

with a mere lexical-grammatical transposition of a text. Means must be found to provide what some people have called "the tone, the spirit, and the genius" of the source text. If one fails at this level, the translator has robbed the text of much of its value and the receptor has been cheated. But success at this level results in a masterpiece.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Gottwald, Norman K. *The Hebrew Bible: A Socio-Literary Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Kee, Howard Clark. *Miracle in the Early Christian World: A Study in Sociohistorical Method*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Robinson, Douglas. "Intensions, Signs and Interpretations: C. S. Peirce and the Dialogic of Pragmatism." *Kodikas/Code* 1985, 8.179-194.

MAGNE SÆBØ

THE NORWEGIAN BIBLE TRANSLATION OF 1978/ 85—WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

Dr. Magne Sæbø, professor of Old Testament in the Free Faculty of Theology (Church of Norway), Oslo, was chairman of the Norwegian Old Testament translation committee 1968-78, and has been chairman of the general translation committee since 1978.

The subject of this paper is, one may assume, first of all meant to be an assessment of the new Norwegian Bible translation, especially with a view to benefiting from the various experiences we have had in the course of the work.¹ Additionally, the new translation of 1978/85 will be examined against the background of the "history and tradition" of our Bible translations.

1. Speaking of a Norwegian *history* of Bible translation is, however, a rather complicated matter. Unlike the rest of the Nordic and other European countries—and Iceland—Norway did not get a new Bible translation of its own in connection with the Reformation; because of our national union with Denmark, even Bible translation was carried out in Copenhagen.²

When this period of nearly three centuries (from the 1520s to 1814) is included, it may be stated that the tradition of Bible translations in our church shows a *dual* character. At the time of the Reformation the influence of Luther's translation with its plain and popular language was decisive among Danish Bible translators, culminating in 1550 in the so-called Bible of King Christian III, which was very close to Luther's revised Bible translation of 1545. Not many

¹ Paper read at the Russian-Norwegian consultation on "The Bible in our History, Tradition and Culture—with Special Reference to Translation", held at Refsnes Gods, Jeløy/Moss, 7-10 September 1987, with participants from the Russian Orthodox Church, the United Bible Societies, the Norwegian Bible Society and the Church of Norway Council on Foreign Relations.

² For a general historical survey see Einar Molland, "Norske og danske bibeloversettelser brukt i Norge", in Frederic Kenyon, *Bibelen*, Oslo 1951, 127-155; "Bibelübersetzungen", III/1-2 and IV/1-2, in: *Theol. Realenzyklopädie [TRE]* 6, 1980, 228-254; 266-283.

decades later, however, a translation having a quite different method and style appeared. It was made by Professor, later Bishop, H. P. Resen in 1607, and revised by Professor Hans Svaning in 1647. Due to its extreme literal dependence upon the Hebrew and Greek text, it had a rather artificial Danish style and was less intelligible than the Bible of Christian III. Now two different translations existed side by side; but the winner was the later one by Resen and Svaning.

When the Norwegian Bible Society was founded in 1816, only two years after national independence had been won, it started to print, for the first time in Norway, parts of the Bible and whole Bibles—but they were only light revisions of the Resen-Svaning Bible; so the Danish Bible remained dominant in this country in the 19th century. Therefore, it was seen even more strongly as a priority to start working on a new translation into Norwegian. When it was finally completed—the Old Testament in 1891 and the New Testament in 1904—its language was decidedly Norwegian in character, but still syntactically heavy, encumbered with many Hebraisms and Grecisms; and its translation method was still that of the Resen-Svaning Bible. The same was true for the linguistic revision made in 1930; Sigmund Mowinckel maintained that this version was “really the same as the one of 1891.”³

Meanwhile, two currents were running counter to the mainstream from the days of Resen-Svaning. Firstly, the ‘New Norse’ (‘nynorsk’ or ‘landsmål’) movement led to different attempts at fresh and popular rephrasing of the Bible language in the last quarter of the 19th century; a complete New Norse Bible was published in 1921 (and revised in 1938).⁴ Secondly, from 1929 onward Sigmund Mowinckel and other scholars produced a scholarly translation of the Old Testament which proved very influential.⁵ In both instances, although in different ways, the translation is characterized by a new and more idiomatic way of translating and by considerable creativity.

It is thus clear that the soil was not unprepared for a new translation of the traditional ‘church Bible’ (in ‘bokmål’). But in view of the long and strong tradition of literal translation, it was necessary to provide very good reasons and a solid motivation for a new Bible translation. These were provided by a man of vision, Bishop Eivind Berggrav.

2. The very first *beginning* of the Bible translation of 1978 goes back to May 1939 when the Board of the Norwegian Bible Society gave consent to a proposal of its—relatively new—chairman, Bishop Berggrav, to “present some samples of a more living style in the translation of the New Testament”.⁶ The Second

³ Åge Holter, *Det Norske Bibelselskap gjennom 150 år*, I, 1816-1904, Oslo 1966, esp. 113-195; 277-324; 387-462; cp. also S. Mowinckel, “Bemerkninger til Salmene i den norske bibeloversettelse”, *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift [NTT]* 63, 1962, 129-270.

⁴ Cp. Holter, *op. cit.*, 442-462.

⁵ *Det gamle testamente*, oversatt av S. Michelet, S. Mowinckel og N. Messel, I, Oslo 1929; II, 1935; III, 1944; IV, 1955; V (by Mowinckel, A. S. Kapelrud and R. Leivestad), 1963.

⁶ E. Berggrav, “En ungdoms-utgave av Det nye testamente”, *Kirke og Kultur [KoK]* 51, 1946, 559-571, 559; cp. Åge Holter, “‘Den levende makt i Bibelen’. Eivind Berggrav som bibelmann”, in the memorial volume *Eivind Berggrav. Brobygger og kirkeleder 1884-1984*, ed. Per Voksø, Oslo 1984, 165-178, esp. 169-171. Cp. also “Bishop Eivind Berggrav—A Centenary”, *UBS Bulletin* 136/137, 1984; and “The UBS at 40”, *UBS Bulletin* 144/145, 1986.

World War delayed his plans, but they were not completely shelved. When he was in prison during the war he started translating parts of the New Testament; after the war he published “A Trial Edition of the Letter to the Philippians”;⁷ and on 2nd April 1946 he presented to the Board the first half of the Gospel according to Mark. In a long memorandum to the Board, dated 25th October 1946, he outlined his plans for a new translation strategy.⁸

Bishop Berggrav had a great vision and a clear goal: in order to make it easier for people to understand the living Word of God, the stumbling-blocks and abstruse formulations of various kinds in the traditional Bible had to be removed from the text, and the text was to be rephrased into a more easily understandable form of modern Norwegian, “but without giving the impression of being colloquial (‘hverdagslig’) in a bad sense”.

To reach this goal, Berggrav envisaged, first, as a short-term project, a *linguistic revision* of the New Testament, with young people as the specific target group, and then, as a long-term project, a *new translation* of the whole Bible from the original languages. He sketched in his letter what might be the principles of a linguistic revision—or of a translation, but saying that the formulation of the principles were not ‘his business’. Today, more than forty years later, it is most interesting to read his wise words on our language situation, on the proper linguistic level of a translation, and most of all his “Notes” (written in 1943 when he was imprisoned) on his own experiences in Bible translating, in the end an “impossible” task. These “Notes”, quoted verbatim in his letter to the Board, begin: “*To translate the New Testament* is like transforming a whole symphony into words. One may keep a middle path, trying only to express the ‘meaning’. But the musical accompaniment of the meaning, which gives the richness, the nuance, the profoundness, will disappear. The meaning is in a way *correct*, but it has become poor. It does not sing... The extraordinary thing about the Bible is that its source was a living life. The words in it must be a bridge from life to life”.⁹

On 30 October 1946 the Board decided to start a linguistic revision of the NT, aimed at young people. The work started along the lines that Berggrav had indicated in his letter. The drafts were made by two experts and checked by a review committee, of which Berggrav was a member. A sample edition of Mark¹⁰ was published in 1951, and the whole New Testament was ready in 1959—the year in which Bishop Berggrav died.¹¹ Meanwhile, the more extensive work on a new Bible translation had also started.

Looking back on the first steps of this revision and translation, we may ask: What did we learn? Firstly, although a ‘man of vision’ is no *sine qua non* for a new Bible translation, the fact that there was a man like Bishop Berggrav was of very great significance for the new Norwegian translation, both for the initiative and

⁷ “Et forsøk med Filipperebrevet”, *KoK* 51, 1946, 257-262.

⁸ *KoK* 1946, 559ff (see n.6).

⁹ *KoK* 51, 1946, 564-67; the quotation on p.564f.

¹⁰ *Vær ikke redde. Evangeliet etter Markus oversatt for ungdom*; in magazine format, illustrated with modern photographs.

¹¹ *Det nye testamente oversatt for ungdom*; New Norse version published 1961. In 1945 Professor Lyder Brun had published his own NT translation, *Det nye testamentet i ny oversettelse*, I-II (Oslo); stylistically it was *along the same lines* as the scholarly translation of the OT.

for the orientation of the work. Secondly, it was important that the work started modestly with a linguistic revision of the existing Bible. In this way valuable experience was acquired. Thirdly, if we had listened more carefully to the words of Berggrav in 1943/46, we might have avoided unnecessary discussions about the language level of the translation, and some criticism.

3. Up to a point it is true to say that the vision of Bishop Berggrav was followed up by discussion within the Society; and this transition from vision to discussion was necessary, especially with regard to the new translation of the whole Bible. The first urgent issue to be discussed was the question of *basic principles* for the translation work.¹² These were considered and formulated by a special committee and adopted by the Board in November 1956. The Board also decided to embark on a new translation of the Bible into both official languages of the country ('bokmål' and 'nynorsk/landsmål' or New Norse).¹³

The *Principles* adopted cover "five principal areas", namely the alternative of a new translation or a revision, the questions of base (original) text, exegetical basis, the language level, and the question of formal or dynamic equivalence.¹⁴

The question of *revision or translation* is discussed first but is somewhat surprisingly left open; in the rest of the Principles, a new translation from the original languages is clearly presupposed. This caution or hesitation may, perhaps, be explained by some internal compromise or by some uncertainty about the resources of the Society¹⁵ and the relationship of a new translation to the existing Bible of 1930/38. In any case, at this point there seems to be some ambiguity in the Principles, which should have been settled from the beginning—or the Principles should have been adjusted or 'up-dated' after a period of work. On the one hand, it is emphasized that there must be *continuity* with the existing translation, especially in "kernel" passages of great religious or theological significance; but on the other hand, various examples of possible discontinuity are given.

As for the question of *base (original) text* there is agreement that for a 'church Bible' the text to be followed is not to be any 'original' text that may be arrived at by text-critical assumptions, but that it should be the historical text of the biblical canon. As for the OT, this means that the *Massoretic Text* (MT) as published by Kittel in *Biblia Hebraica*—later *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*—is to be generally accepted. There is, on the whole, a conservative attitude towards the MT. But the MT is not absolutized, inasmuch as independent text-critical work is

¹² See E. A. Nida, "Establishing Translation Principles and Procedures", *TBT* 33, 1982, 208-213, esp. 208; *Toward a Science of Translating*, Leiden 1964, esp. 245-251; E. A. Nida and C. R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden 1969, esp. 174-188; Jan de Waard and Eugene A. Nida, *From One Language to Another*, New York 1986.

¹³ The "Principles for a New Bible Translation" are published in *Tidsskrift for Teologi og Kirke [TTK]* 28, 1957, 1-17 ("Om prinsippene for en ny bibeloversettelse"), and in *NTT* 58, 1957, 151-171 ("De teologiske prinsipper for ny bibeloversettelse"). Members of the Committee on the Principles were Professors Nils A. Dahl, Sigmund Mowinckel, Sverre Aalen and Bishop Johannes Smemo, the successor of Bishop Berggrav and the next Chairman of the Society. Dr. Åge Holter acted as its Secretary.

¹⁴ Cp. Nida, *TBT* 1982, 208; see n.12 above.

¹⁵ The Norwegian translation, unlike those in other Nordic countries, had to be made at the expense of the Norwegian Bible Society alone, without any support from outside.

presupposed; on specific text-critical conditions, other readings, especially when supported by some of the ancient versions, may be preferred. On the question of harmonizing parallel passages, Mowinckel, without the consent of the other members, advocated such a possibility. As for the Greek text of the NT it is stated that the process of substituting the *textus receptus* for an older and better text—a process that had started already in connection with the NT translation of 1904—had to be pursued. The Greek text as edited by Nestle, and later by the Bible Societies, is generally accepted, but without binding the translator to all decisions made by Nestle; on independent text-critical discussion and decision the base text, with respect for the main tradition and with a preference for the Hesychian text, is a premise. With regard to the biblical text basis the Principles are accurate and precise; and the relation to the 1930/38 Bible is clear.

As for the question of *exegetical basis*, however, the relation of a new translation to the existing Bible is to some extent ambiguous and not well-defined. On the one hand, it is clearly stated that in cases where another textual basis than that of the 1904/30 Bible has been preferred, a different or new exegesis may be expressed in the translation. On the other hand, exegetical *continuity* with the 1930/38 version is taken into consideration and generally recommended; some conditions for potential deviations are listed, but as for religious 'kernel' passages the utmost caution has to be shown.

With regard to the *language and stylistic level* of a new Bible translation, the Principles are also to some extent undecided. In view of the special language situation in this country, characterized by a high degree of inner tension and linguistic instability, this may be understandable. It is nevertheless surprising that the possibility of postponement of the whole translation project was considered, in the "hope that the language situation in Norway in the meantime will be somewhat more clarified that it is to-day".¹⁶ Bishop Berggrav's main concern was that the Bible might be presented in a language as 'smooth' and plain as possible, without unnecessary discontinuity with the language of the existing Bible. This may also be the general concern expressed in the Principles, where the *stylistic goal* is defined to be a "proper and intelligible Norwegian, not an unnecessarily strange, complicated and archaizing one"; even the demand for "a popular and colloquial Norwegian" is considered positively. However, it is also maintained that the concern for "a readily intelligible" ("lett forståelig") Norwegian "cannot be given first priority", because of certain theological and exegetical concerns. Remarkably, the question of the language character of the new translation is closely related to the question of literal or idiomatic type of translation and is primarily dealt with under that section, where also theological and exegetical concerns are taken into consideration (sect. 4).

In other words, the question of *formal-correspondence* (word for word) or *dynamic-equivalent* (meaning for meaning) translation¹⁷ is not dealt with as a

¹⁶ The Principles, section 1 (*TTK* 1957, 1f; *NTT* 1957, 152); all quotations here in sect. 3 are from the Principles, unless otherwise stated; cp. n.13 above.

¹⁷ Cp. Nida, *TBT* 1982, 209; *Toward a Science*, 156ff; *Theory and Practice*, 1ff; further "Bibelübersetzungen", sect. V.3-4, *TRE* 6, 302-311; Åge Holter, "Bibelordet i tidens språkdrakt", *Kirkens arv—Kirkens fremtid*. Festskrift til Biskop Johannes Smemo på 70-årsdagen 31. juli 1968, Oslo 1968, 152-168; Ole Chr. M. Kvarme, "Dynamisk ekvivalens. Et nytt prinsipp for bibeloversettelse", *Ung Teologi* 4, 1971, 27-40.

purely technical matter of translation, but is discussed with regard to its theological and exegetical implications. It is first stated as a main point that the translation is to be as *accurate and reliable* as possible; then, it is maintained that the accuracy aimed at is "first and foremost a reliable rendering of the meaning and the message of the text", while a "literal translation" or "a mechanical rendering" is "no guarantee" of an accurate translation. At the same time, however; the question of literal or idiomatic translation is not regarded as "a real alternative". For "in central matters the meaning and the message of the text can only be expressed by the Bible's own words", as, for example, the formula "in Christ". Further, one has to be aware of the fact that the need for "a careful exegesis" increases as one attempts a more idiomatic translation. Also, the translated text should not be more comprehensible than its original; and paraphrasing is to be avoided. "The monumental and concise character of the biblical text is not to be erased".

Summing up, we may say that the Principles of 1956 have *two main concerns*: On the one hand, the translational method intended is clearly that of an *idiomatic* or *dynamic-equivalent* translation; methodologically, therefore, there is a break with the long translation tradition from the Resen-Svaning Bible and a return to the translation principles and practice of Luther, and of the Christian III Bible. It seems, however, that idiomatic translation is mainly understood in linguistic categories, as a 'modernizing' of the Norwegian Bible language. Theological and exegetical *continuity* with the existing Bible of 1930/38 is strongly stressed. This is a concern which is of special importance in churches and cultures with an old and strong tradition of Bible translation. It is, however, not made sufficiently clear in the Principles how these two concerns are to be related to each other.

What did we learn? Firstly, that it is not only useful and significant for a meaningful translation work to have concrete and well-defined principles, but that it is in fact imperative. Secondly, it is of vital importance for the concrete translation work that the principles, without being too casuistic and detailed, are concrete and well-defined. Thirdly, principles should be reformulated after some time, in the light of experience and new findings in the study of translation.

4. A successful translation is dependent not only on the formulation of clear principles and guidelines, but also on clear decisions on *organizing* the translation work, including organizational *procedures*.¹⁸

As already mentioned, there was to begin with some caution or hesitation in the Norwegian Bible Society with regard to the scope of a new translation of the whole Bible. The possibility of working in defined *stages* had been proposed¹⁹ and the first concrete decision on the procedure was in accordance with this proposal. As the linguistic revision of the New Testament was about to be completed at that time, it was decided that the work on a new translation should embark on a translation of the Old Testament; but, as a first step, only sample translations of the books of Genesis, Isaiah and the Psalms were envisaged.²⁰

¹⁸ Cp. Nida, *Toward a Science*, 245ff; *Theory and Practice*, 174ff; and *TBT* 1982, 212f.

¹⁹ The Principles, sect. 1 (*TTK* 1957, 2; *NTT* 1957, 153: "oversettelsen fremmes i ctapper").

²⁰ Cp. Oddmund Hjelde, "En ny bibeloversettelse—prinsipper og problemer", *Årbok for Den norske kirke* 15, 1966, p.190-201.

However, in view of the textual problems of Isaiah, and especially the Psalms, one may query the wisdom of beginning the work with these texts.²¹ The drafting, which started in 1957, was not carried out by a team of translators, but by one person, Oddmund Hjelde, who was well qualified both theologically and linguistically. He was supposed to work in co-operation with a review committee, a Translation Committee, of experts (later called "the large commission") and which consisted of the OT scholars, Professors Sigmund Mowinckel and Ivar P. Seierstad, the NT scholars, Professors Nils A. Dahl and Sverre Aalen and a Professor of Classics, Leiv Amundsen, with Dr. Åge Holter as Secretary. In the meetings of this committee Hjelde's drafts were thoroughly discussed; but since the committee went into great detail, it made rather slow progress. In addition, the committee may have been too 'scholarly'. Therefore, when the three sample translations were completed, Hjelde returned in 1960 to his University position and was succeeded in the translation work by the OT scholar Ole Øverland Gjerde. The committee structure and translation procedures were then slightly modified. On the one hand, some of the biblical scholars left the committee, but continued to serve as consultants. On the other hand, the committee was, after some time, expanded to include experts in pedagogy and the Norwegian language. The Society did not succeed in getting an author or a stylist as a member of the committee.

The sample translations of Genesis, Isaiah and the Psalms were not published in any form, but, after some revision, portions of them constituted a considerable part of an edition of Old Testament Selections (in both varieties of Norwegian), published on the occasion of the Society's 150th Anniversary in 1966. In 1967 a complete edition of the Psalms was published.²² At that time the translation work had been accelerated—primarily due to the fact that Revd. Birger Mathisen was now the General Secretary of the Society. In the same way as Bishop Berggrav had been the influential initiator, Birger Mathisen became the person who, more than anybody else, strongly promoted the new Bible translation.

In 1968 the Translation Committee was divided into an OT section and a NT section; the staff of full-time and part-time translators was increased; some of them had also been trained in translation courses abroad. At this time the Society can be said to have had a strong translation milieu. In addition, consultants were called upon when special problems made it necessary. Sometimes, selected parts of translations, after having been examined in the Translation Committee, were sent to a larger group of consultants (approximately 30 persons of various backgrounds) for comment; afterwards, the comments were evaluated both by the translators and by the committee. In 1973 a sample edition of the Minor Prophets was published in both languages,²³ and in 1975 the translation of the New Testament was completed, also in both languages. The many comments and remarks that were made on these editions, in the press and

²¹ Cp. Nida, *TBT* 1982, 212.

²² *Utvalg av Det gamle testamentet*. Oversettelse av 1966 (nynorsk: *Utval or Det gamle testamentet*. Omsetjing frå 1966), Oslo 1966: *Salmenes bok*. Ny oversettelse av 1967, Oslo 1967.

²³ *Så sier Herren. De tolv profeter* (nynorsk: *Så seier Herren. Dei tolv profetane*), Oslo 1973.

in private letters to the Society, were seriously considered by the translators and in the Translation Committee—as had also been the case with the earlier sample translations. As for the New Testament of 1975, some two hundred alterations were made before it became part of the complete new Bible translation of 1978. Finally, during the next six or seven years all comments on the new Bible translation were discussed open-mindedly and soberly by the Translation Committee. In a revised edition of the Bible, published in 1985, some three hundred alterations were made.

The long and arduous path of the new Bible translation had now come to an end. All the way, not only translators, the Translation Committee and various consultants had been involved, but the whole Board, in which other churches than the Lutheran Church of Norway are represented, and the Society's General Assembly, including all Bishops of the Church of Norway. These two bodies, which made the final decisions regarding the translation—and the Norwegian Bible translation is given no other 'authorization'—took part all along in the translation process, and constituted its last two stages. The Board, especially, took an active part in the work; in long sessions it scrutinized the individual translations very carefully, and it contributed significantly to the specific profile of the new translation. The same thing can, to some extent, be said about the meetings of the General Assembly, where the discussion, at times, tended to be somewhat arbitrary, but where usually more fundamental problems were discussed, such as, for example, the translation of metaphors and of some theologically basic 'concepts'.

Regarding the procedure of the translation work, we may ask: What did we learn? Firstly, it may be disputed whether the first organization of the work and the first choice of books to be translated were the best; team work should perhaps have been given higher priority in the beginning, and the more difficult books, Psalms and Isaiah, should have waited until a later stage. Secondly, the discussions of the Board and the General Assembly went at times into too much detail. The procedure may have been too 'top-heavy'. Thirdly, it was clearly an advantage that various sample editions of the new translation were published in the course of the work. In that way critical remarks could be evaluated carefully. There can be little doubt that this has improved the quality of the translation.

5. The *final product* of the whole process, *the new translation of the Norwegian Bible*, is, of course, of the greatest interest. An evaluation or appraisal of its *quality* cannot be made on this occasion, for obvious reasons, but must be made by others. One may, however, call attention to some of the *characteristics*—and problems—of the new translation.

The relationship between the Principles of 1956 and the final translation of 1978/85 is problematic. The continuity which the new translation was supposed to have with the Bible of 1930/38 is not as strong as one might have expected. This fact may be explained partly by the ambivalence of the Principles and partly by the fact that the translation work revealed inner dynamics of its own as it went on. Moreover, it was during these years the theoretical study of translation methodology was pursued very strongly, for example by Eugene A. Nida, and his theories turned out to be influential in our country, as throughout the world. Therefore, the new translation attained a higher degree of independence,

methodologically, linguistically and exegetically, compared with the 1930/38 Bible, than might have been expected in 1956.

It may be fair to say that in the course of the work one became less occupied with the relation to the existing Bible translation and increasingly engaged in the concern, as formulated by Bishop Berggrav, “that the *original text* must always be translated *correctly and properly*.”²⁴ Bearing this in mind, one tried, open-mindedly, to take advantage of progress in various fields of learning in this century, such as exegesis, biblical theology and also archaeology and the ancient languages, hermeneutics and semantics, in order to *come closer to the meaning and message of the original text*. The whole process helped to create an increased understanding of what “meaning and message” really are about, that they are not only related to single words and ‘concepts’ but to their context and text-structures as well.²⁵ These new insights have left their mark on the new translation in many ways.

In recent years some theologians have also introduced the concept of a specific *theology of Bible translation*.²⁶ However this may be defined and described, there is here a phenomenon of great theological significance which I should like to call a ‘*petrification of language*’. With regard to Bible translations that means that a language (including linguistic units such as words and idioms) which at a specific time was a living and expressive language, in the course of time has perhaps slightly changed its meaning or lost its original freshness. In some religions, the established literal character of their Holy Scriptures has to be kept under all circumstances, in spite of the ‘petrification’ of the language. But that is not the view held by the New Testament, as it is stated, for example, in 1 Cor 14.10-11 or 2 Cor 3.6. The Church as the “wandering people of God”, should always be prepared to break up—even from a petrified biblical and religious language. Its Holy Scripture is a “source of living life”, and its translation “must be a bridge from life to life”.

What have we learned? In a word, we have learned that Bible translation is a very complicated and arduous task. It is also a work that always has to be corrected, renewed and redone—and it will never be finished. As Bishop Berggrav wrote in prison in 1943, at the end of his “Notes”: “Finish we never shall, but this is really a part of the fascinating glory of the word of God”.²⁷

²⁴ See *KoK* 1946, 567.

²⁵ Cp. *inter alia*, E. A. Nida, *Exploring Semantic Structures*, Munich 1975.

²⁶ Cp., for example, Barclay M. Newman, “Toward a Theology of Translation”, *UBS Bulletin* 124/125, 1981, 10-21; also Daniel C. Arichea Jr, “Theology and Translation”, *UBS Bulletin* 140/141, 1985, 7-24.

²⁷ *KoK* 1946, 567.