

Journal of Biblical Text Research. Vol. 14.

Published Semiannually by

The Institute for Biblical Text Research of the Korean Bible Society; April 2004

Table of Contents

• Paper •

[Kor.] An Introductory Note to Users of WTT in the Korean Bible Society's CD-ROM Bible -----	Yeong-Mee Lee / 7
[Kor.] A Review of Koehler & Baumgartner's <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> -----	Hwan-Jin Yi / 26
[Kor.] A Comparative Review of the Critical Apparatus of NTG ²⁶ and NTG ²⁷ -----	Seon-Jeong Kim / 37
[Kor.] The Prayers of Q 10:21-24; 11:2-4, 9-13 - Focused on <i>the Critical Text of Q Unformatted and the Critical Edition of Q</i> - -----	Ky-Chun So / 58
[Kor.] Exegesis and Textual Criticism in Mark 4:24-25 -----	Hyeon-Woo Shin / 87
[Kor.] An Alternative Translation of Luke 2:49b based on Semantics -----	Gwang-Mo Kim / 107
[Eng.] Bible Translation in the UBS -----	Aloo Osotsi Mojola / 128

• Translated Paper •

[Kor.] Bible Translation in the UBS -----	Aloo Osotsi Mojola (Hwan-Jin Yi, trans.) / 141
--	--

• Book Review •

[Kor.] <i>The Living Text of the Gospels</i> by David C. Parker -----	Dong-Soo Kim / 151
--	--------------------

<Abstract>

An Introductory Note to Users of WTT in the Korean Bible Society's CD-ROM Bible

Yeong-Mee Lee

The present article examines the differences between the Groves Wheeler Westminster Hebrew Old Testament (WTT) and the *Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS), and explains how to use the Groves Wheeler Westminster Morphology and Lemma Database, 4.0 version (WTM). Both WTT and WTM are investigated here because both are included in the CD-ROM Bible recently released by the Korean Bible Society. Comparison of the texts of WTT and BHS confirms that WTT is a reliable electronic Hebrew text for both scholars and lay persons. A few differences, discussed in this article, are as follows:

(1) WTT puts kethiv and qere next to each other within the text, rather than separating them as BHS does in Masora parva. Kethiv is marked by parentheses, and qere by brackets.

(2) WTT treats kethiv qere differently from BHS, abandoning the kethiv/qere relative to BHS but following the Leningrad Codex (L).

(3) WTT treats kethiv differently from L, in agreement with BHS.

(4) WTT adapts a qere that L and BHS do not indicate.

(5) WTT includes a qere suggested by another Hebrew manuscript, which BHS has suggested in Apparatus.

(6) WTT corrects some mistakes in BHS, such as the missing *sop pasuq*, large letters, small letters, and inverted nun.

<Abstract>

A Review of Koehler & Baumgartner's
Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament.

Hwan-Jin Yi

The purpose of this article is to introduce the third edition of the *Hebrew and Aramaic Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner (KBL 3). This dictionary was published in German in 5 volumes (1967-1995), and was translated into English by M.E.J. Richardson (1994-2000).

KBL 3 reflects the biblical Hebrew scholarship of the last century: context and etymology. The dictionary tries to treat each context of the words and expressions in the Bible. Furthermore, it offers readers wider usages of the cognate languages. This becomes clear when we compare KBL 3 to BDB. KBL 3 suggests that מַיִם (Gen 2.4) would be a Sumerian loan word meaning “the subterranean stream of fresh water, ground water” (1:11). The word was taken as “mist” or something like that in BDB. KBL 3 also suggests that עֹז can mean “strength, might” (2:812) in Psalm 115.9-11. BDB takes this word only as “help, succor” or a similar meaning. In fact, BDB does not succeed in dealing with the cognate languages properly. One of the merits of KBL 3 is that it includes the Ugaritic cognates, which BDB does not have.

KBL 3 indeed shows the best and the most thorough scholarly achievement of the last century in the field of Hebrew semantics and comparative philological studies. It is certain that this dictionary will give us the best chance to enjoy biblical scholarly flavor.

<Abstract>

A Comparative Review of the Critical Apparatus of
NTG²⁶ and NTG²⁷

Seon-Jeong Kim

The purpose of this paper is to explain the differences between the 26th and the 27th editions of *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Nestle-Aland). The text of the 27th edition reproduced that of the 26th edition unchanged. Major differences, however, are found in the critical apparatus. While some of the uncials and minuscules are eliminated from the list of witnesses, other manuscripts including papyri are added. Lectionaries are cited in support of the text. The quotations of the Church Fathers are thoroughly reviewed according to restrictive criteria. The full readings of the witnesses with some minor variations are represented in the new appendix(II). Therefore, it is expected that the new edition of *Novum Testamentum Graece* will provide readers with more developed and richer critical devices for textual studies.

<Abstract>

The Prayers of Q 10:21-24; 11:2-4, 9-13
 - Focused on *the Critical Text of Q Unformatted* and
the Critical Edition of Q -

Ky-Chun So

A number of scholars simply presume the presence of the prayers in Q, as can be seen from study on the position variant. Those who give reasons for their presence in Q most frequently offer as reasons the shared vocabulary and structure and the fact that the prayers are closely associated with Q's other material on prayer, Q 10:21-24; 11:2-4, 9-13. In addition to this thematic association with prayer material, I also associate it with Q's sapiential character and note its lack of polemic. My demonstration of the coherence of the prayers with other Q material is confirming evidence for the presence of the prayers in Q.

Claims that the present formulations of the prayers derive from liturgical usage or from a prayer given by the historical Jesus rather than from a common written source do not of themselves preclude the possibility that Q included a written version of the prayer. The close similarity of wording and structure of the prayers in the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke allows the variations to be easily explained on the basis of the redactional activity of the evangelists. The shared structure and wording, as becomes clear in the subsequent analysis, indicates that one has to do with the same prayer in both Matthew and Luke.

The Lord's Prayer (Q 11:2b-4) and its interpretation (Q 11:9-13) are in Matthew in the same sequence as in Luke, though in Matthew they are held still further apart (Matt 6:9b-13 and Matt 7:7-11), largely as the result of other intervening interpolations into the Sermon on the Mount. Thus the Lord's Prayer is in a (secondary) Q context in Matthew as well as in Luke.

The assumption that the Matthean and Lucan communities have

influenced the wording has often taken the form of assuming that glosses derived from each community's usage had already worked their way into the copies in the evangelists' respective communities; this assumption can be coordinated with the assumption that the Lord's Prayer was in Q.

<Abstract>

Exegesis and Textual Criticism in Mark 4:24-25

Hyeon-Woo Shin

The aim of this article is to reconstruct the original text of Mark 4:24-25. For this purpose, Mark 4:24-25 has been investigated exegetically. Exegesis is an essential step in textual criticism. To choose a reading which fits the context, we need to make an exegesis of each reading in its context. Exegesis thus influences textual criticism, as textual criticism can also influence exegesis by changing the text. This mutual influence constitutes an hermeneutic circle between exegesis and textual criticism.

We have interpreted Mark 4:24-25 in two ways. (i) “Beware of what you hear: ‘With the measure which you measure, it will be measured to you.’ For it [i.e. the meaning of the parables] will be given to him who has [the secret interpretation from Jesus], but from him who does not have [it] even what he has [i.e. the parables] will be taken away.” (ii) “Beware how you interpret [the parables]. With the measure [i.e. way] which you measure [i.e. interpret the parable], it will be measured [i.e. interpreted] to you. For it [i.e. the meaning of the parable] will be given to him who has [a right way of interpretation], but from him who does not have, even what he has [i.e. the parable itself, or a wrong way of interpretation] will be taken away from him.”

Mark 4:24c (καὶ προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν) is located in this context, and does not fit the context interpreted according to the exegetical possibility ii above. Mark 4:24c breaks the balance between “giving” and “taking away,” emphasizing the idea of “giving.” Thus, v.24c sharpens the contrast between v.24 and v.25. This contrast does not fit exegesis ii. Though Mark 4:24c appears to fit the exegetical possibility i, it may not be regarded as a part of the quotation since it does not occur together with Mark 4:24b in any Jewish literature. Thus, Mark 4:24c does not fit exegesis i.

Therefore, Mark 4:24c, which does not fit the context, may be regarded as being secondary. This judgement is supported by more pieces of text-critical

evidence. (i) The style of Mark: Mark 4:24c does not seem to fit Marcan style, since Mark does not use the verb προστίθημι. (ii) Rhythm: Mark 4:24c breaks the structural balance and rhythm. (iii) Repetition: Mark 4:24c repeats the idea of "giving" which is contained in μετρηθήσεται and δοθήσεται. Further, ὑμῶν is also unnecessarily repeated.

If Mark 4:24c is secondary, how could this reading have occurred? The process of its occurrence can be conjectured as follows. (i) A scribe finds that Mark 4:24 allows no room for grace. (ii) He discovers that Luke 12:31 and Matt 6:33 state that God gives us what we need by grace. (iii) In the margin, he writes προστεθήσεται ὑμῶν (as an intertextual gloss) which occurs in Luke 12:31 and Matt 6:33. (iv) Another copyist inserts προστεθήσεται ὑμῶν into the text, adding καί to link it to the preceding passage.

<Abstract>

An Alternative Translation of Luke 2:49b based on Semantics

Gwang-Mo Kim

The only passage speaking of Jesus' childhood life (Lk 2:40-50) includes his first speech, that is, "ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου δεῖ εἶναι με." In this speech, the article plural *τοῖς* is not followed by a noun, so it is not easy to understand and interpret its meaning. Traditionally, scholars have preferred to translate it into "house," but others want to interpret it as "teachers" or "things." And *εἶναι* can be translated into "be" or "engage in." This writer proposes that the speech be translated, "It is necessary for me to engage in my Father's works." The methodology is (structural) semantics. And the procedure is developed in the following order: explanation of structural semantics, macroscopic analysis of Jesus' infant narrative; analysis of semantic pattern of Jesus' Temple narrative; and translation of the first speech.

In any text defined as occurrence in communication, meaning of the word(s) is determined by its structural meaning, by the methodology called structural semantics. In order to analyze structural semantics, we must give our attention to the macrostructure of the text, and then to its semantic patterns. The narrator "Luke" structures Jesus' earthly ministry as one of carrying out God's saving activity and establishing the Kingdom of God in conflict with the religious authority. The account of Jesus' temple episode is the concluding part of Jesus' infant narrative in the Gospel of Luke. Jesus' discussion with the scribes and his parents is characterized as one committed to God's purpose.

Jesus' first speech, *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου δεῖ εἶναι με* has both syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations. Firstly, *δεῖ* means divine necessity, that is, the mission Jesus must carry out in the great scheme of God's plan and purpose. Secondly, *εἶναι* is in syntagmatic relation with *ἐν*. Thus, *ἐν..... εἶναι με* means "for me to engage in....." Thirdly, *τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου* indicates two points. One is the familiar relationship between Jesus and God. God is Jesus' Father, which

Jesus knows. The other is that article plural *τοῖς* without any noun can indicate “houses” or “teachers,” but “works” is the most fitting in the terms of structural semantics. Therefore, this writer proposes that *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ ἐνθά με* be translated into “It is necessary for me to engage in my Father’s works.” This translation helps readers focus not on the temple or building but on God’s works, so they commit themselves to God and God’s works.

Bible Translation in the UBS

By Aloo Osotsi Mojola*

I. Introducing the Nida & Post Nida Perspectives: *Third Presentation*

Introduction:

Bible Translation in the UBS in the 20th Century was characterized by the Nida perspective. Eric M. North's brilliant appreciation of Eugene Nida's life and contributions written to mark his 60th birthday in 1974 is good place to begin. (See Matthew Black and William Smalley, eds. *On Language, Culture and Religion In Honor of Eugene A. Nida*, The Hague: Mouton, 1974: vii-xxvii). Nida's interest, labours and contribution to Bible translation began in the late 1930's and continue to this day albeit in a limited way. Nonetheless his writings and ideas dominated the field for the rest of the century. We are all to various extents indebted to him.

1. Just to name a few, Eugene Nida's key contributions to our field:

- a) He was trail blazer and pioneer through the medium of his ground breaking books, eg. *Bible Translating*, ABS, 1947 & *Toward and Science of Translating* E. J. Brill, 1964, *The Theory and Practice of Translating* (with Charles Taber), E. J. Brill, 1969 (Translation Studies),

* United Bible Societies, Nairobi, Kenya. Presentation to be given at the Korean Translation Workshop in Seoul, Korea, February 2003.

Customs and Cultures, Harper & Row, 1954 (Cross Cultural Studies), *Message and Mission*, Harper & Row, 1960 (Communication Studies), *Componential Analysis of Meaning*, Mouton, 1975 & *Greek Dictionary based on Semantic Domains* (with Johannes Louw) (Semantics and Lexicography), etc.

- b) He pioneered through his global travels and field visits to translation teams in remote locations world wide much of what UBS translation consultants are still doing today.
- c) He recruited and trained the first group of UBS translation consultants. This original group multiplied to present day levels. More significantly Nida contributed in a fundamental way to the professionalization of Bible translation. William Smalley has written that “The promotion of professional expertise, the development of translation of theory and of translation procedures based on such theory, began when Eugene Nida joined the American Bible Society staff in 1943’ (William Smalley, *Translation as Mission*, Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1991: 28).
- d) He promoted and popularized the theory of dynamic equivalence translation, later renamed functional equivalence translation . This was given powerful embodiments through popular model translations such as the *GNB* and *CEV* in English, *DGN* in German, *FC* in French, *Version Popular* in Spanish, *Biblia Habari Njema* in Swahili, among others.
- e) He provided leadership to teams involved in the creation and development of the best critical editions of both the *Biblia Hebraica* and the *Greek New Testament*.
- f) He promoted the development of UBS translators’ helps such as the *UBS translators handbooks, monographs, TBT*, etc

2. Some Characteristics of the Nida perspective:

- a) Originally inspired and grounded in prevailing theories of linguistics,

it slowly evolved to include insights from anthropology and cross cultural studies, communication theory, semantics, lexicography and semiotics.

- b) Its approach to translation although essentially functionalist and in principle capable of generating a multitude of translation possibilities tended to confine itself to promoting the so-called common language translations of the *GNB* variety. This was perhaps encouraged by the missiological situation of the time.
- c) Its approach to translation although based on a relatively sophisticated model of communication (see *Message and Mission*, Harper, 1960) deeply grounded on insights from cross-cultural communication, it still understood translation as a reproduction of meanings and thus promoted a dependence on what Michael Reddy referred to as the “fallacy of the conduit metaphor” (see Michael Reddy “The Conduit Metaphor A case of Frame Conflict in Our Language about language” in Andrew Ortony ed., *Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge, 1979: 284-324, see also William Frawley’s discussion of this in “Text, Mind and Order” - appearing as a chapter of his *Text and Epistemology*, Norwood, NJ, Ablex Publishing Corp., 1987: 129-181). According to this metaphor “language is a system by which humans package ideas in words and send those packages across to receivers who then extract those ideas from the words to successfully complete the communication dyad or exchange” (*ibid*: 130). This poses the problem of context free, objective meanings independent of time and space.
- d) Nida & Taber’s three stage approach to translation (analysis, transfer and restructuring - “(1) analysis in which the surface structure (i.e., the message as given in language A) is analyzed in terms of (a) the grammatical relationships and (b) the meanings of the words and combinations of words, (2) transfer, in which the analyzed material is transferred in the mind of the translator from language A to language B, and (3) restructuring, in which the transferred material is restructured in order to make the final message fully acceptable in

the receptor language.”(*TAPOT*, p33) tended to stay focused on sentence & kernel level (*ibid*: 39) and tended to encourage a bottom-up strategy that ignored discourse considerations, genre studies, literary theoretic considerations. James Holmes (1988: 100) correctly claimed in the 1970s that: “No adequate general theory of translation can be developed before scholars have turned from a sentence-restricted linguistics to produce a full theory of the nature of texts. Such a theory will devote extensive attention to the *form* of texts - how their parts work together to constitute an entity -, to the way texts convey often very complex patterns of meaning, and to the manner in which they function communicatively in a given socio-cultural setting”.

- e) The Nida perspective developed within the context and ideology of a Eurocentric, conservative Protestant missionary driven movement. It however grew to partner with the Catholics and to take advantage of developments spanned by the Vatican II fall out. Although it never took on the character of a fully fledged interconfessional movement, fully integrating all Christian confessions and traditions including those of the Orthodox and the new churches of the Southern continents its openness to all cultures and traditions and its inbuilt striving toward globalism and inclusivity became a powerful internal dynamic.

3. Some Characteristics of the post-Nida perspective:

- a) Bible translation is no longer understood purely in linguistic terms but in terms of an integrated interdisciplinary/ multidisciplinary perspective drawing on the insights of not only of the full range of linguistic studies, but equally of cross-cultural studies, literary studies, communication studies, biblical studies, archaeology and historical studies as well as the human and social sciences in general.
- b) Bible translation is now characterized by a variety of approaches such as the literalist, functionalist, literary, post-colonial, foreignization/

domestication perspectives.

- c) Bible translation as well as other translation phenomena are increasingly being understood in terms of the idea of re-writing texts an idea best captured by Susan Bassnett & Andre Lefevere as follows: “Translation is, of course, a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way. Rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power, and in its positive aspect can help in the evolution of a literature and a society. Rewritings can introduce new concepts, new genres, new devices, and the history of translation is the history also of literary innovation, of the shaping power of one culture upon another. But rewriting can also repress innovation, distort and contain, and in an age of ever increasing manipulation of all kinds, the study of manipulative processes of literature as exemplified by translation can help us towards a greater awareness of the world in which we live” (in Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility*, Routledge, 1995: vii).
- d) Bible translation now increasingly understood in terms of the contexts of its production e.g. the sociocultural, organizational, ecclesial/confessional, the sociohistory/ biography/ ideology of translation teams, expected text functions, etc. This may also be understood generally in terms of the idea of frames (an idea developed and popularized by Marvin Minsky in an influential article-, see also the new UBS volume edited by Timothy Wilt, *Bible Translation Frames of Reference*, St. Jerome, 2002).
- e) Definitions of translation no longer understood in simplistic terms a la Nida’s idea of reproduction of meanings but variously a la Venuti as **“a process by which the chain of signifiers that constitutes the source-language text is replaced by a chain of signifiers in the target language which the translator provides on the strength of an interpretation”** (see, Venuti 1995: 18). To which Venuti (*ibid*) makes the observations that: “Both foreign text and translation are

derivative: both consist of diverse linguistic and cultural materials that neither the foreign writer nor the translator originates, and that destabilize the work of signification, inevitably exceeding and possibly conflicting with their intentions. As a result, a foreign text is the site of many different semantic possibilities that are fixed only provisionally in any one translation, on the basis of varying cultural assumptions and interpretive choices, inspecific social situations, in different historical periods. Meaning is a plural and contingent relation, not an unchanging unified essence, and therefore a translation cannot be judged according to mathematics-based concepts of semantic equivalence or one to one correspondence. Appeals to the foreign text cannot finally adjudicate between competing translations in the absence of linguistic error, because canons of accuracy in translation, notions of 'fidelity' and 'freedom' are historically determined categories. Even the notion of 'linguistic error' is subject to variation, since mistranslations, especially in literary texts, can be not merely intelligible but significant in the target-language culture. The viability of a translation is established by its relationship to the cultural and social conditions under which it is produced and read". Others might view translation generally as a mediated, interlingual and intercultural communication event involving at least two languages a source language and a target language, in which a translator on the basis of his/her knowledge of both the source and the target languages and their underlying cultures and values, produces a target text in the target language based on his/her reading and interpretation of the source language text, usually in accordance with the perceived needs of the target audience and the perceived functions or intentions of the source language text or the *skopos*/brief or commission of the translation. The quality, effectiveness and success of this event is a function of all these factors. Of course this whole issue of giving a definition of translation is much more complex. Many recent practitioners have themselves abandoned the search. It may not be easy now to produce a definition of translation that is as widely accepted as the Nida & Taber definition was/is.

Some of the leading translation scholars now opt for an empirically based concept, ie - translation as any target language utterance presented or regarded as such within the target culture, on whatever grounds (Gideon Toury).

- f) Within the UBS the general tendency now is for functionalist-literary approaches that respond with sensitivity to the stated needs of the churches targeted at the diversity and variety of audiences and markets.

II. Some Frequently Asked Questions About Bible Translation in the UBS - *Fourth Presentation*

1. WHY? Why do we translate?

- a) Hebrew Scriptures (OT) originally written in Hebrew except for a few passages in Aramaic (i.e. Daniel 2.4b; 7.28; Ezra 4.8-6.18; 7.12, 26)
- b) The New Testament and Septuagint originally written in Greek
- c) The Example of Septuagint
- d) The Example of Jerome and the Latin Vulgate
- e) The Example of Martin Luther and the German Bible
- f) The Use of translated Bible to satisfy perceived needs of the churches for:
 - i) Evangelism
 - ii) Christian Teaching and theological study
 - iii) Liturgy and Worship
 - iv) Maintenance of Doctrinal stability and continuity
 - v) The Call and Challenge of the Church's Mission and Vision
- g) The Bible as the Foundational document of Christian Church -

ecumenical & inter-confessional function

- h) The Bible as a Literary document impact on other literatures, cultures and languages
- i) The Example of the 19th Century Evangelical Revival and Missionary movement, the rise of the Bible Society Movement BFBS UBS National BS

2. WHAT?

- a) What is translation?

Eugene Nida's classic definition (1969: 12) - "reproducing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent of the source language message, first in terms of meaning and secondly in terms of style". A complex set of questions generated, such as the following:

- source text postulate
 - transfer postulate
 - relationship postulate
 - the problem of equivalence (a mathematical concept?)
 - the problem of similarity
- b) What is the basic unit of translation - Words, Sentences, Paragraphs, Discourse Units, Genres, Whole Texts ? How does the total language system and its underlying socio-cultural system affect the meanings generated by any of the above units?
- c) What is the role of Interpretation in translation in the context of the following:
 - the problem of perspective
 - the problem of power
 - the problem of pluralism and diversity
- d) What do we translate? What is the Source Text?
 - i. Hebrew OT?
 - ii. Greek NT/Septuagint?
 - iii. Established and leading translated Bible texts in the so-called

international languages such as English/French/German/Portuguese, Spanish, etc?

- iv. Translated Bible texts in dominant regional languages?
- e) What canon do we translate? - the problem of canon
 - i) Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox canons
 - ii) Proto-Canon
 - iii) Deutero-Canon 7 books or 14 books
 - iv) Order and Arrangement of books
 - v) Versification

3. FOR WHOM?

- a) For whom do we translate?
 - Adults or Children?
 - Men or Women
 - Youth & Children
 - Christian or Non-Christians?
 - Educated or Non-educated?
 - Theologians & Biblical Scholars or Non-Theologians & Non-Biblical Scholars?
 - Catholics or Protestants or Orthodox or the new churches?
 - Literate or the non-literate
 - Print or non-print
 - Which speakers of the language (dialect, high vs. low, literary vs. common, etc.)
- b) The place of socio-linguistic surveys/ market surveys, etc?
- c) The role of ideological/confessional/theological orientation/agenda in determining audience groups the example of the NIV/R-NIV
- d) For what purpose, function or use is the translation to be put?
- e) Does theology/ideology etc. affect translation?

4. WHO?

- a) Who translates? Some historical examples
- b) Who should translate / What are the qualifications of an ideal Bible translator?
- Moral integrity and authority of the translator
 - Faith commitment or belief system or ideological orientation of the translator
- speaker?
- Educational (general) level
 - Linguistic knowledge of SL, RL/TL
 - Knowledge of Biblical cultures, texts and of biblical languages
 - Knowledge of TL cultures, literatures and languages
 - Native habitual (mother-tongue) speaker or foreign (second language) speaker? How much command or competence is required?
- c) A one person product or a product of team work?
- Structure of a translation Team
 - Role of a representative team of reviewers (age, dialect, church, gender, education, specialisms, etc)

5. WHEN?

- a) When should a translation happen?
- Who initiates a translation?
- Who owns a translation?
- Who should decide when to start a translation?
- What conditions should be satisfied before starting a translation?
- Personnel
 - Office
 - Translation & Reference Resources
 - Computer Resources
 - Financial Resources
- b) How is translation need determined?
- By the Church/Churches
 - By the Bible Agencies ?
 - By concerned individuals?

- As a result of socio-linguistic/ market survey?
 - When some concerned native speakers request?
- c) Is interconfessional co-operation/church partnership a factor? How important?
- d) Should the availability of other translations in the language or related languages, if any, be taken into account?
- e) What about the number of speakers UBS - Chiang Mai, Mississauga and Midrand criteria vs. SIL criteria

6. WHICH?

- a) Which media?
- i) Print Book, Comics, Braille
 - ii) Audio/Visual - Audio, Musical, Visual, Audio-visual, Multi-media
- b) Which formats
- c) Question of cost and affordability

Transmediatization

- a) Pros and Cons
- b) Gains and Losses
- c) Criteria for evaluating faithfulness/fidelity

7. HOW?

- a) Literalist approaches (formal correspondence)
- b) Dynamic equivalent/ Functional equivalent approaches (Meaning-based)
- c) Functionalist approaches
- d) Literary & text linguistic approaches
- e) Domestication and Foreignization perspectives

A SUGGESTED BASIC READING LIST

1. Eugene Nida & C. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*.
2. Eugene Nida & Jan de Waard, *From One Language To Another*.
3. J. Beekman and J. Callow, *Translating the Word of God*.
4. Mildred Larson, *Meaning-Based Translation - A Guide to cross-language equivalence*.
5. E.H. Robertson, *Taking the Word to the World - 50 years of the UBS*.
6. William Smalley, *Translation As Mission*.
7. Philip Stine, ed., *Bible Translation and the Spread of the Church*.
8. Lamin Sanneh, *Translating the Message*.
9. Andrew Walls, *The Missionary Movement in Christian History*.
10. Lawrence Venuti, ed., *The Translation Studies Reader*.
11. David Katan, *Translating Cultures*.
12. Mona Baker, ed. *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*.
13. Mark Shuttleworth, *Dictionary of Translation Studies*.
14. Jeremy Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies theories and application*.
15. Basil Hatim, *Teaching and Researching Translation*.
16. Robert Hodgson and Paul Soukoup, *From One Medium to Another*.
17. Robert Hodgson & Paul Soukoup, *Fidelity and Translation*.
18. Julian Sundersingh, *Audio-based Translation*.
19. Tim Wilt, ed. *Bible Translation Frames of Reference*.
20. J.A. Naude & C.H.J. van der Merwe, eds. *Contemporary Translation Studies and Bible Translation*.

<Abstract>

Book Review:

The Living Text of the Gospels by David C. Parker

Dong-Soo Kim

This book concerns the task of New Testament textual criticism particularly regarding the four Gospels. David C. Parker challenges the traditional idea that the primary task of New Testament textual criticism consists in the reconstruction of the original text. There existed, he claims, no such thing as the original texts of the Gospels. During the first three centuries, the texts of the Gospels developed freely and influenced one another. The texts of the Gospels were not fixed but in the making in that period. This conviction leads him to conclude that the task of textual criticism concerning the four Gospels lies in the understanding of each manuscript rather than in correcting the manuscript in order to reconstruct the original text. This article challenges Parker's thesis that the primary task of New Testament textual criticism does not consist in the reconstruction of the original text. I agree with him that one of the purposes of textual criticism is to recognize each manuscript in its own right and to understand how it has been formed. However, this is not the primary but the secondary purpose of textual criticism. He is probably confusing the secondary with the primary task. Although I am not convinced by Parker's thesis, I think that Parker's question is still valid. He leads us to rethink the important theme of the task of textual criticism, which has often been considered axiomatic.