

expert knowledge of the source languages, of exegesis, of textual criticism, hermeneutics, and at least a good working knowledge of linguistics. The base and model "short-cut" is not a concession to second-class citizens in the field of translation, but a necessity to all. Even the experts will want to know how each team that produced one of the modern language versions made its decisions concerning text, exegesis and translation.

In a way, a translation is a commentary, and by comparing as many translations as possible, the translator's knowledge of a passage can become deep indeed, although not as deep as if he had studied in depth the Greek and Hebrew originals, and the scholarly works analyzing them. But then, he has to translate, not to expound scholarly knowledge, and what better preparation for that than to study other translations?

The help which a key structure analysis of a passage can provide is to isolate the problems, thereby facilitating a comparison of their solutions in different modern versions. Comparing the dynamic translations themselves, as each proposes its own solution to a particularly thorny problem in the base, can be a very rewarding, and often necessary exercise.

However, in final instance, after all is said and done, there are no methods or theories that can replace the true contribution of the gifted translator: the ability to transform and animate a jumble of words and ideas, often from a foreign and ancient culture, into a lively and attractive text. After he has done his linguistic homework, his real task is, not just to list faithfully the qualities of the ancient words, but to recreate them as if they were presented today.

DAVID J. CLARK

THE INFLUENCE OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS ON MODERN TRANSLATIONS OF ISAIAH

Dr David Clark is a UBS Translations Consultant at present living in Bangalore, India.

Introduction

More than three decades have now passed since the first discovery of the documents which have become known as the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS). These documents have proved to be of great value to scholars in such fields as Jewish history, literature and religion, and have given the academic world much new primary source material to evaluate. From the point of view of the Bible translator, the main focus of interest in the DSS is the evidence they offer about the textual history of the Old Testament. Among the scrolls, there were found at least fragments of every book of the Hebrew OT except Esther. For some books, substantial passages were preserved, thus giving textual scholars first hand evidence about the Hebrew textual tradition that was about a thousand years older than the oldest manuscripts previously available.

Inevitably the text of the OT books found among the DSS contained

numerous differences from the traditional text known as the Massoretic Text (MT). Some of the different readings found in the DSS were obviously errors, while others were minor variations of orthography or morphology that were of value in reconstructing the history of the development of the language, but did not affect the meaning. Especially in the case of the books of Samuel, the DSS sometimes preserved readings which were closer to those of the Septuagint than to those of the MT, which raised important issues in the study of both text and canon. As well as all these aspects of textual evidence, there were also a number of places where the DSS readings were significantly different in meaning from those of the MT, and in these instances scholars faced the task of deciding which reading was more likely to have been original. Obviously questions in this category are of great concern to Bible translators.

Since the discovery of the DSS in 1947 and the following years, several important translations of the OT have appeared in English and other major European languages, and of course the scholars involved have had to make practical decisions about whether or not to accept readings found in the DSS as the basis for their translation. In this article, we shall examine the decisions made by the translators of eight recent major versions in English, French and German. We shall use the results as a means of assessing the actual influence of the DSS on a substantial number of scholarly translators representing a wide range of views confessionally, theologically, and in terms of translation principles.

We shall limit the investigation to the book of Isaiah, for two reasons. First, Isaiah is one of the longest books of the OT, and thus offers a reasonable sample without being unmanageably large for a study of this type. Second, the DSS provide plentiful evidence for the Hebrew text of Isaiah, including one manuscript (known as 1QIs^a) which contains the whole book.

The Textual Evidence

In the seventh edition of *Biblia Hebraica* (1951), the variant readings of the complete scroll of the book of Isaiah (1QIs^a) are listed in a third apparatus criticus at the foot of each page. According to the editors' foreword, these readings are only a selection of those in the scroll: "The selection has generally been restricted to such readings as were important from the point of interpretation, whereas peculiarities of purely orthographical or grammatical interest could not be included" (p xxxix). Nevertheless, if my counting is correct, no less than 1403 variant readings are included.

The Isaiah fascicle of *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (1968) does not employ a third apparatus to show DSS variant readings, but incorporates references to them in its second apparatus. By my reckoning there are 291 such references, only about 20 per cent of those listed in the 1951 edition. Presumably this reduction represents a scholarly reassessment of which variants really are significant for the study of the text and its interpretation. Even so, the number is still much higher than that of the variants actually incorporated into modern versions.

The Modern Versions Examined

Most modern versions have usually indicated in their footnotes where they have followed a variant reading found in the DSS. The actual method of indication varies from version to version (see notes below), and at least some of the versions are not entirely consistent in their acknowledgement of DSS readings. This article takes the footnote acknowledgements as the main source of evidence, but also includes a few instances where one or other version seems to have followed a DSS variant without acknowledgement.

The versions used in this study are as in the list below. This includes information on their date of publication, national, theological and confessional background, principles of translation, and method of indicating where DSS variants have been followed.

1) Revised Standard Version (RSV). Old Testament 1952. American liberal protestant background. Formal correspondence translation. DSS variant readings indicated by footnote reference to "One ancient Ms."

2) New English Bible (NEB). Old Testament 1970. British liberal protestant background. The translators were "free to employ a contemporary idiom rather than reproduce the traditional 'biblical' English" (preface, p v). DSS variant readings adopted in the text are not indicated in the footnotes. For this version, the information is drawn from the companion volume *The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament. The Readings Adopted by the Translators of the New English Bible* by L.H. Brockington (Oxford, Cambridge, 1973). Brockington shows where the DSS variants have been followed by the words "with Scroll." There are also fifteen places in the book of Isaiah where he uses the note "cp. Scroll." In these places, there is apparently some influence on the translators from the DSS, and six of the fifteen places have been included in the tables below. But it is not always clear in these cases to what extent the translators have followed the DSS, or combined a DSS variant with ancient versional evidence or with a conjectural emendation. The figures given for the NEB are therefore somewhat more subjective than for the other versions cited.

3) Traduction œcuménique de la Bible (TOB). Old Testament 1975. French interconfessional background. Fairly literal translation. DSS variant readings indicated by footnote reference to "le principal manuscrit d'Esaië trouvé à Qumrân," or to "le texte hébreu d'Esaië trouvé à Qumrân."

4) New International Version (NIV). The Book of Isaiah 1975. International (but mainly North American) conservative protestant background. Fairly literal translation. DSS variant readings indicated by footnote reference to "Dead Sea Scrolls."

5) Bible de Jérusalem (BJ). Nouvelle édition entièrement revue et augmentée, 1978. French Roman Catholic background. Not a literal translation, but not fully dynamic equivalent. DSS variant readings indicated by footnote reference to 1QIs^a.

6) **A new translation of the Holy Scriptures according to the traditional Hebrew text (NJV).** The Prophets 1978. American Jewish background. Literal translation. DSS variant readings indicated by footnote reference to 1QIs^a.

7) **Die Gute Nachricht. Die Bibel in heutigem Deutsch (DGN).** 1982. German interconfessional background. Dynamic equivalent translation. DSS variant readings indicated by footnote reference "mit einer Handschrift."

8) **La Bible en français courant (FC).** 1982. French interconfessional background. Dynamic equivalent translation. DSS variant readings indicated by footnote reference to "le principal manuscrit hébreu d'Esaië trouvé à Qumrân."

Unfortunately, it was not possible to include the *Good News Bible* (GNB) in this study, since its footnotes do not indicate where its translators have followed DSS variant readings. It is to be hoped that this omission will eventually be repaired, either in a later edition of GNB, or perhaps in an article in *The Bible Translator*.

The Data

Subject to the limitations inherent in the method of procedure outlined above, the following table shows where the eight modern versions examined have followed the variant readings found in the DSS. If a reference is given twice, this indicates that two DSS variants are adopted within that verse. References in brackets indicate DSS variants given in a marginal alternative rendering only. References marked with an asterisk* are not acknowledged in the footnotes of the version concerned, but have been discovered by chance. There may well be other examples in this category which have been omitted, but hopefully not enough to distort the picture significantly.

Table 1 The use of DSS variant readings in eight modern versions

RSV <u>1952</u>	NEB <u>1970</u>	TOB <u>1975</u>	NIV <u>1975</u>	BJ <u>1978</u>	NJV <u>1978</u>	DGN <u>1982</u>	FC <u>1982</u>
3.24	(1.20)		(7.14)		(3.24)		3.24
	8.2 (8.11)				8.23 (9.8)	9.16	9.16
				12.2	(11.6)		
14.4	13.22 14.2 14.4 14.24 14.25 14.25	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4	14.4*
14.30	14.30 14.31 15.5			14.30			
				(15.5)			

RSV	NEB	TOB	NIV	BJ	NJV	DGN	FC
15.9	18.7	15.9	(15.9)				
	19.9	19.9				19.9	19.9
	19.18		(19.18)			19.18	19.18*
	(19.22)						
	20.6						
21.8	21.8	21.8	21.8	21.8	(21.8)	21.8	21.8
							21.9
23.2		23.2	(23.2)	23.2		23.2	23.2
		23.10	(23.10)	23.10			23.10
	26.5						
	26.8						
							26.19
	28.1					28.1*	
	28.4					28.4*	
	29.7						
	30.19						
	32.6						
	33.1			33.1			33.1
	33.3					33.3	
33.8	33.8		33.8	33.8	(33.8)	33.8	33.8
					(34.4)		
	34.5				(34.5)		34.5
	34.13						
				34.16		34.16	
	35.6						
	35.8						
	36.5						36.5
				37.9			
	37.18					37.18	
	37.20		37.20				
	37.25		37.25				37.25
	37.26						
	37.27		37.27		37.27		37.27
	37.27			37.27	37.27		37.27
	37.28						37.28
	37.29						
				38.8			
	38.12						
	38.13	38.13					38.13
	38.15						38.15
				38.16			
				38.16			
	40.6				(40.6)		
							40.12
				40.17			
	41.11						
		41.14					
						41.25	41.25
	41.27						
				41.29		41.29	41.29
	43.19	43.19			(43.19)		
	43.25						
				44.7			
	44.8						
	(44.19)						
		44.21					(44.21)

RSV	NEB	TOB	NIV	BJ	NJV	DGN	FC
45.2			45.2				
45.8		45.24					
	47.14			(48.10)			
		49.7		49.5			
	49.12	49.12	(49.12)		(49.12)	49.12	
49.17*	49.17	49.17		49.17		49.17	49.17
49.24	49.24	49.24	49.24	49.24		49.24	49.24
						51.6	
51.19	51.19	51.19*	51.19	51.19	(51.19)	51.19	51.19
	51.23						
			52.5				
	52.6						
	52.8						
	53.3						
		53.8		53.8		53.8	53.8
	53.9	53.9					
	53.11		53.11	53.11		53.11	53.11
	55.9						
	56.5			56.5			
56.12		57.2					
	(57.11)						
	58.13						
	59.21						
		60.7					
60.19	60.19	60.19			60.19	60.19*	60.19*
	61.4						61.6
						61.8	
		62.5			(62.5)		63.3
				63.3			63.3
						63.11	
							64.5
		65.18					
14	64(5)	23	11(6)	25(2)	7(12)	22	32(1)

Observations

The different modern versions vary considerably in their degree of acceptance of DSS variant readings. The average number of variants accepted is 25, and TOB, BJ and DGN are all very close to this average. NEB accepts twice as many as any other version, while NJV accepts less than one third of the average number. It is difficult to know whether the tendencies shown by the various versions could fairly be attributed to confessional pressure or academic fad, but on the whole, this seems rather unlikely. In the case of the NEB, the greater acceptance of DSS readings may have been at least partly due to the views of Prof. G.R. Driver, the dominant personality on the committee. The NJV, as already noted, claims to translate the traditional Hebrew text, so it is hardly surprising if it is reluctant to accept variants from another source. We can certainly say that the general attitude of all these modern versions towards DSS variant readings is a very cautious one. Despite the large number of DSS variants,

they have exerted relatively little influence on modern translations.

A total of 113 DSS variant readings have been used in at least one of the eight versions studied, though ten of them are used only as marginal alternative renderings. Thus out of over 1400 DSS variants listed in the seventh edition of *Biblia Hebraica*, only 103 have actually been taken as preferable to the MT in at least one modern version, a mere 7.4 per cent. Of these 103 variants, no less than 63 have been used in only one of the modern versions, and thus evince very little scholarly support. Of these 63 variants, 35 are used only in NEB, and account for 55 per cent of the places where NEB adopts a DSS variant. NEB can therefore be said to show a marked inclination to adopt variants which completely fail to attract other scholars. Translators in other languages should therefore be wary of taking NEB as their guide in these matters.

Of the 40 variants used in more than one modern version, only nine (0.64 per cent of the original 1403) have been accepted by five or more of the eight versions, and can thus claim the support of a majority of the scholars involved. Of these nine, only one (0.07 per cent of the original 1403) has been accepted by all eight versions (14.4). See the table below for a summary of the support in the modern versions of these nine DSS variants. Brackets and asterisks are used with the same meanings as in Table 1.

Table 2 Summary of modern versional support for the nine most widely accepted DSS variant readings

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Versions which adopt the DSS variant reading</u>							
14.4	RSV	NEB	TOB	NIV	BJ	NJV	DGN	FC*
21.8	RSV	NEB	TOB	NIV	BJ	(NJV)	DGN	FC
23.2	RSV		TOB	(NIV)	BJ		DGN	FC
33.8	RSV	NEB		NIV	BJ	(NJV)	DGN	FC
49.17	RSV*	NEB	TOB		BJ		DGN	FC
49.24	RSV	NEB	TOB	NIV	BJ		DGN	FC
51.19	RSV	NEB	TOB*	NIV	BJ	(NJV)	DGN	FC
53.11		NEB		NIV	BJ		DGN	FC
60.19	RSV	NEB	TOB			NJV	DGN*	FC*

We will now examine the nine DSS variants listed in Table 2 and see what kind of changes from the MT readings are involved.

1) **14.4** MT מרהבה (mdhbh); 1QIs^a מרהבה (mrhbh). The change is of only one letter, from a d to an r, letters which are very similar in Hebrew script. Here it makes the difference between an otherwise unknown word and a known word meaning "fury." This change is adopted by all eight of the modern versions studied, and is also recommended in the UBS Hebrew Old Testament Text Project Preliminary and Interim Report (HOTTP), Vol. 4. It also has ancient support in the Greek versions of Symmachus and Theodotion, in the Syriac, and in the Targum.

2) **21.8** MT אריה (ryh); 1QIs^a הראה (hr^h). The differences involve changes in two of the four letters, and give a much improved sense, "lookout" instead of "lion." This variant has the support of seven of the

modern versions, but is afforded only a grudging acquiescence in HOTTP, which says “translators may follow the reading of 1QIs^a... although this is certainly not the original text.” This reading also has ancient support from the Syriac.

3) 23.2 MT מלאוף (ml^ʿwk); 1QIs^a מלאכף (ml^ʿkyk). The differences involve the addition of one letter, and the change of w to y, letters which are very similar in Hebrew script. Again the sense is considerably improved, with “your messengers” instead of “they filled you.” This variant has support from five modern versions, and from HOTTP, but no ancient support.

4) 33.8 MT ערים (ʿrym); 1QIs^a עדים (ʿdym). This is a single letter change from an r to a d (the opposite of the change in 14.4), and yields a sense more appropriate to the context, “witnesses” instead of “cities.” It is supported by six modern versions, and by HOTTP, but has no ancient support.

5) 49.17 MT בניף (bnyk); 1QIs^a בוניף (bwnyk). The DSS variant includes one extra letter, but in a sense no change is involved. The consonants of the MT reading may be vocalised either as בְּנֵי־ (banayik) “your sons” or less probably as בְּנֵי־ (bonayik) “your builders.” The MT tradition records the former, but the DSS variant with the o written as an extra letter (w) proves that the latter was also current in ancient times. The DSS variant makes better sense in the context, and enjoys the support of six of the modern versions, and HOTTP, as well as the ancient Greek version of Aquila and the Latin Vulgate. (1QIs^a has a similar variant at 54.13, where it does not improve on the MT reading.)

6) 49.24 MT צריק (sdyq); 1QIs^a עריץ (ʿrys). The change involves three letters out of four, and produces a different word, meaning “fierce” instead of “righteous.” However, the new word is found even in the MT in the parallel clause in the following verse. Its occurrence in 49.24 would give a smoother flow and a more clearly marked poetic structure to the whole passage. The DSS variant has the support of seven of the modern versions, and HOTTP, as well as the ancient Syriac and the Latin Vulgate.

7) 51.19 MT אַחַמַּף (ʾnhmk); 1QIs^a ינחמף (ynhmk). The difference is of one letter, and changes the verb “comfort” from first person singular to third. This fits the parallelism of the verse better, and has the support of seven of the modern versions (but not HOTTP), as well as of the ancient Greek Septuagint, the Syriac, the Targum, and the Vulgate.

8) 53.11 1QIs^a and 1QIs^b both add the word אור (ʾwr) “light” which is absent from the MT. This improves the balance of the verse, and is accepted by five of the modern versions, and HOTTP, as well as having the ancient support of the Septuagint.

9) 60.19 1QIs^a adds the word בלילה (blylh) “in the night” which is absent from the MT. The addition gives a better balance to the parallelism of the verse, and has the support of six of the modern versions (but not HOTTP), as well as that of the Septuagint and the Targum among the ancient versions.

Conclusion

We have already seen that only nine out of over 1400 variants recorded in the DSS texts of Isaiah have commended themselves to a wide spectrum of recent scholarly translators in three major European languages. Clearly these nine DSS variants should be taken seriously by all OT translators. (We may note in passing that all nine are also accepted by GNB.) This does not mean that all the other DSS variants can be ignored. They need careful study, especially where a DSS variant agrees with the Septuagint or one of the other ancient versions. (This happens quite frequently in the books of Samuel.)

When we examine the actual differences from the MT in the nine places where DSS variants have wide modern support, we see that they are of various types. Though some yield significant differences of meaning, yet in terms of the orthographical differences in the Hebrew script, they are all relatively minor, and none affects more than one Hebrew word. This in itself is a remarkable vindication of the general reliability of the MT, and is a source of encouragement for the vast majority of OT translators who are not equipped to undertake independent evaluation of textual problems, but accept the MT tradition as their normal translation base.¹

¹The writer wishes to acknowledge gratefully the helpful comments of Dr. E. C. John, Professor of Old Testament and Principal of the United Theological College, Bangalore, on an earlier version of this article.

PHILIP W. COMFORT

LIGHT FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT PAPYRI CONCERNING THE TRANSLATION OF πνεύμα

Philip Comfort is a research student based in Columbus, Ohio, USA.

Translators have been perplexed about how to render the word πνεύμα in certain verses of the New Testament. Does the particular passage indicate the divine spirit or the human spirit or another spirit?¹ In several such places the translator has the option of capitalizing the word "Spirit" or not capitalizing it; either way, his rendering necessitates interpretation. Thus, a faithful translator may have wished that the New Testament writers themselves had made the distinction. But how could the New Testament authors orthographically make the distinction between the divine spirit and

¹For example, see Romans 8.15 (compare RSV, NASV, with NIV); 2 Corinthians 3:16 (compare AV, ASV, with RSV, NASV); 12.18 (see ASV mg.); Ephesians 1.17 (see NIV mg.); 5.18 (see ASV mg.); James 4.5 (compare ASV mg., NIV with RSV, NASV); 1 Peter 3.18 (compare AV, NIV with RSV, NASV); Revelation 1.4 (compare ASV, NASV with RSV, NIV); 1.10 (see NASV mg.).