2. This ecclesial signification of the sacrament of order is inseparable from the more traditional view of orders as signifying configuration to Christ, with the difference that this configuration does not occur within an ordained minister in isolation from that minister's *ordo* within an ecclesial community. The primary configuration to Christ is that of the ecclesial community according to the ordering of the charismata and the participation of that community in the body and blood of Christ. The ordained minister is configured to Christ as the head and representative figure of that community. In other words, the minister is configured both to Christ and to the community, the ecclesial body of Christ.

3. Although a study of the presbyterate is beyond the scope of the present essay, our understanding of this sacrament needs to be realigned according to our understanding of the episcopacy, since the presbyterate is a participation in the episcopacy. The need to retrieve its collegial nature, however, is apparent. Since the particular church is a microcosm of the universal Church, the presbyterate will function somewhat analogously to the college of bishops. However, one theological distinction is the difference in the relationship of presbyters to their bishop from the relationship of the bishops to the bishop of Rome. The bishop of Rome does not possess sacramental ordination beyond that of bishop and is himself a member of the episcopal college. A bishop's ordination, however, does signify an ecclesial reality beyond that signified in presbyteral ordination.

4. If one understands the Church as ordered according to the charismata in 1 Cor 12, Gal 3:28 cannot be interpreted to mean that there is no differentiation within the charismata of the ecclesial body. The Church is indeed the people of God, but a charismatic people. Since office within the Church is itself a charism, it would be false to dichotomize the leadership in the Church and its charismatic elements.[50] Eucharistic presidency will remain an *ordo* within the Church, since it is related to the role of leadership and the responsibility for maintaining communion within the body.

5. The distinction between the priesthood of the laity and the ordained minister does not lie in the fact that one is more configured to Christ than the other, but in their role in relation to the community. The ordained minister, charged with preserving the unity of the ecclesial body, represents it and speaks on its behalf in the name of Christ. Even though this means that the priesthood of the faithful is not the basis for Eucharistic presidency, this does not preclude the fact that the entire

[50] Karl Rahner, *The Dynamic Element in the Church* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964) 13–83. See also Carolyn Osiek, "Relation of Charism to Rights and Duties in the New Testament Church," in *Official Ministry in a New Age* 41–59.

assembly celebrates and offers the liturgy. The ordained minister as representative of the assembly does not function apart from it, but unifies, sums up, and represents both the assembly and its offering. Thus the function of the ordained minister in relation to the worshiping assembly is analogous to that person's function in relationship to the sacrifice of Christ. Both assembly and Christ are "represented" rather than "offered in the place of " or "repeated."

6. The episcopacy is not strictly monarchical in the sense that a bishop functions independently of the college of bishops or in isolation from his college of presbyters. While it is true that episcopal consecration confers a fulness of sacramental power in the bishop's role of teaching and ruling, it can by its very nature be exercised "only in hierarchical communion with the head and members of the college."[51] The supreme exercise of this power is collegial within an ecumenical council.

7. According to the relational and representational view of the episcopacy presented here, the practice of ordaining titular bishops needs re-examination, since it is of the essence of the episcopacy to preside over a church.[52] Bishops exercise authority precisely as heads of Eucharististic communities.

[51] *Lumen gentium* 21.

[52] Karl Rahner argues to the contrary in *Bishops: Their Status and Function* 27–34. His position seems to be limited by an overly territorial identification of particular churches, as well as by the idea that bishops can be ordained for leadership in the universal Church without having direct responsibility for a particular church. This creates a tension between a view of the Church conceived as a "communion of communions," wherein the universal Church is present in each particular church, and a monolithic view of the Church as having an existence over and apart from particular churches.

NOTES

DYNAMIC-EQUIVALENCE TRANSLATIONS RECONSIDERED

Several years ago in the faculty lounge at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky, a colleague was stating that he preaches directly from the Greek New Testament. "All these modern translations of the Bible," he alleged, "put their own interpretation into the translation." "You mean the people where you preach understand Greek?" I asked, playing the role of devil's advocate. "What do you mean?" he replied. "Well," I responded, "you said that you preach right from the Greek text. You mean that you read aloud in Greek?" Flustered and irritated, my colleague shot back at me, "You know what I mean! I just give a literal translation without putting my interpretation into it!"

While I am willing to grant that some translations contain more of the translator's interpretation than others do, I am not prepared to admit that any translation is free of interpretation.[1] Some translations even contain more of the translator's interpretation than is necessary. But that brings us to the question of dynamic-equivalence translations, since a major criticism of such translations is often that they are too paraphrastic and reflect too much the interpretation of the translator. How do we decide how much "interpretation" in the translation is too much? Part of the answer to that question lies in the answer to a previous question: For whom is the translation intended?

Mary Snell-Hornby has recently written that "the extent to which a text is translatable varies with the degree to which it is embedded in its own specific culture, also with the distance that separates the cultural background of source text and target audience in terms of time and place."[2] Snell-Hornby discusses in this same chapter three recent translation theories in Germany. Common to all three is the orientation towards cultural rather than linguistic transfer. They "view translation,

---

[1] I have argued elsewhere that translators must make both textual and exegetical decisions. Exegetical decisions include the meanings of words in their contexts, the punctuation to be used, paragraphing, and decisions about grammatical constructions such as gender and case of nouns. See my "Translations: Text and Interpretation," *Evangelical Quarterly* 57 (1985) 195–210. Translators must sometimes make decisions also about meaning which the receptor language requires, such as inclusive or exclusive first-person plural pronouns, even though the Greek or Hebrew language does not make the distinction required. See my "Can You Get There from Here? Problems in Bible Translation," *Christian Century*, June 22–29, 1988, 605–7.

[2] Mary Snell-Hornby, *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* (Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1988) 41.

not as a process of transcoding, but as an act of communication; ... they are oriented towards the function of the target text (prospective translation) rather than prescriptions of the source text (retrospective translation)."[3] The main criteria are determined by the recipient of the translation and the translation's *specific function*. From this perspective Bible translations should be "prospective" rather than "retrospective." While the practitioners of dynamic-equivalence translations have not used this terminology, the emphasis is not greatly different.

In a June 1989 article in *Theological Studies*, "Contemporary English Translations of Scripture," J. P. M. Walsh raised some serious objections to dynamic-equivalence translations, going so far as to label such efforts as "wrongheaded." In the brief space of this article I wish to respond to Walsh's criticisms, some of which are certainly valid, and to state what I see to be the purpose and value of dynamic-equivalence translations. I write as a translation consultant with the United Bible Societies and have worked extensively with translators in West Africa and with Indian translators in South America.

First, however, a few comments on terminology are in order. Walsh correctly credits Dr. Eugene Nida of the American Bible Society with the use of the principle of dynamic equivalence in Bible translation. But Walsh's quotation from Dahood to give a working definition of dynamic-equivalence translations, or to "sketch the basics of this theory of translation," certainly is not a description which Nida or his United Bible Societies colleagues would accept. According to Dahood, dynamic equivalence "seeks to produce identity of thought without any attempt to retain the forms of the original. Its chief concern is to create in the contemporary reader a response as close as possible to that of the original reader."[4] Precisely because the principle of dynamic-equivalence translation was being misunderstood in this way to mean that no attempt should be made to retain the forms of the original or that anything was acceptable which might have special impact and appeal for receptors today, Nida and his UBS colleague Jan de Waard have proposed that one speak of "functional equivalence."[5] This does not mean that Nida and his colleagues have changed their basic principles of translation as set forth in earlier works such as *Toward a Science of Translating, Theory and Practice of Translation*[6] and in numerous articles in *The Bible*

    [3] Ibid. 43 f.
    [4] Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms* 3: *101–150* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1970) xviii, cited by Walsh 336–37.
    [5] Eugene A. Nida and Jan de Waard, *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating* (Nashville: Nelson, 1986).
    [6] Eugene A. Nida, *Toward a Science of Translating* (Leiden: Brill, 1964), and E. A. Nida and Charles R. Taber, *Theory and Practice of Translation* (Leiden: Brill, 1969).

Translator, a publication of the United Bible Societies. The principle of dynamic-equivalence translations has undergone some development, but it is better to speak of that in terms of refinement rather than as a change in direction. Probably the most serious weakness in the earlier use of the dynamic-equivalence method was the failure to give adequate attention, both in theory and in practice, to discourse considerations and rhetorical processes, but those deficiencies are now being addressed.[7]

Certainly Walsh is correct in observing that often something is lost when we translate words according to the context and thereby eliminate certain kinds of plays on words or thematic developments. The examples which he gives from the parable of the Prodigal Son in Example 4, and from Mk 15:33 in Example 5, are interesting, and the points which he makes are valid. Likewise, his comments on 1 Jn 3:11–21 demonstrate possible dangers in rearranging the order of the text.

So, while recognizing that Walsh does raise some valid and useful questions concerning principles of translation, I am nonetheless perplexed by some of his comments and questions. He writes that "Since such [close] adherence [as possible to the original text] is not always possible, dynamic equivalence seems to offer a way out of difficulties" (337). In the remainder of his article, though, he rejects the use of the dynamic-equivalence principle in favor of formal equivalence. But he never adequately faces the possibility that indeed sometimes close adherence to the original text is *not* possible—if one is concerned to translate meaning and not just the form of the original. To quote from Nida and de Waard:

> Translating involves a constant process of discovering valid functional isomorphs between languages on all levels, in other words, signs and series of signs which will be functionally isomorphic. One must always be on the lookout for so-called "equivalent" words, grammatical structures, and rhetorical features, but in moving from one language to another the equivalences are essentially functional rather than formal. This is precisely why the concept of isomorphic relations becomes so important, since the significance of isomorphs is not their formal resemblance but their functional equivalence.[8]

While formal-equivalence translation of a text should not be rejected solely to make the translation more interesting or more dynamic, neither should formal-equivalence renderings be kept when to do so will cause confusion or misunderstanding. Translators in the Gbaya language of

---

[7] Chapter 6 of *From One Language to Another* (n. 5 above) discusses a number of rhetorical devices such as repetition, rhythm, and irony; and Part 1 of *Issues in Bible Translation,* ed. Philip C. Stine (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988), focuses on discourse studies and Bible translation.

[8] Nida and de Waard, *From One Language to Another* 68.

Cameroon sometimes have had to change direct speech of the biblical text into indirect speech in Gbaya or vice versa. In Gbaya "The most frequent change from direct to indirect occurs in embedded discourse where the last level is usually in indirect form."[9] The structure of Gbaya is simply different from Greek and Hebrew; and in order to avoid ambiguity in Gbaya, it is sometimes necessary to avoid a formal-equivalence translation at the level of reported speech.

Some narrative texts in the OT end with repetition of the main character's name, using a full noun. But in at least two Kru languages of West Africa, use of the person's name at the end of the narrative would be deceptive, since "repetition of the full noun referent of a character tends to suggest that the speaker is poking fun at that character. Thus in Godie folktales, it is the 'loser' who gets his name repeated mercilessly at the end of a story."[10] A translation in Godie sometimes needs to use pronouns even when the Hebrew source text has full nouns, lest the Godie reader misunderstand.

Or, to take an example from English and to answer one of Walsh's questions at the same time, why, indeed, should translators not keep the terms "sixth hour" and "ninth hour" in translations of Mk 15:33 (343)? A formal-equivalence translation will keep "sixth hour" and "ninth hour"; and Walsh's question seems to suggest that a formal-equivalence translation is preferable here. But in the United States at least, the new day begins at 12 a.m., unlike Judaism, where the day began at 6 a.m. Though the average native speaker of American English will not refer to 6 a.m. as "the sixth hour," nonetheless the person who hears the words "the sixth hour" will assume that this is the sixth hour of the day beginning at midnight or 12 a.m. But the sixth hour in Mark's Gospel does not mean 6 a.m. It means noon. Anyone not familiar with the Jewish method of reckoning time in the period of the NT would have no way of knowing that "sixth hour" means "noon." One does not change the meaning of the text by using the word "midday" and "three in the afternoon." To quote again from Nida and de Waard, "Functional equivalence, however, means thoroughly understanding not only the meaning of the source text but also the manner in which the intended receptors of a text are likely to understand it in the receptor language."[11] To refer again to the work of Snell-Hornby, the orientation is toward the function of the target text.

Walsh states (337) that the principle of dynamic equivalence is most

[9] Philip A. Noss, "Quotation, Direct, Indirect and Otherwise in Translation," in *Issues in Bible Translation* 138.

[10] Lynell Marchese Zogbo, "Advances in Discourse Study and Their Application to the Field of Translation," ibid. 18.

[11] *From One Language to Another* 9.

attractive once certain premises are granted. One of those premises is that "the message of the Bible must be gotten across to people of every culture and language. It must be 'translatable.' " While that premise would no doubt be granted by most translation consultants of the United Bible Societies, I know of no consultant who takes the additional step of understanding this to mean "that the Bible can be rendered intelligible to people just as they are, without more . . . . No mediation, or minimal mediation, is required—no explanation or instruction about matters peculiar to the world of the Bible, whether geographical, cultural, historical, linguistic, social, economic, or even botanical and zoological" (337).

This is at best a caricature of what one hopes to achieve through a dynamic-equivalent translation. Without question, even the best of dynamic-equivalent translations will leave many things unintelligible to the reader. At the same time, one must acknowledge that no amount of mediation will make some texts intelligible in a formal-equivalence translation to one who is not a biblical scholar.

Let us look at the pericope concerning the payment of the temple tax in Mt 17:24 ff., especially verses 24–25. The RSV provides a formal-equivalence translation of these verses: "When they came to Capernaum, the collectors of the half-shekel tax went up to Peter and said, 'Does not your teacher pay the tax?' He said, 'Yes.' And when he came home, Jesus spoke to him first, saying. . . ."

First, the Greek text of verse 24 begins with a genitive-absolute construction which makes clear that the collectors of the half-shekel tax cannot be the ones who came to Capernaum. A formal-equivalence translation in English, using pronouns where pronouns are used in Greek, completely changes the meaning. The most natural antecedent in English for the pronoun "they" is "the collectors of the tax." The NAB NT, in both the first edition and the revised edition, is ambiguous in English at best and misleading at worst. A dynamic-equivalence translation removes the ambiguity which exists in English (but not in Greek) when a literal translation is made. The GNB translates as follows: "When Jesus and his disciples came to Capernaum, the collectors of the Temple tax came to Peter. . . ." Similar translations are found in the dynamic-equivalence translations in German, French, and Spanish.[12]

Secondly, the Greek literally talks of collectors of the half-shekel tax, as the RSV translates. To their credit, both the first edition and the revised edition of the NAB NT translate these words as "the collectors of the temple tax." Yet, even with this dynamic-equivalence translation

---

[12] *Die Gute Nachricht: Die Bibel in heutigen Deutsch* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1982); *La Bible en français courant* (Paris: Alliance Biblique Universelle, 1982); and *La Biblia: Versión popular* (New York: Sociedad Bíblica Americana, 1983).

(it most definitely is not a formal-equivalence translation), the NAB text cannot be said to be "rendered intelligible to people just as they are, without more." But the amount of the tax is not the point in focus in this passage. The amount simply made clear for a first-century Jew *which* tax is being discussed—the temple tax. A basic principle of dynamic-equivalence translation is that meaning has priority over form when the meaning will not be understood in a formal-equivalence translation.

Third, in verse 25 the Greek text is clear that *Peter*, a noun in the accusative case, is the one who *entered* (a participle in the accusative case) into the house and not *Jesus* (a noun in the nominative case). A formal-equivalence translation such as the RSV is misleading. To write "When he came home, Jesus spoke to him first, saying..." clearly indicates by all standards of English writing style that the antecedent of "he" is "Jesus." The NAB translation is not immediately clear upon first reading ("When he came into the house, before he had time to speak, Jesus asked him..."), since the reader's first instinct is to assume that Jesus is the "he" mentioned twice at the beginning of this verse. A dynamic-equivalence translation such as the GBN replaces the Greek pronoun with a proper noun in English: "When Peter went into the house, Jesus spoke up first...."

These are perhaps small points, but they do illustrate the fact that a formal-equivalence translation can be obscure to one who has no knowledge of the Greek text or of first-century Jewish culture and history. Even the revisers of the NAB NT, who claim to have moved in the direction of a formal-equivalence approach to translation, have recognized the need to follow dynamic-equivalence principles at times.

Another example Walsh uses is his Example 2, which discusses the translation of the word "brother" in passages (1 Kgs 20:31–34 and Gen 26:26–31) which apparently reflect the ancient Near Eastern practice of using the word "brother" as a technical term for a treaty partner. Walsh notes that the KJV (mis)translates Gen 26:31 as they "sware one to another" instead of translating literally as "they swore each to his brother." He likewise finds the RSV translation to come up short with its rendering of this verse: "they took oath from one another." The translations of NAB, JB, and NJB all say "they exchanged oaths," a translation similarly inadequate according to Walsh. His criticism of all of these translations is that they obscure the fact that a treaty partnership was established when the characters in the narrative called one another "brother." He says: "Now it may be the case that the use of 'brother' in this passage has nothing to do with the ancient Near Eastern treaty terms; but that is a question to be decided by exegesis, not translation" (340).

Though Walsh does not state how he would translate these verses from 1 Kings and Genesis, apparently he would translate them literally, i.e. he would keep the word "brother" in the translation. But that raises a major question of meaning for many translators around the world. Assuming that Walsh is correct in seeing here the use of technical terminology (and he most likely is), how is the average reader in many Third World countries—without a commentary in his or her language and with no other scholarly tools available—how is this reader to decide "by exegesis" that this is a technical term when the reader knows nothing of the nature of ancient Near Eastern covenants?

Now Walsh's criticism of the KJV, RSV, NAB, JB, and NJB was that they practically remove the possibility that an English reader would know that a treaty partnership had been established. He assumes that if the literal translation were maintained, then readers themselves could make their own exegetical decision. But could they?[13] Yes, perhaps, if they have modern critical commentaries, Bible dictionaries, etc., but the hard fact is that this is a luxury unavailable to most Christian readers. If one does not already know that "brother" is a technical term in the context of treaty-making, one is not likely to make the exegetical decision that the participants in the narrative have created a partner relationship. Rather than being an argument in favor of a formal-equivalence translation of these two OT passages, the recognition by scholars of the technical nature of this word argues for a translation which will communicate the *meaning* of the word. Walsh seems to fear that the translations he mentions on these two passages, by having failed to translate the word "brother," have removed the possibility for an accurate interpretation. It may well be that they have not translated these verses well. But if the best exegesis leads the translator to conclude that "brother" is here a technical term, then the best translation is not to omit the word or to give a formal-equivalence translation, but rather to translate the meaning by means of a dynamic-equivalence translation.

To leave the text of Scripture for a moment, let us return to the recent translation theories in Germany discussed by Snell-Hornby. Hans Hönig and Paul Kußmaul[14] speak of "the necessary grade of differentiation" in

[13] It is interesting that Walsh, writing for theologians and biblical scholars, apparently felt the need to explain that the words "horse" and "legs of a man" in Ps 147:10 mean respectively "horse and chariot" in the sense of "the might of armaments" and "swiftness and ease in military action" (352). If Walsh needed to explain the meanings to readers of *TS*, how much more do translators need to ensure that the meaning is clear by following the principles of dynamic-equivalence translation rather than those of formal-equivalence translation.

[14] *Strategie der Übersetzung: Ein Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch* (Tübingen: Narr, 1982), cited by Snell-Hornby, *Translation Studies* 45.

translating texts. They give the following two English sentences:

(1) In Parliament he fought for equality, but he sent his son to Winchester.
(2) When his father died his mother couldn't afford to send him to Eton any more.

The following German translation of the first sentence is "underdifferentiated," since German readers would not know the significance of the name "Winchester":

(1) . . .seinen eigenen Sohn schickte er auf die Schule in Winchester.

On the other hand, the following translation of the second English sentence is "overdifferentiated":

(2) . . .konnte es sich seine Mutter nicht mehr leisten, ihn nach Eton zu schicken, jene teure englische Privatschule, aus deren Absolventen auch heute noch ein Großteil des politischen und wirtschaftlichen Führungsnachwuchses hervorgeht.

Hönig and Kußmaul propose the following translations as having the "necessary grade of differentiation":

(3) Im Parlament kämpfte er für die Chancengleichheit, aber seinen eigenen Sohn schickte er auf eine der englischen Eliteschulen.
(4) Als sein Vater starb, konnte seine Mutter es sich nicht mehr leisten, ihn auf eine der teuren Privatschulen zu schicken.

Most readers would agree with the judgment of Hönig and Kußmaul that translation 1 is too literal and lacks for the German reader an essential element in the meaning of the English sentence. Most would also agree that translation 2 is too freely translated, i.e. too paraphrastic. Translations 3 and 4, however, do convey the meaning of the two English sentences.

The aim of dynamic/functional-equivalence translations of the Bible is also to achieve the "necessary grade of differentiation." But such a differentiation can be made only when the translation is oriented toward the function of the target language and when the task of translation is seen not as transcoding but as an act of communication.

Let us consider Mt 17:24 in light of the need neither to underdifferentiate nor to overdifferentiate in translation. The formal-equivalence RSV translation underdifferentiates: "the collectors of the half-shekel tax." But the following translation overdifferentiates: "the collectors of the temple tax in the amount of a half-shekel which every male Israelite twenty years old and older had to pay every year, whether living in Palestine or elsewhere." The translation of GNB, however, seems to have the necessary grade of differentiation: "the collectors of the Temple tax."

Certainly the GNB translation of "the half-shekel tax" in Mt 17:24 cannot be said to explain everything to the reader so that no further study is required, but at least this translation is more successful than is a formal-equivalence translation in communicating across cultural barriers.

Rather than reject dynamic-equivalence translations as "wrong-headed," is it not the better approach to retain the literal translation when possible while working within the framework of functional equivalence? Those who would reject the principle of dynamic/functional-equivalence translations on the basis of what may admittedly be unsatisfactory translations of individual verses are throwing out the baby with the bath water.

United Bible Societies, N.Y.C.   ROGER L. OMANSON

DYNAMIC OR FORMAL EQUIVALENCE? A RESPONSE

Roger Omanson's response to my *TS* article (June 1989) is most helpful. It brings out clearly many of the theoretical issues involved in translating Scripture. It also serves to sharpen some of the differences between the views I sketched in my previous article and the principles Omanson now so lucidly expounds.

There is one area of agreement between us that upon examination proves to contain a profound disagreement. We agree, I believe, that every translator worth her or his salt will have a decent concern to make a translation intelligible to the reader. A translation should be "user-friendly." It should communicate to the reader, so far as is possible in a translation, the meaning of the original text. But to examine this principle more closely is to bring out significant differences in the ways one can understand what a translation does, and indeed differences in fundamental questions about language, meaning, and communication. These questions have theological implications as well.

Omanson has stated his case well. "The main criteria [for a translation] are determined by the recipient of the translation and the translation's specific function." That function is to communicate the meaning of the text being translated. Although, according to principles of dynamic or functional equivalence, "every effort is made to adhere as closely as possible to the original text" (as I wrote in my original article), nevertheless "meaning has priority over forms when the meaning will not be understood in a formal equivalence translation." "'Functional equivalence ... means thoroughly understanding not only the meaning of the source text *but also the manner in which the intended receptors of a text*