

Dr. George Payton, Bible Translation, Session 6, Language, part 1, How We Communicate

© 2024 George Payton and Ted Hildebrandt

This is Dr. George Payton in his teaching on Bible Translation. This is session 6, Language, Part 1, How We Communicate.

Hello. In this talk, we want to talk about how people communicate. To understand how we communicate then helps us to understand how translation fits into this whole realm of human communication. By review, I'm going to talk about some topics we covered in some of the other talks.

We talked about what is translation and we defined that. We talked about the three different types of translation. We talked about the qualities of a good translation, and we will come back to that.

The importance of scripture engagement material as a part of the translation process. Scripture engagement material is things like movies, songs, spoken word, all of those things that are not the Bible, but they relate to the Bible, and they draw people into the Bible. The goal of these scripture engagement materials is not looking for natural, accurate, clear, or acceptable.

These materials are there to draw people in, draw them into the Bible, draw them into the Gospel, draw them into a relationship with God, or to enhance their relationship with God if they are already believers. So those are the important aspects from translation we've covered in previous talks. I have an example here of translation.

As I said yesterday, I see these examples as I go out and about just here in my town, and this was at the drugstore. And it says, Medicaid prescriptions welcome. We deliver Medicaid prescriptions at no charge.

And then they have the Spanish there. And so if you know Spanish then you can evaluate, well how did they do? Did they communicate the same thing? Well, this is what the Spanish says. So, the first one, Sortimos recetas de Medicaid.

We fill Medicaid prescriptions. Compare that with the bold English title. The English title says, Medicaid prescriptions welcome.

What doesn't the English say? The English doesn't say, we fill. And the Spanish doesn't say, welcome. So, it would sound very strange that the word for welcome in Spanish, I believe, is Bienvenidos.

So, Medicaid prescriptions Bienvenidos would sound really, really weird in Spanish. It would sound like, wait, you got this from English didn't you? So, is this a good translation? People who believe translation should be a literal rendering, following the form. This would then say, no, this isn't a good translation.

Does it communicate the right idea? Yeah, it seems to. So, people are free to bring their Medicaid prescriptions there, and they will get them filled. Okay.

What about the second one? We deliver Medicaid prescriptions at no charge. And then I'm not going to read the Spanish for you. My Spanish is deplorable and I don't really speak Spanish.

So, let's have the translation. So la entrada de medicina a domicilio es gratuita. Okay.

Home delivery is the first part of Medicaid medications is free. So, the question is, is that a correct rendering of the English? So, if we compare them, we see we deliver. Does it say where we deliver to? It doesn't.

We deliver Medicaid prescriptions and the Spanish says Medicaid medications. It doesn't say prescriptions. Prescriptions is the word up in the recetas de Medicaid.

Recetas is not in this second line in Spanish. So, it doesn't say medications, I'm sorry, it doesn't say prescriptions as medications. At no charge and free, that's essentially the same thing.

We'll give them that. We see you can communicate the same meaning effectively, but it doesn't have to be exactly the same wording. It can still communicate well in a way that makes more sense or sounds better in this other language.

And we deal with this with every verse of the Bible. We wrestle with this every day. This is something that we always deal with.

But if you look at this, did they add information by saying home delivery? Remember what we said: the qualities of good translation, accuracy. And accuracy is that nothing is added, nothing is taken away, and nothing has changed. Did they add something by saying home delivery? Or was that the intention behind the English? Did they add something, or did they change something by saying medications instead of prescriptions? Perhaps not.

That's the essence of "We deliver prescriptions at no charge." That implies that they're delivering medications rather than the paper prescription or whatever that you have to submit when you want your medication. So the point is that we look at this, and we say they made it more clear and more understandable to the customer who comes up to the counter.

And these are just regular people. It doesn't matter who they are. But they're Spanish speakers and they want to know, can I bring my medications here? And what if I can't

come pick them up? Or what if this is for someone else who is homebound? How are they going to get their medication? And so right there it says, we'll take it to your home.

Now, probably in the English they weren't thinking of, well, we'll deliver it. We're like Uber. We'll deliver it to your office.

We'll deliver it to wherever you are. If you're out in the park and you want Uber Eats, they'll bring you your McDonald's order. It doesn't say all that.

But it probably means we'll deliver it to your house. Because when you call, or you make an arrangement to have them deliver your medication, I've looked it up online, and they say, where's your house? What's your address? So, we're trying to show you through this illustration that this is indeed a good translation because it communicates well, it communicates clearly, and it communicates all the information. And it adds pieces that were missing that were necessary for the other language to have.

Okay. Can we do this with the Bible? Yes and no. And how do we know the difference? We will talk about that as the sessions go along.

Okay. All right. We did talk about intralingual.

Intralingual means within the same language. And we still have those same qualities of a good translation in mind when we do intralingual. Simplifying and paraphrasing.

And here are some other sentences that I didn't give you before. You need to register for your annual physical exam with Dr. Fox. Register.

Can you say sign up? Sign up. Can you say yearly instead of annual? Yeah, probably. Again, this is if you were speaking to a child, what might you tell them? And so you would change some of these vocabulary words.

Physical exam, check-up, and with Dr. Fox. Another one. We need you to get a chest x-ray in order to confirm that you do not have tuberculosis.

So, we need to get a chest a picture of your chest. Is that a good substitution for x-ray? Yeah, probably. Does a child who is 8 years old know what an x-ray is? They may or they may not.

But picture of your chest. You go in, and they sit this big machine down on top of you. You don't need to explain what an x-ray is.

You just say picture. Okay. To confirm.

To make sure you don't have. Again, confirm is an adult word that you may not be able to communicate to a child. Okay.

Tuberculosis. You can say a lung disease. You can say tuberculosis, a lung disease.

That way, you're putting it in the context of that. Or you can just say that your lungs are not sick. Or that your lungs are not sick with something.

Okay. So again, we're trying to reword this and trying to restructure things so that it makes sense to the person that we're talking to. And as we said, this is paraphrasing it to fit the person that we're speaking to.

In the same way that we have windows for dummies and all these other books for dummies because it needs to be put into language that they can take in in order to function and do the thing that they're trying to learn. All right. We need to give you a sedative before taking you to the operating room.

In England, theater, surgery. All right. So, what is a sedative? Some of my students when they're saying this sentence they said something to ease your pain.

Sedative makes you asleep in my vernacular. I've never had a doctor give me a sedative when I had pain in my body. So something, medicine to make you sleep.

Okay. So, easing the pain is slightly different. I think the connotation there would not be what we were looking for.

So, the idea is, again, what is this picture? What's happening? Where are they, and where is this conversation taking place? It's either right before the kid gets taken into the operating room or when you come next week. We're going to do these things before you get operated on. And so, it's in the context of the doctor's office or in the surgery in preparation. And so, you can kind of imagine how much you need to fill in and how much you do not need to fill in.

And so, before we take you into your operation, we're going to give you some medicine that makes you fall asleep. That covers the ground. Notice that we swapped around the last part of the sentence and put it in the first part.

So, before we take you in there, we're going to give you something to make you sleep. Before you get operated on, before you have your surgery, all those things, by

now, the kid knows he's going to have surgery. We're going to take your appendix out, and we're going to cut your stomach open, and we're going to take it out.

All that stuff has already been talked about. We don't need to add it here. So, we keep that scenario in mind as we're trying to communicate this to the child.

Okay. Have you had any nausea or vomiting? Have you felt like throwing up? Have you thrown up? Okay. Most of my students would say throw up.

I think maybe a few of them might have said puke, but not, probably not. Some of them said they had sore stomachs. Can you have a sore stomach without vomiting? Yeah, you can.

I've had it. So, is this a question about sore stomach? Actually, no. Feeling like throwing up is nausea.

Actually, throwing up is vomiting. And the kid might know the word vomiting, but certainly, all kids know about throwing up because, by the time you're eight years old, you've thrown up a lot. You've had the flu.

You've had other things. So, as we look at that, we still want to stay within the context of that sentence and use phrases that rework and rephrase the problem word or phrase in normal connotations of normal American English. All right.

The last one. The doctor will see you again at the office for a follow-up appointment in two weeks. Okay.

The doctor wants you to come back in two weeks. If that's all you say, is that covering all the information? And we're uncomfortable, aren't we? What's missing? Follow-up appointment. What is a follow-up appointment? It's seeing the progress that you've made from now and in two weeks, right? So, you get medication, or you have been treated somehow, and the doctor wants to know, how have you been and how are you now from the last time you were here? So, see how you are doing so the doctor can check on you to see if you're better.

Some things like that would need to be conveyed in order to communicate the follow-up appointment. If the person just says he wants you to come back in two weeks, what would we call that? You've removed information that's important in the sentence. Again, nothing was added, nothing was taken away, and nothing changed.

These are the principles that we apply to interlingual, but these same principles come into play when we actually do translation. So, what are the kind of things that we just talked about? We talked about adjusting vocabulary. Audience appropriate vocabulary is what we try to do.

Sometimes, we change the order of the words in the phrase, so the operating room is the room where you'll be operated on. Sometimes, we change the order of the clauses.

Before we take you in there, we're going to give you some medication rather than we'll give you medication before we change, before we take you in there. Sometimes, you have a little piece that you add to make things clearer, and you want to keep that phrase in an appropriate expression for the child, for the person who's hearing it. For example, tuberculosis, a certain type of lung disease, or a certain sickness of the lung called tuberculosis.

And so, you use the phrase that explains it together with the phrase that is the trouble part. And we stay in the text. We don't add a bunch of explanations.

We're going to take you into this big room where they have this huge machine, and the machine is going to come down, and it's going to take a picture of your chest. And no, we stay in the text and we don't add extra things. We just want to communicate in a clean way.

So, we want to cover all the information. Remember, we don't want to leave out follow-up appointment. We want to make sure that all the content is there and it's carried over.

And so again, we try to consider what the situation is here. Where are they? What happened before this? What's going to happen after this? And how, then, can we convey the message that we're trying to say in a different way? We make all these same kinds of adjustments, all these same kinds of adaptations to a text in the source language when we translate it into a target language. So, all of these things are the same mental processes and the same translation processes that we do when we do actual interlingual translation between two languages. And that leads us to talk about language.

And this is our starting point. If you read any book on translation, chapter 1, and often sentence 1 in chapter 1 of a number of different books that I've read, they start with language and communication. And why does that? Because translation is a type of language.

It's a subset of human language. So, we need to understand what language is, how we function, and how we use language before we tackle what's going on in the Bible as far as interpreting what it says and before we get into the step of translating it into another language, the second language. So, translation is a subset of human language.

Why do we need to talk about this? We all know about language. We use it every day because there are certain things about it that we don't realize.

It's all subconscious. And so, what we want to do is talk about things that you know, but bring it out to light and make it explicit, make it open. We can talk about it in the front brain instead of back in the back brain.

Subconscious, we want to talk about it upfront. And one of the things that we know for sure is that language is a social activity. So unless a person has issues, usually you talk to someone.

So, it's an interactive social activity. And it's between people. Sometimes you talk to your dog and your dog wags his tail.

Okay, fine. But you're not going to talk about deep spiritual things with your dog or anything like that. So, it's between people.

And why do people communicate? What are some things that we do when we communicate? Or what are some of the reasons why we communicate? Or all of that process of communication, ways that we use language and communication. First of all, thinking. If you sit and talk about an idea with someone else, you're exchanging ideas.

That's this cognitive process of exchanging. And if you consider what goes on in the brain when you're sitting there pondering something, we think with words. Words are tied to how we think and how we speak.

So, speaking and thinking are very closely related. And so thinking and processing and the whole cognition piece of the human experience is involved with language. And this is one of the reasons why people communicate is so that they can express ideas.

Second of all, interpersonal connections. Hey, how are you doing? Great, man. What's up? I've had a rough week.

Sorry to hear that. So, we do that through making personal connections: another thing, creative expression.

So, we have poetry. We have other artistic expressions with language. We have songs.

Songs are a different level of communication, but they still use language and words. So creative expression is one of the ways that we use language, one of the ways that we communicate. And oftentimes, not always, but oftentimes, an artist will have

maybe a message in mind that they think about when they're communicating, maybe in a song, or when they write a particular poem or something, or even writing a novel.

Sometimes you read a novel, and you say, this person had an ax to grind. They're on their platform, and they're making a point about this. That's part of the creative expression of words in these different art forms.

One of the things is we just use it to express emotions. Man, I'm feeling really down today. You can express that to someone else, and they can empathize with you.

Another thing is to influence or to persuade or to impact someone else. It could be to evoke certain emotions. It could be to evoke certain activities.

It could be encouraging them to think differently. It could be some other reason why you want to influence them. But this is one of the things that we do with language.

We often do this with children. Tommy, if you don't finish your food, we're not going to have any ice cream. So, Tommy says, okay, how many more bites do I need to take? And you say, Tommy's got five bites.

And then Tommy finishes four and a half, and he goes, is that good enough? No, you need to finish one more. Okay, fine. So you're influencing Tommy by speaking to him, by promising him a reward if he does what you want.

Okay, inform. Sometimes we just want to tell people information. When my son, Kerry, was small, we bought him a watch for Christmas.

And he was like seven years old. And he'd come in, and he'd go, Mom, it's 9:47. And Mom would go, Kerry, that's great.

Why was he giving you that information? He was giving that information because he was excited that he knew how to read a watch and he knew how to tell time. Okay, but he's giving information. Now, I've talked about these concepts with my students and I asked them, so what are the three most common ones that you see in your life? What do you think the number one was for students? Inform.

They're there to take in knowledge in the classroom, in lectures. And then the other two, it varies. A lot of people said interpersonal communication was one number one.

How many times, though, in normal conversations with people is the main reason why you're saying something that you want to inform them about something that they don't know? I mean, when I go see my grandkids on the weekend last weekend,

I wasn't there to tell them, hey, guess what? We drove from our house to your house. It took us 37 minutes to get here. And now, it's Grandpa! Oh, Judah! Hi, how are you? How have you been? I've been doing great, Grandpa.

How are you? I'm fine. How often is that the default reason for communicating? I don't know what it is. We definitely think, and we use words to think and process.

We definitely have creative expression. Interpersonal connections connect with this whole thing of it being between two parties, or between two people, or two groups. So, there is that interpersonal aspect to this.

I can't say which are most important, but I can say that all of these are different ways that we use, and there could be even more. And why are we talking about this? Eugene Nida was a translation theorist back in the '60s, '70s, '80s, '90s; and he initially proposed an idea called dynamic equivalence in the '70s, which was very misunderstood, and he didn't really get his point across. And then he said, okay, well, what I'm really talking about is functional equivalence, and now we're going to explore this area of functional equivalence.

Initially, he thought, what we're looking at is, what was the impact of the Bible, or the message in the Bible, to the hearers of the Bible? And in actuality, we don't know because we weren't there, and it's not recorded for us. But then he thought, well, what did the person want that impact to be? So, when Paul says to the Galatians, you foolish Galatians who bewitched you to believe this garbage, what did Paul want them to do in reaction to what he said? So, Nida asks, what is the function of the speech or utterance, and how does that relate to translation? And so, he said, the first thing is to understand that there is a function, understand that the person who said it had a reason for saying it, and they have some, not necessarily ulterior, but they have some motivation behind why they wanted to say it. And so, what was the whole idea of what the author intended? So, authorial intent is very important in determining this.

Another thing is, what is the relationship between this rhetorical function, and rhetorical means to influence or persuade? So, rhetoric is there to influence people. What is the relationship between the rhetorical function intended by the speaker or the writer of the biblical text and translation? We see that the forms in the Bible are one type of way of phrasing it, with a particular reason or function behind it, and when you take it into another language, do you want the forms the same? Well, sometimes, and we're going to see the examples of this, you wouldn't say it that way in another language, but you still want the same idea, the same intent, and the same impact to be carried across. So, how can we put that form of the target language? How can we bring in that function and put it in the target language ways? And we will see examples of that.

Looking at the Bible as a whole, are there different functions in the books of the Bible? What are the functions that we see in the Gospels? There are all kinds of them. One of the reasons for Jesus' teaching is to help people to understand God better and help people to know how to walk with God better, so these are some of the reasons why he told these parables. What about Acts? What about the Epistles? The Epistles are full of Paul encouraging people to change the way they think, change the way they believe, change the way they behave, and maybe some others.

What about the Pentateuch? The Hebrew word is Torah, and Torah is from the verb to teach, so Torah means teaching. Is it teaching for information? Is it teaching for impact? Is it teaching to influence? What is it teaching us, and why is it teaching us that? What about Psalms, Proverbs, etc.? So, I'm encouraging us to think along these lines even before we open up a particular book to translate that book or parts of it. Okay, how can we know the function? Someone said, well, you can't know that.

You don't know what's in the mind of the speaker. Sorry, but it's pretty obvious when Paul says, you stupid Galatians, what are you doing thinking this stuff? It's pretty obvious that he wants them to stop doing something, right? So, we will look into this further, but our starting point is, can we know this when we interpret a passage, and once we know it, can we translate it? And how do we translate it effectively so that that intention and the original get carried over into the translation into this other language? And when we read a book, we assume that we understand the function. We assume that we understand why the author said it.

We assume that we know one of those reasons why people communicate. We assume that we see one in there based on our understanding and our usage of literature in our own language, in our own system, and in our own way of communicating. Let me give you an example.

The book of Genesis. The book of Genesis is a sequence of events, and so you look at that, and you say, well, this is a history. And if you look at the beginning, this is the primeval history.

This is what the world was like in the first however many centuries, however long it took God to create everything, and then up to the flood, and then after that is the patriarchal history, the history of the patriarchs. That is a legitimate way of interpreting the book of Genesis. Genesis is a part of the Torah.

Is the purpose of Genesis specifically to teach history? Is that why it's been recorded for us? There's a question for you. You can ponder that one, and we'll continue, but keep that in mind as we're talking. In my personal opinion, everything in the Bible teaches us theology.

Everything in the Bible teaches us about God in one way or another, and oftentimes, it teaches us about God, it teaches us about ourselves, and some way that we need to realign ourselves better by walking in God's ways. That's my personal opinion about the whole Bible, and I would say that everything in the Bible helps us to understand God better. All right, the information that I'm presenting now is from a Bible scholar named Janine Brown, and her book is Scripture as Communication.

If you don't have that book, I would recommend it to you, and so we're drawing out some of the principles that she presented, and not only her but other scholars, Van Hoover, and other Bible scholars also echo some of these ideas, so it's not just Brown or me, it's a number of other people talking about the Bible as a communication, and if we think about the Bible, we have the biblical writer, and we have the audience, and so we know that there's a relationship between that author and his audience, and we say his, all of the people in the Bible, all the authors were male. In some ways, it's the author communicating a message from God to people. I want to look at it that way, and in that sense, it's God through the writer communicating to people, and so it's this seeing the Bible as a communication process rather than, oh, this is a book, and I'm going to read this book. Sometimes we remove ourselves from the book a bit too far, but if we keep in mind this is God communicating to us, Holy Spirit can speak to us as we read it, and it can impact us, and even you can read the same passage on one day, and it says one thing to you, another day it says something else to you, so this is this communication process, and God is not absent from this process.

God is there with us to help us and illumine our minds as we read scriptures, and so it's really this whole communication process. One of the things that Brown starts with that we've already alluded to is this whole thing of authorial intent. Why is it important to start with looking at what the author intended when understanding the scriptures? Again, we're trying to say this author, and we believe communication is communication with a specific purpose.

They didn't write it randomly just because they felt like writing it. This wasn't just, hey, I want to publish a book, therefore I'm going to write this. There was usually some reason for it, and oftentimes, particularly if you look at the epistles, Paul was speaking into the situation of the local people that he knew about and that they knew about, and so his talking or his writing was relevant to their situation, so he was speaking for a specific reason or reasons that related to those people.

So, this idea of the author having something in mind is not a new concept. This is not something that is unusual. In what ways does seeing the meaning of scripture as a communication act by the author, rather than a printed text, impact your views or our views of how we understand the Bible? And anyway, who is this author, and what were their goals? What were the things that we're going to look at? What are we saying? Seeing that this Bible that we have, that we're trying to communicate in

these other languages, viewing it as a communication act can help us look for different things and see different things in the text that we might have missed or overlooked otherwise.

And understanding that this is a process of human communication that's in print helps us to see the scriptures in a different way that then can enhance our ability to translate it. Are there other opinions about the meaning of the text and, as it were, where it is determined or where it resides? So we're saying that the author determines what the meaning is. The author is the one that said something, and what they meant is what the text means.

Not everyone believes that. Some people say, well, it's up to the reader, and the reader says, well, this is what it means to me. What it means to you is what it means to you.

What it means to me is what it means to me. That's one view. Another view is the text itself, not the author, but the text itself is where we get the meaning from.

So, you look at the meaning, stay in the text, and the text determines that. One of my students said his seminary professor had that view. Okay, but what do you do when Jesus quotes Moses? Moses said this, but yet I say to you.

The law said this, but I say to you. When he says that in the Sermon on the Mount, he's taking us outside the text, and unless you understand what the law is, you can't stay in the text. It's really, really difficult because you have all these hints and allusions and references to things outside the text.

It's really, really hard to say. Just stick with the meaning of the text, and that's all we can go on. Another one is the historical view of where meaning is. Well, it's in that history, it's in that time period, and that's how we determine what the meaning is.

This view that the author has the source of the meaning, and they communicate the meaning, and it's determined by what they think, was the standard way of biblical interpretation until maybe the early 1900s, maybe a little bit later, and then it started falling out of favor. Even secular authors in the 70s and 80s started saying, well, actually, there is something to this authorial intent stuff. So even secular authors started challenging the view that you can't really know what the meaning is and whether the meaning is in the text or somewhere else.

Let me ask you this question. Apart from the Bible, have you ever read anything and not thought about what the author means? What about a text message to you? And the text message is not clear, and you think, what does this guy mean? What about an article in the newspaper, or a thing on a website, or a book that you're reading?

What is this author on about? I don't get what they're trying to say. That's our default way of thinking.

And why? Communication is for the purpose of communicating some kind of message. I'm not getting the message, therefore I'm not getting what the meaning is. So, this is our default way of thinking, that somehow we kind of divorce ourselves from that when we then look at the Bible.

And I say, okay, this is communication. It fits in that category. Let's look at it in the same way.

All right. Psalm 1. What is the authorial intent here? How blessed is the man who does not walk in the counsel of the wicked, nor stand in the path of the sinners, nor sit in the seat of scoffers, but his delight is in the law of the Lord, and in his law he meditates day and night. He will be like a tree firmly planted by streams of water, which yields its fruit in its season, and its leaf does not wither, and whatever he does, he prospers.

Not so with the wicked, and so on. Is there anything that you could think of that the author maybe wants us to do from that? Is there anything that you can see there that the author doesn't want us to do? Or is the author encouraging us to move in this way and encouraging us to avoid that way? If it's merely for information, we look at it, and we go, gee, that's nice, and then we flip the page. What if it's more than that? And this is the whole thing of authorial intent.

Why is this even in the Bible? Why did the author write it in the first place, and why was it included in Holy Scripture? Think about that. Continuing on this theme of authorial intent, we have this passage from Colossians. So, as those who have been chosen by God, holy and beloved, put on a heart of compassion, kindness, humility, gentleness, and patience, bearing with one another and forgiving each other, whoever has a complaint against anyone, just as the Lord forgives you, so also should you beyond all these things put on love, which is the perfect bond of unity, let the peace of Christ rule in your hearts, to which you were called, in one body, and be thankful.

Paul uses language that sounds pretty much like encouraging, doesn't he? Now, it's not, as it were, a command, put on a heart of compassion, but he's exhorting his audience in Colossae, and also us today, for us to do these things too, and that's obviously because he uses language that sounds like he's asking them to do something, put on a heart of compassion, etc., bear with one another, hang in there when you're in this relationship, forgive each other, because God forgave you, put on love, let Christ's peace rule in your hearts, be thankful, so he's giving them these exhortations that look like exhortations, it's very clear. I don't think anyone can read

this and not get that from this text. However, Paul's writings are deep and mysterious.

What about this one? Love is patient, love is kind, and not jealous. Love does not brag and is not arrogant, does not act unbecomingly, it does not seek its own, is not provoked, etc. And the last thing, now, faith, hope, and love, these remain, but the greatest of these is love.

What does Paul want us to do with all of this? Does he even want us to do something? How can we know whether he wants us to do something? Well, we need to read scripture in the context of scripture. At the end of chapter 12, he says what? Spiritual gifts are great, but let me show you a better way. A better way for what? He's a little cryptic there, and he doesn't spell it out for us.

And then we have chapter 13, and it's famously called the love chapter. Could it be that he's telling us this is how we should be? Think about that. So we read on in chapter 14, and chapter 14 verse 1 says this, follow the way of love.

Wait, what do you mean follow? What am I supposed to do here? Then we go back and read chapter 13, and we go, oh, is that what Paul was trying to say? But you notice how up there, it's totally lacking any of those words that he used in Colossians that clearly say, you should do these things, you should be humble, you should be kind, you should be, etc. So, he doesn't say it in 1 Corinthians 13. It does come out subtly, and so this is the whole thing of what do they say, what do they mean, how can we determine that? And I don't think anyone would disagree that Paul wants us to live like this.

And we definitely have 14 verse 1, when he wraps it up and then moves on to another topic of the other gifts. So, as we look at that, we think, oh wow, I never realized that there were some instructions in here, and this is what we're trying to say, is what did the author intend, and how can we communicate those intentions in another language? So, first of all, what is it? And second of all, how can we communicate that? Here's another one from Paul in the same book, Corinthians. Food will not condemn us; chapter 8 talks about eating food sacrificed to idols.

We are neither the worse if we don't eat that food sacrificed to idols, that meat, nor better if we do. But take care, this is one of the few things where he actually says what they should do, but take care that this liberty of yours does not somehow become a stumbling block for the weak. There's not a real strong command there.

He goes on, for if someone sees you, you who have the knowledge, eating in an idol's temple, so eating in one of these temples where the meat is sacrificed, will not his conscience if he is weak, be strengthened to eat those things sacrificed to idols. If he

sees you doing wrong, won't that influence him to do the wrong thing too? For through your knowledge, he who is weak is ruined. So, we lead them astray.

For the brother whose sake Christ died. So, this is a brother in Christ, and by us eating those idols that meat to the idols, that could then mislead and put someone off of their walk with God. And so, by sinning against brethren and wounding their conscience when it is weak, you sin against Christ.

Therefore, if food causes my brother to stumble, I will never eat meat again, so I may not cause my brother to stumble. What does Paul want them to do? When he says that last sentence, he's couching this desire of his in a roundabout way, and we need to dig out what those roundabout ways are. What is it that he's actually saying? Because of the way that he says it here, it's not clear in English that he's giving them exhortations or commands.

At least not to some. It could be, well, he's just giving them important information. So when he says, if that's going to happen to my brother when I eat meat, then I'm not going to eat meat again.

Can we extrapolate? Go ye therefore and do the same. If what you're doing causes another brother to stumble, please don't do it. Please consider them.

Please know that what you're doing is going to influence them. Am I off-base on this? I hope that what I'm trying to do is to encourage us to look more closely at the scriptures and look more closely at this communication that Paul has with his people and that biblical writer has with his audience so that we can then determine what the point is. Then, the whole question is, how do we communicate this in another language? And that is a really, really challenging and difficult process to do, especially when you have these languages from other parts of the world.

Okay, so, we start with, from interpretation to translation, we start with what is our interpretation of the passage? What does it mean? What is the other telling the people? And as we said, what is God telling the people? And what is he telling the people to do, or what is he telling us to do? How can we translate what the text means while at the same time communicating this intention and/or function in the text, as well as the pragmatics of what the text is all about? So, you have the meaning, and you have the reason for the meaning, and so we need to keep both of those in mind when we translate. We use the target language ways of communicating. We use their forms to communicate those subtle intentions so that the readers of that other Bible pick up on these hints and clues and subtle ways of communicating, and they understand what the author intended for his audience, which is then the same as what God and the biblical scriptures intend for us in our day. So, we'll stop there and then we'll move on to another one in just a few minutes.

Thank you.

This is Dr. George Payton in his teaching on Bible Translation. This is session 6, Language, Part 1, How We Communicate.