Anthropology and the Translation of the New Testament Key Terms

John Beekman
©FOBAI - 2008

Introduction

A good translation results when a translator recognizes the interrelated importance of Biblical exegesis, anthropology, and linguistics (including applied linguistics in literacy and translation). Translators frequently fail to apply the discipline of anthropology in the selection of New Testament key terms, the topic of this paper.

Theologically technical terms constitute a problem for the translator, because he has to take the vocabulary already in use in the receptor language and impress it into the service of a different system of thought from the one for which these vocabulary items are customarily used, that is, he faces the challenge of correctly representing the message of Christianity by utilizing a vocabulary that has only, or largely, been used to represent a non-Christian system of thought. This involves not only bridging differences in linguistic systems but also in the thought systems conveyed by the linguistic structure.

Every culture, and therefore every language, carries with it a distinct way of looking at the world. It is important, therefore, that the translators know the world view and thought forms which are held by the speakers of the receptor language. To do this involves him in anthropological research-questions concerning the social structures, authority patterns, and religious beliefs of the receptor language culture. His aim is to arrive at an integrated understanding of the receptor language culture.

In an article by Sherwood G. Lingenfelter entitled "The Relevance of the Anthropological Study of Kinship and Local Politics to Linguistic Research and Translation," he says, and I agree,

> If you do not understand the basic social structure upon which people operate, you will not really understand enough of the culture to be able to translate effectively...Anthropology provides the tools from which we can discover significant culture meanings which lie beyond the scope of linguistic analysis...To study meaning one must study the larger cultural context in which grammar and vocabulary are used by native speakers to generate the meanings significant to them in their own social and ecological milieu.

There should be no question that a good understanding of the culture of a people is essential for good translation work. Its significance influences the quality of a translation at every level, but it is particularly important as it relates to those crucial New Testament terms upon which the message of the gospel depends. The necessity of understanding the receptor language culture, as it relates to religious beliefs and practices, is most critical when it comes to the translation of New Testament key terms. Since there are different opinions as to what New Testament terms constitute *key* terms,

for this article I have chosen to limit consideration to names for incorporeal or supernatural beings and to words used in Scripture to describe primary relationships between these beings and man. This includes such terms as: God, Holy Spirit, Son of God, devil, demon, angel, and such basic terms as sin, forgive, love, repent, hell, life everlasting, heaven, salvation, faith, and judge.

The rest of this paper discusses some guiding principles for finding adequate equivalents for New Testament key terms. It is presented in three parts.

1. How to *discover* potential equivalents for New Testament key terms which may prove to be useful in translation or which, in any case, will help in understanding the belief system of the people.

2. How to *validate* the receptor language meaning of these potential key terms.

3. How to *choose* or *adjust* potential key terms.

The Discovery of potential equivalents for New Testament key terms

There are four methods which have been used successfully to discover potential key terms. These are (1) native-text method, (2) hypothetical example method, (3) question method, and (4) listening to others converse. These have been arranged in the probable order of greatest usefulness to the translator.

In an unpublished paper written by Harry McArthur several years ago, he shows how one short text that did not even take up a full page of single-spaced typewritten material produced "a mine of invaluable information." He introduces his paper appropriately by saying:

> A thorough knowledge of the religious beliefs of a people is imperative for a successful translation...A good understanding of the religious beliefs and practices can only be obtained through close association with the people and conscientious effort to seek out its norms. One of the most fruitful areas of investigation involves the mythology which concerns itself with the origin and description of the world, the origin and rationale of beliefs and customs observed at the various crises periods of life, such as birth, puberty, marriage, and death. This type of text is invaluable to the translator in revealing areas where there is a lack of correspondence in objects, actions, and concepts. They are a deep mine of words and idiomatic expressions that can be used with confidence to express many Biblical truths.

In a short text (concerning a ceremony on a mountainside conducted by the shaman with the parents present for the purpose of establishing the birth of the child with the spirit world), the following potential key terms for use in the New Testament were discovered: Savior, Lord, guarantor, to buy us, their hearts might be washed, sins, faults, sacred, and sins being made white. The article points out that many of these proved to be useful and, even though found in context, some of the terms proved to have a different meaning than at first assumed. For example, 'sins

being made white' meant that they were being revealed or made known.

A second method used to discover potential key terms may be called the hypothetical example method. Many translators have found key terms through this procedure. It involves a certain understanding of the culture to be able to imagine appropriate situations which have or could occur. Potential terms for forgiveness, repentance, and salvation, when not discovered through other methods, have been elicited successfully through the use of hypothetical stories.

One of our translators in Colombia, working with the Desano had not been able to find a term for 'salvation'. Having had experience using the hypothetical story approach, I knew it would be fruitless to merely give a single example to which a specific answer would be given. Four examples were, therefore, given before any question was posed. The first was about a boy who was cutting down a tree. The tree twisted as it fell and the boy was pinned under a heavy branch, unable to free himself. Hours later, Roberto came and cut the branch, setting the boy free. The second was about a man in a canoe which, when it hit a submerged log, capsized, and the man was thrown into the water. He was unable to swim. Roberto happened to come by and dived in and pulled him safely to shore. The third story concerned a man hunting in the forest. He shot at a wild boar and had the unfortunate experience of only wounding him. The boar turned on him and was attacking when Roberto saw the man's predicament and shot and killed the wild boar. The final story was of a burning house where it was realized too late that a small baby was trapped inside. Roberto pushed past the terrified onlookers and risked his life to save the child. Then the question was asked, "What did Roberto do for these people?" The language helper paused in thought and then answered, "He passed them through." By utilizing several stories, it was possible to elicit a generic response which applied to all four examples.

A third procedure used to discover potential key terms is to ask questions which will elicit the names of supernatural beings. What questions should be asked will depend on the particular term one is seeking to elicit. One must always be aware of the fact that it is almost impossible to ask a question which does not include some presupposition. The questioner's presuppositions may be entirely wrong in the specific culture, thus invalidating the answer received. Suppose, for example, one is asking a question to discover a potential term for 'devil'. He might ask, "Who causes us to sin?" This presupposes that sin ultimately originates in a spirit being referred to with an animate form. The specific culture may not attribute it to a spirit being at all, or if it does, may use an inanimate form in the question word. The result may be an answer that the translator may incorrectly assume to be the equivalent for 'devil'. On the other hand, presuppositions may present no problem in eliciting a potential term or terms for a particular supernatural being.

There are various relevant questions to ask in eliciting a vernacular term for God, such as: Who made the earth? Who created the first man and woman? Who has more power than anyone else?

Other questions may be formulated in an attempt to elicit possible terms for demons and Holy Spirit. A very useful approach to find possible terms for the Holy Spirit is to ask for the personality components of a human being. Very frequently the spirit part of man when he is alive has the potential to refer also to God's Spirit. After a person has died, that spirit part of him may be referred to by a different name which essentially means 'disembodied spirit,' and which in various cultures is

often equated with evil spirits. Thus, to ask a question such as: What lives on after we die? will very likely elicit a term which means disembodied spirit. To assume that such a term also applies to one's spirit while he is alive and might be a potential term to use for God's Spirit would introduce such errors, as: God is dead; He is evil.

A fourth and final procedure used to discover potential key terms is to listen to others converse and observe how terms are used. Very frequently when one is involved in medical activities or interacting with groups of people in other ways, one will overhear new terms in the people's conversations. As these are noted, the context in which they occur will suggest whether or not they represent potential equivalents for New Testament terms.

Each of these methods has advantages and disadvantages. None is to be considered adequate in itself. The discoveries made through any one of these procedures or a combination of them is still to be considered *potential* key terms for the New Testament rather than as accepted equivalents. Each method of discovering key terms requires follow-up procedures to validate the meanings tentatively assigned to the terms discovered.

Validating the receptor language meaning of potential key terms

There are basically two procedures by which to validate the meaning of potential key terms. They are the cycle check and componential analyses.

Simply stated, the cycle check represents the obverse of the procedure used to discover potential key terms. The obverse of the text method is to take the potential term out of context and have another individual, that is, a different language helper than the one who produced the text material, produce contexts in which the word would be used. These contexts will suggest the meaning of the term which will then be compared with the meaning which was assigned on the basis of the original context. If the meaning derived from the discovery procedure and that determined from the check procedure coincide, then the cycle has been completed. That is, the analyst started with a word in context to which a meaning was assigned. The word was then taken out of context, given to a different language helper who provided one or more contexts which suggested the same meaning, thus closing the cycle between the word, the situations in which it is used, and its meaning.

The cycle check as applied to the hypothetical example method is similar. In illustrating the hypothetical example method, four examples were given from which a term for salvation was elicited for the Desano of Colombia. To assume, at that point, that an adequate term for salvation had been found would have been premature. The next step was to take the term out of context and ask a different language helper to give examples of how and when such a term would be used. Then, if the examples provided coincided with the examples originally given, not in details, of course, but in meaning, then the term can be utilized in Scriptural contexts with confidence.

The application of the cycle check to the question method applies the same principle of reversing the procedure originally followed. In the question method, questions are formulated from a Scriptural perspective which elicits possible terms for supernatural beings. To validate whether these terms are acceptable for use as equivalents of Scriptural terms, questions will now be directed

toward understanding the meaning of such terms. Questions would be asked such as: Who is so-and-so? What does he do? What else does he do? Where does he come from? What is he like? What power does he have? Where does he live? What can he not do? Similar questions to elicit the characteristics and activities of each of the supernatural beings investigated would be formulated. Again, comparing the information communicated through the original questions which elicited the name for the supernatural being with the characteristics and activities elicited by questioning a different language helper will validate the meaning of that particular term.

The obverse of the listening method is not different from what we have already outlined for the other methods. The terms which have been overheard in the context of conversations are now taken out of those contexts and checked with another language helper in the same way as explained above.

The second method by which to validate the meaning of potential key terms is through componential analyses. This is especially useful when there are several potential terms for God or sin or devil and it becomes important to differentiate as precisely as possible the meaning components that distinguish terms which are in the same semantic set. This has been discussed elsewhere such as in the book by Nida and in *Translating the Word of God*. It is an essential method to be applied when terms occupy the same semantic space.

Choosing or adjusting potential key terms

Once one has discovered potential key terms and established their meaning as used by the people, a further judgment is required by the translator. The cycle checks validate the meaning as used by the people in their communication with one another but do not validate the adequacy of the terms as to (1) whether they are accurate equivalents of the Scriptural concepts and (2) whether they represent the most natural and relevant equivalent for the receptors. This process by which a translator arrives at a form that is natural, accurate, and most relevant is sometimes referred to in current discussions as the process of linguistic contextualization. The Lausanne report "The Gospel, Contextualization, and Syncretism Report" gives four definitions of contextualization, one of which, in referring to the translation process, is labelled 'linguistic contextualization'. In that report, they allude to a special means by which to achieve contextualization when they talk about the usefulness and limitations of cultural substitutes. The term 'contextualization' is a fresh way to refer to goals which have been expressed earlier, in our statements of translation principles. However, the aims of linguistic contextualization should encourage and challenge us to focus upon reaching equivalences that are not only accurate but also the most relevant for the people.

In every translation there will be many vernacular terms that are immediately adequate. It is fortunate indeed for the translator when a single concept or idiom used in the receptor language matches a key concept or other concepts found in the New Testament. This, however, is not always the case. The equivalences are not always so readily at hand, so the translator must introduce some type of adjustment for terms which are potential equivalences but are lacking in one regard or another. There are three possible courses which the translator may follow in order to arrive at adequate equivalence in such instances. The three procedures which are available to the translator are: (1) borrowing, (2) modification, and (3) dependence on context.

Choosing between a vernacular term and a borrowed term which is partially or fully assimilated.

Borrowings may be of two classes, namely, unknown terms with zero meaning or terms that have been partially or fully assimilated. The latter are the focus of the following discussion.

Borrowed terms which are partially or fully assimilated originate, of course, from another language. If a translator is faced with a selection of a vernacular term versus an assimilated borrowing, it is important that he understand the meaning of each of these terms as understood by the speakers of the receptor language. Although there are some guiding principles which may assist the translator in making such a choice, the variety of factors that may enter into a decision sometimes lead to one choice on one problem and another choice on a different problem. It is not possible, therefore, to suggest a general preference of vernacular term or borrowing.

A borrowing often has sociolinguistic disadvantages - sometimes only temporarily. For example, in an early translation for one of the languages of the Philippines, a term for God was borrowed from a neighboring tribe. The response to the message was, "Why should we be concerned about someone else's God?" The translator then shifted to the vernacular term with no objection from his translation helper who soon after changed from a sympathizer to a believer. Through his witness, a number of others became believers. As they grew in faith and knowledge, they decided to use the borrowed term which the translator had first used to refer to God.

Sometimes a fully assimilated borrowing may have the correct sense only for the Christian in-group. In one allocation in Brazil, borrowings were introduced orally long before the translator arrived on the scene. The Christians became so accustomed to using these terms in referring to their supernatural beings that it would have been unwise to attempt to introduce more adequate vernacular terms, especially in view of the continued interest of the first missionary group. While it is generally impossible to make radical changes in New Testament key terms which are already in use and which are accepted by the church leaders, when the equivalences are poor, especially for the believers, but even when they may be misunderstood only by non-believers, cautious consideration and efforts should be taken to introduce better terms to represent these fundamental concepts.

Frequently, when a term has been partially assimilated, it is immediately equated with a term already found in the language. Once a borrowed term has been equated with a vernacular term, the purpose for borrowing a term in the first place is usually cancelled out.

Moreover, since aboriginal societies have a greater number of deities or supernatural beings than is found in the Christian tradition, it has been the experience of some translators to find that such partially assimilated borrowings may refer to one deity in one context and to another deity in another context. Such an intolerable situation invalidates the potential usefulness of such a term.

Where an assimilated borrowing is equated with a vernacular term, sometimes greater prestige is attached to the use of the borrowed term. For example, the term for Holy Spirit in Spanish is *Espiritu Santo*. *Santo* in most places refers to an image and communicates wrong information when one is attempting to refer to the person of the Holy Spirit. However, in some languages of Latin America,

including the Chol, it is possible to borrow part of the term, namely, *Espiritu* which equates with the vernacular term for spirit. Modifying this with a vernacular term that is equivalent to 'holy' gives an acceptable equivalence for the person of the Holy Spirit. An assimilated borrowing serves at the core of the phrase.

It is important for the translator to be aware that partially or fully assimilated borrowings may have a distinct combination of components which is neither that used by the donor culture nor equitable with any local term. Finally, it needs to be pointed out that frequently a partially or fully assimilated borrowing is more subject to correction by its occurrence in context. This will be treated more fully as we discuss the process of contextualization in a later section.

Modification of a vernacular term or a borrowing with zero meaning

The second procedure available to the translator to adjust potential key terms is (1) to modify a vernacular term which is inadequate for one reason or another or (2) to modify a borrowing with zero meaning.

Borrowings with zero meaning are inevitable for a translation with the cultural and time distance between the New Testament text and any group for whom one may be translating. Frequently, then, the best equivalent is to borrow an unknown term and modify it with a classifier. This is especially applicable for such culturally specific items as names of rivers and places, and of religions and political groups. In this category are such terms as temple, Sadducees, Pharisees, Levites, synagogue, etc. Even for religious offices such as elder and deacon, it is often better to borrow a term and avoid the implications of sorcery or idolatry that are so central to the meaning of some of the vernacular possibilities. This type of borrowing should never, however, be used to represent such basic concepts as prayer, conversion, repentance, salvation, forgiveness, and sin.

When unknown terms are borrowed, it is because the concept is foreign or because of the preference to start with a term with zero meaning rather than a vernacular term for which the core components are hopelessly non-equivalent. When a term with zero meaning is borrowed, it becomes necessary either to add a classifier or an apt description which gives meaning to the unknown term. Where fuller descriptions may be preferable, these will appear as footnotes or in a glossary.

Vernacular terms may also be modified to correct lack of acceptable equivalence. Languages, as flexible tools for communication, can combine terms in new ways to express new concepts or to avoid negative denotations and connotations. For example, the cross was a sacred object worshiped by the Chols and was spoken to by the shaman as a source of information and power. There are several instances in the New Testament where the cross is used figuratively referring to what happened on the cross. For example, Paul bursts out emotionally in Galatians and says, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." Such references to the cross could very easily be understood by the Chols in terms of the use of the wooden crosses by the shaman and by the people in general. To avoid such potential misunderstanding, the cross was consistently modified in those instances so that specific reference was made to the event that took place on a particular cross in a particular historical location.

New combinations must be completely natural both semantically and grammatically. The combination itself may represent a new or unknown concept, but the manner in which the words are combined must be completely natural. It is important, when new combinations are introduced, to validate the meaning of such terms by their use and acceptance by native believers.

Very frequently it is possible to find a full descriptive expression in Scripture itself which defines a New Testament key concept. At other times, a very generic term can be modified with specifying modifiers to reach the desired equivalent. Some books explaining translation principles give various examples of how this procedure may be applied. A missing component may be supplied by modification or an unwanted component can frequently be cancelled out in the same manner.

Dependence on context to reshape a vernacular or borrowed term with or without modification

Two procedures utilized by translators in arriving at adequate key terms in translating the New Testament have been discussed, that is, (1) borrowing and (2) modification. In these instances, the equivalents reached are considered to be adequate; that is, there are no essential components missing nor are there unwanted extraneous components. The third procedure utilizes a borrowed or vernacular term (with or without modification) in spite of the fact that it communicates an undesirable component or misses an essential component. The justification for utilizing this procedure is based upon two observations, (1) simple modifications are not always adequate and (2) one can depend upon context to correct some inadequacies. When a referent occurs in, say, twenty or more contexts, experience has shown that what is said about that referent shapes and may correct the reader's understanding. This procedure depends upon the frequent use of a word in different contexts to ultimately result in an adequate understanding of the Scriptural concept.

Frequently vernacular terms chosen to refer to supernatural beings may not possess all of the desired components of meaning. In these situations, dependence on context often corrects or minimizes the inadequacy.

Translators often hesitate to utilize a vernacular term which may miss some desirable components or which carry some undesirable components of meaning. I have had occasion to encourage translators to try a vernacular term at least in their preliminary materials. There are some good reasons for following this procedure, if, of course, it is applied within reason.

There is Scriptural precedent suggesting the preference of identifying God in the cultural context of the people for whom the translation is being prepared. Paul, at Athens (Acts 17:23-30), spent a good part of his message identifying the God of Scriptures with their unknown God. Similarly Christ, with the woman at the well (John 4:20-24), felt it necessary first to identify God in her particular context. The successful use of vernacular terms, even if some may need to depend on the corrective influence of context, makes a translation more relevant from the very first.

Of course a borrowed term may be as relevant as a vernacular term. However, a borrowed term in a society with a plurality of gods may soon be associated as a name not for one deity but for several. In such a situation and in others as well, it is generally preferable to utilize a vernacular term,

especially when the crucial components for God, or most of them, are present. Some of those components are:

1. supernatural power,

2. personal

3. control over nature and man,

4. creator of all,

5. moral,

6. unique, that is, he is the only true God,

7. eternal; that is, not created.

The available vernacular term to refer to God may not be satisfactory from all of these perspectives. It is hardly to be expected that a non-Christian community would hold an accurate conception of who God is. Very frequently some of the activities in which a deity of the culture may engage would certainly be considered unethical or even immoral. Most of us are rather conservative and feel it is safer to borrow a term which has zero or near-zero meaning than to utilize a more relevant term which may have some disturbing components. A judgment, of course, is required, but we tend to underestimate the power of context and Christian experience to modify not only the connotations of a word but also some of the denotations. For example, the word used for God in Chol not only referred to the God who possessed the crucial components just referred to, but also included reference to the sun, the moon, the cross, and various images in the local church. To attempt to modify the word so it would not refer to these other 'beings' would present an impossible translation task unless one resorted to a paraphrastic paragraph. Rather, it was context and Christian experience that removed these references from the word referring to God. Here a fully assimilated borrowing highly relevant to the people, came to be understood correctly through the influence of context.

A second example shows how the connotation of a word was altered through context. The concept 'to die' in Chol ($\kappa\alpha\psi\chi\eta\wp\mu\varepsilon\lambda$) was used interchangeably to speak about the death of a child or a loved one with another term meaning 'to no longer exist' (*jilel*). The connotation attached to death was one of finality with no hope or expectation for the future. With the entrance of the gospel, the word utilized for 'to die' ($\kappa\alpha\psi\chi\eta\wp\mu\varepsilon\lambda$) lost its negative connotations through its Scriptural context. The Christians now never use (*jilel)* 'to no longer exist' in referring to the death of one of their children or fellow believers. I have never heard the use of this word proscribed, but a Christian view of physical death has narrowed the usage of one word (*jilel*) and modified the connotations of the other ($\kappa\alpha\psi\eta\wp\mu\varepsilon\lambda$).

The proper translation of the Scriptural concept of sin always faces the translator with a crucial

decision. All societies have one or more words to refer to conduct and activity which is considered to be wrong. Very frequently, however, the word or words available as potential renditions for the concept of 'sin' represent a rather restricted specific list of unacceptable activities. When it is determined that the words are unduly restricted in their range of application, even if no unacceptable items appear in the list, there is little likelihood that the influence of context can help. For example, there may be a separate word for sins committed against God with a very limited range of actions and a second word referring to those wrongs committed against man. The first word is more likely to focus on the observances of rituals and the other on extreme sins against one's fellow man. On the other hand, there may be two words representing sins which arise from the temptations of the devil in contrast to another word referring to a list of sins which arise from one's own desires. In some very difficult situations, it may be found that the best solution is to combine both words in an attempt to represent the Scriptural concept of sin. However, better solutions are generally available.

Sometimes there is a single term of the vernacular which does not exactly parallel the concept of sin as found in Scripture, but which generates extensive lists of different sins by different language helpers. Frequently the list may differ as to what may or may not be considered a sin by different members of the same language group. This generally means that the term does not suggest a closed set but is open for modification and is a good candidate for the corrective influence of context.

When vernacular terms for sin are restrictive in their range of reference, bilingual language helpers and semi-independent mother-tongue translators frequently suggest such terms as equivalents for sin. Upon investigation, their choice invariably has to be rejected because it is too culture-bound to represent the Biblical concept. In most instances of this type, a generic term referring to any wrongdoing may at first thought be considered too weak because it may include such errors as dropping a dish or taking a wrong path on a journey. However, such generic terms often prove to be the best choice when the influence of context is given consideration. When it is obvious that the generic term is not acceptable, one can always modify the generic term to narrow its total range. This was done for one of the Mixe languages, rendering the concept of 'sin' as 'to do what God says is bad.'

In spite of necessary precautions in utilizing borrowed or vernacular terms that are inadequate in some way, again and again context has enlarged or modified the meaning of such words resulting in correct meaning. Discreet dependence on the influence of context is an important aspect of translating the Scriptures accurately, faithfully, and in as culturally a relevant way as possible.

Conclusion

There are at least two important implications to be drawn from the previous discussion of procedures relevant to the translation of New Testament key terms.

1. The larger cultural context of a language underlies the meanings assigned to words and constructions by the speakers of that language. Only by entering into that larger context can a translator ever expect to effectively communicate.

2. The necessity of an anthropological and sociolinguistic orientation in translation needs to be constantly emphasized.

The goal in translation work is to utilize available terms from a non-Christian context in such a way that their use in Scripture gives them a correct sense representing the original context and message. To reach this goal, there must be an integrated interplay between linguistics, Biblical studies (exegesis), translation principles, literacy and anthropology. If we fail to properly exegete, regardless of how well we control the other disciplines, the message will be distorted. If we are weak linguistically, the results will be disastrous or at best unnatural; if we fail in literacy, of what value is an excellent translation; if we fail in an anthropological, cultural understanding of how the people use their language in different circumstances, we only deceive ourselves into thinking we have a good translation.

Think of the translator who was witnessing and used a wrong word for 'sin'. In effect, he was saying that he had committed adultery and was caught and that he had stolen great sums of money and was caught and therefore needed a Savior. His plea, "You too have sinned and need a Savior" was met with laughter or denials.

Another translator failed to use the cycle system in determining what word he would use for 'repent'. He gave a hypothetical example and received a word which appeared to fit his preconditioned mindset of what he expected for the concept of 'repentance'. When the book of Acts was being checked, to his dismay, it was discovered that it was used only in a legal court action when a witness, having told the truth against the accused, feels sorry for him, changes his mind, and tells a lie.

Nida explains an instance where 'good news' was used as a translation of 'the gospel'. Again, to the dismay of the translator, he found that it was used primarily when lying in ambush to kill an enemy. When they were certain that their arrow would kill the man from an enemy village, that is when they used the word 'good news'.

Lee Ballard who has become a master at sociolinguistic elicitation procedures, explains that the word for 'sinners' which he used in his trial edition of Mark, upon further checking, referred to halfwits, blind people, cripples, people with club feet, paralyzed people, and insane people.

The translator who is conscientious in his desire not only to produce a translation which accurately represents the meaning of the source text but also one which is natural, intelligible, and of highest relevance to the people, will not overlook the importance of anthropology and its contribution to the quality of his translation.

Bibliography

Beekman, John and John C. Callow. 1974. *Translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.

Bradshaw, M. and P. Savage. "The Gospel, Contextualization and Syncretism Report." From

Let the Earth Hear His Voice (Lausanne Report), pp. 1224-1228.

Brislin, Richard W., ed. 1976. *Translation: Applications and Research.* New York: Gardiner Press, Inc.

Dye, T. Wayne. 1976. "Toward a Cultural Definition of Sin." *Missiology* 4.27-41.

Grimes, Joseph E. 1963. "Translating Incommensurables." *Babel* IX.91-93.

——.1962. "Sin." Unpublished ms.

Huttar, George L. 1977. "World Views, Intelligence, and Cross-Cultural Communication." *Ethnic Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 3.

McArthur, Harry. "The Necessity of a Knowledge of the Pagan Religion for the Bible Translator." Unpublished ms. c.1960.

Nida, Eugene A. 1975. *Componential Analysis of Meaning: An Introduction to Semantic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.

——. and Charles R. Taber. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill (published for the United Bible Societies).

Pinchuk, Isador. 1977. *Scientific and Technical Translation*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press. (pp. 155,156?).

Slocum,Marianna c. 1958. "Christianization of Vocabulary in the Translation of the Tzeltal New Testament." *The Bible Translator*, Vol. 9, No. 2, April 1958. pp. 49-56.