

Translation as Reincarnation?

David J. Clark

Retired Translation Consultant with UBS and IBT Moscow

The Bible Translator

2015, Vol. 66(2) 117–128

© The Author(s) 2015

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/2051677015590808

tbt.sagepub.com



Abstract

This article is based on the author's checking session notes, and presents several categories of examples of domestication in translations of the Gospel of Luke in five minority languages of Russia: Yakut, Tuvan, Khakas, Kalmyk, and Chechen.

Keywords

domestication, Yakut, Tuvan, Khakas, Kalmyk, Chechen, translation problems affecting lexical matters, figures of speech, nature and climate, social structures and attitudes

Introduction

The contrast between “domestication” and “foreignization” in translation has been a subject of lively debate in translation studies.¹ Whatever one's theoretical attitude to this issue, in the case of Bible translation into new languages, a certain amount of subtle domestication is unavoidable, as I often observed in my work as a Translation Consultant with pioneer New Testament translation projects in different parts of the world, specifically,

¹ I would like to record my deep gratitude to the friends and former colleagues in the translation projects discussed in this article for checking the accuracy of the statements derived from my fallible notes, namely Peter Knapp (Khakas), Dr. Erwin Komen (Chechen), Sargylana Leontyeva (Yakut), Beth Long (Kalmyk), and Dr. Vitaly Voinov (Tuvan). They all responded to my request for help with exemplary promptness and thoroughness. This article first appeared as the only item in English in *Translationswissenschaft als Interdisziplin: Beiträge des Ehrenkolloquiums zum 70. Geburtstag von Heidemarie Salevsky* (Berlin, 2014) and is reproduced, with a few minor changes, by kind permission of the editor and copyright holder, Dr. Ina Müller.

Corresponding author:

David J. Clark, 20 Wellington Lodge, 2 Firwood Drive, Camberley, Surrey GU15 3QD, UK.
Email: djcgrc@hotmail.co.uk

for this article, in five minority languages in Russia. The languages in question were (from east to west) Yakut, Tuvan, Khakas, Kalmyk, and Chechen.

- 1) Yakut is a Turkic language spoken in the Sakha Republic in eastern Siberia by 450,000 people (all population figures are as given in the current online edition of Ethnologue: www.ethnologue.com). The underlying worldview is shamanistic, but there is an Orthodox Christian tradition in the area dating back to the seventeenth century, and since 1991 some Protestant congregations have been formed. The New Testament was published by the Institute for Bible Translation (IBT) in Moscow in 2004.
- 2) Tuvan is a Turkic language spoken by 254,000 people in the Tuva Republic in southern Siberia, bordering on Mongolia. The primary religious tradition is shamanism, with Tibetan Buddhism as a more recent influence. There are small numbers of Orthodox and Protestant Christians. The New Testament was published by IBT in Moscow in 2001 and the whole Bible in 2011.
- 3) Khakas is a Turkic language spoken by 42,600 people in the Republic of Khakassia, adjacent to the Tuva Republic in southern Siberia. There is an Orthodox Christian tradition as well as some Protestant congregations. There is also a layer of shamanism. The New Testament was published by IBT in Moscow in 2009.
- 4) Kalmyk is an Altaic (more specifically, a Mongolic) language spoken by 80,500 people in the Republic of Kalmykia in the steppes to the west of the Caspian Sea. The religious tradition is Tibetan Buddhism, with a small Christian presence both Orthodox and Protestant, and at least one Catholic church. The New Testament was published by IBT in Moscow in 2002.
- 5) Chechen is a North Caucasian language spoken by 1,350,000 people in the Republic of Chechnya and neighbouring republics in the North Caucasus. The religious tradition is Sunni Muslim with Sufi influence, and there are very few Christians of any persuasion. The New Testament was published by IBT in Moscow in 2007 and the whole Bible in 2012.

The data

In the course of my numerous checking sessions with the above translation teams, I made many notes on points of interest from a translation perspective. The notes were made with the needs at the time in mind, and not as raw material for papers to be written many years later. Thus they are rather haphazard, and do not hold all the information I would now like to have.

Nevertheless, they do contain a great deal of data that stimulate further reflection. When I started to prepare this article, I feared I might need to plough through hundreds of pages of notes on the whole New Testament in order to gather enough material. The fact that the notes are all hand-written did not make the task any more inviting. In fact, however, when I started to read the notes, it soon became clear that they contained far more information than I could use, so I was able to limit my examples to the Gospel of Luke. This choice was not made according to any explicit principle. I tackled the notes in chronological order, and the earliest notes I had (from May 1995 on Yakut) happened to be on Luke, and not even on the whole Gospel. They contained enough interesting material that, in order to facilitate comparisons where possible, I restricted myself to the notes on Luke in the other projects as well. My notes on Kalmyk were made in December 1999, those on Tuvan in November 2000, those on Khakas in March 1997 and again in November 2004, and those on Chechen in February 2004. In the sections that follow, the references to Luke are to the places where my note happens to occur, and do not imply that the fact observed does not occur anywhere else. Biblical quotations in English are from the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) of 1989 unless otherwise stated.

The points at which unavoidable “domestication” of the translation took place can be conveniently sorted into four categories, and I will present them under these headings. First, and most predictable, were lexical issues, and I will say relatively little about them. Next came figures of speech, another well-known problem for translators. Then there were questions related to the natural world and the climate. Finally, somewhat to my surprise, the largest category was items related to social structures and attitudes.

Lexical issues

Because the checking sessions with the different languages were spread over a period of nine years, there were certain features which I had not noticed until I came to compare the notes on the different projects. One was the absence of certain lexical items. In Kalmyk (23.42) there is no word equivalent to “remember,” so this has to be expressed as “don’t forget.” Likewise in 8.45 where Jesus is asking who touched him, both Khakas and Chechen have no word for “deny,” so in Khakas, “all denied it” was expressed as “nobody who touched him was found” and in Chechen as “nobody admitted it.” In 14.26, Jesus, speaking hyperbolically, says, “If anyone comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple.” In Kalmyk and Chechen there is no word for “hate” appropriate to

this context so the sentence has to be restructured to say, “if anyone does not love me more than . . .” (Kalmyk) or “esteem me more than . . .” (Chechen).

One semantic field where English lacks a distinction made in Greek is marriage: English does not have separate verbs for a man marrying and a woman marrying. In Luke 17.27 NRSV resorts to the archaic and somewhat foreignizing rendering, “They were . . . marrying and being given in marriage.” GNB tries to maintain something of the distinction without the archaism by saying “men and women married.” GuNB (1982) goes further with “Die Menschen . . . heirateten.” Yakut, Khakas, and Chechen (like Russian) all have separate expressions for men marrying and women marrying, and thus do not need this particular fragment of domestication.

In 18.25 Jesus makes the oft-quoted remark that “it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.” At this point the Greek speaks simply of the hole in the needle, τρήμα (*trēma*), and English translations import a quiet piece of domestication when they say “the eye of a needle.” In German translations I find a different piece of domestication in that German needles have ears rather than eyes (*Nadelöhr*), and in this matter German is joined by Khakas, where needles also have ears rather than eyes. In Yakut and Tuvan, the word used is close in meaning to the Greek, conveying the idea of a small hole. On the anatomy of needles in Kalmyk and Chechen, my notes are silent, though I have recently been informed that Chechen needles do indeed have eyes.

As a final note on lexical matters, Khakas is unusually rich in homonyms, which leads to potential ambiguities. In 12.32 the Khakas word for “flock” is homonymous with a word for “girl-friend” so the translators added “of sheep” in order to prevent misunderstanding. In 14.34, the Khakas word for “salt” is homonymous with a word for “time,” and in the very next verse the word for “land” is homonymous with a verb for “to eat.” In 17.29, the word for the “fire” that fell upon Sodom is homonymous with a word for “grass,” so to avoid any impression that Sodom was overwhelmed by grass, the translators said “burning fire.” In 22.20, the words for “king” and “blood” are homonyms, so the translation clarified the intended referent by saying, “the new covenant established by my shed blood.”

Figures of speech

Not infrequently a Greek figure of speech can be retained in translation, and such a situation tends to pass unnoticed. Where a figure is either incongruous or even unintelligible in the receptor language, its meaning may have to be expressed in non-figurative language. However, under certain conditions the figure may be adjusted or replaced by a parallel figure, and these cases

tend to be more interesting. Inevitably, different languages may respond in different ways to the same figure. In Luke 23.31, on his way to Calvary, Jesus comments, "If they do this when the wood is green, what will happen when it is dry?" In Khakas this was not a natural way of speaking, but the translators considered it intelligible, so the figure was retained. In Tuvan, however, it was felt that the figure needed adjustment. In the traditional nomadic yurts, the fireplace is an important social centre, so one option considered (though in the end not adopted) was, "If they do this before the fire is lit, what will happen when it is blazing?"

In Luke 12.35 the Greek uses an expression rendered literally in the KJV as "Let your loins be girded about." NRSV translates more generically as "Be dressed for action." In Yakut the Greek is adjusted to "have your belts done up tight," which carries the implication of readiness for action while retaining a reference to clothing. The same Greek verb occurs in 12.37 in the context of being ready for serving food, and here the Yakut uses a different clothing allusion and says, "he will roll up his sleeves."

Other parallel figures occur in other contexts. In Luke 12.50, Jesus speaks of his future sufferings with the expression, "I have a baptism with which to be baptized." In Chechen this figure is replaced by a natural figurative expression: "I have a sea of suffering to undergo." In 19.46 in the same language, the Greek "cave of robbers" becomes "a nest of robbers." In 24.32 the question, "Were not our hearts burning within us?," becomes in Khakas, "Were not our hearts constricted within us?"

Inevitably, some figures of speech are lost and have to be replaced by non-figurative language, but more often than one might expect there is compensation for such losses in the form of new figures that occur naturally in a receptor language in places where the Greek text does not use a figure. Of course in a sacred text such new figures must pass two tests: they must convey the right meaning, and they must not introduce any element that would have been historically or culturally impossible in the biblical context. For instance, in Luke 3.16 one could not have John the Baptist declaring himself unworthy to clean the mud off Jesus' football boots. On the other hand, in Mark 7.6 where Jesus says to the Pharisees and scribes, "Isaiah prophesied rightly about you . . .," it would be very effective in English to translate as, "Isaiah hit the nail on the head when he said about you . . .," though I know of no English version that does so. Such new figures inevitably entail a modicum of domestication, but they contribute a vividness that may add significantly to reader response.

Numerous examples of new figures occurred in the languages under consideration. In Luke 1.25, where Elizabeth said that by her unexpected pregnancy the Lord "took away the disgrace I have endured among my people,"

in Chechen she says that the Lord “has put me in a white face.” In 10.40, Martha complains that “my sister has left me to do all the work by myself.” In Chechen this becomes “Mary has flung all the work on me and is sitting down.” In the same language, the destitute prodigal son in 15.16 is “blinded by hunger,” and in 24.29 “the day is now nearly over” is expressed as “the day has rocked in the direction of evening.” In Luke 21.26 in Kalmyk, “people will faint from fear” becomes “people’s hearts will be in their heels.” In Yakut in 19.22, “You wicked slave” becomes “you fellow with black thoughts.” In 12.20 Khakas and Yakut have different figures for “you fool!” In Khakas it becomes “you muddle-head!” whereas in the Yakut draft it first appeared as “you duck-brain!”—which does not sound as absurd in Yakut as it does in English! However, this was later deemed to be too colloquial, and was changed to a higher-level term meaning something more like “you blockhead.”

Issues of nature and climate

The climate in Russia, and especially in Siberia, is very different from that of Palestine, and this inevitably gives rise to problems in translation, especially where plants and animals are concerned. How, in Luke 10.19 and 11.12, is one to translate “scorpion” in an area where such creatures are unknown and there is therefore no term for them? One option is to do what major versions in Russian, German, and English have all done, and simply borrow and adapt the Greek word *σκορπίος* (*skorprios*). This option has two problems: first, it introduces what is obviously a borrowed word which may be stylistically undesirable, and second, it carries little or no meaning. In these two contexts, the scorpion stands for a harmful and undesirable creature, and that is the meaning that needs to be captured, so in Yakut and Chechen the scorpions became “poisonous spiders.”

In Luke 17.37, Jesus makes the rather enigmatic statement, “Where the corpse is, there the *ἀετοί* (*aetoi*) will gather.” The Greek word *ἀετοί* (*aetoi*) covers both birds that are predators, such as eagles, and those that are scavengers, such as vultures, but in the context of a corpse, it is clear that vultures are intended. Khakas, like Greek, has a generic term that includes both predators and scavengers, and was thus able to leave it to the context to show which was intended here. In Yakut neither eagles nor vultures are known, so the translation became “ravens,” which are known. In Chechen, the term chosen was “crows.” A somewhat analogous situation arose in 12.33 with the word “moth” in Jesus’ statement about “unfailing treasure in heaven, where no thief comes near and no moth destroys.” In Tuvan “moth” was rendered by a generic term covering both moths and butterflies, so again the reader has

to deduce from the context which is in mind. In Yakut it was rendered by an even more generic term meaning "insect." In Yakutia, I suspect that the first destructive insect that people would think of is the cockroach, as I know from personal experience that such creatures flourish there.

Occasionally the opposite situation occurs, where a receptor language has more specific terminology than Greek. In Luke 19.30 Jesus speaks of "a colt that has never been ridden," but in Kalmyk there is a specific word for an unbroken colt, and this term enabled the statement to be expressed more succinctly than in the original. In 2.24, the thanksgiving sacrifice to be offered for a firstborn child is described as "a pair of turtledoves or two young pigeons." In Khakas this is expressed neatly by a phrase that means "two wild or domestic pigeons." In some other places, the boot was on the other foot. The Khakas have a strong traditional interest in horses and horse racing, and donkeys are not used. Where donkeys are mentioned in the New Testament in a literal sense (as in Luke 10.34; 13.15; 14.5; 19.30), the Khakas translators felt that the least unsatisfactory option was to borrow a word, not from Russian but from another Turkic language.

The greatest ecological mismatch between Palestine and a receptor language area was in Yakutia, where the winter climate is extreme. In Yakut the fox of Luke 13.33 had to become a wolf, and the goat of 15.29 had to become a young calf, in contrast with the fatted calf of 15.23, 27, 30, which was specified as a two-year-old.

As with living creatures, so with vegetation there were numerous problems, especially in Yakutia, where the extremely cold climate prevents the growth of many plants and trees. In Luke 11.42, there are no words for the herbs mint and rue, so they have to become generic "seasoning herbs." In 13.19, the "mustard seed" is rendered as a "larch seed," a small seed which does indeed grow into a large tree just as Jesus says. In 19.4, the tree Zacchaeus climbed is in Yakut just "a tree," which represents a loss of precision but is adequate for the events narrated, in which the exact species of tree is a circumstantial detail of no significance to the understanding of the story.

In Luke 12.27 the lilies in Kalmyk become tulips. These have grown in the area for a very long time (since before the tulip mania of the 1630s in Western Europe) and have spread widely. Nowadays they provide a very colourful addition to the steppe in spring time, and fit the context of what Jesus was saying just as well as lilies. In Luke 6.44 Jesus states the truism that "figs are not gathered from thorns, nor are grapes picked from a bramble bush." This is an illustration of a principle rather than a technical botanical observation, and in Chechen the illustration is much more naturally expressed as, "thorns do not yield mulberries or dog roses grapes." The mulberry tree occurs again in 17.6, both in Chechen and in NRSV, and in

Chechen also in 19.4. In Greek there are two slightly different words for the trees in 17.6 and 19.4, but it is not certain whether any real distinction is intended. In Khakas both words are translated as a fig tree: thus in 6.44 in Khakas, the figs present no problem, but the grapes become cherries.

In Luke 12.54-55, Jesus speaks of rain coming from the west and heat from the south, but for the Khakas both rain and heat come from the south. However, to make a change here would entail a factual distortion of the climatic patterns of Palestine, so no change was made. But an adjustment based on the climate had to be made in Yakut at 12.39, where Jesus speaks of a house being broken into. The picture is of a thief digging through a house wall to gain entry, but this is unimaginable in Yakutia, where the walls of houses are very thick to minimize the cold, and even the windows are triple-glazed. The permafrost means that it would not even be practical to dig under the wall, so the translation had to speak of the thief entering by breaking down the door of the house.

Social structures and attitudes

The Gospels contain many examples of conversations, and these often raise the question of who can say what to whom in the receptor language. In translations into major European languages, this question has often been hidden behind an unthinking literalism that can produce some very unfortunate results. The classic example in English is in John 2.4, where even in such recent versions as NRSV, NJB (1985), and ESV (2002), Jesus addresses his mother with the vocative “woman.” This form of address from son to mother is downright rude in modern English, and gives a highly misleading impression of Jesus’ attitude towards his mother. More sensitive versions translate as “mother” (NEB 1970 and CEV 1995) or simply omit the problematic vocative (GNB 1976 and REB 1989).

Vocatives cannot safely be translated literally, because their use in many receptor languages is subject to social conventions very different from those of New Testament Greek. The Greek vocative “woman” (γύναι—*gunai*) was in frequent and unmarked use in the New Testament and did not carry the overtones that a literal translation into English carries. In Luke it occurs in 13.12 (where Jesus is addressing a woman he has just healed) and in 22.57 (where Peter is addressing a servant girl). In Yakut, the translators assumed that because the woman Jesus healed had been crippled for eighteen years, she was probably older than Jesus, so they had him address her with the polite form, “older sister.” In Chechen the translators discussed whether the context required “aunt” or “sister,” and in 13.12 decided on the latter. However, in 22.57, they retained “woman,” which provides the

somewhat derogatory connotation that fits the context. In Kalmyk the vocative chosen included a softening possessive, “my sister.”

In 22.57 in Khakas the vocative was omitted in order that Peter should not sound too deferential. In Yakut, however, it was decided to omit the vocative in order to avoid having Peter sounding rude. For the same reason, the vocatives were also omitted in 22.58 and 60 where Peter is addressing men who are strangers to him. In Kalmyk the vocatives were also omitted, but for a different reason: a vocative tends to be used to people of higher rank than the speaker, so it would be inappropriate when Peter is addressing a servant. For the same reason, the vocatives were again omitted in 22.58 and 60, where Peter is addressing men who are not of particularly high status.

In Luke, wherever a vocative is repeated, as happens at 8.24; 10.41; 13.34; and 22.31, it is always in the context of administering a rebuke. In English and, I suspect, in most European languages, the repetition of a vocative does not necessarily carry the overtone of rebuke, so a connotative element is lost or at best reduced. In Khakas the connotation of rebuke may be preserved in the repetition of the vocative (as in 10.41), but in a different context such as that of 8.24, where the disciples are in a boat that seems about to sink, it smacks more of panic. In Chechen it is not good style to repeat a vocative, but the implication of rebuke can be conveyed by the addition of a certain particle, or in 22.31 by the formulation, “Oh, Peter!”

Khakas was thoughtful in its handling of vocatives, depending on the context. In 10.40 Martha is rather annoyed with Jesus, so there the vocative with which she addresses him was omitted in an early draft, though later restored. However, in 13.8 where the gardener is addressing the landowner deferentially, it was consistently retained. In 16.25 where Abraham is addressing the rich man in a rather reproachful manner, the somewhat condescending vocative, “child” (τέκνον—*teknon*), was retained, and rendered as “my son.” The same term in 15.31 is used by a father to a biological son, and in Tuvan, one possible option was a diminutive of the usual word, implying intimacy and urgency. In 18.41 where a blind beggar is asking Jesus to restore his sight, a respectful vocative was clearly needed, as also in 19.8 where the repentant Zacchaeus is speaking to Jesus. This was also the case in 19.16, 18, 20, 25, where servants are addressing their master. Vocatives can indeed be an unmarked minefield for translators.

Similar issues may arise in languages that distinguish singular and plural in second-person pronouns and/or verb inflexions. In New Testament Greek, the singular and plural forms simply mark number, and do not carry the sociological overtones that they carry in many European and other languages. In Khakas as in Greek, singular forms are appropriate in a variety of

contexts, such as Luke 10.37, where Jesus is giving the punch line of his response to a tricky question (“Go and do likewise”), in 13.8-9 where a gardener is speaking to his landowner, and in 14.12 where Jesus as a dinner guest is addressing his host. In Yakut in 23.3 the singular is appropriate both for Pilate to address Jesus and for Jesus to reply to him, notwithstanding the difference in their social status.

A related problem at a different level arose in Chechen at 12.32, where Jesus addresses his followers as “little flock.” In this context, the Greek phrase is something like a term of endearment, but in Chechen it sounds scornful and insulting, so it needed to be restructured as, “though you are few and weak, above you is a shepherd,” with the implication that the shepherd is the heavenly father already mentioned in the wider context.

Expected attitudes within the home and family can also affect translation and the way readers perceive the text. In Luke 12.53 Jesus gives a somewhat expanded quotation of the words from Mic 7.6 about divisions within a family, “father against son and son against father, mother against daughter and daughter against mother, mother-in-law against her daughter-in-law and daughter-in-law against mother-in-law.” To the average English reader, the last pair sounds rather odd, because in British culture, the stereotypical family squabble is assumed to be between a mother-in-law and a son-in-law, which gives rise to plenty of mother-in-law jokes told from a male perspective. What most English readers do not realize is that in the social setting of both Old Testament and New, the cultural assumption is that a newly married couple will live with the husband’s parents, thus bringing the daughter-in-law into close contact with her mother-in-law. This gives rise to the summary statement that resonates in many parts of the world, “one kitchen, two women, much trouble.” Nowhere is this more common than in India, where the media not infrequently have to report on a daughter-in-law being driven to suicide by a domineering mother-in-law. In Yakut, the potential for tension between mothers-in-law and daughters-in-law was well understood, so Yakut readers will have a better appreciation of this passage than English (and most other European?) readers.

In 14.10 Jesus, in speaking of humility, urges people when invited to a wedding banquet to take the lowest place. In Tuvan society and Chechen society this would be the place nearest the door. In 18.29-30, Jesus assures Peter that “there is no one who has left house or wife or brothers or parents or children, for the sake of the kingdom of God, who will not get back very much more in this age, and in the age to come eternal life.” The order in which the relationships given up are mentioned can give rise to problems, not least because the Russian Synodal translation, which cannot be ignored

by any translation team in Russia, at this point follows Greek manuscripts with a slightly different list in a different order, namely house, parents, brothers, sisters, wife, children. For many readers this seems a more logical order, and it was the order followed in Khakas. In Chechen the items were put into the terminology and order that seemed more culturally appropriate, that is, house, parents, wife, children, relatives. In Tuvan, where the traditional living accommodation was a portable yurt, the “house” was taken to refer to the nuclear family rather than a building, and translated by a term derived from an expression meaning “yurt-group.”

A further question of cultural assumptions arose in Tuvan in the case of John the Baptist (Luke 7.20). The instinctive way to translate this name denotatively would be “John the Dipper,” but this would carry the highly misleading connotation that he drowned people. It was therefore decided that his label should focus on the other major aspect of his work, that is, proclaiming that the Messiah would soon succeed him. (Compare his title in Russian, “John the Forerunner.”) So he became “John the Announcer,” which fortunately did not seem to give rise to any confusion with radio newsreaders!

Conclusion

Finally, a question raised by the Khakas translation team which I had certainly never thought of, and could not answer: Was Peter left-handed? The question arose from Luke 22.50 in the account of the arrest of Jesus. There one of the disciples (identified as Peter not in the Synoptic Gospels but only in John 18.10) “struck the slave of the high priest and cut off his right ear.” If Peter held his sword in his right hand, one would expect that if he were facing the slave, it would more naturally be the left ear that would be cut off. Was Peter perhaps standing behind his victim? This seems less than likely in a situation of confrontation. So perhaps Peter was holding the sword in his left hand? The question cannot be definitively resolved, and fortunately it was of no translational consequence in the languages under consideration. But it is not difficult to imagine that languages exist in which there are different verbs or at least different verbal affixes for actions carried out with the right hand and actions carried out with the left, so the issue may not always be of merely theoretical interest.

What principles if any may be derived from the above examples? Nothing very novel, but they do serve to emphasize that an unthinking and culturally insensitive literalism can be practically guaranteed to distort a translation. The receptor language and culture cannot avoid leaving their own fingerprints on a translation that succeeds in communicating with its readers, especially those with no prior familiarity with the Bible.

All in all, we have seen many examples of subtle, unavoidable, and usually inconspicuous domestication in the translations studied. Is it too fanciful to suggest that as the living Word was incarnated in the human Jesus, so the written word is constantly reincarnated when a sensitive translation is made in a new language?

Bible versions cited

CEV	Contemporary English Version (1995)
<i>Chechen New Testament</i>	Moscow: Institute for Bible Translation, 2007; Bible 2012
ESV	English Standard Version (2002)
GNB	Good News Bible (1976)
GuNB	Die Gute Nachricht (1982)
<i>Kalmyk New Testament</i>	Moscow: Institute for Bible Translation, 2002
<i>Khakas New Testament</i>	Moscow: Institute for Bible Translation, 2009
KJV	King James Version (1611)
NEB	New English Bible (1970)
NJB	New Jerusalem Bible (1985)
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version (1989)
REB	Revised English Bible (1989)
<i>Tuvan New Testament</i>	Moscow: Institute for Bible Translation, 2001; Bible 2011
<i>Yakut New Testament</i>	Moscow: Institute for Bible Translation, 2004