LANGUAGE AND TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

STANLEY E. PORTER

The language and translation of the New Testament are two closely related issues. One addresses the question of the nature and background of the language in which the New Testament was written by its original authors, and the other addresses the varied and ongoing responses to this text by those who for various reasons have found it necessary to read the New Testament in languages other than the original. I will here discuss the issues surrounding the Greek of the New Testament, with reference to theories regarding other languages that may have played a part in the linguistic milieu of the New Testament. Then I will discuss issues surrounding the rise of modern translations, especially those into English.

1. THE LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT—GREEK

Whereas the Old Testament was written mostly in Hebrew, with some portions in Aramaic, the New Testament was, apart from a few individual words (e.g. Mark 5:

41, 7: 34, 15: 34//Matt. 27: 46), written virtually entirely in a form of ancient Greek. This much has long been recognized by scholars and others alike. However, there have been a number of issues surrounding this Greek of the New Testament. These include: (a) the nature of this Greek, (b) the use of Greek in the early church and possibly by Jesus and his followers, (c) the characteristics of this Greek, and (d) recent innovations in the study of the Greek of the New Testament.

a. The Nature of the Greek of the New Testament

Classical philology dedicated itself to studying the best examples of literary Greek produced by the most distinguished Greek stylists. When these same scholars and others turned to the Greek of the New Testament, it was clear that the Greek that they were reading was recognizably similar in many ways, but in many ways also quite different. The periodic (intricate and involved) sentences of classical Greek were noticeably missing in New Testament Greek (exceptions would include Luke 1: 1–4 and arguably some parts of Hebrews), being replaced by a much more straightforward and linear or paratactic style; some of the linguistic forms that distinguished some of the best authors were missing (for example, the optative mood or the dual number); and the vocabulary was restricted in scope (there are only a little over 5,000 different words used in the New Testament), among other features. As a result, when biblical scholars especially (who often in the past were classically trained) turned their attention to the Greek of the New Testament, they had to explain how it was that a Greek text could be so culturally important and convey such deep theological truths while being written in what appeared to be an inferior form of Greek—certainly not a form of Greek that could rival the style of writers such as Thucydides, the great tragedians, or even Plato. As a result, there were a number of explanations put forward to explain the nature of this Greek.

The first theory was that the Greek of the New Testament was a special form of Greek, called by various names, such as 'biblical Greek', 'Jewish or Christian Greek', 'ecclesiastical Greek', 'synagogue Greek', or even a divinely inspired Greek (so-called Holy Ghost Greek). This position, advocated by some in the eighteenth and even late into the nineteenth century (such as Friedrich Blass 1898), and revived again in the twentieth century, tried to come to terms with the powerful impact of the New Testament while not having a suitable linguistic point of comparison. Their explanation was that the elevated thought demanded some form of elevated language, even if it did not appear to be elevated in comparison with other forms of Greek.

With the discovery of quantities of Greek documentary papyri in the sands of Egypt near the end of the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth, however, the situation changed dramatically. Suddenly there was a wealth of evidence that

the Greek of the New Testament did not stand alone, but, so it was argued by such scholars as Adolf Deissmann (e.g. in Porter 1991: 39–59) and James Hope Moulton (e.g. in Porter 1991: 60–97), was part and parcel of the Greek used throughout the Graeco-Roman world. To use the language of more recent discussion, it reflected one of the registers of usage of the Graeco-Roman world. Deissmann and Moulton, among others, undertook in their publications to show at various points where items of New Testament Greek lexis and syntax were to be paralleled in the Greek papyri from Egypt. Some questioned whether the examples from Egypt were suitable parallels, themselves having possibly been influenced by Semitic languages, but, as Teodorsson (1977: 25–35) so ably makes the point, there are no other types of Greek to be found in Egypt, or elsewhere, from this time.

The deaths of Deissmann and Moulton left discussion open for a backlash against their ideas and a resurgence of a form of Semitic language hypothesis, usually focusing upon Aramaic, although it has been argued that Hebrew was in use in Palestine during this time. The enduring Semitic hypothesis has taken a number of different forms, from arguing that the New Testament reflects Semitic language because in many places it is a direct, theological translation from Aramaic (Charles Torrey in Porter 1991: 98–111), to the more widespread and persistent belief that the New Testament is directly dependent upon an original Aramaic stratum. Earlier forms of this hypothesis failed adequately to support their retroversions into Aramaic (recently revived by Maurice Casey 1998), although more moderate forms of the hypothesis have continued to identify the possible influence of Aramaic upon the Greek of the New Testament (e.g. Matthew Black in Porter 1991: 112–25 and Joseph Fitzmyer, e.g. in Porter 1991: 126–62).

More recently, two earlier theories have been revived. Gehman (e.g. in Porter 1991: 163–73), Turner (e.g. in Porter 1991: 174–90), and most recently Walser (2001), are each identified with attempts to revive the notion that the Greek of the New Testament constitutes a special form of Greek. They believe that this was a special dialect of Greek used in the synagogue and early church, which is reflected in grammatical peculiarities of the Greek of the New Testament. There has also been a revival of Deissmann's and Moulton's belief that the Greek of the New Testament was reflective of at least some of the dialects or registers of Greek in use throughout the Mediterranean area in the first century (such as Moises Silva e.g. in Porter 1991: 174–90, Lars Rydbeck e.g. in Porter 1991: 205–26, and Stanley Porter 1989, 1996). Much of the most recent discussion has occurred within the growing recognition that first-century Palestine was heavily multilingual.

Progress on the issue of the nature of the Greek of the New Testament seems to focus now upon differentiation of registers or dialects of usage, with recognition that particular registers may well have local or even personal characteristics (e.g. see Porter 2000c).

b. The Use of Greek in the Early Church, and Even by Jesus

The question of the type of language found in the New Testament is closely related to the question of the language of the early church, and even of Jesus and his closest followers. By the time of the emergence of the books of the New Testament, and the Apostolic Fathers in the late first and early second centuries, it is clear that Greek was the language of the Christian church. This comes as a surprise to many, who cannot imagine peasants as being able to use Greek. This stereotype is based upon a number of misunderstandings, however. These include a failure to realize the integration and Hellenization of the Mediterranean world certainly from the time of Alexander on (if not before), enhanced by the conquests of the Roman Empire, the importance of a lingua franca for economic survival within such a world, the linguistic competence of the early Christians, such as Paul and even James (see Johnson 1995), and the diverse socio-economic nature of the early church as it quickly spread outside Palestine, among others.

If it is granted that, at least by the time of writing of the New Testament books, Greek was a major language of the early church, and the conclusion seems undeniable, then the question becomes whether Jesus himself and his disciples may have spoken Greek. Aramaic was the predominant language of the Jewish people ever since their return from exile in the fourth century BCE, and Aramaic continued to be widely used, especially in Palestine by Jews. The development of the Targumic tradition—Aramaic paraphrases or translations of the Hebrew Scriptures—probably constitutes evidence that Aramaic, rather than Hebrew, became the language of communication and religion for a significant number of Jews, at least within Palestine. Nevertheless, there remains dispute over the earliness and relevance of the Targumic tradition for study of the New Testament.

The question of the language(s) of Jews outside Palestine, however, is often neglected, but proves illuminating. The translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek—what has come to be called the Septuagint (or sometimes in its earliest form, the Old Greek)—beginning in the third century BCE in Egypt and continuing up to the Christian era, indicates that Greek became an important language not only for communication but also for the religion of the Jews. The situation in Egypt is probably reflective of the situation elsewhere in the Graeco-Roman/Mediterranean world, such that even Palestine was influenced by the use of Greek for religious purposes, as is evidenced by the discovery of a variety of Greek documents, such as apocryphal Greek manuscripts and a number of Greek manuscripts of the Hebrew Scriptures as well as other Greek documents, even among the Dead Sea documents (e.g. Minor Prophets Scroll, Bar Kokhba letters, Babatha archive). Thus, there is substantial evidence to establish that the vast majority of the Jews of the time, who lived outside of Palestine, used Greek as their primary language, even if they also spoke a local language or Aramaic.

In discussing the languages in use in Palestine itself, and hence the potential language of Jesus, there are three possibilities. There is substantial textual and epigraphical evidence to establish that Aramaic was widely used in Palestine by Jews of the time. This evidence includes the biblical books of Daniel and Ezra, non-canonical books such as *1 Enoch*, and a range of inscriptional, ossuary, epistolary, papyrological, and other literary evidence. It is highly likely that the Gospels, when they record Jesus using Aramaic, are citing the original wording that he uttered and offering a translation for readers who knew Greek but not Aramaic, rather than suggesting that Jesus spoke Greek and used the occasional Aramaic word.

A more highly contentious issue is the amount of Hebrew used in Palestine at the time. As already noted above, it appears that few outside Palestine knew Hebrew, apart possibly from those in some restricted religious contexts. There is even serious question about how widespread knowledge of Hebrew was in Palestine, including questions about its use in the synagogue. It has been argued on occasion that a form of Mishnaic Hebrew was in use, as confirmed by Judaean Desert documents, such as the Hebrew Bar Kokhba letters, as well as ossuary, numismatic, and literary evidence. Some have even argued that, while Aramaic was the language of the upper social level, Hebrew was the language of the lower social levels. Nevertheless, if Hebrew was used at all, its usage was probably not widespread, and the number of Hebrew inscriptions found in Palestine is small.

There is even more controversy over whether Jesus and his disciples spoke Greek. It is fairly easy to establish that in Galilee in particular Greek was widespread, especially by those who engaged in commercial enterprises. The same is true, although probably to a slightly lesser extent, in Judaea. Besides the evidence offered above concerning the lingua franca of the Roman Empire, there is the evidence from the Gospels (see below), literary evidence, and a diversity of epigraphic evidence. The last includes several key letters from the time of Bar Kokhba (*c.*132–5 CE) that attest to the fact that it was at times easier to find someone who could write in Greek than who could do so in a Semitic language—and these letters come from the Jewish revolutionaries themselves.

Although there are some who deny that Jesus spoke any language other than Aramaic, there is a growing number of scholars who recognize that Jesus certainly spoke Aramaic but probably also spoke Greek on occasion. Most scholars do not wish to attempt to identify such episodes, even if they recognize it as possible that Jesus did speak Greek. A few scholars have been willing to try to identify such episodes. The criteria for identification might well include the plausibility of Greek being used in the particular context. For those episodes where Greek is presumed, the use of independent accounts is helpful in establishing what may well have been said on the occasion. Those passages that have been identified as possible instances where Jesus conversed in Greek with others are the following (see Porter 2000*a*, 2003):

1. John 12: 20–8, where the Greeks approach Jesus (but Jesus is not recorded as saying anything);
2. Luke 17: 11–14, the healing of the Samaritan leper;
3. John 4: 4–26, Jesus' conversation with the Samaritan woman;
4. Matt. 8: 5–13//John 4: 46–54, Jesus' conversation with the centurion or commander;
5. Mark 2: 13–14//Matt. 9: 9//Luke 5: 27–8, Jesus' calling of Levi/Matthew;
6. Mark 7: 25–30//Matt. 15: 21–8, Jesus' conversation with the Syrophoenician or Canaanite woman;
7. Mark 12: 13–17//Matt. 22: 16–22//Luke 20: 20–6, Jesus' conversation with the Pharisees and Herodians over the Roman coin;
8. Mark 8: 27–30//Matt. 16: 13–20//Luke 9: 18–21, Jesus' conversation with his disciples at Caesarea Philippi;
9. Mark 15: 2–5//Matt. 27: 11–14//Luke 23: 2–4//John 18: 29–38, Jesus' trial before Pilate.

These possible instances have been arranged in order of increasing probability. The first is an episode where it is plausible that Greek was used, but provides no possible wording. The second and third are found in only a single episode, where multiple independent attestation cannot be established. Instances 4–8 depend upon the independence of the accounts, but have both the presumption of Greek being used in the context and the possibility of independent accounts attesting to this fact. The last instance has the greatest degree of probability and likelihood that Greek was spoken; since all four Gospels record the same basic event and specifically the wording of Jesus, there is a high likelihood of independence in the Gospel traditions, there is no interpreter recorded as being present, and there is very little chance that Pilate would have spoken Aramaic. In fact, it is plausible that on this basis we have the very words of Jesus in Greek in this episode.

At the very least, this discussion indicates that it is highly probable that Jesus was himself multilingual, knowing Aramaic and Greek, and possibly Hebrew (Luke 4: 16–30), even if we cannot establish with certainty the language of a given episode, especially where the question of Greek is involved.

c. Characteristics of New Testament Greek

The language that the New Testament was written in is a form of Hellenistic Greek. Hellenistic Greek was the lingua franca of the Graeco-Roman world, and became so after the conquests of Alexander the Great in the fourth century BCE. Although a number of indigenous languages continued to be used in various regions—such as Aramaic in Palestine, but also various other local languages in Asia Minor (e.g. Phrygian)—Greek became the language of commerce, administration, and

even government. Numerous multilingual inscriptions from the Hellenistic and Graeco-Roman periods, as well as references in literary authors and the record of communication throughout the empire by means of letter, make clear that the common language was Greek.

The history of the development of the Greek language is an intriguing one, and of relevance for describing the Greek of the New Testament. Although Linear A has yet to be deciphered, it has been established that the language of the Myceneans was a form of early Greek, reflected in their script, called Linear B. When the Mycenean age closed abruptly in the thirteenth century BCE or so, the Greek territory fell into what is often called a dark age. It emerged again from this dark age in the ninth century BCE. This is often referred to as 'the period of the dialects', and includes the Archaic and Classical literary periods. It is called 'the period of the dialects' because there were a number of different local dialects used by the Greek city-states. Scholars are undecided as to whether they came about through a series of migrations or invasions, or whether they came about as local developments of linguistic tendencies already found in those areas (see Horrocks 1997: 7–15). The major three dialects were West Greek, Attic-Ionic, and Boeotian, with many scholars now adding a fourth, Arcado-Cyprian. These languages were recognizably similar in most regards and were appropriately given the label Greek, although there were distinctive regional peculiarities in terms of morphology, syntax, and vocabulary (e.g. the use of *an* versus *ke* as the conditional particle). Most importantly, there were differences in pronunciation that perpetuated divisions among the dialects.

The Attic form of the Ionic dialect gained in significance due to the literary, cultural, and economic power of the city of Athens. As a result, the Attic dialect came to be established as the literary standard, and it is the dialect in which much of the literature of Classical Greece is preserved. Attic also came to be the language that was used for administrative purposes. This form of Greek is what Horrocks calls 'Great Attic' (1997: 27–31), due to its widespread significance and usage. As a result, there were a number of changes that took place in the language as it was regularized in terms of the other dialects and more widespread usage. Many of these features (e.g. the use of -σσ rather than -ττ characteristic of Attic Greek, and the loss of the dual number) are ones that were carried into the Greek of the Hellenistic period, and hence into the Greek of the New Testament. This process of Attic forming the basis of the administrative as well as literary language of the Classical Greek world then became more widespread with the conquests of the Greek mainland by Philip II of Macedon, Alexander the Great's father, and then with the conquests of Alexander himself (who was educated by Aristotle, and who shared his father's reverence for things Greek).

There have been a number of opinions regarding the nature of the development of the Greek of the Hellenistic world, and more particularly of the Greek of the New Testament. Some scholars have maintained that the Greek of the Hellenistic world was an amalgamation of features of the various Greek dialects, and that each of

them contributed in recognizable ways to this linguistic hybrid. This theory is not so widely held in recent research, which indicates that the basis of the common Greek of the Hellenistic period—a virtually dialectless form of language in widespread use for administration and even literature, consistent in linguistic structure, even if subject to regional pronunciation differences (Palmer 1980: 189–90)—is the Great Attic of the Classical period. This form of a common Greek language, based mostly upon the Attic form of the Ionic dialect, became the common Greek, or Koine, of the Hellenistic world, and was widely disseminated, initially through sporadic trade, but especially by Alexander and his conquests from 330 to 320 BCE. This process of dissemination by soldiers, merchants, and bureaucrats moved Greek further from its language base, and, as a result, a process of simplification and systematization took place. With the establishment of the Greek kingdoms after Alexander's death—the kingdoms of the Diadochi included Greece, Asia Minor, Ptolemaic Egypt, and Seleucid Syria—the cultural milieu of Greek domination continued, even if local languages survived. The evidence for this is seen especially in the Greek documentary papyri from Egypt, along with those from Palestine. Greek was clearly the second language of a huge number of people—but it was the first language for many as well.

As a result, Greek was forced to become a suitable tool for the range of communication contexts in which it was utilized. The result was register adaptation according to need and circumstances. There was even an effort in the second century CE to rebel against the widespread use of Greek in forms that did not match the supposed standards set by Classical usage. This so-called Atticistic movement tried to impose the characteristics of the earlier period, and resulted in introducing instances of artificial Greek usage that hyper-corrected to Attic norms (e.g. in use of the optative mood in some writers). These register differentiations can be distinguished along the following lines (Porter 1989*b*: 153):

vulgar usage—found in many documentary papyri;

non-literary usage—official and documentary papyri, scientific and related texts, inscriptions, and some more popular philosophers, such as Epictetus;

literary usage—historians and philosophers of the Graeco-Roman era, such as Philo, Josephus, Polybius, Arrian;

Atticism—Plutarch and Lucian, among others.

Some of the noticeable features of Hellenistic Greek include the following:

paratactic style and word order was utilized more than periodic style;

the subtleties of classical pitch accent were replaced by stress accent;

vowel reduction occurred as itacism (the tendency toward the use of the *i* sound) occurred;

the personal endings of verbs and nouns were simplified and regularized;

the final *nu* was used more frequently;

prepositions were used increasingly with the accusative case;

certain particles fell out of use;

the older *mi* verb forms were regularized with *omega* forms;

sigmatic aorist verbal tense-forms tended to replace non-sigmatic forms;

a little later the perfect tense-form came under pressure;

the optative mood virtually disappeared (except in certain Atticistic writers, where it was often used unnaturally) under pressure from the subjunctive mood;

the middle voice began to be restricted in usage;

the subjunctive with *hina* began to replace the infinitive to indicate purpose and result clauses;

the dative case eventually disappeared under pressure from the accusative;

and verbal periphrasis increased in frequency.

Many of these features, as well as others, continued to develop in subsequent periods, and can be witnessed in the Greek of the Church Fathers and later the Byzantine period.

d. Recent Innovations in the Study of the Greek of the New Testament

The greatest innovation in recent study of the Greek of the New Testament is the utilization of modern linguistic methodologies for the study of this ancient language (see Porter 1989*a*). Traditionally, the Greek of the New Testament has been studied according to the canons of classical philology, which (as noted above) has resulted in some of the confusion and misunderstanding regarding the language. Modem linguistic methodologies have, for the most part, been developed for the study of modern languages, especially English. The result has been resistance to their use, especially since their employment requires development and modification of the methods so as to be suitable for application to Greek. Despite the efforts of some to resist such efforts, there have been a number of recent methodological innovations and resultant conclusions in the study of the Greek of the New Testament. Several can be mentioned here, if only briefly (see Porter 1997, 2000*d*).

1. Verbal Structure   Analysis of the Greek verbal structure has developed from one that was time-based (well into the nineteenth century; Winer 1882) to one that was based on the purported objective kind of action (*Aktionsart*; late nineteenth into the twentieth century; Moulton 1908) to one that was based upon realizing the subjective perspective of the speaker or writer (aspect; twentieth and twenty-first centuries; Porter 1989*b*, Fanning 1990, McKay 1994, Decker 2001, Porter and

O'Donnell 2001). As a result of recent research, fewer and fewer scholars are arguing for the time-based nature of the tense-forms in Greek, even in the indicative mood. Scholars for the last 100 years have increasingly realized that the non-indicative moods (e.g. the subjunctive, optative, imperative, as well as participle and infinitive) do not indicate time by the selection of tense-form. In some ways, this makes the Greek verbal structure more like, rather than unlike, the Hebrew verbal structure (incidentally, this calls into question some of the unwarranted disjunctions drawn between Greek and Hebrew, and their respective mindsets, on the basis of language). Most Western European languages are quite heavily time-oriented in their verbal system, unlike some Eastern/Oriental languages, and Greek in this regard relies upon contextual indicators, including genre and temporal and discourse indicators, rather than verbal morphology (the so-called tense-forms of the verbs) to determine the time of an event. Instead, the selection by an author or speaker (the choice is often sub- or un-conscious) of a particular tense-form indicates the author's perspective on the action. The full exegetical implications of these findings have not yet been realized, as it is only recently that commentaries on the Greek texts of the New Testament are being written that try to appropriate these insights into Greek verbal structure (see e.g. Gundry 1993). However, more and more exegetes are noting that the verbal tense-forms in Greek are used to indicate the author's perspective on the action, and to shape the discourse in its communicative function.

2. Case and Frame Analysis   Case and frame analysis are related in recent research in Greek, since they are both concerned with what are often called semantic cases. The traditional category for discussing cases in Greek is in terms of morphological case-forms: that is, the cases that are indicated by the endings on words, including the nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative (and sometimes the vocative) cases. As noted above, there were some changes in the formal case systems in Hellenistic Greek, which finally resulted in the disappearance of the dative case and an increase in occurrence of the accusative case. Recent case and frame analysis, however, is not concerned with formal cases but with the underlying semantic functions that are represented by various cases. As a result, there have been a number of analyses of the semantic cases of New Testament writers. Simon Wong (1997) in his analysis of case in Paul defines the following: agent, experiencer, patient, complement, reference, benefactive, locative, source, goal, path, instrument, comitative, manner, and measure. Frame analysis in recent New Testament study (pioneered by Paul Danove 2001) focuses upon what is called valency: that is, the number of places that a verb can take (one, two, or three). These places are then correlated with semantic cases. The result of such efforts is to develop a lexicon of the Greek of the New Testament that analyses verbs, and verbal elements, in terms of their valency and semantic frames.

3. Written Texts and Literacy Studies   The analysis of ancient languages, including ancient Greek, is limited to the textual remains, whether these are in the form of scraps of papyri of documentary texts or extended literary texts such as Thucydides. In the application of modern linguistic methodology—most often developed in terms of the spoken forms of modern languages—the fact that such methods must be applied to written texts has not been fully appreciated. There are two major points to notice here that are being taken into account in recent research. One is that the literary remains are inherently skewed, because many of the documents that have survived from the ancient world have survived only as a result of chance and caprice, others because of interest, and others because of the limitations of literacy (see Harris 1989). Therefore, there is nothing that guarantees that the remains that we have for examination are at all representative of the texts that were being generated in the ancient world. In fact, we know that there were huge numbers of works written in the ancient world that have disappeared without any trace being found so far. There is also the problem that even if we were to have all of the written texts from the ancient world, we would still not have any of the spoken texts, since these have literally disappeared into the air in a pre-recording device era. However, the second point to note is that recent research has made clear that it is unwise to overemphasize the differences between spoken and written language. In the past, much research drew firm distinctions between the two, whereas more recent research has indicated that written and spoken forms of languages fall along a continuum (Biber 1988). The entire range of the continuum needs to be explored, and in some ways is represented by the various authors and books of the New Testament.

4. Register Analysis   Whereas dialect analysis is concerned with the permanent differences in languages, such as differences in spelling, syntax, and pronunciation, register analysis is concerned with the non-permanent differences. Register in fact is used in a variety of ways to describe differences in usage of a language, without wishing to draw the kinds of firm lines of distinction that are often implied by the use of the notion of dialect. To be more precise in terms of our analysis here, register is concerned with analysis of the features of language that resulted from a particular context of situation. Recent studies of register in terms of the Greek of the New Testament have made advances in analysing the various features of the Greek used in the New Testament in terms of the ideas that are being conveyed, the people who are involved in the interaction, and the medium by which the communication takes place. As a result, one can analyse a book such as Mark's Gospel and note a number of features of that book that are different from, say, one of Paul's letters. The medium might be similar—that is, a written document—but in the original context an oral reading was probably expected, certainly for Paul's letters. The people involved are quite different, however. One of the recent

questions in Gospel research is whether the formally anonymous Gospels were written primarily with a particular church in mind, or whether they were written from the start with a much wider audience envisioned, or some place in between (see Bauckham 1998). Paul's letters, by contrast, were written by the apostle himself, perhaps with some help or accompaniment, for a specific church or group of churches in a specific city or region. The ideational level is highly contrastive between the Gospel of Mark and a Pauline letter. The biographical structure of the Gospel is quite different from the occasional and theological nature of the Pauline letters (for contrasting examples, see Porter 2000*b*, 2000*e* on Mark, and Porter and O'Donnell 2000 on Romans).

5. Discourse Analysis and Corpus-Based Studies   Discourse analysis, or sometimes (better?) called text linguistics, has taken modern linguistics to a new and potentially much more productive level of analysis. What distinguishes discourse analysis is attention to an entire discourse. Traditionally, much modern linguistic research confined analysis to small linguistic units, such as the word or sentence. Discourse analysis appreciates the fact that language, when it is used, is not used simply in terms of individual words or sentences, but as entire discourses. These entire discourses set the parameters for the consequent analysis. Discourse analysis, originally derived from conversational analysis, has been applied in an intense way to the study of written texts. Approaches to the material include both top-down and bottom-up analyses. Top-down analyses begin with the shape of the discourse (register or genre) and proceed to analyse the increasingly smaller parts that make up the discourse. Bottom-up analysis begins with smaller units and assembles the discourse from these smaller units. Discourse analysis has found that there is usually an abundance of data to be analysed. This has resulted in studies that concentrate on various dimensions of the discourse, such as discourse boundaries, cohesion (the linguistic elements that create a unified discourse) and coherence (the ideational elements that create comprehension), and focus and prominence. Reed (1997) provides an interesting instance of how use of discourse analysis can address not only issues of recent provenance but ones of long standing, such as the literary integrity of Philippians. Studies of discourse analysis—as well as other areas of Greek language study—are also benefiting greatly from advances in corpus linguistics (see O'Donnell 1999 and forthcoming). Corpus linguistics is less a method than an approach that believes that observations regarding language should be based upon study of as large a corpus of texts as possible. In many ways, the New Testament comprises a representative corpus for study of Greek, but efforts are under way to develop a larger corpus of Hellenistic texts for study. Machine-readable and retrievable formats have increased the possibilities of utilizing such resources.

These are only some of the issues being discussed at the forefront of recent New Testament Greek study. There are other issues that have been introduced and will

no doubt attract further attention in the future. It is fair to say that, despite a lengthy history of study, there is still much more to be learned from close examination of the Greek of the New Testament, especially as innovative methods are developed and refined.

2. The Translation of the New Testament

The New Testament has probably been translated more than any other book, ancient or modern. The history of the translation of the New Testament provides a fascinating account of how various individuals and groups of people have understood this text. Most translations have come about because of the inability to read the original Greek, and, as a result, the translations themselves have in many, if not most, instances come to be given the same kind of sacred status that the original has had—in effect, if not in fact. The issues discussed here focus upon the English translations and include: (a) the textual basis of modern translations, (b) issues in translational theory, and (c) modern translations of the Bible into English.

a. The Textual Basis of Modern Translations

There has been a significant shift in the textual basis of the translations of the Greek New Testament (see Porter 2001*a* for fuller treatment). The Catholic versions, even until recently, were based upon the Latin Vulgate. Those translations that utilized the original Greek, however, still faced a number of issues regarding the text. The Renaissance rediscovery of classical learning, and the advent of movable type printing, provided the impetus to publish the Greek text of the New Testament. In a race with the appearance of Cardinal Ximenes' Complutensian New Testament (printed in 1514 but not issued until around 1522), Erasmus published his Greek New Testament in 1516 (second edition 1519, and a further three editions). This text was based mainly on two late Byzantine manuscripts (supplemented by three or four others, dating to around the twelfth century), with some portions of Revelation retroverted from Latin because of the limitations of his manuscripts. The preface to the second edition of the Elzevirs' printing of a Greek New Testament in 1633 (resembling that of Erasmus but based on one of Beza from 1565) contained

reference to the text as the one that was 'received' by all. This *Textus Receptus* was used by New Testament Greek scholarship until the nineteenth century, when publication of the major early codexes (fourth and fifth centuries), and discovery of the Greek papyri (not fully appreciated until the twentieth century, however), shifted the textual basis of New Testament scholarship toward the Alexandrian tradition. Constantin Tischendorf established the importance of these recent textual findings, issuing eight editions of the Greek New Testament, especially utilizing in the eighth edition his recently discovered Codex Sinaiticus (1869). B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, however, became probably the most well-known systematizers of the principles of textual criticism, when they published their Greek New Testament and principles of textual criticism in 1881—a system still used widely in creating today's eclectic text: that is, one that collates a number of manuscripts, rather than relying exclusively on one. Nevertheless, they relied heavily upon the codexes Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, against which readings in other manuscripts were assessed. In 1898, Eberhard Nestle created a completely eclectic text by collating the readings in Westcott and Hort's, Tischendorf's, and at first Richard Weymouth's and later Bernhard Weiss's editions, the basis of the current Nestle–Aland New Testament (27th edition, Aland 1993). In the early 1960s, in an effort to provide a Greek text for Bible translators, Eugene Nida instigated the American Bible Society's Greek New Testament project. That edition, although originally independent, is now the same text as the Nestle–Aland text since its 26th edition (1979) and the third edition of the UBS text, which itself has reached four editions (1966, 1968, 1975 corr. 1983, 1993).

A number of texts have formed the bases of other versions of the Bible discussed below. We do not have the exact text that was used for the Authorized Version (or King James Bible), but a reconstructed text was issued by F. H. A. Scrivener in 1881 as part of the revisions for the Revised Version, and was thought by him to reflect the fifth edition of Beza's text, published in 1598 (others have thought it reflects an edition published by Stephanus in 1550). Organizations such as the Trinitarian Bible Society have continued to keep editions of the *Textus Receptus* in print. An edition of the majority text, relying upon the Byzantine textual tradition and in many ways resembling the *Textus Receptus*, has been issued by Zane Hodges and A. L. Farstad (1982). The text of Hermann von Soden (1913) was used by Moffatt for his translation (the only major version to follow von Soden). Richard Weymouth published the Greek text that he translated (1886), which was based upon a collation of the major published editions available in the nineteenth century, including those that followed the *Textus Receptus* and the Alexandrian textual tradition. R. V. G. Tasker in 1964 published the eclectic Greek text followed by the New English Bible, with appended notes regarding variant readings.

Since the time of the Revised Version, there has been a definite rejection of the *Textus Receptus* as the basis of modern English translations, and the acceptance of the Alexandrian textual tradition in the form of various eclectic texts, especially

that of Nestle–Aland. With the number of complete or nearly complete early codexes, such as Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, however, it would be possible for New Testament scholars to use a single manuscript as their textual basis. Early complete New Testament manuscripts are much closer to the time of writing than are later eclectic texts (and even the single text Hebrew manuscripts used in Old Testament study). One advantage of using a single manuscript is that it represents an actual text that was utilized historically and transmitted within a faith community, unlike the modern eclectic text, which is a product of nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarship, not that of an ancient church.

b. Issues in Translational Theory

The ancients themselves were familiar with the issue of translation—although in the West this usually meant translation of ancient documents into Greek. The Septuagint, the most important and largest translation project of the ancient Western world, no doubt came about because most ancient Jews, especially those in Egypt, did not know Hebrew. There were probably also non-Jews who wished to read the Hebrew Scriptures, but they did not know, nor were willing to learn, ancient Hebrew. As a result of such situations, a number of ancient writers, such as Cicero, reflected upon translation. However, there was no consistent ancient theory of translation. Instead, one discovers a range of approaches among ancient translations—even the Septuagint includes a number of translational styles, moving (interestingly enough) from a more fluid and literary translation in the Pentateuch to increasingly more literalistic translation in later books (on these issues, see Porter 2001*a*, 2001*b*, 2005).

1. Formal and Dynamic Equivalence   Most translation in the ancient world, as well as into modern times, followed what has come to be called literalistic or formal equivalence translation—even though a number of earlier translators were not slavish in their renderings. Formal or literalistic translation, represented in such translations as the Authorized Version, the Revised Standard Version in English, and the English Standard Version, is characterized by what is claimed to be a close following of the original text, a consistency in the translation of individual words, word order that reflects the original, and even an archaic type of language that maintains the biblical sound of the tradition.

In the middle of last century, Nida began systematizing a new approach to biblical translation. In his major works (1964; Nida and Taber 1976; De Waard and Nida 1986), Nida developed his dynamic or, now, functional, equivalence translational principles. Rejecting theories regarding the specialness of the Greek

of the New Testament, Nida endorses the notion that the Greek reflects the common language of the Mediterranean world of the time. He believes that there was mutual understanding between users and receivers, governed by the speaker's intention. It is the distinctive characteristics of each language, however, that create the problems for translation, since these features demand that the content be preserved even if the incidentals, such as form, must be changed. Nevertheless, he endorses the notion that what can be said in one language can be said in another.

As a consequence, Nida developed his now well-known theory of kernel sentences in relation to the source—message—receptor structure of language. He also utilizes the notions of surface and underlying kernel sentences, in which similar surface structures do not necessarily mean that the underlying kernels are the same. As a result, the translator must analyse the surface construction in the source language and render this into its kernel, and then transfer this to the receptor language, and render it in the surface structure. The example that Nida utilizes is Mark 1: 4, and the phrase that John preached 'a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins'. This phrase consists of five 'basic kernels' and their proposed relations: (1) 'John preached X' (X stands for the entire indirect discourse), (2) 'John baptizes the people', (3) 'The people repent', (4) 'God forgives X', (5) 'the people sin'. Nida then offers two means of rendering the phrase—'I will baptize you' or 'You will receive baptism', for languages that do not have passive formations, and 'John preached, "Repent and be baptized, so that God will forgive the evil you have done" ', for those that do.

Several criticisms have been raised against Nida's theory—although much translation theory, at least in biblical studies, continues to look to Nida for guidance. The first concerns his kernel-based theoretical model (Porter 1999). Nida's model has not kept pace with developments in the Chomskyan-influenced linguistic world, but continues to reflect a model similar to Chomsky's early phrase-structure model (Chomsky 1957). This model has been superseded in the eyes of many. There are also doubts as to whether there is any method by which recovery of meaning at the deep structure is possible. Further questions have been raised about the relationship between the Chomskyan theory and the applied translational theory of Nida. The example of Mark 1: 4, an attempt to bridge this gap, has been criticized for lack of precision.

A second criticism concerns functional equivalence itself. There is the question of whether functional equivalence is a goal that can be attained, and if so, whether it is desirable to attempt to do so (Van Leeuwen 2001). Rather than run the risk of distortion of the message of the original, it has been argued that features of the original should be preserved, especially when there are not direct equivalences between the original and receptor languages. It is only when these features are maintained that an equivalent effect can be maintained.

The third criticism concerns common language translation. The question has been raised as to whether, especially in English, the same principles of translation

should be utilized for a culture in which the Bible is being rendered into a language receiving the Bible for the first time (Ryken 2002). This is a criticism of restricting oneself to a single translation, rather than being a criticism of dynamic equivalence translation itself. The notion of a common language translation, however, would appear to have its rightful place in the increasingly diverse cultural world in which English is the world language.

There are a number of other models of translation that have been, or are being, developed (see the essays in Wilt 2003). These include discourse-based models, the application of relevance theory, and the use of systemic linguistics, to name a few. In many ways, however, each of these more recent developments reflects or responds to the underlying principles of dynamic equivalence translation theory as pioneered by Nida.

2. Gender and Language Issues   One of the most highly contentious issues in recent discussion of Bible translation is how to render gendered language in a gender-free, gender-neutral, or gender-inclusive way. These grammatical issues impinge on the larger issue of the male orientation of the biblical world, and how one might address that through translation (individual translations are discussed further below).

The New Revised Standard Version and the Revised English Bible were the first major Bibles to be published as gender-sensitive Bibles (the New Jerusalem Bible made some attempt to address the issue). The appearance of the New Revised Standard Version, more so than the Revised English Bible, caused little reaction focused on their gender-inclusive language. The attempt to introduce in North America a New International Version reflecting gender-free language was not so successful. Such a Bible was published in the United Kingdom (1995), but a concurrent attempt in the United States brought a reaction that resulted in the publisher withdrawing this revised version (see Strauss 1998, Carson 1998, and Poythress and Grudem 2000). Then, in 2001, the publisher decided to publish the TNIV New Testament, amid a predictable amount of furore but an equal, if not larger, attempt by the publisher to justify the venture by marshalling the opinions of supporters and orchestrating mass distributions of these New Testaments.

The immediate issue stems from the linguistic questions involved—even if there are underlying (and sometimes unspoken) theological issues. Greek has grammatical gender: that is, certain kinds of words that appear with a designation of gender (e.g. masculine, feminine, or neuter). This gender often follows natural gender, but not always (e.g. 'woman' is feminine, but 'child' is neuter). In ancient times, if there was a single male in an audience of women, reference to the group would require a masculine word-form. An example is use of the Greek masculine word 'brethren' when speaking to a group of Christians that might include numerous women. Further, there are certain words that are used to speak of representative individuals

(e.g. 'someone'), and these words are gendered also. There is the further question of how one speaks of God—and here the theological issues confront the linguistic. The word for 'God' in the Greek New Testament is grammatically masculine, so grammatical reference is made with masculine pronouns. Grammatically, concord of a masculine noun and masculine pronoun may be required, but recent theological discussion has raised the question of the gender of God, and whether it is now advisable to speak of God being masculine *or* feminine, or masculine *and* feminine, or whether these terms are even relevant at all.

Gender-inclusive Bibles have attempted to overcome some of these difficulties by adopting a number of contextually sensitive translational features. For example, in some contexts the word 'they' can be used to indicate male and female participants, while in others 'brothers and sisters' might be more appropriate; or the word 'humanity' or 'humankind' can be used for generic 'man'. Not all problems can be solved so easily, however. Besides the problem with God mentioned above, there is the problem of Jesus Christ, who is clearly depicted in the New Testament as both a man and the saviour of humankind. For many, it is not an issue that Jesus is still referred to as a man, so long as his being the Christ is seen not to be gender-based. This raises further issues related to some of the earliest Christological controversies of the Church, regarding the human and divine natures of Jesus Christ and their interrelationships. Further difficulty is created by the title that Jesus often uses of himself, 'son of man', with its twofold gendered reference. One soon realizes that tension can often be created between the gendered basis of the original language and attempts to eradicate such reference in modern English.

3. Cultural Issues   The modern Bible translation movement is closely linked with the modern missionary movement, so it is inevitable that issues regarding cultural imperialism are raised regarding translation. It has been argued recently, for example, that the kind of translation programme reflected by Nida imposes a cultural hegemony of the receptor language over the source language (Venuti 1995). This is caused by the fact that the translation, meant to be fully comprehensible in the receptor language, neglects both the context and the content of the source text. Venuti has argued for restraining 'the ethnocentric violence of translation' (p. 20), which, he believes, exerts control over the translated text. He believes that Nida's translational model domesticates the text in the process of creating fluent translations. As a result, differences in language and culture are sublimated to the influence of the receptor language. Venuti argues for a foreignizing translation that, while not free from its own cultural political agendas, 'resists dominant target-language cultural values so as to signify the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text' (p. 23).

It is probably not fair to chastise Nida and his fellow Bible translators for being culturally insensitive. Nevertheless, some important insights should be appreciated

from the cultural critique of modern translational practice. One is that all translational theory—even that of those who criticize dynamic equivalence—is theory-laden, even (or especially?) for those who claim that they are trying to produce an especially accurate translation. However, while the cultural critique of translation has validity in our pluriform world, the critique is also objecting to much more than simply the particularities of modem Bible translation. There is what appears to be a cultural and religious disagreement between Nida and his objectors. The objection is to the particular Christian orientation of those involved in Bible translation world-wide. At the end of the day, one's response may be governed by one's agreement with the theological position of those involved in Bible translation.

c. Modern Translations of the Bible into English

Modern vernacular translations have often reflected the theological climate of the times, besides proving to be important linguistically (for more detail, see Ewert 1983; Porter 2001*a*). For a number of languages, such as German (Luther's Bible of 1522), a significant translation has been instrumental in fixing the modern form of the language. English had a number of important translations, such as those by Tyndale (1526) and Coverdale (1535), and the Bibles that preceded the Authorized Version (AV) or King James Bible (Great Bible 1539, Geneva Bible 1560, Bishops' Bible 1568)—all of which were drawn upon in various ways by those who translated the AV (1611). This Bible established itself as pre-eminent from the second half of the seventeenth until into the twentieth century.

   Before the twentieth century, there had been a number of individual translations, such as by Wesley (1775), but the AV held sway. However, in the light of the efforts of individual scholars and new manuscript discoveries, the need for a revision of the AV was known. The formation in 1870 of a committee to oversee the revision of the AV created huge interest in new versions. As a result, there were more Bibles translated into English in the twentieth century than during any other period in history.

   The translation that paved the way for most of these translations was the Revised Version. The committee formed in 1870 in England, which had representation by various denominations, and was shadowed by an American committee, sought to bring the Revised Version into line with recently discovered ancient manuscripts, to correct errors, and to clarify inconsistencies and ambiguous wording—all without unnecessarily changing the AV. The New Testament appeared in 1881 (Old Testament 1885, Apocrypha 1895). Despite large sales, the conservative revision committee was seen to have failed. Excluding those disappointed that favourite texts were now excluded (e.g. John 5: 3–4; Acts 8: 37; 1 John 5: 7; the Westcott and Hort edition, being developed, was followed), the most important shortcoming was its inelegant

English style, especially in the New Testament, because of an attempt to render each Greek word with the same English word, a practice not followed in the AV. The American counterpart, the American Standard Version (1901), bolder than its English counterpart in eliminating archaisms, was more popular. This failed attempt helped to set the stage for more, rather than fewer, modern translations in the twentieth century.

In the history of translation, one of the noteworthy tensions has been between versions produced by individuals and those by committees, of which there have been numbers by each. Once the need for a more up-to-date English version had been illustrated by the failed Revised Version, a number of individuals in the first half of the twentieth century produced their own versions. Motivated by differing circumstances, these individuals produced a number of credible and well-received translations. The success of the personal translations then gave renewed impetus to committee translations, which dominated translation in the second half of the twentieth century.

Even after considerable passing of time, several personal translations still merit comment. Weymouth's (1903)—the result of his having worked with other translation projects, his classical expertise, and his work in textual criticism (see above)—was published as a supplement to other versions as a contemporary English translation. The Scottish pastor and scholar James Moffatt published two translations—The *Historical New Testament* (1901) and his better-known New Translation (New Testament 1913, Old Testament 1924, combined version 1926). Moffatt, an innovative translator, wished to overcome the archaisms of the AV and reflect what he considered the most important linguistic advances. This led to the major criticisms of the translation, especially his using Old Testament source criticism and von Soden's Greek text.

The first American English personal translation of lasting value was made by Edgar J. Goodspeed. Goodspeed, a New Testament scholar with interest in the recently discovered Greek papyri, wished to produce a translation in American English suitable for public use. The New Testament of his An American Translation (1923) was written in a smooth American English, evidencing much detailed knowledge of the Greek text (Old Testament by J. M. P. Smith 1927, combined edition 1931). Goodspeed's teaching at the University of Chicago, considered by many a theologically liberal institution, and his wording that differed from the AV (though more accurate), resulted in much criticism of the translation.

Catholics during this time continued to use the Douai–Rheims translation of the Vulgate (New Testament 1582, Old Testament 1609–10, revised in the eighteenth century by Richard Challoner; reprinted numerous times in the nineteenth century). A revision of this translation was thought necessary, and the British Catholic scholar and man of letters Ronald Knox completed his revision of the New Testament in 1945 (Old Testament 1949). His attempt to render the language of the Vulgate into what a native English-speaker would say was commendable; but,

since 1943, and especially after Vatican II, Catholic scholars were allowed and even encouraged to utilize the original languages, so his version is anachronistic.

From his work with British youth during the Second World War, J. B. Phillips wanted to communicate the Bible to those who did not understand biblical English. He produced a translation that reflected spoken English, translating the original in a smooth, flowing, and understandable language. Beginning with his *Letters to Young Churches* (1947), which included Paul's letters, Hebrews, and the catholic epistles (with a laudatory preface by C. S. Lewis), and following on with other parts (Gospels in 1952, Acts in 1955, and Revelation in 1957), Phillips issued his entire New Testament in 1958. Phillips produced a revised edition in 1972, based upon the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament, rather than his earlier use of Westcott and Hort. Many consider Phillips's translation to reflect high literary sensitivity, although most probably consider it too paraphrastic.

Other personal translations of the New Testament worth noting, including those produced in the second half of the twentieth century, include Gerrit Verkuyl's Berkeley Version (New Testament 1945, entire Bible 1959); that of the Jewish scholar Hugh Schonfield, the first Jewish translator of the New Testament into English (1955); the classical scholar E. V. Rieu's Penguin Gospels (1952), and his son C. H. Rieu's Acts of the Apostles (1957); that of the classical scholar Richmond Lattimore (Gospels 1962, Acts and Letters 1982); the paraphrase of the American Standard Version by Kenneth Taylor in his Living Bible (1971); and the Presbyterian minister Eugene Peterson's *The Message: The New Testament in Contemporary Language* (1993; entire Bible 2002). A revision of the Living Bible, using the Hebrew and Greek texts, has been published as the New Living Translation (1996). The translation of the New Testament in 1966 of the Today's English Version, which became the New Testament portion of the Good News Bible (1976), was done by essentially one person, Robert Bratcher (but this was never promoted as a personal translation) (see below).

These personal translations all represent significant achievements in the history of Bible translation. These translators had to overcome the resistance to creating any translation other than the AV in English-speaking circles, and did so by a combination of phenomenal learning and wise judgement in deciding how to render words and phrases into language understandable by their audiences. Without these individual efforts, the history of Bible translation would certainly be much impoverished.

The second half of the twentieth century was dominated by group translational projects. Such projects were undoubtedly slow in developing in the first half of the century on account of the failure of the Revised Version and the continuing admiration, even veneration, of the AV. A noteworthy exception (if it can be said to be so) is the Twentieth Century New Testament, a version by a small group of twenty ministers and laymen (none of them scholars) in 1902. The translators, concerned that the Bible be understood by readers in their own language as they use it, organized the New Testament in chronological order.

There are two committee-made translations created in the English-speaking world in the second half of the twentieth century that stand out above the rest. One is the Revised Standard Version, itself a revision of the American Standard Version. The International Council of Religious Education (later the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA) was given the copyright of the American Standard Version, and in 1937 set up a committee with broad denominational representation to oversee its revision. The translation was meant to preserve the AV where possible, but to take into consideration recent biblical scholarship, including textual criticism, and render this into a form of English that could be used for both public and private reading. The New Testament essentially used an eclectic text based on Nestle's Greek New Testament (16th (1936) and 17th (1941) editions). The Revised Standard Version returned to the AV's practice of rendering the same word by differing English words. The Revised Standard Version met with mixed reactions when the New Testament was published in 1946 (both Testaments 1952). For over twenty-five years, until the New International Version was published, it was the predominant English version. Among many revisions, in 1974 a project was started that resulted in the New Revised Standard Version with gender-neutral language (1989). The sometimes vitriolic negative reaction to the Revised Standard Version would seem quaint if it were not that similar kinds of reactions still confront translations (see above on the TNIV). There were accusations that theological truths had been lost in the translation. In many circles, the consensus is that the Revised Standard Version and now the New Revised Standard Version in most ways accomplished their purpose.

In Britain, the New English Bible attempted to be a completely new translation, rather than simply a revision of a previous translation. C. H. Dodd, and later G. R. Driver, headed a committee set up in 1947 to produce such a translation meant to have a timeless quality that avoided both archaisms and modernisms, did not preserve the language of former versions, and was written so that it could be used for reading aloud (New Testament 1961, complete Bible with Apocrypha 1970). However, it was criticized for not finding the right stylistic level—some thought that it had gone beyond what the average intelligent reader could understand, while others thought that it was rather too prosaic in its phrasing and expression. The New English Bible never caught on in North America. A revision, published in 1989 as the Revised English Bible, utilized inclusive gender (see above).

At about the same time in Britain, Roman Catholics undertook an English version directly from the original Hebrew and Greek, rather than from the Latin Vulgate. English-speaking Catholic scholars, including J. R. R. Tolkien, taking their model and inspiration (as well as the textual notes), from the French translation La Bible de Jerusalem (1956), produced their own rendering of the Hebrew and Greek (checked against the French version), publishing the Jerusalem Bible in 1966. The Jerusalem Bible, without the encumbrance of residual AV English still found in the Revised Standard Version, was designed especially as a study Bible. Revised and

reissued as the New Jerusalem Bible in 1985, some have thought that its revisions are more literalistic than the earlier version. In the United States, the equivalent Catholic translation was the New American Bible. Originally the Confraternity Bible, this version took a long time to appear in its final form, due to changing policy on translation by the Roman Catholic Church. The New Testament, first translated from the Vulgate, was issued in 1941 (the Old Testament from the Hebrew in 1969). Retranslation of the New Testament from Greek delayed issuing of the entire Bible until 1970. The version has maintained some traditional Bible translation language, while utilizing some of the developments of the twentieth century, such as rendering the same word by differing English words depending upon context.

In the United States at about the same time, several other significant and lasting Bible translation projects were under way. A conservative foundation undertook publication of a new version of the Bible, out of concern that the virtues of the American Standard Version were being lost in the spate of translations since 1901. The New American Standard Bible was published with the New Testament in 1963 (entire Bible 1971, revised 1995). This version has proved highly useful for students of the original languages, because of the literalness of the translation, but it is far from fluid modern English.

The second, the translation of the Good News Bible, or Today's English Version, was the brain-child of Nida, and exemplifies his dynamic or functional equivalence translation theory (see above). As a result, technical and biblical language are avoided, expressing the text in short sentences utilizing limited vocabulary. Sponsored by the American Bible Society, the New Testament was translated from the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament by Robert Bratcher, and appeared as *Good News for Modern Man: The New Testament in Today's English Version* (1966, with subsequent editions; entire Good News Bible 1976, with Apocrypha 1979; now known as the Good News Translation). This translation has been widely used by those for whom English is not their first language, and as an aid in rendering the Bible into languages for which the Bible is the first written document—although many castigated it because of what they perceived as theological deficiencies. Reflecting the same translational tradition, but with more attention to its place at the end of a process beginning with the AV, is the Contemporary English Version. Utilizing the latest Greek texts (UBS Greek New Testament, third and fourth editions, 1975 and 1993), this translation utilizes dynamic or functional equivalence, while also wishing to be seen as a translation that preserves the virtues of the AV in its literary style. The Contemporary English Version (currently under revision) was published in 1995, and aroused the same kind of negative response as did the Good News Bible.

Along with the Revised Standard Version, the most significant American translation to date is the New International Version. Growing out of a concern of some American denominations to find a general purpose Bible in contemporary English

(they rejected the Revised Standard Version), the New International Version committee, set up in 1965, brought together scholars from not only the United States but other English-speaking countries, such as Canada, Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand—hence its name. In many ways a conservative alternative to the Revised Standard Version, the New International Version used a text very similar to that of the standard eclectic Greek New Testament, and was published in 1973 (entire Bible 1978). A gender-neutral version, Today's New International Version, has recently been published to great fanfare (New Testament 2001; entire Bible 2005), as noted above. At times the NIV/TNIV is colloquial and unstilted, while at other times it retains biblical language. Not as dependent upon the tradition of the AV as the Revised Standard Version, the NIV/TNIV is generally consistent in its renderings of gender-neutral language.

This survey will close with reference to three further translations, which perhaps reflect the diversity now present in English translations. Not unexpectedly, Bible translation has not escaped the desire to be technologically up-to-date. The result has been a number of translations that are now available in a variety of machine-readable forms, including availability on the internet and on CD-roms. Whereas most of these translations are electronic forms of previously made translations, one translation, the NET Bible (New English Translation), has been developed in both print and electronic form from the start (1996 and following). This translation seems to follow a modified form of dynamic equivalence. Distinctives of this translation are its availability for free distribution through the net and its publication with extensive and insightful notes, which comment on a range of issues from language to theology. By contrast, the English Standard Version (2001) is a conscious attempt to pull back from dynamic equivalence translation and produce what the publisher describes as an 'essentially literal' translation based on the Revised Standard Version. More specifically, in the area of gendered language, the translation endorses the use of 'he' on the basis of how the pronouns are used in the original language and as consistent with its literalistic approach. In some ways, this makes it surprising that they also endorse for the most part the use of the eclectic text of Nestle–Aland and the United Bible Societies. The Holman Christian Standard Bible (2000) attempts to hold a mediating position. Rejecting both formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence, the Holman Bible contends that it follows a principle of optimal equivalence: that is, being literal where possible and dynamic where necessary, so as to optimize meaning. In other words, as the twenty-first century gets under way, there are translations of the Bible that represent the range of translational methodologies, as well as availing themselves of the latest in technology to package the modern form of the ancient text.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALAND, B. *et al.* 1993. *Nestle–Aland Novum Testamentum Graece.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

BAUCKHAM, R., ed. 1998. *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

BIBER, D. 1988. *Variation across Speech and Writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BLASS, F. 1898. *Philology of the Gospels.* London: Macmillan.

CARSON, D. A. 1998. *The Inclusive Language Debate: A Plea for Realism.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker.

CASEY, M. 1998. *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CHOMSKY, N. 1957. *Syntactic Structures.* The Hague: Mouton.

DANOVE, P. 2001. *Linguistics and Exegesis in the Gospel of Mark: Applications of a Case Frame Analysis and Lexicon.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

DECKER, R. J. 2001. *Temporal Deixis of the Greek Verb in the Gospel of Mark with Reference to Verbal Aspect.* New York: Lang.

DE WAARD, J., and NIDA, E. A. 1986. *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating.* Nashville: Nelson.

EWERT, D. 1983. *From Ancient Tablets to Modern Translations: A General Introduction to the Bible.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan.

FANNING, B. M. 1990. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

GUNDRY, R. H. 1993. *Mark: A Commentary on his Apology for the Cross.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

HARRIS, W. V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

HODGES, Z., and FARSTAD, A. L. 1982. *The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text.* Nashville: Nelson.

HORROCKS, G. 1997. *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers.* London: Longman.

JOHNSON, L. T. 1995. *The Letter of James.* New York: Doubleday.

McKAY, K. L. 1994. *A New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament Greek.* New York: Lang.

MOULTON, J. H. 1908. *Prolegomena to A Grammar of New Testament Greek.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

NESTLE, E. 1898. *Novum Testamentum Graece.* Württemburg: Württemburgische Bibelanstalt.

NIDA, E. A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating.* Leiden: Brill.

—— and TABER, C. 1976. *The Theory and Practice of Translation.* Leiden: Brill.

O'DONNELL, M. B. 1999. 'The Use of Annotated Corpora for New Testament Discourse Analysis: A Survey of Current Practice and Future Prospects'. In S. E. Porter and J. T. Reed, eds., *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results,* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 71–117.

—— forthcoming. *Corpus Linguistics and the Greek of the New Testament.* Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

PALMER, L. R. 1980. *The Greek Language.* London: Faber & Faber.

PORTER, S. E. 1989*a.* 'Studying Ancient Languages from a Modern Linguistic Perspective: Essential Terms and Terminology'. *Filología Neotestamentaria,* 2.4: 147–72.

—— 1989*b. Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood.* New York: Lang.

—— ed. 1991. *The Language of the New Testament: Classic Essays*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

—— 1996. *Studies in the Greek New Testament: Theory and Practice*. New York: Lang.

—— 1997. 'The Greek Language of the New Testament'. In S. E. Porter, ed., *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*, Leiden: Brill, 99–130.

—— 1999. 'Mark 1.4, Baptism and Translation'. In S. E. Porter and A. R. Cross, eds., *Baptism, the New Testament and the Church: Historical and Contemporary Studies in Honour of R.E.O. White*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 81–98.

—— 2000*a*. *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

—— 2000*b*. 'Dialect and Register in the Greek of the New Testament: Theory'. In M. D. Carroll R., ed., *Rethinking Contexts, Rereading Texts: Contributions from the Social Sciences to Biblical Interpretation*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 190–208.

—— ed. 2000*c*. *Diglossia and Other Topics in New Testament Linguistics*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

—— 2000*d*. 'Greek of the New Testament'. In C. A. Evans and S. E. Porter, eds., *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 426–35.

—— 2000*e*. 'Register in the Greek of the New Testament: Application with Reference to Mark's Gospel'. In M. D. Carroll R., ed., *Rethinking Contexts, Rereading Texts: Contributions from the Social Sciences to Biblical Interpretation*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 209–29.

—— 2001*a*. 'Modern Translations'. In J. Rogerson, ed., *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Bible*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 134–61.

—— 2001*b*. 'Some Issues in Modern Translation Theory and Study of the Greek New Testament'. *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies*, 9: 350–82.

—— 2003. 'Luke 17.11–19 and the Criteria for Authenticity Revisited'. *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, 1.2: 201–24.

—— 2005. 'Eugene Nida and Translation'. *The Bible Translator*, 56.1: 8–19.

—— and O'DONNELL, M. B. 2000. 'Semantics and Patterns of Argumentation in the Book of Romans: Definitions, Proposals, Data and Experiments'. In Porter 2000*c*: 154–204.

—— —— 2001. 'The Greek Verbal Network Viewed from a Probabilistic Standpoint: An Exercise in Hallidayan Linguistics'. *Filología Neotestamentaria*, 14: 3–41.

POYTHRESS, V. S., and GRUDEM, W. A. 2000. *The Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy: Muting the Masculinity of God's Words*. Nashville: Broadman and Holman.

REED, J. T. 1997. *A Discourse Analysis of Philippians: Method and Rhetoric in the Debate over Literary Integrity*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

RYKEN, L. 2002. *The Word of God in English: Criteria for Excellence in Bible Translation*. Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway.

SCRIVENER, F. H. A. 1881. *The New Testament in Greek According to the Text Followed in the Authorised Version Together with the Variations Adopted in the Revised Version*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

STRAUSS, M. L. 1998. *Distorting Scripture? The Challenge of Bible Translation and Gender Accuracy*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press.

TASKER, R. V. G. 1964. *The Greek New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

TEODORSSON, S.-T. 1977. *The Phonology of Ptolemaic Koine*. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

TISCHENDORF, C. 1869–72. *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 8th edn. Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient.

VAN LEEUWEN, R. C. 2001. 'On Bible Translation and Hermeneutics'. In C. Bartholomew, C. Green and K. Möller, eds., *After Pentecost: Language and Biblical Interpretation*, Carlisle: Paternoster, 284–311.

VENUTI, L. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation.* London: Routledge.

VON SODEN, H. 1913. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*, Part 2: *Text mit Apparat.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

WALSER, G. 2001. *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue: An Investigation on the Greek of the Septuagint, Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

WESTCOTT, B. F., and HORT, F. J. A. 1881. *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, 2 vols. Cambridge: Macmillan.

WEYMOUTH, R. F. 1886. *The Resultant Greek Testament.* London: James Clarke.

WILT, T., ed. 2003. *Bible Translation: Frames of Reference.* Manchester: St Jerome.

WINER, G. B. 1882. *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek Regarded as a Sure Basis for New Testament Exegesis*, trans. W. F. Moulton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

WONG, S. S. M. 1997. *A Classification of Semantic Case-Relations in the Pauline Epistles.* New York: Lang.