SIL Global
Language and Culture Archives

Journal of Translation
ISSN 1558-7282 (online)
https://siljot.org

Four Bible Translation Types and Some Criteria to Distinguish Them

Sebastian Floor

Journal of Translation 3 (2), 2007: 1–22.
https://doi.org/10.54395/JOT-PFW5H

License

©2007, SIL Global

Made available under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0

More resources available at:
https://sil.org/resources/language-culture-archives

Four Bible Translation Types and Some Criteria to Distinguish Them

Sebastian J. Floor

Sebastian Floor and his wife Karen are from South Africa and joined SIL in 1987. From 1989 until 2000 they worked among the Mwani people in northern Mozambique. In 2003, after a study program at Stellenbosch University, Floor became a translation consultant of the Mozambique Branch of SIL. The Floors reside in the city of Nampula.

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to contribute to the discussion on the classification of Bible translation types. This paper proposes four types instead of the traditional two: literal and idiomatic or dynamic equivalent. The four types are Type 1) close (or literal) resemblance, Type 2) open resemblance, Type 3) close (or limited) interpretative, and Type 4) open interpretative. There are several continua of criteria: the degree of resemblance to the original semantic content, the degree of explicitness, and the type of adjustments needed to unpack the meaning. Eight criteria of adjustments are proposed to distinguish these four types: 1) order of clauses and phrases, 2) sentence length, 3) reference disambiguation and tracking, 4) concordance of lexical items, 5) key terms and unknown terms, 6) figurative usage and idioms, 7) transition marking, and 8) information structure.

1. Introduction[1]

It does not take long in any Bible translation or consulting session to come to the question of translation type or style. "Do you aim for a more idiomatic translation? Or one that is very free? Or maybe for one that is not very literal, definitely not too literal, but is trying to keep relatively close to the original forms?" There is pressure from all sides: the churches want a more literal translation that sounds authoritative[2] and is not too far removed in style from a translation in the national or regional language, but the translators and their advisors often prefer a translation that communicates well. In recent history, Bible translation agencies have promoted one specific translation type, that is, a "functional equivalent" or "idiomatic" translation. Often, however, the exact nature of the proposed idiomatic translation is not clear. In cases where a literal translation has been known, any small shift away from that standard is taken as a "free" or "idiomatic" translation. In other cases, the term "idiomatic" is limited to a very free, almost paraphrased translation.[3] The terms have often been used with a wide range of meaning. This issue is not new to the Bible translation theorist, as will be seen in the discussion below, but I believe that there is a real need to define more exactly what we mean when we use a certain category of translation type. There are four reasons for this:

One reason that it is necessary to revisit the problem of translation types is that the two-fold distinction between literal and idiomatic translation is not really adequate. Most early translation theorists categorized translation types in two opposite styles: formal correspondent versus dynamic equivalent (Nida and Taber), and literal versus idiomatic (Beekman and Callow). This pattern has continued to this day. Mojola (2002:209) mentioned some other authors on translation theory who also maintain this dichotomy, albeit in

[1] This paper has been written and re-written several times since 1997. Five people have read the drafts and given valuable input. I want to acknowledge the input from Dr. John Callow on an early draft; Dr. Katy Barnwell, who raised the point of implicatures and Relevance Theory as a possible point of departure; and Benjie Leach, fellow translation consultant in Mozambique, for raising the point that the two in-between types are the ones most relevant to us, at least in Africa, and it is therefore important to be able to distinguish well between them. I also want to acknowledge Tom Crowell and Hessel Visser for valuable input on the form and content of the manuscript.

[2] Echoed by Ezard (2003).

[3] By "paraphrase" is meant a rendering that has taken significant freedoms in terms of form and meaning in restating an original.

other terms (the more literal is mentioned first): overt vs. covert translation (Juliane House); foreignising vs. domesticating (James Holmes); semantic vs. communicative (Newark); form-based vs. meaning-based (Larson); documentary vs. instrumental (Nord); observational vs. participative (Pym); and direct vs. indirect (Gutt). I do not argue against this dichotomy; it is still relevant, but it needs to be further specified in order to become a really useful distinction for translators on the field. More exact criteria are called for to distinguish between the two types.

A second reason to address the definition of translation types is that of terminology. The terminology, by being broad and somewhat vague, is used inconsistently. What some take as idiomatic, others take as quite literal. Translations referred to as dynamic or idiomatic are sometimes very free and other times quite literal. Terms are used with considerable freedom. This inconsistent use depends on several factors. One factor is that of language family. For example, translations of the Old Testament in Semitic languages could "look" very close to the Hebrew forms in many ways and still be very idiomatic, because they are in the same language family. In Bantu languages in Africa, however, even an intentionally literal translation will look quite different from the form of the original, since the respective language family grammatical structures are so different. Another factor that complicates the terminology issue is that different genres may require different translation styles. Translations of narratives can be more literal, and still be well understood, while the expository and hortatory nature of the Epistles requires much restructuring to make the meaning intelligible and readable. In some translations it is not unusual to find some sections translated quite literally and other sections very idiomatically, depending on the genre at hand. Inconsistent translation style is almost unavoidable.

A third reason is that recent developments in translation theory, especially Skopos Theory[4] (which argues for a translation type that best fits the situation and needs of the receptor audience), have neutralized the need to promote only one type as the most desirable. The goal is still a translation that communicates, but no longer with the understanding that only idiomatic or functional equivalent translations do this effectively. So which translation type should language communities opt for, and which types should translation consultants promote? To eliminate the vagueness of the terms, it is necessary to differentiate between translation types with more precision, and preferably to have more than two types to differentiate.

Finally, a fourth reason that this issue is important: what translation type, or types, should be taught to translators? Translators have been made aware of the different types in all the Bible translation handbooks, but generally one type has been promoted at the expense of the other.[5] Given the fact that different genres require different translation styles, translators should be trained to handle more than one type. With training to distinguish between the different types, translators can be aware of which type or style they should choose for a certain passage. Translating according to exact translation types is not possible. For that, human language is too complex and the language and message of Scripture too rich and varied. Nevertheless, specific core types are clearly distinguishable, despite the fact that their borders are fuzzy.[6] The distinctions are important, and even fundamental.

We may ask whether it is realistic at all to propose criteria for distinguishing between translation styles. Because Bible translation is so complex, so interdisciplinary, and so multifaceted, I will argue that the criteria need to be exact enough, but realistic enough, to indicate more or less what type of translation is before us, or what we are aiming for. The question is: what meaningful criteria could be employed to differentiate translation types? This paper will attempt to speak to this problem.

The outline of the paper will be as follows:

1. The continuum of translation types as defined in modern translation theory
2. The two main criteria to distinguish between translation types

[4]See article by De Vries (2001).
[5]The experimental draft of the new Introductory Course in Communication and Translation (ICCT) has changed this approach.
[6]My appreciation to John Callow for this insight. He wrote in a personal communication: "Since translations are inconsistent, this blurs the distinctions between them, which is indeed the case, I am sure. But the distinctions are important, even if the borders are fuzzy."

3. Classifying some of the adjustments to distinguish between translation types
4. The four translation types proposed and compared
5. Summary: the tables comparing the types
6. Examples of translations in the different types
7. Comparison of the types in terms of translation qualities
8. Conclusions

Every attempt is made to avoid introducing new or complex terms that need elaborate definitions, but some new labels are suggested none the less. This article assumes that the reader will have at least some minimal notions of Relevance Theory.

2. The continuum of translation types as defined in modern translation theory

Until recently, most studies in Bible translation theory defined two main translation types. Nida and Taber (1969) had formal correspondent translations versus dynamic equivalent translations. Dynamic equivalent translation was defined as finding the closest natural equivalent in the receptor language (1969:12). Beekman and Callow (1974) maintained the same distinction, but with different terms: literal versus idiomatic translations. Generally the dynamic equivalent or idiomatic translation type has been favored, especially for translations in the Two Thirds world. It has been favored principally for the better communication it is believed to render for newly literate people.

Bible translation theory has suggested two main translation types, namely formal correspondent or literal versus functional equivalent or idiomatic. Current theory recognizes that there is a scale, a difference of degree, between the types, but with little explanation of what exactly distinguishes them from each other. However, Bible translation theorists have already given attention to the issue.

Beekman and Callow describe what they call "types of translation" (1974:21–25). They distinguish two "approaches" to translation, namely literal and idiomatic. Within that framework they distinguish four types of translation on a continuum, of which two are acceptable and two unacceptable:

Unacceptable	Acceptable	Acceptable	Unacceptable
Highly literal	Modified literal	Idiomatic	Unduly free

Beekman and Callow then proceed with a useful description of the differences between the types. Unacceptable highly literal translation is defined as a translation which "…reproduces the linguistic features of the original language with high consistency" (1974:21). "Obligatory rules of the receptor language are set aside and the translation follows the order of the original word for word" (21). Original grammatical structures are transferred whenever reasonably possible, and full concordance is maintained (i.e., every one word in the original is matched every time by a single word in the translation). And from the source language, "…idioms and figures of speech are preserved intact" (22–23).

On the opposite end of the continuum, Beekman and Callow continue, one finds the unacceptable unduly free translation type. By "unduly free" they mean that unnecessary extraneous information is included (23). "There is no intention to reproduce the linguistic form of the language from which the translation is made," but in the attempt to make the translation as clear as possible, what they call "distortions of content" appear. For example, historical facts may be modified, just to achieve a high communication value (23). For Beekman and Callow, "unduly free" basically means unduly free in terms of the meaning and the message communicated.

They discuss the two acceptable types. The modified literal translation basically follows the grammatical forms of the original, along with a high level of concordance. Although "departures from the original" are made when the translator becomes aware of communicating possible error (23), this type of translation is often unnatural in style and continues to have unnecessary ambiguities and obscurities. Beekman and Callow say there is a place for such translations among well-educated people with the necessary will and resources to read and study, but that the other acceptable translation type, namely idiomatic translation, is the preferred type, especially "among groups emerging from illiteracy" (24). The idiomatic translation is

oriented to the meaning of the original "by using the natural grammatical and lexical forms of the receptor language" (1974:24). The form is just seen as the "vehicle" of the meaning (25).

Larson (1984:17) also gives a scale of the possible "in-between" types, and proceeds with a helpful, albeit short, discussion. She calls the types "kinds of translation".[7]

> Literal – modified literal – inconsistent – near idiomatic – *idiomatic* – unduly free
> (emphasis the original author's, highlighting the desirability of the idiomatic type)

The issue of the "in between" types has been helped by developments in translation theory. The renewed interest in the function of source forms as part of the meaning has led to a new focus on rhetorical structures, word and clause order, and other pragmatic and discourse issues of the source text. That focus in turn has led to two significant developments in Bible translation theory. One, in the appearance in 1986 of De Waard and Nida's book "From one language to another: functional equivalence in Bible translation," where the concept of "functional equivalent" translation is proposed to replace the concept of dynamic equivalence. The authors claim that the functions of source text forms have meaning and are significant. The other is Wendland's proposal that "proximity to the form of the original" is a fourth requirement for a good translation (1991:8):

	Meaning	Form
Source Language	Fidelity	Proximity
Receptor Language	Clarity	Naturalness

Together with this new focus, voices have recently arisen in favor of translations still having a foreign flavor (see Jordaan 2002). Bible readers should be constantly aware that there is a vast cultural-historical gap between the original and modern readers. In language communities where access to the Scriptures is a long-standing fact, this type of translation is more and more called for. However, there is a distinction between foreign form and foreign content. It is true that in successful communication one's desire is to minimize foreign form and content, but is it possible to avoid it completely? Whatever the answer to this question, the fact remains that Bible translators continually struggle with the measure of historicity and foreign form and content to be maintained in a translation.

How is this continuum to be interpreted? What makes a rendering a "modified literal" rendering? Or "idiomatic" vis-à-vis "modified literal"?

3. The two main criteria to distinguish translation types

The two main criteria to distinguish translation types are 1) the degree of semantic resemblance to the original, and 2) the extent of adjustments made vis-à-vis the original forms. The adjustments include making implicit information more explicit, on the one hand, and on the other hand, making adjustments to the syntax, semantic forms, and discourse-pragmatic forms to exploit the features the receptor language has to offer.

The first criterion is the degree of semantic resemblance to the original. It has to do with the basic orientation of the translation, following Gutt's (2000) distinctions. The continuum here moves from close and direct semantic resemblance on the one extreme, to indirect resemblance with an interpretative quality in the translation. The twofold distinction between direct resemblance and indirect resemblance holds well here. Indirect resemblance is also called interpretative resemblance. For the purposes of this paper, translations with a direct resemblant orientation are called *resemblant* translations, and translations with an indirect resemblant orientation are called *interpretative* translations.

Brown and Hoyle (2005), following Gutt (2004), explain this continuum of resemblance in the following terms: semantic resemblance moves from code-level resemblance (or formal resemblance) to explicature-

[7]Larson uses useful nonbiblical examples to illustrate her point, which is that idiomatic translation is to be pursued. She is very much in agreement with Beekman and Callow, but she does not discuss in detail what she means by inconsistent and near idiomatic kinds of translation.

level resemblance to interpretation-level resemblance. Code-level resemblance means similar semantic content to the original. Explicature-level resemblance involves similar explicit content, the "full semantic and referential meaning of a text in the specific context it occurs." Interpretation-level resemblance is the "complete meaning of a text as understood by the audience, including 'reading between the lines' as well as understanding what was actually said." (Brown and Hoyle 2005: Parameter 22). We will use these distinctions in this paper.

The continuum of making implicit information more explicit provides an equally crucial translation problem.[8] Implicit information comes in a variety of forms: the requirements of syntax, the cognitive frame of concepts and expressions with the cultural worlds it activates, pragmatic processes such as intention, expectation, rhetorical effect, the communication situation, and finally, implicit textuality and coherence. The typical things that translators make more explicit in translation are the following:

1. Morphosyntactic requirements of the receptor language that are different from the source language, but necessary to make the text accessible. Examples are the explicit translation of the missing element in the case of an ellipsis in the source language, or of the actor in a passive construction.
2. Key thematic terms that are sometimes unknown to receptor language speakers or are so significant that an explicit rendering needs to be maintained throughout. Examples are the translation of complex and rich theological terms like "kingdom of God," and unknown terms like "Scribes."
3. Cultural contextual information that contributes to the understanding of the text, meaning implicit information that the original author assumed his readers understood. For example, the meaning of Old Testament laws or the fact that roofs were flat in those times, might be made explicit.

Other aspects of implicit information that could be made explicit, but are less implemented in translation, are the following:

1. The meaning of word order; for instance, nouns fronted before verbs in Biblical Hebrew have a variety of very specific usages, such as focusing on the constituent. This area is technically called "information structure" or "information packaging."
2. Pragmatic operations, such as intensification of an event; confirmation of participants' identity ("that very one," "she herself"); certification in the sense of eliminating any lingering doubt of an event or person or outcome, signaled by words like "certainly," "indeed," and other means of local prominence marking.
3. The transitions between sentences and paragraphs. For example, the receptor language may require a clear marking of how the new paragraph relates to the previous one.

Ernst-August Gutt's application of the pragmatic theory called Relevance Theory to Bible translation was a significant development in dealing with implicit information (Gutt 1987, 1992, 2000). One of Relevance Theory's principal contributions is that it provides a sounder theory for understanding context and "implicit" information. Without going into many details, and while not claiming to make a complete review of Relevance Theory's (RT) main points, some concepts in the theory are of particular importance to this paper. Some RT concepts are related to different types of implicit information: explicatures, and two types of implicatures: contextual assumptions and contextual effects:[9]

[8]This viewpoint was expressed to me as far back as 1987, by Dr. John Callow, in a personal communication about the most burning question in Bible translation.

[9]In the technical terms of Relevance Theory, the division of implicit information falls into explicatures (for language-specific and language-based semantic implicit information), and implicatures (for pragmatic implicit information that is not semantic and language-based but context- and culture-based). Implicatures are divided into contextual assumptions and contextual effects, and contextual effects in turn are subdivided into weak and strong contextual effects. For introductions to Relevance Theory, see Gutt (1992) and Blakemore (1992).

1. *Explicatures or language-based*[10] *semantic implicit information* of the source languages that is inferable from the grammar and logical flow of thought. This idea is what Sperber and Wilson (1986:176-183) call the "fleshing out (of) the semantic representation of an utterance." These implications are derived from the special characteristics, demands, and possibilities of the source language itself. Ellipsis, reference assignment, anaphora and participant tracking, text-world deixis (reference to time and space in the text), logical implications (like result, association, missing steps in an event), and much more, are all cases of language-specific, semantic implicit information. These can be made explicit in the receptor language to the extent required by the that language. Even very literal translations need to make this type of implicit information explicit. The differing degree to which translations make this type of semantic implicit information explicit, and thus make the renderings more clear, is one of the most significant criteria for determining translation types.

2. *Implicatures or communication-based implicit information* is a more complex form of implicit information that is inferable from the source text. Such implicit information is different from the semantic implicit information in the sense that it is not dependent on the linguistics of a specific language. The communication-based implicit information includes all other implicit information that is not language-specific but is still part of the communication. Such implicit information from the source language text is divided into two types:

   2.1 *Assumed premises or contextual assumptions,* which contain information from the context the reader and author need to share in order to communicate effectively about a specific point, for example cultural background, a shared knowledge of the world, a shared knowledge of customs, etc. The implicit meaning of Biblical customs; historical and geographical background of Bible times and places; the meaning and range of important Biblical key terms like "sacrifice" or "faith;" all fall under contextual assumptions shared by the original author and readers. The meanings of proper names, and the meaning of terms like "Pharisees," unknown in many parts where the knowledge of the Scriptures and education in general have not yet reached, are further examples of such contextual assumptions. The meanings of metaphors are also in this category, for instance when Jesus referred to Herod as "that fox."

   2.2 *Implications or contextual meaning effects,* which are the implicit meanings the Biblical author is inviting the reader to infer from the reading of the text.

   Implicit effects are subdivided into two types: strong and weak implicit effects. Strong implicit effects[11] are those in which the author is inviting only one implicit effect, and only this one implicit meaning is intended. The reader-hearer is given a clue to infer only one implicit meaning. Technically this is called strong communication (Gutt, 1992). This implicit effect is necessary to properly understand the Biblical text. By not being able to "retrieve" this information, by way of speaking, the reader misses some thematic point. For example, in Acts 2:39 Peter refers to "you and your children" and "all who are far off " (NIV rendering). The phrase "you and your children" refers to the addressees as the people of Israel with whom God has made the promises of the covenant. The phrase "those who are far off" are the non-Jews, the Gentiles, the peoples who are not in this covenant relation with God. Peter is not referring to people who are geographically far away; this is not his point. His implication is that this message of the risen Christ and the promise of salvation are now available for *all* people, both Israelites and Gentiles (cf. Bruce, 1952:98-99).[12] This type of strong implicit

[10] This distinction between language-specific and communication-specific implicit information is based on the insight recorded by the policy statement of the New Dutch Translation (NV) committee between language-specific translation issues and text-specific translation issues (*Werk in Uitvoering* 1998: 217–219).

[11] This effect is also called specific, or better still "more specific" information, in which the "communicator takes responsibility for specific contextual implications" (Hill et al. 2007: 75).

[12] One cannot help but wonder if Paul's use of "near" in the clause "The Lord is near" in Philippians 4.5 does not have the same implication, namely of covenantal accessibility. The Lord is near in the sense that he is accessible, his covenant promises are in force and applicable. This interpretation will make irrelevant the debate whether "near" is to be interpreted as either temporal or geographical.

effect sometimes involves thematic information as well, crucial implicit information the reader must grasp in order to understand the point. If the reader cannot make this inference without extra clues, the translators need to provide those clues to make the meaning of the translation accessible. Translations differ in the extent to which they give clues to this type of implicit effect.

Weak implicit effects[13] are those in which the author invites more than one, even many, implicit effects. Several interpretations are possible; for instance, "quiet waters" in Psalm 23:2, "by quiet waters he leads me," has more than one implicit effect: it could mean peace of heart, tranquility of circumstances, rest in pleasant surroundings, relief from thirst, coolness, and more. A whole world of impressions is created in the mind of the reader. It is the genius of the poet to evoke with so few words so many possible effects. To understand all these different meaning possibilities is not crucial to understand the text. If a reader picks up only one, the communication is successful. In translation, the difficulty is to translate in such a way that the same effects are achieved when someone reads the passage in the receptor language. Translation types differ to the degree in which they evoke this type of implicit effect, and to the extent to which they make these weak implicit effects explicit.

An example from Genesis 12:8 may illustrate the points made above. Literally, Genesis 12:8b reads "and Abram … called upon the name of the Lord." This fixed expression, repeated several times in Genesis (4:26; 13:4; 21:33; 26:25) contains some examples of explicatures and implicatures. Three pragmatic processes take place in this communication (using Relevance Theory terminology):

1. an explicature (which is language-specific, linguistic implicit information),
2. an implicature which is a contextual assumption, and
3. an implicature which is a contextual effect.

The explicature in this clause is the relationship between the verb "call" and the phrase "upon the name of the Lord." The lexical meaning and the contextual usage of the verb "call" here is wider than only calling someone, or calling a name of someone. Several translations have "called on the Name of the Lord" (cf., NIV). NRSV also used the phrase "invoke the name of the Lord" (cf., Keil-Delitzsch, Pentateuch, p. 120). An alternative rendering is supplied in a NIV footnote: "to proclaim the Lord's name." An implicature that is a contextual effect of this clause is that Abram (and others) probably employed the variety of means to interact with the Godhead, like making sacrifices to the Lord, invoking the Lord, meditating on the Lord, crying out to the Lord in petition, or giving praise and thanksgiving to the Lord. This clause implies all these possible interpretations. It is a "weak communication" in RT terms, allowing for a variety of interpretations. "Worship" seems to be a close equivalent in English. But there is a further aspect of the meaning of this clause that needs to be explored, the meaning of "the name." Name here refers to more than merely a proper name, it refers to the revealed identity of the Lord as well (cf., Keil-Delitzsch, Pentateuch, p. 120). It is a contextual assumption which original readers would have understood. Many versions did not translate this concept at all and took "the name of the Lord" as equivalent to just "the Lord" (NET, NLT, TEV, CEV, GW, cf., Translators Notes on Genesis).

These different categories of implicit information will be one of the criteria used to distinguish the four translation types. In the next section some of the adjustments that translators typically make to render translations more explicit or to exploit more of the features of the receptor language, are developed.

4. Classifying some of the adjustments that distinguish between translation types

As pointed out above, to meaningfully differentiate between translation types, we will need criteria to help distinguish more clearly between the various degrees of explicitness. But where are such criteria to be

[13]Also called "less specific communication" in the Hill et al. 2007 trial edition, where the speaker allows the audience more responsibility for any particular contextual implications (p. 75).

found? What are the things that differ in the range of literal to more functional to more dynamic to free translation?

Eight criteria are proposed, based on a perception of certain variables observed in several European language translations.

1. order of clauses and phrases
2. sentence length
3. reference disambiguation and tracking
4. concordance of lexical items
5. key terms and unknown terms
6. figurative usage and idioms
7. transition marking
8. information structure

Explicatures or language-specific implicit information that explains the differences between the source language and receptor language are generally the syntactic and discourse pragmatic differences between the source language and receptor language, but not exclusively so. The order of clauses and phrases and sentence length is not directly related to implicit information, but they can have implicit effects.[14]

The semantic criteria, in turn, are mostly in the area of explicatures and contextual assumptions. The full meanings of lexical items are implicit contextual assumptions, and translations make this type of information available in different degrees to the reader-hearers. Key terms and unknown terms (from the receptor language's perspective) fall in the same category of contextual assumptions as do most idioms. Figurative language is again used for implicit meaning effects, the third subcategory of implicit information.[15]

Transition marking and information structure issues are in the area of discourse-pragmatics, dealing with the finding of equivalence between source language and receptor language discourse features and what types of adjustments are needed. Translations differ in the way these discourse features are handled.

These eight criteria do not claim to be exhaustive; they only claim to cover a significant percentage of the instances where translation types differ. These criteria will now be defined in more detail.

4.1 Order of clauses and phrases

Here the difference in degree is from strict correspondence of source language clause orders, to slight order adjustments for more naturalness and readability, to total disregard of the original clause order. The order of nouns in a list, which varies according to the language, is also included within this parameter (for example, male before female referents). This parameter is sometimes closely related to the next one, namely sentence length. Once a translator does not feel bound by the original order of clauses, restructuring of clauses takes place, which has a direct effect on sentence length.

In the two English renderings of Psalm 23:3 below, the phrase "for his Name's sake" appears at different positions in the sentence. The first has the order of the Hebrew:

> He guides me in paths of righteousness for his name's sake (NIV)
> For his name's sake he guides me in the right paths (REB)

4.2 Sentence length

By long sentences is meant not only very wordy single clause sentences, but especially multi-clause sentences, and complex sentences with complementation and/or relativization. Very long clauses with only one predicate can be unnatural in many languages. In the original very long multi-clause sentences might have been fine for the original readers, but a literal rendering makes for cumbersome reading in other

[14]Normally weak effects, but strong meaning effects are frequent too.
[15]A strict categorization of the seven criteria in the three main implicit information categories is not possible, but such a generalistic categorization is enough for the purposes of this paper.

languages. Shorter sentences are read much more easily, especially by new or inexperienced readers. Paul's twelve-verse long sentence in Ephesians 1 is a case in point. Even a modern literal translation like the NRSV only has a full stop at the end of verse 4, while the NLT has it at the end of verse 3. The translator, however, needs to be careful to not just dismiss long sentences out of hand. According to Callow (2000, personal communication), Paul uses long sentences in eulogies, starting with the phrase *eulogētos ho theos*. Compare, for example, 1 Peter 1:3–10–12 and 2 Cor. 1:1–7. The issue before the translator is to find out how eulogies can be most appropriately and idiomatically handled in the receptor language. Archaic literal translations normally kept the long sentences.[16]

4.3 Reference disambiguation and tracking

Languages differ in the way participants are referred to and tracked in narratives and other genres. Some languages refer to main participants only by means of pronouns; others prefer to make use of full nouns and even demonstratives with the nouns, as in some Bantu languages. Thematic and non-thematic participants are referred to by different patterns.

For instance, in the narrative of Jesus walking on the water, Mark 6:45–56, the Greek does not have a single full proper name reference to Jesus. The name Jesus occurs for the last time in verse 30, at the beginning of the previous episode of Jesus feeding the five thousand. Translations differ in the way they disambiguate and track participants. Some stay as close as possible to the source language, others are less constrained by such source language patterns and rather follow receptor language patterns.

4.4 Concordance of lexical items

By concordance is meant the maintaining of the same word for each source language equivalent where it appears. The study of semantics teaches us that word meanings are determined from their contexts. Sometimes words have only one sense, but often they have more than one sense. This is known as polysemy and is especially found in words rich in Biblical meanings, which sometimes have several senses. Concordance[17] can be handled in different ways in translation: from full concordance (one source language word, one receptor language word, regardless of sense differences); to limited concordance (one source language word, few receptor language words according to sense differences); to minimal concordance; to no concordance at all (that is, a full context-sensitive translation with no attempt to maintain any polysemy concordance at all). In limited concordant translations, the different senses of the lexical item in the Greek, for example, are identified, and one equivalent in the original for that sense is then consistently applied. When there is no attempt at any concordance at all, the context *only* will determine the choice of rendering. For instance, the "kingdom of God" will be rendered in the way the context requires. No attempt is made to use even one equivalent word for each distinct sense of a word with polysemy in the original. The result will be a variety of renderings where a limited concordant translation will only give a few for one source language term, and full concordant ones only one rendering.[18]

For example, *sarx* in the Greek in literal translations will only have one equivalent in literal translations, namely 'flesh'. In the more limited-concordant translations, *sarx* will consistently be translated either as 'human/humanity', or 'sinful nature', or 'physical body' or 'descent' or 'sexual desire', for example. On the other hand, a translation that follows the principle of context-sensitivity, might have eight, ten or more different renderings for *sarx*, with the most appropriate rendering for a verse based on the degree of explicitness the translator wants to achieve.

[16]See for example the KJV and the JFA Bibles.
[17]For understanding the concept of the degrees of concordance, see *Werk in Uitvoering*, 247–248. See also Brown and Hoyle 2005:Parameter 21: Lexical concordance.
[18]The issue of concordant translations is a burning issue for a more educated Bible-reading audience. As a rule, the more experienced the audience is in Bible-reading, the greater the desire for a more concordant translation.

4.5 Biblical key terms and unknown concepts in terms or phrases

This criterion is related to the previous criterion of concordance, with the focus not only on concepts that are key terms of the Biblical themes in Scripture, but also on concepts that are either unknown in the receptor language culture, or concepts that are more or less known, but difficult to define and apply. For example, Biblical key terms like *sacrifice*, *holiness*, *salvation*, etc., fall in this category. The difference in degree here is between strict literal correspondence of source terms and phrases, sometimes disregarding the effect on the reader; to slight amplifications; to periphrastic representations; to elaborate descriptions where reader considerations are overriding. This parameter is related to the degree of making explicit the implicit information connected with a particular concept.

Form-based translations will try to find a one-on-one correspondent word to translate unknown or difficult concepts in the receptor language. But translations can be very inconsistent in this regard. It often depends on the repertoire of terms the receptor language has ready for use in the translation. If there are only a few available, many terms will need to be made more explicit by slight amplification (for example 'the *river* Nile' instead of only 'the Nile'), periphrastic representations (for example the Mwani[19] 'house of sacrifices' for the 'temple'; or 'the Human from heaven' for 'Son of man'), or by more elaborate descriptions. Literal translations will avoid amplification, periphrastic constructions, or descriptions, but free translations will use such mechanisms to make unknown concepts clearer for the reader. That is not to say that literal translations will never use amplifications, nor that free translations will never use one-on-one correspondent words. In between the two "poles" any range of variation that is possible or called for by the translation type may be used by the translator or required by the audience. Nevertheless, translations will tend to prefer a certain method of handling unknown terms, in spite of the fact that the method may be applied inconsistently at times. For instance, the phrase "ways of righteousness" in Psalm 23:3 means "path of rightness" in terms of ways that are in line with God's law or divine order. However, the term *tsedeq* in Hebrew is an example of a word that activates several contextual assumptions and can have many implicit meaning effects. "Path of rightness" evokes more than only "the morally right path." It can also evoke concepts of covenant faithfulness, fulfillment of expectations, and excellence of condition (right path = best path). This can be translated in a variety of ways in Mwani, as illustrated below:

Njira ya shariya	'path of rightness'
Njira za haki	'legitimate ways'
Njira ngema futi-futini	'extremely good path(s)'
Kankunitafuti sana-sana	'He is dealing with me very, very well'

4.6 Figurative usage and idioms

Figurative usage means figures of speech like metaphors, simile, metonymy, hyperbole, etc. Idioms are language-specific sayings (like proverbial expressions) and language-specific constructions (like double negatives, demonstrative usage, etc.). Translators' choices would vary between the literal transfer of source language figures of speech and idioms, to amplified literal renderings, to functional equivalents, to meaning explanations, to total and free restatements in the receptor language.

An example is found in Gen 14:23, where the Hebrew idiom "not even a thread and sandlestrap" has been slightly modified by a functional equivalent in the Mwani translation:

> *…anta luzi wala singano*
> (back translation: …not even a thread or a needle)

The Mwani 'not even a thread or needle' is more idiomatic than the literal or direct resembling 'thread and sandalstrap', as an example of a functional equivalent idiom.

[19]Mwani is a Bantu (G40) language spoken by 80,000 people in Cabo Delgado province, northern Mozambique.

4.7 Transitions between paragraphs and sentences (and verses).

This criterion can also be called "boundary marking" or "segmentation marking." It has to do with the so-called boundary features that occur at the transitions between different sections in a discourse, but not only that. It refers especially to words or phrases that link paragraphs and sentences, connectives like logical conjunctions between propositions (for example *when, because, if, although*, etc.) and connectives that are transitions between paragraphs (like *therefore, then, but, however*, etc.).

The degree of differentiation here ranges from literally following source text connectives—even if they are not natural in the receptor language—to an inconsistent use of source language and receptor language transitions; to a total reworking of transitions to the extent that in some places source language transitions are not translated at all; and in other places receptor language-driven transitions appear where there is nothing corresponding in the source text.

For example, the Hebrew *waw* has been translated in many different senses: 'and', 'then', 'but', 'therefore', 'moreover'. The problem is not that *waw* has these senses as part of its meaning, but its core meaning of "and" is open and unmarked enough to allow for a range of uses. The places where it does not just mean "and" are instances of language-specific implicit inferences that can be made from the text, the so-called explicatures. The information flow and the logical theme flow allow for a countering 'but' or a resultative 'therefore' interpretation, depending on the context. In a literal translation like the KJV or Portuguese JFA, the *waw* is consistently translated by 'and'. This is generally seen only in older, very literal translations. A modern literal translation like the NRSV has significantly moved away from a consistent translation of source language connectives.

4.8 Information structure

Languages differ in the way already-established information and new information interact with each other. Established (or presupposed) participants are topics, and focus has to do with the new information or the information that is asserted in a proposition. Topics as well as focus structures are syntactically ordered in clauses.[20] In many of the world's languages, established information or a topic typically precedes the comment made about it. In many VSO languages, like Biblical Hebrew, the normal place for established subjects is following the verb. But subjects are sometimes fronted before the verb, and even topical objects can be fronted before the verb. More than one constituent can even be fronted. Languages differ in the way information is "packaged."[21] For example, English has a cleft-construction to mark contrastive focus:

> "Are you looking for the book or the pen?"
> "It is the book that I was looking for." (the book and not the pen)

The clefted constituent "book" has contrastive focus, followed by a relative clause. Biblical Hebrew does not have such cleft constructions. The pragmatic function of contrastive focus is marked by fronting rather than a cleft construction.

For example, new participants in Biblical Hebrew are often introduced by fronting the subject noun before the verb, like Genesis 3:1:

> *The-serpent* was-more-crafty than all the animals of the field.

In Hebrew, a VSO language, subjects normally follow the verb. But in Gen. 3:1, the noun "the-serpent" is fronted before the verb in the clause that for the very first time in the discourse introduces the actor. Languages differ in the way topical participants are introduced, and since languages sometimes overlap in their information packaging strategies, it is then possible just to follow the packaging order of the source language when one translates. In Bible translation, the packaging order of the Greek and Hebrew texts have often been copied, and in some cases this is still acceptable, though not necessarily an idiomatic word order in the receptor language. Information structure ordering is a significant criterion for comparing different

[20]For a thorough yet brief introduction to information structure and topic and focus, see Dooley and Levinsohn (2001). Lambrecht (1994) is a good starting point of current thinking on information structure from a functional perspective.
[21]This term by Wallace Chafe (1976) and Vallduví and Engdahl (1996).

translation renderings to determine where on the continuum of proximity to source language form the translation features and whether a translation is more source language-oriented, or more receptor language-oriented. Translations differ widely with regard to information structure. Literal translations will resemble source language word-order and information structure configuration as much as possible. On the other end of the continuum, the source language word-order and information structure will be disregarded. In more literal translations, the syntactic configurations and word-order of the original is sometimes followed, even if it sounds slightly unnatural.

5. The four translation types proposed and compared

The proposed eight criteria to measure types show how complex is the whole matter of differentiating translation types. But equipped with these criteria, an attempt can be made to propose the four translation types. In this paper I classify some current translations and try to describe the characteristics of each type. Following most translation theorists as set out in section 1, two major or macro translation types are distinguished. Influenced by Gutt (2000), I will call these two general types *direct* versus *indirect* translations, or alternatively, *resemblant* versus *interpretative* translations. These two types are subdivided into four different translation types, by two axes. One axis is the degree of adjustments away from the original form, designated here as the contrast between *closer* and more *open*. In other words, some translation types have fewer adjustments of the source language forms and are therefore closer or tighter, and others have made more adjustments and so are more open or free. The other axis is the degree of resemblance to the semantic content, from more *resembling* the semantics of the source language message to more *interpreting* and making the message more explicit. Both axes are continua; it is a matter of degree.

Under direct resemblant translations, I propose the following two subtypes:

Type 1: Close resemblant translation
Type 2: Open resemblant translation

And under indirect resemblant or interpretative translations, I propose two subtypes:

Type 3: Close interpretative translation
Type 4: Open interpretative translation

A table sets the axes out more clearly:

Table 1: The translation type grid

	Close	Open
Resemblant	Type 1. Close resemblant	Type 2. Open resemblant
Interpretative	Type 3. Close interpretative	Type 4. Open interpretative

Close resemblant and open resemblant translations are of the direct type, in Gutt's terms. Close interpretative and open interpretative translations are of the indirect translation type. Open interpretative translations are also called free translations, and going a step further, they become paraphrases. No clear breaks between types 2 and 3 exist, however, as we will see below. Rather type 3 forms something of a transition between the two macro-types of direct and indirect. The four translation types differ to the degree that they make implicit information explicit, and to the degree that they make adjustments in the receptor language vis-à-vis the original form in order to take better advantage of receptor language features. The differences in the degree of resemblance and explicitness for the four types can be laid out in the following summary:

1. Close resemblant translation – maximum form resemblance with minimal explicitness
2. Open resemblant translation – generally maximum form resemblance with some explicatures made explicit
3. Close interpretative translation – some limited form resemblance, significant interpretative resemblance, with significant and even optimal explicitness
4. Open interpretative translation – little or no form resemblance, extensive interpretative resemblance, also with optimal explicitness

The four types also differ in the degree that they make syntactic, semantic, and discourse-pragmatic adjustments to the original form, as per the following summary:

1. Close resemblant translation – zero or minimal adjustments
2. Open resemblant translation – some adjustments
3. Close interpretative translation – considerable adjustments
4. Open interpretative translation – maximal adjustments

Recently the terms "literary[22] translation" and "concordant[23] translation" have been raised in terms of translation styles. How do these terms fit in with the four types proposed? Literary translations seem to be either open resemblant or close interpretative translations. The close resemblant type is excluded because the requirements of literal translation put too many restrictions on exploiting the literary features of the receptor language. The open interpretative translation type, in its turn, does not easily accommodate the need to represent or at least compensate for the complex literary features of the original.

Literary translations:

1 Close resemblant | 2 Open resemblant 3 Close interpretative | 4 Open interpretative

Concordant translations put a high premium on full concordance or at least a consistent limited concordance. Only close and open resemblant translations would qualify.

Concordant translations:

| 1 Close resemblant 2 Open resemblant | 3 Close interpretative 4 Open interpretative

The four different types are now to be more clearly defined and distinguished from each other.

5.1 Type 1: Close resemblant translation

Close resemblant translations are fully form-oriented, in the sense that both the source language meaning and form are followed as the guide.[24] Close semantic resemblance is the goal and the minimum of adjustments are made to make the translation readable. A close resemblant translation is a source—language-sensitive translation, with no attempt to make source language implicit information explicit, except when some language-specific linguistic explicit information is required to prevent ungrammatical forms in the receptor language. Some minimal adjustment will be necessary; otherwise the translation will only be an interlinear translation. By nature of being a translation, communicating the meaning of the original is primary, but not primary to the extent that original grammatical and semantic forms (like idiomatic expressions) are disregarded or adjusted when successful communication for certain audiences is at risk. The receptor language idiom is disregarded except where grammatical correctness requires it.

Close resemblant translations represent one end of the continuum, the extreme side of formal correspondence to the source language. As an aside, two subtypes can be distinguished here: archaic literal and modern literal. An archaic literal translation is either one that was done some time ago, in which the language and style reflect older forms in the receptor language, or it can be a recent translation in which the translators have followed a literal translation approach together with the use of old vocabulary and syntax, and even old figures of speech in the receptor language. A modern literal translation uses current vocabulary and syntax, but is heavily constrained by the source forms. Examples of literal translations are:

- Archaic close resembling versions: King James Version, João Ferreira Almeida (Portuguese), Statenvertaling (Dutch)
- Modern close resembling versions: New King James Version, New Revised Standard Version, New American Standard Bible, English Standard Version

[22]Compare to Wendland (2002).
[23]Compare to Van der Merwe.
[24]As a matter of fact, the term "meaning-based" translation versus "form-based" translation is not altogether correct. All translation is supposed to be "meaning-based." Meaning is what translation is all about, be it literal or free. The issue is the orientation to the forms of the source text and language. To what degree should they be maintained or not?

A close resemblant translation is one in which the form of the source language is followed as much as possible within the limits of intelligibility. It would be wrong to say that a literal translation is a word-for-word translation. An exact word-for-word translation is an interlinear translation, and it is unlikely to make immediate sense to the reader not familiar with the source language.

In the tables above, we see that the Type 1 translation in terms of form resemblance is oriented towards maximum resemblance, and adjustments are made towards explication and other source language forms only when absolutely required by the receptor language grammar. In the syntactic adjustment comparison tables above, we see that a close resemblant translation directly follows the source language's phrase and clause order and sentence length. It also prefers to have one-to-one correspondent terms for key terms and unknown terms. In figures of speech, the source language forms are represented literally. There is also full, or almost full, lexical concordance, especially in the area of key terms. The different senses of terms (polysemy), and the underlying meaning of figures and idioms are often disregarded to maintain as close as possible proximity to the source language. Minimal attempts are made to translate discourse features like the tracing of participants according to receptor language requirements. Form proximity, or formal correspondence, is the overruling orientation. In some cases, as in certain editions of the KJV, grammar-required explications like ellipsis are printed in italics to show the reader that those words do not have a corresponding equivalent in the source text. However, it is necessary to remember that even among close resemblant translations, there are degrees of literalness.

5.2 Type 2: Open resemblant translation

An open resemblant translation is a translation that is oriented to semantic resemblance of the original as much as possible, but at the same time making some limited adjustments to render the translation more idiomatic and communicative.

In terms of the resemblance orientation, Type 2 mostly pursues semantic content resemblance, with only very occasional interpretation. In terms of the degree of explication and adjustments of the original syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic forms, a policy of minimal explication and minimal adjustments is pursued, just enough to make the translation into relatively clear and idiomatic language.

Concerning explicatures expressed, some semantic adjustments are made: minimal Biblical key term concordance is pursued, with attempts to find equivalents for the different subsenses. In a very few cases, choice of terms will be driven only by the context and will disregard any concordance. Unknown terms are generally minimally adjusted for clearer communication. In terms of idioms and figures of speech, there is some literal semantic resemblance, but also some minimal interpretation if a certain passage requires it. In the case of implicatures made explicit, contextual assumptions (premises) are not made explicit in Type 2 translations, nor are contextual conclusions (effects).

Syntactic adjustments, sentence length as well as clause order, are readily adjusted and changed for better communication.

In terms of discourse-pragmatic adjustments, participant reference tracking is sometimes clarified, sentence and paragraph transitions are adjusted to be more in line with the receptor language, and information structure adjustments are made, when the translators are aware of these types of adjustments.

A Type 2 translation is basically a direct or resembling translation that, although guided by source language form, is willing to take some limited steps to open it up in terms of using receptor language features for better communicability. The difference from a Type 1 translation is most readily noticed in the syntactic and explicature explications like concordance, unknown terms, and figures of speech. The difference between Type 1 and Type 2 is also seen in the more natural language of the Type 2 version as exemplified by discourse-pragmatic adjustments.

Examples of Type 2 translations are: REB (Revised English Bible), NIV (New International Version), New Jerusalem Bible, NVI (Nova Versão Internacional; Portuguese NIV), and to some extent, the new Dutch (2004) translation, which shows signs of Type 3 as well. The NIV is generally a Type 2, with a style that seems occasionally Type 1 or Type 3. The NET is similarly a Type 2 with occasional Type 1 and Type 3 renderings.

5.3 Type 3: Close interpretative translation

A Type 3 translation has some resemblance to the original semantic content, but is basically an interpretative translation in spite of the fact that its level of interpretation is still constrained and limited. The degree of explication of the original, both semantic and pragmatic, can be described as the maximum necessary explication, and in terms of syntactic, semantic and discourse-pragmatics adjustments, Type 3 has considerable, even maximal, adjustments.

Concerning semantic adjustments, Type 3 follows a general policy of limited concordance, by sense only, and is similar to Type 2 in this regard. It follows limited concordance, but it is even less concordant than a Type 2 translation, allowing more freedom. Unknown terms are somewhat adjusted for clearer communication, and the same is true for idioms and figures of speech, where some occasional literal resemblance to the semantic content can still be observed. On the whole, however, a more interpretative resemblance is the order of the day. A figure of speech can be rendered literally if it is meaningful; otherwise a functional equivalent or an explicit meaning of the figure is given.

In terms of implicatures made explicit, only a few contextual assumptions (premises) are made explicit, sometimes even none. The same is true for contextual effects or conclusions. In terms of syntactic adjustments made, sentence length is readily adjusted, a feature that all types from Type 2 to 4 readily make, and sometimes even Type 1. Clause order is also readily changed, much more than Type 2, and this may be one of the most important distinctives between Type 2 and Type 3.

In terms of discourse-pragmatic adjustments, participant reference disambiguation is frequent, as are proper receptor language-required transitions. Receptor language packaging is dominant. Connectives and transitions generally follow the receptor language requirements, although attempts are made to find equivalents for the source language forms. Information structure equivalence is a mixture.

What are the differences between Type 2 and Type 3? The distinction is less obvious than between other types, but at the same time it is the most crucial for many translation projects in Africa. Churches tend to request a more literal version, whereas the demands of the language, the translation team, and the background knowledge of the target audience require more explication. So many translations, at least in Africa, reflect a choice between Types 2 and 3 and they are often mixtures of the two. It is therefore necessary to give special attention to the differences, however fuzzy, between these two types. On the surface it may seem to be a matter of degree of explicitness only, but using the criteria set out, a few specific—but fundamental—differences can be pinpointed. The foundational difference is that Type 2 directly resembles the semantic content, and Type 3 translations indirectly resemble the original semantic content. Type 3 is an interpretative translation, aiming to communicate well in the receptor language; it is a question of primary orientation, of priority. Type 3 translations primarily follow receptor language meaning requirements, while attempting to stay as close as possible to source language forms. Type 2 translations, by contrast, primarily follow meaning and form proximity of the original, while secondly they make the most of idiomatic language use. Like Type 2, Type 3 is a bit of a mixture. Where proximity to original clause order can be maintained, a Type 3 will do so, but as a whole it is freer to follow more natural and idiomatic clause order than Type 2. With unknown terms, figurative speech, and idioms, Type 2 tends to be more constrained by the form of the original, while Type 3 is more unrestrained, quicker to adapt to making the meaning more explicit. With Type 3 translations, it is harder to detect the underlying original semantic forms than would be the case with Type 2. Type 2 is still a proximate translation, closer to the original semantic content: not so Type 3.

Examples of Type 3 translations are: New Living Translation, Good News Bible (TEV), Portuguese Boa Nova, 1983 Afrikaans translation, God's Word to the Nations.

5.4 Type 4: Open interpretative translation

In Type 4 translations, which can also be called free translations, the semantic resemblance orientation to the original is minimal but extensive interpretative resemblance is the rule. The degrees of explication and adjustments of the original syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic forms are maximal, and even some implicatures are made explicit. The semantic 'what' has been translated to the full, not the 'how it was said'

in the original. The source language form is disregarded as much as possible, at times to the extreme. Translating for complete clarity as well as reader effect has been an important motivation.

In terms of semantic adjustments, Type 4 translations follow limited concordance, normally by sense only, but often even beyond that to no concordance at all, preferring a full context-sensitive approach to words. Unknown terms and key terms are freely adjusted for clearer communication, and the same is true for idioms and figures of speech. There is no literal resemblance; maximum interpretative resemblance is the policy. For instance, the word *sarx* 'flesh' is rendered in many more ways than only the five or six senses it has. Periphrastic representations and elaborate descriptions are used wherever needed. One-on-one correspondence is avoided as far as possible where complex terms are foreign to the receptor audience. Figures of speech are rendered maximally explicit, with metaphors or metonymies often totally unpacked. Resemblance to the literal source language forms of idioms and figures is avoided.

In terms of implicatures made explicit: quite a few assumptions are made explicit, more than in any of the other types. Some contextual effects are made explicit, also more than in any of the other types.

Type 4 translations consistently follow the demands of receptor language clause order and sentence length; thus, appropriate syntactic adjustments are made. In terms of discourse-pragmatic adjustments, participant reference disambiguation is freely done, and receptor language transitions are freely inserted and adjusted according to receptor language needs. Information structure adjustments are also freely done.

Type 4 differs from Type 3 in that the original semantic content is no longer easily detected in Type 4, whereas in Type 3 translations a little of the form resemblance is still observable. In Type 4, receptor language and receptor culture needs totally overshadow any semantic resemblance to the original. Type 4 translations will also not maintain any lexical concordance, or will do so only minimally. Type 4 breaks totally free from any form resemblance, and makes significant adjustments to the syntactic, semantic, and discourse-pragmatic form of the original. This type even attempts to make explicit some of the contextual assumptions, often in the text itself, and occasionally some contextual effects. Generally the adjustments are in the explicature domain.

Examples of open interpretative translations are CEV (Contemporary English Version), and the Portuguese "Bíblia na Linguágem de Hoje." The "Living Bible" is generally Type 4, but also a step beyond Type 4 towards a paraphrase. The same can be said for The Message.

6. Summary: the tables comparing the types

Table 2: The summary of translation types

	Type 1: Close resemblant	Type 2: Open resemblant	Type 3: Close interpretative	Type 4: Open interpretative
RESEMBLANCE ORIENTATION to the original semantic content	full content resemblance; code-level resemblance	mostly content resemblance, occasional interpretative resemblance; explicature-level resemblance	some content resemblance, more but still limited interpretative resemblance; limited interpretation-level resemblance	extensive interpretative resemblance; significant interpretation-level resemblance
DEGREE OF EXPLICATION & ADJUSTMENTS of the original syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic forms	none, or strictly those required by the receptor language grammar to make sense	minimal explication, some adjustments	maximal explication, considerable, even optimal, adjustments	maximal explication, optimal adjustments, some implicatures made explicit (assumptions and conclusions)

The criteria tables:

Table 3: Explicatures expressed

	Type 1: Close resemblant	Type 2: Open resemblant	Type 3: Close interpretative	Type 4: Open interpretative
Concordance	full concordance	limited concordance: by senses only	mixture limited concordance by senses, and context-driven	minimal concordance: mostly by senses and context-driven
Unknown terms and historicity	maintained	minimally adjusted for clearer communication	Maximally adjusted for clearer communication	generally not maintained
Idioms and figures of speech	literal resemblance of semantic content	some literal resemblance of semantic content; also minimal interpretative resemblance	minimal literal resemblance; maximal interpretative resemblance	no literal resemblance; maximal interpretative resemblance

Table 4: Implicatures made explicit or not

	Type 1: Close resemblant	Type 2: Open resemblant	Type 3: Close interpretative	Type 4: Open interpretative
Assumptions (premises)	no	no	no or minimal	yes, maximal
Conclusions (effects)	no	no	no	yes, but rarely

Table 5: Syntactic adjustments made or not

	Type 1: Close resemblant	Type 2: Open resemblant	Type 3: Close interpretative	Type 4: Open interpretative
Sentence length	no	yes	yes	yes
Clause order	no	some	yes	yes

Table 6: Discourse-pragmatic adjustments made or not

	Type 1: Close resemblant	Type 2: Open resemblant	Type 3: Close interpretative	Type 4: Open interpretative
Participant reference	some, when grammatically required	yes	yes	yes
Transitions	no	yes	yes	yes
Information structure	no	no and yes, a mixture	yes and no, a mixture	yes and no

7. Examples of translations in the different types

In this section, four example verses that indicate some of the degrees of resembling, degrees of explicitness, and types of adjustments, are shown. These verses are Matthew 23:2, 1 Timothy 3:16, and James 1:1.

7.1 *Moses' seat* in Matthew 23:2

Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4
Saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat (KJV)	in these words: 'The scribes and the Pharisees occupy Moses' seat; (REB)	"The scribes and the Pharisees teach with Moses' authority. (GW)	The Pharisees and the teachers of the Law are experts in the Law of Moses. (CEV)

The further along on the continuum of explicitness, the more each version elaborates on the religious-cultural phrase of "seat of Moses." Notice that not until the close interpretative translation is an attempt made to make explicit what is for us rather obscure, viz. "seat of Moses" becomes "teaching with Moses' authority" (GW), and "are experts in the Law of Moses" (CEV). Type 1 and Type 2 are very close in form, except for the difference in the verb "sit" versus the less-literal "occupy." The "Scribes" has been unpacked in Type 4 as "teachers," but Type 3 already interpretatively stated that the sitting in Moses' seat actually means to teach.

7.2 *Came in the flesh* and *justified in the Spirit* in 1 Timothy 3:16

Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4
God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit (KJV)	He was manifested in flesh, vindicated in spirit, (REB)	He appeared in human form, was shown to be right by the Spirit, (GNB)	Christ came as a human. The Spirit proved that he pleased God, (CEV)

The KJV follows the original form very closely. As a Type 2, the REB made minimal adjustments: it adjusted the rendering of the literal "justified" to "vindicated," but maintained the resemblant "manifested in flesh." The GNB, a close interpretative Type 3 translation, went a bit further and interpreted "manifest in the flesh" as "appeared in human form" and unpacked "justified" or "vindication" as "was shown to be right by the Spirit." However, notice how the use of the word "right" still has some limited resemblance to "justified." As a Type 4 translation, CEV made no attempt to use the verb "manifest, revealed" and just interpreted the clause as "Christ came as a human;" nor did it make an attempt to bring out some aspect of the verb "justified/vindicated," but rather rendered the clause interpretatively as 'The Spirit proved that he pleased God." Notice also that CEV made two different sentences out of these two short clauses.

7.3 *The twelve tribes in the dispersion* in James 1:1

Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4
James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting. (KJV)	James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, To the twelve tribes scattered among the nations: Greetings. (NIV)	This letter is from James, a slave of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is written to Jewish Christians scattered among the nations. Greetings! (NLT)	From James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ: Greetings to all God's people scattered over the whole world. (TEV)

The versions above progressively bring out more explicit information: The KJV is zero explicit; the NIV made "among the nations" explicit; the NLT goes a few steps further by making explicit the language-specific explicature "it is written" and then explicating the twelve tribes as the Jewish Christians. The NLT also makes "among the nations" explicit. Notice that all three types maintain the order of "Greetings" at the end, a clause order which the TEV changes. The TEV goes one step further in explication by amplifying "in the dispersion" to "over the whole world." TEV also gives a more generic rendering of "God's people" for the Greek "twelve tribes," instead of NLT's more limited explicit rendering of "Jewish Christians." There are adjustment differences among the types as well: the introduction of the name James as the author

in a more receptor-culture-friendly manner, for instance, and the placing of the greeting. The one sentence in the KJV has also been divided differently in the other types, except Type 2 which maintained one sentence.

8. Comparison of the types in terms of qualities of translations

Good translations have been defined as having the following qualities: accuracy, clarity, naturalness, and acceptability to the churches (Barnwell 1986). The following table compares the four types in terms of the qualities of a good translation.

Table 7: Comparison of translation qualities

	Type 1	**Type 2**	**Type 3**	**Type 4**
Level of clarity	meaning sometimes more difficult to retrieve because of unnatural idiom	meaning, even the deeper meaning, is clear or at least accessible, but sometimes harder to retrieve	meaning is in most cases relatively clear, but in some cases at the expense of access to deeper or ambiguous meanings*	meaning is generally clear, but at the expense of access to deeper or ambiguous meanings
Level of acceptability with churches	high	(normally) high	slightly lower, unless it is an alternative second Bible in the language complementing others	low, unless it is an alternative Bible in the language complementing others, or unless it is the only Scriptures known in the area
Level of accuracy	high, but meaning sometimes inaccessible	high	high, but some deeper meanings may be less accessible	can be high, but some deeper meanings may be less accessible, or additional explicit or implicit information is introduced
Level of naturalness	low	average, but can be high with skill	can be very high	can be very high

*Especially true in the case where weak or less specific communications, in RT terms, have been translated by strong or more specific communication, thus denying the reader-hearer access to a wide range of possible meanings. Such translation is also the case when a conscious attempt is made to always disambiguate and not leave anything to multiple interpretations.

9. Conclusion

In this paper four Bible translation types have been distinguished, based on the degree of explicitness and adjustments made to make the meaning more accessible, and on the basic orientation towards the source semantic content. These four types are:

1. Type 1, close resemblant translation, also called *literal* translation,
2. Type 2, open resemblant translation, also called *adjusted literal* or *idiomatic literal* translation, but still basically resemblance-oriented,
3. Type 3, close interpretative translation, also called an *idiomatic* or *functional equivalent* translation, but basically an interpretation-oriented translation in a more limited or restricted way,
4. Type 4, open interpretative translation, also called *free* translation or, if even further on the continuum, a *paraphrase.*

In conclusion, in evaluating translations or training translators, it is necessary to stress again that it is not possible to promote or maintain one exact point on the continuum of translation types. It is more a case of translators operating within a range that is acceptable for the type they desire. Furthermore, sometimes only one rendering in a language really hits the spot and most effectively translates the text.[25] This "right" rendering may be close resemblant, open resemblant, close interpreting, or open interpreting. Translators who choose one type are not—and should not—be bound to the features and policies of that type only. Whereas there may be only one really correct rendering for some texts in a specific language, the majority of the Biblical text allows for a variety of styles and translation types. The many English versions available today attest to this point. One underlying translation principle that should be taught much more often is that "there is more than one way to say the same thing." Fine pragmatic nuances may distinguish the different renderings, and it is good for the translators—and blessing for the end readers—if they understand and exploit these nuances. Such decisions can make the difference between merely adequate, generally good, or really excellent translations.

Finally, the mere existence of a variety of translation types shows why it is so important for a language and church community to study the different types and the criteria on the continuum, and to choose where the limits of the degree of resemblance and explicitness should be for their translation. In this area translation consultants can provide meaningful assistance by establishing clear guidelines and policies on translation types early on. Such guidelines will certainly help the translation process along by sharpening the translators' focus and minimizing the amount of time spent on weighing the merits of one translation type with another. However, the question can rightly be asked how a community can "choose a type" when the "right" rendering, as stated in the previous paragraph, may be any one of the types? A valid concern is that choosing a type is rather complex, often intuitive, sometimes subjective, sometimes driven by tradition. Many exceptions and variation and mixture of types will occur in any one translation, but this fact does not make it impossible to select a general type as the guiding policy of the translation project. As a general goal it is possible, and the desirable pattern, notwithstanding the many inconsistencies and exceptions.

[25]I am grateful to Katy Barnwell (personal communication) for this insight.

References

Barnwell, K. 1986. *Bible translation.* Dallas: SIL.

Beekman, J. and Callow J. 1974. *Translating the Word of God.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Blakemore, D. 1992. *Understanding utterances: An introduction to pragmatics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Brown, Rick and Richard Hoyle. 2005. A guide for language programs. ms.

Bruce, F.F. 1952. *The Acts of the Apostles.* London: The Tyndale Press.

Callow, K. 1975. *Discourse considerations in translating the Word of God.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Chafe, W. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In C. Li. (ed.), *Subject and topic,* 25–26. New York: Academic Press.

De Blois, K.F. and Mewe, T. 2002. Functional equivalence and the new Dutch translation project. In Naudé and Van der Merwe, 214–227.

De Vries, Lourens. 2001. Bible translations: Forms and functions. *The Bible Translator* 52(3):306–319.

De Waard, Jan and Nida E.A. 1986. *From one language to another.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Dooley, R.A. and S. H. Levinsohn. 2001. *Analyzing discourse: A manual of basic concepts.* Dallas: SIL.

Ezard, Bryan. 2003. Modified idiomatic translations. ms.

Gutt, E-A. 1987. What is the meaning we translate? *OPTAT* 1(1):31–58.

Gutt, E-A. 1992. *Relevance theory: a guide to successful communication in translation.* Dallas: SIL and New York: UBS.

Gutt, E-A, 2000. *Translation and relevance: Cognition and context* (revised edition). Manchester and Boston: St. Jerome Publishing.

Gutt, E-A. 2004. On the significance of the cognitive core of translation. ms.

Hill, H., Hill, M., Gutt, E-A., Barnwell, K., et al. 2007. Introductory course in communication and translation (trial edition). Dallas: SIL International.

Jordaan, 2002. Problems in the theoretical foundation of the functional equivalent approach. In Naudé and Van Der Merwe, 19–27.

Kiel, C.F. and Delitzsch, F. (Not dated). *Commentary on the Old Testament: Volume 1, The Pentateuch.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Lambrecht, K. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus and the mental representation of discourse referents.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Larson, M. 1984. *Meaning-based translation.* London/Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Mojola, A.O. 2002. Bible translation in Africa: What implications does the new UBS perspective have for Africa? An overview in the light of the emerging new UBS translation initiative. In Naudé and Van Der Merwe 202–113.

Naudé, J.A. and Van der Merwe, C.H.J. (eds.). 2002. *Contemporary translation studies and Bible translation: a South African perspective*. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State, and Cape Town: Bible Society of South Africa.

Nida, E.A. and Taber C.R. 1969. *The theory and practice of translation*: Leiden: Brill.

Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. 1986. *Relevance. cognition and communication*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Vallduvi′, E. and E. Engdahl. 1996. The linguistic realisation of information packaging. *Linguistics* 34:459–519.

Van der Merwe, C.H.J. Konkordante vertaling? ms.

Wendland, E.R. 1991. Culture and the form/function dichotomy in the evaluation of translation acceptability. In *Meaningful translation*. UBS Monograph Series, No. 5, UBS.

Wendland, E.R. 2002. Towards a "literary" translation of the Scriptures: with special reference to a "poetic" rendition. In Naudé and Van der Merwe 164–201.

Werk in Uitvoering (Nieuwe Bijbelvertaling). [Work in progress, New bible translation] 1998. Haarlem: Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap, and s'Hertogenbosch: Katholieke Bijbelstichting.