Christiane Nord

University of Applied Sciences, Magdeburg/Germany
University of the Orange Free State, Bloemfontein/South Africa

Function plus Loyalty: Ethics in Professional Translation

Loyalty as a corrective to radical functionalism

Functional or target-oriented translation theories (among them *Skopostheorie*, cf. Nord 1997) are gaining ground in many parts of the world. Nevertheless, criticisms have been levelled at the theoretical foundations and applicability of functionalist approaches in general, and of *Skopostheorie* in particular.

The first and foremost principle of the functional approach is the skopos rule formulated by Hans Vermeer more than 25 years ago: "The purpose of the translation determines the choice of translation method and strategy" (cf. Vermeer 1978, my transl.). I call it the "functionality principle". Experience shows that there is always more than one method or strategy for the translation of one particular source text. Therefore, translation is a decision process which must be guided by some kind of intersubjective criterion or set of criteria (= strategy). Skopos theory suggests that this criterion should be the communicative function or functions for which the target text is needed.

This is the reason why some critics reproach functionalism for producing "mercenary experts, able to fight under the flag of any pupose able to pay them" (Pym 1996: 338). Others are of the view that translators who take the needs and expectations of their target audience into account must necessarily lose sight of 'the' source text.

The latter criticism can be answered on the grounds of the concept of 'text' as used in functional translation theory. In accordance with Vermeer's concept of the text as an "offer of information" (cf. Reiss & Vermeer 1984: 19), the form in which the source text presents itself to the translator is a product of the many variables of the situation (time, place, medium, addressees) in which it originated, while the way this form is interpreted and understood by the translator, or any other receiver, is guided by the variables of the new situation of reception.

The first criticism, however, refers to an ethical quality related to the status of the source text. While narrower linguistic approaches still praise the autonomy or authority of a source text, which must not be touched in the translation process, skopos theory no longer considers the source text, or more precisely, its linguistic and stylistic features, to be a valid yardstick for a translation. Does this mean that the translator is entitled to do as he or she likes with the source text?

Indeed, the functionality principle might be paraphrased as 'the translation purpose justifies the translation procedures', and this could easily be interpreted as 'the end justifies the means'. Then there would be no restriction to the range of possible ends; the source text could be manipulated as clients (or translators) see fit. In a general theory, this doctrine might be acceptable enough, since one could always argue that general theories do not have to be directly applicable. Yet translation practice does not take place in a void. It takes place in specific situations set in specific cultures. Therefore, any application of the general theory, either to practice or to training, has to consider the specific cultural conditions in which a text is translated.

At different times and in different parts of the world, people have had and still have different concepts of the relationship that should hold between an original and the text that is called its translation. According to the prevailing concept of translation, readers might expect, for example, the target text to give exactly the author's opinion; other cultures might want it to be a faithful reproduction of the formal features of the source text; still others could praise archaising translations or ones that are far from faithful reproductions, but are comprehensible, readable texts. Taking account of all these different expectations, which may vary according to the text type in question or depend on the self-esteem of the receiving culture with regard to the source culture, the translator acts as a responsible mediator in the cooperation developing between the client, the target audience and the source-text author. This does not mean that translators always have to do what the other parties expect, which may even be impossible if the three parties expect different translational behaviours. It means that the translator has to anticipate any misunderstanding or communicative conflict that may occur due to different translational concepts and find a way to avoid them.

This responsibility that translators have toward their partners is what I call 'loyalty'. The loyalty principle was first introduced into *Skopostheorie* in 1989 (Nord 1989, cf. Nord 1997:123ff.) in order to account for the culture-specificity of translation

concepts, setting an ethical limitation to the otherwise unlimited range of possible *skopoi* for the translation of one particular source text. It was argued that translators, in their role as mediators between two cultures, have a special responsibility both with regard to their partners, i.e. the source-text author, the client or commissioner of the translation, and the target-text receivers, and towards themselves, precisely in those cases where there are differing views as to what a 'good' translation is or should be. As an inter*personal* category referring to a social relationship between individuals who expect not to be betrayed in the process, loyalty may replace the traditional inter*textual* relationship of 'fidelity', a concept that usually refers to a linguistic or stylistic similarity between the source and the target *texts*, regardless of the communicative intentions and/or expectations involved. It is the translator's task to mediate between the two cultures, and I believe that mediation can never mean the imposition of the concept of one culture on members of another.

In introducing the loyalty principle into the functionalist model, I would therefore also hope to lay the foundations for a trusting relationship between the partners in the translational interaction. If authors can be sure that translators will respect their communicative interests or intentions, they may even consent to any changes or adaptations needed to make the translation work in the target culture. And if clients or receivers can be sure that the translator will consider their communicative needs as well, they may even accept a translation that is different from what they expected. This confidence will then strengthen the translator's social prestige as a responsible and trustworthy partner.

The loyalty principle thus adds two important qualities to the functional approach. Since it obliges the translator to take account of the difference between culture-specific concepts of translation prevailing in the two cultures involved in the translation process, it turns *Skopostheorie* into an anti-universalist model; and since it induces the translator to respect the sender's individual communicative intentions, as far as they can be elicited, it reduces the prescriptiveness of 'radical' functionalism.

Seen in this light, the functionality principle must be complemented by the "loyalty principle", which says that the acceptability of translation purposes is limited by the translator's responsibility to all her or his partners in the cooperative activity of translation. Loyalty may oblige translators to reveal their translation purposes and justify their translational decisions.

In what follows, I will illustrate this point by means of few examples from the new German translation of the New Testament published in 1999, which was produced in close cooperation between my husband, Klaus Berger, a New Testament scholar of Heidelberg University, and myself.

Bridging coherence gaps (Jas. 1,14-18)

Quite a few New Testament scholars have considered the Epistle of James to be a collection of incoherent statements. But as recent research has found out, the apparent incoherence may be due to the fact that metaphors of procreation and birth are not as familiar to modern readers as as they were to the addressees of the writer of this letter, as we may guess from other texts drawing on the same fundamental human experience. If coherence works through the combination of what is verbalized in a text and what is presupposed to be part of the audience's previous knowledge, as pragmatic text linguistics have taught us, the balance between verbalized (i.e. explicit) and presupposed (i.e. implicit) information may have to be shifted if the message is to be coherent for an audience whose previous knowledge is different from that of the original addressees.

Example 1: Coherence

BSP (no year)	DNT 1999:76	Engl. Transl. of DNT 1999
(14) Ao contrário, cada um é tentado pela sua própria cobiça, quando esta o atrai e seduz.	(14) Wenn man sich zu bewähren hat, dann immer und ausschließlich gegenüber der eigenen Triebhaftigkeit, die an jedem einzelnen zerrt oder ihn ködert.	(14) Whenever we have to prove our firmness it is solely against our own desire, by which each of us is drawn away and enticed.
15) Então a cobiça, depois de haver concebido, dá à luz o pecado; e o pecado, uma vez consumado gera a morte.	(15) Das Ganze ist dann wie zweifaches Zeugen und Gebären: Die Triebhaftigkeit des Menschen ist wie ein Mutterschoß, der den bösen Gedanken empfängt und die böse Tat gebiert. Die böse Tat ihrerseits wird reif und wächst sich aus, und sie gebiert den Tod. (16) Macht euch über diesen schrecklichen Zusammenhang kein e falschen Vorstellungen! (17) Aber Ähnliches gilt auch von der Gegenseite: Alles, was gut und bewundernswert ist, kommt vom Himmel als Geschenk von Gott, dem Vater der Lichter, der unveränderlich ist und nicht den kleinsten Hauch des Wandels zeigt. (18) Auch hier gibt es Zeugung und	(15) The whole process is like a twofold procreation: Human desire is like a womb that conceives the bad thought and brings forth the bad deed. The bad deed then grows to maturity and brings forth death.
(16) Não vos enganeis, meus amados irmãos.		(16) Don't fool yourselves about this terrible sequence of events!
(17) Toda boa dádiva e todo dom perfeito é lá do alto, descendo do Pai das luzes, em quem não pode existir variação, ou sombra de mudança.		(17) But the same is true of the opposite: Everything that is good and worth admiring comes down from heaven, as a gift from God, the father of lights, who is stable and never shows the slightest trace of change. (18) Here is
(18) Pois, segundo os		

seu querer, ele nos gerou pela palavra da verdade, para que fôssemos como que primícias das suas criaturas.

<u>Geburt</u>: Gott wollte uns; durch das Wort der Wahrheit hat er uns als seine Wunschkinder in die Welt gesetzt, als Erstlinge seiner [neuen] Schöpfung.

<u>procreation too</u>: God wanted us; through the Word of Truth, he brought us into the world as his longed-for children, as firstborn creatures of his [new] creation.

Traditional translations of this passage (BSP, the Brazilian version by Pereira de Figueiredo, is by no means an exception and stands for many others) leave the text as it stands in the Greek original, thus producing the impression of a series of unconnected utterances. In our translation, which has been back-translated for the purpose of this paper, the coherence gaps have been 'filled' by means of cohesive devices, as they are quite common in difficult argumentative texts: cataphoric references indicating the main point of the following passages (verse 15, 17, 18 with a colon at the end), anaphoric references to the preceding passage (verse 16: "this terrible sequence of events"), connectors (verse 17: "the opposite"), explicitation of the metaphor by means of a simile (verse 15: "like a womb"), and a number of parallel constructions. These cohesion markers guide the reader's comprehension whithout being additions to the message. Since modern readers cannot be expected to be familiar with the idea of the 'old' creation being replaced by a new and better one which starts with the birth of Jesus, we added the adjective "new" in verse 18. This addition is marked by square brackets.

Strange words for strange things

The skopos of our translation was to make otherness understood, not to turn it into sameness. Therefore, where the source text refers to source-culture realities, we sometimes decided to create a new word rather than to use a word that suggests a reference to target-culture reality. In the Gospel of St. Mark, Mk. 2,18-19, for example. we used a neologism, *Vorhochzeit* ('pre-wedding'), to refer to the time before the wedding during which the bridegroom is celebrating with his (male!) friends. The neologism was formed in analogy with existing words denoting 'the period before a certain event', e.g. *Vorweihnachtszeit*, 'the period before Christmas'. The unusual word was meant precisely to avoid quick equations with similar rituals in the target culture, and at the same time to make clear that it is not yet the wedding day, as is suggested in various translations which use words like *wedding guests* and *bridegroom* or its equivalents (cf. GNB 1997: *Hochzeitsgäste*, *Bräutigam*; NTF 1922:

les garçons des neces, l'épous; SBE 1964: *los invitados a bodas, el esposo*; BSB 1982: *os amigos do noivo, o noivo*).

Example 2: Pre-wedding

BSP	DNT 1999:76	Engl. Transl. of DNT 1999
(18) Ora, os discípulos e Joã e os fariseus estavam jejuando. Vieram alguns e lhe perguntaram: Por que motivo jejuam os discípulos de João e dos fariseus, mas os teus discípulos não jejuam? (19) Respondeu-lhes Jesus: Podem, porventura, jejuar <u>os convidados para o casamento</u>, enquanto <u>o noivo</u> está com eles?	(18) Die Jünger des Johannes und der Pharisäer hielten bestimmte Fastengebote ein. Daher traten Neugierige an Jesus mit der Frage heran: 'Warum halten die Jünger des Johannes und der Pharisäer Fastengebote ein, deine Jünger aber nicht?' (19) Jesus erwiderte: 'Können etwa die <u>künftigen Hochzeitsgäste</u> in der Zeit Fastengebote einhalten, wenn der <u>künftige Bräutigam</u> mit ihnen schon die <u>Vorhochzeit</u> feiert?'	(18) The disciples of John and of the Pharisees used to keep certain fasting periods. Therefore, some people asked Jesus out of curiosity: 'Why do the disciples of John and of the Pharisees keep fasting periods, and your disciples don't?' (19) Jesus answered: 'Do you think the <u>prospective wedding guests</u> can fast at a time when the <u>prospective bridegroom</u> is celebrating the <u>pre-wedding</u> with them?'

"False friends" with severe consequences

False friends or cognates are words or phrases with the same etymological origin which have developed diverging meanings in two languages and cultures or even within one culture, as the following example shows.

Example 3: The Lord of the Sabbath

In the Gospel of Mark (Mk. 2,28) we find the famous phrase about Jesus being master or Lord of the Sabbath: "The Sabbath was made for the good of human beings; they were not made for the Sabbath. So the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath." (quoted according to TEV 1992). António Pereira de Figueiredo translates: "O Filho do homem é senhor também do sábado." Our translation "The Son of Man has the right to interpret the Sabbath in favour of the humans" (DNT 1999) was criticized rather harshly by a theological scholar in the German daily paper *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*:

> A translator who does not translate literally, presumes being 'master of the word' instead of 'servant of the word'. It is the translator's duty to be faithful to the words, structures and sounds of the original.' (Schuler 1999; my transl.)

What the reviewer did not know is that according to the language use of the time, the Greek phrase used in Mk. 2.28 (literally: *to be Lord of sth., e.g. a law or rule*) meant "to master a law" in the sense of "having the competence and the right to interpret it". If we say in English that we master the art of public speaking, for example (cf. DCE

1978), we are not implying that we plan to abolish it, but that we are competent to use it adequately. The traditional translation had severe consequences: my husband himself was declared heretic when, in his doctoral thesis of 1967, he maintained that Jesus did not abolish the Jewish law but interpreted it in the light of his time – a statement which many years later was included almost literally in John Paul's new World Catechism in 1998.

Word equivalence in a changing world

A faithful and concordant translation of polysemic words may change the message severely, especially when social conditions make the language use change.

Example 4: Porneia

In the various books of the New Testament, the Greek word *porneia* has a very wide range of meanings, from "prostitution" (1 Cor. 6,18; 7,2), "adultery" (Mt. 19,9) and "incest" (1 Cor. 5,1), to "lecherousness" (1 Cor. 6,9), "homosexuality" and general breach of taboos (e.g., Eph. 4,19) to "sexual intercourse or marriage with heathens" (Rev. 2,14 and 20). In order to make the translation work as an 'information about how St. Paul appeals to his addressees', the translator (and the theologian) must analyse each passage separately to find out which meaning is the one intended in this particular context and translate *porneia* accordingly – this is a philological task. The result will be a philological translation presenting the text as a historical document that may be of interest to readers who want to know more about the strange culture in which St. Paul lived and preached. I suppose that this is what most readers would expect (according to their subjective theories). A translation of *porneia* as "marrying a gentile" would then be interpreted as a marker of foreignness or alterity, whereas "homosexuality", "incest", or "prostitution" may allow an analogy to be drawn with modern societies. But considering the liberalising tendencies in contemporary societies, the appeal is continuously reduced to something like: We should refrain from doing indecent or immoral things (as, in fact, GNB 1976 translates the references to *porneia* in all the passages mentioned above). We knew this before we read the texts, thinking of indecencies like cheating the tax office or kissing in public.

Moreover, when Paul appeals to the Corinthians to "flee fornication" (1 Cor. 6,18, according to KJV) or "die Unzucht zu fliehen" (according to most German translations), English and German readers will understand different things, although

all the dictionaries translate the Greek word *porneia* by "fornication" or "Unzucht", respectively. The *Dictionary of Contemporary English* (DCE 1978) defines *fornication* as "sexual relations outside marriage", whereas *Unzucht*, marked as obsolete in *Der Große Duden* (Duden 1993), is a juridical term referring to sexual practices sanctioned by the law (e.g. sodomy). While English readers may find St. Paul's attitude rather old-fashioned, German readers would not see why they should take the appeal seriously: "Unzucht" is something *we* do not practice, we think it is immoral, and St. Paul is right to tell the Corinthians they should refrain from doing these dirty things. So contrary to St. Paul's intention to make people change their ways of life, the translation may even cause the opposite reaction: readers feel they are fine as they are and need not worry because they actually avoid "Unzucht". Since many translators, including Luther and the anonymous authors of the King James Authorized Version, have decided to translate the Greek word *porneia* by "fornication" (or "Unzucht" in German, "fornicaciones" in Spanish, "fornications" in French, "fornicacões" in Portuguese, "fornicazione" in Italian, etc.), our subjective theories do not protest. We have grown accustomed to the word, and so much so that we regard other translations as 'wrong'.

But if a translation is intended to 'bridge the gap' between the two cultures, to make otherness comprehensible, it might be in order to look for analogies. In contemporary Western societies, sex is commercialized, used as a selling device or as an instrument of violence and oppression. So, in order to make the readers feel that things are not so different now from what they were in Ephesus or Corinth, we used the colloquial German word *Sex* ("sexuality as it is represented in the media", cf. Duden 1993), especially in contexts where *porneia* appeared side by side with other words denoting specifically prostitution or adultery, e.g. "sexdriven behaviour" (Mt. 15,19; Col. 3,5), a "sex scandal" (1 Cor. 5,1, referring to somebody having intercourse with his mother), "unrestrained sexuality" (1 Cor. 5,9-11), "sexual greed" (1 Cor. 10,8). This was not in line with the subjective theories of some reviewers who regarded this 'modernization' as 'completely idiotic' (Leicht 1999). But since both the translation strategy and methods and the theory behind it were explained in detail in the preface (Berger & Nord 1999: 11-32), I do not think this criticism is justified. Once the translation purpose has been defined explicitly, critics can only judge whether or not the translation achieves the intended purpose(s), regardless of their own subjective theory of what a translation is or should be.

By explaining the translation purpose and its underlying criteria, we have taken account of the fact that our readers most probably have subjective theories about translation that do not justify this kind of procedure. Since our translation – in various respects – does not follow the trodden paths of 'normal' bible translations, we felt obliged to make our theory transparent in order not to deceive those readers who have different expectations. Thus, we tried to be *loyal* to the addressees – just as we tried to be loyal to St. Paul, trying to respect his communicative intentions (as far as the philologist, historian, and exegete was able to reconstruct them) in spite of the cultural gap.

Interpretation as an act of loyalty

Loyalty may also be at stake in ambiguous passages that allow more than one interpretation. Translations produced by translator teams, consisting of representatives of various denominations (Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, Catholics, etc.), often have to compromise, and this frequently leads to solutions that do not take sides. Our translation strategy was the opposite: Wherever possible, we opted for a clear interpretation, based on the findings of the theologian and modern theological research. Taking into account that the addressees are laypersons who are not in a position to make a choice between two different interpretations, we believed that loyalty requires the reduction of ambiguity, under the condition that the decision is laid open and justified, e.g. in a footnote. The history of reception of the New Testament shows that lay receivers' interpretations of some controversial passages have done a lot of harm to both individual believers and the Church as a whole.

Example 5: Darkness and the Light (Jn. 1,1-5)

Im Anfang war das Wort, und das Wort war <u>bei</u> Gott, und <u>Gott war das Wort</u>. Dasselbe war im Anfang bei Gott. Alle Dinge sind durch dasselbe gemacht, und ohne dasselbe ist nichts gemacht, was gemacht ist. In ihm war das Leben, und das Leben war das Licht der Menschen. und das Licht scheint in der Finsternis, und <u>die Finsternis hat's nicht ergriffen</u>. (LUTHER, rev. 1984)

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was <u>with</u> God, and <u>the Word was God</u>. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by <u>him</u>: and without <u>him</u> was not any thing made that was made. <u>In him</u> was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness <u>comprehended it not</u>. (KJV)

Au commencement était le Logos; et le Logos était <u>près de</u> Dieu, et <u>le Logos était dieu</u>. Il était au commencement près de Dieu; tout par lui s'est fait, et sans lui ne s'est fait rien. Ce qui s'est fait, en cela fut vie, et la vie était la lumière des hommes, et la lumière dans les ténèbres luit, et le ténèbres <u>ne l'ont point saisie</u>. (NTF 1922)

En el principio existía el Verbo, y el Verbo estaba <u>con </u>Dios, y <u>el Verbo era Dios</u>. <u>El</u> estaba en el principio con Dios. Todo fue hecho por <u>él</u>, y sin <u>él</u> nada se hizo cuanto ha sido hecho. En él está la vida, y la vida es la luz de los hombres; la luz luce en las tinieblas y <u>las tinieblas no la sofocaron</u>. (SBE 1964)

Al principio era el Verbo, y el Verbo estaba <u>en</u> Dios, y <u>el Verbo era Dios</u>. El estaba al principio en Dios. Todas las cosas fueron hechas por El, y sin El no se hizo nada de cuanto ha sido hecho. En El estaba la vida, y la vida era la luz de los hombres. La luz luce en las tinieblas, pero <u>las tinieblas no la acogieron</u>. (SBN 1975).

No principio era o Verbo, e o Verbo estaba <u>com</u> Deus, e <u>o Verbo era Deus</u>. No princípio estava ele com Deus. Todas as coisas foram feitas por intermédio <u>dele</u>, e sem ele nada se fez de todo que foi feito. Nele estava a vida, e a vida era a luz dos homens. A luz resplandece nas trevas mas as trevas <u>não a compreenderam</u>. (BSB 1982)

In principio era il Verbo, e il Verbo era <u>presso Dio</u> e <u>il Verbo era Dio</u>. Egli era in principio presso Dio: tutto è stato fatto per mezzo <u>di lui</u>, e senza di lui niente è stato fatto di tutto ciò che esiste. In lui era la vita e la vita era la luce degli uomini; la luce splende nelle tenebre, ma <u>le tenebre non l'hanno accolta</u>. (BDG 1974)

No principio era o Verbo, e o Verbo estava com Deus, e <u>o Verbo era Deus.</u> Ele estava no princípio com Deus. Todas as coisas foram feitas por intermédio <u>dele</u>, e sem ele nada do que foi feito se fez. A vida estava nele, e a vida era a luz dos homens. A luz resplandece nas trevas, e as trevas <u>não prevaleceram contra ela. (BSP)</u>

Zuerst war das Wort da, Gott nahe und <u>von Gottes Art</u>. Es war am Anfang bei Gott. Alle Dinge sind durch <u>das Wort</u> entstanden. Ohne <u>das Wort</u> konnte nichts werden. In ihm war das Leben, und für die Menschen ist Leben auch Licht. Das Licht macht die Finsternis hell, und <u>die Finsternis hat das Licht nicht verschluckt</u>. [The first thing that was there, was the Word, it was next to God and <u>of God's kind</u>. In the beginning it was with God. All things were made by <u>the Word</u>. Without <u>the Word</u>, nothing could come into being. It contained life, and for humans, life is also light. The light lightens darkness, and <u>darkness did not swallow the light</u>.] (DNT 1999)

This is a very familiar passage, and people praise its 'powerful' style. But this may be precisely one of the reasons why we do not really understand what the text is all about: how many and who exactly were where when? In view of a modern idea of what a person is, the relationship between God and the Logos (identity with regard to substance, "consubstantial", and different with regard to person, as SBN 1975 explains in a footnote) is not comprehensible. Especially in KJV, but also in the other translations, which are all absolutely literal, it does not become clear whether *him* – or *lui*, *él*, *dele* – refers to God or to the Word (in the original, it refers to the substantial union of God and the Word), and this increases the confusion about whether the Word is something outside God or within God (as SBN suggests), like God, or God himself (NTF 1922 marks the difference by capital vs non-capital letter). Since we have learned that it was God who created the world, we are even more willing to read this from the text, whereas, according to what biblical studies have found out, the original says (to put it simply) that the Word or Logos was God's instrument of creation.

Our translation tries to make the text more transparent. The Word is not *identical with* God, but *like God*. Although it was there "in the beginning", this does not mean it was there before God (the source culture never questions God's existence and nobody would ask where he came from). The difficulty of understanding the origin of evil and suffering is often derived from misunderstandings of this kind.

Another ambiguity is found in verse 5, which offers two possible interpretations: a metaphorical one (*darkness [= the world]* did not understand or recognize the role of *the light [= Jesus]*) and a literal one (*the light* was so strong that *darkness* could not do anything against it, as in SBE 1964). The metaphorical meaning is rather pessimistic (and, therefore, modern because we are aware of the fact that after 2000 years, the 'light' is far from having won the battle against darkness), whereas the literal meaning expresses the confidence of being victorious in the end. On the grounds of two reasons, a philological and a logical one, we opted for the literal and positive meaning. The philological reason is based on the observation that biblical authors generally tend to be far more concrete in their expressions than what we are used to; and the logical reason is that if you want to attract people to your cause you would not start telling them that it is not worth the effort in the first place.

Function plus Loyalty

Loyalty in the sense of considering the partners' expectations (or subjective theories) is usually not a problem in the translation of texts whose intended function can be clearly derived either from situational clues or from the text itself. But it is an important complementary criterion when the gap between source and target cultures or situations is so large that analogies are hard to detect and when it is impossible that the source-text sender's communicative intentions find a target in the target-culture addressees. In these cases, the translator (or the commissioner, or both, in co-operation or negotiation) has to decide what kind of function the target text can possibly achieve in the target culture. A translation of the documentary type (cf. Nord 1997: 47ff.) will always be a good solution in that it does not produce an illusion of direct applicability, which would be artificial. But it will inevitably turn any directly appellative function into an informative function (= informing about the appeal the author directed at the source-culture addressees). The bigger the cultural gap, the smaller the possibility for the readers to establish analogies with their own world.

Choosing an 'exoticizing translation' (in my terminology: a translation that focusses on the foreignness of the source-text content, thus creating the impression of 'exotic' strangeness and cultural distance for the target audience, cf. Nord 1997: 48f.), however, the translator has the possibility to make strangeness understandable and to help the audience both to gain access to the other culture and to see the analogies with their own situation more clearly. In this case, however, the translator has a responsibility to both the target audience, whose subjective theories have to be taken into account, and the source-text sender, whose communicative intentions must not be turned into their opposite. This responsibility is what I call 'loyalty'.

Loyalty is *not* the old faithfulness or fidelity in new clothes. Faithfulness and fidelity referred to a relationship holding between the source and the target *texts* as linguistic entities (i.e., translating *porneia* by "fornication" or "Unzucht" throughout the whole New Testament means being faithful to the text surface of the original). Loyalty, however, is an interpersonal category referring to a social relationship between individuals. It can be defined as the responsibility translators have toward their partners in the translational interaction. Loyalty commits the translator bilaterally to both the source and the target side. Therefore, a translator who renders *porneia* as "fornication" may be faithful to the source text and even produce a translation that is functional in the sense of being fit for a particular purpose, but will lack loyalty with regard to both the source-text author (whose intentions are distorted) and the target addressees, who – relying on their subjective theory – get the (wrong) impression that the target text gives them a 'true' account of St. Paul's appeal to the Corinthians (and maybe even to them as Christians).

My approach to translation thus stands on two pillars: functionalism (i.e. the aim of making the target text work for target-culture receivers) and loyalty (i.e. respecting the intentions and expectations of *all* the partners in the communicative interaction named translation). To 'respect' does not mean to 'do what the others expect you to do' (because this would lead into an insoluble dilemma if the interactants expect divergent forms of behaviour). It means that translators have to consider the subjective theories of their partners and explain their translation purposes and methods if they behave in a way that may be contradictory to these theories. To come back to our example: If the translators decide to use words stylistically marked as 'modern' (like *sex scandal*, or *unemployed*, or *lynch justice*) in the translation of a text classified as 'old' according to the receivers' world knowledge

and experience of previous translations, they have a moral obligation to justify their translation strategies telling the readers what they did and why they did it.

References

Berger, Klaus & Nord, Christiane. 1999. Zur Anordnung, Übersetzung und Kommentierung. Vorwort zu DNT 1999, 11-32.

DCE 1978. *Dictionary of Contemporary English.* Longman-Langenscheidt.

Duden 1993. *Das große Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, Mannheim: Dudenverlag.

Leicht, Robert. 1999. Im allerneusten Testament knirscht es. Review of DNT 19999 in *Die Zeit* 20-12-1999.

Nord, Christiane. 1989. Loyalität statt Treue. Vorschläge für eine funktionale Übersetzungstypologie. In: *Lebende Sprachen* 34 (3), 100-105.

Nord, Christiane. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained.* Manchester: St. Jerome.

Pym, Anthony. 1996. Material Text Transfer as a Key to the Purposes of Translation, in Neubert, Albrecht / Shreve, Gregory / Gommlich, Klaus (eds.): *Basic Issues in Translation Studies. Proceedings of the Fifth international Conference Kent Forum on Translation Studies II*, Kent/Ohio: Institute of Applied Linguistics, 337-346.

Reiss, Katharina & Vermeer, Hans J. 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Schuler, Christian. 1999. Review of DNT 1999 in *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, November 30th, 1999.

Vermeer, Hans J. 1978. Ein Rahmen für eine allgemeine Translationstheorie. In: *Lebende Sprachen* 23 (1): 99-102.

New Testament Translations

BDG 1974. *La Bibbia di Gerusalemme*. Testo biblico di La Sacra Bibbia della CEI; note e commenti di La Bible de Jerusalem. Nuova edizione 1973 (Paris: Editions du Cerf), edizione italiana e addattamenti a cura di un gruppo di biblisti italiani sotto la direzione di F. Vattioni. Bologna: Centro Editoriale Dehoniano.

BSB 1982. *Bíblia Sagrada*. Transl. by Mateus Hoepers. Petrópolis (Brazil): Editora Vozes.

BSP no year. *Biblia Sagrada*. Transl. by Antônio Pereira de Figueiredo, Difusão Cultural do Livro. Brazil: Cremagrafic S.A.

DNT 1999. *Das Neue Testament und frühchristliche Schriften*, neu übersetzt und kommentiert von Klaus Berger und Christiane Nord. Frankfurt a.M.: Insel Verlag.

GNB 1997: *Gute Nachricht Bibel*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft (CD-ROM).

KJV no year. *The Holy Bible containing the Old and New Testaments*. Transl. out of the original tongues and with the former translations diligently compared and revised by His Majesty's special command. Cambridge: University Press.

LUTHER 1984. *Die Bibel*, nach der Übersetzung Martin Luthers (Revision 1984). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

NTF 1922. *Les Livres du Nouveau Testament*, traduits du Grec en Français par Alfred Loisy. Paris: Émile Nourry.

SBE 1964. *La Santa Biblia*, traducida de los textos originales [al español], por Antonio G. Lamadrid, Juan Francisco Hernández, Evaristo Martín Nieto, Manuel Revuelta Sañudo. 18^a edición. Madrid: Ediciones Paulinas.

SBN 1975. *Sagrada Biblia*, versión directa de las lenguas originales por Eloíno Nácar Fuster y Alberto Colunga, O.P. 4^a edición (1^a ed. 1970). Madrid: Editorial Católica (= Bibblioteca de Autores Cristianos).

TEV 1992. *Good News New Testament. Today's English Version*. New York: American Bible Society.