THE BIBLE TRANSLATOR

QUARTERLY PUBLISHED BY THE UNITED BIBLE SOCIETIES

EDITOR
John J. Kijne

ASSISTANT EDITOR
David H. Wallington

EDITORIAL BOARD
Wilfred J. Bradnock
Fidel P. Galang
Åge Holter
Eugene A. Nida

VOL. 13, No. 1, JANUARY 1962

DIGLOT SCRIPTURES

EUGENE A. NIDA

The publication of the Scriptures in more than one language in the same book is becoming an increasingly common practice in many parts of the world, for not only do missions and churches often regard such multilingual publications as being very useful, but some government authorities, e.g., Portuguese officials in Angola and Mozambique, have ruled them obligatory, while in other instances educational authorities, e.g., in Mexico and Guatemala, have greatly favored such publications. On the other hand, the production of diglot Scriptures is no simple task—in fact there are a welter of problems, both in form and meaning which make such publications an editorial "nightmare."

Types of diglot, or polyglot, Scriptures

Scriptures published in more than one language are primarily of two types, depending upon those for whom such publications are designed. The first type is a strictly scholarly production, such as the famous polyglot Bibles. These include the Complutensian Polyglot (1520) in Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, and Latin; the Antwerp Polyglot (1572) in Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, Latin, Syriac; the Paris Polyglot (1645) in Hebrew, Aramaic, Latin, Samaritan, Greek, Syriac, and Arabic; and the London Polyglot (1657) in Hebrew, Aramaic, Samaritan, Persian, Syriac, Latin, Ethiopic, and Arabic, though in these famous polyglots no attempt was made to reproduce all of the Biblical text in all of the languages, but rather only in those languages which were relevant to the portion in question, e.g., the Samaritan Pentateuch. In addition to these more famous polyglots there were other minor multilingual editions of Scriptures, and even today there are numerous bilingual publications of the Bible, usually called "diglots," which are prepared principally for scholars or students, e.g., New Testaments in Greek-English or Greek-Latin, or Hebrew Old Testaments with parallel translations in English, Latin, or German.

For the most part there are no serious problems involved in the publication of these scholarly diglots, for if there are any inconsis-

tencies of rendering due either to interpretation or underlying text, such matters can be either explained in footnotes or left to the reader to figure out, for he is presumably sufficiently informed as to the textual and translational problems of transmission so that such variations in readings and renderings are not of any special concern.

The second type of multilingual (usually bilingual, or diglot) Scriptures do, however, present a number of serious problems, for these are publications which are meant for so-called "evangelistic purposes," as means of communicating to people a message which they have presumably not heard before or with which they are only partially familiar. Of course, in some cases a New Testament such as in the diglot of the English (Revised Standard Version) and Spanish (Latino-americana Version) goes primarily to the better educated constituency of Latin America and such persons can presumably judge minor differences between language in the light of their relatively superior education. The same thing is true of a recent Gospel published in four languages in Switzerland. But even in the case of these diglot or polyglot publications one must give very serious consideration to the fundamental reasons for such publications and the problems which almost inevitably arise in their production. Such difficulties become especially acute in diglot publications which include languages of utterly different structures and involve cultures of widely varying types, e.g., Spanish-Chol (the latter a language in southern Mexico), Japanese-English (RSV), and Portuguese-Luvale (the latter a language of Angola, Congo, and Southern Rhodesia).[1]

Reasons for diglot publications

There are a number of reasons for publishing the Scriptures in diglot (or possibly in polyglot form) for evangelistic purposes, but in general these fall into four principal categories: (1) the desire of the people for some help in making transition to the dominant national language, (2) the importance of acquainting the people with the religious terms in the national or trade language, (3) the need which the people have for a book possessing the prestige which comes from having the text in the dominant national language, and (4) the practical requirements of some governments which insist that in all publications for tribal peoples the national or colonial language must appear together with any tribal language text.

One must recognize that in many parts of the world tribal peoples, who are just now emerging from a strict minority status, feel a strong desire to possess some aids which will assist them in making the transition to the dominant language. They instinctively feel, and

[1] It is necessary to distinguish between (1) a biscript publication, the same text in two different writing systems, one alongside of the other, such as a Gospel in the Anuak language, published in both a Roman and Amharic writing system, and (2) a diglot publication, which is the same text in two different languages.

rightly so, that if they can only acquire a working knowledge of the language which so often appears to be the instrument of their socio-economic enslavement (contracts, leases, mortgages, and titles to property are all written in this language which seems to be the principal means by which they are robbed of what they have), they can finally be free. It is not strange therefore that a book such as the Bible, which proclaims this theme of freedom and liberation, should in some way be associated with a language which has such liberating potential.

At the same time, the desire for the national language, even though it may be very poorly understood, is prompted by a need for cultural prestige. This is especially true of culturally insecure people, who seem to be in some instances almost pathetically anxious to lend prestige to their own language by having it alongside of the national language—thus proving that their own language is a true language, a medium of effective communication, and no mere jumble of noises or grammatical oddities.

Quite apart from what the people may themselves be aware of, there is also an important factor in giving to people what they need and what they will rapidly come to appreciate, for in most instances minority peoples, as represented so largely in those who are only now receiving the Scriptures for the first time in their own language, must become acquainted with the religious vocabulary of the dominant language. They need to be helped in learning these national languages, so as to take their place in the church life of the nation, rather than to be restricted to the ghetto-like existence of their own tribal isolation. This incorporation of minority groups within the larger family of the national (and international) church is of incalculable importance, especially for individuals whose departure from the strictly enforced patterns of the small face-to-face society usually brings estrangement and ostracism. Such converts must be led to feel that they are a part of a wider, all-embracing fellowship. And the publication of the Scriptures in this visibly symbolic form of their own language and that of the nation as a whole can do much to reinforce their feeling of solidarity with the church which exists outside the confines of their own tribal life.

The requirements by some governments that Scripture publications (or often, any publications) in indigenous languages must also have the same text in the national or colonial language are dictated usually by three considerations: (a) diglot publications seem to, and actually do, stimulate and facilitate learning of the dominant language, (b) the necessity for diglot publication tends to cut down somewhat on how much is published in the indigenous languages (some colonial governments actually prefer to restrict publication in indigenous languages, in the mistaken belief that such publications detract from the usage of the colonial language), and (c) publications in indigenous lan-

guages are easier to control and censor if a national or colonial-language text must accompany the text in the indigenous language.

Problems of diglots

In general people think of diglots as presenting no special difficulties, for they reason that if the two texts are supposed to say the same thing (the problems of different underlying texts, especially in the case of the New Testament, are frequently overlooked), then they must be of substantially the same length. This is more or less true in the case of languages belonging to the same family, e.g., translations into the various Indo-European languages of western Europe; but most diglots involve a host of complex problems, which may be classified under difficulties of (1) the basic text, (2) overall length, (3) phonological correspondence, (4) grammatical equivalence, and (5) semantic equivalence.

The basic text

For the most part people think of all Bibles as being more or less identical, and this is substantially true, but especially in the New Testament there are some important textual problems, arising principally from the fact that early translations in so many European languages were based upon the *Textus Receptus,* which has thus been projected in one form or another into many mission fields. At the present time, missionary translators tend to employ more critical Greek texts as a base or they use modern language translations, which are themselves based upon more critical Greek texts. As a result their translations and the traditional translations in principal languages just do not match. Even in the case of a Spanish-English diglot of the New Testament we had certain serious problems a few years ago. The Spanish text chosen was the Hispanoamericana Version, which reflected primarily the Greek text as selected by the English Revisors of 1881. This text, however, differs in some significant ways from the Revised Standard Version, which is based upon a somewhat different Greek text. If the Hispanoamericana Version and the RSV had been published side by side, there would have been entirely too many differences, and as a result people would have complained that the two forms of the New Testament were in some places contradictory. It would have been possible to incorporate a series of marginal notes to explain the various discrepancies, but the results would not have been satisfactory to the average reader, for he would not have understood the notes fully and would have been misled by problems which he could not adequately comprehend. Accordingly, it was decided to make certain changes in the Hispanoamericana Version, resulting in its being called the Latinoamericana Version, so that the two texts in Spanish and English were sufficiently similar as not to seem contradictory or inconsistent. Of course, many of the dif-

ferences between the Hispanoamericana and the RSV were discrepancies of rendering, not of underlying text, but the differences of text were, of course, the more striking and hence necessitated some radical alterations.

This problem of basic text produces a real challenge and at the same time constitutes a serious thorn in the flesh for the qualified translator working in an area where the Biblical text in the dominant language represents an inferior Greek original. For example, in Spanish-speaking Latin America the basic Spanish version is the Reina-Valera Version, which is substantially a translation of the *Textus Receptus*. A translator working in some Indian language and knowing something of the superiority of certain critical readings naturally wants to incorporate these into his Indian-language translation, but if he plans on a diglot publication, which is generally regarded as highly desirable in such areas, he must of necessity adjust his translation to the Spanish Reina-Valera. The necessity of such relatively close correspondence is required by the nature of his prospective readers for they are in general only partially educated and such persons always expect a higher degree of formal correspondence than individuals with superior educational background. In other words, the "home-town boy" who has gone off and made good in the big city comes home as the expert in Spanish. If he finds something in a diglot publication which does not seem to fit his standards of literal equivalence, he will often use such discrepancies to discredit the work of the "foreigner" and to enhance his own prestige. Moreover, the inconsistencies which he can point out would be very obvious ones, for which no amount of explanation about Greek manuscripts or the history of the transmission of the text would ever be adequate.

On the other hand, a translator with some acquaintance with better critical texts need not completely despair, for he can frequently "slant" his translation in the direction of better texts, without specifically seeming to violate the area of meaning of the national language translation which may be based on the *Textus Receptus* or some similarly inadequate Greek text.

From the standpoint of underlying texts, translations into minority languages must inevitably follow the lead of dominant language translations, for translations in the languages of culturally dependent peoples can never hope to have sufficient prestige so as to challenge the texts in national languages, except perhaps in some very exceptional situations where the indigenous people are stubbornly resistent to the outside or defiantly confident of their own superiority.

Total length

Most people assume that the same ideas expressed in different languages are likely to turn out about the same in total overall length,

but this is not necessarily true. In fact, it is almost always the case that a good translation is longer than the original. There are two principal reasons for this: (1) in a translation one must communicate all that is given in the original plus what is obligatorily required by the particular grammatical categories of the receptor language (the language into which the translation is being made), (2) an original communication always takes a good deal for granted, in assuming that the hearers (or readers) will have considerable knowledge of the circumstances of the communication and of the matters mentioned in the message. This means that the more diverse any two languages are, in terms of their grammatical and semantic structures, the more likely it is that the text in the receptor language will be proportionately longer than the original in the source language. Similarly, in proportion as the cultures of the two language areas differ, so will the length of the communication, if it is to be a truly equivalent rendering. The whole concept of word-for-word translating is manifestly based upon wrong premises, for it is not the equivalence of lexical units (the words or the parts of words) that is sought, but the correspondence of concepts which are communicated by such word symbols. This means that in most instances, even between languages of the same linguistic family, translations tend to be longer than the originals, whether in Biblical or non-Biblical publications. For example, Romans 1:1-7 has 93 words in the Nestle text (24th edition) in contrast to the following numbers of words in various translations in European languages: King James Version 126, Revised Standard Version 127, Moffatt 127, Phillips 146, Reina-Valera Spanish 120, Revised D'Almeida Portuguese 134, and Revised Luther 114. With the exception of Phillips Version all of these translations are relatively "close" translations. Of course it may be argued that the differences in word count are merely a matter of the differences in the inflectional type of word structure, and to an extent this is true. Moreover, one may also contend that Romans 1:1-7 is not a typical passage, and this likewise is true, but a comparison of Luke 15:1-7 in these same translations reveals about the same relative increase. On the other hand, non-Biblical translations of Greek into English exhibit a much freer, and in many instances much more meaningful set of equivalences, for they are not restricted by certain false standards of correspondence nor are they so completely under the influence of heavy ecclesiastical traditions. A comparison of the several volumes in the Loeb series, e.g., *Isocrates* by George Norlin, *The Nicomachean Ethics of Aristotle* by H. Rackham, and *Plato's Republic* by Paul Shorey, reveals an average increase in total bulk (based on word count and total printed form of text) of between 20 and 30 percent, with the greater increases in passages which deal with subject matter which is culturally more disparate. It is of interest to note that when a classical scholar, such as E. V. Rieu, undertakes to make a translation of the New Testament

Greek, as he has done so brilliantly in the Gospels, his treatment of the text involves an expansion of almost the same dimensions (about 30 percent), while more traditional translations of the Scriptures, e.g., the King James Version and the Revised Standard Version, reflect such a heavy ecclesiastical heritage that they have an expansion of less than half this much.

If there is this much required expansion even between two languages as closely related as English and Greek and ones which reflect so much common cultural heritage, it is no wonder that good translations of the New Testament into languages such as Burmese, Thai, Hausa, and Totonac (in Mexico) require considerable expansion over the originals.

It might be assumed that if both languages go back to the same Greek original the rate of expansion might be about the same and hence the two translations would fit each other. This is relatively true for diglots such as English and Spanish, German and French, and Dutch and Portuguese. But in comparing translations into quite different languages, e.g., Spanish and Totonac, one must realize that even if the Totonac is a translation of the Greek, it would need to be proportionately much longer than the Spanish, for the linguistic structure of Totonac is very different from Indo-European (and hence involves a number of different obligatory features) and the cultural setting of Totonac in central Mexico is utterly diverse from the cultural context of the New Testament account. Actually, of course, even though the translator of the Totonac New Testament made constant reference to the Greek text, the very nature of the proposed Spanish-Totonac diglot publication required him to follow more or less closely the Spanish text, so that if the resultant translation was to be at all adequate, it would of necessity be somewhat considerably longer.

Phonological correspondences

Problems of phonological correspondence are of two principal types: (1) general orthography and (2) the transcription of proper names. Under general orthography one must consider not only problems of the values of consonant and vowel letters, but the use of punctuation, and under the transcription of proper names one must take into consideration not only consistency of rendering, but varying traditions and different types of names, e.g., familiar vs. rare.

If one is using strictly monoglot publications, some discrepancies between tribal and national languages may not seem too striking, but if both orthographies occur within the same book, it is obvious that any unnecessary departure from consistency will be much more evident and irksome to the readers. If letters such as *c*, *q*, *z*, and *x* mean one thing in one system of writing, but something quite different in the other, it is quite understandable that people will object, especially if

they have an exaggerated respect for the prestigeful national language—a situation which usually exists. In matters of diacritics one must also be quite careful, for accent marks may represent quality of vowels in the national language but tone in the tribal, and though this combination is not impossible (it does occur in several instances in Africa), nevertheless, one must make sure that the tribal language does not have vowel contrasts for which accent marks are really required, and which the reader somewhat familiar with the national language will assume are indicated by the accents used to mark tone. If, on the other hand, the language in question has only five vowels, and hence no accents for vowel quality are required, it is sometimes possible to use the acute, grave, and macron symbols for tonal distinctions, but in so far as possible one should attempt to adjust any two orthographies as closely as at all possible.

One of the really serious problems in French-speaking areas of West Africa is the tendency for missionaries to employ the use of the so-called "open vowel signs" for the low front vowel and the low back vowel, following the usage of the London School of Oriental and African Studies, which has recommended these symbols for English-speaking areas of West Africa. For regions such as Liberia, Ghana, and Nigeria the use of these symbols is almost a *must,* for there are no adequate means of symbolizing more than five vowel contrasts with the typical English alphabet, but in French the grave, acute, and circumflex accents are very valuable symbols for designating different vowel qualities and should be used in preference to the so-called open ɔ and the open ɛ.

Some persons may think that the rapid extension of independence to more and more countries of Africa will perhaps result in the lessening of importance for the traditional "colonial languages," but there is nothing to justify this position. Actually, there is every indication that the colonial languages will increasingly become "national languages," for this is the only possible means whereby countries representing scores of different tribes can develop any significant linguistic and cultural unity. This means that phonological correspondence with the new national languages will be even more necessary than it may have been in the past.

Conformity in consonants and vowels is not, however, the only problem. Some persons expect almost literal conformity in punctuation between corresponding texts. Basically, of course, this is impossible, for no two languages can be punctuated phrase for phrase in the same manner. The punctuation must reflect the meaningful divisions and units of the language in question. However, it is important that one employ the same general system of punctuation. For example, in some languages question marks are really not necessary, for each question has some introductory particle which clearly marks it off as a question in contrast with a statement. Some translators have

felt that since such is the case, question marks can simply be omitted. Theoretically this is true, but practically most readers of tribal languages seem to feel that their language is in some way not complete if it does not have the full punctuation system, even though the symbols may not occur in exactly the same places. Some missionaries, for example, have thought that the use of capital letters was quite unnecessary—just an extra burden to the learner—and this is likewise true, but the elimination of such caps has been interpreted in many instances as a kind of degrading paternalism, implying that the "natives" could not learn and use what other people can and do employ.

The second principal area of difficulty involving orthography concerns the transcription of proper names. Since these names are so essentially foreign anyway and since their form is so largely arbitrary—at least from the standpoint of the uneducated reader—some more or less literal conformity to the prestigeful national language is generally expected. In some instances, of course, the forms of names in the national language are quite "hopeless" if taken over letter for letter into a tribal-language translation, for they are entirely "unpronouncable." Some adaptations are hence quite necessary, but in general the solution is not to be found by going back to the Greek and Hebrew and trying to work out some systematic form of transliteration, for the history of these names in the tradition of the national language is a complex one, often involving a number of different linguistic levels and foreign influences. For example, Greek names in English have been incorporated into the language very largely through Latin influence, both on spelling and pronunciation. This means that for the most part one must take the forms of proper names as they occur in the dominant language of the area and work out a system of transliteration which will be reasonably consistent.

There is, however, one major obstacle to consistent and systematic transliteration, namely, the fact that some proper names are much more widely used and known than others. There is no problem in transliterating such names as *Tiberius, Lysanias, Trachonitis, Zacharias, Matathias, Zorobabel* and *Salathiel,* but treating *John, Paul, Peter, James,* and *Andrew* may be quite another problem, for the people may have already borrowed such names and apply them to themselves and to their friends. Moreover, they may have pronunciations which are not a close reflexion of the spelling, e.g.,*Pelu* for *Peter,* but they may insist that the proper spelling is *Peter,* not *Pelu.* This means that one can often work out some systematic adjustments for the forms of quite unknown proper names, but must employ the national-language form for names which are in current use.

This discussion of the problems involved in phonological correspondences between languages in diglot publications may have seemed

to be based on the assumption that many people have a rather wide knowledge of the national language, even before getting a diglot publication or that they may actually know a good deal about the writing system of the national language before knowing much about reading their own tribal tongue. This is actually the case in many instances. Despite heroic efforts in adult literacy in many parts of the world, the truth is that well over 75 percent of the people in smaller tribal languages who learn to read are first taught the alphabet in a dominant national or colonial language. They often learn to read such a language, even without being able to understand it, but they are instructed in the orthographic system (and unfortunately in very little else) and they gain great respect for it. This means that they tend to be highly sensitive to the "correctness" of what little they have learned and hence very demanding that their own language be written in rather close correspondence to the dominant language. It is hence readily understandable that a diglot publication will thrust these very factors very much into the focus of attention, where they must be dealt with realistically and comprehensively.

Grammatical equivalence

In trying to find the "closest natural equivalent" between the source and the receptor languages one is always plagued by the lack of grammatical correspondence between languages. Of course, within a single family of languages one can usually translate passives by passives, conditionals by conditionals, and questions by questions, but this is by no means the case between languages of widely different structures. For example, some languages simply do not have rhetorical questions. The only equivalent is an emphatic statement. In other languages, there is no such thing as an agentive, dependent upon the verb, e.g., "he sent the letter through his friend." Rather, one must say, "he caused his friend to take the letter." Such differences have been widely treated in *Bible Translating* (American Bible Society, 1947) and are constantly illustrated in the pages of *The Bible Translator*. The problem for the translator is how far he can and must go in making adjustments and how the constituency receiving such diglot publications can understand the requirements for change. Of course, it is impossible to give a comprehensive answer to these problems within the compass of this short article, but essentially the problem can be treated in terms of (1) obligatory and optional adjustments and (2) preserving a balanced "communication load."

When some grammatical construction in the source language can only be expressed by some other construction in the receptor language, e.g., passives changed to actives, there is no alternative to the translator, for he cannot artificially manufacture passive constructions in the receptor language. When, however, there is more than one possibility of translating a particular grammatical construction (that

is, when the problem involves some optional alternatives), he can for the sake of grammatical correspondence attempt to use the closest formal equivalent. But it is at this point that he comes face-to-face with the second principle, namely, the production of a balanced "communication load," for if in trying to preserve formal grammatical correspondence, he employs a number of legitimate, but very rare constructions in the receptor language, the ultimate result will be overloading his channel of communication. All the sentences may be grammatically correct, but the total effect is entirely too "heavy" and the result is that people just will not take the time or spend the necessary energy to try to decipher these complex combinations of words.

On the other hand, most people, and especially those with limited educational backgrounds, expect diglot publications to contain very similar, if not identical constructions, especially in dealing with the Scriptures, which they tend to look upon as formally sacrosanct. When people object to a lack of conformity between two languages, there seems to be no solution other than taking some parallel expression, not in the Biblical context (for the misconceived "sanctity of the Word" tends to cloud the issue) and to ask people how they would translate such a statement into the receptor language. In general, people will respond with something more or less equivalent to what the translator has done—that is if he has done a good job, for apart from the Biblical setting people quite readily make formal adjustments in order to communicate ideas effectively. It seems that only, or at least principally in the realm of religion, do some persons have a predisposition for preferring obscurity—perhaps because religion is supposed to be mysterious and possibly because the truth may be too disturbing.

Lexical correspondence

For any one problem which a translator faces in formal correspondence between languages, in diglot publications he has a score of difficulties in trying to provide adequate equivalences between words. For example, in Lahu, a language spoken in Burma, Thailand, and Southwest China, one does not say literally "heir" (as in Hebrews 1:2) but "to eat an inheritance" (as also in Bahasa Indonesia and in Hausa). Also, it is quite incorrect to use the Lahu technical word meaning "adoption", for among the Lahu adoption is a method by which you raise children in order to make them slaves. In Huichol, a language of Mexico, it would be wrong to translate John 1:2 as simply 'the Word was God', for this would be equivalent to say 'God was the Word' (the basis of the patropassian heresy). To be quite correct in Huichol, it is necessary to render this difficult passage as 'while being the Word he was God.' This combines individual identity with qualitative equivalence.

In general people do not seem to object too strongly to the use of figurative expressions in receptor languages to correspond to non-figurative expressions in the source language. For example, in Loma, a language of Liberia, "to marvel" (Mark 6:6) is 'his mind walked' and "woke him" (Mark 4:38) is 'opened his face'; and in Shilluk, a language of the Sudan, the "wayside" is called 'the ribs of the path', "to be sick" is 'to have been grabbed by God' and "stinginess" is 'to have a big heart'. If these are the only ways to express such ideas, most people will accept the situation and not feel that any violence is being done to the Scriptures by such figurative "additions" or alterations. However, when figurative expressions are changed into nonfigurative ones, many persons (especially foreigners to the receptor culture) object, for they think that something has been lost from the Bible. For example, in Galatians 1:9 it makes no sense in Zoque, a language of Mexico, to speak of the apostles as the 'pillars'. Rather, they are called simply 'the big one's.' In Navajo the metaphor of "bridling the tongue" (James 1:26) simply does not make sense, even though the Navajo people are famous for their horsemanship. One must say merely 'to take care of their tongues'. In Marshallese, one cannot use the expression "covered" in speaking of sins in Romans 4:7, for this would mean concealment, not forgiveness, and in Mazatec "stiffnecked" is only a medical term, and hence must be rendered as 'stubborn.'

With the change from figurative to non-figurative expressions there is an obvious "loss of meaning" and it is this loss to which people generally object. They do not seem to hesitate to accept a "gain in meaning" when nonfigurative expressions must be communicated in figurative ways. This seems all to the good. But in translating from one language to another there is bound to be both a loss as well as a gain, for no two languages are ever identical. Nevertheless, when there is no strict word-for-word correspondence, many people, especially those of more limited educational backgrounds, tend to be critical. Many of these persons actually cannot judge the real problems of semantic equivalence, but when they do not see word-for-word parallelism, they immediately assume that something is wrong, especially when they know one language relatively well and another very poorly. Such lack of correspondence seems to reflect inconsistency, and there is nothing like inconsistency as a "hobgoblin of little minds." There are, of course, those who hold to a view of translation which insists that a rendering must be as literal as grammatical science can make it, but most experts in the field are convinced that translation is a process of reproducing a form which is as equivalent in meaning as the two linguistic-semantic structures can provide.

It is not easy to establish an ultimate criterion for effective translation, especially of the type which must be used in diglot publications. However, one very valid basis of judgment is the reaction of the

complete bilingual and bicultural person (one who not only knows the two cultures but who is a full participating member of the two societies), who, we hope, would be able to say of any rendering, "That's just the way we would say it." Of course, for the Scriptures there are obviously no bilingual and bicultural persons, i.e., ones who are bilingual with the Biblical languages and bicultural in sharing the culture of Biblical times. The best we can do is to take the results of Biblical scholarship and attempt to reproduce the cultural setting with sufficient fullness as to attain a relatively close approximation—which unfortunately will always be tantalizingly far in many passages.

Formal arrangements of text

From the preceding discussion it would be possible to gather the impression that basically the problems of the publisher of diglots were identical with those of publishing any translation, except that the proximity of the texts causes the difficulties to be more acute. In a sense this is true, but there are also complications of format which result largely from the fact that good translations cannot be word-for-word equivalents. It is this necessary disparity in linguistic form and semantic content which produces the basic complications of format, for, as noted above, sentences are not always the same length or structural types and the total length of the receptor text tends to be longer than in the source language.

An earlier practice in publishing diglots for general circulation was to use matching pages of type, with necessary adjustments of leading between lines or photographically reducing pages, if necessary, in order to make the contents match. This practice did not prove very satisfactory, especially with two-column formats, for corresponding passages were never contiguous, but always separated by at least one column of type. Accordingly, there has been a tendency to employ parallel columns, for this does provide greater facility in comparing texts, but such a procedure has the disadvantage of making it necessary to use the plates merely for the one publication. With the former procedure of having facing pages, the same plates could be used for two different monoglot publications, and then put together for a diglot printing (assuming, of course, that pagination was duplicated).

Where the two languages of a diglot are of approximately the same importance and especially if they are of the same language family and derived from substantially the same original, as for example in the case of the diglot with the RSV English and the Latinoamericana Spanish, there is very little difficulty in adjusting the parallel columns. In many instances, however, there are some important reasons for regarding one of the languages of a diglot as being more "important" than the other. This importance is not

one of cultural prestige—rather, quite the opposite, for the importance consists in its strategic relevance for the reader. For example, in considering a diglot between Spanish and Totonac in Mexico, it is quite evident that for most readers for whom this publication is designed the Totonac is the language which will of necessity carry most of the message. Moreover, the readers are likely to be new literates, which means that they should have large clear type in this language which they are to read. Accordingly, it is preferable to print the text in such a language in at least 12-point type. For an entire New Testament it is rather out of the question, however, to produce the text in 12-point type in both languages, for this would make a very big, bulky volume. Accordingly, recognizing the strategic importance of the tribal language for such a publication, the tendency has been to grant priority in type size and location on the page to the indigenous language, while using a smaller type face, e.g., 8-point for the parallel column in the national or colonial language.

This use of different size types has some other advantages than merely saving space, (1) it points up the importance of the indigenous language, and thus enhances its prestige, (2) it makes possible a clear demarcation between languages (the two texts look different), and (3) by careful calculation of approximate differences in average length, the width of the two columns can be so adjusted as to result in a minimum of lost space in the parallel-column arrangement.

On the other hand, despite careful calculations between average length of the corresponding texts and hence relative width of columns of type, there are many points at which space is inevitably lost because the two texts do not match in various kinds of passages. Accordingly, because of this tendency for waste space on the page, resulting in large sections of blank space or wide leading out of lines, some diglot publications are put out with the primary, strategic language (i.e., the indigenous tongue which one wishes to emphasize) at the top of the page, often in single column and large type, with the national language text beneath, in smaller type and possibly in double columns. For example, in Mexico most of the publications with Spanish and some of the Indian languages are now being put out with a 12-point type, single-column text at the top in the Indian languages, set off by a hair-line rule from the two-column 10-point text in Spanish which comes at the bottom of the page. By means of the two-column arrangement of the Spanish, it is possible to set the text more closely, both between words and between lines, so that the difference between 12 and 10-point type is further compensated for in the two-column arrangement (it is always possible to set text more closely with the same degree of legibility in a narrow column than in a wide one).

By having the text of the two languages one above the other it is always possible to fill each page fully, and thus conserve a great

deal of space. Moreover, this arrangement also permits the convenient use of illustrations which may take up only part of the page, provided, of course, that they go completely across the page. However, even for vignettes which take up only half of the width of a page, the adjustment in space can be made much more readily with the texts above and below, than in parallel columns.

There is an additional value in the vertical, rather than horizontal matching of texts, namely, that people do not tend to be quite so demanding of literal word-for-word order or semantic correspondence. It seems that the juxtaposition of lines tends to lead more to excessive concern for literalness, while finding the same contents at different points on the page, especially when there is a break between single column and two-column format, eliminates some of this tendency for expecting literal equivalents.

Advantages and disadvantages of diglot publications

There are a number of rather obvious advantages in diglot publications, even as we have suggested in the introductory portions of this article. They may be summarized as follows: (1) in areas of considerable bilingualism but with little biculturalism diglot Scriptures may constitute a bridge between groups, (2) dependent minority groups may be helped in their transition to languages of greater prestige and utility in the "outside world," (3) culturally insecure people may be aided in having greater respect for their own language if it is "dignified" by being published together with a dominant language, and (4) diglot publications may be important in meeting governmental regulations or in obtaining greater cooperation from government officials, who tend to see in diglot publications an effective tool for the educational advance of minority, depressed groups.

There are, at the same time, certain distinct disadvantages in diglot publications: (1) they are costly, often more than twice what it would cost to put out two monoglot publications in the respective languages, (2) they tend to demand too much literalness (it is for this reason that a revision committee for the Aymara New Testament requested that their New Testament not be printed as a diglot, for they were convinced that diglot publications would be a stumbling block to acceptance), (3) the books tend to be rather large and bulky, and hence less likely to be carried around by the people.

The future of diglot publications

With the greatly increased multilingualism in so many parts of the world, especially in India, Africa, and Latin America, it is almost inevitable that more pressures will be exerted to have diglot publications. Moreover, rapidly growing nationalistic tendencies will most certainly make themselves felt in educational circles, and Bible societies and churches will no doubt have more demands made upon

them to provide diglot Scriptures in order to foster education in the national languages, or at least to appear to reflect national aspirations for unity by printing everything with the national language included. Otherwise, it is not unlikely that in some regions all publication in tribal languages will be prohibited. This means that if the suppression of tribal tongues is to be avoided, some use of diglots will be inevitable. Diglots are certainly not the answer to all problems, for they create some problems while resolving others. Nevertheless, they do have very important advantages in certain situations, for they are a real asset to any group in the process of rapid social and linguistic transition. And since for the next decade or so, such groups will be increasingly more numerous, we must certainly be prepared to produce these important tools.

BIBLICAL RESEARCH AND OLD TESTAMENT TRANSLATION

HENRY R. MOELLER

Many questions concerning the precise meanings of words and phrases of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament have remained unsolved problems for a long time. Such problems are as much a challenge to scholars engaged in biblical research as they are a difficulty to translators and expositors. Those engaged in basic research in the areas of biblical culture, history, and language, are the natural, if not always recognized, allies of Bible translators, since the results of their work often provide the translator with the solutions to his problems.

To those translators who can work directly from the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, the question is: How can I be sure, in a given problem passage, that my translation is valid, if I am not sure what this word or phrase means? For one who must work primarily from one of the standard versions in a modern language, the question is: Does the version which I am using as my base for translating the scriptures into, *e.g.*, Witoto or Miao, conceal problems which have really yet gone unsolved; and further, would their solution enable me to produce a more faithful translation?

Biblical scholars are ever seeking to find definitive answers to existing problems if at all possible, or, failing that, to suggest solutions which have the highest degree of probability in the light of the facts. From a wide range of researches into the total background of the biblical period, they are often able to bring together data which suggest reasonable answers for some of these problems of long standing. To this search for answers, the results of archaeological