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INTRODUCTION

Roman Jakobson said, "Translating activities must be kept under constant scrutiny by linguistic science."\(^1\) There is a tendency to give priority to literal fidelity over verbal excellence in the translation of religious books in all ages and countries. Especially in the case of scripture translation, translators tend to aim at faithful translation of the original text. However, even when a translator sets to work with best intentions, there is a possibility of betraying the author of the original by this very attitude of pursuing fidelity, if he lacks understanding of translation theory and if he lacks the qualities required of a translator.

Translated works are destined to be revised with reference to the degree of social change -- such as feudal system to democracy, class system to equal society etc., -- and vocabulary change. It will be twenty years in May next year since the Book of Mormon was revised into colloquial\(^2\) Japanese. It is the writer's desire, at this time, to examine this present translation from the point of view of current literary usage, to analyze it in reference to recent developments in

---


\(^2\) The term 'colloquial' used here is a translation of ポゴ, 'kōgo' as opposed to 休居, 'bungo' which means literary language in the literal sense of the word but is in reality Japanese of a former age which is not used at present. The more proper translation of ポゴ, 'kōgo' might be 'spoken language of modern Japan.' It does not imply a substandard level nor familiar class of writing. The writer will use this term 'colloquial Japanese' or 'colloquial version' in this thesis since they are generally used.
translation theory and to consider certain problems in the translation of apparent Hebraisms found in the English Book of Mormon. The hope of the writer of these pages is that this work will in some modest way contribute to the possible future revision of the book.

Statement of the Problem

There are indications that the standard works in Japanese, especially the Doctrine and Covenants which is translated into literary Japanese, are difficult for young people to read. It is not rare to hear the same kind of opinion about the Book of Mormon, also. The writer estimates that there are more than a few items in the present Book of Mormon translation which need examination and consideration for revision.

Almost two decades have passed since the last revision of the Book of Mormon, and although it is claimed to be a "colloquial" version, it nevertheless still presents difficulties for many of its readers. The difficulties are attributable mainly to the fact that the translator sought to render a formal equivalent of the original text rather than to transport the original to the reader and leave him as undisturbed as possible by rendering into natural target language. The writer proceeded with this research under the assumption that the present translation lacks an appreciation of the characteristics of Hebrew idiom and the background knowledge of Jewish and Egyptian cultures.

3 Out of ten Japanese who responded to a questionnaire, five of them said it is not easy to read; four said the style is marked by peculiarities which are not familiar to them, and one mentioned that there are portions which require extra effort to understand. Also, seven out of ten answered that the colloquial version of the Japanese Bible is easier to read than the Book of Mormon.
One of the purposes of this thesis is to discuss the current theory of translation in the discipline of linguistics and to apply the theory to a discussion of the Japanese translation of the Book of Mormon, showing what alternatives the current translation theory implies. A secondary purpose is to make clear how a knowledge of Hebrew idiom observed in the English Book of Mormon would help a future revision.

Regarding the Hebrew idioms in the original English version, this thesis assumes that the book was originally written by men who knew the Hebrew language and traditions well and consequently introduced Hebrew idioms into their writing.

**Justification of the Problem**

Some people complain that the present Japanese translation is not easy to read. The investigation of the reasons for this complaint with the hope of contributing to a future revision is then the major purpose and justification of this research. A great amount of knowledge concerning the book itself and information concerning the old and new world relative to the book has been added since the present translation was completed. It is the desire of the writer of this thesis to apply this knowledge to the examination of the present translation, and to make available the findings of this study as reference material for the use of translators of the book into other languages.

**Delimitation of the Problem**

The writer attempted to concentrate on the first book of Nephi and carry out a detailed examination.
Procedure

Interviews with Japanese informants were conducted to apply a cloze technique in which every tenth word of a message was deleted and the reader was asked to fill in the word which seems to fit the context most satisfactorily. At the same time, comparisons in terms of type of translation and length of sentence were made between verses picked at random from the Book of Mormon and sentences picked from current translated literature at random. Occasional comparisons were also made with two translations of the colloquial Japanese Bible in chapter three where various problems are treated.
Chapter 1

THE THEORY OF TRANSLATION

Linguistic theory of translation

Reuben A. Brewer wrote that he had been asked, "Why a book on translation," in his introduction to a book "On Translation." Up to that time, it had been the feeling of many that it was hard for them to understand the motive for writing a book on translation rather than on inter-cultural relations, on linguistics, even on comparative literature. In Brewer's words, "Translation has as yet no Aristotle or Coleridge."2

However, George Mounin writes that since 1945, a more systematic investigation of the problems of translation had begun.3 A German scholar of translation theory and practice wrote that there were only three Western books published which dealt systematically and comprehensively with the problem of translation-in-general from a linguistic point of view: Georges Mounin, Les problèmes théoriques de la traduction (Paris: Gallimard, 1963); Eugene A. Nida, Toward a Science of Translating (Leiden: Brill, 1964); and J. C. Catford, A Linguistic Theory of Translation (London: OUP, 1965).4

2 Ibid.
4 Ibid., pp. 28-29.
People have written books on translation in the past, but they have not gone any further than presenting problems. The last two books mentioned by Boecker are the treatises which deal systematically and comprehensively with translation from a linguistic point of view. (Mounin's work does not attain the levels of these two.)

A brief discussion on the question of whether or not translation is possible and the problem of semantics might be pertinent here before entering into the theories of the two linguists. There are two extremes of opinion as to the first question: (1) translation is not possible since there is ordinarily no full equivalence between code-units; (2) translation is always possible since it is an activity which involves human languages, the difference of which are not insuperable barriers to communication. Both of the opinions relate to semantics.

Meaning is of course crucially important in translation and has often been referred to in definitions of translation which indicate that a translation is to 'have the same meaning' as the original.

In summary, it may be said that, particularly in America, where from 1933 (Bloomfield's 'Language') to 1957 (Chomsky's 'Syntactic Structures') the field was dominated by behaviorist and mechanistic views of language, any consideration of 'meaning' was largely excluded from narrow linguistic research. The American 'school' which was the most influential of all the different schools, held a pessimistic view concerning the possibility of a scientific analysis of meaning, and

---

thus also concerning the possibility of setting up a scientific theory of translation.

However, with the appearance of transformational grammar, semantic elements were inculded in linguistics. In England, where behaviorism was never taken as seriously as in America, semantics was not excluded from linguistic science.

Catford. Catford, at the outset, giving a broad definition of translation as, "an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another," insists that, "any theory of translation must draw upon a theory of language."6

As he comes from the English School of linguistics, he distinguishes, following the Firth-Halliday model of language, four intralinguistic levels: phonology, graphology, grammar, and lexis.

He gives the definition of translation as "the replacement of textual material in one language — source language (SL) — by equivalent textual material in another language or target language (TL)."7 The term, 'equivalent,' becomes a key term. The central problem of translation practice is that of finding TL translation equivalents. And a central task of translation theory is that of finding the nature and conditions of translation equivalence.

Regarding translation equivalence, Catford distinguishes between textual equivalence and formal correspondence. "A textual equivalent is any TL text which is observed to be the equivalent of a given SL text. A formal correspondent, on the other hand, is any TL


7Ibid., p. 20.
category (unit, class, structure, element of structure, etc.) which can be said to occupy the same place in the TL as the given SL category occupies in the SL.\textsuperscript{8}

Catford defines broad types or categories of translation in terms of the extent, levels, and ranks of translation. By these three terms he gives the following three dichotomies of types.

1. Full vs. Partial translation. This simply identifies the extent in a syntagmatic sense of SL text which is submitted to the translation process.

2. Total vs. Restricted translation. The former is a translation in which all levels of the SL text are replaced by TL material. (SL grammar and lexis are replaced by equivalent TL grammar and lexis.)

3. Rank-bound vs. unbounded translation. This relates to the rank in a grammatical hierarchy (morpheme, word, group, clause, sentence) at which translation equivalence is established.

The popular terms: free, literal, and word-for-word translation, partly correlate with this third distinction.

Meaning, in Catford's, or J. R. Firth's view, is "a property of a language."\textsuperscript{9} And an SL text has an SL meaning, and a TL text has a TL meaning. Therefore SL and TL texts cannot have the same meaning. In other words, exact transference cannot occur in translation.

However, a restricted kind of 'transference of meaning' from one language to another is possible. In translation, there is substitution of TL meanings for SL meanings: not transference of SL meanings into the TL.

\textsuperscript{8}Tbid., p. 27.

\textsuperscript{9}Tbid., p. 35.
The SL and TL items rarely have the 'same meaning' in the narrow linguistic sense Firth is talking about; but they can function in the same situation. He generalizes the conditions for translation equivalence as follows:

translation equivalence occurs when an SL and a TL text or item are relatable to (at least some of) the same features of substance.\(^{10}\)

In the case of translation between genetically and culturally closely related languages, textual equivalence can, in rare cases, go hand in hand with formal correspondence. In by far the larger number of cases, however, textual equivalence can only be attained by means of so-called translation shifts, i.e. "departures from formal correspondence in the process of going from SL to TL."\(^{11}\) Catford distinguishes between "level shifts (grammar to lexis and vice versa)" and "category shifts (structure shifts, class shifts, unit shifts (i.e. rank changes) and intra-system shifts)."

E. A. Nida. One scholar\(^ {12}\) who examined William Faulkner's novels in German, regards E. A. Nida's 'Toward a Science of Translating' as the most systematic and comprehensive general theory of translation based on principles of linguistics which has been published so far. When we read a paragraph such as the one that follows, Nida's theory seems to rest on Chomsky's notion of generative grammar.

For the translator, the view of language as a generative device is important, since it provides him first with a technique for analyzing the process of decoding the source text, and secondly with a procedure for describing the generation of the appropriate corresponding expressions in the receptor language.\(^ {13}\)

\(^{10}\)Ibid., p. 50. \(^{11}\)Ibid., p. 73. \(^{12}\)See note 3 on p. 5.

He also recognizes a distinct advantage of transformational technique in its greater facility whereby ambiguous expressions can be analyzed and described.\(^\text{11}\)

Using the terms of Transformational Grammar, he further explains that, in the process of translation, "it is both scientifically and practically more efficient (1) to reduce the source text to its structurally simplest and most semantically evident kernels, (2) to transfer the meaning from source language to receptor language on a structurally simple level, and (3) to generate the stylistically and semantically equivalent expression in the receptor language."\(^\text{15}\)

Nida's model of the translator's role is shown in Figure 1.

![Figure 1](image)

**Figure 1**

Model of the translator's role

In his model a message in language A is decoded by the translator into a different form of language A. It is then transformed by a "transfer mechanism"\(^\text{16}\) into language B, and the

---

11 Ibid., p. 61.

15 Ibid., p. 68.

translator then becomes a source for encoding of the message into language B. 17

In his semantic theory, Nida distinguishes between linguistic meaning on the one hand, and referential and emotive meanings on the other. First, linguistic meaning: on the lexical level of generative grammar he finds "that the principal function classes consist of the following four principal types (1) 'objects' ('nouns' in traditional grammar); (2) 'events' ('verbs'); (3) 'abstracts' ('adjectives, adverbs, numerals, and similar words'); (4) 'relational' ('prepositional and conjunctions') which serve to relate various objects, events, and abstracts."18

Referential meaning can be discovered from an examination of the extra-linguistic field of reference covered by the word, and from the linguistic context in which it is placed.

Emotive meanings consist of "polar contrasts separated by a graded series with a high percentage of usages for most words clustering around the neutral position."19 Languages tend to differ more radically in emotive meaning than in referential significations.

Nida considers language as something 'dynamic' (cf. Humbolt's emergeia). He also regards the communication which is made possible by means of language as a 'dynamic' process;

17 It is interesting to note that Junction Grammar, which is the base on which a computer-assisted translation system stands, has a similar model of translation process. See Charles D. Bush, Fundamentals of Junction Grammar (Provo, Ut. 1973), p. 44. Junction Grammar is a generative grammar developed by a B.Y.U. linguistics professor, Dr. Eldon Lytle.

18 Nida, p. 63.

19 Ibid., p. 113.
We must analyze the transmission of a message in terms of a dynamic dimension. This analysis is especially important for translating, since the production of equivalent message is a process, not merely of matching the parts of utterances, but also of reproducing the total dynamic character of the communication. Without both elements the results can scarcely be regarded, in any real sense, as equivalent. 20

Nida distinguishes two kinds of translation equivalence: 'formal' and 'dynamic' (F-E and D-E). An F-E translation looks exclusively to the original and attempts to reproduce as fully as possible its formal peculiarities. A D-E translation, on the other hand, looks not so much to the original as to the expected reaction of the readers of the translation. Nida gives his definition of a D-E translation as follows:

One way of defining a D-E translation is to describe it as "the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message." This type of definition contains three essential terms: (1) equivalent, which points toward the source-language message, (2) natural, which points toward the receptor language, and (3) closest, which binds the two orientations together on the basis of the highest degree of approximation. 21

He observes that in practice, F-E translations tend to distort the message more than D-E translations. The reason is that those persons who produce D-E translations are in general, more adept in translating, and in order to produce D-E renderings they must perceive more fully and satisfactorily the meaning of the original text. For the most part, a translator who produces D-E renderings is quite aware of the degree of distortion, and because of greater conscious control of his work, is able to judge more satisfactorily whether or not the results seem to be legitimate.

On the other hand, a translator who produces strictly F-E renderings is usually not conscious of the extent to which his

---

20 Ibid., p. 120.
21 Ibid., p. 167.
seemingly "faithful" translations actually involve serious distortions. This lack of awareness in F-E translating as to what is happening results in far more serious skewing than is generally the case with D-E translating.

Nida's theory indicates that a translator must possess the following fundamental qualities: (1) He must know the source language sufficiently well to be able to understand, beyond the apparent content of the message, the fine nuances of meaning, the emotive value of the words, and the stylistic aspects which determine the 'flavor and feel' of the message. (2) He must be familiar with the subject matter of the message; in the case of literary translation, this includes complete familiarity with the cultural context of the source language. (3) He must possess the ability of emotive empathy with the text and its author. (4) He must have full command of the target language with all its nuances; he must possess the stylistic capability to transfer, as completely as possible, into the target-language code the content derived from the source-language code.

Both traditional and linguistic theories of translation emphasize the necessity of a dynamic as opposed to a static view of language. Nida emphasizes that the translator "perhaps more than anyone else must take language in its dynamic aspect." He feels that only the 'dynamic equivalence' in translation takes into account both the 'linguistic' and the 'cultural distance' existing between the two languages.

Thus modern translation practice has moved increasingly away from formal equivalence and toward dynamic equivalence, though the translator will, in most cases, have to select an intermediate form between the two poles.
It is immediately clear, of course, that translations are oriented on different points of view, and just as the two authors' views cited above illustrate,\(^\text{22}\) it is difficult to find a unified scale on which to orient criticism.

However, the important contribution which linguistic research has made to a more accurate understanding of the translation process furnishes the translator with new insight and more delicate tools. The writer of these pages now turns to consider concrete problems in a specific literary work.

**History and trend of translation in Japan**

The translation of foreign literature into Japanese started relatively early in Japan. Translated odes of Chinese poems are found in Man'yōshū\(^\text{23}\) (about 759 AD). Books of Buddhism, Confucianism were translated into Japanese or expounded in Japanese widely after the Kamakura era (13 C). The translation of Western literature started with the so-called 'Kirishitan' or Christian literature, including Aesop's fables by Christian missionaries towards the end of the sixteenth century. However, the activity was later discontinued by the nation's strict isolation policy.

Entering the Meiji era (1868-), Japan started to import Western civilization with remarkable speed and the nation as a whole hailed

\(^{22}\) In contrast to Nida's model of the translator's role (see Fig. 1), Catford rejects the 'transcoding' view of translation process as it ignores the idea of 'meaning as a property of a language,' see Catford, pp. 41, 42.

translated literature enthusiastically. After 1889, professional literary men such as Ōgai Mori, Teishime Futaba, Shiken Morita, Shōyō Tsubouchi, and Bin Ueda started to fill the role of translator and laid the foundation of modern translation literature. Those men of letters were, at the same time, excellent writers, themselves.

The influx of world literature gradually increased and with the general mobilization of old and new translators the new era of Shōwa (1926-) saw numerous literatures of the world in Japanese translation, so that today translated literature is popularized in Japan and is indeed mass-produced.

Present civilization and progress in technology found in Japan are almost totally indebted to the imported western civilization, and so the role that translators have filled is quite significant. And no doubt the activity of translation will be essential in the future, also.

Meanwhile, the level of translation rose considerably higher through the experiences of these years and the remarkable development of higher education. However, there were times when inferior translation was circulated, as there were no regulations which could check that kind of publication. One professional translator and professor at a university deplores the present state of translation activities:

"As a result of the new situation in which very many people engage in translation, people with little or no background in literature (and accordingly with little or insufficient foundation in the Japanese language) and who only have a partial command of English appeared on the translation stage. This situation is quite different from the Meiji period when outstanding writers were engaged in translation. Because of the present unfortunate situation, poor Japanese expressions due to literal translation and

\[P_{Fujimura Saku}, "Translated Literature," Encyclopedia of Japanese Literature (1951), VI, pp. 1141-1147.\]
containing many unnecessary loanwords and transliterated new terms, are overflowing throughout the country. The Japanese language, itself, is beginning to become corrupted."

Among the writers who have laid the foundation of translated literature, Shōyō and Ōgai, at their first stages, tried to carry out word-for-word translation even to the extent of retaining punctuation marks such as commas and periods, and having the same number of words in the target language. However, they later changed their principles of translation and moved in the direction of free translation. They even advocated naturalness which made the easy-to-understand modern language the standard for translated work. A translation school which was established in 1972 with the support of the Japan Translators Association, also emphasizes dynamic equivalence translation, rejects formal equivalence translation and instructs students to transport the author to the reader. Thus we can say that the tendency in the field of translation toward dynamic equivalence seems to have been recognized already in Japan.

---

Chapter 2

TWO VERSIONS OF THE JAPANESE TRANSLATION OF THE BOOK OF MORMON

The literary version

The initial attempt at translating the Book of Mormon into Japanese started only three years after the Japan mission was opened in 1901. Alma O. Taylor, the youngest of the first four missionaries, was appointed to do the translation work on July 16, 1904. The first translation took a little less than two years. He wrote the first manuscript in romanized representation, in a colloquial style which he thought would be easier to understand. Then he revised it or translated it again from May of 1906 until December of 1907.

However, many thought that the work should be in the "bungotai" or literary style. Samples of the English manuscript were given to competent Japanese critics asking them to render it into Japanese. They returned the sample in "bungotai." Both claimed that the best translation for power and effect was that done in the "bungotai."


2Ibid., p. 45. In the process of translating the Bible into Japanese in 1870's, accomplished by three foreign translators with three Japanese assistants, just the same conflict of opinions was observed. In the case of the Meiji Version, the foreign translators gained their point, but Japanese assistants, through a tactful device, left ground to change it later into literary style with many Chinese characters, and they did so a year after the first version was published. See Kenji Morioka, "Translation of the Bible and the expressions of modern speech," The Study of Bible Translating, No. 8, Mar. 1974, pp. 3-4.

17
Obviously, Taylor's work had to be completely redone. Hiroharu Ikuta, who had graduated from the Imperial University (now Tokyo University) and was the author of several books, was hired. He began the undertaking on August 31, 1908, completing it on April 13, 1909.

It was then sent to a third critic, Kōsaburo Kawai, who was a writer and a poet. Several critics were engaged in the final draft. Alma O. Taylor, then President of the mission, checked all the references, correcting mistakes he found, and writing them correctly in the translation.

The first one thousand copies of the Book of Mormon were delivered on October 10, 1909.

The style of the translation is literary as the above account shows and the sentences in the version are excellent and of very high tone. See the duplicate copy of the version on the following page.

3Shōyō Tsubouchi and Sōseki Natsume were contacted before Hiroharu Ikuta was hired, but they were unable to give time to the translating work. It was Sōseki Natsume who suggested Hiroharu Ikuta. Nichols, pp. 46-47.
Illustration 1

The duplicate copy of the literary version of the Book of Mormon in Japanese.

1 Nephi 1:1-5.
The colloquial version

Edward L. Clissold, the first mission president of Japan following the twenty-four years during which the mission was closed, appointed Tatsui Satō⁴, a Japanese member, to revise the translation of the Book of Mormon in order to make it easier for Japanese readers to read and understand.⁵ That was in 1948. Tatsui Satō spent eight years in preparation for the work in the areas of understanding the original text and interpreting doctrines contained in it. During this period he consulted mission presidents, church leaders who visited from time to time, and missionaries.

On June 4 of 1956, a translation committee made up of five members, namely Paul C. Andrus, Tatsui Satō, Tomigoro Takagi, Don C. Landberg, and Ben Oniki, was organized, and started the work of final revision in a concentrated manner finishing it on August 13 in the same year.⁶ As a result of this, a version of the new translation was published on May 30, 1957.

The purpose of the revision was to change the literary style to colloquial style⁷ to meet the aims of the initiative taken by Edward L.

⁴ A convert to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He was graduated from Tōhoku Imperial University where he majored in metallurgy and studied theoretical chemistry.


⁶ Ibid., p. 2.

⁷ Tatsui Satō uses the term 'spoken language style' which he differentiates from 'colloquial style.' Tatsui Satō, "On the new translation of the Book of Mormon," Seito-no-Michi (August 1957), p. 4. But the more established term 'colloquial version' will be used in the thesis throughout.
Clissold. In the revision, this purpose was attained throughout the book excluding the words of Jesus Christ. Also, the use of syllabaries was updated to conform to their current use, and forty-one thousand difficult and unnecessary Chinese characters were removed. As far as the structure of the sentences is concerned, the first literary translation was valued and was in most cases followed carefully.  

The status of the revised translation of the Book of Mormon can be compared with that of the colloquial version of the Japanese Bible published in 1955. Just as the colloquial version of the Bible is widely distributed throughout Japan, to the extent that a mere reference to the word 'Bible' means this version automatically, so also the colloquial version of the Book of Mormon was established. It is this version that the libraries and bookstores as well as most members of the Church generally have. And it is this version that is cited in other Church literature. A considerable number of copies have been distributed in these nineteen years.

The following page is a duplicated copy of this colloquial version of the Book of Mormon in Japanese.

---

8 Tatsui Satō, (July 1957), p. 8. He admits that the first literary translation is a very excellent work and that he is certain that it had been done by an eminent scholar of English. Ibid.

9 However, the Lockman Foundation published a new version called 新訳聖書, 'shin-kaiyaku-seisho' or 'New Japanese Bible' in 1970 which is also rendered in modern spoken Japanese. And the Japan Bible Society is now undertaking a translation of the Common Bible with the cooperation of both Catholic and Protestant translators. They have just published the Gospel of Luke as a pilot book. And interestingly, Tatsui Satō also anticipates another revision of the translation of the Book of Mormon in decades of years which will take the place of his version. Tatsui Satō, (July 1957), p. 8.
Illustration 2

Chapter 3

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRESENT TRANSLATION

In this chapter, the writer will examine what type of translation the colloquial version belongs to in view of the translation theories discussed in chapter one, and where the difficulty in reading lies. Also, he will list and discuss intralinguistic and extralinguistic problems observed during the research. Lastly, he will take up the problems of Hebrew characteristics evident in the English version, how the translator dealt with them, and how this knowledge should be used in the future.

Nida lists three criteria to be used in judging translations.
1. General efficiency of the communication process. 2. Comprehension of the original intent. This criterion is designed to cover what has often been traditionally spoken of as "accuracy," "fidelity," and "correctness." 3. Equivalence of response.1 Discussions will proceed taking these criteria into account.

Shōichi Saeki, a critic, wrote in 1970, "translated works must be regarded as a part of Japanese culture, necessarily, since they are written in Japanese. The era when translation was regarded as belonging to a special domain was over."2 Is it not high time to start to

1Nida, pp. 182-183.

2He also points out that the Japanese have been too broad-minded toward translation. They used to have unconditioned trust in printed material. It was also their tendency to be soft-headed, to make them think that it was their inferiority that they could not understand what was actually a poor translation which did not make sense as good Japanese. -- "Inside of defective translation," The Asahi Newspaper, November 16, 1970, p. 15.
turn strict eyes on translation, which attitude in turn will raise the standard of translation in the real sense."\(^3\) The present writer is going to deal with the problems with quite the same positive attitude as Saeki, giving alternative translation as occasion demands, rather than listing personal opinions and pointing out mistranslations aimlessly.

**Linguistic problems**

The type of translation. Catford discusses three broad types of translation in terms of extent, levels, and ranks of translation.\(^4\)

However, since the whole SL text is submitted to the translation process, and all levels of the SL text, i.e. grammar and lexis and consequently phonology and graphology are replaced by equivalent TL material, the only question is to see if the translation is a rank-bound translation or an unbounded translation. To examine the question, the writer picked up twenty verses from the Book of Mormon at random and translated sentences\(^5\) from Chūō-kōron, a monthly review, at random and made a comparative study of them. The result was as follows. See Table 1.

---

\(^3\) Remarks of Saeki quoted in the above news article.

\(^4\) See p. 8 of this thesis.

Table 1
Comparison in terms of rank of translation between the B. of M. and Chūō-kōron

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rank of translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sentence  clause  group  word  morpheme  total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. of M.</td>
<td>3.75%  34.0%  22.5%  39.0%  0.15%  100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chūō-kōron</td>
<td>7.75%  29.05%  27.2%  36.0%  0%  100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers show what percentage of a sentence was translated in that rank. The Book of Mormon has a little higher number than Chūō-kōron as far as the numbers in the word rank column is concerned and a little lower number in the sentence rank column. So it might be possible to observe that the translation of the Book of Mormon has more traits of low-rank-bound translation than Chūō-kōron. However, we cannot come to any definite statement because the Book of Mormon has a little larger number than Chūō-kōron in the column of clause rank.

There is a great difference between English and Japanese in terms of structure. Consequently it is almost impossible to carry out a translation between the two languages if the translator tries to retain lexical equivalences in the lower ranks such as word and morpheme, there being a great degree of divergence between textual equivalence and formal correspondence. Consequently, any translator is thus frequently led to go to higher ranks to find equivalence.

According to Nida's theory, a Formal-Equivalence translation attempts to reproduce several formal elements, including: (1) grammatical units, (2) consistency in word usage, (3) meanings in terms of the
source context;\textsuperscript{6} in contrast, Dynamic-Equivalence translation is the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message.\textsuperscript{7} These notions are, of course, explained by Nida in more detail, and they are presented very persuasively; however, the scope these notions cover is fairly wide and, unlike Catford's notion of rank-bound translation vs. unbounded translation, rather inconvenient for analyzing a particular translation concretely. For the purpose of the present analysis, the writer chose to deal simply with the questions of whether or not the sentences remain intact and whether marks of punctuation are preserved; the intactness and the latter formal indicator being parts of grammatical units which F-E translation attempts to reproduce; also he counted the number of places where violations of naturalness were observed. Nida lists those things which a truly natural translation avoids:

1. anachronism, either contemporary words or old-fashioned language,
2. serious anomalies, e.g. crude vulgarities, slang, and colloquialisms.\textsuperscript{8} The result is shown in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of violations of naturalness</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Punctuation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intact %</td>
<td>increase %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. of M. 1.2/verse</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chūō-kōron 0.1/sentence</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{6}Nida, p. 165. \textsuperscript{7}Ibid., p. 166. \textsuperscript{8}Ibid., p. 169.
Again this data has only indirect implication to any conclusion. However, it shows that the Book of Mormon has more elements of F-E translation than the other. The Chūō-kōron has far fewer violations of naturalness, and the ratio of splitting sentences is higher than in the Book of Mormon. Punctuation marks decreased in number in the case of the latter, with the effect of making sentences long.

It is evident that the colloquial version of the Book of Mormon has a tendency to go to low-rank bound translation and is closer to F-E translation than to D-E translation in comparison with the samples from Chūō-kōron. In either translation, there are difficulties unless the translator shifts freely up and down the rank scale. Though the figures in the two tables do not tell clearly what type of translation the colloquial version is, the writer plans to pursue this question later in this chapter, by observing various items such as, whether or not an obligatory grammatical category in SL which is redundant or unnecessary in Japanese is carried into the latter, and cases of violation of naturalness which in number amounted to one to two per verse in the above chart.

Result of cloze technique and others. According to Nida's information theory, the more unpredictable the message, the greater the effort of decoding is required for the transmission of the message. In an original message prepared for a specific audience, there is a high degree of 'fit' between the form of the message and the 'decoder's channel.' If, however, such a message is translated literally to an audience belonging to a linguistically and culturally different community, it is clear that its linguistic awkwardness will increase its
communication load. In this situation, the decoder's channel will inevitably be narrower, because the new receptor lacks much of the cultural data available to the audience of the original. The translator should smooth out the linguistic awkwardness as much as possible to make it fit the narrower decoder's channel. Without proper adjustments, an overloading of the message is almost inevitable.

This does not mean, of course, that a decoder may not be able to figure out the message after a long and arduous study, but a really satisfactory translation should not impose that sort of burden on the receptor. If it is too hard, he is likely to give up from discouragement or to feel that the results of his efforts are not proportionate to the investment of time and trouble. Of course one can to some extent compensate for an inferior translation by placing great pressures upon the receptors to read and understand, but there is no real justification for this type of cultural bigotry and paternalism.9

Nida introduces three simple devices for comparative analysis of communication load: 1. The so-called "cloze technique." In this method, every fifth or tenth word of a message is deleted and the reader is asked to fill in the word which seems to fit the context most satisfactorily. 2. Another method is to measure the hesitations and mistakes in oral reading. This method is not so "objective" as the cloze technique. 3. The last type of test involves having persons read over a message or listen to its being read, and then having them report what they have read or heard. In each case, persons will have difficulty or make mistakes at a place where there is either an abrupt rise in communication load, an incorrect grammatical form, or a word which seems out-of-context. Because of this, it is thought that the method of investigation proposed herein will provide a ready means of testing the quality of naturalness.

---

9Ibid., pp. 131-132.
Ten native Japanese participated in a cloze test in which every tenth word was deleted from a text of about 640 words in two pages of the colloquial version of the Book of Mormon. The participants succeeded in filling in the right words for seventy-five percent of the blanks. Among the nineteen words which more than half of the people could not fill in correctly six were due to problems to be discussed later in this section.

Each of the ten participants in the above test also gave an oral reading of a selected text. From this the writer also found that the verses where all or more than half of the readers made mistakes or hesitated contained problems which can be readily accounted for. These will also be discussed later in this section.

The writer also inquired of the same ten participants as to their opinions regarding the literary style which occupies one-tenth of the present colloquial version. Six people out of the ten expressed their preference for the colloquial style over the literary style. Four people answered that they do not feel any difficulty in reading those literary portions.

Problems caused by the differences which exist between the two languages. The differences which exist between languages and the resultant adaptations which must be made because of these differences may be treated under the following factors: (1) phonological, (2) morphological, (3) syntactic, and (4) lexical. Unsatisfactory adaptation and the violation of naturalness will be discussed under these four items.

---

10See p. 22 of this thesis. A line by line count of the present translation reveals approximately one tenth of the total is in the old literary style.
1. The phonological systems

Usually in transliterating proper names the translator must compare the phonological systems involved in the two languages. However, the transliteration of proper nouns in the English text will not give a correct translation of the original in the case of the Book of Mormon, because English is not the language in which the book was originally written. Therefore, the problems which would come under this item will be discussed in connection with Hebrew idiom in a later section of this chapter.

2. The morphological structures

a. Number

Number is important in English, but it is not so important in Japanese wherein a singular form is often used for a plural form. This substitution is common in the case of collective nouns. It will give a cumbersome impression if in the Japanese translation plural suffixes are attached one after another to collective nouns. The following are some examples in which a plural form has been used in the translation, where a singular form would have given a more natural Japanese: II N 21: 33 "קַנַּבָּכָהוֹ טַמִי-תַּכִּי," where 'טַמִי, 'tami' is a collective noun and therefore it also stands for plural; similar examples are found in III N 6:29, IV N 3:4, and II N 2:26. In Japanese, a singular form is also used quite often when context shows that the noun is plural. Some examples where plural suffixes are attached even with such contexts are I N 1:10 'רַנַּבָּכָהוֹ יֶנָּפִי-בַּטִּי,' or 'twelve people,' prefatory note of I N 2, II N 1:9 and I N 1:20, 11 'תַּכִּי,' being the plural suffix.

11 Other examples are I N 12:9; 14:12, 14; Alma 44:15. In the colloquial version of the Japanese Bible, 'ten vergins' (דְּשֶאָה נַפָּהֲבִי) in Matt. 25:1 is rendered 'נַרְנַבָּכָהוֹ יֶנָּפִי-בַּטִּי,' and 'the people' (in pl. יִבּוֹטְנֵנֹי) in Deut. 32:3 is translated 'תַּמַי קַנַּבָּכָהוֹ יֶנָּפִי-בַּטִּי' in the singular form respectively.
3. Syntactic differences

a. The problem of long sentences

One of the greatest problems in translation from English to Japanese arises from syntactic differences between the two languages. The structure of English readily permits long, complex sentences, whereas the structure of Japanese does not.

The "Broadcasting Culture Research Center" of N.H.K. or "Japan Broadcasting Association" lists five items which they pay special attention to in their broadcasting activities. Among them are two items, (1) to clarify the relationship of subject and predicate, and (2) to make sentences short. Table 3 is a comparison chart of the number of words per sentence taken from the Book of Mormon (twenty verses), colloquial version of the New and Old Testament (ten verses each) and Chūō-kōron, a journal (ten sentences), the verses and sentences picked up at random.

Table 3
Comparison of translations in terms of the length of sentence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of words per sentence</th>
<th>No. of words between punctuations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. of M.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Testament</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Testament</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chūō-kōron</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ken Sugano, "Written word and spoken word," The Study of Bible Translating, No. 8 (Mar. 1974), pp. 11-12.
One of the Japanese whom the writer asked to read texts of the present translation orally, mentioned that it would be much easier to read if it had more marks of punctuation.

b. Two subjects in a row

One of the most serious causes of difficulty in reading and interpretation of translated texts in Japanese occurs frequently when a complex English sentence containing a subordinate clause is translated. Ordinarily such a sentence would be rendered into a Japanese sentence containing two subjects in direct sequence, which may cause difficulties in understanding. Alternative solutions to this problem are: first, to give a subject-marker particle 'wa' 'ga' to the subject of the subordinate clause which is different from a particle 'wa' 'wa' which may be used to mark the subject of the main clause; second, to delete the subject of the main clause when the context makes it clear; or third, to place the subject of a main clause just before the predicate of the same. To illustrate a case of this problem, let us examine this sentence from IN 1:20.

I will show that mercies are to make them mighty.

I subj. mercy subj. power obj. give fact obj. show will
marker marker marker marker

wa watashi-wa, awaremi-wa - chikara-o atae-tamato o - - shimeso-u.

S o V 0 V

awaremi-wa chikara-o atae-tamato koto-o shimeso-u.

mercy subj. power obj. give fact obj. show will
marker marker marker marker

S o V 0 V
Here, the subject of the main clause is deleted since it is known from the previous sentence.

The following is another example found in I N 1:9.

--- he --- beheld that his luster was ---

chichi-wa sono hito-wa --- kagayai-te iru-no-ga mie-ta.

father subj. the man subj. shine -ing fact obj. see past

marker marker tense

S modifies 0 V

or

sono hito-ga kagayai-te iru-no-ga mieru-

the man subj. shine -ing fact obj. see past

marker marker tense

The former is a case in which a subject-marker, a particle, substitutes for another subject marker, and the latter is a case in which the subject of the main clause is deleted since it is known from the context and retains the original verb. There are other cases\(^\text{13}\) of the same kind with only minor differences in the aspects involved.

c. Difference of positions of predicate and object

Inappropriate placements of predicate and object in sentences will also cause considerable difficulty for the reader. In Japanese

\[\text{IN 13:23; IIN 18:1; 26:5,11; Alma 11:10, 17:20, 47:13; IVN 12.}\]
the object always precedes the verb. Either an inversion of the positions of the two or exceptionally great distance between them will make it difficult to read. The following example from I N 1:20 is a case of the former.

and they also sought his life, that they might take it away

and kill complete might (do) my father's life obj. seek past

Other examples of the same nature are found in I N 1:20 and Mos. 10:1.

d. Subject

That the subject of a sentence can be deleted is a notable characteristic of Japanese. While in English, a subject always appears in a sentence (except in the case of an imperative sentence) the subject is often deleted in Japanese. Other signals in the language and in the context serve to keep the meaning in focus. In fact, Japanese readers react negatively if subjects in the English text are consistently translated into Japanese. If one were asked

'Tokyo-kara Fuji-san-ga mie-masu-ka' meaning 'Can (you) see Mt. Fuji from Tokyo?' he would immediately know that the deleted subject is the person to whom the question was addressed, 'anata(-wa)' or 'you' in this case. This subject is seldom used in this particular type of question.

In the similar question, 'Nonji-wa nani-ga mieru-ka,' or 'what beholdest thou,' the subject 'nanji-wa' or 'thou' could easily and naturally be deleted. Furthermore, there precedes an addressing word 'Nephi' here.  

Also, the subject is often deleted when the speaker and hearer(s) of a discourse are clearly in focus. In a sentence which expresses a speaker's desire, such as found in Alma 29:1 "0 that I were an angel, and could ---," the subject 'I' or 'watakushi-ga' could or should be deleted to make a good Japanese translation. The subject is automatically understood from the style of the sentence as well as from the word 'watakushi-no' or 'mine (heart)' in the sentence. The appearance of the subject here detracts from the emotive effect of the original.

A second or third repeated subject, if not preceded by a different one in a sentence or succeeding sentences is usually left out.  

---

16 Subject can be deleted in such verses as I N 1:13, Alma 42:25, etc.  
17 See I N 1:1, 15; 2:14; and 17:6.
e. Passive voice

The passive voice is not used so frequently as in English. Translation of a passive expression in English into a passive form in Japanese usually betrays the fact that the material is not native Japanese. Let us examine a sample from Alma 24:15.

that they may be kept bright

肯が引きているまま通って見られるように

sword(s) sub. shine -ing as it is keep (put) pass. that - - may marker

肯がいつまでも引きったままあるように

sword(s) sub. forever shine -ed as it is to be that - - may marker

The passive expression '肯が引きられた'to-tte oka-ru' or 'to be kept' - - conveys an unnatural impression, whereas the active expression of the latter does not.

There is an expression '肯が引きられた'jōjusa-re-ta' or 'to be fulfill-ed' in the present translation. 18 This passive form of an intransitive verb '肯が引きられた'jōju-suru' or 'to fulfill' again gives a foreign impression.

The active form of the verb is preferred and transmits the original meaning satisfactorily. 19

18 See II N 5:20, 15:18.

19 It may be noteworthy to see that irregular intransitive verbs called 'サ動接頭動詞,sagyō-henkaku-katsuyō' such as '就職する,shūshoku-suru' or 'to find employment,' and '昇進する,shōshin-suru' or 'to rise in rank' are never used in passive voice. On the other hand, transitive verbs such as '殺す,kageki-suru' or 'to attack' are used in passive voice without any problem.
The combination of passive voice and ability such as 'sukwa-ru koto-ga dekiru' or 'to be able to be saved' found in Alma 24:16 also gives an odd impression. It should be rendered simply 'sukui-o eru koto-ga dekiru' or 'to be able to gain salvation.'

f. New set of expressions

Nida points out that "an attempt to force a new set of grammatical forms on a language has about as much chance of success as a Hindu attempting to introduce the turban as the standard headdress among American farmers."20

The above remarks may be too harsh if applied to the following item, but the expression 'sura hazu-no -' or 'that which should do -,' frequently found in the present translation of the Japanese Book of Mormon,21 is seldom used outside of the book.

This expression 'sura hazu-no' is understood to be a result of an effort to transmit the notion of future tense with some extent of the idea of 'inevitability.' Expressions such as shōrai okoru koto or 'things which will happen in the future' and 'kami-no kuchi-kara deru no koto' or 'the words which shall proceed forth out of the mouth of the Lamb of God' are enough for the purpose, 'hazu-no' having been left out from the sentence (see the asterisk).


g. Pronominal expressions

Nida is right in stating that the feature in which languages seem to differ to the greatest extent is in the use of pronominal expressions.\textsuperscript{22} Japanese, at present, has pronominal systems with first to third person both in singular and plural forms. However, they are often omitted when enough information is provided through the use of honorific expressions or from context. If a translator ignores this fact, he will leave many indications of the foreign origin of the work.

For example, a possessive pronoun of the first person, "わたくしの" 'watakushi-no' or 'my' is not necessary to refer to one's immediate family, because those words themselves imply the relationship between the speaker and the member of the family.\textsuperscript{23}

There are also other cases where pronominal expressions are redundant or rather give an uncomfortable impression.\textsuperscript{24}

4. Lexical items

Without doubt, the problems of equivalence and adaptation between languages, are greatest in the lexical items.

a. Anachronism

Anachronisms involve two types of errors; (1) using contemporary words which falsify life at historically different periods, and (2) using old-fashioned language.

\textsuperscript{22}Nida, p. 96.

\textsuperscript{23}Examples of retaining unnecessary and therefore often cumbersome possessive pronouns before immediate family are found frequently in the following verses: prefatory note to I N 1:14; 1 N 1:4, 5, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18; 2:1, 3; 7:17; II N 4:19.

\textsuperscript{24}See I N 1:13; 2:4; II N 4:7; Mos. 10:1; Alma 15:3; 19:36; 24:15.
As examples of the first, '市' - 'shi' or 'city' and 「投票」
'tôhyô' or 'vote' from Alma 58:13 and 2:1 respectively may be discussed
here. The former reminds us of the present municipal system and the
latter can not be taken literally since it is inconceivable that they
had a system of voting as we do today and, furthermore, the English
text does not say anything about an activity of voting. 25

Though not an anachronism on the part of Japanese, the trans-
lation of 'brass' may well be treated here since the cause of
mistranslation is related to time. Brass meant an alloy of copper and
tin (=BRONZE) but in much later times the alloy of copper and zinc
came into general use. 26 The Japanese「銅」 'seidô' is the equivalent
to the former and 「銅銅」 'shinchû' the latter. Apparently the word
'brass' in the Book of Mormon is used in the sense of the former 27 and
therefore it should be translated as「銅」 'seidô'. 28

The writer did not come across any noticeable example of the
second type; however, there may be some which are close to this type in
the literary expressions treated below.

25「国境」 'kuni-zakai' or 'the boundaries of a country,' as a
translation of 'border,' found in I N 2:5 ; 16:11; may also be regarded
as one of the case of anachronism because it could easily be associated
with the present image of border between countries.


27George Reynolds and Janne M. Sjodall, Commentary on the Book

28See I N 3:3, 24 ; 4:38 ; 5:10, 18, 19 ; Omni 11 ; Alma 37:3.
In all of the cases it is translated「銅銅」 'shinchû' or 'brass' in the
modern meaning. The same 'brass' in the Bible is translated「銅」 'seidô'
or 'bronze' in 12 cases out of 11 in the colloquial version. See e.g.
Gen. 4:22 ; Dan. 5:4 ; Num 21:9 etc.
b. Literary expressions.

About ten percent of the whole translation is written in literary style for those parts of direct narrative by God or Jesus Christ. Apart from the question of this policy, some attention should be paid to an argument of a Japanese scholar who insists that mixed use of literary language and colloquial language should be strictly avoided as a cause of obscuring and compromising the standard Japanese language. The writer also considers that this practice of mixing only creates peculiar Japanese. As an example of this, one can easily notice that the verb form "しんじる" or 'to believe' which is the literary form of "しんじ" appears in countless verses in the present translation of the Book of Mormon. "モノノガ" or 'armor' in Alma 46:21, "すなわち" or 'that is to say' in I N 1:1, and "かれど" or 'to this extent' in I N 17:51 are similar examples.

c. Unnatural or non-idiomatical Japanese

The existence of unnatural or non-idiomatic expressions have the effect of lowering the dignity and the status of the sentence and the book itself. The following are some of the examples with their improved renditions on the right.

---


30 I N 1:20, 12:10 ; Alma 19:36 ; 45:2, 3, 4, 5.

31 For other examples see II N 21:1 ; I N 17:11 ; Jacob 5:77 ; Enos 7 ; Alma 43:17 ; II N 28:32 ; I N 15:18 ; II N 24:23.
LII
25:12  'uwasa-ga okonawa-reru'  'uwasa-ga tatsu, uwasa-ga naga-reru'
rumor sub. do pass.  rumor sub. stands, rumor sub. flows
marker  marker  marker

Mos.
16:7  'oshi-e o hodokosu'
'teaching obj. to give
marker  to teach

Hel.
6:4  'shinko-o suru'  'shinko-o motsu
faith obj. do  faith obj. have
marker  marker

Morm
5:12  'zaiaku-ga tsuzui-te okonawa-reru'  'zaiaku-ga tsuzuku'
wickedness sub. continually do pass.  wickedness sub. continu-
marker  marker  marker  ues

IVN
11  'yome-ni iki yome-o morau'  'metori-totsugi-suru'
bride to go bride obj. get  take a woman to wife,
(become)  marker  marry to a man

Eth
11:11  'takai mi-no take-ga a-tta'
high body's height sub. (there) was
marker

'mi-no take-ga takaka-tta'
body's height sub. high past tense
marker  marker

32 English text reads 'he did teach them.'
There are two verbs in Japanese which express existence. One is 'ある', 'aru' for the inanimate object and the other is 'いる', 'iru' for the animate. This distinction seems to be ignored in many places.¹³

D. Colloquialism

Serious anomalies will immediately strike the reader as being out of place in the context. Colloquialism as one of the anomalies is observed in the present translation of the Japanese Book of Mormon, which however, might have been introduced with the intent of bringing the translation closer to the colloquial language.

³³ A similar disagreement of categories in the opposite way, that is, an adjective being mingled in the succession of nouns, is found in II N 25:12.

³⁴ See Jacob 7:9; IV N 37; Morm. 8:35; I N 4:1; 14:12.

³⁵ The term 'colloquialism' is used here to refer to familiar or sometimes broken expressions in informal conversation.
First of all, the personal pronoun second person singular "おまえ" or 'you' and plural "おまえたち" or 'you (pl.)' sound a little vulgar to the writer who is accustomed to reading "アナタ" or 'you' (which is a standard personal pronoun of second person) in the colloquial version of the Bible. And that pronoun does not go well with the gentle and feminine expression "ごらん" or 'behold' which seems to appear on almost all the pages of the book. 36 There are various opinions on how to handle the problems of personal pronouns in the Bible and it is not likely that they will be solved in a short period of time. 37 However, a dictionary reads that "this is used to address a person who is of the same rank or lower" 38 and another dictionary explains that "it is a way of calling a person in a rude manner." 39 Therefore the writer prefers "アナタガ" or 'you' (pl.)' to "おまえ" or 'omae-tachi' in the sermon of King Benjamin to his people. 40

36 See Mosiah Chapter two.

37 The Study of Bible Translating, No. 2 (1970), pp. 3-6, No. 7 (Oct. 1973), pp. 31-37, No. 8 (Mar. 1973), p. 6, No. 9 (Aug. 1973), pp. 6-7. Shigeyuki Kuroda, "Anatagata," Gengo, I, No. 4 (July 1972), pp. 31-37. In the Gospel of Luke of the Japanese Common Translation which has been published in 1975, the personal pronoun "おまえ" is widely used in the words of the angel to Zacharias, to the shepherds, the words of John the Baptist to the people, and in the conversation between Jesus and Satan. Whereas "アナタガ" is used in the conversation between Mary and Elizabeth. Also, Jesus uses "アナタ, tachi" or 'you (pl.)' addressing his disciples and people. Thus, this version seems to use different personal pronouns according to situations. See The Gospel of Luke of the Japanese Common Translation (Tokyo, The Common Bible Translation Executive Committee, 1975), 1:13-20, 2:11-12, 3:7-16, 4:6-12, 5:42-45, 6:21-27, 6:20-21.

38 "おまえ," 言葉 (Jikai) 1952, p. 259.


40 Mosiah Chapters 2-4.
Also, in the cases of 'くう' 'kuu' or 'to eat' and 'るる' 'oru' or 'to be,' the former is described as "conveying a coarse image" \(^{11}\) and the latter as "having intention of abusing and despising others," \(^{12}\) so the different forms 'たべる' 'taberu' or 'to eat' and 'いる' 'iru' or 'to be' are more qualified to be used in the scriptures.

Furthermore, the end forms of the imperative 'と--と' \(^{13}\) 'te-oke,' and of a request sentence 'と--と' \(^{14}\) 'te-kure,' and of a warning sentence 'と--と' \(^{15}\) 'zo' are all subject to the same criticism of coarseness.

A word 'すぐに' \(^{16}\) 'sugu-to' or 'immediately' is labelled as a "vulgar" alternative of 'すぐに' 'sugu-ni' in a dictionary. \(^{17}\) This may be one of the translator's peculiar expressions.

**Extra-linguistic problems**

**Honorific expression.** "Honorific expression is one of the remarkable characteristics of Japanese. There can be no natural translation which ignores this fact. Honorific expression in describing the speech and behavior of God or Christ is essential from the viewpoint of believers." This was one of the opinions common to most of the replies.

---

\(^{11}\) "Ku-く," 輔字百科事典 (Shinsen-kōgo-jiten) 1971, p. 356.

\(^{12}\) "Oru," 訳海 (jikai) 1952, p. 271.

\(^{13}\) Jac. 3:10.

\(^{14}\) Jac. 7:16; Alma 1:7:13.

\(^{15}\) Jarom 10; Alma 4:11.

\(^{16}\) Alma 19:31; 30:57; 33:21; 10:23; He 5:17; ITI N 19:2; Moroni 8:1.

\(^{17}\) "Sugu-to," 明解国語辞典 (Meikai-kokugo-jiten) 1957, p. 189.
sent back to the Japan Bible Society, when they conducted a survey on the colloquial version of the Bible in 1967.\textsuperscript{48}

Scholars and persons concerned still favor a dignified style for the Bible.\textsuperscript{49}

Therefore there is no question about the necessity of using proper honorific expressions in translating scriptures.

However, honorific expression change as time passes. A council on Japanese proposed the following to the Minister of Education in 1952: (1) the honorific expressions up to the present retain the original form of earlier date and are unnecessarily complex. The tendency to go too far should be pulled back and errors should be corrected to make the honorific expressions as plain and simple as possible; (2) While honorific expression in the past developed depending on the relationship between ranks, the same expression in today's democratic world should be determined depending on the horizontal relationship, respecting the individuals.\textsuperscript{50}

Minoru Watanabe, whose treatise is included in a voluminous work called "Lectures on Honorific Expression" published by Meiji-shoin, defines honorific terms as "a form of expression on the part of a speaker to pay respect to persons addressed or to his audience. Typically speaking, spoken language provides the most appropriate environment for the honorific expression. Conversely, honorific


\textsuperscript{49}See The Study of Bible Translating, No. 3 (June 1971), p. 32, No. 8 (Jan. 1975) p. 8, etc.

\textsuperscript{50}Jirō Suzuki, pp. 26, 27.
expression will not be used in the sphere of written language, in a normal situation.\textsuperscript{51}

In fact, there is a tendency toward simplifying honorific expressions in current literature.

The colloquial version of the Bible makes the fullest use of two honorific auxiliary verbs "\textsuperscript{\textasciitilde} tramou, 'reru' and "\textsuperscript{\textasciitilde} tamou, 'rareru' and this use is criticized as being confusing or poorly chosen because these forms also function as passive auxiliary verbs. The Book of Mormon however consistently uses a different honorific auxiliary verb "\textsuperscript{\textasciitilde} tamou," avoiding the above two. It also frequently uses "\textsuperscript{\textasciitilde} see-ni-naru' an honorific expression for "\textsuperscript{\textasciitilde} iu' or 'to say.' These two Book of Mormon honorifics are rather old expressions and the writer feels that they should be simplified, even at the cost of the above criticism, because context usually tells that the substitutions for them are honorific expressions rather than passive auxiliary verbs.

**Discriminative word.** The problem of this discriminative word has become the focus of interest recently. Some words uttered, either consciously or unconsciously, reveal the speaker's intent, feeling, attitude, and sometimes prejudice. Especially words referring to a crippled person have, since ancient times, tended to reveal contempt.

Those words referring to a person who can not see, speak, hear, or walk, and ones who are crippled in a general sense, namely "\textsuperscript{\textasciitilde} mekura, 'oshidono, 'otsumo, 'tsumbo,' "\textsuperscript{\textasciitilde} or 'chimba or bikko' and "\textsuperscript{\textasciitilde} katawa' should be handled with utmost care or else

\textsuperscript{51}Quoted in Ibid., p. 27.
avoided entirely in translating scriptures. A certain minister who is blind assures us that Jesus would never have used such a discriminative word as "חָּפָר 'mekura' or 'blind' when he taught the people. 52

The Book of Mormon seems to pay little attention to this problem, 53 words of this kind could be changed to less discriminative terms in cases where the nature is apparent. However, this is not a problem that could be solved by just substituting a different word. An appropriate judgment is required in each case because the policy of avoiding all of these kinds of words will limit even the use of many useful idioms and also general vocabulary when the policy goes too far.

Problems caused by the Hebraism in the English Book of Mormon

As has been mentioned in the introduction, this thesis assumes that much of the Book of Mormon was written by a people whose mother tongue was Hebrew and, therefore, that the English text of the Book of Mormon abounds in Hebraism. Though there are different opinions as to whether the original language was Hebrew or Egyptian, 54 it is at least possible to assert that the original text had Hebrew characteristics 55.

52 Yasunari Imaoka, "Discriminative words in the Bible," "Hon-no Hiroba," No. 205 (June 1975), pp. 4-5.

53 For the equivalents of 'blind,' 'dumb' and 'deaf' the terms in question above appear in more than half of the occurrences in the present translation. See e.g. II N 9:32; Mos. 3:5; 27:19; Alma 30:47; III N 17:7; 26:15. כָּפָר 'bikko' or 'lame' and הָאֹּל 'katawa' or 'crippled' are also found in one verse III N 17:7.

54 Sidney B. Sperry maintains that it was Hebrew. See Sidney B. Sperry, "Our Book of Mormon" (Salt Lake City, Ut., 1947), pp. 28-39. Hugh Nibley claims that it was Egyptian. See Hugh Nibley, "Lehi in the Desert and the World of the Jaredites" (Salt Lake City, Ut., 1952), p. 17.

when we consider the fact that the mother tongue of Lehi and Nephi was Hebrew\textsuperscript{56} and Egyptian was a second language to them.\textsuperscript{57}

Quite similar to the King James Version of the Bible, which contains Hebrew idioms abundantly, the English Book of Mormon, which is nearly literal translation,\textsuperscript{58} has a great number of Hebrew expressions or expressions akin thereto.\textsuperscript{59}

Brookbank has written an article entitled "Hebrew Idioms and Analogies in the Book of Mormon," which extends over sixty-nine pages in the Improvement Era. He writes that "the book is far more Hebraic than English"\textsuperscript{60} and "it may be said that there is not a single one (page) in the whole volume which does not illustrate some Hebraisms or some literary practices of the ancient Jews."\textsuperscript{61}

Only those Hebrew expressions which affect the Japanese translation will be discussed below.

**Proper nouns.** Proper nouns are treated here because transliteration of English will not restore the pronunciation spoken among the people of the Jews. Among the many proper nouns in the Book of Mormon, those well-known names such as Abraham, Moses, David, and

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{58} Tvetness, p. 50. See also Joseph Smith, History of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, (Salt Lake City, Ut., 1946), I, pp. 9-18.
\item \textsuperscript{60} Brookbank, XVII p. 370. \textsuperscript{61} Ibid., XVIII p. 140.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Jesus are rendered the same way as found in the Japanese Bible, closer to the original sound than the English pronunciation. However, those names rarely used, as well as some of the well-known names, and, of course, some supposedly new names (in fact, very similar ones are found in the Bible) are transliterated into Japanese according to the English sound. Table 1 shows the inconsistency.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proper nouns which follow the translation of the Bible and those which follow the English pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>J</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan יָרָדנה́</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus יֵסֵע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob יָקָב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehovah אלהו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem יְרוּשָׁלָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah יְרֵמְיָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John יְהוָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua יְשָׁעַל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph יְשֵׁף</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judah יַד</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62Since this name referring to Elijah the Tishbite is revered second only to Moses in the mind of Jews and is well-known among Christians as well, the more established form יֵרִיָּה 'eriya' should be preferred to conform with the phonology of Hebrew.
### Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound in question</th>
<th>Same as Bible</th>
<th>Anglicized translation</th>
<th>Proposed revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Christ</td>
<td>'kirisuto'</td>
<td>Sariah 'saraiya'</td>
<td>サリア 'sariya'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>'isaku'</td>
<td>Sidon 'saidon'</td>
<td>シドン 'shidon'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>'izaya'</td>
<td>Sinim 'sainimu'</td>
<td>シニム 'shinimu'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi</td>
<td>'maraki'</td>
<td>Lehi 'rihai'</td>
<td>レヒ 'rehi'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zede-kiah</td>
<td>'zedekiya'</td>
<td>Moroni 'moronai'</td>
<td>モロニ 'moroni'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zion</td>
<td>'shion'</td>
<td>Mosiah 'mōsaya'</td>
<td>モシャ 'mōshiya'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrahaham</td>
<td>'aburaham'</td>
<td>Pahoran 'pehōran'</td>
<td>パホラン 'pahoran'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>'dabide'</td>
<td>Leman 'rēman'</td>
<td>ラマン 'raman'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satan</td>
<td>'satan'</td>
<td>Abish 'ēbishi'</td>
<td>アビシ 'abishi'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>'aberi'</td>
<td>Amos 'ēmosu'</td>
<td>アモス 'amosu'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edem</td>
<td>'eden'</td>
<td>Eve 'ivu'</td>
<td>エバ 'eba'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>'ejiputo'</td>
<td>Ether 'iteru'</td>
<td>エテル 'eteru'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephraim</td>
<td>'efuraimu'</td>
<td>Enos 'inosu'</td>
<td>エノス 'enosu'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edom</td>
<td>'edomu'</td>
<td>Lehi 'rihai'</td>
<td>レヒ 'rehi'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elam</td>
<td>'eramu'</td>
<td>Nephi 'nifai'</td>
<td>ネヒ 'nehi'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>'mose'</td>
<td>Shem 'shemu'</td>
<td>シェム 'shemu'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>'samueru'</td>
<td>Lemuel 'remyueru'</td>
<td>レムエル 'remueru'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a remarkable trend in Japan which approaches original pronunciation. 'The New Japanese Bible' and 'The Japanese Common Translation' render Moses as 'moshe' and the latter translates Jesus as 'イエス, iesusu' (which stands really in the middle place among Protestant's 'イエス, iesu,' Catholic's 'イエス, iezusu' and Greek Orthodox's 'イエス, iesus') and Luke as 'ルカ, rukasu.' If we follow this line of idea, then 'シェム, shemu' and 'モシー, +mōshe' will be favored.
Some morphological items.

1. Prophetic perfect

In Hebrew, the perfect tense is used to express future actions, when the speaker intends by an assurance to represent them as finished, or as equivalent to accomplished facts.

"This use of the perfect occurs most frequently in prophetic language. The prophet so transports himself in imagination into the future that he describes the future event as if it had been already seen or heard by him."64

Examples are found in Gen. 23:11; Is 5:13; 9:1; 10:28; 11:9; 19:7; Job 5:20; II Ch 20:37. They are in all cases translated into present tense in the colloquial version of the Japanese Bible (note that present tense form is usual to express future in Japanese) and not in the past tense. Examples of this use are observed in the Book of Mormon in the following verses: I N 12:8; 13:24, 26, 27, 32, 34; 14:23; II N 31:6, 8, 9; 27:33.65 All of them are rendered in the past tense in the present translation which, of course, causes a careful reader to think: 'why past tense?'

2. Enallage

This grammatical term is defined as the substitution of one form of speech for another.

Again, we find that the Nephite authors made frequent use of a figure of speech called enallage, which is a convenient term to express the substitution of one gender, person, number, case, mode, tense, etc., of the same word for another; and learned commentators inform us that it was frequently applied by the ancient Hebrews.66

---

Brookbank continues by stating that the plural forms are often employed instead of the singular forms in order to imply that there is more than one person in the mind of the speaker although the reference or address is made directly to only one. To restate this, the plural usage, when the communication was directly to one individual, showed that this person was not the only one to whom the message was pertinent, but that others were to share in the thought, sentiment, or promise, etc. This grammatical curiosity works conversely, also. When the singular form is used, in reference to a group, an individual is singled out as one of those who formed the collective mass and thus is made to know that he, individually, has responsibility.

Examples in the Bible are: Ex. 20:24, 25, 26; 22:22, 23; Deut. 8:19; 9:7; 11:20, 21; 12:15-17. In the Book of Mormon we find examples in I N 2:19, 20; 10:19, 20, 21; 11:17; 17:12-14, 19, 55; II N 1:7; 2:13; 25:8; 26:31; 29:6-10. Almost all of the verses in the latter are given free translation to make the line of passage consistent with the context. It is interesting to contrast this with the fairly literal translation on this point in the Japanese Bible. At any rate, a translator should know this figure of speech of Hebrew so that he might make either a literal or a free translation with the consciousness of what he is doing.67

3. Pronominal suffixes

In Hebrew, pronouns used for possession are ordinarily attached to suffixes to the noun. If several nouns are coupled with the use of a conjunction, the possessive pronoun must be attached to each noun.

67See p. 12 of this thesis.
This is clearly reflected in the Book of Mormon: "And he left his house, and the land of his inheritance, and his gold, and his silver, and his precious things," 68 These repeated pronominal prefixes, if translated each time, give a cumbersome impression to the Japanese readers. The present translation does not follow the literal method here.

4. Plural nouns

Hebrew frequently uses nouns in the plural. As an example, מַהֲרֵים or seraphim is used only in the plural. 69 'Seraphim' in II N 16:6 the quotation from Isaiah 6:2 should be rendered צְרֵיָה 'serapim' instead of the singular form צְרֵה 'serafu.' Both the Japanese colloquial Bible and New Japanese Bible render it in the plural form.

5. Preposition

'ג from, out of.' The basic meaning is "the idea of local departure from an object," 70 but it also has a meaning of "the local departure referred to as a proceeding or issuing from an immediate cause." 70 So the phrase 'written out of the book' in II N 28:12 "The things which shall be written out of the book, shall be of great worth," does not mean to write something which is in the book on a different thing, but the whole clause means that the things written in the book shall be of great worth. Both the literary and the present colloquial

68 I N 2:4.


70 "[VII,]" Student's Hebrew Lexicon pp. 360, 361.
version of the Book of Mormon render this verse literally, giving a meaning quite different from the above interpretation.

לָע 'on, upon, over, above.' When 'used after verbs of 'standing' and 'going'," it expresses "a towering over some one or something in which the original local idea has altogether fallen into the background, and which are therefore to be rendered in English by means of other prepositions (by, with, before, near), e.g. Gen. 41:1, &c., 'Pharaoh -- stood עלון above by the Nile (above the water level)." Therefore, the phrase "the whore who sat upon many waters" in I N 11:12 can be interpreted as "the whore who is sitting or living by or near waters." The Japanese translation retains the quaint English expression.

**Syntactic problems**

1. Compound subject

The rule for Hebrew syntax states that when a compound subject is of different persons, the first person precedes the second and the second precedes the third. Several examples of the syntax, "I and my brethren" or "I and my father," are found in the Book of Mormon. In each of these cases the first person will find its most natural and comfortable position in the last slot in Japanese in which honorific

---

72 Bramwell, pp. 80-81.
74 I N 3:9, 10 ; 5:20 ; 7:2, 3, 22 ; 22:31.
expressions are established. All of the examples cited, but one, follow the original syntax.

2. Introduction of direct quotation

"And it came to pass that the Lord spake unto me, saying -- ." The narrative portions of the Book of Mormon containing dialogue are replete with this introduction. This common Ḥebraism, יְמַר לָאָמַר, means literally, "he spake, to speak." It is not necessary to repeat the same verb 'to speak' twice or similar verbs to render this Hebrew expression literally. Among eight verses the writer studied, two are translated literally. 75

3. Cognate accusative

There exists in the Semitic languages a construction called "cognate accusative." It consists of a verb immediately followed by a noun derived from the same root, and is often used for emphasis. Perhaps the most well-known cognate accusative in the Book of Mormon is found in Lehi's conversation with his son Nephi: "Behold I have dreamed a dream, -- ." (I N 3:2) Since one of the marks of poor Japanese sentence is to place the same or very similar words close to each other, a literal translation of this construction should be avoided. Of a dozen occurrences of this construction in the first book of Nephi, only a case in 2:33 is rendered literally.

75I N 2:19 ; 3:2.
4. "To stiffen the neck"

This is a Hebrew idiom which means "stiff, stubborn, obdurate." Literal translation of this will only produce odd Japanese. Two cases out of seven occurrences studied are rendered literally. 76

5. The verb "to begin," a copulative

William H. Green says that the predicate of a sentence in Hebrew may be connected with its subject without an intervening copula, or "verbs which denote some modification of being are sometimes employed." 77

Thus we have, "his eyes began to be dim" — I Sam. 3:2, and in the Book of Mormon, "And thus he slew a certain number of them, insomuch that they began to be astonished" -- Alma 17:36, 37.

Brookbank says that the meaning which "began" implies is wholly foreign to his model of thinking, and, consequently, the word "began" should be omitted from the text, if trimmed to meet an English standard. The expression, "began to be offended" is in English "were offended." 78

Five out of fourteen examples Brookbank lists from the Book of Mormon are translated ignoring the meaning of "began." The rest 80

76 II N 6:10; 28:11.


78 Brookbank, Improvement Era XVII pp. 626.

79 Ibid., pp. 625, 626.


81 II N 3:14; 17:19; 8:12; 16:21; 18:13; TTT N 1:7; Alma 35:15; 11:46; Enos 1:11.
should be examined with this knowledge of the copulative use of the verb "to begin."

6. נָה "hinnēh" or "behold"

The word נָה, traditionally translated as "behold," is very frequent in Hebrew prose and deserves special attention in translation. Thomas O. Lambdin argues that, "The retention of archaic expressions like 'behold' even in the RSV merely points up the translators' refusal to come to grips with the meaning and syntactic functions of נָה in terms of modern English correspondents."82 He admits that "there is some difficulty in this," but "it is hoped that the following discussion will enable the reader to translate this word more accurately."82 He gives the following discussion.

(1) The clearest and most basic use of נָה is as a predicador of existence. It emphasizes the state of being immediate, the here-and-now situation. An example: נָה הָיֶה Here is your wife. (Gen. 12:19 "Behold thy wife" in KJV.)

(2) It is also used to add this same nuance to sentences with adverbial, adjectival, or participial predicates. An example:

Your father is now ill.

Most hinnēh-clauses occur in direct speech and serve to introduce a fact upon which a following statement or command is based. It becomes important to consider each hinnēh-clause together with the type of clause that follows it, i.e. whether they stand in a conjunctive or

disjunctive relationship. In the first case, 'since,' in the first clause or, 'so,' or, 'therefore,' in the second clause is recommended.

Examples: Now (נָלַי) your handmaid is in your charge; do to her --.

Or: Since (נָלַי) your handmaid is etc. (Gen. 16:6)

(נָלַי) You have grown old. So set a king over us --.

(I Sam. 8:5)

In the second case, 'although' in the first clause or 'but' in the second clause is recommended.

Examples: Although (נָלַי) I have blessed him (i.e. Ishmael), my covenant will I establish with Isaac --.

(Gen. 17:20-21)

Here are (נָלַי) the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb?

(Gen. 22:7)\(^{83}\)

Among the nineteen examples Lambdin gives, the colloquial version of the Bible gives a literal translation in only two cases. In contrast to this, eighteen out of twenty occurrences in the first three chapters of the Book of Mormon are translated literally.

This word 'behold' is one of the four most common Hebraic idioms found frequently in the Book of Mormon. The other three are "yea," "and," and the phrase "it came to pass."\(^{84}\) The translator of the present version was not shackled by the last two idioms. Since they are expressions unique to the Hebrew, examination of each occurrence of this item in the light of the foregoing knowledge is essential for future revision.

---

\(^{83}\) Lambdin, pp. 168-170.

\(^{84}\) Tvetness, p. 52.
Lexical items

1. "Therefore"

This word is sometimes employed in the Book of Mormon where it is not at all proper, according to its English signification of "for this" or "that reason," or "consequently," or "by consequence." 85

Angus states that:

Therefore itself generally expresses an inference or conclusion from what precedes; but it sometimes indicates that the sentence has been interrupted by a parenthesis, or is repeated; and means, 'as I said before;' or, 'to resume.' 86

An example:

And the Lord said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their task-masters; for I know their sorrows. And I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians. — — — Now therefore, behold the cry of the children of Israel is come unto me." — Ex. 3:7-9.

"Therefore" in this quotation, has the sense of "as I said before," referring to verse 7.

A Book of Mormon example:

And these are the names of the cities of the Lamanites which were converted unto the Lord; and these are they that laid down the weapons of their rebellion, yea, all their weapons of war; and they were all Lamanites. And the Amalekites were not converted save only one, neither were the Amulonites. — — — Therefore we have named all the cities of the Lamanites in which they did repent, — — — and were converted. — Alma 23:13-15.

It is illogical to say that some Lamanite cities were named for the reason that certain people were not converted to the teaching, and

85 Brookbank, p. 1149.
86 Angus, Bible Hand Book par. 290, quoted in Brookbank, p. 1149.
"therefore" in this case has the meaning of "as I said before," or "to resume." 87

2. "Wherefore"

This word, meaning "for which reason," differs very little from that of "for this" or "that reason" as signified by "therefore." The former is sometimes used for the latter in the Bible and in the Book of Mormon. "Wherefore" is employed to serve the above mentioned special purpose more frequently in the Book of Mormon than "therefore" is. 88

A Book of Mormon example:

For behold, it came to pass that fifty and five years had passed away from the time that Lehi left Jerusalem; wherefore, Nephi gave me, Jacob, a commandment concerning the small plates upon which these things are engraven. — Jacob 1:1.

This commandment was not given for the reason that a certain number of years had passed away since Lehi left Jerusalem. "Wherefore," in this passage, has about the meaning of "as you already know," and the connection is thus made with Nephi 19:4.

Of the nine examples which the writer checked in the translation, only two were free of literal translation.

3. Borders

Nephi records that after leaving Jerusalem, Lehi and his party "traveled in the wilderness in the borders which are nearer the Red Sea." (1 N 2:5) Here, borders לְעָבְרָיָן (pl. מַעֲבְרֵי יַם) means a bounded district, region, or country included within the borders or

87 Brookbank, p. 1150. 88 Ibid.
margin of the land, seashore. The Japanese translation of this word, 'kuni-zakai' or 'border between two nations' is not only inaccurate, but it also gives an impression of being an anachronism, because there were apparently no border in the modern sense of the term in the wilderness where Lehi and his party journeyed.

4. Isle

Isle is the translation of a Hebrew word which has a much wider significance. Its root-meaning is supposed to be habitable land, and in one passage (Is. 42:15) it means undoubtedly dry land, as opposed to water. In by far the greater number of passages, it signifies coastland — land either washed or surrounded by the sea, whether belonging to continents or islands.

It is more probable that Jacob used the word isle in the above sense when he said, "we are upon an isle of the sea." (II N 20:20, 21)

5. Fountain

Nephi records that his "father saw that the waters of the river emptied into the fountain of the Red Sea -- ." (I N 2:9) On this Hugh Nibley writes:

Is the Red Sea a fountain? For the Arabs any water that does not dry up is a fountain. Where all streams and pools are seasonal, only springs are abiding — water that never runs away or rises and

---

89 Student Hebrew Lexicon, p. 113.
falls and can therefore only be a "fountain." This was certainly the concept of the Egyptians, from whom Lehi may have got it.\(^{91}\)

Though there seems to be ground for further study about this word,\(^{92}\) the word "ָהוֹשָׁנָה, 'kashira' or 'head' which is the translated word for 'fountain,' in the present Japanese translation cannot claim to be a better translation than the first literal translation which did not translate this word 'fountain' at all in this verse.

6. One jot, one tittle

Apparently this expression refers to the smallest point or part of Hebrew characters, either addition or deletion of which will cause no small difference in the meaning of the whole content. In one place this expression is substituted with the Japanese idiom "יְהוֹשָׁנָה יְהוֹשָׁנָה, 'ichigōn-banku' or 'one word and half phrase,' but the writer prefers another translation "יְהוֹשָׁנָה יְהוֹשָׁנָה, \(^{93}\) 'itten-ikkaku' or 'one point, one stroke' since the latter is closer to the original nuance and it is already established in Japanese through the colloquial Japanese Bible.

7. Hosanna

This word comes from "יְהוֹשָׁנָה יְהוֹשָׁנָה, or 'save now' found in Psalm 118:25. It is a kind of small psalm. For some reason or other this word is translated "יְהוֹשָׁנָה יְהוֹשָׁנָה, \(^{95}\) 'hozana-yo,' attached with a particle of addressing a person. Used thus, it draws the reader's attention and weakens the effect of the text.

---


\(^{92}\)Bramwell, p. 110.

\(^{93}\)Alma 34:13.

\(^{95}\)III N 12:18.
Chapter 4

CONCLUSIONS

It was perhaps inevitable that the first translation of the Book of Mormon was completed in an old literary style. The people's view in the early 1900's unitedly demanded that style. The writer can readily understand the suggestions made by competent critics and Japanese Church members in view of the response on the part of the readers, and the effect of the translation on the readers. It was an excellent work, as a student of history has called it 'a piece that could be rated among the highest of L. D. S. literary achievements.'

A few years after the colloquial version of the Japanese Bible was published, the translation of the Book of Mormon was also revised into a colloquial version following the trend of the day. It was nearly fifty years since the first literary translation had been published. The contribution of this colloquial version was considerably great in view of the fact that it decreased about forty-one thousand Chinese characters which meant the decrease of a great number of difficult words at the same time that it introduced those church terms such as "しゅ" 'shu' or 'Lord' for "てんしゅ" 'tenshu' (which is a Catholic term now), "神聖" 'shinken' or 'priesthood' (literally, 'God ('s) power') for "聖組" 'seihan' (literally, 'sacred group') and "バプテスマ" 'baputesuma' or 'baptism' for "洗礼" 'shinrei' or 'immersion ordinance,' and, of course, it changed the old literary style into a colloquial style.

1 Murray L. Nichols.
This revision was done, however, mainly retaining the syntax or the structure of sentence pattern of the first literary version. Because of this policy, many of the ending parts of sentences turned out to lack tightness, or in other words the ending part gives loose impression, whereas the old literary form had no problem with its own style throughout. In many places the old literary style leaves its marks behind both in style and vocabulary. One-tenth of the texts retained a literary style for the part of heavenly beings' speech.

It is also observed that the translator introduced expressions which might be classed as colloquialism in the process of making a colloquial rendition, probably as an attempt at making the version easier to read. However, the writer thinks that colloquialism which comes closer to crude expression lacking culture, and taste, should be avoided. To keep the translation on the dignified, refined level, formal expressions should be retained.

In view of the type of translation we have studied, it is not easy to judge which type the present translation belongs to. Because English and Japanese are structurally so different, a translator cannot help but shift up and down the rank to get translation equivalence. Even as it is, some tendency of going to low rank bound translation is observed in the use of plural forms, pronominal expressions, redundant subject, passive voice, new sentence pattern, and awkward position of subject and predicate, and verb and object. Some of the grammatical items are obligatory in English and not in Japanese. The length of the sentence and the length between punctuation marks are considerably longer than those of a colloquial version of the
Bible. The reasons why some people say that it is not easy to read seem to be found in the above factors.

It is observed that the attitude of aiming at faithful translation gave way to the idea of "leaving the reader as undisturbed as possible and transporting the original to him." The idea of having regard for Japanese language was also sacrificed. It has more traces of Formal-Equivalence translation than Dynamic-Equivalence translation. It also contains some personal peculiar expressions.

The text of the English Book of Mormon reflects a great amount of Hebraism, as if it were written by an ancient Hebrew. Without the understanding of these characteristics, it is impossible to render an accurate translation and natural Japanese. There are a considerable number of literal translations and mistranslations in this respect.

In conclusion, the writer makes the following recommendations for a possible revision of the Japanese version of the Book of Mormon. In addition to rectifying apparent mistranslations and obvious self-explanatory suggestions for revision, the future retranslation should take the following direction.

The writer of these pages agrees with the opinion that the translation of the Book of Mormon should be rendered into a dignified and refined Japanese with appropriate honorific expressions; he interprets this dignified and refined Japanese as a style which occupies the following place in the classification of scripture translation, according to William L. Wonderly.² (See Fig. 2.)

The place that the future revision III in Fig. 2 should occupy is characterized 'contemporary' in terms of time dimension; 'regular-formal' in terms of functional variety, for the purpose of making the translation compatible with the reading in formal situations and worship services; and 'B and A' in terms of social dialects (See Fig. 3). The reason for selecting these is to render the translation into a dignified and expressive Japanese.

A few remarks on two premises are necessary before making explanations about the above three dimensions. One is the assumption that the translation should be a Dynamic-Equivalence translation which
aims at the natural target language, rejecting foreign tones. For this purpose, natural Japanese, or a translation which sounds like Japanese should avoid the characteristics of a literal translation. Recommendation one: the translator should shun forcing grammatical categories of English which are redundant or inappropriate to Japanese. In brief, "translationism" does not foster dignity and refinement.

The other assumption is that one type of translation is sufficient. We recognize that there are translations appropriate for scholars, theologians, some for uneducated, non-Christian readers, and one for general socio-educational population. This assumption is based on the fact that the language and people of Japan are highly homogeneous since the greater part of the population are high school graduates and almost hundred percent of the people speak Japanese.

Turning to the three dimensions in Figure 2, the dimension of time selected should be 'contemporary.' Recommendation two: the ten percent of the present translation which uses formal literary expressions should be retranslated into somewhat more colloquial language. In terms of functional variety, the translation should range between "regular" and "formal" (Figure 2) so that it might be appropriate for

---

3 This is a term used by Wonderly (p. 29) to mean a tendency of having many marks of translation which are foreign to readers, or which immediately tell the readers that the text is a translation.

4 This observation of the homogeneity of Japanese people and their language is not unusual. It could be argued that the Japanese language exists in a heterogeneous linguistic situation since there exist high and low socio-educational levels in spite of the spread of higher education, and varying literary and educational traditions including rigid manners, strict requirement on the choice of words, etc. While these conditions argue for a common language version in addition to the one advocated above, the writer still assumes that one version would be sufficient.
reading on formal occasions and also for worship services. Recommendation three: those expressions which can be labeled "vulgar" such as 'お前' 'omaes' or 'you,' '食べ' 'kuu' or 'to eat' should be avoided. Regarding the socio-educational dialect, the translated work should consist of language common to the speech of both higher and lower socio-educational levels (B in Fig. 3) including literary characteristics such as learned vocabulary, technical terms, and rhetorical refinements (A in Fig. 3), in order to maintain a dignified expressive style. Recommendation four: unnatural Japanese, incomplete or odd idiomatic expressions, and crude modes of expression should be avoided.

Recommendation five: lastly, the writer maintains that the Hebrew idioms need not be retained in the Japanese translation. It is fairly difficult to retain them in the Japanese translation consistently. In fact, it is actually inconceivable to carry such typical expressions as "and" and "it came to pass" into the Japanese language one by one. Especially the latter is very difficult if not impossible to translate into Japanese. The shifting of number, and use of the prophetic perfect and vocabulary such as "isle" and "border," if translated literally, will give a strange impression and cause misunderstandings rather than edifying the readers.

A deep appreciation of the difference of English and Japanese, and an understanding of Hebrew are two indispensable qualities which the translator of the Book of Mormon should possess in order to convey the original text to the readers.

5Of course there is an argument for retaining the Hebrew idioms in order to demonstrate the Semitic origin of the original.
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English and Japanese are very different from each other in terms of their structures. And consequently no one would call the present translation of the Japanese Book of Mormon a low rank-bound translation.

However, a substantial amount of grammatical categories of English such as number, redundant subject for Japanese, pronominal expression, and the passive voice which is not used so often in Japanese as in English, are introduced in the translation. The improper placement of subject, verb and object also serves as a cause of foreign tones. Thus the present translation has more factors of Formal-Equivalence translation than those of Dynamic-Equivalence translation.

The principle of 'accuracy and fidelity' resulted in an unnatural translation to some extent, imposing an effort of understanding the text on the shoulders of the readers.

It was also found out that a lack of knowledge of Hebraism resulted in 'betrayal by ignorance,' creating many unnatural Japanese expressions as well as a certain number of mistranslations.

COMMITTEE APPROVAL:

Rey L. Baird, Committee Chairman

Harold S. Madsen, Committee Member

Rey L. Baird, Department Chairman