

Aldrich: Here we are back with Dr. MacRae and Dr. Dillard discussing the versions of the Bible. Remember the OT was written in Hebrew and Aramaic; the NT in Greek. So we can't have the original unless we know those languages and we're dependant on translators. The two things we want to pursue -- one thing raised by Dr. Dillard, the theological bias of the translator. And the second question that you raised during the break and that is we'll get back to that word "ambiguous." That might be misleading. ~~Now~~ I used it. So how would you qualify that?

MacRae: I think it's important to recognize that in any language no word is a point. Every word is an area, and the areas differ in different languages. So it is very difficult to ~~fix~~ make an English sentence that is an exact equivalent to the Hebrew.

Aldrich: A good example that comes to my mind is we all the of Chinese red is red orange, but apparently in Chinese the word we translate red when a Chinese person hears that word he thinks of an orange red or what we would call a Chinese red. So you have the same thing with words.

MacRae: Yes, a word has an area and the areas don't exactly coincide, so the translator has to decide what English word is sufficiently in that area to give the idea required in the context. The purpose of the translator is not to show what you feel sure the original writer meant, but what did he mean by these words. If there is a possibility of two meanings you'd rather preserve that by translation, rather than put your own idea.

Aldrich: And this is what a theological bias or orientation may be loaded (?) words of the translator ~~is~~ significant.

Dillard: It shows up in any number of places and as Dr. MacRae mentioned one sample passage in the RSV, I think it certainly does show up in the NIV, the orientation of the translators and in the NASB already mentioned; it shows up in the NEB in terms of the orientation of the == toward the text.

Aldrich: Would the NEB be suffering the same defects as RSV or not so much?

MacRae: I would say more. I would say that the NEB is more of a paraphrase by far than the RSV.

Aldrich: How about in terms of theological bias. ?

MacRae: I would say it is more biased than the RSV. Wouldn't that be your judgment?

Dillard: Well in a sense the NEB is kind of a monument to OT criticism of a generation ago, and the kind of text critical