

Summary Paper

BIBELÜBERSETZUNG IN THEORIE UND PRAXIS

- EIN MISSIOLOGISCH-THEOLOGISCHES KONZEPT -

**ETHNOLOGISCH-LINGUISTISCHE UNTERSUCHUNG
IM RAHMEN VON MODELLLEN DER KOMMUNIKATION UND ÜBERSETZUNG
AM BEISPIEL DER BIBELÜBERSETZUNG IN DIE SPRACHE DER ZAZA**

**Bible Translation in Theory and Practice
- A Missiologically-Theological Approach -**

**Ethnologically-Linguistical Researchin the Context of Models on Communikation and Translation
Referring to the Bible Translation in the Language of the Zaza People**

Abstract

The topic of this thesis is Bible Translation which constitutes a complex communication model. Within this framework it unites the divine Initiator and His human partners in the activity of translation.

Bible Translation is considered both a specific translation as well as a recently developing science which combines communication theory, linguistics, anthropology, social sciences, theology and missiology. Within this framework, Bible Translation represents the churches' tool to understand and pass down Scripture. New translations enable it to remain intercultural and by revisions help overcome language and culture shifts. Beyond that Bible Translation proves itself to be the only divine examination tool given to the church as a body and the individual Christian as an authentication and instruction, thereby setting up the framework of Divine communication.

The *incarnational translation principle* resulting from the initial trigger of *Incarnation* (becoming flesh), *Condescension* (coming down) and *Kenosis* (emptying himself), forms the elemental point of Bible Translation. Whereas the Incarnation of Christ represents the divine part of the communication process (chapter 1 and 4), the anthropocentric task is composed of researching beneficial ways to communicate the Scripture worldwide (chapter 2). For this reason the science of *Bible Translation* looks with favour upon linguistics and communication theoretical models (such as Scopos and functional theory, literal, cultural and mass communication approaches, as well as relevance theory). These models impact *in* and *on* the teaching of Bible Translators, serving as indicators for their efficiency in disseminating Scripture through new translations or revisions (chapter 3). The main purpose of Bible Translation as a science is the bridging of cross-cultural, interlingual and interdenominational gaps, as is illustrated by an anthropological study about a translation project from a people group in Turkey, the Zaza people (chapter 3). The framework for divine communication is represented in *Missio Dei* as the sending of God himself, in *Missio Christi* as the plan of its fulfilment and *Missio Spiritu* as its realization. Thus, Bible Translation forms a missiological and theological concept.

Introduction

This summary cross-references my thesis. Only usual abbreviations are used, therefore it contains no list of abbreviations. Bibliographic references are given at the end of this paper. More details about tables, appendices and attachments are given in my thesis. Attached to the generic use of the term *Bible Translation* is marked by capitalization. For references on tables take a look at the Content of Tables in the introductory part of my thesis (German: *Schaubildverzeichnis*).

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Introduction	2
Table of Contents	3
Summary.....	5
Concept of “Bible Translation”	5
Localization.....	5
Science of Bible Translation.....	6
Micro and macro approach.....	6
<i>Micro approach - outer frame</i>	6
Science of communication	7
Language	7
Science of Translation.....	8
Translation, translating and interpreting	8
Translator	8
Text	8
<i>Micro approach - inner frame</i>	9
Mandate of Bible Translation.....	9
Historical progress	9
Sacred literature	9
Internal and external power display	9
Excursion on “modern” Bible Translation.....	9
<i>Communication and translation models</i>	10
Ideological foundations	10
Shannon-Weaver code model	11
Dynamic equivalence (Nida).....	11
Criticism of dynamic equivalence	12
Scopos Model (Reiß and Vermeer).....	12
Functional model (Nord).....	13
Criticism of functional models	13
Cultural model (Katan)	13
Criticism of the cultural model	14
Mass media model.....	14
Criticism of the mass media model	14
Literal approach	14
Criticism 15	
Relevance-Theory	15
Criticism of relevance theory	16
<i>The Zaza people - an ethnological overview</i>	16
<i>Training Translators</i>	16
<i>Macro approach</i>	17
Hermeneutics, Zeitgeist and Missio Dei	17
History of Bible Translation.....	17
Motivation, inherent power and Heilsgeschichte.....	18

The incarnational translation principle.....	19
Bibliography	20
German and English Bible Translations	21

Summary

Concept of “Bible Translation”

This research enquires into the significance of Bible Translation as a missiological and theological concept. Bible Translation herein is considered both a specific translation of Scripture as well as a scientific, interdisciplinary subject.

Looking closer at this topic, the involvement of Bible Translation in recent theological, missiological and linguistic training brings forth its fundamental position within these scientific fields. According to this deductive entry the research question is demonstrated by the discussion on “theory and practice of different communication and translation models,” currently used in Bible Translation. This theoretical framework of the models explains *how* communication is moving forward and *which* models are used to deal with the complexity of communication and translation, the practical side of translation is confirmed through a translation project with a people group called Zaza. This proves that the theory and practice of the models are complementary to each other, implying that the training of Christian development aids personnel in Bible Translation and always has to be reflected by its practical outcome.

Localization

“Bible Translation” has, so far, no clear cut location in Christian missiology and theology¹, the more an interdisciplinary approach is used, the more its allocation is disguised. Until today lack of interest in this subject manifests gaps in research methods concerning the influence and importance of Bible Translation for missiology and theology. Part of this thesis is to bridge the gulf and bring the “science of Bible Translation” into the awareness of present research.

The links between the “science of Bible Translation” and modern linguistic findings is represented in different communication and translation models as presented in this paper. In theory *or* practice, sometimes in both, there is lack of a reciprocal relationship. This becomes evident in the field of training translators, resulting in the restriction of one or two models. In order to bring linguistic and communication theory research closer to translators, the theoretical basics of these models have to be presented and their practical repercussions pointed out. The illustrative example of the translation project with the Zaza people provides a glimpse into this problem. It is plausible that training translators in these models necessarily highlights the communicative channels used in divine communication processes, as well as which model or mix of models is best used to accomplish a contextualised translation. In addition to better linking, this procedure reveals the function and classification of Bible Translation within missiology and theology. In other words as a consequence of this localization and linking, the questions concerning translation projects could be answered, namely *which* model(s) of

¹ Subsequently the concept *theology* refers to Christianity, meaning the “understanding of the faith” (*fides quaerens intellectum*). Theological understandings of other religions are especially marked.

communication or translation are best be used from (Bible) Translators and in which way (*how*).

Science of Bible Translation

The “Science of Bible Translation” as understood in this thesis is based upon close connections to linguistics, anthropology, missiology, theology and the social sciences. One can conclude based on its interdisciplinary nature, that these bonds distinguish it from the “science of translation”. However, at the same time, both sciences add to each other by developing new models, practicing and proving them. As Bible Translation offers the most historical experience and the widest cultural, linguistic, methodical and geographical spread of all translation activities it becomes the best testing ground for models. As proved, the correlative relation of both sciences becomes obvious when it comes to training (Bible) Translators (see 3.2).

The example of the Nida *dynamic/functional equivalence* model (1964 and Taber 1969) as well as the Gutt's approach in *relevance theory* for Bible Translation ([1991] 2000; 1992) and their influence on science of translation in general, prove this reflexive and dynamic relationship. One should not forget the *functional* approach from Nord that comes from the science of translation and is now in widespread use in Bible Translation.

Another indicator is that both sciences are themselves influenced by the *code model* of Shannon and Weaver (1948/1949), which deals with informational processes (though using a binary code system to describe communication). This has become the father of all *transmission* models, still in use today. This means that communication theory and all translation theoretical approaches depend more or less on the, so called, *channel* or *conduit metaphor principle*. Restriction of communication to a binary system has become recently the most criticized aspect leading to new translation models (see 2.3.3.6.5, 2.3.5.6, 2.3.6.5, 2.3.8.5.3 und 3.2.1.2.3).

Micro and macro approach

In order to effectively focus on the research question, there needs to be a separation between a *micro* and a *macro* approach. Whereas the *macro approach* (chapter 1 and 4) covers the missiological and theological framework of Bible Translation, the *micro approach* (chapter 2 and 3), so to speak, goes microscopically into linguistic and ethnological details, such as training of translators or exemplifying the culture of the Zaza ethnicity (see 3.1). So the macro approach indicates the motto “*Bible Translation - bridge head of missiology*,” and the micro attempt specifies the slogan “*Bible Translation - approved in theory and practice*.” The microscopic focus revolves around an inner and outer frame of Bible Translation. While the inner frame deals with factors concerning Bible Translation directly, the outer frame points to indirect subjects concerning the activity of translating, now being presented (see 2.2.1 to 2.2.8).

Micro approach - outer frame

It is within the *micro* approach that the sciences of communication and translation are introduced and defined. Going one step deeper, the outer framework of Bible

Translation consists of manifold components. For an extensive understanding of theoretical and ideological fundamentals of the chosen models used in communication theory, it becomes vital to define precisely the core concepts of Bible Translation.

Science of communication

Starting with the *science of communication* it becomes clear that its subject – communication – represents the key factor to a comprehensive understanding of its function. To summarize the findings of this science, it is a more recent discipline with several links to neuro, computational and evolutionary sciences, as well as linguistics and translation science. Generally speaking, a definition of human *communication*² depends on the views of its corresponding scientific branches. This is why various understandings are intertwined in the given summarized definition of communication (see 2.2.2.6). Beyond that definition communication implies general conversation principles. Grice defines them as maxims of quality, quantity, relevance and manner (Grice 1975: 60ff). They lead on to the *inference* model in contradistinction to transmission models (see relevance theory, 2.3.9).

Language

It is apparent that *communication* and *language* are not identical. Hence linguistics is seen as one part of a communication theoretical framework, while the science of communication outlines its own branch. Surely both are closely related but they also form their own scientific branches. De Saussure points out that linguistics treats *language* as either *langue*, the structure of linguistic systems and language, or as *parole*, the speaking of a specific language (cit. in Fawcett 1997:3).

Language as creative skill is forming and influencing cognition, as stated in the Sapir-Whorf-Hypothesis (see below). This could be summarized in the rationale, that the worldview within a culture is essentially build upon its language (culture can form language), depending on one's education and environmental influences. This process initially happens during enculturation and lasts the whole lifetime (see 2.3.6.1).

Neurolinguistics contributes significantly to the understanding of the brain, concerning language learning and language skills, as well as the structure of language memories. The locations of long- and short-term memory, as well as the cause for language damage, like aphasia or alexia, contribute much to the knowledge of mother tongue or first language acquisition (Fabbro 1999; Bunge & Ardila 1990:284, 304, 311, 312-313).

The importance of the mother tongue for Bible translation is reflected by the fact, that enculturation and first language acquisition has become an international political issue. Thus the right to use ones mother tongue in public and education has been strongly supported by the UNESCO in the last five years (see 2.4.5.2 and 4.2.1.1). Summed up, *language* acts as key factor to translation, but beyond that its activity, speaking in a wider sense (gestures, body language etc.) as well as its scientific shaping, describes its content.

² Animal communication hereby is noticed to be an instinctive and therefore mechanical way of expression, lacking cognitive potential (Luzbetak 1993:64-65).

Science of Translation

The *science of translation*, still in its infancy, starts with Nida in the sixties of the last century, but has roots reaching back to ancient times. Whereas the activity of translation stretches back to advanced civilization like ancient Egypt, the Sumerians, the Hittites, the Babylonians and eastern complex civilizations (such as the Indus and China cultures) it has not become a scientific field until recently. Yet Robinson demonstrates that during all epochs individuals gave thought to methods of translation (2002) resulting in three techniques of translation: literal, free and paraphrasing.

As a marginal note it should be said that today's knowledge about translation activities during the ages is best reported and preserved in the subject of Bible Translation.

Translation, translating and interpreting

"*Translation*" can be defined in many ways. It has become an issue concerning ethnological and cross-cultural, colonialist, missiological and linguistic interests, thus internalizing many of these branches in its service. At least three lines of defining "*translation*" should be recognized (Gutt 2000:5). First, a large group of researchers assume that it just exists, without even questioning it. Secondly, another group creates a confusing multitude of understandings by various demarcations and restrictions. Finally, one group argues culturally, saying "translation is that what a culture makes out of it". All of these lines include some truth, so the main factors behind translation should be summarized from these efforts.

One important issue concerning translation is its colonialist influence and bias, sometimes unintentionally, sometimes consciously, as a powerful tool proclaiming cultural superiority (see Rudyard Kipling's *The Jungle Book*).

The subject matter of *translating* versus *interpreting* shows that both activities generate methods to transfer information from one language into another by using effective implementation. This is illustrated by simultaneous or textual *interpreting* and direct and indirect translation serving as an example for translation techniques.

Translator

The actor of translation, the *translator*, being a multicultural and intuitive interpreter operates as a hermeneutist and cultural mediator between participating cultures (dynamic social structures). His ethical responsibility (due to his public appearance) gives him, on one hand, the freedom to use personal style in translation but, on the other hand, forces him to be loyal to his assignment and employer. Praise and critique of his product always falls back on him. Modern training in translation offers the interpreter and translator prestige and effective tools.

Text

The "*Text*" as a starting point for translation implicates co- and context. Whereas the text is explicitly present and can be researched with exegetical or hermeneutical tools (including text discursive methods or other linguistic techniques), co- and context have to be detected by analyzing their genre and metatextual means.

Thus the *outer* frame of Bible Translation is set by defining all the constituents of its environment, which contribute towards an extensive insight on the subject.

Micro approach - inner frame

The *inner frame* of Bible Translation consists of the “translation mandate”, its historical progress, the sacred character of the Bible as Holy Scripture, the internal and external function of Bible Translation and its global influence on religion (see 2.2.9.).

Mandate of Bible Translation

The *Bible Translation mandate* is derived from the following causes:

- the global network constituted by the church as body of Christ,
- the lengthy historical tradition of Bible Translation,
- the inner evidence given by passages such as Mt 28,18-20 or Rev 7,9 and
- the urge of church members to tell others about their spiritual experience.

Historical progress

The *historical progress* of Bible Translation is categorized in five eras. Namely the epoch of the printer's art (since 1450), the period of Bible Translation societies (since 1804), the era of professional translation (since 1943), the interdenominational period (since 1965) and the modern epoch of mother tongue oriented translation (since 1970; Smalley 1991:22-31). Progress is also found in strategic concepts like “*accommodation*”, which is utilized during the Middle Ages in the context of Christian development aid. These days’ *contextualization* and *indigenization* have become central strategic concepts for cross-cultural work, thus affecting Bible Translation directly by focusing on the training of mother tongue translators.

Sacred literature

Sacred literature has its own genre pattern, demonstrated by the Quran, the Vedas and other holy books for religious communities. The principles of “otherness” (Nichols 1996: ii) and “salutary or understood foreignness” (Wick 2004:14) symbolize the holy character of the Bible (see appendix 1). This is why the translator is forced to take special responsibility for the religious sensibility of readers and receivers of his product.

Internal and external power display

Bible Translation unfolds an *internal* and *external* display of power. Internally it serves the church as *the instruction* for its constitution and conduct of daily life. Breaking it down further to the church member, Bible Translation becomes an *internal* source of living their faith in close relation to the author of the Holy Scripture and participating in ecclesiastical procedures. Externally Bible Translation generates an impact on political, social, local community-oriented, global and public structures through the church, as well as the individual member. Bible Translation shapes a preserving global movement, because it is being retained internally by Scripture orientation and externally since it is actively working towards the betterment of its environment, including mother tongue, higher education, literacy, social aid work etc.

Excursion on “modern” Bible Translation

An excursion about the recent debate of “modern” Bible Translations in Germany, following the Anglophone World in the seventies, is included to sum up linguistic and theological considerations about the subject (see 2.2.10 and appendix 1). The main criticism, given in *theological*, *social-clerical* and *translational* issues affects target-

group specific communicative Bible Translations such as *Volxbibel*, *Gute Nachricht Bibel*, *Bibel in gerechter Sprache* and a few others. This debate can be compared to criticism in the Anglophone World over the *Good News Bible*, *The Message*, *Today's New International Version* and other communicative translations. Common ground for all critics is the acceptance of so called "inspired" translations, like the Lutheran translation or the King James Version, functioning as the standard text of church liturgy. But obviously even those texts are revised and in need of adaptation to theological insights (textual criticism etc.) as well as linguistic and cultural changes. Revision work is based on the need to keep the church in line with the culture and language that it is translated for. The *incarnational principle* of translation, presented in this thesis seeks the ongoing revision of the Holy Scripture. This cannot be done by self-acting programs but by the need of the church members to understand Scriptures as all-encompassing as possible. This becomes a response of the church, all the while living in a constantly changing environment which requires constant adaptations of the biblical text. Normally this is done within the framework of the sermon but textual alignment, caused by culture and language shift, leads from time to time to revision as is best demonstrated by the German Lutheran Bible or the English King James Version. This requirement articulates the "mandate to Bible Translation" (in detail see appendix 1).

Social-clerical objections about "modern" translations mainly include concerns about their target group orientation. This argument splits the church by taking away the opportunity to be united around a liturgical text. Likewise the so called "homogenous unity principle" (HUP by McGavran 1973:4; see also Vicedom 2002:177; grounded on Pickett 1953), expressing target group orientation as a strategic implementation is criticized for culturally rooted forms of racism and lack of feasibility. These accusations are disproved by the fact that humanity on all aspect of life, including business, trade, politics, ecology and so forth, tries to break down its activities on shrinking social groups. In large cultures, Bible Translation even within one culture needs to be aware of educational, social, psychological and linguistical factors relating to the readers as target audience. Mainly there is need of more than one Bible Translation.

Translational concerns, expecting translations that lead to sectarianism or desacralization of the Scripture, could be nullified by the fact that every motivation to translate the Bible can only be controlled by the whole body of the church. Thus the church has proved in the past and does so in the future, that she is indeed in the position to reject or adopt a biblical text within its liturgy without becoming a religious cult. Marcion, the New World Translation, the DaBHaR translation and others could be held up as examples of the church's inherent vigour in this regard.

Communication and translation models

Within the *micro* approach, theoretical foundations of *communication* and *translation models* are presented (see 2.3). Going one step further, they prove their feasibility for Bible Translation in general and the training of translators in particular (see 3.2). The field of training translators best illustrates the influence and usage of the researched models by Bible translators.

Ideological foundations

Following a historical outline and overview on the ideological concepts of these models they are chronologically illustrated to point out their ties. For a full understanding of each model its ideological background is placed first, beginning with *dynamic*

equivalence (1964/1969; Nida) as a product of information theory. The simultaneous increase in cultural diversity as a subject in ethnology, linguistics and theology (ecumenism) has become evident. Thus the need for target-group oriented translations arises. Plurality and individualism, as part of modernity, has contributed to this trend. The *Scopos* theory questions the sender orientation of the Nidas model and points out the *purpose* of a translation (Greek: σκοπος). Reiß and Vermeer (1971 and 1984) introduce this principle, which serves as the groundwork for *functional* models (see 2.3.4). This is the time when as a result of the enlightened reactions of the sixties, functionalism is seen as the way to explain the world, based on its physical roles. Thus the *conduit metaphor*, within the code model has been and is still accepted in these models. Going one step further, Nord presents her *functional* approach in 1997. Her model is also influenced by postmodernism like other approaches in the nineties. The *cultural* oriented and *mass media* model lead to receiver orientation, both being embedded in postmodernism. In contrast, *literal* approaches display unchanged translation doctrines during all historical epochs, thus becoming the most preserving model by keeping the form close to the original. *Relevance Theory* also grows out of post-modern thinking, thus having a holistic picture of communication in focus.

Shannon-Weaver code model

The Shannon-Weaver *code model* becomes basic to most models (1948/1949; see 2.3.2). It is developed after World War II, when information technology is highly valued for its effectiveness during wartime. Communication and language and is reduced to binary codes and mankind to physical constituents. During these days everything is explained by its physical, chemical or biological structure. Communication is seen as an encoded *signal* given by a *sender*, conducted through a *channel* and decoded by a *receiver*. Sometimes the signal is confused by *noise*, implicating misunderstanding, and damage of informational content or unpredictable aspects. The *conduit metaphor* remains basic for the transmission model (see 2.3.2). The military tool of a *black box* best describes communication processes in this model, whereby only the input (original decoded signal) and output (encoded received signal) of a communication process is of interest and communication procedures within translation become irrelevant.

Dynamic equivalence (Nida)

Dynamic equivalence is introduced by Nida (1964) and developed together with Taber (see 2.3.2 and 3.2.1). The concept is changed into “*functional equivalence*” by Waard and Nida (1986), stating that it is “the same concept, just giving more precise naming” (Waard & Nida 1986: vii-ix; Pattemore 2007:224). This is criticized for the fact that Waard and Nida had unintentionally moved the emphasis on to social scientific and cultural communicational factors, as well as stressing co- and context and longer text chunks, while focussing more on the physical and metacommunicational environment of “text” (Statham zit. in Pattemore 2007:225; Pattemore 2007:228). Despite those criticisms, even the naming of functional equivalence is not taken up by science, while the principles of *dynamic equivalence* become mandatory in the science of translation.

Although Nida calls his book “Toward a science of translation” (1964), he establishes with his model not only the *science of translation* but of *Bible Translation* as well. TAPOT (1969) becomes the standard reference work for translation. Up until

today there is a close relationship between both of them, giving impetus to each other (see 2.3.3). The *dynamic equivalence* is overwhelmingly welcomed in translation and interpreting theory as the prevailing model of communication and translation until 1972. The underlying code model is implemented in “dynamic equivalence” and “formal correspondence” by Nida (Ellingworth 2007:326), both principles working closely together. The first expresses, that the reaction and impression of readers of the translated text and the original should be equal. A translation therefore emphasizes contextual *and* formal correspondence of the original, both principles going together to get to the same reaction. Dynamic equivalence contrasts formal equivalence, which is used in literal translation. The main advantage of this model is that it can easily be learned from even less educated translators, it fits the intuitive approach of translation, simply adding some procedural recommendations.

Criticism of dynamic equivalence

The main criticism of Nida concerns his usage of the code model for communication processes without even questioning it. Using a *black box* (input-output) principle to describe the complexity of communication and leaving out aspects of the communication process appears to be far too short-sighted. The main concern has to do with the *conduit metaphor* leaving out the metamessage, co- and context and metalanguage of communication (see 3.2.1). Critics conclude that the code model could only be used in automatic respective concordant or computational translation.

A second criticism deals with its target group orientation (HUP; disproof see above). Thirdly its constraint to Bible Translation is used to argue that it is only applicable for few and ancient texts, because of its tri-cultural approach (biblical culture, translators or translation manager culture and target culture). This argument cannot be taken seriously, since the model is used cross-culturally worldwide and on a variety of texts. It is also well adapted to a two-culture approach (original text culture, target culture). Another critique struggles with Nidas' loan of deep structural grammatical fields, like Chomsky's transformational grammar. He applies this tool to church ministry as well as language structures. Maybe Nida is going one step to far, but his deep structure approach is not central to dynamic equivalence. It is often disregarded by translators given that it can easily be done without losing any efficiency of the model.

By summarizing the benefit of *dynamic equivalence* for Bible Translation, it constitutes a foundation for training mother tongue speakers with even less education and it presents a flexible and easily adaptable tool for cross-cultural translation projects.

The following models have to be considered in contrast to *dynamic equivalence*, since it has become the favourite model in the science of (Bible) Translation. This is why their focus and groundwork is mainly on the refusal of *dynamic equivalence* (see criticism above).

Scopos Model (Reiß and Vermeer)

The focus of the *Scopos* model lies in the product of a translation process, claiming that translation should be done with regard to the intended product (see 2.3.4 and 3.2.2). The translators' responsibility moves from sender orientation to the receiver, who is asking for a translation and offering the entire information, fulfilled during the process (employer). Undoubtedly the *Scopos* model increases the responsibility of a translator

from a sheer mechanical transformer (literal model) to a full project manager, being transparent in his activity because of a clear work description. Thus the intuitive task of the translator is made public and becomes part of the whole translation process. The *Scopos* model represents a beneficial tool for Bible Translation concerning its purpose-orientation, which could be easily described for a specific Bible Translation project. At the same time it is not easy to find out the initial purpose of the original text, which would be helpful to translate sacred and ancient texts.

Functional model (Nord)

Nord presents not just a *functional* approach, but a complete model for training translators and practicing translation within a scientific framework (1997 and 2003; see 2.3.5 and 3.2.2). Her model first and foremost includes textual criticism and mechanisms to eliminate malfunctions during the translation processes. Using feedback and back coupling components called “recursive circle mechanisms” (German: Rückkoppelungsmechanismen), she challenges the translator to optimize his product and the translation process. As the paragon of her model she uses the *hermeneutical spiral* as represented by Gadamer (Gadamer 1972; Nord 2003:39). She also introduces *ethics* to translation, through the aspect of *loyalty*, between the translator and his employer (Nord 2004). The greatest shift for the *functional* communication and translation models lies in the focus on translation as a product of translating. The German Bible Translation *Das Neue Testament und frühchristliche Schriften* (Berger & Nord 1999) is the first translation based entirely on the functional approach. The model has been and is also used in Africa for translation, where it seems to have favoured adaptation in Bible projects, since 1998. These projects demonstrate that the *hermeneutical spiral* for translation presented by Nord works well. Another beneficial factor is the constant planning and flexible adaptation to new translation situations caused by change of team members or difficulties in translation.

Criticism of functional models

Criticism of the theoretical foundation and feasibility of the *Scopos* and *functional* model can be found in the rejection of the code model on which it is based. Its hierarchical structure also brings about its purpose orientation, which leaves the translator alone in decisions about the purpose of the texts. Another critique concerns the restriction to some specific genres only and the fact that there are hermeneutical restrictions and complex structures that presume higher education (see 2.3.4.51; 2.3.5.6 and 3.2.2.1). In Bible Translation, as an activity of less or uneducated mother tongue speakers, this is often a tremendous difficulty to overcome as project manager.

Cultural model (Katan)

Katan introduces the *cultural* approach to Bible Translation (1999; see 2.3.6 and 3.2.5). Its structure is composed of “frames”, thus belong to the frame models. “Frames” are seen as “internal, psychological states as part of our worldview (Bateson cit. in Katan 1999:34)”, or “internal mental representations of ideals or prototypes whom we expect (Katan 1999:36)”. They implicate language, culture, traditions etc. His model is based in part on the *Sapir-Whorf-Hypothesis* (Sapir 1961:13; Whorf 1956:213-214; see above), arguing that language influences culture, and also on *prototype hypothesis* of

semantics (Rosch 1973 and 1978), claiming that people store and organize knowledge by key concepts which lead back to root symbols. These prototypical assumptions are acculturated and therefore culturally addicted. For Katan, culture shapes the frame in which communication is structured. Thus frames include other frames and so on. That is why his proposal for a network of frames, working together for (Bible) Translation becomes complex. Yet it reflects being valuable for planning a cross-cultural project, including the ancient cultures of the original, the culture of the project manager and the culture of mother tongue translators (tri-culture approach).

Criticism of the cultural model

The *cultural* model fails in training opportunities, including classes and material, therefore lack of experience with this model forms in itself the weakest flaw. Moreover, the frame approach and the highlighting of cultural elements in translation is not entirely welcomed in translation theory, at least these factors have not improved the model. As the understanding of communication is based on the code-model (transmission model), its critique also affects the *cultural* approach (see above).

Mass media model

The considerable increase in *mass media*, such as newspapers, radio, TV, Internet and other new technologies (mobile, laptop, etc.) these days, give reason to shape an addicted model of communication (see 2.3.7 and 3.2.6). Maletzke (1978) and McQuail ([1983] 2005) set up the basics of the understanding of communication within *mass media*. Based on the transmission model (see 2.3.2) an additional constituent is lined up called “medium” representing *mass media*. Reciprocal relationships between the sender and the “medium” and the “medium” and receiver are pasted into the process (see table 10) to demonstrate the effects caused by *mass media*. Certainly Bible Translation falls into the category of mass media communication, for the simple reason that its receivers are an unknown group. This further more demonstrates that it is a public task aiming at as much exposure to readers or hearers as possible (as an oral product). The “medium” approach is beneficial to Bible Translation, inasmuch as the model offers options for translating that fit within Bible Translation requirements.

Criticism of the mass media model

The additional constituent “medium” is placed right into the communication channel. This generates misunderstanding as to whether “medium” is seen as a *noise* factor of communication, thus being a drawback, or if it is perceived as additional component helping to ease specific communicational processes. Another shortcoming lies in its inflexible setup. It does not provide cross-cultural adaptations concerning “medium”. Thus western pride caused by technological advances, can easily be misunderstood as a colonialist movement.

Literal approach

Literal communication and translation models are all transmission models based on the *code model*. This approach has the longest tradition of all models, reaching back to the beginning of translation activity. Picked out from the many enthusiasts, the models of Turner (2001), Forrest (2003) and Nabokov (Kimmel 1964) stand out as striking examples. Advocates of literal translations have a bias towards *formal equivalence* to the original, which for them is of significant importance (concerning sacred and ancient

texts). Also, the aspect of verbal inspiration, generated by some denominations, fit appropriately in that model. Beneficial to this approach is that everyone who understands a text can start with translation, even without being trained. This is why less educated mother tongue translators tend to use a *literal* translation approach. In the same way the inner evidence caused by Scripture, namely Rev 22, 18-19, compels a *literal* translation. The fixed structure of the translation process only demands tools to understand the original, including hermeneutical, exegetical or theological introductions.

Criticism

By breaking down the complex communication process to a mechanical and computational procedure, it can only fit a concordant, interlinear translation (as well as a technical instruction). Besides that, the *literal* approach struggles with its foundations, namely the code model and the principle of concordant translation. The latter meaning, every word in the original equals another in the translated text. As a reply to this critique it has to be said, that semantic congruence (German: *Deckungsgleichheit*) can never be reached between two languages. Therefore the risk within this approach leads to lack of comprehension and at some point to an artificial ecclesiastical language (German: *Kanaanitsch*).

Relevance-Theory

Sperber and Wilson develop a new approach to communication, called *Relevance Theory* (1986; see 2.3.9 and 3.2.4). Singled out, the principle of relevance from Grice's conversation maxims (see Grice above) they argue that "relevance" best describes the main purpose of communication. Their cognitive approach is built on the inferential model, taken up and transformed for the use of (Bible) Translation by Gutt ([1991] 2000; 1992), who still argues that it is not a model for translation but a theoretical framework to understand communicational processes in translation. This becomes a trigger for new understanding of communication procedures, adding cognitive processes to the code model. The code model herein works only for the mechanical acquisition on the income level, one might say, as an initial step. The essential communication process thus consists of the presumption that within a communicative act "a speaker gives all information that is required on to the hearer, to understand and process it" (see table 11). That's why communication is based on the *minimax principle*, stating that speaker-wise a *maximum* of information is therein included and hearer-wise a *minimum* of effort is necessary for understanding it (*ostensive-inferential* communication). *Mutual knowledge*, also called "common shared world knowledge" or "common shared lexicon", is basic for successful communication. *Implicatures* and *explicatures* describe the co- and context of speech acts. Another component of the relevance theoretical approach is its distinction in *direct* and *indirect* translation. Whereas direct translation is based on "interpretative use", leading to "interpretative affinity" between the original and the translation, indirect translation deals with "*interpretative interlingual use*" (Gutt 2000:136; 2004:1-2).

Training in *Relevance Theory* has existed since 1992, only consisting of short introductory courses on its theological essentials. Even though Gutt produced the relevance theory only as a theoretical framework, since 2007 one course for trainees and one for trainers on *relevance theoretical* translation exists. Since the experience with this model is sparse, it has taken on a theoretical approach with no impact on the practice of translation at all for nearly twenty years. This is has changed due to training

material based on its theoretical frame. There are some translations that take at least parts of this model and use it within their project.

Criticism of relevance theory

Relevance Theory aims to be a paradigm shift in communication theory. Its inferential and cognitive approach is so highly complex that it has been ignored (although mainly the terminology used contributed to this impression). Today the level of understanding is lower but still an education of more than 8 school years is necessary to understand and practice this model, thus becoming very impractical. Another critique is composed of its *historic-metaphorical* approach in contrast to Nidas' *literal-factual* understanding of the Bible (Borg 2001:4-5). On epistemological grounds the relevance model seems to open up an unlimited variety of translations, without delivering tools to control or supervise the process, because of its speaker orientation. Thus in Bible Translation all information is placed in the original text, leaving the translator with the huge task to gather all this information. The distinction in direct and indirect translation leads, on the one side, to the effect that "translation achieves the same cognitive effect, within the same context", on the other side it is not obvious "how much context has to be integrated in a text" (Grooteest cit. in Pattemore 2007:259).

Referring to the subject of the thesis, the next step is an anthropological study as point of reference to the information's given in this research so far.

The Zaza people - an ethnological overview

An ethnological overview of the Zaza people in Turkey and a Bible Translation project with this group becomes the point of comparison for the practical feasibility of the introduced models (see 3.1). The worldview, language and culture of the Zaza is highlighted by the parallelism of religious and linguistic splitting, the borrowing of Turkic, Arabic and Iranian loanwords, the tribal system, the hierarchical position of leading persons, the Islamic, Christian and Persian influence, which is illustrated by a small grammar sketch of Zazaki, summarizing the handling of envy and the "site (location) of emotions, intellect, and character" (German: *Sitz der Emotionen, des Intellekts und des Charakters* = SEIC).

Training Translators

To summarize the findings in the models for training translators, it is evident that every project opts to take its own approach. None of the communication and translation models covers training for translators extensively. This tendency points to mixed models, picking out helpful factors from a model and including them in specific project-oriented training (see 3.3.1, 3.3.2 and table 19). The need for effective training lies in the teaching of basics about the presented models. As a result the project manager is able to decide which constituents he has to pick up for his project. This is proved in a qualitative study, with a questionnaire on translation models within 6 translation organizations, spread worldwide, to 42 Bible Translators, who have finished a translation project or have started more than 3 years ago (see 3.3.3).

Macro approach

The introductory question of where to locate Bible Translation in the world of sciences and its interdisciplinary assignment is raised in the *macro* overview (chapter 1), since it has recently been seen as part of missiological strategies (Hill 2006:180) and as a fundamental concern for indigenizing the gospel to ethnic groups (Walls 2006:27). Closing the *macroscopical* framework, a representation of possible solutions for acceptable assessments of Bible Translation in missiology is discussed (chapter 4). It is within this *macro* approach (chapters 1 and 4) that the specificity of Bible Translation is discussed.

Whereas the location of a “science of Bible Translation” within a scientific scaffold is characterized in the wider framework of communication sciences (chapter 1), it is one step further that content and orientation of *training in Bible Translation* discloses current improvements and future expectations in this discipline. Its *interdisciplinary* attitude, thus being a dynamic and powerful tool for the body of Christ, is beneficial for the unlimited distribution of divine communication, represented in Scripture and therefore fully integrated by human communication theory.

Hermeneutics, Zeitgeist and Missio Dei

It is within *hermeneutics* that the formulation of the basic essentials of understanding concerning the content and purpose of Bible Translation, directing its missiological and theological reflection. The *interpretation* of Holy Scripture can be traced down to its implying a contextualized and “homogenous unit” oriented approach (see 1.4.2.2, 2.2.10 and appendix 1). Related to its divine nature the question arises, *how* the translation of a sacred book transports its inspirational and authorized tenor into another language. This is answered in the Bible, pointing to both an internal commitment (Rev 22, 19) and the responsibility of ethically-committed translators claiming loyalty (Nord 2001:125 and 2004:236) to its substance and the author. These considerations guide translation models that include such demands (see above and 2.3).

Due to the fact that behind every model a time-dependent ideology (German: *Zeitgeist*) influences its formation, its corresponding philosophical background is given preliminarily (see 1.5). Therefore it is summarized in the ”mandate of Bible Translation“ (chapter 1; see above), concluding an internal and external purpose *within* and *around* Bible Translation to fulfil (Greek: $\tau\epsilon\lambda\omega\varsigma$) the gathering of all believers into the body of Christ (Mt 28, 18-20).

Research on ”Missiology and Bible Translation“ continue the *macro* approach (chapter 1) by taking up all points discussed so far and leading to the culmination in the *Missio Dei*. This term is understood both as the transmission of God himself (God being send), and divine instruction to all believers being sent into the world (God sending humans; chapter 4; see 4.2).

History of Bible Translation

As mentioned above Bible Translation has a tremendous empirical background relating to historical, geographical, missiological, theological, linguistic and ethnological facts (Nida & Taber 1969: iii; Gentzler 2001:46). This is why an outlook on its impact (relating to missiology and theology) leads one back to the origins of this activity. Obviously *history of Bible Translation* is the key to its recent and future advancement (see 4.1). Amazingly its impact within missiology, linguistics and theology is enormously undervalued. Less than 5% of literature in those disciplines more or less

deal with Bible Translation, and only a few standard works or encyclopaedic references process it (~ 5). In the last 5 years increasing interest has resulted in a growing number of publications concerning Bible Translation. Observing church history some points stand out.

Jewish influence on the early Christian community concerning translation, starts with translation of the Hebrew Bible into Koine Greek. This is due to the fact that the Septuagint as a basic text for the early church is translated by manifold principles, spanning literal to paraphrasing procedures. Thus it becomes a model to a variety of mother tongue translations in the ancient and the Middle Ages, produced by mother tongue speakers educated in biblical languages (Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek).

At the end of the Middle Ages, a renewed interest in Bible Translation takes place (particularly the Waldenser movement should be noted). Contrary to this translation activity the monastery movement contributes to Bible Translation by preserving Scripture in traditional forms, precedent in the Jewish practice of scribal art. During the Reformation methodical ways of proceeding are introduced in translation principles. Erasmus (literal approach), Luther (literal and paraphrasing approach) and others initiated different methods. Beside those the Roman Catholic "accommodation" approach (Xavier) takes the place as a countermovement of the Reformation.

The Reformation directs to pietism, started by Spener with his work *Pia Desiderata* (1675). Astonishingly, this introspective religious movement develops an outgoing tendency and, as result, triggers the first evangelical Christian development aid program by the Moravians (Herrenhuter; Zinzendorf). Another era begins with William Carey and his translation activities in India, which is today called the "Century of Christian development aid" (19. century). Carey first implements the "Christian development conference" to develop worldwide strategies for development aid. Related to Bible Translation this century mainly transfers the responsibility of translation from mother tongue speakers on to Christian development aid personnel.

A new epoch starts in the 1930s, when Cameron Townsend establishes schooling for Bible translators with the Summer Institute of Linguistics (1936), now called SIL International. Soon Eugene Nida working together with Townsend, as linguist and translation consultant, introduces a systematic and methodologic approach, thus laying the groundwork for a *science of Bible Translation*. He also supports the launching of the United Bible Societies (UBS). There the training of translators with his dynamic equivalence model becomes mandatory (see 2.2.6 and attachment 1). While Townsend worked on missiological aspects of Bible Translation, Kenneth Pike establishes applied linguist methods to research languages on linguistic and anthropological grounds. Nida brought the *science of (Bible) Translation* into motion. Retrospectively we can say that the ongoing "Century of Bible Translation" had its origin in the 20th century (Sanneh 1991:206; 2003:97-100, 106; Meurer 1978:10; Smalley 1991:22-31).

Motivation, inherent power and Heilsgeschichte

The *history of Bible Translation* illustrates its motivation. Christians are motivated by the Bible to bring its content - the gospel - in acceptable and understandable form to other people. This is done for their own culture, if there is already a Bible Translation at hand, through adaptations or revisions. Cross-culturally new translations for non-Christian cultures are needed. Both methods expect equal translation procedures. The Bible as source of daily and true life for the believer urges translators to translating activity, with the aim to spread this experience to others. Thus the science of Bible

Translation is set up in an inner and outer driving force. The first directs one to Scripture perceived as the impetus of its translation, the second guide's one to Scripture, which reveals its inherent power in the believer, spurring him to spread it on to others. This motivation originates in the fact that divine communication is solely summarized in the Bible, thus becoming the unique source about the resurrection plan called "history of salvation" (German: *Heilsgeschichte*).

The incarnational translation principle

Crucial to the "history of salvation" is the triune process of transformation. Thus God is revealing himself in the Word (Jesus; Joh 1,1-4), which is transformed into the Bible (Scripture) and the Bible transfers its message by bringing forth faith in Jesus to the believer and in this way constituting the church as body of Christ (1 Petr 1,18-19). Closing the loop, the church, through Christians, transforms the message into other languages, so that everybody is given the chance to participate in divine communication. This procedure is called the "incarnational translation principle". It represents the secret of God, becoming human in the person of Jesus through *Incarnation* (becoming flesh), *Condescension* (coming down) and *Kenosis* (emptying himself), forming the foundation of Bible Translation.

Based on this elemental principle of Bible Translation it becomes perspicuous that this issue, by itself, forms a model of communication. This is all the more apparent as it contrasts with insufficient Christian communication models (see 2.3.10), which do not contribute to Bible Translation. Going one step further the "incarnational translation principle", combined with the doctrine of *Missio Dei*, *Missio Christi* and *Missio Spiritu* (Reimer 2006:93; s. Pkte. 4.1.3.1.3 und 4.3.2.1.3) turns out to be, not only a Christian communication model, but also a sound missiological concept (see 4.3.3). While *Missio Dei* shapes the missiological background of Bible Translation, *Missio Christi* conceptualizes its methodology relating to the kingdom of God and *Missio Spiritu* outlines the theological frame of Christian development aid (:93).

The motto of the *macro* approach, thus not only describes the environmental function of Bible Translation as researched in this thesis, but constitutes the axiomatic framework of this science: **Bible Translation – bridge head of missiology!**

Bibliography

- Berger, Klaus & Nord, Christiane 1999. *Das Neue Testament und frühchristliche Schriften*. Frankfurt am Main: Insel.
- Borg, Michael J. 2001. *Reading the Bible Again For the First Time: Taking the Bible Seriously But Not Literally*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Bunge, Mario & Ardila, Ruben [1987] 1990. *Philosophie der Psychologie*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Ellingworth, Paul 2007. Translation Techniques in Modern Bible Translations, in Noss, Philip A. (ed.): *A History of Bible Translation*, 307-334. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Fabbro, Franco 1999. *The Neurolinguistics of Bilingualism: An Introduction*. Hove: Taylor and Francis.
- Forrest, Jay N. 2003. *Why a Literal Translation*. Online im Internet: URL: <http://web.archive.org/web/20030626112812/http://www.jayforrest.org/cd/literal.htm> [Stand 2007-10-19].
- Gadamer, H. G. 1972. *Wahrheit und Methode*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Grice, Herbert Paul 1975. Logic and Conversation, in Cole, Peter & Morgan, Jerry (Hgg.): *Speech Acts*, 41-58. Cambridge: Harvard University. (übersetzt ins Deutsche von Kemmerling, A.: Grice, Herbert Paul 1993. Logik und Konversation, in Meggle, Georg (Hg.): *Handlung, Kommunikation, Bedeutung*, 243-265. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp).
- Gutt, Ernst-August [1991] 2000. *Translation and Relevance: Cognition and Context*. 2nd ed. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Gutt, Ernst-August 1992. *Relevance Theory: A Guide to Successful Communication in Translation*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and United Bible Societies.
- Gutt, Ernst-August 2004. Applications of relevance theory to translation - a concise overview. Online im Internet: URL: <http://homepage.ntlworld.com/ernst-august.gutt/> 2004%20Applications-%20of%20RT%20to%20translation.d [2009-02-119]. (Thesenpapier).
- Hill, Harriet S. 2006. *The Bible at Cultural Crossroads: From Translation to Communication*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Katan, David 1999. *Translating Cultures: An Introduction for Translators, Interpreters and Mediators*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Kimmel, Leigh 1998. *Nabokov as Translator: An Examination of his Changing Doctrine of Translation*. Online im Internet: URL: <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/3682/nabokov2.html> [Stand 2008-12-18].
- Luzbetak, Louis [1988] 1993. *The Church and Cultures: New Perspectives in Missiological Anthropology*. Maryknoll: Orbis.
- Maletzke, Gerhard [1963] 1978. *Psychologie der Massenkommunikation: Theorie und Systematik*. Hamburg: Hans-Bredow Institut.
- McQuail, Denis [1983] 2007. *McQuails Mass Communication Theory*. 5th ed. reprint. London: Sage.
- Meurer, Siegfried 1978. Einige Grundsätze heutiger Bibelübersetzung, in Meurer, Siegfried (Hg.): *Eine Bibel - viele Übersetzungen: Not oder Notwendigkeit?* 7-10. Stuttgart: Ev. Bibelwerk.
- Nida, Eugene A. & Taber, Charles R. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nord, Christiane [1997] 2001. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functional Approaches Explained*. Reprint. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Nord, Christiane 2003. *Textanalyse und Übersetzen: Theoretische Grundlagen, Methode und didaktische Anwendung einer übersetzungsrelevanten Textanalyse*. 3. Aufl. Tübingen: Julius Groos.
- Nord, Christiane 2004. Loyalität als ethisches Verhalten im Translationsprozess, in Müller, Ina (Hg.): *Und sie bewegt sich doch ... Translationswissenschaft in Ost und in West, Festschrift für Heidemarie Salevsky zum 60. Geburtstag*, 234-245. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- McGavran, Donald A. [1955] 1968. *The Bridges of God: A Study in the Strategy of Missions*. 2nd printing. New York: Friendship Press.
- Nichols, Anthony Howard 1996. *Translating the bible: A Critical Analysis of E. A. Nidas theory of Dynamic Equivalence and its Impact Upon Recent Bible Translations*. London: The British Library.
- Nida, Eugene A. & Taber, Charles R. 1969. *Theorie und Praxis des Übersetzens unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Bibelübersetzung*. New York: Weltbund der Bibelgesellschaften. (Deutsche Übersetzung von Kassühlke, Rudolf & Loewen, Jacob A.).
- Pattemore, Stephen 2007. Framing Nida: The Relevance of Translation in the United Bible Societies, in Noss, Philip A. (ed.): *A History of Bible Translation*, 217-263. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Pickett, W. [1933] 1953. *Christian Mass Movements in India*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Reimer, Johannes 2006. Gemeindegründung in der islamischen Welt. Vorlesungsskript. Bergneustadt: Missionshaus/Bibelschule Wiedenest. (unveröffentlicht).
- Reiß, Katharina 1971. *Möglichkeiten und Kriterien der Übersetzungskritik: Kategorien und Kriterien für eine sachgerechte Beurteilung von Übersetzungen*. München: Max Hueber.
- Reiß, Katharina & Vermeer, Hans J. [1984] 1991. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. 2. Aufl. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Robinson, Douglas 2002. *Western Translation Theory: From Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Rosch, Eleanor H. 1973. Natural Categories. *Cognitive Psychology* 4, 328-50.
- Rosch, Eleanor H. 1978. Principles of Categorisation, in Rosch, Eleanor H. & Lloyd, Barbara B. (eds.): *Cognition and Categorisation*, 27-48. Hillside: Erlbaum.

- Sanneh, Lamin 1991. *Christliche Mission und westliche Schuldkomplexe*. ZfM XVII/3, 146-152. Stuttgart: Evangelischer Missionsverlag.
- Sanneh, Lamin 2003. *Whose Religion is Christianity? The Gospel beyond the West*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Sapir, Edward [1921] 1949. *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Sapir, Edward 1961. *Die Sprache: Eine Einführung in das Wesen der Sprache*. München: Max Hueber. (Übersetzung des englischen Originals s.o.).
- Shannon, Claude L. & Weaver, Warren 1949. *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Smalley, William A. 1991. Translation as Mission: Bible Translation in the Modern Missionary Movement, in Shenk, Wilbert R. (Hg.): *The Modern Mission Era: 1792-1992*, 1-111. Macon: Mercy.
- Sperber, Dan & Wilson, Deirdre [1986] 1995. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Turner, Charles V. 2001. *Biblical Bible Translating: The Biblical Basis for Bible Translating with an Introduction to Semantics and Applications Made to Bible Translation Principles and Problems*. 2nd ed. Lafayette: Sovereign Grace.
- UNESCO Bangkok 2007. *Promoting Mother Tongue-based Multilingual Education (MLE)*. Bangkok: Asia-Pacific Programme of Education for All. Und Online im Internet: URL: www.unescobkk.org/education/appeal [CD-ROM] [Stand 2009-06-16].
- Vicedom, Georg F. [1958] 2002. Actio Dei: Mission und Reich Gottes, in Müller, Klaus W. (Hg.): *Missio Dei: Einführung in eine Theologie der Mission - Actio Dei: Mission und Reich Gottes*, 115-230. Neu herausgegeben. Nürnberg: VTR.
- Waard, Jan de & Nida, Eugene A. 1986. *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translation*. Nashville: Nelson.
- Walls, Andrew F. 2006. *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith*. 11th printing. New York: Orbis.
- Wick, Peter 2004. *Die Bibel als Heilige Schrift auslegen und übersetzen. Zerstören und bauen: Die Macht des schwachen Wortes*. Referate. Und Online im Internet: URL: <http://www.bibeluebersetzungen.ch/link2.php> [PDF-Datei] [Stand 2008-01-03].
- Whorf, Benjamin Lee 1956. Science and Linguistics, in Carroll, J. B. (Hg.): *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*, 207-19. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press. (Herausgegeben und übersetzt ins Deutsche von Krausser, Peter: Whorf, Benjamin Lee 1963. *Sprache, Denken, Wirklichkeit: Beiträge zur Metalinguistik und Sprachphilosophie*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.).

German and English Bible Translations

- Baader, Fritz Henning 1989. *DaBHaR: DIE GESCHRIEBENE des Alten Bundes und DIE GESCHRIEBENE des Neuen Bundes*. 2. Bde. Schömberg: Eigenverlag.
- Bibel in gerechter Sprache* 2006. Bail, Ulrike u. a. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.
- Die Volxbibel - Neues Testament* 2005. Dreyer, Martin. Witten: Volxbibel.
- Das Neue Testament nach Martin Luther* 1975 1989. Revidierter Text. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Die Bibel nach der Übersetzung Martin Luthers* 1912 2001. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Die Bibel nach der Übersetzung Martin Luthers* 1984 1985. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Die Bibel oder die ganze Heilige Schrift des Alten und Neuen Testaments nach der deutschen Übersetzung Martin Luthers* 1908. Elberfeld: Bergische Bibelgesellschaft.
- Das Neue Testament unseres Herrn und Heilandes Jesu Christi nach der deutschen Übersetzung D. Martin Luthers* 1934. Neu durchgesehen nach dem vom Deutschen Evangelischen Kirchenausschuß genehmigten Text. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt.
- Das Neue Testament unseres Herrn und Heilandes Jesus Christus, nach der deutschen Übersetzung D. Martin Luther* 1956. Revidierter Text. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt.
- Gute Nachricht Bibel* 1997. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- King James Version [1611]* 2008. With Apocrypha. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures*. NT 1950, whole Bible 1961. Pennsylvania: Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society. (German *Neue-Welt-Übersetzung der Heiligen Schrift* [revidiert 1986] 1997. Selters/Taunus: Wachtturm Bibel- u. Traktat-Gesellschaft).