

SECTION III

DE THEORY INCARNATE - THE TEV TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE

CHAPTER 9

A BRIEF HISTORY OF ENGLISH BIBLE TRANSLATION

No translation of the Bible can be undertaken or evaluated without due regard to its predecessors in the field. An Israeli linguist has commented that the translation of the Bible into English has been "distinguished by two salient features: the constant appearance of new translations and the continuing fascination of an archaic master version" (Aryeh Newman 1978:160).

The history of English Bible translation is a fascinating one worthy of a volume in itself.¹ What follows is but a brief sketch; but a necessary background to any discussion of modern principles of Bible translation and to our evaluation of the Today's English Version.

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

¹Such a volume has been provided in F.F. Bruce's excellent History of the Bible in English (1979). For other useful reference works see Works Cited, especially the 3 volume The Cambridge History of the Bible (1970, 1963, 1969).

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

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

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

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

look that he examine truly his Latin Bible, for no doubt he shall find full many Bibles in Latin full false, if he look many, namely new; and the common Latin Bibles have more need to be corrected, as many as I have seen in my life, than hath the English Bible late translated (Bruce 1979:17-19).

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

Though the translation of the Old Testament was undertaken some two hundred years before Christ, when the Hebrew Scriptures were rendered into Greek, extensive translation of the Bible has been a relatively recent development. In fact, even by the time printing was invented, some 500 years ago, the Bible existed in only 67 languages. During the 19th century, however, more than four hundred languages received some part of the Scriptures and within the first half of the 20th century some part of the Bible was published in more than 500 languages - an almost incredible undertaking and one in which the Bible Societies played a major role, having been responsible for the publication of at least some portion of the Scriptures in 1,153 languages (Nida, 1972).

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

in a version produced in the city of Calvin and Beza. The Bishop's Bible (1568) utilized many of the Geneva renderings but predictably removed the anti-prelate and aggressively Calvinistic glosses.

The wide circulation of other English versions provoked English Catholic scholars in France to produce the Rheims version of the New Testament (1582) and the Douai Old Testament (1609). The Douai-Rheims Bible was rather literal in its translation of the Vulgate and much more worthy of Nida's indictment - "Anglicised Latin" than the King James Version (TAPOT: 19). The Rheims translators, however, did provide a glossary explaining 58 of their Latin neologisms. Catholic doctrine was safeguarded in the section headings and marginal notes.²

The Authorized Version (KJV) of 1611

That the non-Roman English-speaking world received one and the same English Bible as a common heritage was largely due to the sheer merit of the Authorized Version. But also due credit must be given to King James I who not only eagerly approved the idea that his accession be marked by a new translation of the Bible, but also insisted that at the outset it should be without divisive marginal notes. Very probably he was thinking not only of theological controversies within the Church of England but also of those "democratic" and "seditious" sentiments in the Geneva Bible.

Whatever the King's own motives, the decision to produce the Authorized Version, or the King James Version, as the Americans call it, was a felicitous one. For wherever the English language is

2

F.F. Bruce provides amusing examples of glosses reflecting both Protestant and Catholic prejudice: Tyndale on Exodus 32:35 comments: 'The Pope's bull slayeth more than Aaron's calf', whereas the Rheims version's heading for Acts 8 reads: 'Simon Magus more religious than the Protestants'.

spoken, it has proved the Bible, par excellence, for over 350 years:

No book has had an equal influence on the English people. Apart from all religious consideration, it gave to all classes alike, an idiom in which the deeper emotions of life could be recalled. It gave grace to the speech of the unlettered, and it entered into the style of the most ambitious writers. Its phrasing coloured the work of poets, and its language has so embedded itself in our national tradition that if the Bible is forgotten, a precious possession will be lost (Ifor Evans 1940:195).

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

The King James Bible has been augmented but never superseded by new translations that aspire to, and undoubtedly in some measure achieve greater accuracy and readability, incorporating the insights of contemporary attitudes and scholarship (A. Newman: 1978:5).

In view of the dominant role of the KJV in the history of the English Bible, a brief note on its genesis is not inappropriate. The team of 47 men included most of England's leading Biblical scholars. They were divided into 6 panels: three worked on the Old Testament, two on the New Testament and one on the Apocrypha. When the panels had finished their task, the draft translations of the whole Bible were reviewed by a smaller group of twelve men, two from each panel, before the work was sent to the printer (Bruce 1979:98).

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

As to the principles on which they based their translation, they are well stated in the preface "The Translators to the Reader". This is seldom reprinted these days and must not be confused with the brief dedication "To the Most High and Mighty Prince James" (though even

this contains interesting information about their desire to avoid extremes represented on one hand by "Popish persons at home or abroad" and on the other hand by "self-conceited Brethren" of Puritan outlook).

The Preface to the Reader sets out to justify the general principle of Bible translations in the vernacular, and this work of translation in particular. Their debt to earlier English translation is acknowledged and it is claimed that their present concern is not "to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one . . . but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones one principal good one." They pay tribute to their sixteenth century predecessors who "deserve to be had of us and of posterity in everlasting remembrance." But they do not specify the man whose influence can be traced throughout so much of their work - William Tyndale.

They express forcefully their preference for idiomatic rather than literal translation in a passage frequently cited by Nida with some justification, in defending his own DE theory (e.g. 1977:78).

Another thing we think good to admonish thee of, gentle Reader, that we have not tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identity of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done, because they observe, that some learned men somewhere have been as exact as they could that way. Truly, that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signified the same thing in both places (for there be some words that be not of the same sense every where), we were especially careful, and made a conscience according to our duty. But that we should express the same notion in the same particular word; as for example, if we translate the Hebrew or Greek word once by purpose, never to call it intent; if one ~~one~~ where journeying, never travelling; if one where think, never suppose; if one where pain, never ache; if one where joy, never gladness, etc, thus to mince the matter we thought to savour more of curiosity than wisdom, and that rather it would breed scorn in the atheist, than bring profit to the godly reader. For is the kingdom of God become words or syllables? Why should we be in bondage to them, if we may be free? use one precisely, when we may use another no less fit as commodiously? . . . We might also be charged (by

scoffers) with some unequal dealing towards a great number of good English words. For as it is written of a certain great Philosopher, that he should say, that those logs were happy that were made images to be worshipped; for their fellows, as good as they, lay for blocks behind the fire: so if we should say, as it were, unto certain words, Stand up higher, have a place in the Bible always; and to others of like quality, Get you hence, be banished for ever; we might be taxed peradventure with St. James's words, namely, "To be partial in ourselves, and judges of evil thoughts." Add hereunto, that niceness in words was always counted the next step to trifling; and so was to be curious about names too: also that we cannot follow a better pattern for elocution than God himself; therefore he using divers words in his holy writ, and indifferently for one thing in nature: we, if we will not be superstitious, may use the same liberty in our English versions out of Hebrew and Greek, for that copy or store that he hath given us.

Thus in the KJV rendering of the fifth chapter of Romans we read: "we . . . rejoice in hope of the glory of God"(verse 2), "we glory in tribulations" (verse 3), "and we also joy in God" (verse 11), where the underlined words represent the same Greek verb. The Revisers of 1881 did not share the enthusiasm for skilful use of the appropriate synonyms and rendered all three occurrences by "rejoice".

The Preface makes it clear that the translators followed a middle course in rendering technical terminology:

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

The "late translation" of the "Papists" is the Rheims New Testament (1582) mentioned above. It is salutary to note that of the six examples of latinate vocabulary singled out for censure in the Preface,

scoffers) with some unequal dealing towards a great number of good English words. For as it is written of a certain great Philosopher, that he should say, that those logs were happy that were made images to be worshipped; for their fellows, as good as they, lay for blocks behind the fire: so if we should say, as it were, unto certain words, Stand up higher, have a place in the Bible always; and to others of like quality, Get you hence, be banished for ever; we might be taxed peradventure with St. James's words, namely, "To be partial in ourselves, and judges of evil thoughts." Add hereunto, that niceness in words was always counted the next step to trifling; and so was to be curious about names too: also that we cannot follow a better pattern for elocution than God himself; therefore he using divers words in his holy writ, and indifferently for one thing in nature: we, if we will not be superstitious, may use the same liberty in our English versions out of Hebrew and Greek, for that copy or store that he hath given us.

Thus in the KJV rendering of the fifth chapter of Romans we read: "we . . . rejoice in hope of the glory of God"(verse 2), "we glory in tribulations" (verse 3), "and we also joy in God" (verse 11), where the underlined words represent the same Greek verb. The Revisers of 1881 did not share the enthusiasm for skilful use of the appropriate synonyms and rendered all three occurrences by "rejoice".

The Preface makes it clear that the translators followed a middle course in rendering technical terminology:

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

The "late translation" of the "Papists" is the Rheims New Testament (1582) mentioned above. It is salutary to note that of the six examples of latinate vocabulary singled out for censure in the Preface,

three subsequently passed into common currency ("tunics", "rational" and "holocausts"). This fact needs to be remembered in assessing Nida's claim that the technical terms such as redemption and justification are merely Anglicized Latin that should have no place in a modern English translation of the Bible.

We have already noted Nida's appeal to the example of KJV whose translators affirmed "that we have not tyed ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing, or to an identitie of words, as some peradventure would wish that we had done." This usage of a variety of synonyms undoubtedly contributed to the generally excellent style of the KJV so superior to the wooden literalism of the later Revised Version (1881). Nida is correct in interpreting the Preface to the Reader as a plea for the twin qualities that he himself advocates: readability and accuracy. The trouble is that these terms are not self-defining. We need further criteria to give them substance. These, it seems have changed over the centuries. Certainly the KJV was not a "dynamic equivalence" translation. It was not written in popular, simple, everyday English. We are told, for instance, that its style was already archaic³, perhaps deliberately so, at the time of publication. Just as the New Testament itself was originally written in a Jewish Greek⁴ so the KJV could be said to be written in a Hebraized English (Bruce 1979:121 ; A. Newman 1978:161). It was a formal correspondence version and whatever flexibility translators displayed in rendering common or indifferent diction they still retained the images and idioms from the biblical languages, thus

³See preface to the New English Bible, 1961.

⁴See Section IV Ch. 12A of this thesis.

making English readers familiar with Oriental modes of thought which were woven into the texture of the English Bible. More especially, as Bishop D.W.B. Robinson recently pointed out, the KJV translators:

were constantly aware that it was the Bible that they were translating, with a definite community of themes and vocabulary of salvation, so that it was easy for the reader to recognize the important ideas and words relating to God's character and to the continuity of the history of salvation, wherever such ideas and words occurred (D.W.B. Robinson 1979:2).

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

For the English speaking world, the KJV became the master translation and the subsequent attempts of other translators to improve upon it were destined to have but temporary and limited appeal (Hollander and Kermode 1973:528-42). A variety of translations and paraphrases appeared in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries of which the most noteworthy was John Wesley's revised edition of the KJV with notes "for plain unlettered men who understand only their Mother Tongue" (1768). Bruce cites a literary curio by the

classicist Edward Harwood who produced a New Testament in the idiom of Hume and Johnson. His rendering of the opening words of the Lord's Prayer ("Our Father who art in heaven: Hallowed be thy name") helps us to understand its speedy consignment to oblivion:

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

Despite the many excellencies of the Authorized Version, the passage of time saw increasing pressure for revision. The English language had not stood still since 1611. But the weightiest consideration of all was provided by developments in the field of textual studies. A growing scholarly consensus regarded the so-called "Textus Receptus"⁵ with which the KJV translators worked, as inferior. Nineteenth century textual critics concluded that it represented a "Byzantine" text type stemming from later manuscripts which had in turn been copied inaccurately. A wealth of manuscripts discovered and researched in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has enabled scholars to trace the textual history of the New Testament well back into the second century. Though it must be admitted that there is still debate as to whether the Alexandrian, Western, Caesarean or old Antiochian text-types most faithfully represents the original "autographs".⁶

⁵ The Textus Receptus - based on a twelfth-century manuscript emended by Erasmus and printed in 1515.

⁶ However, as pointed out by the distinguished editor of the Revised Standard Version of 1946 - out of the thousands of variant readings among the manuscripts there is still, as in 1881, nothing requiring a revision of Christian doctrine. See F.C. Grant in An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament (1946) p. 42.

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

The ERV proved to be a "schoolmaster's translation" that failed to satisfy the critics or to displace the KJV in the popular affection, as we have noted in chapter one. On the whole, the Old Testament revision, which followed the 1611 text more closely, was well received. But the New Testament revision was attacked on two scores - its quality as a translation, and the principles of textual criticism which it embodied. The second issue requires more attention than can be justified in this thesis. As regards the first, it is evident that the Revisers' concern for formal concordance resulted in a version which knew nothing of the rhythm, cadence and euphony of good English. They were accused of ruining many of the loveliest passages in English literature. On the other hand it has been said that the stylistic elegance of the KJV is largely absent from the Greek original - a claim we shall return to later.

The last hundred years, and recent decades in particular, have witnessed the publication of other "revised" versions of the KJV removing what the editors regarded as obsolete usages, archaisms and Hebraisms and taking into account the prevailing scholarship of the period. Thus the Jewish Publication Society published in 1917

The Holy Scriptures According to the Massoretic Text whose debt to the KJV and ERV is obvious (though Christological overtones have been pruned out). It remains the standard version used by Jews of all denomination. Most important of all is the Revised Standard Version (1946, 1952) produced by American scholars in fairly literary English acceptable on both sides of the Atlantic. This version has made the strongest bid to replace the KJV. It is probably the most common version used in Australia and with the recent inclusion of the Apocryphal books it has gained the approval of the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches as well as the Protestant community. The New American Standard Bible (1963) was a slightly modernized revision of the American Standard Version: the latter being the American edition of the English Revised Version of 1881.

However, alongside this process of continuing revision of the KJV, the last twenty years has also seen the emergence of major new translations which make a distinctive break with the KJV-RSV tradition. The most prominent of these are: the New English Bible or NEB (1970) undertaken by major Christian bodies, other than Roman Catholic, in Britain; the Catholic Jerusalem Bible (1966) which was very much inspired by the popular Dominican La Bible de Jerusalem (1955); the New Jewish Version intended to replace the 1917 translation; the Berkley Bible or Modern Language Bible (1959); the American Bible Society's Today's English Version (1976) of which the New Testament section had already become a best seller, Good News for Modern Man (1966); Kenneth Taylor's controversial paraphrase, The Living Bible (1971) which was so commercially successful as to earn an article in the Wall Street Journal,⁷ and lastly the New International Version

⁷Wall Street Journal, March 1, 1974.

(1979) produced by the New York Bible Society and marking conservative Protestant dissatisfaction with existing modern translations - especially the RSV. Besides the product of these scholarly panels working under the auspices of large organizations, mention should be made too of monumental individual efforts such as those of J. Moffatt (1913, 1924), E.J. Goodspeed (1923), R.A. Knox (1949) and J.B. Phillips (1958, 1970).

The proliferation of new translations and the increasing tendency to eschew the formal register of solemn worship and recital in favour of the informal style of the mass media shows that a drastic change has taken place in the popular expectation of what a translation is meant to accomplish. Popular and scholarly discussions of the respective merits of these rival translations underline the importance of formulating criteria for evaluating translations in general, and Bible translations in particular. This is what Eugene Nida has attempted to do, utilizing the insights of modern linguistic science to describe what is involved in the translation process. Our own focus is subsequently to be on the TEV translation, not simply because of its phenomenal acceptance, but because it represents a conscious and consistent attempt to implement Nida's DE theory of translation.

CHAPTER 10

THE TODAY'S ENGLISH VERSION - ITS BACKGROUND, PURPOSE AND NATURE

The TEV was commissioned by the American Bible Society as a completely modern translation on a level of language that could be readily understood by any reader of English, regardless of his education.

In 1966 the New Testament was published in paperback as Good News for Modern Man. Old Testament portions appeared between 1970 and 1975. The complete Bible was ready for publication in 1976. Apart from its communicative language another important factor in its popularity has been the brilliant line drawing illustrations of the Swiss artist, Annie Vallotton. According to one of the seven OT translators, "This was the first English translation to make consistent use of advances in general linguistics and in secular translation theory" (Crim 1978:936).

Nida has described how the story of the TEV begins not in the U.S.A. but in the extraordinary success of two other Common Language translations in Latin America and Liberia (Nida 1977:45f.). In accordance with the principles expounded in William L. Wonderly's Bible Translation for Popular Use (1968), a Spanish Versión Popular was first prepared for ten million Indians from northern Mexico to Southern Chile. But it was soon discovered that this translation was even more popular in cities such as Mexico City, Bogota and Buenos Aires than among the Indians for whom it was designed. The success of a similar venture in Liberian English (i.e. the form of English used in West Africa) provided further stimulus to attempt a translation in a more broadly based form of modern English.

The major responsibility for the translation fell to Robert G. Bratcher, a professional translator, who prepared a draft of the whole

New Testament which was subsequently reviewed by a panel of scholars. Bratcher also served as chairman of the committee of six who produced the OT translation. Prior to joining the Bible Society Translation Staff he had experience as a lecturer in Greek and had also served as a missionary in Brazil where he had been involved in the revision of the famous d'Almeida Portuguese version of the Bible.

A Common Language Version

Dr. Bratcher himself has explained that the TEV is both a Common Language Translation and a Dynamic Equivalence translation. (Bratcher 1971:98-107, cf. 1978:146-152). All dynamic equivalence translations are not common language translations but all common language translations must be dynamic equivalence translations. Canon Phillips' translation of the New Testament (1958) has been acknowledged as the first modern DE translation in English but the language was more of a literary character because it was aimed at British University students. The TEV, on the other hand, follows a simple level of English because, in accordance with DE theory, it has been restructured to fit in with the readership ability of a very different target audience. It originally set out to meet the needs of one billion people who speak English as a second language (Bratcher 1971:106). The preface to the fourth edition (1976), however, states that: "This translation of the New Testament has been prepared by the United Bible Societies for people who speak English as their mother tongue or as an acquired language." It is a Common Language Version and as such has a number of characteristics:

1. It deliberately avoids technical terms wherever possible.
2. It is written, not spoken, English, and so conforms to the written style of the language.

3. The vocabulary of the language is restricted but not artificially as in "Basic English" (Which is not a living language)¹.
4. Difficult polysyllabic words and complex sentence constructions are avoided.
5. Slang, regionalisms and provincialisms are avoided in an attempt to give universal appeal. Bratcher actually suggests that this is a kind of KOINE English².
6. Idioms are avoided for the same reason. Idioms are vivid and effective for native speakers but may be unintelligible or misleading for non-native speakers (Bratcher 1978:147-148).

"Common language" has been defined as "that part of the total resources of a given language common to the usage of both educated and uneducated." (Wonderly 1968:3). It is interesting to compare the TEV with a good literary translation like the NEB. A quick glance at the Psalms in the NEB, for instance, reveals many words which are not part of everyday speech in all classes of society: for example, "myriads" (3:6), "profligacy" (12:8), "acclaims" (27:6), "calumnies" (73:8). All these disappear in a common language version such as the TEV.

Sometimes a literary translation may use groups of words which are all simple and well-known, but which used together have a special sense. For example in Psalm 4:1, NEB translates "Thou didst set me at large". The TEV has "You came to my help". Again a literary translation may use sentences which not only contain uncommon words,

¹Basic English is the simple form of the language produced by C.K. Ogden of the Orthological Institute and consisting of only 850 words. A Basic English Version of the Bible was produced by Prof. S.H. Hooke in 1949.

²KOINE is the name given to the type of Greek used in the New Testament.

but which are long and complicated. Educated people may have no difficulty with them but others may. Compare, for example, the NEB and TEV translations of 2 Corinthians 8:3-5a.

NEB

Going to the limit of their resources, as I can testify, and even beyond that limit, they begged us most insistently, and on their own initiative, to be allowed to share in this generous service to their fellow-Christians. And their giving surpassed our expectations; for they gave their very selves, offering them in the first instance to the Lord, but also, under God, to us.

TEV

I assure you, they gave as much as they could. Of their own free will they begged us and insisted on the privilege of having a part in helping God's people in Judea. It was more than we could have hoped for! First they gave themselves to the Lord; and then, by God's will, they gave themselves to us as well.

Both translations are modern in their language and in the methods by which the translators have worked. But whereas the NEB is written at a more literary level of language, the TEV is intended for anyone who reads English. Ellingworth (1972:222-3) has spelled out three implications of common language Bible translation.

First, a common language translation must use language which is up to date: this is, language spoken by people not more than about 35 years old. It is intended for people who read English now, in this day and age. Hence the titles of the DE translations read: "Today's English Version", "Bonnes Nouvelles Aujourd'hui", "Kabar Baik Masa Kini" etc.

Secondly, a common language translation cannot use language which will be understood only by people who go to church. Non-church-goers should be able to understand the message of the Bible even if they don't want to accept it. Common language translations avoid traditional, ecclesiastical language because they are intended for everyone.

Thirdly, a common language translation must be written in language that is natural to those who speak and write it as their

mother tongue. For instance, formal correspondence translations such as the KJV reproduce features of the source text which are unnatural in English. A good example is the consistent translation of Mark's kai by "and". In the KJV the first chapter of Mark has 32 sentences beginning with "And". It was natural, apparently, for a Jewish writer like Mark to write this kind of Greek since it was normal to begin sentences with ^{waw}~~vav~~ in Hebrew. It was not common in classical Greek and it is very unnatural in English; some would say incorrect. Hence the NEB has only 5 sentences in this chapter beginning with "and"; the TEV has only two.

A Dynamic Equivalence Version

The TEV follows a Dynamic Equivalence principle of translation not a Formal Equivalence principle. Bratcher cites Nida's succinct definition: "To translate is to try to stimulate in the reader of the translation the same reaction to the text as the one the original author wished to stimulate in his first and immediate readers." He reminds us, too, that the principle is not so novel as is sometimes thought. Luther with customary vigour claimed on translating the Pentateuch, "I endeavoured to make Moses so German that no-one would suspect he was a Jew." Support is also sought from Mgr. Ronald Knox. "A translation is good in proportion as you can forget, while reading it, that it is a translation at all." (Bratcher 1971:99). It is doubtful, however, that the works of either of those translators exhibited the amount of cultural adaptation that their stated principles demanded. Bratcher singles out three features that mark the TEV as a DE translation: contextual consistency, naturalness and explicitness.

Contextual Consistency

That the TEV is a DE translation is reflected firstly in its emphasis on contextual consistency over verbal consistency (cf. Nida

1969:15f). Bratcher's own example is the translation of hoi Ioudaioi in the Gospel of John. He claims that to woodenly render it by "the Jews" on every occasion is to misrepresent the meaning of the original. It usually refers, he says, to the Jewish authorities and is best so translated. (Bratcher 1978:148).

Nida and Bratcher acknowledge that the most controversial feature of the TEV has proved to be the decision not to translate such terms concordantly. In his popular introduction to the TEV, God News for Everyone (1977), Nida devotes a whole chapter entitled "Great Truths Made Clearer", to answering critics who attack the TEV's failure to reproduce such terminology. It is significant that Nida does not justify the TEV practice on the grounds that it is a Common Language translation but actually maintains the new renderings are superior. Terms such as expiation, justification, sanctification, predestination are dismissed as not much more than anglicized Latin! More plausibly he argues that words such as "redemption", "saints", "propitiation", "fear of God", "blood" are misleading to the modern reader.

The greatest number of criticisms (Bratcher 1971:104) have been directed against the translation of the Greek haima ("blood") by "death" or its equivalent in eleven passages where Christ's sacrificial death is referred to (Acts 20:28; Rom. 3:25; 5:9; Eph. 1:7; 2:13; Col. 1:20; Heb. 10:19; 13:20; 1 Pet. 1:19; Rev. 1:5; 5:9). In a detailed defence of his renderings Bratcher maintains there are four differing senses of haima. Firstly the word is often used to signify "violent death" as also did the Hebrew word for blood (dam) in the OT. He cites Matt. 27:24,25 where Pilate washes his hands before the crowd and says, "I am innocent of the haima of this man" and the crowd responds, "May his haima be upon us and our children". The reference is clearly to the execution of Jesus and in Greek this death

can be quite naturally and dearly denoted by haima. But he goes on:

In English, however, the word blood does not mean death; it means only the liquid that flows in the veins and arteries of men and animals. Such compound expressions in English as "bloodthirsty", "bloodguiltiness", "spilling blood", "blood-letting" do mean death but the simple word "blood" alone does not. In translating Matt. 27:24,25, then, it is only natural that a common language translation that tries to be simple and clear for all readers will use "death" in Pilate's statement and the crowd's reply; "I am not responsible for the death of this man! This is your doing . . . Let the punishment for his death fall on us and on our children." The same is true in Matt. 23:25, which speaks of the murder of all innocent men . . . from the murder of innocent Abel to the murder of Zechariah . . .) (see also Matt. 23:30; 27:4; Luke 11:50,51; 13:1; Acts 5:28; 22:20; Rom. 3:15; Rev. 6:10; 19:2).

Secondly, in two passages, haima, he says, refers to spiritual death. Thus in Acts 18:6 Paul confronts the Jews in Corinth who are opposing him with the words, "Your haima be upon your head; I am innocent." (cf. Acts 20:26). The TEV restructured this "If you are lost, you yourselves must take the blame for it. I am not responsible"

Thirdly, where haima refers literally to the blood of animals used in sacrifice, the appropriate translation is "blood" (as e.g. in Heb. 9:7,12,13,19-22,25; 10:4; 13:11).

Fourthly, there are contexts where haima is used of Christ's sacrificial death and where the context makes clear the spiritual and symbolic nature of the usage. In such passages as John 6:53-56 for instance, which speaks of drinking the blood of the Son of Man, or in others which speak of being cleansed by the blood of Christ, it is obvious from the context that "blood" is not meant literally (cf. Heb. 9:12,14; 10:29; 13:12; 1 Jn. 1:7; 5:6; Rev. 7:14; 12:11; Mt. 26:28; Mk. 14:24; Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 10:16; 11:25,27).

The whole question of "Concordance" is a complex one and we shall return to it in the next section. But Bratcher, in following Nida here, adopts too narrow a view of context. It focuses attention on the sentence and loses sight of the broader context supplied by the author's

writings and, in fact, that of the whole Biblical corpus.

Naturalness in Language

Secondly, Bratcher points out that the TEV as a DE translation does not follow the word order or imitate the word classes of the Greek text, but seeks to express the meaning as naturally and as clearly as possible in English. Nida's classification of words into object, event, abstraction and relation enables the translator to better represent the meaning of the text. His example is Romans 1:17 which in formal correspondence translations reads: "For in the gospel the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith. As it is written 'He who through faith is righteous shall live.'"

The TEV rendering is more natural and clear: "For the Gospel reveals how God puts people right with himself: it is through faith from beginning to end. As the Scripture says, 'The person who is put right with God through faith shall live.'"

The DE emphasis on naturalness has implications for stylistic features of the translation. Bratcher mentions a number of Greek or Semitic forms that require restructuring in the interests of clear idiomatic English (1978:150). Thus rhetorical questions are replaced by declarative statements lest the modern English reader assume that information is being sought. For example in Mark 8:37 instead of "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul" (KJV) the TEV has the assertion "There is nothing a person can give to regain his life."

Naturalness and the Problem of Semitisms

Naturalness in translation demands also that Semitisms be identified and translated in such a way that the right meaning will be carried. Bratcher singles out the idiom "son of", and the use of the passive as the reverential way of avoiding naming God as the subject of the action. Certainly the NT writers' use of huios ("son") is "Semitic

rather than typically Greek" (Turner 1963:207 cf. Moule 1953:174-175). In many cases "son" expresses a quality or characteristic of a person mentioned. Thus "sons of thunder" in Mark 3:17 is rendered "men of thunder" by the TEV while "sons of disobedience" in Ephesians 2:2 are "people who disobey God." These are clearly different from the usage in "John, the son of Zechariah" (Luke 3:2) or "Son of David" (Matthew 15:22) where a physical relationship is signified.

It is assumed that these Semitisms did not represent a "noise factor" to the original receptors (whether because of their own Hebraic linguistic heritage or because of familiarity with the translationese of the LXX) but if translated literally for the contemporary English reader they are apt to cause psychological and semantic noise. This is also true of the noun-noun genitive constructions (not mentioned in Bratcher's articles but given dynamic equivalents in the TEV) whose relationship can be clarified by a verb or verb phrase. Here Nida's neo-Chomskian approach to Grammatical analysis is utilized in making explicit the nature of the relationship in the ST and applying it in the transformation of the noun-noun genitive construction. Some common examples that cry out for analysis are the love of God (1 John 4:9), the God of love (2 Cor. 13:11), the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38), the fear of the Jews (Jn. 7:13), the faith of Jesus Christ (Rom. 3:22), the God of peace (Phil. 4:9), the peace of God (Phil. 4:7), the knowledge of God (Col. 1:10), "the body of death" (Rom. 7:24); "the work of faith" (1 Thess. 1:3).

One Greek scholar has pointed out that this Greek form of the genitive absolute construction is "immensely versatile and hard-worked" (Moule 1953:37) and a translator is likely to encounter a genitive phrase of this kind about twice in every three verses of the NT! Analysis is complicated by the fact that as in most cases two nouns

are involved in the construction, it is not uncommon to find that one or both of them is an abstract noun. This means that the translator must clarify not only the function of the genitival relationship but also the function of the abstract noun(s). Again a significant percentage of the genitive constructions found in the NT involve figures of speech - one of the nouns may be figurative, such as "light" or "bowels" or "way" or one of the nouns may be involved in a figure in addition to its being part of the genitive construction e.g. Acts 14:27 "he had opened the door of faith" where "opened the door" is an idiom, but door is connected with faith (an abstract noun) by the genitive. The metaphor has to be considered first and then the significance of the genitive may be studied within the metaphorical setting. Another complication is that the same genitive construction may have opposite meanings in different contexts. Thus "the love of God", to take the usual example, may mean "you love God" or "God loves you". Again, a similar genitive construction may have different senses as in "the gospel of Jesus Christ" (Mark 1:1), "the gospel of God" (Rom. 1:1) and "the gospel of me" (Rom. 2:16). The first probably means "the gospel about Jesus Christ", the second "the gospel which comes from God", and the third "the gospel which I preach". In each case the genitive signals different semantic relationships between the pairs of forms that are linked.

Another Semitism singled out by Bratcher following Nida (TAPOT:114) for restructuring, is the so-called "passive of divine avoidance". FC translations have preserved the form of the ST e.g. "Judge not that you be not judged" (Mt. 7:1) and "Blessed are the merciful : for they shall obtain mercy" (Mt. 5:7). In the TEV, on the other hand, God is explicitly shown to be the subject of the action - "Do not judge others so that God will not judge you" and "Happy are those who are merciful

to others; God will be merciful to them" (cf. Mt. 4:24; Lk. 6:37-38). Nida claims the passive may be misunderstood. But was that not equally possible in the case of the original Greek speakers for whom these Jews wrote? It is surely arguable that if the Jews were accustomed reverentially to avoid the name of God by using a passive form, then this reverential attitude should be preserved in translation. No doubt the grammar of some languages would compel the use of the active voice with the subject made explicit but English does not.

Since we do not share the Semitic culture of the NT writers and most of their original readers, the figurative use of words poses a special problem. Bratcher suggests that the metaphors must often be changed to similes or the figurative language abandoned altogether in the interests of clarity. He cites Luke 16:22 as an example where a literal translation would elude the modern reader. The FC translations read: "The poor man died and was carried by the angels to Abraham's bosom" (RSV). The TEV provides cultural conditioning to clarify the allusion: "The poor man died and was carried by the angels to Abraham's side, at the feast in heaven." The justification being that "a literal translation tells nothing to the reader who does not know the way in which people at that time reclined at feasts, and does not realize that in Jewish circles the hereafter for the righteous was sometimes portrayed as a great banquet in heaven with Abraham as the host of God's people" (Bratcher 1971:99).

Other Semitic structures to be restructured in the TEV include "son of perdition" (referring to Judas, Jn. 17:12) which becomes "the man who was bound to be lost"; "to close up his bowels" (1 Jn. 3:17 KJV) becomes "closes his heart against his brother"; "those who give suck^k" and "breasts that never gave suck^k" (Mt. 24:19 and Luke 23:29 RSV) becomes "mothers who have babies" and "women who never bore babies, who

never nursed them."

There are, of course, passages where the TEV's "naturalness" does not distort the message and where the style (though not distinguished) is superior for modern readers. Compare the translation of the Parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11-32) in the RSV and TEV below:³

Revised Standard Version

And he said, "There was a man who had two sons; and the younger of them said to his father, 'Father, give me the share of property that falls to me.' And he divided his living between them. Not many days later, the younger son gathered all he had and took his journey into a far country, and there he squandered his property in loose living. And when he had spent everything a great famine arose in that country, and he began to be in want. So he went and joined himself to one of the citizens of that country, who sent him into his fields to feed swine. And he would gladly have fed on the pods that the swine ate; and no-one gave him anything. But when he came to himself he said, 'How many of my father's hired servants have bread enough and to spare, but I perish here with hunger! I will arise and go to my father, and I will say to him, "Father, I have sinned against heaven and before you; I am no longer worthy to be called your son; treat me as one of your hired servants."' And he arose and came to his father. But while he was yet at a distance, his father saw him and had compassion, and ran and embraced him and kissed him. And the son said to him, 'Father, I have sinned against heaven and before you; I am no longer worthy to be called your son.' But the

Today's English Version

Jesus went on to say, "There was a man who had two sons. The younger one said to him, 'Father, give me now my share of the property.' So the man divided the property between his two sons. After a few days the younger son sold his part of the property and left home with the money. He went to a country far away, where he wasted his money in reckless living. He spent everything he had. Then a severe famine spread over that country, and he was left without a thing. So he went to work for one of the citizens of that country, who sent him out to his farm to take care of the pigs. He wished he could fill himself with the bean pods the pigs ate, but no-one gave him anything to eat. At last he came to his senses and said, 'All my father's hired workers have more than they can eat, and here I am, about to starve! I will get up and go to my father and say, "Father, I have sinned against God and against you. I am no longer fit to be called your son; treat me as one of your hired workers."' So he got up and started back to his father.

'He was still a long way from home when his father saw him; his heart was filled with pity and he ran, threw his arms around his son, and kissed him. 'Father,'

³This treatment is an adaptation of Nida's use of the same passage to compare the RSV and the NEB (TAPOT:134-140)

father said to his servants, 'Bring quickly the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand and shoes on his feet; and bring the fatted calf and kill it, and let us eat and make merry; for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost and is found.' And they began to make merry.

"Now his elder son was in the field; and as he came and drew near to the house, he heard music and dancing. And he called one of the servants and asked what this meant. And he said to him, 'Your brother has come, and your father has killed the fatted calf because he has received him safe and sound.' But he was angry and refused to go in. His father came out and entreated him, but he answered his father, 'Lo, these many years I have served you, and I never disobeyed your command; yet you never gave me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends. But when this son of yours came, who has devoured your living with harlots, you killed for him the fatted calf!' And he said to him, 'Son, you are always with me, and all that is mine is yours. It was fitting to make merry and be glad, for this your brother was dead, and is alive; he was lost, and is found.'"

the son said, 'I have sinned against God and against you. I am no longer fit to be called your son.' But the father called his servants: 'Hurry!' he said. 'Bring the best robe and put it on him. Put a ring on his finger and shoes on his feet. Then go get the prize calf and kill it, and let us celebrate with a feast! Because this son of mine was dead, but now he is alive; he was lost, but now he has been found.' And so the feasting began.

"The older son, in the meantime, was out in the field. On his way back, when he came close to the house, he heard the music and dancing. He called one of the servants and asked him, 'What's going on?' 'Your brother came back home,' the servant answered, 'and your father killed the prize calf, because he got him back safe and sound.' The older brother was so angry that he would not go into the house; so his father came out and begged him to come in. 'Look,' he answered back to his father, 'all these years I have worked like a slave for you, and I never disobeyed your orders. What have you given me? Not even a goat for me to have a feast with my friends! But this son of yours wasted all your property on prostitutes, and when he comes back home you kill the prize calf for him!' 'My son,' the father answered, 'you are always here with me and everything I have is yours. But we had to have a feast and be happy, because your brother was dead, but now he is alive; he was lost, but now he has been found.'"

In order to highlight the differences between these two translations, it is useful to list the more important contrasts in parallel columns:

RSV

TEV

- | | | |
|------------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Luke 15:11 | 1. And he said | 1. Jesus went on to say |
| | 2. And the younger | 2. The younger one |
| 15:12 | 3. younger of them | 3. The younger one said |
| | 4. the share of property that falls to me | 4. my share of the property |
| | 5. And he divided | 5. so the man divided |
| | 6. his living | 6. the property |
| 15:13 | 7. Not many days later | 7. After a few days |
| | 8. gathered all he had | 8. sold his part of the property and (left home) with the money |
| | 9. took his journey | 9. went to |
| | 10. far country | 10. a country far away |
| | 11. there | 11. where |
| | 12. his property | 12. money |
| | 13. loose living | 13. reckless living |
| 15:14 | 14. when he . . . spent . . . | 14. He spent everything he had. |
| | a great famine | Then a severe famine |
| | 15. great famine | 15. severe famine |
| | 16. a great famine arose | 16. severe famine spread over that country |
| | 17. to be in want | 17. were left without a thing |
| 15:15 | 18. joined himself to | 18. he went to work for |
| | 19. into his fields | 19. out to his farm |
| | 20. to feed swine | 20. to take care of the pigs |
| 15:16 | 21. have fed on the pods | 21. wished he could fill himself on the bean pods |
| | 22. that the swine ate | 22. the pigs ate. |
| 15:17 | 23. came to himself | 23. came to his senses |
| | 24. hired servants | 24. hired workers |
| | 25. have bread enough and to spare | 25. have more than they can eat |
| | 26. I perish here with hunger | 26. here I am about to starve |
| 15:18 | 27. I will arise and go | 27. I will get up and go |
| | 28. sinned against heaven and before you | 28. sinned against God and against you |
| 15:19 | 29. I am no longer worthy | 29. I am no longer fit |
| 15:20 | 30. And he arose | 30. So he got up |
| | 31. came to his father | 31. Started back to his father |
| | 32. yet at a distance | 32. still a long way from home |
| | 33. had compassion | 33. heart was filled with pity |
| | 34. embraced him | 34. threw his arms around his son |
| 15:21 | 35. And the son said | 35. 'Father,' the son said |

15:22	36. Bring quickly the best robe	36. Hurry. Bring the best robe
	37. put a ring on his hand	37. put a ring on his finger
15:23	38. let us eat and make merry	38. let us celebrate with a feast
15:24	39. this my son	39. this son of mine
	40. is alive again	40. is alive
	41. they began to make merry	41. so the feasting began

Several features of the above sets of contrasts require some comment:

1. The RSV is an FC translation. As here, it often begins a sentence with "And" (though not so often as the KJV) thus reproducing the Hebraic Greek kai, e.g. verses 11, 12, 14, 16, 20, 21, 23, 26, 27, 31. The TEV regards this kai as a discourse transition marker signalling a shift from one episode to another. Accordingly it uses an equivalent English marker "Jesus went on to say". In other places the TEV renders kai "but" or "so" or leaves it out altogether, as seems appropriate to the context.
2. The TEV makes for easier understanding by starting a new sentence.
3. In verse 12 the TEV does not reproduce the literal "younger of them" which is pleon^astic in English. The "younger one" is regarded as a natural equivalent.
4. The RSV's "that falls to me" is a literal rendering but unnatural in English. The TEV's "my share of the property" is semotactically appropriate.
5. The TEV's use of "so" in place of the literal translation "and" is used to mark an intra-discourse transition.
6. The RSV's literal "his living" could be misleading in modern English where it would refer to "income". The TEV's choice of "estate" is based not so much on stylistic criteria in this case as on dynamic

equivalence of which it is a good example.

7. Simplicity presumably determines the TEV's "few" instead of "not many".

8. The TEV's more explicit "sold his part of the property and left home" is not so much based on style as interpretation.

9. The RSV's "Took his journey" is archaic.

10. TEV replaces "far country" by a more modern "country far away".

11. TEV prefers "where" to "there" and thus subordinates the clause.

12. The TEV replaces "property" by "money" to make it clear that what was squandered was cash.

13. The TEV's choice of "reckless" rather than "loose living" is an interpretation of the Greek asōtōs (which the RSV had rendered more with regard to contextual consistency!).

14. The RSV construction "when he . . . spent . . . , a great famine arose" might be taken to imply that the first action took place with anticipation of what was to follow. The TEV rendering emphasizes the unexpectedness of the famine - a stylistic refinement.

15. The use of "severe famine" rather than "great famine" by the TEV is probably more appropriate semotactically.

16. We speak of calamities "falling" rather than "arising".

17. The RSV's "to be in want" is archaic.

18. The RSV's "joined himself to" is archaic.

19. The TEV's "out to his farm" is probably more natural.

20. "Swine" is relatively obsolescent except when applied to humans with a bad connotation.

21. The TEV's rendering is simpler but less impressive than the RSV's "he would gladly have fed on the pods".

22. Again "pigs" is more contemporary than "swine".

23. The TEV's "came to his senses" is more natural than the RSV's

"came to himself" which could suggest a fainting fit.

24. The TEV's "hired workers" is perhaps more contemporary. Does the RSV's "hired servants" avoid cultural transposition better?

25. The TEV's "have more than they can eat" is simpler and more contemporary.

26. "I perish here with hunger" is unnatural translationese. But the TEV's "Here I am about to starve" could be improved on. Perhaps "Here I am starving to death".

27. The TEV also retains this Biblical structure merely replacing "arise" by "get up".

28. In the interest of clarity the TEV makes explicit the reference to God.

29. This verse has long been a traditional part of the Church's liturgy so that the TEV's "no longer fit", although denotatively equivalent, seems inadequate.

30. Again the TEV substitutes "got up" for the somewhat archaic "arose".

31. The TEV's "started back to his father" can be justified from the context. It better conveys narrative progression.

32. "Yet" is replaced by the more contemporary "still".

33. The TEV's "his heart was filled with pity" is not superior to "he had compassion". Nida's suggestion: "His heart went out to him", as an idiomatic rendering of the Greek spagnizo, is preferable.

34. The RSV's "embraced" probably normally carries a sexual connotation. The TEV is more appropriate.

35. The RSV's "And" is translationese. The TEV's intradiscourse transition is better.

36. "Hurry. Bring . . ." is more natural than "Bring quickly".

37. The RSV's "putting a ring on his hand" reproduces the Greek but sounds strange. The choice is presumably between a "bracelet on

the arm" or a "ring on the finger". The TEV chooses the latter.

38. "Eat and make merry" is archaic.

39. The TEV reconstructs "this my son" in more natural word order, viz. "this son of mine".

40. The TEV's "is alive" is sufficient.

41. "So the feasting began" is more contemporary.

The differences between the two translations in the case of this passage, a parable, are not significant. Almost all are stylistic and these mainly at the phrase level. If, as Nida says (TAPOT:145), stylistic devices can be divided into two categories: (1) those which increase efficiency of communication, and (2) those which are designed for special effects (i.e. which enhance interest, increase impact, or embellish the form of the message), then it is the former that we have been noting. Because of the nature of the material the level of vocabulary is not markedly different (unlike more condensed teaching sections of the Epistles, e.g. Hebrews 1:1-4). But it can be said that the TEV's modifications consistently reflect its purpose to provide a version in simple, contemporary and natural English.

Explicitness

A third feature of the TEV which marks it out as a DE translation, according to Bratcher, is its provision of "redundant information" which was available to the original readers but which is not necessarily shared by the modern reader. As examples he gives "myrrh" in Mark 15:23 which the TEV identifies for the modern reader as "a drug called myrrh"; and "Asia" in 1 Corinthians 16:19 which the TEV clarifies as "the province of Asia" (in the hope that the reader will not confuse it with the modern continent of Asia) - (Bratcher 1971:99; 1978:148). By "redundant information" (from Nida's rather idiosyncratic usage, TAPOT:163-165) then, is meant the provision of information

which is implicit in the original message either because the writer and readers have certain shared knowledge or because the information may be understood from either the linguistic context or the non-linguistic context.

It has long been recognized in the history of translation not only that there is implicit information in the original, but also that some of this implicit information has to be made explicit if the translation is to be understandable at all. (Beekman & Callow 1974: ch. 3). Ellipses are a prime example (Nida TAPOT:115). Thus the translators of the KJV found it necessary to clarify many ellipses though they used italics to show an English reader what was not overtly expressed in the original e.g. "and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit" (Jn. 15:2); "her that had been the wife of Urias" (Mt. 1:6); "who has not bowed the knee to the image of Baal" (Rom. 11:4), and "If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast (1 Cor. 10:27). Subsequently the (English) Revised Version abandoned the practice. Its Preface (1884) stated "that all such words as are plainly implied in the Hebrew and necessary in the English, be printed in common type". English often demands the addition of the verb "to be" where it is omitted in the Greek clause (Turner 1963:294-310). All English versions supply the omitted copula. However, in epistolary formula where the KJV and other FC versions were content to retain the form of the original (e.g. Rom 1:7 "To all that be in Rome"), the TEV supplies the verb "to write" - "And so I write to all of you in Rome". Similarly in the benediction formulas of the New Testament letters where the RSV preserves the Greek form "Grace to you and peace from God . . ." the TEV renders it "May God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ give you

grace and peace (e.g. in Rom. 1:7; 1 Cor. 1:3; 2 Cor. 1:2; Eph. 1:2; 6:23; 2 Thess. 1:2; 2 Tim. 1:18; Rev. 1:4).

The TEV also makes some of its references more explicit by adding classifiers. The original readers of the NT writings realized that Bethphage, Antioch and Rhegium were cities, and that Saul, Tertullus and Lysias were persons. However, the TEV and other DE translations employ classifiers to make clear the reference of many unfamiliar proper names: the river Jordan, a man called Fortunatus, the city of Rhegium, the town of Puteoli, cloth linen and sect Pharisees etc. Such classifiers "provide a convenient device for building meaningful redundancy into an overloaded text." (Nida 1964: 230) and "can be used whenever a borrowed word needs some semantic redundancy attached to it, so that the reader will be able to understand at least something of its form and/or function (TAPOT:167). Due to the historical and/or geographical importance of the Biblical names they are usually transliterated rather than translated. (See Nida 1964:193-195 for a good treatment of problems involved).

Provision of such contextual conditioning can be very helpful to the reader when there are distinct differences between the cultural forms or functions of the Biblical referents and the corresponding receptor language parallels". Bratcher points out that cultural matters such as weights, measures and hours of the day should be given their modern equivalents. No one today knows how far "a Sabbath Day's journey" or the weight of a talent, or the length of a cubit was. On the other hand to substitute modern currency results in obvious anachronisms. Footnotes can supply the additional information that will make the meaning clear to the reader (Bratcher 1978:151).