

Journal of Biblical Text Research. Vol. 22.

Published Semiannually by

The Institute for Biblical Text Research of the Korean Bible Society; April 2008

Table of Contents

• Paper •

- [Kor.] The Significance and Vista of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri --- Kyoung-Shik Min / 7
- [Kor.] Modality in Biblical Aramaic ----- Sun-Nam Kang / 23
- [Kor.] Alexander Pieters' Revising Work for the *Korean Revised Version* (1938)
----- Hwan-Jin Yi / 48
- [Kor.] The Metaphorical Interpretation of Hosea 11: A Textual Critical-Analysis of the Text
Based on Early Versions ----- Kyung-Hee Park / 73
- [Kor.] Study for Korean Translation of the Septuagint 2: Genesis 1:1-2:3
----- Keun-Joo Kim, Sun-Jong Kim, Jong-Hoon Kim, Sang-Hyuk Woo / 94
- [Kor.] Logical Connection of the Passage in John 4:43-45: Translation of Two Particles in 4:44
and 4:45 ----- Chang-Wook Jung / 122
- [Kor.] Translation of Definite Article in Revelation 12:14: Based on Intertextuality Theory
Modified by Relevance Theory ----- Shin-Wook Kang / 139
- [Kor.] Linguistic Cohesiveness and Textuality Represented by Subjective Postpositions,
'-ee/-ga' and '-kkeseo' in the Korean Language: Focusing on the Textuality of Genesis 1:1
----- Moo-Yong Jeon / 161
- [Eng.] A Drift on a Sea of Implicature: Relevance Theory and the Pragmatics of Translation
----- Stephen Pattemore / 180

• Book Review •

- [Kor.] *The Translator Studies in Intercultural Communication Special Issue: Evaluation and
Translation, 6:2* (C. Maier, ed., Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2000)
----- Seong-Hee Kim / 203
- [Kor.] *Let the Words Be Written: The Lasting Influence of Eugene A. Nida* (Philip C. Stine,
Leiden: Brill Academic Press, 2004) ----- Ji-Mi Yu / 223

<Abstract>

The Significance and Vista of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri

Dr. Kyoung-Shik Min
(Yeonse University)

The main purpose of this study is to illustrate the significance of researches in New Testament fragment manuscripts including Oxyrhynchus papyri and to suggest a direction for future researches according to the fruit of our long scholarship in this field.

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri were first excavated more than 110 years ago in Egypt by Grenfell and Hunt and have continually been published until the present. Until this discovery came to light, we had no direct access to the text of the New Testament of the first three centuries. It was this epoch-making discovery at the end of the 19th century which opened the door to the New Testament text before the time of Constantine, namely the door to the text of the third, and even to the second century AD.

Oxyrhynchus Papyri, however, were neglected as text critical sources, because these are all small fragments and no proper text critical method to analyze fragments had been developed until the end of the 20th century. Consequently it has been believed that they are subject to restriction in restoring the “original” text. They were considered only as an evidence which supports the already reconstructed New Testament text based on the majuscule manuscripts of the 4th century and the subsequent ones.

A recently developed method, however, threw a new light upon text critical researches into fragments. The method showed that one of the recently published Oxyrhynchus papyri preserved a very strict text of the earliest stage (P104). On the basis of the analysis on this small fragment, we can even take a whole verse out of the text of the New Testament (Mt 21:44), which is placed in brackets in the critical edition (NTG²⁷).

The already published Oxyrhynchus papyri, on the one hand, hold the majority of the early New Testament Greek papyri. On the other hand, they are only a small part of the discovery (ca. 10 %). Therefore ten times as many New Testament Oxyrhynchus papyri are expected to be introduced in the future. Researches into these materials will certainly expand the horizon of our understandings of the history of the text and help to restore a text which is closer to the “original.”

<Abstract>

Modality in Biblical Aramaic

Ms. Sun-Nam Kang

(Graduate School of Theology of Sogang University)

This paper offers a few short studies on various modal points in Biblical Aramaic texts. The purpose is to shed light on the various modal forms of the verb in Biblical Aramaic by placing each form within in the context of various types of modality. As presented in Classical Hebrew grammars, so too Biblical Aramaic generally presents such nuances and the jumble together rather distinct uses of a given verb form in different modal types. The modal nuances, which are discussed here, are connected with the finite verbal forms, namely, imperfect, imperative, jussive, and perfect.

Biblical Aramaic verb has two moods, an imperative and a jussive, which express modal nuances. In addition to imperative and jussive, imperfect and perfect forms can carry such nuances. Mood is a category of verbal form whereas, modality is a category of meaning. According to the general linguistic definition, modality is the linguistic domain that covers the speaker's attitudes and opinions about a proposition. Two basic categories of modality have been distinguished: 'epistemic', and 'deontic'. Epistemic modality is used to indicate the possibility or necessity of the truth of the proposition. Deontic modality is concerned with the realization of the proposition.

The list of the categories for the modal uses of the imperfect and the other verb forms in Biblical Aramaic is as follows: (1) The uses of imperfect: Declarative modality; Assertive modality; Assumptive modality; Dubitative modality; Obligative modality; Permissive modality; and Abilitative modality. (2) The uses of imperative: Obligative modality; and Optative modality. (3) The uses of jussive: Obligative modality; Precative and optative modality; Permissive modality; and Declarative modality. (4) The uses of perfect: Declarative modality; Assumptive modality; and Obligative modality.

The modality is an important factor in Biblical Aramaic because it helps one to catch the true and profound meaning of the Biblical texts.

<Abstract>

**Alexander Pieters' Revising Work for the *Korean Revised Version*
(1938)**

Prof. Hwan-Jin Yi
(Methodist Theological University)

Alexander A. Pieters' article, "Notes on Old Testament Revision", published in May 1940 in *The Korea Mission Field* (pp. 78-80) is fascinating in that it reveals us how to translate the *Korean Revised Version* of the Bible (1938). In the article he offered us precious information about the translation team members, translation rule and method. Even though he took his project as a revising work of the former Bible, *Korean Old Translation*(1911), his work can be called a new translation because his team worked with the original Hebrew Bible. The *Korean Old Translation* of the Bible is said to be a translation of an English Bible.

According to him, the members of the project are W. R. Reynolds, Yi Won-Mo, and Alexander A. Pieters himself. They tried to translate the Hebrew Bible as literal as possible. When making a textual decision, they followed the opinion of the majority among the translators, as many other Bible translation teams did.

One of the most important contributions to understanding of the term "Hananim"(하나님) for "God" in Korean would be the fact that the word derived from "heaven." Pieters mentioned in his article that it means "honorable heaven" (p. 79). His idea about the term is close to that of J. Ross, the first translator of the Korean Bible. As a matter of fact, nowadays Korean Christians think that "Hananim" literally refers to one God because "Hana" means "one" in Korean and "-nim" is attached to it for expressing honor or respect. The idea, however, does not seem to make sense because any numeral in Korean cannot be adorned by an ending of respect or so.

The difficulties encountered by Pieters' translation team were how to translate the passive voice of Hebrew verbs and the Hebrew verbal forms of the third person into Korean. The two verbal forms are rarely used or never used in

Korean. For the latter case they adopted the formula of “cause to do” (하게 하오), and for the former, at times they created a passive. We get the answer from this statement why the literary style of the *Korean Revised Version* is not so natural to read. Compared to the *Korean Revised Version*, the newer Korean Bibles such as the *Korean Common Translation* (1977) and the *Revised New Korean Standard Version* (2001) are full of more natural expressions because they are the works of Koreans who tried to avoid awkward expressions as much as possible.

In spite of the weakness of the translation of the *Korea Revised Version*, the enormous effort of Pieters’ translation team should be honored and fully appreciated. What is more, his article on the revision of the Hebrew Bible fills the gap of the history of Korean Bible translation. It does clearly reveal us the unknown facet of the process of the translation of the Old Testament of the *Korean Revised Version*. All in all, the *Korean Revised Version* of the Bible should be called as a new translation, rather than a revision.

<Abstract>

**The Metaphorical Interpretation of Hosea 11:
A Textual Critical-Analysis of the Text Based on Early Versions**

Dr. Kyung-Hee Park
(Korean Baptist Theological University/ Seminary)

The purpose of this study is to demonstrate a theological understanding of divine love in Hosea 11. For the full understanding and interpretation of Hosea 11 and the theological implications of the text, this study is organized into two steps. First, a textual-critical analysis is employed. The study primarily investigates the textual variants among the early versions of the text and translates the text. Hosea 11 in some places remains textually difficult to translate and interpret with certainty so that it requires some textual emendation. The translation of the text primarily follows the literal reading of the Masoretic text, and then reconstructs it to a degree. This reconstruction follows early versions of the text and references on the textual emendations. Second, this study attempts to understand divine love in the context of the metaphors used for it in Hosea 11. A comprehensive textual analysis of Hosea 11 with the study of metaphorical meaning conceptualizes an understanding of divine love in the book of Hosea. Accordingly, the metaphorical interpretation is employed. The prominent metaphor in Hosea 11 is the parental metaphor which covers the whole theme of divine love. As a parent Yahweh has suffered from the waywardness of his children. Yahweh's compassionate love toward his obstinate children, however, overcomes the punishment. Yahweh's love in his holiness shall not end a relationship with his children. This power of divine love has embraced the failure of the chosen people throughout their history. This power of divine love also will be the ultimate hope and peace in the future. In the metaphorical description of Yahweh as parent, divine love and divine suffering coexist. Yahweh justifies his suffering love with the statement: "I am God no human, the Holy One in your midst." The power of divine love emanating from holiness of God embraces the apostasy of the people. In this divine love forgiveness yields reconciliation, which creates a new way of the relationship between God and Israel and between human relationships in the community. There is hope where this love lives.

<Abstract>

Study for Korean Translation of the Septuagint: Genesis 1:1-2:3

Prof. Keun-Joo Kim (Westminster Graduate School of Theology)

Mr. Sun-Jong Kim (Marc Bloch University in Strasbourg)

Dr. Jong-Hoon Kim (Hannim Biblical Institute)

Dr. Sang-Hyuk Woo (Marc Bloch University in Strasbourg)

The Septuagint (LXX) has been so far regarded only as an ancient, although most important, witness for clarifying the Masoretic Text (MT) so it tends not to attract public attention which it deserves. As a matter of fact, the study of LXX has been limited to specialized scholars. But closer consideration on the Old Greek translation shows us that it occupies a very significant position at least in two aspects: LXX reflects a pre-Masoretic ancient Hebrew text, and LXX was read as “the” Old Testament for the first Christian church for centuries. Based upon the above significance, LXX should be circulated and meditated not only in the sphere of specialized students, but also among ordinary Christians, especially among those who seem to consider the *Korean Revised Version* (KRV) as a kind of “the inspired version of the Bible”. This article is the first step to introduce LXX under this background, and translates Gen 1:1-2:3 of LXX, keeping as many words in *KRV* as possible to let the readers find how it differs from *KRV*. The translation consists of two sections: translation proper, and its critical apparatus to show the difference between MT and LXX, and to explain the variants among different versions.

<Abstract>

**Logical Connection of the Passage in John 4:43-45:
Translation of Two Particles in 4:44 and 4:45**

Prof. Chang-Wook Jung
(Chongshin University)

Two particles, γάρ and οὖν, appear in John 4:44 and 4:45, respectively. A trivial problem arises with the conjunction γάρ in v.44, which usually indicates the causal meaning ‘because’ or ‘for’: (v.43) After the two days, He (Jesus) left from there to Galilee, (v.44) for Jesus Himself testified that a prophet has no honor in his own hometown. The logical flow of the two verses requires an explanation. This problem, however, is to be easily resolved, since the particle may function simply as a narrative marker ‘now’, or ‘then.’ In contrast, the conjunction οὖν in v.45 which connects the sentence in v.45 with that in the preceding verse causes a serious problem. The normal meaning of the particle, i.e. ‘therefore’ or ‘so’ makes the logic obscure; (v.44) For Jesus Himself testified that a prophet has no honor in his own hometown (v.45). Therefore, Galileans received Him when He arrived in Galilee (His hometown), because they had seen all things He did in Jerusalem during the feast; for they too had gone to the feast.

Various explanations thus have been suggested by scholars concerning the interpretation of the passage in John 4:43-45. However, they have never tried to clarify the usage of the particle οὖν even though such work is necessary; they usually have attempted to resolve the problem by suggesting various theological explanations.

This study demonstrates that the proper interpretation of John 4:43-45 depends on the appropriate understanding of the particles γάρ and οὖν. Especially, the study illustrates that the conjunction οὖν conveys the adversative or contrastive force in some instances in the Gospel of John and other NT books. The conjunction should be thus translated and interpreted as indicating the adversative conjunctive sense in John 4:44-45. As a result, the conjunction needs to be translated as ‘however’ or ‘nevertheless’ in 4:45, which makes the logic of the narrative clear.

<Abstract>

**Translation of Definite Article in Revelation 12:14:
Based on Intertextuality Theory Modified by Relevance Theory**

Dr. Shin-Wook Kang
(Presbyterian Theological Seminary)

In most of the Korean translations of the Bible, articles are not translated. It would be partly because the Korean language lacks the grammatical element. Meanwhile, in the English translations of the Greek definite article, the problem would be whether to translate it as definite article or indefinite article because the Greek definite article can either be interpreted as generic, which should be translated as indefinite article in English, “a” or “an”, or as anaphoric, in which case the Greek definite article should be turned into the English counterpart, “the”.

That little grammatical unit, the Greek definite article, is suddenly activated and fully empowered by the intertextuality theory recently in full swing. According to that theory, all elements of a text are related to and interact with other elements of other texts. In this line of thought, the anaphoric function of the definite article, more explicitly and tightly, ties the word or phrase with the definite article to the signified of the article in other texts. However, the unlimited potentiality of relations implicit in the intertextuality theory may naturally lead to the readers’ manipulation of the texts by arbitrarily selecting and combining relevant texts in order to produce their intended meanings. This potential danger necessitates modifying that theory with the relevance theory, which argues that only meanings relevant to the situation are communicated between the speaker and the hearer.

One is now equipped with theoretical resources to deal with the definite article before “great eagle” in Revelation 12:14. Most English Bibles translate that as an indefinite article, and all the Korean Bibles do not translate that. However, given the then situation in which idolatry was a major issue for the churches of Revelation, the definite article of the phrase in Rev. 12:14 seems to point to the stock image, “an eagle’s wings” in the OT, particularly Exod. 19:4, of which the contexts correspond to that of Rev. 12:14 at many points, especially in relation to the subject of idolatry. The article in Rev. 12:14 functions as a kind of ineliminable hinge between the two contexts and thus should be translated even in Korean.

<Abstract>

Linguistic Cohesiveness and Textuality Represented by Subjective Postpositions, ‘-ee/-ga’ and ‘-kkeseo’ in the Korean Language: Focusing on the Textuality of Genesis 1:1

Mr. Moo-Yong Jeon
(Korean Bible Society)

Although a sentence is grammatically correct, it may or may not be a suitable expression for a given situation. An expression can be regarded to have ‘textuality’ when a sentence is not only grammatically correct but is also appropriate for the situation. In the Korean language, there are subjective postpositions, ‘-ee/-ga’ that neutrally indicates the subject of the sentence, and also an honorific subjective postposition, ‘-kkeseo’ which is used to signify respect for persons of greater seniority. Even when these subjective postpositions are used correctly in terms of grammar, they can become awkward or suitable expressions depending on the circumstances they are used.

In this paper, I have studied whether “하나님이 천지를 창조하셨다” or “하나님께서 천지를 창조하셨다” would be a better translation of Genesis 1:1. Among the currently available Korean Bibles, there are translations that have selected ‘-ee’ and also ones that have selected ‘-kkeseo’ as the subjective postposition. In terms of grammar, neither postposition is grammatically wrong. Nevertheless, it is still important to thoroughly examine which expression better suits the situation because opinions on this matter differ among Koreans.

To this end, I have reviewed diachronically the contexts in which these two subjective postpositions have traditionally been used while studying the use of these two postpositions in the contemporary Korean language as well. Considering that Genesis is an epical record about the creation of the universe, emphasis was placed on determining a better postposition to the term, “hananim” in relation with the literary genre of the book.

If it is a conversational context where a person from Genesis is talking to God, ‘hananim-kkeseo’ may be used to express the speaker’s personal reverence toward God. Genesis 1:1, however, is not such a text; instead it is a sentence written with the purpose of stating an objective fact. Because of this, it would be more appropriate to use the neutral subjective postposition, ‘-ee’ after the term, ‘hananim’.

A Drift on a Sea of Implicature: Relevance Theory and the Pragmatics of Translation*

Stephen Pattemore**

1. Introduction: Problems raised by the application of Relevance Theory

1.1. Relevance Theory: A Brief Sketch of Some Important Terms

The application of Relevance Theory (RT) to the translation of the Bible has proved surprisingly controversial. I have elsewhere tried to moderate the debate and trace the “history of reception” within the United Bible Societies.¹⁾ My intention here is not to engage in a theoretical discussion, but to reflect on issues arising from my practice as a translation consultant. I do this also because one criticism of RT, this time from academic sociolinguists rather than Bible translators, is that the proponents of RT have not demonstrated its usefulness with reference to the analysis of real language data, preferring instead to illustrate with concocted examples of conversation.²⁾ Space does not permit a detailed introduction to Relevance Theory, but it is important to understand some of the key concepts which will be used in this article.³⁾ As with many

* This paper was presented, in slightly different forms, at the SBL International Congress in Edinburgh, July 2006, and at the UBS Asia-Pacific Regional Translation Consultation, Phuket, Thailand, June 2007.

** United Bible Societies Asia-Pacific Area Translation Consultant.

1) S. W. Pattemore, *Souls under the Altar: Relevance Theory and the Discourse Structure of Revelation*, UBS Monograph Series 9 (New York: UBS, 2003), 29-38; S. W. Pattemore, “Framing Nida: The Relevance of Translation Theory in the United Bible Societies”, P. Noss, ed., *History of Bible Translation* (Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2007).

2) See the response to this by D. Sperber and D. Wilson, “Remarks on Relevance Theory and the Social Sciences”, *Multilingua* 16 (1997), 145-151.

3) A full presentation of RT can be found in D. Sperber and D. Wilson, *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995). Easier introductions can be found in E. A.

theories, RT uses some special terms of its own, and also uses some ordinary terms with special meaning.

Relevance Theory is a pragmatic, cognitive explanation of the way human communication works. It is based on a number of observations. Firstly, human communication is not simply code-like. Although it does use a system of coding, the results of the coding-decoding process are subjected to interpretation based on the extensive use of inference. Thus, the text of a message interacts with its context to prompt the audience towards the meaning communicated. This process of searching for meaning is driven by the desire to find the communication *relevant*. Simply put, RT suggests that we are programmed to understand messages by interpreting them in contexts that provide the best or most likely set of useful ideas. These contexts are sets of ideas that we already hold to be true or probably true, The sum of such ideas is our **cognitive environment** and two participants in a dialogue assume each other shares a **mutual cognitive environment**. An idea or a communication is more **relevant** if it has lots of useful implications (called **cognitive effects** or **contextual effects**) for the listener, which may provide new information, strengthen or modify information the listener already has, or negate such existing information. The communication is also more relevant if it requires less mental effort to process (**processing effort**). A text, or communication is said to be **optimally relevant** when it is worth the listener's effort to process it, and it is the most relevant text that could have been generated consistent with the speakers abilities and preferences. When we receive an intentional message, we assume that there are good ideas that we can access for an acceptable amount of thinking.

These ideas may appear common-sense or trivial on the surface, but carefully applied they can provide considerable help in our study of the way human communication works, whether mediated by ancient biblical texts, or new translated texts.

One of the key outcomes of this theory for the way we understand texts is that the old distinction between *implicit* and *explicit* information is considerably refined. Usually *explicit* information is considered to be all that is actually stated

Gutt, *Relevance Theory: A Guide to Successful Communication in Translation* (Dallas: SIL, 1992); and G. Green, "Relevance Theory and Biblical Studies", Paper read at SBL International Meeting, at Groningen, The Netherlands, 2004.

by the text of a communication, while anything which has to be either assumed or deduced from this is *implicit*. RT instead uses the idea of *implicatures* and *explicatures*. **Explicatures** are derived from the actual form of the text, but they include ideas which result from assigning appropriate reference to pronouns, general terms and deictic particles, resolving the ambiguity of ambiguous terms, and enriching the ideas in the text from the listeners' previously stored memory. Thus they include many ideas which used be described as *implicit information*, but under certain strict conditions: they must be able to be derived by logical processing from the text itself.

Implicatures, by contrast, can only be derived by processing the text *in a particular context*. They result from the interaction of text and context, not from either individually. Some implicatures may be strong, and are almost certainly part of what the speaker wants to communicate. But many implicatures are weak and there is no firm boundary between the strong implicatures and those weak ones which do not form part of the communicator's intentions.

With these ideas in mind we can proceed to describe the problems which this paper will attempt to address.

1.2. Two Recurring Problems in Translation Checking

Bible translation (especially into non-Indo-European languages) is a crucible for exegesis. Every translator is familiar with the experience of going to a learned commentary for help on a specific problem of exegesis, which will significantly determine how a verse is translated, only to come away disappointed, feeling that the commentator has been asking all the wrong questions and ignoring some key determiner of meaning. But sometimes even the translations we use as resources, and the textbooks and handbooks we rely on to undergird our decision-making, are not asking the right questions. Or they are, perhaps, assuming things that those of us who work in minority-language contexts cannot take for granted. Because Bible translation is also a point of intersection of what could be rather abstract textual analysis with real acts of communication in the target language. Relevance is arguably an important criterion in exegesis, but perhaps even more obviously in the crafting of a new text to communicate with a new audience. For some time now I have been

making brief notes on verses or passages where I think that a relevance-sensitive hermeneutic would aid translators, or where RT would critique existing translation practice or model translations. I have selected issues from translation checking sessions over the past year or so, supplemented by a few examples from my work on Revelation. Where it is helpful or illustrative I will quote a back-translation of the target language text which alerted me to the problem, but all of these verses have come to my attention through problems in minority language translations. These translation issues cluster around two main focal points.

The first of these is brought into sharpest relief by considering the question of whether “implicit information” in the source text should be made explicit in the translated text, though the problem is much wider than that. It is essentially to do with *implicatures* and since traditional translation theory and practice has no principled way of dealing with implicatures, translational adjustments sometimes proposed or modeled set the translated text adrift to be carried in unpredictable ways by the currents of interaction between text and context.

The second focus has to do with what is sometimes called “contextual consistency” as opposed to “lexical consistency” in translation. In these examples, translational adjustments can drastically change the nature of one of the most accessible dimensions of context – the text itself – distorting or obscuring patterns in the tapestry, with a consequent loss or distortion of meaning.

2. A-Drift On a Sea of Implicature

Consider first

2 Corinthians 3:15-16

15 ἀλλ' ἕως σήμερον ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκηται Μωϋσῆς, κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν κεῖται· 16 ἡνίκα δὲ ἔαν ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς κύριον, περιαιρεῖται τὸ κάλυμμα.

NRSV 2 Corinthians 3:15-16

15 Indeed, to this very day whenever Moses is read, a veil lies over

their minds; 16 but when one turns to the Lord, the veil is removed.

GNT 2 Corinthians 3:15-16

15 Even today, whenever they read the Law of Moses, the veil still covers their minds. 16 But it can be removed, as the scripture says about Moses: “His veil was removed when he turned to the Lord.”

Cf. Exodus 34:34, LXX

34 ἡνίκα δ' ἂν εἰσπορεύετο Μωυσῆς ἔναντι κυρίου λαλεῖν αὐτῷ περιηρείτο τὸ κάλυμμα ἕως τοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐλάλει πᾶσιν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ ὅσα ἐνετείλατο αὐτῷ κύριος

There is no doubt that Exodus 34 is an open and active context, a strong component of the mutual cognitive environment of Paul and his readers. But does Paul intend verse 16 to be heard as a direct quote, as GNT makes very explicit by inserting the quotation formula “as the scripture says about Moses”? The move by GNT is problematic on several levels. It adds assertions like “these are the precise words of scripture”, assertions which themselves have a wide array of weak implicature attached. Taken in a canonical context, not the least of the problems is that neither Septuagint nor Hebrew says precisely what GNT puts in quotes (both have *Moses* taking the veil off his own face when he *goes in before* the Lord). Nor does the exact quote suit Paul’s purpose, which is to say something about the Corinthians or Christians in general, not something about Moses. I do not want to exaggerate the problems of the GNT here, because clearly the translators have taken some trouble to compensate for the extra or unintended implicatures involved in their adjustment – a footnote gives an alternative more literal rendering, and the quote is introduced by a clause which makes the statement about Moses illustrative of the experience of Christians. But I suggest that with these techniques the processing effort has increased dramatically all in order to cope with stray implicatures which would not have been generated by leaving the verse allusive rather than quotative.

Consider another example,

1 Corinthians 10:18

18 βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα· οὐχ οἱ ἐσθίουντες τὰς θυσίας κοινωνοὶ

τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου εἰσίν;

NRSV 1 Corinthians 10:18

18 Consider the people of Israel; are not those who eat the sacrifices partners in the altar?

GNT 1 Corinthians 10:18

18 Consider the people of Israel; those who eat what is offered in sacrifice share in the altar's service to God.

What does it mean to be “partners of the altar”? This is a rather unusual phrase (at least to us) and capable of a wide range of meaning, corresponding to different contexts accessed to derive the implicature which is taken to be “the meaning”. Against a background of understanding of the Jewish communal sacrificial system, the meaning was probably clear to the Corinthians. The Translator’s Handbook comments, highlighting the importance of the mutual cognitive environment:⁴⁾

As in verse 16, Paul is appealing to well-known facts and common beliefs. The sentence is concise and may need to be expanded in translation. For example, “those who eat the sacrifices share with one another in the sacrifice to God made on the altar.” When an animal was sacrificed by the Hebrews to God, part of it was burned on the altar, and part of it was eaten by the people who were performing this act of worship. The underlying thought, then, is that by sharing in the sacrificial meal, Jewish worshippers enter into a relationship with God that also unites them with one another. Paul’s readers would know, of course, that although some sacrifices had to be burnt whole, there were others that priests, Levites, and even ordinary people could share by eating part of the flesh (see Lev 10:12-15; Deut 18:1-4).

If this social context of reference to sacrifice on an altar is readily accessible to Paul’s audience, it may well be necessary to help readers in non-sacrificially oriented societies. The GNT chooses to make some of this explicit but in a way that is itself ambiguous and problematic, having its own quite different set of possible implicatures. One translation I checked offered as a back-translation of

4) P. Ellingworth and H. Hatton, *A Translator’s Handbook on Paul’s First Letter to the Corinthians* (London; New York: UBS, 1985), 200.

their final version “are the ones who make the sacrifice at the altar.” Now this is a reasonable implicature of GNT’s version, but not of the original, and ends up with the people and priests very much confused.

When an implicature is raised to the level of an explicature, or either implicature or explicature raised to an explicit assertion, their status in the interpretation changes. They are now presented as something for which the author takes direct responsibility and intends directly to communicate. That in itself may be problematic. Background information which would be shared by the original author and his audience, or by the speaker and his audience within the world of the text, is not normally explicated. It is part of the mutual cognitive environment and to explicate it (on either level) usually decreases the relevance of the communication by increasing the processing effort for no extra cognitive effects. On relatively rare occasions, when such background information is explicated, it is in order to draw attention to it as the starting point of a discussion (e.g. in Paul’s “We know…” Statements). When we consider the situation of the secondary audience (of a translated document), the situation may be slightly different and some background information does dramatically increase the cognitive effects of the text for little extra processing effort (e.g. the *river* Jordan, the *region* of Judea etc.). The question that has to be decided is – at what cost does this come, in terms of the integrity of the text itself? Are we producing a totally new text which communicates (the same message) to a new audience, or are we giving a new audience access to an existing text? There will necessarily be some trade-off in terms of explicating background information. Usually information in the nature of *explicatures* will not greatly distort the communication when it is made explicit.

But there is a further problem that occurs when implicatures (sometimes weak or disputed implicatures, but even relatively strong ones) are raised to the level of explicatures. They entail their own set of implicatures which are now grounded on the newly created explicature (or even assertion). It is possible that these second level implicatures would have been communicated in the original communication situation, but at best much more weakly. Given that there is also a change of context of communication this new set communicated by the translated text might not represent anything communicated in the original context at all. And even if they had been present for the original audience, they

are now much stronger because they are based not on implicatures but on something which is explicitly vouched for in the text. The down-stream effect of this is most readily seen in minority-language translations which are themselves based on major language translations, like the Good News Translation.

Consider a few more cases

1 Corinthians 10:5

5 ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πλείοσιν αὐτῶν εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεός, κατεστρώθησαν γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.

NRSV 1 Corinthians 10:5

5 Nevertheless, God was not pleased with most of them, and they were struck down in the wilderness.

GNT 1 Corinthians 10:5

5 But even then God was not pleased with most of them, and so their dead bodies were scattered over the desert.

This follows the LXX of Number 14:16, which seems to have read *ψυπ* (scattered) for MT's *שחט* (slaughtered), and while GNT has on this occasion followed a more literal rendering of the Greek verb, the total phrase raises many more questions (who killed them? Who scattered them? Were they killed in one place and then scattered like salt?) and wide array of possible and distracting scenarios. NRSV's restrained rendering does not create such a plethora of implicatures.

1 Corinthians 10:7

7 μηδὲ εἰδωλολάτραι γίνεσθε καθὼς τινες αὐτῶν, ὥσπερ γέγραπται, Ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν καὶ πίνειν καὶ ἀνέστησαν παίζειν.

NRSV 1 Corinthians 10:7

7 Do not become idolaters as some of them did; as it is written, "The people sat down to eat and drink, and they rose up to play."

GNT 1 Corinthians 10:7

7 nor to worship idols, as some of them did. As the scripture says, "The people sat down to a feast which turned into an orgy of drinking and sex."*

The Translator's Handbook judiciously observes "TEV's translation of the quotation from Exodus 32:6b is a vivid paraphrase, the meaning of which may be implied in the Greek but is not expressed."⁵⁾ Not only has GNT explicated the sexual component, but it has regrouped the drinking with the play/sex/dance rather than with the eating, where it belongs. Once again, this is a clever and well expressed explication of some implicatures of the original text, but it itself carries so many further implicatures (particularly to do with drunken sexual behaviour) that are at best only weakly derivable from the text.

On an entirely different note are the implicatures of GNT's

Romans 11:16

16 εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα· καὶ εἰ ἡ ῥίζα ἁγία, καὶ οἱ κλάδοι.

NRSV Romans 11:16

16 If the part of the dough offered as first fruits is holy, then the whole batch is holy;

GNT Romans 11:16

16 If the first piece of bread is given to God, then the whole loaf is his also.

GNT raises quite humorous implicatures for the modern reader, in a day of sliced bread, Does God get the crust? Is this a good thing or not?

Notice that the problem is not with the practice of making implicit information explicit *per se* – NRSV also does this. It is really a case of monitoring the possible range of implicatures which are let loose by changing the status of the implicit material.

And in 1 Corinthians 14:17 both NRSV and, much more so, GNT sound like Paul is damning with faint praise, where no slight is intended on the quality of their thanksgiving.

1 Corinthians 14:17

17 σὺ μὲν γὰρ καλῶς εὐχαριστεῖς ἀλλ' ὁ ἕτερος οὐκ οἰκοδομεῖται.

NRSV 1 Corinthians 14:17

5) Ellingworth and Hatton, *Translator's Handbook on Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians*, 193.

17 For you may give thanks well enough, but the other person is not built up.

GNT 1 Corinthians 14:17

17 Even if your prayer of thanks to God is quite good, other people are not helped at all.

Very similar to these cases of unintended or uncontrolled implicatures is the problem which arises when a so-called “meaning-based translation” moves in the opposite direction, making a statement which has *fewer* implicatures than the original statement (e.g. promise for oath).

Hebrews 3:11

11 ὡς ὄμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου·

NRSV Hebrews 3:11

11 As in my anger I swore,

GNT Hebrews 3:11

11 I was angry and made a solemn promise:

The contracting set of implicatures involved in GNT’s rendering became evident when I was presented with a back-translation reading just “I was angry and promised...”, now a long way distant from oath-taking.

Romans 12:1

1 … τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν·

NRSV Romans 12:1

1 … which is your spiritual worship.

GNT Romans 12:1

1 … dedicated to his service

This came back in back-translation from a third language as “faithful in doing his work”. Once again, this is quite a reasonable step based on quite strong implicatures derived from the GNT rendering, but now communicating ideas of which are scarcely if at all present in Paul’s text.

The problems discussed here are a subset of the more general problem, a kind of cross-linguistic “semantic drift”, whereby a translated expression moves in one direction from the source text and a secondary translation moves even

further. One of the key points raised by a RT approach is that this is not simply a problem of semantics. It is far more extensive, given the high proportion of the communication content carried by implicatures. In fact it can take place when terms of very similar semantic content are used – a drift of implicature is created by the changing context.

3. Unraveling the Tapestry of Context

It is a common-place of translation theory and practice that many words in a source language do not permit a single word to be used in their translation into a given target language. Even word pairs which are a good fit in one context do not correspond to each other in a different context. Such word pairs are said to have different semantic ranges. A word with a broad semantic range in the source language may need to be translated by several different words in the target language. (Let us leave aside for the moment consideration of the fact that the semantics sometimes obscure what is in itself really a pragmatic issue – a consequence of the context-dependent search for optimal relevance.)

Nida and Taber express this idea as the first in their “System of Priorities”: “The Priority of Contextual consistency over Verbal Consistency.”⁶⁾

“it is inevitable that the choice of the right word in the receptor language to translate a word in the source-language text depends more on the context than upon a fixed system of verbal consistency, i.e. always translating one word in the source language by a corresponding word in the receptor language.”

At first glance this appears entirely consistent with an RT perspective on the importance of context, but in fact it contains a hidden danger based on the nature of and understanding of the term “context”. A problem arises, to which insufficient attention is often given by translators, because an important component of the mutual cognitive environment of a particular word, phrase, or

6) E. A. Nida and C. R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), 15-22. The quotation is from p.17.

sentence is the text itself, and the other texts to which it explicitly or implicitly refers or alludes. On the assumption that authors are self-conscious and deliberative in their composition of texts, it is reasonable to suppose that choice of a particular word or phrase is made in full awareness (and an assumption of mutual awareness) of its previous use in accessible contexts. These other accessible contexts (be they earlier parts of the same text, or other texts to which connection has been or can be established) are therefore part of the context of interpretation of the new use of the word or phrase, *even when a semanticist might decide that they are being used in a different sense!* When a translator chooses to translate with a different word in the new context, this web of contextual implication is broken and the interpretation of the translated text cannot help but be different from that of the original.

I have elsewhere highlighted the importance of verbal consistency in translation for the book of Revelation⁷⁾, but a few examples here will help clarify what I mean.

Revelation 6:9

9 εἶδον ὑποκάτω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐσφαγμένων διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἣν εἶχον.

The statement that the souls are of those who have been *slaughtered* (ἐσφαγμένων) immediately evokes two recent contexts – that of the second seal (6:4), and that of the slaughtered Lamb (5:6, 9, 12). Although the former is the more recent one, I suggest that it is less strongly evoked and that the predominant association is with the slaughtered Lamb. The opening of the second seal sees a rider on a red horse permitted to take peace from the earth καὶ ἵνα ἀλλήλους σφάζουσιν (and that they might slaughter one another). Not only is the verb here future active indicative, as opposed to the perfect passive participle in 6:9, but its object is the reciprocal pronoun ἀλλήλους. Access to this context then raises the unanswerable question of whether the slaughtered souls, or even Christians in general, have themselves taken part in the slaughter of others. To attempt to answer this requires unnecessary processing effort and

7) S. W. Pattemore, “Repetition in Revelation: Implications for Translation”, *TBT* 53:4 (2002), 425-441.

returns few results. On the other hand, the slaughtered Lamb stands over the whole of the seal-openings as the primary subject, and the perfect passive participle of σφάζω has twice been used of him (5:6, 12, and an aorist passive at 5:9). I conclude from this that, while the association of the death of the martyrs with the period of mutual slaughter may be weakly implied, the association of these people with the Lamb is much more strongly so. These are people whose story is, at least with regard to their death, like the story of the Lamb.

NRSV translates σφάξουσιν as “slaughtered”, a suitably strong and marked word, and the same as has been used of the Lamb in chapter 5, allowing this connection to be made. GNT and CEV use a rather colourless, or semantically drained “killed”, which allows but scarcely encourages the connection. But NLT in this case explicates the fate of the souls under the altar as “those who had been martyred.” Now in terms of contextual consistency, this is a good move, but it completely breaks the connection with the story of the Lamb (who was described as having been “killed”).

Revelation 7:2-3

2 καὶ εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον ... ἔχοντα σφραγίδα θεοῦ ζώντος, καὶ ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ... 3 λέγων, Μὴ ἀδικήσητε τὴν γῆν μήτε τὴν θάλασσαν μήτε τὰ δένδρα, ἄχρι σφραγίσωμεν τοὺς δούλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων αὐτῶν.

The most immediate cognitive environment to which the mention of a seal and of sealing leads, before any cultural or inter-textual contexts are considered, is the inner-textual environment of Revelation 5:1-8:1, in which the scroll with seven seals is the overarching symbol.⁸⁾ There can be little doubt that the choice of identical terminology is not accidental and that there is a deliberate irony here, an irony which works in favour of the people of God. The seals that close the scroll which is first seen in the hand of the one seated on the throne (5:1) presumably bear the imprint of God’s own seal. The *opening* of the seven seals, which is almost complete, is revealing the wrath of God against disobedient humanity. But here there is a simultaneous sealing to take place. And just

8) σφάζω occurs, apart from ch.7; at 5:1, 2, 5, 9; 6:1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 12; 8:1; 9:4.

as the inexorable revelation of the judgment of God has been marked by a repetitive formula (Καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὴν σφραγίδα...), so now the sealing of God’s servants is emphasised by repetition (7:2, 3, 4, 5, 8). Against the background of the unsealing of the scroll, with its attendant disasters, the people of God are secured by a process of sealing.

Most versions retain this possibility with a reference to “sealing”, although GNT does dilute the effect a little by saying “marked with God’s seal”. It is CEV that loses the plot here, by referring throughout this scene to “marking” rather than “sealing”. This could be seen as a good example of contextual consistency, but in fact it loses the connection completely, and in the process sets up a closer connection than is warranted to another mark not yet mentioned at this point– the mark of the beast.

The importance of translational consistency for Revelation’s verbal tapestry may be an extreme example, but it is far from unique to this genre. Let us first look at some examples where the textual connection to be made is close by.

Hebrew 2:11b-12a

11 ... δι’ ἣν αἰτίαν οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοὺς καλεῖν 12 λέγων, Ἐπαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου,

NRSV Hebrew 2:11b-12a

11 ... For this reason Jesus is not ashamed to call them **brothers and sisters**,¹ 12 saying, “I will proclaim your name to my **brothers and sisters**,^m

GNT Hebrew 2:11b-12a

11 ... That is why Jesus is not ashamed to call them his **family**. 12 He says to God: “I will tell my **people** what you have done;

These two verses have the closest of connections. The quote in v.12 is in support of the assertion of v.11, but GNT obscures this logical link by translating “adelphos” differently in each verse. NRSV is rather awkward with its “brothers and sisters” in each case, but at least it preserves the link. Why could GNT not have used “family” both times? “My people” is significantly wider in its meaning and the quote no longer directly supports the assertion of v.11.

Acts 9:14-16

14 καὶ ὧδε ἔχει ἐξουσίαν παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων δεῖναι πάντα τοὺς

ἐπικαλουμένους τὸ ὄνομά σου. 15 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος, Πορεύου, ὅτι σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς ἐστίν μοι οὗτος τοῦ βαστάσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐνώπιον ἐθνῶν τε καὶ βασιλέων υἰῶν τε Ἰσραὴλ· 16 ἐγὼ γὰρ ὑποδείξω αὐτῷ ὅσα δεῖ αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματός μου παθεῖν.

NRSV

14 and here he has authority from the chief priests to bind all who invoke your **name**.” 15 But the Lord said to him, “Go, for he is an instrument whom I have chosen to bring my **name** before Gentiles and kings and before the people of Israel; 16 I myself will show him how much he must suffer for the sake of my **name**.”

GNT

14 And he has come to Damascus with authority from the chief priests to arrest all who worship **you**.” 15 The Lord said to him, “Go, because I have chosen him to serve me, to make my **name** known to Gentiles and kings and to the people of Israel. 16 And I myself will show him all that he must suffer for my **sake**.”

Ananias expresses his reluctance to visit Saul by raising inferences about the potential damage to the Lord’s reputation he presents. But the Lord takes up precisely this challenge and turns it back – “I am quite capable of looking after my own interests, thank you Ananias. In fact this man will further those interests and himself suffer for those interests in precisely the same way he has been making others suffer.” These implicatures are made possible by the network of context created by the repetition of the work “name”, a network completely lost in GNT. I am not arguing that a literal “name” is the only possible translation. But the irony and interaction can only be preserved by taking note of this tapestry and replicating it somehow.

1 Corinthians 9:8-10

9 ἐν γὰρ τῷ Μωϋσέως νόμῳ γέγραπται, Οὐ κημώσεις βοῦν ἀλοῶντα. μὴ τῶν βοῶν μέλει τῷ θεῷ 10 ἢ δι’ ἡμᾶς πάντως λέγει; δι’ ἡμᾶς γὰρ ἐγράφη ὅτι ὀφείλει ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι ὁ ἀροτριῶν ἀροτριᾶν καὶ ὁ ἀλοῶν ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι τοῦ μετέχειν.

NRSV

9 For it is written in the law of Moses, “You shall not muzzle an ox while it is **treading out the grain**.” Is it

GNT

9 We read in the Law of Moses, “Do not muzzle an ox when you are using it to **thresh corn**.” Now, is God

<p>for oxen that God is concerned? 10 Or does he not speak entirely for our sake? It was indeed written for our sake, for whoever plows should plow in hope and whoever threshes should thresh in hope of a share in the crop.</p>	<p>concerned about oxen? 10 Didn't he really mean us when he said that? Of course that was written for us. The one who ploughs and the one who reaps should do their work in the hope of getting a share of the crop.</p>
---	--

Once again we have two verses with a very close connection to each other. In this case the OT quote comes first in v.9 and is then discussed in v.10. GNT is fine in v.9 taken by itself – better in fact than NRSV, which could lead to the idea that the ox is randomly trampling through a corn field (as it appeared to do in one B/T I saw – a case of semantic drift). It is clear in GNT that the oxen are being used for a purpose by a farmer. But then the connection to v.10 is lost in both GNT and NRSV. In the Greek, the precise word used of the ox is used of the person who threshes in hope! In fact this is the point of the analogy – God's concern is not for threshing oxen so much as for people who thresh in hope. This time CEV gets it right, translating with “grinding grain” in each verse.

James 1:9-10

9 Καυχάσθω δὲ ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὁ ταπεινὸς ἐν τῷ ὕψει αὐτοῦ, 10 ὁ δὲ πλούσιος ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου παρελεύσεται.

NRSV

9 Let the believer^c who is **lowly** he boast in being raised up, 10 and the rich in being brought **low**, because the rich will disappear like a flower in the field.

GNT

9 Those Christians who are **poor** must be glad when God lifts them up, 10 and the rich Christians must be glad when God brings them **down**. For the rich will pass away like the flower of a wild plant.

Little needs to be said here, as it is obvious that GNT has lost the ironic connection between the verses. It takes a lot more effort than warranted to process “bring them down” to get “make poor”.

Now let us consider cases where the web of textual context must be seen on a wider canvas. And just so I am not always putting down GNT, here is a case

where the web of allusion is well woven, at least in the immediate context. In 2 Corinthians 1:3-6 Paul uses παρακαλεω or παρακλησις nine times in four verses: a loud thematic drum beat. And GNT appears to do it well – at least in terms of local lexical consistency (leaving aside the issue that the set of implicatures of “help” is much broader and less marked):

2 Corinthians 1:3-6

3 Let us give thanks to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merciful Father, the God from whom all **help** comes! 4 He **helps** us in all our troubles, so that we are able to **help** others who have all kinds of troubles, using the same **help** that we ourselves have received from God. 5 Just as we have a share in Christ’s many sufferings, so also through Christ we share in God’s great **help**. 6 If we suffer, it is for your **help** and salvation; if we are **helped**, then you too are **helped** and given the strength to endure with patience the same sufferings that we also endure.

So far so good but what about if we range a bit more widely?

2 Corinthians 7:4, 6

4 I am so sure of you; I take such pride in you! In all our troubles I am still full of **courage**; I am running over with joy.

6 But God, who **encourages** the downhearted, **encouraged** us with the coming of Titus.

Once again, pleasingly consistent in the local context. But apparently unrelated to the first chapter. Is this not the same book, talking to the same set of circumstances? And if “encourage” is a suitable translation in ch.7, why not in ch.1?

Let us look at some more examples that begin at a local level but have wider significance:

What about grace in Romans?

Romans 15:15

... διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσάν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ

NRSV

GNT

15 ... because of the **grace**
given me by God

15 ... because of the **privilege**
God has given me

The Translator's Handbook notes:⁹⁾

Because of the privilege God has given me is literally “because of the grace which was given me by God” (“grace” is taken in the same sense here that it was in 1:5). **Because of the privilege God has given me** may also be rendered as “because God has given me the privilege of being a servant ...” In some languages the closest equivalent of **privilege** may be “the wonderful work”, “the very special task”, or “has honored me by giving me the work of a servant.”

And GNT has indeed translated χάρις in the same way as it did in 1:5. But consider now that in a much closer context we have the following:

Romans 12:3, 6

3 Λέγω γὰρ διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι...

6 ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν ἡμῖν διάφορα, εἴτε προφητείαν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως,

NRSV

3 For by the **grace** given to me
I say ...

6 So we are to use our
different **gifts** in accordance
with the **grace** that God has
given us

GNT

3 And because of God's
gracious gift to me I say ...

6 We have **gifts** that differ
according to the **grace** given
to us:

Paul has continued, with only minor interruptions, to talk about the responsibilities of Christians towards one another, through to ch. 15. And earlier parts of ch. 15 have quite strongly focused the issue. So for Paul's audience this presents a much more easily accessed context than his opening remarks (e.g. 1:5), and one which is productive of a flood of good cognitive effects. Paul's ministry to the Gentiles is precisely of the same order as that which the Spirit

9) B. M. Newman and E. A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Romans* (London; New York: UBS, 1973), 279.

inspires in the Roman Christians in various ways, and his exercise of that ministry is also consistent with what he urges on them in ch. 12. I suggest that it is therefore important that the link be made by similar choice of words in translation. There is, of course, another level of problem revealed here in 12:6 – the complete absence of obvious connection between the English words chosen to translate χάρις and χάρισματa (GNT's move in 12:3 seems to be a good way of tying the two together). But that is another story!

Much more could be said on the translation in Romans of the δικαλος, δικαιοσύνη, δικαιώω series, complicated as it is in English by the existence of two different series of words with quite different connotations for ordinary readers: the Latinate justify, just, justification series with its legal context of meaning, and the Germanic right, righteous, righteousness series with many more personal and moral connotations. And it is further complicated by the ongoing debates over righteousness in Paul as scholars seek to penetrate the first-century cognitive environment within which Paul was writing.¹⁰⁾ But whatever view one takes about Paul's relationship to and rhetorical stance with respect to second-Temple Judaism, it can scarcely be denied that the heavy usage of this word family forms a developing web of context in Romans against which each subsequent use of a δίκαι- word must be understood and which is obscured by being split in two in English. However, that should be the topic for another paper.

4. Conclusions

Relevance theoretic approaches to translation are sometimes portrayed as representing a retreat from Nida's functional equivalence theory, back towards literalism. It would not be surprising if this was suggested about my present paper, since the translation that comes in for most criticism is the Good News Translation. In response let me first say that I love the GNT and encourage all translators I work with to use it – both to help understand the text and as a model for what can be done in English. Of course, not all retreats are a bad

10) For a good summary of the implications for translation of the new perspectives on Paul, see Omanson, 2004.

thing. Retreat from an untenable position in warfare is often a necessary precursor to a new advance. If certain positions taken as a consequence of Nida's theory become untenable in the face of new evidence, then retreat may be necessary. Nida's own continuing output of published material demonstrates a responsiveness to new challenges and evidence not always apparent in all who profess to follow him. But the application of Relevance Theory, so far from being a backwards step, advances our understanding of the pathways of human communication, and therefore of the ways in which translated texts can be expected to communicate. Rather than focusing attention on an attempt to match words or phrases between a source text and a growing translated text, RT forces our attention away from the text itself and onto the interaction of text and context, both original and new, and onto the sea of implicatures which washes over the rocks of contention. But aware now of the diverse currents contributing to the making of meaning, we are not left rudderless, because the principle of optimal relevance allows us some calculated steerage.

Gutt's application of RT to translation explicitly rejects the claims of so-called "literal translations" to be able to convey the meaning of the original.¹¹⁾ Throughout this paper I take as firmly established that meaning is paramount in translation, that words have a semantic range which rarely corresponds to that of a word in another language and that context determines the meaning in a particular instance of the word.¹²⁾ It may appear that in some instances relevance considerations move us towards translation decisions similar to those of "unprincipled literalism." But even if this is the case it is for very different and highly defensible reasons. In this paper, I have suggested two types of situation where the results of a "functional equivalence" approach sometimes fail to achieve the stated aims – to communicate the same message to a new audience. First I have discussed the problem of unintended implicatures and the drift of meaning. And secondly I have examined cases where apparently context-sensitive translation decisions in fact set the text adrift from its context. In neither case do we retreat to a rule like "translate as literally as possible". In fact

11) See E. A. Gutt, *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. 2nd ed. (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2000), 130-131, 232.

12) See M. L. Strauss, "Form, Function, and the 'Literal Meaning' Fallacy in English Bible Translation", *TBT* 56:3 (2005), 153-168 for a robust demolition of the fallacy of "literal" translation.

we challenge the meaningfulness of such a rule. Instead we propose a more careful understanding of how the text operates with respect to its intended context.

<주요어>(Keywords)

Relevance Theory, contextual consistency, lexical consistency, Implicature, explicature, translation choice,

<참고문헌>(References)

- Ellingworth, P., and Hatton, H., *A Translator's Handbook on Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians*, London, New York: UBS, 1985.
- Green, G., "Relevance Theory and Biblical Studies", Paper read at SBL International Meeting, at Groningen, The Netherlands, 2004.
- Gutt, E. A., *Relevance Theory: A Guide to Successful Communication in Translation*, Dallas: SIL, 1992.
- Gutt, E. A., *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*, 2nd ed., Manchester: St. Jerome, 2000.
- Newman, B. M., and Nida, E. A., *A Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Romans*, London, New York: UBS, 1973.
- Nida, E. A., and Taber, C. R., *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969.
- Omanson, R. L., "Key Terms in Paul's Letters that Shape Theology", *TBT* 55:1 (2004), 142-152.
- Pattemore, S. W., "Repetition in Revelation: Implications for Translation", *TBT* 53:4 (2002), 425-441.
- Pattemore, S. W., *Souls under the Altar: Relevance Theory and the Discourse Structure of Revelation*, UBS Monograph Series, 9, New York: UBS, 2003.
- Pattemore, S., "Framing Nida: The Relevance of Translation Theory in the United Bible Societies", P. Noss, ed., *History of Bible Translation*, Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 2007.
- Sperber, D., and Wilson, D., *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, 2nd ed., Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.
- Sperber, D., and Wilson, D., "Remarks on Relevance Theory and the Social Sciences", *Multilingua* 16 (1997), 145-151.
- Strauss, M. L., "Form, Function, and the 'Literal Meaning' Fallacy in English Bible Translation", *TBT* 56:3 (2005), 153-168.

<Abstract>

**Book Review - *The Translator Studies in Intercultural Communication*
*Special Issue: Evaluation and Translation, 6:2***

(C. Maier, ed., Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2000)

Dr. Seong-Hee Kim
(Ewha Womans University)

Translation is like an art of creating the work with scrutiny and exquisiteness. The academy of translation studies has discussed the issue of value and quality for a long time while recognizing its importance. However, this kind of discussion needs to be more specialized with technology and business for today. *The Translator: Evaluation and Translation*, edited by C. Maier, is a response to the increasing need of the professional development in the field of literary translation. Maier states in the introduction that conventional translation quality has focused on the self-training of translator and now it is time to develop translation studies for actual practice and application. He also explains the critical concepts such as quality, assessment, and value, introducing their relational sources for to help our understanding of this volume.

This journal consists of nine articles with different subjects and seven book reviews. The first article by Lauscher states about a distance between theory and practice in translation, and tries to bridge it considering the complexity of translation procedure. The second one by Brunette emphasizes on the demand of conceptualization of translational tools in order to make its high quality. Because evaluation is very much subjective in itself, Brunette's terminological definitions provide the clear ways of communication for translators, reviewers, publishers, and readers. Bowker's article illustrates a usefulness of corpus for evaluating student translations compared with other conventional resources such as dictionaries, parallel texts, advice of experts, and intuition. The assesment using corpora can offer objective and constructive feedback to students, and it is more useful in order to improve the students' ability for translation. Campbell's article emphasizes on the application of different criteria in evaluating literary translation by the second language and explains the diverse contexts when translation occurs.

Translation is a "re-expression" in terms of Bastin's argument. He suggests several guidelines for beginners to have creativity and methods of re-expression,

and supports a positive approach in assessment. It is hard to translate the work which contains the elements of regionalism. Most translators' strategy is to use standardization, which refers to replacement of the regionalism of the source text with more common target language elements. In that case, the regional characteristic of the original text is weakened or lost. However, Leppihalme insists that the standardization does not lose all the messages that the author wants to deliver, and target audience get them enough through their experience of reading.

Vanderschelden and Fawcett's articles explain about the current translation circumstances in France and England. Foreign literature is popular in France compared to other countries in Europe or USA. However, the French are indifferent to the existence of translators and quality of translation. Rather, they tend to be much more interested in the popularity of the source text or the author and commercialization in the French market. Fawcett also points out the subjective level of evaluation in the broadsheets and reviews journals in England. Lastly, the review of an Irish writer, Seamus Heaney's *Sweeney Astray* argues how translation is produced in relation to the specific political situation like the colonization of Ireland by England and suggests some criteria for the translation criticism. Seven book reviews at the end provide insight to how the presented theories and suggestions of quality, value, and assessment of translation are well applied to the recent translation literature.

The collection of these articles shows diverse views of quality, value, and assessment, reflecting on the situations of translation in most European countries and USA. However, there seems to be no coherence in terms of order, and some subjects are often overlapped in a few articles. Most of the authors are from English speaking culture, consequently, there is a limitation that lacks the situation of Asia, Africa, and Russia, etc. Nevertheless, this journal contributes to improve the quality of translation and to establish the criteria of evaluation. In addition, it makes us to mull over the issue of translating the Bible. The Bible has not only been written for about 1500 years along with numerous changes of histories and cultures, but also written in classical Hebrew and Greek. It is never easy to translate it with different languages and cultures for today. Considering the uniqueness of the Bible as a literature and God's word, we have to devise and add up more ways of translation method, strategy, criteria, assessment and reader's response beyond the arguments presented here.

<Abstract>

Book Review- ***Let the Words Be Written:
The Lasting Influence of Eugene A. Nida***
(P. C. Stine, Leiden: Brill Academic Press, 2004)

Dr. Ji-Mi Yu
(Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary)

This paper reviews P. C. Stine's book *Let the Words Be Written: The Lasting Influence of Eugene A. Nida*. The book introduces the bible translator E. A. Nida, in both personal and professional setting as it also surveys the history and the background of the United Bible Societies concerning the works of bible translation. It is composed of 9 chapters and using the bible translation history of United Bible Societies as its background, it reflects upon Nida's various achievements.

Nida is a well-known linguist and the pioneer of the innovative translation theory called "dynamic equivalence". And thanks to his work, many bible translators and scholars continue to obtain good results and advancements in their scholarly work. Today, Nida's theory greatly influences Bible translations engaged throughout the world. Although there were many barriers to overcome in constructing a new frame and a system for bible translation, Nida played an essential role in the process of coordinating such organizations as UBS, SIL, and other various committees.

This book is useful in examining an important theory of bible translation and uncovering the dynamic scholar that developed it.