principle of relevance. (Gutt, 5)
  - Thus we find that the freer translation and the stricter one serve two different audiences: The former is easier for those who have little background; the latter gives a richer meaning to those with more biblical knowledge. However, due to the contextual gap between the original audience and almost any present-day receptors, it seems safe to say that neither type of translation will wholly satisfy the principle of relevance for present-day audiences, at least for significant parts of the biblical text. Therefore, it is an absolutely essential requirement that translations be embedded in a wider framework of communication that closes the relevance gap. Otherwise, we can predict that many translations will remain unread.

Summary of Translation Theories and Disciplines

- RT also proposes an alternative to the typical literal/dynamic
- Translation has been going on long before modern linguistics and translation theories
- But modern linguistics and theories help to deepen understanding of translation and does ultimately improve the translation process

Lexical Semantics - Words and Meaning

- example
  • chien (French)
  • dog (English)
  • Hund (German)
  • ńug (Maba)
  • kalib (Arabic)
  • fuga (Mubi)
  • wi (Tama)
  • The form changes, but the meaning stays the same
    • Form = phonetic, lexical, syntactical, discourse
    • Meaning = message or information communicated by the form
• Changes in form can include - audio/visual/linguistic information

• **Goal** -
  • Have a deeper understanding of the relationship between words and meaning (e.g. lexical semantics)
  • realize that translating even one word into a different language is not as straightforward as it may appear.
  • There is never a one to one correspondance
  • Determine the best translation of a word within its given context
  • Phonetics/phonology, semantics/pragmatics, grammar is involved in every word

• **Question** - What is a word? What’s in a word?
  • A word is a symbol which represents an area of experience or a part of one's environment.
  • ‘a minimal permutable element’
  • two features of a prototypical word
    • (i) it can be moved about in the sentence, or at least its position relative to other constituents can be altered by inserting new material
    • (ii) it cannot be interrupted or its parts reordered (Cruse, 88)
  • Words are semantically complex and include semantic components. That which a word represents, that is to say, its meaning, can be divided into components. (Beekman & Callow, ch 4)
    • **Thing**
      • inanimate/animate beings (including supernatural beings) ex. stone, dog, man, ghost, devil, etc
    • **Event**
      • actions and processes (run, think, die, blacken)
    • **Abstraction**
      • qualities and quantities (soft, red, round, many, quickly)
    • **Relation**
      • Relationship with any pair of T,E,A (coordinate, simultaneous, sequential, attributive)

• **Question** (re. derivational morphology) - is ἔργου and ἔργον two different words? or obey, obeys, obeying
  • In one sense [they] are different words; in another sense, they are merely different forms of the same word (they would not have separate entities in a dictionary) (Cruse, 88)

• A distinction is often made between lexical and grammatical meaning. There are dangers in dichotomies. It must be provided that there is a continuously varying scale, of what might be termed 'lexicality and grammaticality' (Cruse, 89)

• **A definition of meaning** - The notion of ‘meaning’ is used here n a special sense. It is what we are conscious of when we grasp the import of an utterance. There is a moment of ‘crystallization’ of understanding. Meaning is produced by a series of processes of construal which are largely unconscious. There is a striking phenomenological difference between experienced meaning-in-use and what a dictionary seems to provide. Meaning in this sense is highly context-dependent (meaning in language, 262)

• Internal word structure - words do not get their meanings from their parts.
  • **English**
    • Patent (non-obvious art), patently (obvious)
    • seaweed
    • butterfly
• **Universal characteristics of words**
  - Every language is composed of words
  - Every word has a unit of meaning. These units can be divided into parts called semantic components.
  - Words are complex in their structure of relations
    - Meaning within the relationship of real or imaginary worlds
      - dogs (fictional, historic, etc.)
    - Relationship with related words
      - pooch, puppy, mutt, canine
      - terrier, hound, poodle, collie
    - Relationship with contrasting words
      - wolf, fox, jackal, dingo
      - cat, bear, horse, cow
  - Phonological relations
    - dot, don, daub, dock, doll, doff, dodge
    - bog, cog, fog, hog, jog, log
    - However, words can also be signed (ASL, etc.)
  - Graphological relations
    - d - o - g
  - Grammatical relations
    - Count noun
      - Can function as a head noun
    - Distributional context
      - Function and relation within noun phrases
      - Function and relation within clauses
  - Phonological variation
    - Quickly, slowly, loudly, softly
  - Grammatical variation
    - Singular, plural
    - Various sentences
  - There is thus contrast, variation, and context (distribution). Within these components there is also coinherence.
  - We must avoid reductionistic thinking in our understanding of words and their meaning.

• **Other thoughts**
  - The problem arises even with words that apparently have only one meaning, words such as "pencil," "cucumber," "money," and so on. For words are such general things: "pencil" can refer to writing implements of a variety of sizes, shapes, and colours, and there are millions of them in the world. Yet when I say "I've dropped my pencil," I am referring to one specific one only. How does the listener travel, mentally, from the general word to the specific reference? (Man & Message 2.1.2)
    - Other possible usages
      - He's such a pencil
      - That boy is as skinny as a pencil
      - He's as sure as a pencil
      - My world is a paper, my life a pencil
      - In a world of pens, he chooses a pencil
• It is not really words that mean things; it is people who mean things when they use words. Words do not have meanings, they signal them. (Man & Message 2.2)

• A word, on its own, does not actually say anything, does not convey ‘a whole thought’: for that purpose, more complex semantic entities are necessary—built out of words, certainly—having at least the complexity of propositions (argument+predicate). Words (and at a more basic level, morphemes) form the building blocks for these more complex structures. (Cruse, 89)

• metaphysics, ontology, and pure forms (related subjects in lexical semantics) - how does it come about that the idea of dog ever has a particular embodiment in a particular dog? How do the particulars come about, and how do they come to have a relation to the general idea? There is no explanation, if the “one” is the only ultimate, of how the many come about. A converse difficulty arises if we start with the particulars. If the particulars are just irreducibly “there,” without further explanation, how does it come about that we can unite them under the heading of one general idea? Extreme nominalism might say that the unity is simply a unity imposed by the human mind. But if so, it is ultimately illusory, in comparison with how the things themselves are related to one another. And how can it come about that different humand minds could agree on the unities? We need God as creator to from the unity among human beings, humans created in his image. (Poythress 276)

• Summary

• A native speaker of English does not just know the word “dog” in total isolation. He tacitly understands this multitude of relations. The relations are an essential part of knowing how to use the word. The speaker has to know relations in meaning to other words and to the world in order to aptly choose the word “dog” instead of a more specific term like “colline” or a more general term like “animal” or “carnivore. In addition the speaker has to know the properties of the word in sound in order to pronounce it correctly, and the grammatical properties of the word in order to use it in a grammatical construction. For the native speaker the word “dog” enjoys all these relations in a unity. Take away the sounds, and the entire word disappears. Take away the meaning, and the word disappears. (We may still imagine the sound of the word “dog,” but without the meaning it would be a nonsense sound, not a word at all.) Take away the grammar, which includes the word “dog” as an instance of the grammatical category “noun,” and nothing remains. Vern Poythress p 271

• ***no word ever has precisely the same meaning twice, for each speech event is in a sense unique, involving participants who are constantly changing and referents which are never fixed. Bloomfield (1933: 407) describes this problem by saying that “every utterance of a speech form involves a minute semantic innovation. In any discussion of communication and meaning, one must recognize at the start, each source and each receptor differs from all others, not only in the way the formal aspects of the language are handled, but also in the manner in which symbols are used to designate certain referents. If, as is obviously true, each person employs language on the basis of his background and no two individuals ever have precisely the same background, then it is also obvious that no two persons ever mean exactly the same thing by the use of the same language symbols. At the same time, however, there is

- Every utterance is unique.
- Words are more like water in a river. They are not static.
- Words and meanings are by no means have a one-to-one correspondence. One word, viewed as an isolate, may have many meanings. On the other hand, a word in a context has only one meaning. And, in fact, any meaning may be expressed in a variety of different ways, not simply by the word or words used on a particular occasion. (Man & Message 5.1) 
  - **Important** - ἔργον ≠ work! This is a very minimalistic and inadequate understanding of the word ἔργον. Certainly, on one level it is true. But on a more comprehensive linguistic/lexical semantic level it is not true. In order to truly understand a word it is important to get beyond simple glosses and parsing. The word must become much more familiar. You must indwell the word and the word must indwell you, to be familiar and intimate with its proper usage.
- The computer scientist Alan J. Perlis is reported to have quipped, “Learning French is trivial: the word for ‘horse’ is cheval, and everything else follows in the same way.” The tendency is to think that horse and cheval are interchangeable, but they are not completely interchangeable. For example ‘horse’ rhymes with ‘of course’ but not in French. While some contexts rhyming is not important, in other contacts it is crucially important. “The two are not interchangeable precisely because there are in different languages. There is something about speaking English that goes beyond the English words, and equally, something about French that transcends the French. By and large ‘horse’ refers to a horse in America or some other English-speaking country, while cheval refers to a horse in France or some other French-speaking country. (Hoffman 60). There is both foreignization and familiarity with cross-linguistic word meanings.
  - ex. How do you translate the first line of War & Peace in French when it was written in French (eh bien, mon prince).
  - Tree may not be the same across languages. English might qualify a palm tree but Hebrew might just say tree, but qualify a maple or an oak.
  - look up poythress and God transcendance immanence in lnguage perhaps?
- **Thought** - could ‘dirty, scavenging mutt’ be a better term for dog in NT?
- **Some words do not have a simple lexical entry**
  - Greek
  - δέ
    - BAGD - used to connect one clause to another, either to express contrast or simple continuation. When it is felt that there is some contrast betw. clauses—though the contrast is oft. scarcely discernible—the most common translation is ‘but.’ When a simple connective is desired, without contrast being clearly implied, ‘and’ will suffice, and in certain occurrences the marker may be left untranslated
• Thus this particle does not mark the presence of absence of discontinuity. Where does discontinuity derive from when this particle is implemented?

• - it is insufficient to say that καί corresponds to “and,” and δέ to “but”
• It is better to define this particle as a developmental marker. You could make a comparison with English temporal adverbs such as “well” “then” “afterwards”, etc.
• The function of this particle is more discourse-related than lexical.
• Steve Runge - Δέ is a coordinating conjunction like καί, but it includes the added constraint of signaling a new development (notated “+ development”). Καί, on the other hand, is unmarked for development (“- development”). The use of δέ represents the writer’s choice to explicitly signal that what follows is a new, distinct development in the story or argument, based on how the writer conceived of it

• Examples
  • 1 Cor 12:4 - Διαιρέσεις δὲ χαρισμάτων εἰσίν, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα. Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit,

• English
  • conjunctions - so, a/an, not, very, but, of, the
  • expressions - hmm, uhh, ow
• Dictionaries will only be a limited help in understanding the function of these words. Discourse analysis, semantics, pragmatics, etc. can be more useful.
• It could be more helpful to understand their function in discourse or pragmatics.

• Words with multiple senses
• Before the components of meaning can be analyzed, it must be determined if there are multiple senses.
• Ex. Jump
  • Jump – move upward with both feet in the air
  • Jump – move upward with both feet in the air and exit a plane (parachute)
  • Jump – move because startled; the explosion made everyone jump.
  • Jump – move quickly (jump in the shower)
  • Jump — Do quickly: when her husband is attacked, she jumps to his defense (fig)
  • Jump – move abruptly from one idea to another (fig)
  • Jump – increase dramatically – house prices have really jumped. (fig)

• Ex. Dress
  • dress timber
  • dress a salad
  • dress rank
  • dress a wound
  • dress the hair
  • dress a shop window

• Words that do not correspond between languages
• English vs Spanish - run and corre
  • Equivalent usages of the word in both languages.
    • The boy runs. El muchacho corre.
  • Secondary and figurative senses in the first language but not the second.
• The clock runs. El reloj anda. ‘The clock walks.’
• Secondary and figurative senses in the second but not the first.
  • El tiempo corre. The time runs. But actually means, “Time flies.”
• Usages with the same collocates, but with differing meanings.
  • The car runs. El carro corre. ‘The car goes fast.’
• Usages which are similar in meaning, but with different forms.
  • The stocking runs. Se corre un hilo. ‘A thread runs.’

• **Teda (Chad)** -
  • ‘zido’ covers the following English colors - ‘green’, ‘blue’, ‘violet’.
  • ‘mado’ covers the following English colors - ‘red’, ‘pink’, ‘orange’

• **Daba (N. Cameroon)**
  • ‘may’ covers ‘love’, ‘like’, ‘want’, ‘desire’
  • ‘zlim’ covers ‘hear’, ‘understand’, ‘obey’

• **Mubi (Chad)**
  • ‘jigeg’ - “follow” ‘obey’
  • deg - ‘carry on head’

• **Kuo (Chad) (?)**
  • ham - to eat bones
  • zem - to eat meat
  • sa - to eat boule
  • ci - to eat peanuts
  • zlea - to eat sauce
  • sea - to eat lemons

• These example show that the meaning of one word can cover the senses of multiple words in another language, and similar words do not entirely correspond cross-linguistically.

• **Collocations**
  • Words that are regularly grouped together.
  • Collocations vary among languages
    • **troupeau de boeufs** - herd of cattle
    • **troupeau de chevres** - flock of goats
    • **troupeau d’oies** - gaggle of geese
    • **troupeau de chiens?**
      • **bande de chiens** - pack of dogs

• **Example**
  • That book is deep vs the water is deep
  • That book is profound/penetrating/challenging
  • That book is superficial/shallow/sketchy
  • The water is profound/penetrating/challenging
  • The water is superficial/shallow/sketchy

• **Understanding the components of meaning within a word**
  • The translator must determine and understand all the senses within a word. It can be helpful to outline all the senses.
  • A faithful translation will make sure the most important components are incorporated into a translation
  • Ex Gen 32:15 -
    • cow: domestic animal, gives milk, female, horns, edible
    • bull: domestic animal, gives milk, male, horns, edible
  • Often there are generic/specific levels of relation between words.
- Words within a generic-specific list remain in the same semantic class
- Ex. - A translator who works with the Manobo language in the Philippines was searching for a term to translate the concept of “to blaspheme.” He started with the generic term to criticize, modified this with a manner component, and arrived at the generic expression, “to criticize by speech.” With this generic expression he asked his language helper for different kinds of verbal activity whereby one could criticize another. This produced a semantic set of eight words some of which had not before been encountered. Comparing and contrasting the meaning of each of these words revealed significant components which were essential in choosing an accurate equivalent for the Biblical term “to blaspheme.” 28 The generic-specific character of the vocabulary of each language may be utilized to advantage by the translator to arrive at a more explicit and thus a more accurate understanding of important terms used in his translation.

- **Lexical relations**
  - Homonymy - unrelated senses of the same phonological word
    - lap (course) lap (part of body)
    - ring - wring
    - keep (v) keep (n)
    - not - knot
  - Polysemy - related senses of the same phonological word
    - hook - curved metal, trap, snare, something that attracts, a sharp bend in a geological formation, a short swing in boxing, a golf shot that serves sharply
  - Synonymy - different phonological words which have the same or very similar meanings
    - coach/safa, boy/ad, lawyer/attorney, toilet/lavatory
    - true or exact synonyms are rare
  - Antonymy
    - Simple Antonyms
      - dead/alive
      - pass/fail
- hit/miss
- gradable antonyms
  - rich/poor
  - fast/slow
  - young/old
- reverse
  - right/left
  - come/go
  - ascend/descend
- converse - (alternative view points)
  - own/belong to
  - above/below
  - employer/employee
- taxonomic sisters
  - red-blue
    - same level of taxonomy but incompatible
- hyponymy
  - dog/cat - animal
  - sister/mother - woman
- meronymy
  - page/book
  - nose/face
    - part-whole relations
- member-collection
  - ship/fleet
  - tree/forest
  - book/library
- portion mass
  - drop/liquid
  - grain/salt
  - sheet/paper
  - lump/coal

**derivational relations**
- causative
  - apple/ripe
  - road/wide
  - gate/open
- agentive
  - skier, walker, whaler, toaster

**Approaches to lexical semantics**
- **One-level vs. two-level approaches**
  - can semantics and encyclopedic knowledge be divided?
  - ‘raw’ meaning is virtually infinite
  - perhaps a continuum? Hard to separate.
- **Monosemic vs. polysemic**
  - monosemic - few senses as possible should be given separate recognition and as many as possible senses could be derived from these. Lexical rules specify potential extensions of meaning, only some of which become conventionalized and incorporated in the lexicon
• polysemic - more sense are given primary consideration

• **componential approach**
  • one of the earliest and still most persistent and widespread ways of
    approaching word meaning is to approach meaning as being constructed out
    of smaller, more elementary, invariant units of meaning (similar to atomic
    structure) - semes, semantic features, semantic components, semantic
    markers, semantic primes

• **holist vs localist approaches**
  • holist - lexical meaning can in some sense be finitely specified in isolation from
    the meanings of other words
  • localist - contextual variation can be accounted by rules

• **dynamic construal approach**
  • deals with how unsatisfactory it is to determine determinate structural
    properties in the lexicon and the infinite flexibility of meaning in context.
    Approaches to lexical semantics often take it for granted that words have a
    stable, inherent attribute (e.g. ‘meaning). There is also general agreement that
    meaning is highly contextualized. Standard approaches locate a stable and
    determinate meaning in the lexicon and allow for variability through pragmatic
    rules and principles. However, it is difficult to achieve a satisfactory picture of
    lexical semantics through this construct.
  • **dynamic construal** - proposes that words have no stable semantic properties
    (no permanent assigned meaning), but rather meanings emerge in actual use
    as a result of various processes of construal.
  • **Construal** - the mental processes of meaning construction. Uses purport as
    raw material which is subject to various constraints; context highlights certain
    features of purport. While words do not have permanent meanings, every word
    does have a permanent property of mapping onto a body of conceptual content
    called purport.
  • **purport** - under-determines any specific meaning. It is some function of
    previous experiences of the contextualized use of the word. It is continually
    developing: every experience of the use of a word modifies the word’s purport
    to some degree. Contextualized meaning is subject to a variety of constraints
    of different strengths.

• **constraints** - basic constraints such as the way the world is, the way in our
  minds work,
  • conventional constraints - how society uses words, construes situations
  • contextual constraints - linguistic context, physical context, cognitive
    context, type of discourse, relations between communicants

• **Context** - plays a very influential role in the availability of conventional
  constraints
  • linguistic context - previous discourse, immediate linguistic
    environment, historical usage
  • physical context - what participants can see, hear, etc.
  • cognitive context - the encyclopedic knowledge and experiences of
    participants
  • type of discourse - words can be construed differently in poetic,
    technical, casual speech, etc. formal vs informal context,
  • relations between communicants - similarities and differences in social
    and power relations, how they think and feel about each other
• But just as words are not associated with specific meanings, so there are not specific conceptual categories, about bodies of purport which allow variable construal in different contexts
  • ex. pet and cyberpet
  • ex. cats and dogs have four legs
  • ex flightless birds
  • hyponymy - a cat is entailed within pet, but not always
• It does seem plausible that words may have a default construal (cat - pet, but maybe not animal?)

• advantage of dynamic construal approach
  • free to give up the search for the ‘real’ ‘basic’ ‘underlying’ meaning, which is usually not helpful
  • helps explain the vast intuitive gulf between our vivid experience of living, situated meaning and the experience of reading a word in a dictionary
  • provides depth and insight for variety among logical characterization
  • unified approach for context-dependent and relatively context-independent properties

• re. dictionaries - certainly dictionaries are useful, but words do not have stable meanings, so what does a dictionary record?

• Conclusion
  • So we see in God himself the logical origin for the words in language. Words do not come out of nowhere. Out of his bounty, his goodness, God has supplied human beings with all the words in each particular language. He has not given words in isolation, but words that are tied to and related to one another in their meanings, their sounds, and their ability to form constructions that communicate rich truths. And it is not a gi that is unrelated to the Giver. e gi reflects the Giver in mysterious ways. Words, with their ability to describe, reflect God who describes himself, as is hinted at in his self-description, “I am who I am.” God describes himself to himself in the communication and communion of the persons of the Trinity, in unity and diversity. And then that unity in diversity is reflected in the unity (contrastive-identical features), diversity (variation), and interconnectedness (distribution) that exist in any one single word. When you use a word, you rely on God. Each word shows God’s eternal power and divine nature (Rom. 1:20). Each word comes to you in a situation that depends on God’s creation of you and of your environment. In its coinherence of aspects, each word images the coinherence in God’s Trinitarian character (Poyhtrss 279)

• Suggestions for understanding a word’s meaning
  • Yes, dictionaries are helpful. Look up words. But that is very minimal.
  • Read a lot!!
  • See the word in different contexts
  • “The most reliable way of determine what a word in a dead language means is to see how the word is used in context. (Hoffman, 36)
  • Look for semantic relations
  • Look for synonyms. What word could replace the word in question without losing much lexical information? What is the difference between the synonyms? Is there a difference?
Implicit and Explicit Information

This is hugely important! This is critical for comprehension and a major issue in translation.

- **Introduction**
  - **Implicit information** - things I do not need to say (shared context)
  - **Explicit information** - things necessary to say for understanding
  - **Context** - Every message is given within a particular context
    - Communication - every person communicates his message in the context of both shared and exclusive information between the audience and author.
  - **Biblical Context** - does not always correspond to a modern context
    - Ex. Acts 8:27 - a eunuch was not someone who could not bear children, but had a privileged and high status.
  - A message always has implicit and explicit information.
  - *Translation is not just from one language to another, but from one culture to another!*
  - A translator must always ask:
    - What was the original intention of the author?
    - What did he intend to communicate to his audience?
    - What is the implicit information in the text

- **Examples**
  - **Jn 18:28** - Then they took Jesus from Caiaphas to the governor’s headquarters. It was early morning. They did not enter the headquarters themselves; **otherwise they would be defiled** and unable to eat the Passover. (HCSB)
    - **Question** - Why would they be defiled?
      - Jews are defiled if they enter a non-Jewish house
      - The governor’s headquarters was the place of Roman judgements (non-Jewish)
      - The governor’s headquarters was impure
    - **Question** - Why would they not be able to eat the Passover if they were defiled?
  - **Lk 18:13** - But the tax collector, standing far off, would not even raise his eyes to heaven but kept striking his chest and saying, ‘God, turn Your wrath from me—a sinner! (HCSB)
    - **Question** - Why does he beat his chest?
      - In Jewish culture, beating your chest signifies painful sorrow. In this situation, it expresses repentance and the pain of acknowledging sin
      - However, some cultures beating your chest means you are proud and arrogant. So if a culture has this meaning, is it possible for this verse to be misunderstood? How could it be changed? Answer - make it explicit.
    - Example - he kept striking his chest “as a sign of repentance”

Different types of implicit information:

- a) **Cultural information**
  - cf. Jn 18:28
  - Acts 21:24 - take these men and purify yourself along with them and pay their expenses, so that they may shave their heads. (ESV) (cf. Acts 18:18)
• This makes perfect sense to a first-century Jewish culture, but could prove difficult to understand in a modern context.
• Mt 11:21 - For if the miracles that were done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented in sackcloth and ashes long ago!
  • One culture a burial platform is used to mourn. It was proposed to translate this verses “Just as you sit on the burial platform and wail in grief, so the foreigners of Tyre and Sidon would have put on sackcloth and ashes in grief for their sins.” (Fortosis: 26).

b) Historical information
• Luke 17:32 - Remember Lot’s wife! (HCSB)
  • What if someone doesn’t have the Old Testament? They will not know what Lot’s wife did.
• John 3:14 - Just as Moses lifted up the snake in the wilderness, so the Son of Man must be lifted up. (HCSB)
  • (Num 21:9)

c) Geographical information
• Biblical authors can just mention the name of a place and their readers know what it refers to. Modern readers might not know a place name refers to a city, region, or river.
• Mt 2:1 - After Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea… (HCSB)
  • Might need to add “the village called…” “in the region called….”

• Historical information
• Our logic might not correspond to the logic of biblical writers. Implicit logic might need to be made explicit
• Mk 2:4 - Since they were not able to bring him to Jesus because of the crowd, they removed the roof above where He was. (HCSB)
  • Might need to add “They climbed on top of the house”
• Mk 14:17 - When evening came, He arrived with the Twelve
  • Twelve what?

e) Grammatical information
• Occurs when receptor language uses more precise grammatical information than source language

Pronominal Exclusivity
• Inclusive vs exclusive 1pl
  • Mt 2:2 - wise men from the east arrived unexpectedly in Jerusalem, saying, “Where is He who has been born King of the Jews? For we saw His star in the east and have come to worship Him.” (HCSB)
  • Mt 7:22 - on that day many will say to Me, ‘Lord, Lord, didn’t we prophesy in Your name (HCSB)
  • Jn 12:38 (Isa 53:1) - But this was to fulfill the word of Isaiah the prophet, who said: Lord, who has believed our message? And who has the arm of the Lord been revealed to? (HCSB)
  • Mk 4:38 - A fierce windstorm arose, and the waves were breaking over the boat, so that the boat was already being swamped. 38 But He was in the stern, sleeping on the cushion. So they woke Him up and said to Him, “Teacher! Don’t you care that we’re going to die?” (HCSB)
  • 1 Jn 1:4 - We are writing these things so that our joy may be complete.(HCSB)

Pronominal hierarchy
• Bali
  • has 4 different 3ms pronouns:
    • ida - (nobility)
• dane - (religious leader)
• ipun - (formal)
• ia -familiar
• apostles start off as ipun and then in acts they are idane. Prophets of noble line were ida.

• Thai
• three different pronoun sets used by different classes of people - kings, monks, commoners
• should Jesus use the king pronominal set?

• Participant reference
• It is important to understand the discourse structure of a language in order to properly signify the development of participants within a discourse unit (i.e. when are null subjects, pronouns, proper nouns appropriate?)
• Lk 5:29 - And Levi made him a great feast in his house, (ESV)
  • Who did Levi make a banquet for? In whose house?
• Acts 18:16-17 - And he drove them from the tribunal. 17 And they all seized Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, and beat him in front of the tribunal. But Gallio paid no attention to any of this. (ESV)
  • Who beat Sosthenes?

• Passive voice
• some languages do not have passive voice. Others do, but passive voice is not typically used, functions as a marked case.
  • Ex. Mt 6:33 - But seek first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness, and all these things will be provided for you (HCSB)
    • who will provide ‘these things’?
    • option “all these things God will give you”

• Future tense
• Some languages distinguish between near future, distant future

• Demonstratives
• Languages differ in the degree of distal grammatically marked. Near, far, distant

• Lexical categories
• Folopa language does not have a generic word for “wound” but only specific terms based on the object used to create the wound, e.g. ‘spear wound, dagger wound, axe wound, arrow wound, bear hands (no open wounds), club wounds would though. This came across clearly
  • Lk 10:34 - He went over to him and bandaged his wounds, pouring on olive oil and wine.

• Question - When should implicit information be made explicit in a translation?
• a) When the implicit information is indispensable for communicating the essential point of the message (grammatical fidelity)
  • Lk 11:9 - And I tell you, ask, and it will be given to you; seek, and you will find; knock, and it will be opened to you. (ESV)
    • Some languages (ex. Kuo) must indicate the object of a phrase
    • A solution might be “ask God and he will answer you…”
• b) When leaving information implicit makes a translation meaningless or gives false information (fidelity to meaning)
  • Mk 5:9 - Jesus asked him, “What is your name?” And he said, “My name is Legion, for we are many.” (NET)
• In Kuo, they understood his name was Legion because the man had many brothers.
• Thus, they added “for we, the evil spirits, are many”
• c) When RL style/discourse requires it (dynamic fidelity)
  • Even though one may be able to communicate the correct meaning without making implicit information explicit, fidelity to the dynamics of the original may require it to be made explicit. If, for example, leaving information implicit results in too high a rate of new information and too little redundancy in the RL so that the message is difficult to understand, then there would be a lack of dynamic fidelity. To avoid the resultant clouding of the clarity of the message and the loss of ease in understanding the message, implicit information in such cases should be made explicit. Only then will the dynamics of the original be faithfully reflected in the RL translation.

• Question - What are some cautions in making information explicit?
  • a) Be careful to only make explicit the meaning without changing the emphasis or theme of a passage.
    • Always keep in mind the intention of the author.
    • Too many unnecessary or unimportant details can obscure/change the overall message.
  • b) Only make explicit what corresponds to the original, historical situation.
    • Always make sure the explicit information is historically accurate
    • The translator must maintain a balance between two elements: the faithfulness of the historical text and good/understandable communication to the modern audience.
    • The translator must be aware that explication of implicit meaning—however big or small the explication—always has the potential for distorting the original meaning (Gutt 5.5
  • There are important long-term perspectives that need to be thought about.
    • First, while explication is obviously advantageous to uninitiated readers, in the long run it will often prejudice a deeper and richer understanding of the originally intended meaning, since it focuses on one particular aspect of meaning, perhaps precluding the reader from exploring wider ramifications of the original intention.
    • Second, once explicated, these renderings become part of the sacred biblical text for the readers, and changes or removals at later stages may cause their own problems, including the charge of a paternalistic attitude on the part of the translator. (Gutt)
    • The urge to explicate implicit information in the translated text will depend on how narrow or wide an approach is used for communicating the meaning of Scripture. In a narrow approach that builds mainly or almost exclusively on the translated text alone, this urge will be felt more strongly than in a wider approach that anticipates contextual gaps and incorporates additional means for narrowing or closing these gaps. (Gutt)
    • There seem to be many instances where translators resort too quickly to something like explication or the change from figurative to nonfigurative renderings without really having understood the problem (see Gutt 1985).
    • for explication often narrows the range of information conveyed and misrepresents the strength with which it was intended to be communicated. - really good Gutt…. he more knowledge of the biblical context the receptors acquire, the less helpful the “extra” explicated meaning becomes. In fact, there is a point where the distorting influence of
explication prevents users of a freer translation from getting as close to the meaning of the original as users of stricter translations.

- One culture had a skin disease, *pinto*. They never heard of leprosy. But *pinto* could not be used since it implied biblical writers recognized the illness, and it was not historically accurate. (Fortosis: 26).
- Sometimes it could be helpful to use cultural substitutes initially, but as native speakers come to better understand biblical cultures, terms can be replaced with more literal terms. James 3:12 describes figs, olives, and vines. The translator replaced the terms with two native fruits and the native palm tree and would return to the original terms when readers became more familiar with the original culture (Fortosis: 27). (Beekman and Callow, 211)

**Question** - How much information should be made explicit?
- There is not one correct answer for every translation.
- At least enough for the translation to be understandable.
- The local situation must be considered
  - local churches
  - need for evangelism
  - other available literature
  - attitudes of the community
  - the style of the translation
  - the development of the church
- People’s comprehension when a translation is tested should also be considered
- People’s reaction must also be considered
- Always stay faithful to Scripture

**Question** - How to find the meaning of implicit information?
- In the immediate context
  - Ex. Lk 13:32 - “Go and tell that fox, ... (Herod - v. 31)
- In the larger context
  - Search the entire chapter or book
  - Ex Mk 8:34 - “If anyone would come after me, he must deny himself and take up his cross and follow me
    - what does it mean to ‘take up his cross’?
    - immediate context - losing / finding life (v. 31, 35-37)
    - larger context - persecution under the Roman empire
- In other passages
  - Search other related books (gospels, epistles, etc.)
- In other sources
  - Dictionaries, reference books, commentaries, etc.

**Question** - What to do when implicit information is ambiguous?
- Follow the prestigious translation
- Choose the best interpretation
- Have a footnote

**Question** - What methods can be used to clarify implicit information
- Within the text itself
- Footnotes
- Within titles/subheadings
- In introductions
- With images/maps
Exercise 1: The following are two translations of one passage. The second translation gives explicit information that is implicit in the first. Underline information that is made explicit in the second translation. Why is this information made explicit? Is this a valid use of making implicit information explicit?

- a) Mt 12:2
  - 1 - Your disciples are doing what is not lawful to do on the Sabbath!
  - 2 - Your disciples are working, which is not lawful on the Sabbath.

- b) Mk 9:11
  - Why do the scribes say that Elijah must come first?
  - Why do the teachers of the law say that the prophet Elijah must come first before God sends the Messiah?

- c) Lk 1:26
  - In the sixth month, the angel Gabriela was sent by God
  - In the sixth month of Elizabeth’s pregnancy, the angel Gabriel was sent by God

- d) Lk 10:13
  - For if the miracles that were done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes.
  - For if the people that lived long ago in Tyre and Sidon had viewed the miracles I have done among you, even though they were extremely wicked, they would have grieved deeply over their sin and sincerely repented .

- e) Jn 3:14
  - Just as Moses lifted up the snake in the wilderness, so the Son of Man must be lifted up
  - Just as Moses lifted up a bronze snake on a pole in the wilderness, so the Son of Man must be lifted up

- f) Acts 11:3
  - You went to uncircumcised men and ate with them!
  - You who are a Jew went to the house of an uncircumcised pagans, and you even ate with them!

- g) Acts 21:8
  - we entered the house of Philip the evangelist, who was one of the seven,
  - we entered the house of Philip the evangelist, he was one of the seven deacons that were first appointed to serve the church,

Exercise 2: What information is implicit within this text?

- Lk 10:13-14 - Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you, Bethsaida! For if the miracles that were done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes! 14 But it will be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the judgment than for you.
  - Chorazin and Bethsaida were towns in Galilee inhabited by Jews.
  - Tyre and Sidon were Gentile towns singled out repeatedly by OT prophets for severe divine judgment because of their great sinfulness.
  - The miracles talked about were done by Jesus as part of his ministry in Chorazin and Bethsaida.
• As part of his ministry there, he had called the people to repentance.
• Mighty works were seen as divine authentications of spiritual ministry.
• Thus the miracles Jesus did in Chorazin and Bethsaida had authenticated his divine authority.
• In spite of this divine authentication, the Jews living in these towns had not followed Jesus' call to repentance.
• Since Jesus' miracles would have moved the notoriously sinful Gentiles of Tyre and Sidon to repentance, the Jews in Chorazin and Bethsaida were much worse than those Gentiles.
• For biblically illiterate readers of this short passage from Luke, the problem is [that] they don't just lack the right clue to access the necessary information in their cognitive environment - this information is not actually part of their cognitive environment at all. - (Gutt RT 12, 13)

Exercise 3: Discuss the translation of the following verses
• John 8:58 Jesus said to them, “Truly, truly, I say to you, before Abraham was, I am.” (ESV)
  • also - (...I assure you: Before Abraham was, I am. HCSB)

Translating Key Words

• Introduction
  • Definition - Key words are words that by their frequency and theological importance, play an important role in the Bible.
  • Because of their importance, it is essential that key words are studied in-depth before translating, and to include church leaders and other interest groups before finalizing the translation.

• Two types of key words:
  • 1) Words that have the same meaning everywhere
    • Ex - temple, apostle, synagogue, priest
  • 2) Words that have multiple meanings
    • non-key words can have multiple meanings
      • Ex - ‘to eat’ in kera - eat something, eat the market, eat the politician
      • Ex - tongue - part of the body, language, people, tongue of fire
    • key words can also have multiple meanings
      • pneuma
        • a) demon, evil spirit - Mk 5:2 - “unclean spirit”
        • b) angels - Heb 1:14 - “Are they not all ministering spirits”
        • c) Holy Spirit - Acts 2:4 - “they were all filled with the Holy Spirit”
        • d) of a person - Mt 26:41 - “The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak.”
        • e) wind - Jn 3:8 - “The wind blows where it pleases”
        • f) breath - 2 Thess 2:8 “will destroy him with the breath of His mouth”
    • world
      • a) creation - Eph 1:4; Jn 3:7; Acts 17:24; Rom 1:20
• b) people of the world - Jn 3:16; 
• c) unbelievers - Jn 15:18-19; 14:19; 7:7 
• d) worldly pleasures - James 4:4; 1 Jn 5:4; Mt 16:26; 1 Cor 7:33; Gal 6:14

• glory 
• bless 
• grace 
• righteous 
• judge 

• Three difficulties encountered in translating key words
  • 1) Terms are already used within the church, but they are not adequate 
    • Ex - one language had to modify their word for ‘prophet’ since there was no 
      distinction between a prophet and a preacher. (from ‘a person who proclaims 
      the word of God’ to ‘a person who speaks the mouth of God’)
  • 2) Different terms are used by different denominations 
    • A translation should be accepted by everyone. But if different groups or 
      denominations have different words for the same term, there could be 
      challenging decisions to make. 
    • It is often necessary to assemble different denominations, discuss the terms 
      that are already in use, discuss what the term means, find a solution that all 
      can agree upon 
    • Ex - baptism 
  • 3) The names of God 
    • Names used for God are some of the most difficult key words to translate. 
    • Often the name for the God of the Bible is translated by a term already known 
      and used within the culture. 
    • The term is not the problem, it is people’s understanding of what the term 
      means (their idea of God) that’s the problem. Teaching is important to show 
      how God is different and distinct from their understanding of God. 
    • Ex. Yahweh - out of all the names of God, this is the most difficult to translate. 
      There are several options: 
    • Transliterate (may not be accepted by the Catholic church) 
    • Use the same term as Lord (Adonai), but in capitalized letters (LORD) 
    • Replace the term with a different title (King) 
    • Come up with a new name 
      • Ex. (Kera - Tewbang “who has no end”)

• Four steps to translate key words with one meaning
  • 1) Carefully study the term to understand the original meaning 
    • Consult biblical dictionaries, concordances, etc. 
    • Find the different contexts that the word is used 
    • be certain the term has only one meaning. if not, other steps will be needed to 
      analyze key terms with multiple meanings 
  • 2) Compare the term with related words 
    • Find points in common 
    • Figure out the differences and nuances 
    • Ex. kid vs ram vs goat 
      • in common - goats
• difference - age/size/sex

3) Think about possible solutions and choose a provisional solution
  • Is it easy to understand?
  • Does it express the most important aspects of the original term?
  • Is anything communicated that is different from the original term?
  • Present provisional solutions to translation committee

4) Test the provisional translation

Exercise

How could the following terms be translated if these specific words did not exist? - tabernacle, temple, synagogue

Translating the names of God

In the Greek language of the first century a.d., the main word for “God” was theos. Unfortunately, to a Greek pagan that word did not mean “God” in the sense that the Bible describes him. The word occurred often in the plural, “gods,” and it designated the plurality of gods of the Greek and Roman pantheon, that is, all the gods that they worshiped. Moreover, the Greek language made no distinction between a capitalized word “God” for monotheism and a lowercase word “god” for polytheistic gods. So [Paul] could not expect to be understood if he merely used the word for “god” without explaining it. So he proceeded to explain the biblical teaching of monotheism. One all-powerful God (theos) created the whole world and continues to sustain it (Acts 14:15–17). By this teaching Paul proceeded to redefine the meaning of the word “god” (theos) within the context of his teaching. Fortunately, human language has this exibility. The Greek language in Lystra, as understood by the people of Lystra, was not an ideal vehicle for expressing the truths that Paul had been commissioned to proclaim. It was contaminated by the false thinking of the people. Fortunately, however, the language was an adequate vehicle. Given time for explanation, Paul could use enough words to work his way through the mistaken assumptions normally associated with the Greek word theos. (Poythress 134, 135)

Allah - why use Allah

1) it is the Arabic equivalent of the Hebrew name El, Elohim
2) Arab Christians from before the dawn of Islam have been praying to Allah, and Allah was used by Christian theologian writing in Arabic. So the Christian usage is older than Islam.
3) Allah is the word used for “God” in all Arabic versions of the Bible from the old Arabic Bible all the way to the modern Arabic Bible (Today’s Arabic Version).
4) Christian in countries like Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Indonesia, Malaysia, Brunei, and other places in Asia and Africa where the languages are in contact with Arabic, have almost all been using this word Allah as the Creator God and the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ.
5) in Malay and Indonesian the word Allah has been used continuously from the time of the first printed edition of Matthew’s Gospel in Malay (A.C. Ruyl, 1629). The first complete edition in 1733, and the second complete edition 1879. (52, 4 p 416 – Names of God in Indonesia and Malaysia.
Idiomatic Expressions

- **Definition** - an idiomatic expression is a group of words that when used together, give a different sense than when they are isolated. (Petit Robert)
- **English examples**
  - Break the silence
- **German**
  - Ich habe einen Bärenhunger - I have a bear-hunger
- **Spanish**
  - las horas punta - rush hour (hour point)
- **Chadian Arabic**
  - karrab raasha - engaged (‘grab her head’)
- **Chadian French**
  - on est ensemble - see you later (we are together)
- **Biblical examples**
  - Lk 12:35 - Ἔστωσαν ὑμῶν αἱ ὀσφύες ‘gird your loins’
- **Methods for idiomatic expressions**
  - **Render the expression directly**
    - Lk 2:51 - διετήρει πάντα τὰ ρήματα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς ‘kept these things in her heart’
  - **Translate the expression with another idiomatic expression of the RL**
    - Acts 18:6 - τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑμῶν· καθαρὸς ἐγὼ ‘Your blood is on your own heads! I am innocent.’
  - **Utilize an idiomatic expression in the RL when the ST does not use one**
    - “believe” - to put the heart on someone
    - Acts 18:6 - ἀντιτασσομένων δὲ αὐτῶν “the Jews opposed him”
      - Kuo - The Jews pierced his word
- **Examples**
  - **Xhosas** - no concept of boat, they decided to translate Heb 6:19 which refers to God as a firm and secure “anchor for the soul” as the “picketing peg for the soul.” Another tribe translated it as the “center pole for soul” (the solid center pole of a house that keeps the house from shifting or swaying when storms strike. (D. Shaw, *Transculturation*, 50) (Wendland, *The Cultural Factor*, 120).
  - **Samo** - Christ as “cornerstone” as “ridge pole” a corner posts which serves a primary prop for rafters when they begin construction.
  - **Bontoc** - can not use love as a noun. So for “God is love” (1 Jn 4:8, 16) was transalted as *Inal-ayad si Dios* “God is continually loving on and on.” Hefley (Searchlight on Bible Words, 129) **Chacabo** (Bolivia) “God is the owner of loving.”(God is supreme expert at loving) **St Lucian Creole** “Love is the character of God” Jur Modo (south Sudan) “God is what is in the middle of love” Tetelcingo Nahuatl “Gid is a lover” Orizaba Nawati “God is all, pure love” Manding “if you say God, you say love” (Fortosis, 57)
  - **Folopa** - Lk 11:11 “Which of you fathers, if your son asks for a fish, will give him a snake instead?” Testing the translation people asked why wouldn’t he give a snake
since a large snake was a large treat that could feed a whole family (more than a tiny fish), in some ways he could have reversed it, “Which of you fathers, if your son asks for a snake, will give him a fish instead?” but “if your son is hungry and wants a fish, you wouldn’t toss him a live snake of the kind that when it bites people they die.”

**Mazatec** - Mt 11:28-29 - Come to me, all you who are weary and burdened, for my yoke is easy and my burden is light“ Mazatecs carry many things throughout their life using a long rope which is tied around the pack to be carried, the band is placed across the top of their head. There are extremely aware of the differences between a bad (hard) burden and a good (easy) burden. Easy burdens have sharp edges which cut into their backs, or move and throw them off balance. A good burden feels light and is shaped to their backs. They have no word for ‘yoke’ so they transalted the verse “my carrying rope is easy and my burden is light.”

**Folopa** - Gen 3, the ground had been cursed, man would eat bread by the sweat of their brow, but this made no sense because they constantly sweat in the tropics. But they did have an expression for hard work. “No longer will your food just come up by itself, but by bursting your stomach you will do your work and raise your food” (Gen 3:19) (Anderson, *In Search* 57-59) Fortosis 142

**Fore (Eastern Highlands PNG)** Mk 10:31 “may who are first will be last, and the last first,” they took this to mean that those who follow Jesus first will be the last to go to heaven and those who follow him last will go up first. so they transalted it “Many who are leaders will be nothing-people, and nothing-people will be the leaders” Hefley, *Searchlight on Bible Words*, 147. Fortosis, 144.

**Tonga and Chitonga** (Zambia) Mt 15:32 “My intensines are twisted with compassion for the people” (Wendland, *The Cultural Factor*, 128-29; Fortosis 97)

**Uduk** Jn 14:1 “Do not let your hearts be troubled” translated as “Do not shiver in your livers; you believe in God, believe also in me.” (Nida, *God’s Word*, 23; Fortosis, 98)

**Rincon (Zapotec Mexico)** Lk 24:32 “Were not our hearts burning within us?” a correct translation is “Did not our hearts cool within us?” since a burning heart indicates anger, while a cool heart is a deep interest and pleasure. (Hefley, *Searchlight on Bible Words*, 13; Fortosis 99)

**Chewa** - Job 33:20 Elihu speaks of someone whose “soul loathes the choicest meal: was transalted as “food makes his heart black.” (Wendland, *The Cultural Factor*, 131; Fortosis, 99)

**Aguaruna (Peru)** Col 1:18 “Christ is the head of the body, the church” but for them the heart controls the body, the heart even thinks, so the text was adapted “All those sold to him, they are like one body and its true heart is Christ.” (Hefley, *Searchlight on Bible Words*, 50; Fortosis, 99).

**Ixil (Fulani)** - harden the heart means to show bravery. thus it was transalted as “hardneing the head” (Nida and Waard, *One Language to Another*, 34; Fortosis; 100)

**Waorani** Mk 3:5 Pharisees with hard hearts was translated as “jungle-hearts” (dense, uninhabited land)
• **Boras** (NW Peru) - 1 Jn 5:6 “This is the one who came by water and blood” thought this meant Jesus came in a canoe and was bleeding. This was changed to “Jesus passed through water in baptism and shed his blood in dying.” (Fortosis 76) Hefley, *Searchlight on Bible Words*, 56)

• **Jn 3:16**
  - **Iqutio** - God loved-long-ago-continually-it-is-said muchly people. Therefore he sent-long-ago-it-is-said his-Son people to. A person believing-obeying him, he forever will-live-into-the-indefinite-future-it-is-said. Not he will die.
  - **Orejon** - God very much loving those who live here on earth gave the only Son he had. Those believing him will not be lost. They will never stop living.
  - **Cocama** - Like that, very much God love those-on-our-world, therefore, he gave his Son to them. Just one was his Son, the one from him. He gave he who was God’s heart him [his Son] that they might have life, all those whoa re his belieebrs, that they might not be lost.
  - **Burera** “The First One—he stomach-laughed toward us men and women. With his nose he stomach-laughed toward us. his Son he gave to us—the only one. He gave him to us so that anybody his believief he elevates toward him, never does he die go-forever; but he will go on living. (Fotrosis 84-85, Hefly Searchlight 136-8)

• **Question** - Some Nigerian cultures have only very young or insane people or are shepherds. So is God a shepherd a good metaphor? (David Hesselgrave and Edward Rommen, *Contextualization: Meanings, Methods, and Models* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1989).

### Translating Unknown Concepts

• **Question** - what sort of equivalence can there be if a specific concept of the original is unknown or lost in the RL?

• Most common groups of unknown ideas/concepts
  - geography/environment
    - Names of Plants and Trees (Flora)
    - Names of Animals (Fauna)
    - Features of Geography
    - Differences in Climate
  - culture
    - Money and Measurements
    - Clothing
    - Housing and household items
  - Unfamiliar names of places and people
  - weight, measurements, money systems
  - key theological terms

• Options for translating an unknown concept
  - **Use a generic word**
    - The generic word could be adequate, but it could also need to be modified
    - Modified with features of the word
      - Matt. 11:2 “sackcloth” — that which is scratchy - Mazahua (Mexico)
      - Mark 7:4 “bronze” — yellow metal - Wantoat (New Guinea)
      - Mark 15:23 “wine” — fermented grape Hopi (U.S.A.)
• Acts 8:28 “chariot” — box that is dragged by an animal - Lalana Chinantec (Mexico)
• Modified with statement of function
  • Matt. 13:33 “leaven” — the thing that swells the stomach of bread Huixtéco Tzotzil (Mexico)
  • Mark 15:30 “cross” — killing post Samal (Philippines)
  • Acts 20:13 “ship” — that with which we can walk on water Chichimeca Pame (Mexico)
  • Acts 27:29
    • “anchors” — those things which make a boat stay - Chol (Mexico)
• Modified with both form and function
  • Matt. 21:33
    • “winepress” — hole in a rock where they could take out the juice of the grapes - Huixtéco Tzotzil (Mexico)
  • Acts 27:29
    • “anchors” — iron hooks that make the boat stop - Isthmus Mixe (Mexico)
• Modified with a comparison
  • Mark 15:17 “crown” — hat like that of an important person - Wantoat (New Guinea)
  • John 19:29 “sponge” — that which is like a big piece of cotton - Tepehua (Mexico)
  • “tiger” - fierce cat like a lion

**Use a loan word**
- three kinds of loan words
  - already borrowed concepts
  - already borrowed words
  - newly borrowed words/concepts
• Loan word with classifier
  • Matt. 2:11 “myrrh” — myrrh perfume - Huixtéco Tzotzil (Mexico)
  • Mark 1:6 “camel” — animal called camel - Cora (Mexico)
• Loan word with specific form or function or both
  • Mark 1:13 “Satan” — Satan, the ruler of demons - Sambal (Philippines)
  • Luke 1:5 “priest” — priest, the person who deals with that given to God - Kalinga (Philippines)

**Cautions**
- Make sure loan word could not be mistaken for a word in the RL
  - “publicans” - “people who do evil in public” for the Mazahua of Mexico
- Words that may be frequently borrowed in specialized contexts (sermons) may not be widely known

**Use a cultural substitute**
- Examples
  • Matt. 8:20 “foxes” have holes — coyotes - Mazahua (Mexico)
  • Luke 12:24 “storehouse” — basket (about 3 feet high and wide, used for storing corn and other goods) - Villa Alta Zapotec (Mexico)
  • Chadian Arabic - Gen 18:6 “Quick! Three seahs of fine flour!” Quick three koros of fine flour
  • Acts 19:12 - σουδάρια- handkerchief
• **Precautions**
  - Choose something that is as similar in form as possible to the original idea provided that it also communicates the idea that is important from the context. ‘leopard’ is good for ‘lion’, better than ‘wolf’ or ‘eagle’
  - The idea should fit with the biblical culture, or does not seem inappropriate in the context
  - Care should be taken to translate consistently cultural references used throughout OT and NT (fig tree, vine/vineyard)
  - Distinguish between historical and didactic references
    - LK 6:1 - disciples picked grain, not bananas for example
    - Mt 11:13 - Jesus cursed a fig tree, not a mango tree
  - Determine which function of the word is in focus
  - Avoid clashes of functions
    - The form could be correct, but the function could be misleading (‘wooden tub’ for boat)

• **Examples:**
  - **Navajo**
    - There is no words for king or kingdom. The word for headman is derived from a verb meaning “to move the head from side to side” (making an oration or influencing people by their head movements). So this word could work for leader. But how do you represent “the highest ruler”? Ultimately, the best they could do was “of those who move the head from side to side, this one is the greatest.” For crown, “the hat of the one who moves his head from side to side.” (Fortosis: 89)
    - Apache - for kingdom of God, a tribal chairman stated that when a tribal authority is in authority over an area, the Apaches say that the area is “in his hand”. So kingdom of God became “those who are in God’s hand.” (Fortosis: 89).
    - Inupiat eskimos have no words for animals such as horse, pig, or camel. Horse became “like a big caribou,” swine became “queer caribou” and camel became “humpbacked carrier.” (fortosis 30)
  - **Machiguenga (Peru)** - “city” many housed grouped together, “ocean” large lake, “temple” God’s house, “synagogue” the place where Jews gather regularly (Nida and Reyburn, Meaning Across Cultures, 64, Fortosis 145)
  - **Engenni (Nigeria)** no word for crown. Paul says the Christians in Thessalonica are his “crown” (1 Thess 2:18). They say the word “eagle” when they come back from triumphant hunt. So they translated it as “You are the ones who make me shout ‘Eagle’: Translation Treasures, In Other Words, March 1975, 6; Fortosis, 93.
  - **Folopa** - no word for religion or religious. So in Athens when Paul says “Men of Athens, I see that in every way you are very religious” it was translated as “I see that you are very much a praying-all-the-time people” (Anderson, In Search, 202; Fortosis, 95)

• **Example:** It is difficult in some languages to find a satisfactory term for circumcision. If the practice of circumcision is unknown, a descriptive expression often seems quite vulgar. If circumcision is known, direct references to such a practice may be taboo, especially in such context as the Scriptures. In general, there is a tendency to employ some kind of euphemism—for example, “the cutting of the skin” (without specifying
what part of the skin is cut), "a mark in the flesh," or "a cutting of the body." In some instances an even more generic expression has developed by usage—for example, "the Jews cut them." This term might be regarded as being entirely too general in meaning, but which in at least one language it is used to refer specifically to circumcision. In any event, the practice of circumcision must be identified clearly in this type of context, but an explanation of precisely what is involved may be placed in a glossary with appropriate cross-referencing.

- Practice
  - Jn 6:35 - “I am the bread of life,” Jesus told them. “No one who comes to Me will ever be hungry, and no one who believes in Me will ever be thirsty again.

Translation Process

- **Question** - What must be done to begin a translation project
  - Raise awareness with members of all churches
  - Make sure the orthography is correct
  - Make sure there are finances for the project
  - Have a plan of what will be translated
  - Finalize dialect studies

- **Question** - Who should be involved in a translation project
  - Translators
  - Exegete
  - Churches
  - The entire language community
  - Translation community to manage finances/planning
  - Consultant

- **Question** - Where can funding come for a translation project
  - Participation from the community
  - Fields or other community projects (goats, grain, mill)
  - Outside funding

Activities of a translation project

- six steps:

1. **Preparatory stage**
   - Important to work cooperatively.
   - Linguistic and cultural analysis
   - Orthography development

2. **Translation through a team of translators and an exegete**
   - **Question** - Who could be an exegete or translators?
     - Humble
     - Affirmed by church
     - Engaged and perseverant - able to take criticism
     - Speaks the chosen dialect

   - **Question** - What skills are necessary in a translation team?
     - Know an official language (if possible Greek and Hebrew
     - Have Bible training
     - Have training in the principles of translation and exegesis
• Have knowledge of using a computer
• Able to write the language and have a basic understanding of the grammar
• Translators must always be aware that the spiritual life of those who read the translation depends upon the quality of the translation. For that reason, a translator must:
  • Have a strong knowledge of the source language
  • Be fluent in the receptor language
  • Have a solid knowledge of biblical culture and theology
  • Not allow personal doctrinal positions dictate the translation
• Use as many resources and translations as possible

The church must choose the best and most qualified people to work on translation

3. Testing the translation
• After a first draft has been finished, the translators must test the translation with the local community. It is better to test in groups in order to facilitate discussions, which helps discern where there are problems with the translation. The local church community can also be involved in helping determine where to test the translation.

4. Revision Committee
• The revision committee determines if the translation is acceptable for the church and community.
• Important to have other educated people involved in the process.
• Feedback from different churches and denominations.

5. Consultant Checking
• If a group decides to print their translation through a Bible society, SIL, or another organization, they must be in contact with this organization early on.
• The consultant for this organization will verify the translated texts, focusing on the accuracy and comprehension of the translation

6. Printing
• Revising suggestions from consultant
• Typesetting
• It is common to print several of the first translated books to encourage the population to read the translation and to help give advice/feedback to the translators. A common practice is to publish 20-30% of the translation, but this can also be directed by the local church and needs.

7. Distribution and Scripture Use
• Question - How do you organize the distribution of translated texts?
  • Have a location where people can purchase the translation
  • Organize with activities within the church
  • Choose several people to promote and sell the translation
  • Have someone go to each church to advertise in advance
• Question - How to encourage using the translated text in the life of the church?
  • Read the translated text during church services
  • Have pastors and preachers use the translated text
  • Have a contest for the best readers of the translation
  • Have Bible studies use the translated text
• Organize groups to have public Bible readings
• Encourage memorization in the local language
• Have contests and workshops for composing songs based on the translation
• Produce recordings of the translation and have listening groups

Current Status of Bible Translation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1800</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portions</td>
<td>~14</td>
<td>~260</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>1,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>~14</td>
<td>~131</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>1,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>~40</td>
<td>~131</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>2,018</td>
<td>2,524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five things that lie ahead for Bible translation
• 1) 2,393 languages need to be started
   • in three main areas 500+ in Central Africa, Nigeria 500+ in Mainland, Southeast Asia; 750 in Indonesia and Pacific Islands
• 2) 1,168 languages still need the OT
• 3) 1,998 still need more translating to get the entire NT
• 4) Revisions need to be done
   • (general rule is that after 5 years put out 2nd edition, and major revision after 50 years)
• 5) Translations need to be done for special audiences
   • Muslim translation – different script, different media forms, Braille for blind, audio recordings for illiterate, Luke film for illiterate and those not yet saved, as an evangelistic tool, etc.

Three observances of translation
1) The pace of translation continues to accelerate
2) About 97% of the world’s population now has some access to Scripture (6.5 billion people, and 200,000,000 don’t have access)
3) More than half of the world’s languages that need a translation, have some parts (6,909 languages in the world, only 2,393 still need Scripture, but these last languages could be the hardest)

Final Thoughts on Translation
• Is the translator, then friend or foe of the text? There is a kind of “handing over” that is not a betrayal. Or, to be exact, there is a “handing down,” a traditio, that is not a “handing over,” a traditore. Whereas Judas handed Jesus over, the other apostles handed Jesus on to subsequent generations. Faithful interpretation is, I believe, more like apostolic tradition; it is a
matter not of betraying but of continuing the communicative act, of passing it on. One who stands in a tradition attends to and is affected by the past. We receive something that we did not make and pass it on to others. Interpreters, by mediating the past to others, repay their debt to what has gone before. What interpreters ultimately must give to the text is attention, justice, and memory. Like tradition then, translation does not simply repeat the past but rather develops it. Like tradition, interpretation helps the text survive the passing of it original content in order to live on. The text does not preempt dialogue but opens it though an overture of meaning that invites a responsible response. Handing on need not be a guilty handing over. The ethical interpreter seeks the sameness not of the self-identical but of the self-constant; the translator is on who preserves the efficacy of past communicative action. VanHoozr 392

• The immensity of richness of any particular human language is also the immensity of richness in a gift that God has given to us. The immensity understandably becomes the fascination of those who study languages professionally. Even those students who profess not to know God see his wisdom and his beauty and his order and his richness in the object of their study. - pothress 272

• The task of producing a good translation is exceedingly arduous. Students of the biblical languages do not always have a good appreciation of what is involved. They have learned to produce “literal” translations by consulting the lexicon and so the process seems rather straightforward. In fact, however, a successful translation requires (1) mastery of the source language—certainly a much more sophisticated knowledge than one can acquire over a period of four or five years; (2) superb interpretive skills and breadth of knowledge so as not to miss the nuances of the original; and (3) a very high aptitude for writing in the target language so as to express accurately both the cognitive and the affective elements of the message. (Silva 273) (this is why so many people are involved in a translation, it takes more skill than a single individual to do an excellent job.

• It is misleading to assume that a rendering that is formally equivalent to the original necessarily conveys the meaning more faithfully...Literal translations are easier to produce, and the approach can degenerate into an excuse for not doing the hard exegetical and literary work of conveying faithfully the meaning of the ancient text to the modern reader. (Silva 276)

• Meaning is no the only part of translation. Fixating on any one part of a foreign language is one of the biggest traps in translation. In general, it’s a mistake to mimic the syntax or morphology of a foreign language, just as it’s a mistake to mimic the sounds. (Hoffman, 61)

• On the human level, within this world, there are many vocabularies, and many languages. e gospel is spreading and is being translated into each language. As it spreads, the truth is being manifested in each language. Behind the human communicators of the gospel is God, who empowers them. rough the gospel God himself addresses the hearers: “ Therefore, we [bearers of the gospel] are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us. We implore you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God” (2 Cor. 5:20). In this way God is a speaker in each language community, and makes himself known in each language. e diversity of languages and cultures, like other forms of diversity in the body of Christ, enriches the body. Each person grows in the truth through receiving truth from those with different perspectives, including different languages and vocabularies.

• Since the church has multiple languages and multiple ethnic groups, human beings do not now have on earth one final vocabulary” or final language. Unity does not arrive through a final vision of truth in a unitarian way that eliminates all diversity. Rather, the unity of one faith is compatible with the diversity of languages in which God communicates the truth to each ethnic group. at is analogous to the fact that the unity of one work of Christ is compatible with the diversity of the accounts in the four Gospels. (Poythress, 141)
• Language is not a permanent barrier, blocking access to truth and to reality, but rather is a means that provides such access. God created human beings in his image, and that commonality guarantees that the languages of the world can all serve as a means to truth.
• Because the Bible is breathed out by God (2 Tim. 3:16) to address all nations (Luke 24:47), it is true and pertinent to every culture. God so designed it. We know it is universal in its reach, not by intellectual insight that has given us a godlike superiority, but simply because God has told us so, and we trust him. But that universal reach is not worked out in practice without missionaries and translators having to confront surprising knots, complexities, resistances, and rich perspectival diversities.
• The missiologist does not need to “make” the Bible universal. It is already that (Acts 1:8).

(Poythress 141-142)
• Oh that every city had its own translator and that this Book could be found in all languages, hands, eyes, ears, and hearts! - Martin Luther

Lessons I’ve learned from translation

• You must have eyes on both the source text and the receptor text. Do not have one eye on each. By fully immersed in both. Be completely immersed in the one, and then be completely immersed in the other.
• **Consult as many languages and translations as possible!** It is myopic to only work from the Greek. Just like theology, modern translation must acknowledge and assent to what has come before it.
   • Granted, some translations may be so bad/outdated that they provide little or no help, but the majority of cases previous translations are a tremendous help.
   • Ex. you can understand the original and still not know how to best translate it, but looking at what other languages (especially related languages) can shed a lot of light on how to best translate the phrase/verse
• There are countless choices that you must make in translation. There are always many different paths a translation can take.
• Similarly, there is not only one way to translate Scripture into a language. There is not just one right answer.
• Translation is a lot easier than one might think. A lot of it can be fairly straightforward, especially narrative. (he said this, he went there, he got on a boat, he got off a boat, etc. does not require a lot of in-depth research to figure out how to translate it). Because everyday language uses a limited amount of vocabulary for the majority of communication, the same can hold true for translation. There were not a lot of new words I’ve learned through doing translation, only more obscure less-common words.
• But at the same time, some passages are really challenging and take a very long time to figure out the best way to translate them. Sometimes it’s not interpretive difficulties, it’s just a challenge to figure out how to best express the meaning in RL. It can be easy to understand what the original means, but extremely difficult to express that meaning in the RL.
• There is a not a need to have everything figured out in a language before doing translation. A greater depth of the language would produce better translations, but it most likely will not drastically change the overall translation.
   • ex. discourse analysis will help the translation I’ve done, but I think participant reference is still understandable, even if it isn't entirely natural or perfect.
• Read your draft without considering the source text. Does it make sense? Is it understandable? is it natural? This will not be as obvious if you constantly think about the source text.
• In a Muslim setting, it is helpful to start with OT passages and prophets, but it’s a balance of not doing too much that people lose interest in Scripture.

• Know who your initial audience is when translating. I would do translation that I thought would be most helpful for my friend helping me with translation. He was much more open and receptive, so I didn’t think it was necessary to focus too much on OT before going into the NT.

• Translation should be discipleship. It should not just be a job. If a Muslim is helping with translation, make sure to not just do the translation, but draw out the implications of what he has translated.

• Translation should also be devotional. It should grow your love and trust in the Lord. It is not sterile.

• People will not respond the same way to a translation, even if it is a faithful and accurate translation. People will accept or reject, be moved or unmoved. The message is the same, the response is different.

• No language is too complex to translate the Bible. No language is too simple
  • Languages that lack depth of vocabulary and complex grammar are still able to convey the word of God.
  • At the same time, even the most sophisticated, lexically-rich, grammatically complex, syntactically precise language is unable to translate the word of God in its entirety and depth.
  • At the same time, God’s design for saving the nations reassures us that no language of the world has become so corrupt that it has permanently lost fundamental structures that would be necessary for communicating the gospel. (Poythress)

• Translators should try and express the same thing in multiple ways

• The fact that translation is an art shows that you can spend hours on one verse and still not be satisfied. At some point you just have to finish, you’ll never be completely pleased with the finished product, but just like a work of art can never truly be finished, there still me come a point to be done with it.

• There are no major theological issues that hang on different translation possibilities

• Working on translation shows the faults of other translations. You see things in Scripture that you haven’t seen before. Questions come up that might not be addressed in different languages, but must be answered in order to do a faithful translation.

• Translation in a new language and culture has also helped me appreciate the biblical text. Similarities in RL that are not in English. (Gen 18)

• Translation is raw, unstable, and yet the word of God is still able to be communicated. It is a ‘dirty incarnation’. Yet no translation is able to comprehensively express the entire word of God in all its depth. The depths are infinite, yet sufficient understanding through a translation is also possible.