

Aldrich: . . . paraphrase and a translation. Now we've got the NASB obviously that is a translation without a question. Would you say the Living Bible is a paraphrase?

Dillard: Yes.

Aldrich: Now where does one draw the line?

Dillard: I don't think we can draw an absolute boundary, the boundary itself is quite ~~xxxx~~ fluid (?) But what you are talking about is not just translation technique, but is the level of the education of the reading audience. For example the translator can orient his work to the university audience, to give something like the New English Bible.

Aldrich: Which I like very much (?)

Dillard: I enjoy it, yes, it is excellent on English literature. Then going down from the NEW ENGLISH BIBLE you go to something like the NIV, which is something we worked on. It is oriented to about the high school age. The GOOD NEWS FOR MODERN MAN, or GOOD NEWS BIBLE which is about the 14 or 15 year old. Then the LIVING BIBLE, somewhere at the nine or ~~ten~~ year old. You are essentially taking account of the people for whom you are translating.

Aldrich: Well, the LIVING BIBLE does more than that. The LIVING BIBLE, it seems to me, attempts to eliminate all possible ambiguity, in a way that is not faithful to the text. In some places the text is deliberately ambiguous, not that the Lord does not want to reveal Himself, but He wants to have a multitude of meanings in what He is saying. . . . What made you people decide you wanted something less literal . . . to come up with the NIV version? Why was this not totally satisfactory? This being the American Standard.

Dillard: Ken, my reaction would be that there ~~was~~ attempt the to make a direct transfer introduces an awkwardness into the Bible, that makes it really written for me. In effect it is more literal, but by that we don't necessarily mean more accurate, that is more faithfully represent what the original says. If you want a ~~g~~ really good translation it's one that doesn't sound like a good translation. It sounds like he was ~~making~~ looking for (?) written for me. This is one of the things we were after.

MacRae: I've had the experience in committee meetings of the NIV, having a verse which we agreed on the meaning, we could put it into English, but it was a bit awkward. Someone wanted better style but he lost some of the accuracy! Somebody else wanted more accuracy, but he lost some of the style! We spent a whole hour working on the one verse, and when we got through we had something that was both accurate and good style. But it takes time and it takes work to get that . . .

Aldrich: For that cause (?) would you say that in your view the NIV is the preferable version of the different versions we have?