

A Case for De-familiarizing 2 Corinthians

Philip H. Towner*

1. Introduction

Four interests or issues have converged to shape the writing of this paper. First, I am starting to work on a commentary on 2 Corinthians, so matters of exegesis, interpretation, and theology in this unique part of the Pauline corpus are always in front of me these days. Second, of course, is the fact that in the UBS or ABS, exegesis of the biblical text is never done without some consideration of the implications for translation. And in observing translations of 2 Corinthians, I ask what exegetical decisions, theological assumptions, ecclesiastical forces, and so on, have contributed to shape the finished translation. But, third, and equally important is the way in which the study of Bible translation is being enriched as it comes to be seen within the larger world of translation studies.

For me, one locus of this enrichment is the program of the Nida School for Translation Studies, based in Misano, Italy.¹⁾ There, in an annual two-week workshop, Translation Studies scholars (specialists in literary translation, in the effects of translation on cultures, interpreting, dubbing, and so on) and Bible translation specialists engage in a rich dialogue. One of the outcomes has been an increasing awareness of translation as a force—a force exerted intentionally—for the change of culture. Bible translation can no longer simply be regarded as an activity with results in the church; it is not a neutral activity, nor is it one simplistically motivated by the desire to do good for the church. Moreover, it is not an activity that can be done without asking questions of motivation and of appropriateness of method.

Fourth, a logical outcome of this rich engagement of Bible translation with

* Dean of Nida Institute, American Bible Society.

1) www.nidainstitute.org/TheNidaSchool/

Translation Studies has been an awareness of the ethical dimensions of translation. There are three UBS colleagues with us here today who joined me in some early explorations into the ethics of Bible translation. At this point, it is sufficient to say that the character of translation as a power activity raises all kinds of questions about the activity itself. As we will see, my interrogation of a certain type of translation of 2 Corinthians really becomes an ethical examination of a translated text and its potential to influence an audience. This will involve considering matters of accuracy, underlying exegesis, and inscribed interpretation; but above all I am concerned for the ethical consequences of the translated text, and matters of language register, prominence, paratextual elements and their function all play their parts in evaluating the translated text.

Frankly, as the interrelation of exegesis, interpretation, translation and motivation becomes clearer, it is difficult to carry out any one of these operations in isolation from the others. When one becomes aware of the tremendous potential for translation to create opportunities for greater inter- and cross-cultural understanding, let alone for helping churches to engage the Scriptures more effectively, one also has to become aware of the potential for translation to divide people and hinder understanding. In any case, several interests and issues converge to shape my reflections with you around this NT text. I am grateful for the chance to experiment with you.

The paper divides into four parts. Part A sketches the larger translation studies framework for thinking about translation method and motive. Part B provides an overview of the literary features of 2 Corinthians, and asks how a modern reader ought to read a letter not written specifically to her or him. Part C focuses on thematic and exegetical issues that govern translation of the piece of 2 Corinthians that we will observe. This is done against the background of the translation offered by the CEV. Part D evaluates aspects of the CEV translation and then offers some examples of translation strategies that seek to de-familiarize a text that has been made to be unnaturally familiar.

2. Hearing Other Voices

Translation studies and cultural studies scholars have made the case that

translation is one of the primary means by which culture, and cultural identity, may be constructed.²⁾ As such, translation is a means of exerting power—for good or ill. My working assumption is that translation of the Bible, as it has been done through history and is done throughout the churches of the world today, is equally a culture-shaping and identity-creating activity and equally a means of exerting power with good effects and bad effects. People in control, in positions of authority, will determine what is translated for their churches and church communities. They will determine which source texts are authoritative and so should be the basis of a translation; which existing translations may serve as relay or model translations and so perpetuate a translational “shape”; which level of language should be used and so delimit the target audience’s reception; which method of translation will be applied, foreignizing or domesticating, formal equivalence or functional equivalence, form-based or meaning-based, and so orientate the target audience to the authoritative source text or tame the source text to perform for the target audience’s pleasure. All of these questions and options are considered, some consciously and some unconsciously, in the organizing, preparation, and execution of Bible translation projects.³⁾ While lofty missionary agendas and intentions may outweigh everything else when and if translational motivation is considered, these features of translation just enumerated plainly reveal issues of power and therefore issues of ethics in the translation activity.

In many cases, nowadays, another complication enters the equation—that of commercial publishers. On the one hand, while all of the factors above are still in effect, the issue of motive is more easily identified as that of commercial return.⁴⁾ Even if a publisher of religious books plans a Bible translation in conjunction with a Christian denomination or collaboration of essentially like-minded denominations, it will only take the project forward beyond planning to implementation if there is promise of an acceptable commercial return. But, on the other hand, all of those above-mentioned elements are still in play in this

2) Edwin Gentzler, *Translation and Identity in the Americas: New Directions in Translation Theory* (London/New York: Routledge, 2008), 2.

3) See, Eugene A. Nida and Charles R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 174-186.

4) Lawrence Venuti, *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an ethics of difference* (London/New York: Routledge), 1998.

commercially driven translation enterprise. Driven by commercial and market concerns, and financed as only commercially successful companies can manage, the potential to exert culture-shaping and identity-shaping force is likely to be all the more effective in the results it achieves—whether such results are ultimately for good or ill.

In this paper, I wish to select one element of the power panoply sketched above for examination in the context of a particular manifestation of translation power and the exegetical decisions that lie behind it. Always in my mind, when the exegetical discourse seems to get a bit heavy, are those questions of how the translation of a text exerts power (with all of the decisions and motives that lead to the translated text)—for good or ill. Moreover, I am more interested in raising awareness of the power transaction at work than I am of countering the translation specimens to be examined with corrective alternatives, though some alternatives will be offered.

Going back at least to the 1990s and the work of Lawrence Venuti in his book, *The Translator's Invisibility*,⁵ the debate about the relative virtues of foreignizing translations (those which move the reader to the author/favoring source text) and domesticating translations (those which move the author to the reader/favoring target audience and language) surfaced in various contexts. Post-colonial studies, particularly as driven in and through research into the translation of non-Western texts into the commercially dominant Western markets, linked such practices to the hegemonic (domesticating and colonizing) goals of the West, and urged that translation be done in such a way that the Other (non-Western original, often indigenous) cultural voice might be heard in the West and allowed to challenge the receptor values and assumptions.⁶

I would wish to point out that this apparent duality of possible translation methods has been challenged in ways that call for greater descriptive nuance. But Eugene Nida worked with this dipolar model (formal equivalence versus dynamic or functional equivalence; form-based versus mean-based; etc.) and did

5) Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 2nd ed. (London/New York: Routledge, 2008 [1995]).

6) See Maria Tymoczko, "Post-colonial Writing and Literary Translation", Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi, eds., *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice* (London/New York: Routledge, 1999), 19-40; Maria Tymoczko and Edwin Gentzler, eds., *Translation and Power* (Amherst/Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002) esp. xi-xxviii.

much by his championing of naturalizing translations in favor of the target audience to encourage current thinking about Bible translation in these simple “either/or” terms.⁷⁾ We can debate what happens to the two options—foreignizing and domesticating—when they are made to occupy opposite ends of a continuum, and so seem also then to admit to various blends of the two in the middle regions that separate the extreme poles. In any case, the originator or popularizer of this apparent duality was Friedrich Schleiermacher.⁸⁾ In 1813, in a lecture titled “On the Different Methods of Translating,” he effectively reduced translation methods to two. Either the translator moves the reader to the author (through a literal rendering of the source text), or the movement is reversed and the author is moved to the reader (through a naturalizing or domesticating translation)—“there are simply no other ways of proceeding.” For Schleiermacher, the superior model was the translation that moved the reader in the direction of the author. His larger goal was in this way to establish the German language as a world language, a language of scholarship, at a time when French was dominating.

Schleiermacher admitted that translations can never be fully adequate to the foreign text, but he set before the translator these two choices: A domesticating practice that would reduce the foreignness of the text by subjecting it to the receiving audience’s cultural values (a translation which in Venuti’s view is “fluent,” masking or erasing any signs of foreignness)⁹⁾; and a foreignizing practice which subverts the receptor culture’s values (a translation which is in some senses resistant to the target language and capable of bringing the values of the original text’s culture to bear on the receiving audience’s cultural assumptions).

Schleiermacher intended that close adherence to the foreign text should produce in the reader of the translation a sense of its foreignness. But later translation theorists saw in this preference for the foreign voice an ethics of

7) Eugene A. Nida, *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating* (Leiden: Brill, 1964).

8) Friedrich Schleiermacher, “On the Different Methods of Translating”, S. Bernofsky, trans., Lawrence Venuti, ed., *The Translation Studies Reader*, 2nd ed., London/New York: Routledge, 2004 (1813), 43-63.

9) Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 2nd ed. (London/New York: Routledge, 2008 [1995]), 12-13, 16-17.

translation that had as its focus the value of utilizing translation as a way of giving expression to the “cultural Other”.¹⁰⁾ And, as indicated above, it is this ethical frame within which Venuti and many of the post-colonial specialists work. Venuti, influenced by Derrida, further stresses the violence that is unleashed in translation: “The viability of a translation is established by its relationship to the cultural and social conditions under which it is produced and read. This relationship points to the violence that resides in the very purpose and activity of translation: the reconstitution of the foreign text in accordance with values, beliefs, and representations that preexist it in the translating language and culture, always configured in hierarchies of dominance and marginality, always determining the production, circulation, and reception of texts”.¹¹⁾ Thus translation is an act of violence. For the translator it will be a question of deciding the degrees and direction of that violence in the translation task before her/him.

This particular discourse—including topics such as the options open to the translator, the unavoidability of violence in the act, the potential of translation to change culture or to suppress foreign values through fluency strategies—has many implications for the translation of Sacred Texts such as the Christian Scriptures. But we can perhaps see the more obvious of these implications by tracing one further turn in the discussion. Reacting to the simplistic nature of Schleiermacher’s binary model, which Venuti seemed to have taken up, Anthony Pym responded with a critique of translation as cultural mediation in which he stressed the mediating location of the translator and also the act of translation in intercultural spaces and communities.¹²⁾ He points out that Schleiermacher intentionally excluded such communities (populated by half-breeds who belong to no culture).

What this challenge from Pym does is to complicate models of translation, at least those constructed simplistically around the duality of foreignization and domestication. This reaction has in turn had the effect of eliciting from Venuti a much more nuanced description of the foreignizing task. Venuti suggests: “to

10) Ibid., 2008; Berman, A., “La Traduction et la letter, ou l’auberge du lointain”, *Les tours de Babel: Essais sur la traduction* (Mauvezin: Trans-Eurio-Repress), 1985.

11) Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 14.

12) Anthony Pym, “Schleiermacher and the Problem of *Blendlinge*”, *Translation and Literature* 4 (1995), 5-30.

advocate foreignizing translation in opposition to British and American traditions of domestication is not to do away with cultural political agendas—such an advocacy is itself an agenda. The aim is rather to develop a theory and practice of translation that resists dominant values in the receiving culture so as to signify the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text”.¹³⁾ He draws on Philip Lewis’s notion of “abusive fidelity” to extend the lines of his theory. We should notice the language of violence at play here in the term “abusive.” Lewis understood that a relationship of abuse existed between a translation and the foreign text, and he resisted strategies of fluency (in rendering the foreign text) so that he could imitate in the translation features in the foreign text designed to “abuse” or “resist” dominant cultural values and assumptions in the foreign language and original setting.¹⁴⁾ This strategy of “abusive fidelity” directs the translator’s attention to experimentation with phonological, syntactical, and discursive structures in the language of translation that allows a kind of matching of the polyvalencies and plurivocities or expressive stresses of the original by producing its own in the translated text.¹⁵⁾ Schleiermacher simply wanted to evoke a sense of the foreignness in the translated text. But the experimental approach of Lewis shows a different kind of possibility as the translator works with various aspects of the translating language, not only lexicon and syntax, but registers and dialects, styles and discourses.¹⁶⁾ Venuti calls this strategy “resistancy, “not merely because it tries to avoid the narrow kinds of fluency that have long dominated English-language translation, but because it challenges the receiving culture even as it enacts its own ethnocentric violence on the foreign text”.¹⁷⁾

Finally, Venuti points out that a foreignizing strategy does not simply abandon fluency, or, if you like, readability. But fluency is reinvented in innovative ways. The goal of foreignizing translation is not to frustrate or impede reading, nor is it to yield a wooden, artificial translation that can be called “translationese.” The goal is to create “new conditions of readability”.¹⁸⁾

13) Venuti, *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 19.

14) *Ibid.*, 18.

15) *Ibid.*, 18-19.

16) *Ibid.*, 18.

17) *Ibid.*, 18.

18) *Ibid.*, 19.

Experimenting with fluency in the way that creates a foreignizing translation (capable of criticizing the receiving culture) will require the translator to draw on resources available in the translating language with the goal of allowing the foreign text to speak to the receiving audience in ways that allow the voice of the foreign Other to be heard without being suppressed by the receiving culture's values or language.

It may be helpful to identify the orientations of some of the dualities introduced in this discussion within translation studies. On the one hand, the terms “domestication” and “foreignization” as descriptive of translation strategies are orientated to ethics and reflect ethical attitudes towards a foreign text and culture, ethical effects produced by the choice of a text for translation and by the strategy with which it is translated. On the other hand, terms like “fluency” and “resistancy” refer to discursive features of a translation strategy in relation to the reader's cognitive processing. There are other terms with other nuances that belong to this discussion broadly described by the domesticating-foreignizing duality. “De-familiarization” is another way of considering resistancy. As a strategy or translating technique/goal, it seeks to render the text in such a way that readers can read something new, hear another voice, discover possibilities in a text that, through overuse or domestication of the text, have become obscured.¹⁹⁾ In some ways, it is the habituation or over-familiarity of the Biblical text in communities that makes “defamiliarization” a useful concept. It is, I would argue, the danger of domesticating translations to render a text as seeming so familiar, so native to the target audience, that foreign or original voices can simply not be discerned—they are drowned out by the illusion created in the translation of utter naturalness.

This discussion, which is still underway in the world of translation studies, is the background to a question I will seek to explore within the context of 2 Corinthians: essentially, What would a de-familiarizing translation strategy yield in the case of parts of 2 Corinthians? The relevant discussion in translation studies just introduced provides a useful lens. Venuti's agenda is that foreignizing translation [in its nuanced form] allows the translator to restrain/reduce/avoid ethnocentric (i.e. target audience induced) violence in

19) See Edwin Gentzler, *Contemporary Translation Theories*, Rev. 2nd ed. (Clevedon; Buffalo; Toronto; Sydney: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 2001), 156.

translation and thereby release rather the foreign voice to engage critically with the translated text's culture. Pym's agenda is to see in translation, whatever strategy is used, and its location in those "intercultural spaces," the potential to assist in the global task of cultural mediation and understanding (this emerges in several of Pym's works).²⁰ Clearly these agendas converge at some important points despite very different orientations. My own hypothesis regarding approaches to translating Sacred Texts (in our case a New Testament text in the letter genre) engages with several issues.

In the field of Biblical Studies, the application of post-colonial theory to NT and OT exegesis has yielded some interesting results. Included among the issues often raised in such studies is the question of how in the translation of the original languages into the languages of the colonial oppressors, Western values were elevated and indigenous, non-Western values suppressed. Translation matters emerge from time to time *as* translation matters, but generally translation is a function of exegesis for these practitioners, even if the results are the same.

Recently, a publication emerging from the activities of one of the SBL Groups focused on Social Sciences and Biblical Exegesis took up the topic "The Social Sciences and Biblical Translation".²¹ It is interesting to see in this volume that the lead chapter is titled "Foreignizing Translation".²² The author makes very selective use of Venuti's book, *The Translator's Invisibility*, to unveil for his readership the very duality that we discussed above, harking back simplistically to Schleiermacher. However, while the author makes strategic use of the metaphor of foreign travel, coming from Schleiermacher and repeated by Venuti, to describe the need for the translation to "send the reader abroad" (movement towards the foreign, original text, instead of vice versa), he does not seem to understand the broader program of foreignizing translation as set out by Venuti, among others, or chooses not to enlarge upon it. For Rohrbaugh foreignizing translation is that which brings to light most clearly aspects of the ancient Palestinian socio-cultural reality often obscured by modern translations. Thus a foreignizing approach to the translation of Matthew 1:18 has the potential

20) See Pym, "Schleiermacher and the Problem of *Blending*".

21) Dietmar Neufeld, ed., *The Social Sciences and Biblical Translation*, Symposium Series, 41 (Atlanta: SBL, 2008).

22) Richard. L. Rohrbaugh, "Foreignizing Translation", D. Neufeld, ed., *The Social Sciences and Biblical Translation*, Symposium Series, 41 (Atlanta: SBL, 2008), 11-24.

to “lead the reader back to” the original sense of the Greek term *mnesteutheseis*, translated or mistranslated in the NRSV with the modern and Western term “engaged,” but really meaning something more like “contractually bound to marry”.²³⁾ While I would grant that Rohrbaugh’s limited application of a foreignizing translation method does yield in this kind of interpretive instance a more satisfactory result, his intention is not so much Venuti’s as it might be Schleiermacher’s. In this case, foreignizing translation is a tool applied sporadically with the goal of shedding light on aspects of the Greek language and culture that need some socio-cultural clarification. Yes, the technique sends the reader “abroad” to the author, but the only goal is that of recreating the original cultural setting. This is useful for exegesis and honoring of the “author’s” text, but does not intend (explicitly) any critical engagement of the receptor culture. The same is true for the rest of Rohrbaugh’s examples,²⁴⁾ which amount to a number of translation or exegetical problems caused by a failure to see the cultural “embeddedness” of the language of the NT Greek text.

Rohrbaugh identified his technique with the Schleiermacherian dichotomy and utilized Venuti’s discussion of Schleiermacher to explain one danger in translations that over-favor the target audience’s language and cultural assumptions. But in the end, his application is exegetical. He is unconcerned with translation as a power-activity or of considering it within the context of violence as Venuti does.

While my own exploration will have an exegetical component, my concern with the ethical duality of translation method (or intention), and mainly with the aims of domestication, inspires an attempt to probe the more fundamental questions related to a translation’s power to affect cultural or community identity and the legitimacy of domesticating strategies to do so, particularly when domestication of the text through translation (all for the benefit of the target audience) obliterates original voices while it fabricates new ones.

23) Richard. L. Rohrbaugh, “Foreignizing Translation”, 18.

24) And those of the other contributors to the volume, excluding Sandys-Wunsch, John, “Comments from Someone Who Once Shook Hands with S. H. Hooke”, D. Neufeld, ed., *The Social Sciences and Biblical Translation*. Symposium Series, 41 (Atlanta: SBL, 2008), 139-146.

3. Corinthians in Literary Overview

It is a widely accepted rule of New Testament studies that the letters associated with the Pauline mission grew out of the apostle's pastoral and mission activities in and with the communities of believers he established. Assuming the movements of Paul can be correlated with the historical and cultural situations of the churches and individuals he addressed, this rule goes a long way in setting the parameters for interpretation and translation of the letters. On the one hand, it is the nature of letters (at least the kind associated with Paul) to be occasional, linked specifically to a situation in history and culture, addressed specifically to some group (or groups) or individual with whom Paul wished to communicate. The letters of Paul presume, for the most part, an already existing conversation, and this is sometimes a fairly straightforward element of background, as in the case of the Thessalonian letters, and sometimes rather convoluted, as in the case of 2 Corinthians within the Corinthian correspondence. On the other hand, and following from this literary reality, anyone outside that original communication loop wanting to "hear" the letter approaches the activity as an eavesdropper. Such a one is not one of the original voices, not part of the original conversation. We are in that position. If you imagine a Pauline letter as an email, we are not in the list of recipients—not in the "to" category, not in the "cc" category, and not even in the "bcc" category—Paul did not imagine "readers" beyond "the church that is in Corinth" and "the saints in Achaia." Those in and about the church of Corinth who occupy the position of his opponents—those he eventually terms "Satan's servants"—probably fall into the category of the "cc" recipients, that is, those whom Paul wished to hear his message but whom he did not wish to address directly. He may have imagined the further copying of the letter for didactic or parenetic use among other churches in his orbit, but his imagination in this respect did not exceed his basic historical, linguistic and cultural purview. These are surely observations that help to establish certain exegetical parameters. But they are also crucial in determining the goals of translation.

2 Corinthians is no exception. But it is surely the Pauline letter with the most complicated set of historical, social and ecclesiastical elements behind it. It was most likely written in stages to the church in Corinth, and secondarily to that

wider readership in Achaia. The theme of acceptance of Paul's apostolic authority and mission in Corinth echoes in and against such issues as a Corinthian misunderstanding of Paul's travel intentions, his harsh treatment of disloyalty, his desire to engage the church in his collection for Jerusalem and the presence of a Jewish-Christian opposition in Corinth. A deep and robust theological presentation of Christian existence is the glue that holds the whole together. This is true, and we'll need to explore one element of this presentation in a moment.

But before we get to this stage, we have to acknowledge consciously the complexity of the situation and the limitations and obligations we face as translators. First, our canonical 2 Corinthians represents several literary parts (at least two, perhaps more) of a complicated conversation and relationship between the apostle and the church.²⁵ Second, our access to it, as already pointed out, is indirect, as eavesdroppers and even further removed than that. Third, for the most part we do not have access to one of the principal voices in the conversation—that of the main recipients, the Corinthians to whom Paul writes. We have only, or largely, Paul's word, Paul's side of the matter. And this is true in all his letters, and even more so in the case of the other NT letters. How do we do justice to the silence of this Corinthian voice? How do we acknowledge it? How do we allow it space in a translation, even if that space only serves to contribute to the translated text the ambiguity and ambivalence that silence often adds to a conversation? I am aware that for various reasons the churches of the early centuries made decisions that included Paul's one-sided letters to the growing canon of Christian Scriptures. I do not dispute these decisions, but rather seek to acknowledge that within his letters there is always the unacknowledged silence, the dance-partner, or partners, without whom the letter would not have been a letter but instead an essay. But I do not think the answer is to make any attempt to recover or reconstruct, through clever mirror-reading, letters or orally delivered messages that no longer exist. Yet within each part of 2 Corinthians there is that Other voice of the recipients—a response, a shrug, an ambivalent presence, shadows in the corner—that translation must account for,

25) See Victor, P. Furnish, *II Corinthians*, AB 32A (Garden City; New York: Doubleday, 1984), 35-54; Margaret Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians 1-7*, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), 3-49; Hans Dieter Betz, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985).

must allow space for, if only that the ambivalence can be registered in some way. It will be my argument that domesticating strategies, which seek to put modern readers (perhaps of all languages, but certainly in the case of the English common language translation we will briefly consider) in the place of the original recipients can only do so by obliterating that original silent voice. More on this momentarily.

Let us return to crucial matters of background that will guide us. All interpreters acknowledge that one of the major issues engaged by Paul in 2 Corinthians is the disruptive presence of a distinct opposition. There is less agreement as to the identity of this group and its relation to the less clearly defined detractors of Paul in 1 Corinthians, but we are probably safe to conclude that they were in some sense Jewish or Judaizing Christians.²⁶⁾ What is crucial is to understand that from the outset Paul is in apologetic mode, giving answer to apparent charges leveled against him, in his absence, by an opposition that is present. His basic attitude towards the church and his abilities and authority to serve it are questioned. He is charged with being heavy-handed (1:24; 10:8), “tearing down” the community instead of building it up (10:8; 13:10), and criticized for his lack of effective communication skills (10:10; 11:6). They disparaged his weak or unimpressive physical presence (10:1), along with the way he compensated for this by sending fierce letters from a great distance (10:10). Paul’s changes of plan were taken for a weak will and a vacillating or even capricious spirit (1:17-19; 10:2). And his way of writing was judged to be worldly and impenetrable (1:12-13). In any case, it is this criticism of his weakness that will be central to our examination of certain translation tendencies in CEV.

Certain other specifics emerge that round out the picture of contempt held for Paul by this group. Paul’s insistent and sustained argument for apostolic authority in chs. 10–13 makes clear their rejection of his apostleship. They apparently regarded him as a pretender, who failed to demonstrate the signs of apostleship in the church’s presence (6:8; 12:12), and who did not measure up in comparison with the Jerusalem apostles (11:5; 12:11). He lacked the requisite

26) Cf. Dieter Georgi, *The Opponents of Paul in 2 Corinthians: A Study of Religious Propaganda in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985); C. K. Barrett, “Paul’s Opponents in II Corinthians”, *NTS* 17 (1971), 233-254.

letter of commendation to validate his credentials (3:1-3).

On a number of levels, then, in 2 Corinthians Paul can be seen as attempting to respond to charges against him that had hardened into a determined stance against his authority to lead the community. In and through the give and take, a profile of the opponents, at least from Paul's perspective, also emerges. But at this point we do not need to explore Paul's name-calling, of which the majority belongs to the latter part of the canonical letter. For the points I wish to make we need to keep several things in mind.

First, charges have been made against Paul by his opponents and the church at large is now skeptical of Paul's authority and claim to be an apostle. These charges range from his unimpressive presence, to the failure to have letters of recommendation (probably) from Jerusalem, to above all an interpretation of his sufferings by the critics as evidence of weakness which does not befit (and so invalidates a claim to be) an apostle.²⁷⁾

Second, Paul cannot sidestep these charges, he cannot avoid them, and no simple exertion of authority will make them go away. Instead, he must reorientate the Corinthians' understanding of his sufferings and weakness. He must demonstrate that these "disqualifying" marks actually, when understood in accordance with a theology of the gospel, are evidence of God's power.

Third, so Paul will drive his readers on this course that reaches a theological climax in chapters 4 and 5 in an articulation of the gospel that is surprising and that pushes the limits of our theological flexibility somewhat. But what is crucial for my considerations is the rhetorical device that Paul employs from chapter one onwards intended to implicate the Corinthians' experience of Christian existence in himself and his ministry, before the theological statements of chapter 4 and 5 are reached. The device occurs in various forms, but its goal is consistently to engage the Corinthians in a sort of dance: the "we/us" of the Pauline mission is interpreted in terms of the "you" of the Corinthian experience of the faith. The anchor is the core fact of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.²⁸⁾ But, neither the degree of Paul's reflection upon his sufferings nor the

27) See also Steven J. Kraftchick, "Death in Us, Life in You: The Apostolic Medium", David M. Hay, ed., *Pauline Theology, Volume Two: 1 and 2 Corinthians*, Symposium Series, 22 (Atlanta: SBL, 2002), 175; P. Furnish Victor, *II Corinthians*, AB 32A (Garden City; New York: Doubleday, 1984), 277.

28) See also Steven J. Kraftchick, "Death in Us, Life in You: The Apostolic Medium".

frequency of appearance of this device can be found in other Pauline letters. In the next brief section, I will first set out the device in its several forms. Then, we will consider the core gospel statements towards which the device drives as Paul's argument unfolds.

4. “Death in us; Life in you”: Our Sufferings, Your Comfort: the Apostle’s Self-Validation and the Death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ

When the opening section of 2 Corinthians is compared with other Pauline letters, it is clear from the start that something unusual is going on. All of the other Pauline letters (except for Galatians) begin this introductory section with a statement of Pauline thanksgiving (Ephesians does as well, though the form is different and the thanksgiving is somewhat delayed). In the case of 2 Cor 1:3-4, however, Paul shifts to a Jewish blessing form. This produces, in vv.5-7, an emphasis on the theme of “partnership” in suffering and comfort and the appearance of an unusual “compelling of partnership” phraseology. The blessing continues in vv.8-11 with Paul's allusion to his Asian trials and the frank statement of hope in God's future (or ongoing) deliverance *and* the relation of this to the Corinthians' prayers for Paul. The blessing concludes by stating that the goal of this experience of suffering and divine deliverance is the multiplication of thanksgiving to God expressed by the Corinthians—the addressees. Consequently, in this opening the “thanksgiving” statement is (1) left until the end, (2) linked to the deliverance of God in which Corinthian prayers are central, and (3) descriptive of the thanksgiving of the Corinthians, not, as typically, of Paul. The question is, what has motivated this deviation from the typical Pauline letter opening (cf. especially 1 Cor 1:4)?

If we bear in mind the apologetic nature of this section of 2 Corinthians, and the reshaping of Corinthian understanding that Paul is undertaking, I would describe Paul's motive on the basis of 1:5-6:

NRSV 2 Corinthians 1:5-6, 11

5 For just as the sufferings of Christ are abundant for us, so also our

consolation is abundant through Christ.

6 If we are being afflicted, it is for your consolation and salvation; if we are being consoled, it is for your consolation, which you experience when you patiently endure the same sufferings that we are also suffering ...

11 as you also join in helping us by your prayers, so that many will give thanks on our behalf for the blessing granted us through the prayers of many.

GNT 2 Corinthians 1:5-6, 11

5 Just as we have a share in Christ's many sufferings, so also through Christ we share in God's great help.

6 If we suffer, it is for your help and salvation; if we are helped, then you too are helped and given the strength to endure with patience the same sufferings that we also endure ...

11 as you help us by means of your prayers for us. So it will be that the many prayers for us will be answered, and God will bless us; and many will raise their voices to him in thanksgiving for us.

Paul's aim in this "compelling of partnership" statement, and statements like it in 2 Corinthians, is often misinterpreted as designed mainly to heal a rift that has occurred between himself and the community, by emphasizing how deeply connected Paul feels to the church. That is, these kinds of "overstatements" are thought to have been aimed at convincing the community of Paul's love and commitment for it, when its members feel strongly that Paul has slighted and embarrassed the church by his decision to cancel his visit. While these were undoubtedly goals of Paul in relation to this community, the "compelling of partnership" statements drive towards a different goal. If Paul were making negative statements about wrongdoing, this kind of argumentation would aim to implicate the addressees in the crime being described, to catch them in his logical trap, to establish their criminal involvement. "Implicating" is still the goal here, though Paul is describing not crimes, but experiences of suffering, weakness, divine salvation and thanksgiving. Bear in mind, again, Paul is giving answer to the misunderstanding (or opponent's charge) that his sufferings are proof that God is not with him, that his apostolic authority is invalid.

To explain the logic, Paul as much as says:

1. my apostolic experience of the sufferings of Christ (that is, the apostle's experience sharing in Christ's messianic sufferings which led to his death;

- 3:10) are accompanied by experiences of divine comfort;
2. my sufferings, at the same time, are instrumental in your comfort and salvation;
 3. and our experience of divine comfort is also for the sake of you Corinthians and your comfort (which you experience as you patiently endure the same sufferings for the faith);
 4. finally, even the thanksgiving to God (the ultimate goal), offered because of the evidence of God's blessing, comfort, and salvation linked to Paul's ministry, will come from the Corinthians.

In short, Paul begins the letter by immediately implicating the Corinthians in the apologia he is creating to validate his apostolic ministry. Do the Corinthians necessarily pick up on this immediately, or, for that matter, accept Paul's interpretation? Probably the answer to the first question is "no"; the answer to the second is not completely known, but that is immaterial here. The foundation of Paul's argument is yet to come. But at this point, let us see how this argument of "Corinthian implication" unfolds through additional similar "compelling partnership" phraseology.

- a. In 1:14, a similar "compelling of partnership" comment occurs in the statement about eschatological boasting: "as you have already understood us in part— that on the day of the Lord Jesus we are your boast even as you are our boast"—NRSV.

There is a mutuality in the eschatological benefits that accrue to Paul's apostolic ministry. Paul's use of the past tense ("as you have already known in part") implicates the Corinthians already in this partnership.

- b. 1:24 is a compressed restatement of the "implicating" of the Corinthians in Paul's ministry: "I do not mean to imply that we lord it over your faith; rather, we are workers with you for your joy, because you stand firm in the faith"

In this case, Paul reiterates the statement of motivation now in the context of explaining why he chose not to return to Corinth when he had said he would. His decision was "for the Corinthians' benefit."

- c. 2:1-5 is saturated with this "compelled partnership" theme.

1 So I made up my mind not to make you another painful visit. 2 For if I cause you pain, who is there to make me glad but the one whom I have pained? 3 And I wrote as I did, so that when I came, I might not suffer pain from those who should have made me rejoice; for I am confident about all of you, that my joy would be the joy of all of you. 4 For I wrote you out of much distress and anguish of heart and with many tears, not to cause you pain, but to let you know the abundant love that I have for you. 5 But if anyone has caused pain, he has caused it not to me, but to some extent— not to exaggerate it— to all of you.

In this case, Paul implicates the church in the “pain” caused by the disciplinary force exercised. What Paul has felt has also been felt by the whole church (v.5). The church is implicated in the very apostolic ministry that is under scrutiny. Had this paragraph occurred without the preceding sections and “compelling partnership” strategy, it might appear as a simple statement of mutuality and sharing, underscoring closeness of relationship. But the case is actually not one of intimacy, but of repulsion, and Paul’s strategy of “implicating” is designed to catch the Corinthians in his trap.

- d. 2:10 shows a similar reciprocity and action on the part of Paul (like his suffering in 1:6) for the sake of the Corinthian church: “Anyone whom you forgive, I also forgive. What I have forgiven, if I have forgiven anything, has been for your sake in the presence of Christ.”

Not only is the act of “forgiveness” here on the part of the church an implication of partnership in Paul’s ministry, but Paul’s own action is “for your sake in Christ.”

- e. In 3:2 this peculiar implicating of the Corinthians in Paul’s apostolate is seen again, now in the context of the discussion about “letters of commendation”: “You yourselves are our letter, written on our hearts, to be known and read by all.”

Paul’s point here is that the proof of Paul’s validation is what has happened in the lives of the Corinthian believers. They are implicated in the Pauline mission.

- f. 4:12 is the most potent statement of the relationship to Paul and his ministry that the apostle is trying to convince the Corinthians of.: “So

death is at work in us, but life in you.”

In short, Paul at this point can say to the church that his sufferings (sharing in the sufferings of Christ), which are an embodiment of the death of Jesus, have worked to produce life (patterned after the resurrection of Jesus) in the salvation of the Corinthians who have come to faith. (see also 5:13).

The logic of Paul’s argument, slowly but surely allowing the implications of Corinthian involvement in Paul’s apostolic ministry, has unrolled in the context of several apologetic explanations in the first three chapters. But that argument finds its main orientation in, and is predicated upon, an explicit statement of the gospel, in explication of Paul’s mission, which occurs in 4:5. At that point, Paul is speaking of the gospel he preaches plainly and its effects on those who receive it and on those who resist it. He is reluctant to be caught in a game of boasting (cf. 5:12), with the claims of the opponents in the background. Yet to set out his ministry, he must make bold claims such as in 4:1: “God in his mercy has given us this work to do.” So in 4:5 Paul plainly distinguishes himself from the core of the gospel message: “For we do not preach ourselves; but we preach Jesus Christ as Lord and ourselves as your slaves for Jesus’ sake.” It is, however, the second part of the statement that interests us here. The verb, to preach (κηρύσσειν) has two objects. The first, “Jesus Christ as Lord,” is indisputable. But the second, “and ourselves as your slaves for Jesus’ sake,” is disputed. Many commentators are reluctant to admit that Paul here includes the apostle’s role as a part of the gospel.²⁹⁾ But it is not his role, as such, but his behavior with and for the Corinthians (as alluded to in the partnership implicating statements) to which Paul refers.³⁰⁾ And that “cruciform” manner of behavior is, if you will, the human embodiment of the gospel—the demonstration of Jesus’ death and resurrection in the ministry of Paul, which, Paul has been arguing, is evident in the way he has given himself for the Corinthian community.

I grant that this connection requires several leaps. Allow me to sketch the logic.³¹⁾ The foundation for this thinking is chapter 5 and its development of the

29) Cf. Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 223; C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Second Letter to the Corinthians*, HNTC (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), 134.

30) See also Steven J. Kraftchick, “Death in Us, Life in You: The Apostolic Medium”, 168-170.

31) I adapt *ibid.*, 167-169.

death and resurrection of Jesus as the central gospel precept. The explicit claims of 5:18-19 and the ἵνα and ὥστε clauses of vv.15, 16, 17 and 21 provide important keys for determining Paul's understanding of the scope and meaning of Jesus' death and resurrection.

(1) God's act of reconciliation was in and through the death and resurrection of Jesus, and according to 5:20 that same reconciling activity is manifested in Paul's ministry. That is, the shape and quality of that activity of ministry are defined by those founding events, and God's appeal for reconciliation is made through Paul's ministry. Moreover, the granting by God of this ministry (to the Pauline team or to all believers, depending upon how the "us" in v.18c is read) is part of God's reconciling activity. (2) The reconciliation is cosmic in scope (5:19), which excludes elitist understandings of salvation. In this connection, the "all" of v.14b is emphatic and extended conclusively to v.14b ("therefore all"). The result is that an ontological shift of universal proportions has occurred; the death of the one means that all have died.³²⁾

5:15 implies that the eschatological purpose of Christ's death and resurrection is not personal gain (or a personal ticket to heaven for each one who believes); rather it is a missiological, missional purpose: "that those who live will no longer live for themselves, but for the one who died and was raised on their behalf." Consequently, the logic of Paul is thus: dying with Christ means dying to self, but living for Christ (see 4:5 "for Jesus' sake") manifests itself when one takes up the mission of Christ and lives in the service of others.

The experience of the death and resurrection of Jesus has its ultimate goal in the reconciliation of the entire world to God (v.19a). But it is in expressing this event in Jesus, and then reexpressing it in those who believe in Jesus, that the message of reconciliation executes its task.

In any case, Paul's logic, predicated on the death and resurrection of Jesus, and his association with Jesus' death (dying to self) and life (living for others), finds explicit expression in the straightforward statement of the gospel, in 4:5, which associates Jesus Christ as Lord with the "life for others" manifested in Paul. Paul's strategy, beginning in chapter 1 with the first "compelling partnership" statement, and developing in other contexts with similarly shaped and themed statements, implicates the Corinthian church in this divine mission

32) See esp., *ibid.*, 168.

of reconciliation. Whether they believed it—whether Paul won his argument and reshaped Corinthian thinking about weakness as a stage for the manifestation of God’s power, is not entirely known. If the remaining parts of 2 Corinthians represent additional Pauline letters in a sequence of ongoing responses to the questions about him being raised in his absence, we might guess the process was a longer one than Paul hoped at the end of chapter 5. What must be seen in any case is that this language compelling partnership is not simply a plea on Paul’s part, a begging, that the church please understand that all he did was for them. Rather, Paul insists, at first in veiled form, but eventually in bold theological relief, that the Corinthian experience of God (of the gifts of the Spirit, of divine power in miracles, in the give and take of Christian community discipline, in healings, in suffering persecution) is the result of Paul’s ministry “in weakness.” Their Christian “DNA” is Pauline; their cause is the Pauline gospel. In his weakness and sufferings, so misunderstood and maligned by his opponents as invalidating his apostolic claims, God had manifested and executed the ministry of reconciliation with its basis in the death and resurrection of Christ.

This is the argument Paul mounts, and some translations give the modern reader access to this argument—allow the voices to be heard. But some do not. In this closing section, I finally get to my translational points.

5. Translation that Hears Other Voices

5.1. Evaluating a Domesticating Translation

As I think will be apparent from my opening section, my concern is with translations designed to domesticate the translated text—to make it seem natural to the target audience, to make it seem to belong to the target audience’s literary context, to make it easily accessible, and obviously relevant. In the case of translations of the Bible, often the underlying motive is evangelistic. But there are ethical issues to consider, especially if translation is properly located among the power activities that influence cultural-identity, for good or ill. There are voices that any text’s author meant to be heard, voices that belong to and in fact actually constitute the original message of the text, and to silence those voices is an act of violence in some measure or other. Well-intentioned or not, such

treatment of even an ancient text like 2 Corinthians must be questioned. As I will attempt to briefly (and incompletely) demonstrate, domestication not only involves bad or questionable exegesis, it also distorts the voices in the ancient conversation inscribed in the ancient text.

At this point, it remains to offer an evaluation of a translation that reflects the limitations and abuses associated with domestication. But we must first rehearse some of the assumptions of this method of translating that are at odds with the text before us. As I explained above, 2 Corinthians is not a letter written to people in the 21st century. We are not a part of the conversation. We can only ever be eavesdroppers—this is the nature of the letter genre, especially as used by Paul. Therefore, I have to question the idealistic goal often associated with the domesticating/naturalizing program: “to produce in the ultimate receptors a response similar to that of the original receptors.” Paul did not write with us in mind. Furthermore, while we might in our translations achieve something that approximates an original response in the case of clearly universal statements of theology or ethics, or in the case of relating historical or mythical narrative, it is not possible for us to step into the shoes of the Corinthian believers’ and assume their role in the conversation Paul engages them in. All we can do is listen.

This is especially true in the kind of discourse that unfolds in 2 Cor 1–4. Paul is engaged in offering an explanation that will, if successful, reshape Corinthian understanding. He is, via letter, speaking specifically to the Corinthians, though others (e.g. believers in Achaia and eventually other Pauline churches) are invited to listen. We have not specifically been invited to listen, but the church has made this possible through its adoption of the Pauline texts as canonical—though we are very far removed from the conversation.

(1) To illustrate what I feel are the dangers of domestication, I will draw on the CEV. First, some global observations. Whatever conclusions scholars come to regarding the integrity of 2 Corinthians, a complicated literary history is evident, and structural uncertainty is the result. Yet one of the chief tasks of this type of translation is to remove the kinds of uncertainty that frustrate or even offend the impatient modern reader and raise immediately questions of relevancy that might dissuade the modern reader from attempting to engage the text. The section 6:14–7:1 presents a classic case. This is often regarded as part

of a separate letter, added to other pieces of Paul's Corinthian correspondence at some point to form our canonical 2 Corinthians.³³⁾ My view is that, however we explain its association with the canonical letter, it is an insertion of some kind. 6:13 has Paul urging his readers to "open their hearts," and 7:2 resumes that thought in a way that suggests the intervening unified material (6:14–7:1) was inserted. While the CEV is not the only translation by any means to employ the strategy, the insertion of section headings before and after this intervening unit disguises these textual seams, smooths the bumps in the text caused by the insertion of material, and creates for the modern reader the illusion of flow and unity.

As it does so, it also removes what must have been an oratorical rest, a performance caesura or period of silence that may, as the letter was performed or read, have been the occasion for the Corinthian voice to be heard either audibly with puzzled or assenting sounds, or visibly with shrugs or gestures. But after the CEV has bridged the textual gaps, one can read without being challenged to consider the implications of such a pause.

(2) This kind of domesticating road repair is designed to give the text in translation the illusion of fluency in the target language. In translation of 2 Corinthians it is perhaps most obvious in the case just described. But it also occurs in other less obvious ways. Paul's language is richly textured, complex, and carefully measured to achieve his goals of explanation and reconceptualization. While the punctuation of the scholarly Greek texts we use aims to make "best guesses" about Paul's meter and rhythm, and so identify those places where the public reader/performer would have paused for effect or communicative emphasis, the CEV often takes its own course in this matter. Sometimes this is because English has different requirements from Greek, and so achieving any kind of naturalness will require some reorganization of the syntax and adjustment of accompanying punctuation, and so on. But sometimes nuances in the Greek text (such as paradox, irony, metaphor, word-play), and not simply punctuation, invite conceptual rests or responses or reflection, and in any case are capable of driving the reader or hearer of the text to a profound depth of pathos and emotion. Domesticating translation strategies can so flatten the rich

33) See Hans Dieter Betz, "2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?", *JBL* 92 (1973), 88-108.

original texture that the potential for apprehending pathos and emotion is all but removed, and in place of complexity and richness (as in a good wine) there is left a lowest-common-denominator text that fails to attract attention.

The CEV falls into this trap. It has selected a colloquial register aimed at readers for whom English is not a first language. It's most noticeable method is to simplify sentence structure, shorten the original Greek sentences and reorder words to comport with current American stylistic canons, and lexical choices that in some cases reflect (in my way of thinking) a rather superficial, almost gushing, simplistic descriptiveness (e.g. the juxtaposing of "terrible" and "wonderful" in 1:5 when neither of these extremes is suggested by the text). In shortening the sentences, sentence number is of course increased, which requires repetition of the pronouns for the added subjects and objects.

Although the Greek of Paul's letters belongs to what is broadly called *koine* Greek, there are various levels of register that can be reached (compare Luke, Paul, Hebrews, 1 Peter). It is ironic, to say the least, that this richly textured and complex letter, in which in 10:10 Paul refers to the claim of his opponents that "his letters are weighty and strong," should be rendered in such a register-lowering, flattening manner.

(3) In the CEV's translation of 1:3-7, the multiplication of sentences is immediately apparent. While NA27 punctuates the text to produce 4 sentences, the CEV doubles this to 8 sentences. To illustrate the effects of a less radical functional equivalence treatment, the GNT renders the text in 5 sentences. In the case of the CEV, this shortening of sentences carries with it a necessary addition of pronouns (explicitation) and the repositioning of pronouns from object to subject or relocation of pronouns to the heads of sentences. This reflects current English strategies for clarity and simplicity of communication. But some of this remodeling is also shaped by the domesticating goals and theological assumptions which of course rest on exegetical decisions.

For example the CEV translation of 1:5 can be observed in a way that pulls together several of the observations of domestication just cited. First, we can note what seems a fairly harmless move. The Greek of 1:5 is a neatly balanced "just as, so also" sentence (καθὼς . . . οὕτως . . .). By repeating the main verb, "to abound" (περισσεύειν), Paul has foregrounded the abundance of (1) "the sufferings of Christ" and in balance (2) "the comfort which is through Christ."

Reference to the recipients of these things is made by use of the first person plural accusative pronoun “us” (ἡμεῖς; referring to Paul or Paul and his team), related to the verb by preposition in the first case, and by the genitive case in the second (ἡμῶν).

How does the CEV reshape these things? By moving the pronoun to the subject position, “we,” the CEV shifts the focus to the people. The thought of the “abundance” of these things expressed through the repeated verb, which is a measure of “amount,” is shifted to a shared experience of things described by their quality (“we share in the terrible sufferings; we also share in the wonderful comfort”). The CEV chooses a different foreground, a different emphasis, and diminishes Paul’s description of the situation, and lightens the mood considerably in a way that would be far more palatable to the “light-hearted and always optimistic” mood of materialistic America. The reorientation of the text produced by the addition of “terrible” and “wonderful” buys in too deeply to the superficial values often expressed embarrassingly by the stereotypical public-relations person or in advertisements that employ too easily the extremes of life for a culture that is already inured to actual extremes by an ease of life that is not only taken for granted but also virtually unknown in so much of the rest of the world. The CEV’s translation makes Paul’s message about “us,” and the rest, after the prominence of “us” is settled, is either “terrible” or “wonderful”; yet Paul’s translation is about “the sufferings of Christ” and “divine comfort” and how humans relate to these things.

The domesticating result smoothly gives the illusion of accessibility and relevance to the modern reader: the impression is that the reader in the 21st century is among the “we” of Paul’s writing. This may satisfy the egoistic desires of a Fundamentalist assumption about the Scriptures being written for us (anywhere and at all times), but it does so at the expense of rewriting the text in a way Paul did not have in mind.

The texture is flattened and the apologetic tone (at times almost adversarial) in which Paul wrote is erased. The text is remade to sound as if Paul is simply giving an uplifting homily to encourage those facing hardship, when the actual purpose, so much clearer in the Greek and in less-domesticating translations (GNT, NRSV), is to describe and interpret Paul’s suffering, and (as argued above) to implicate the Corinthians in the faith-experience (death and

resurrection) embodied by Paul. The CEV domesticating strategy may achieve that illusion of simplicity and accessibility of language, but in the process, it obliterates the actual message.

(4) Another illustration of the effects of domestication. Paul's paradoxical opening statement "compelling partnership" in 1:5-6 is similarly drastically reduced from a statement of purpose ("if we suffer . . . it is for your comfort and salvation") to a neutralized statement of hope ("we suffer in the hope that you will be comforted and saved"; CEV). In fact to read the Greek text, "hope" or even open-ended uncertainty is the farthest thing from Paul's mind. Instead, CEV supplies an interpretation of suffering as if it aims to encourage Paul. Paul's rhetorical goal is different.

(5) The same flattening result is evident in 1:14. There Paul's implicating statement looks at the Eschaton and he boldly asserts that on that day "we are your (cause of) boasting, and you are ours." CEV reconceptualizes this (presumably in a way that gets past the strangeness of Greco-Roman honor and shame categories, but completely misses Paul's point) as a day of mutual admiration, and in the process pulls the rhetorical teeth from the text, and fails to capture the "compelling partnership" intention of Paul's statement: "Then, when our Lord Jesus returns, you can be as proud of us as we are of you."

(6) The illustrations of this domesticating process could be multiplied. One final and key example may be seen in that linchpin statement in 4:5. It is a troublesome statement, as noted above. Paul seems to include his ministry to the Corinthians (or his ministry as exemplified in his behavior with the Corinthians) as a part of the gospel he proclaims: "For we do not preach ourselves; we preach Jesus Christ as Lord and ourselves as your slaves for Jesus' sake." The Greek text intends the following logic:

(we) κηρύσσομεν	Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν κύριον
	δὲ
	ἑαυτοὺς δούλους ὑμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦν.

This startling text is deflated by the CEV as follows: "We are not preaching about ourselves. Our message is that Jesus Christ is Lord. He also sent us to be your servants." Compare the logic this restructuring expresses:

We are not preaching about ourselves.
Our message is that Jesus Christ is Lord.
He also sent us to be your servants.

Probably for exegetical reasons, the CEV diminishes the focus on the activity of proclamation (which is the only verb in the sentence) by breaking the original sentence into three short sentences. The CEV has succeeded in communicating something in straightforward and explicit form, but in the process it has failed to bring Paul's meaning to expression.

(7) I must summarize this critique at this point. First, as I have just suggested by looking at 4:5, the CEV domesticating strategy has misread a key text, the text that in fact unlocks the theme of "compelled partnership" in the early chapters. It is this theme that is central to Paul's reorientation of the Corinthian's evaluation of his suffering. Second, its choice of register and radical program of reducing discursive complexity, executed by shortening of sentences, shifting of pronouns from object to subject (refraining from passives), flattens what is originally a richly textured and highly nuanced use of language. Third, instances of excessively dramatic language make Paul into an American public relations officer, where the overuse of such effusive and extreme language has rendered it practically meaningless, even if it is typical of one broad usage of American English. These things combine to give an illusion of modern N. American teen-level English fluency to the text.

The goal is to make the modern reader of the text feel after reading that "this is written to me." Subjective or not, my sense in reading the CEV translation of 1:3-7 alone is that the domestication of the text has so flattened out the discourse, universalized it, that the reader is invited too easily to "enter" a conversation in a role he or she is not qualified to fill. The domestication fills all the spaces, removes all the rests, and in the process of deproblematizing the ancient foreign text, it has made it unnaturally familiar, excessively fluent. The puzzles Paul poses to the Corinthians—through language play and his "compelling partnership" sentences—are deconstructed by the familiarizing technique of the CEV. And a significant voice, or voices, is obliterated. One is that of Paul himself. The drastic program of this domesticating translation has either caused, or been based upon, certain exegetical errors. Paul's voice is obscured. The other voice is that silent one I referred to before. Without the rests

and stops and puzzles—when the text is rendered smooth as cream—the thought of a resisting and responding original audience is obliterated. Yet to fully appreciate and comprehend Paul’s voice, the existence of that Other—even a silent Other—is crucial to understanding the drama and chaos of the Corinthian situation and ultimately the theological expression it helped to generate. This kind of translation is not a success in delivering meaning, even if it produces a text that is readable. It is also very probably a translation that breaches translation-ethical principles. In response, I would propose the need to reproblematicize the text, to defamiliarize it, so as to enable modern readers to take the rightful place of eavesdroppers and to create the space for the silent Corinthian Other to be “heard.”

6. De-familiarizing Strategies

Finally, in offering a few defamiliarizing moves to allow the foreign voice to be heard, I will begin with an exegetical adjustment at 4:5 upon which is based the significant theme that has been silenced. Then, I will suggest some strategies for restoring the voices of 1:3-7.

(1) 4:5 makes a theological statement about the gospel that is fundamental to an understanding of Paul’s argument about his sufferings. A straightforward glossing of the Greek text is:

For we do not preach (κηρύσσομεν) ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus’ sake.

The main verb expressed in the first clause remains in effect following “but” (ἀλλά), taking both “Jesus Christ” and “ourselves” as parallel objects.

“For we do not preach ourselves
but
we (preach)
 Jesus Christ as Lord
 and

ourselves as your slaves for Jesus' sake.”

There is certainly some level of ambiguity built into this statement, if only in the fact that we cannot be sure how Paul meant to include “ourselves” as in some sense the object of proclamation. The CEV, discontent with this ambiguity, resolves it, as observed above, by breaking the single statement into three separate sentences and inscribing a heavy interpretation upon the final clause:

We are not preaching about ourselves.
Our message is that Jesus Christ is Lord.
He also sent us to be your servants.

This is an over-interpretation that, perhaps more than anything we have considered in 2 Corinthians, illustrates the idea of translation as violence. This text, through domestication, has been made subservient to an interpretation not readily evident in the text itself, nor particularly recommended by anything in the context. By over-translation or domestication (according to a theological norm), the ambiguity inherent in the original that might release alternative possible readings is obliterated. The foreignizing solution is to return to a translation that leaves other “readerly” options open.

(2) Turning now to 1:3-7, as argued, the CEV in flattening out the texture of the original confuses the voices of the conversation and ultimately illegitimately fills in the silence with a domesticating strategy probably intended to hyper-emphasize accessibility and relevance for its audience. To allow rediscovery of the voices that create the foreign conversation, I would defamiliarize by adding some prominence to the pronoun-participants. For example, on the likely assumption that when Paul uses the first person plural pronoun (“we”/“us”) he often means “me” (note 4:5 where Paul himself broadens out the referent with the reciprocal pronoun, “ourselves”), I would suggest shifting the rhetorical “we” to “I”. In opposition to the pronoun “I,” I would then stress the Otherness of the plural “you” by translating “you, Corinthians.” Compare, for example, the CEV rendering of 1:6 with a foreignizing defamiliarization:

CEV:

We suffer in the hope that you will be comforted and saved. And because we are comforted, you will also be comforted, as you patiently endure suffering like ours.

Defamiliarizing translation:

If *I* am afflicted, it is for the sake of the comfort and salvation of *you Corinthians*;

if *I* am comforted, it is for the sake of *your* comfort which will enable *you* to endure the same sufferings *I* suffer.

This is a quick, first-go, but you can see how I would wish to shift the focus in comparison with the domesticating approach of the CEV. (a) In this way, I aim to sharpen the focus on the original participants or voices. Only a first full reference to “you Corinthians” is needed to create this sharpness. (b) Such a translation disallows and discourages inappropriate fantasizing on the part of modern readers—it “delays” the modern reader from entering the conversation and helps clarify where authentic universal entrances may be implied by the plural pronouns (i.e. where “our,” “we,” and “us” possibly refer to all believers). (c) Also, this treatment of pronouns sharpens the contrast between Paul, on the one hand, and the Corinthians, on the other hand, and clarifies the adversarial atmosphere that exists, as it also heightens the surprise that comes in the “compelling partnership” statements.

(3) Drawing also on 1:6 and the treatment just offered, the importance of translation for stressing what I have called the “compelling partnership” theme emerges. The CEV translation of 1:6 removes any causality from the statement about Paul’s suffering/comfort and that of the Corinthian’s. But, if my exegesis is correct, and if this thematic statement is properly linked with 4:5, causality is indeed to be stressed. It will then be explicated in terms of 4:5. My concern (in serving the foreign text and the modern reader) is somehow to ensure that 1:6 is appreciated for its thematic value and that the link is made to 4:5. To this end, I offer one further, more radical, foreignizing of 1:6 to stress the surprising causality and to insist that the reader be on the look out for its later explanation:

I was afflicted *precisely* for the sake of the comfort and salvation of *you Corinthians*;

I was comforted for the sake of your comfort which will enable *you* to endure the same sufferings *I* suffer.

The assertiveness and causality also possibly allow the reader to react with puzzlement, surprise, even to object to the formula Paul suggests, but all in a way that just might create that conceptual space for the silent Other voice of the listening Corinthians to be “heard.” To flatten this out as the CEV has done removes any bump in the discursive and conceptual road. Reproblematizing the text in translation forces the reader to come to terms with the objecting or wondering silence.

(4) Finally, regarding the matter of foregrounding and prominence, certain adjustments to the domesticating translation could be made to insure that the foreign stresses are recovered. In the first place, to return to the violent domestication of the CEV in 1:5, this would mean restoring the foreign choice to emphasize human beings over the sufferings of Christ and the divine comfort he gives to human beings, and the lexical shift away from superficial American extremist language (“terrible,” “wonderful”).

CEV:

We share in the *terrible* sufferings;
but also *share* in the *wonderful* comfort he gives.

An adjustment is needed to restore a non-egoistic emphasis:

Defamiliarizing translation:

Just as the sufferings of Christ abounded in my case,
so also my comfort has abounded through Christ.

This kind of translation adjusts the register to conform more closely to the Pauline gravitas, as it also repositions the divine as the orientation point in Paul’s argument.

These examples are just samples of what a defamiliarizing approach in translation might yield as seen in comparison to a domesticating approach. In responding to domesticating translations with a competing foreignizing approach, it is important to stress that the goal is not to be slavishly “faithful” to the foreign text, as such, which would very likely yield a translation written in

“translationese.” But the goal is to pay attention to the subtleties and the valencies of the foreign text so that in translating another kind of fluency can be achieved which resists accommodation to the values of the receiving culture and allows the values of the foreign culture and author to engage critically those of the culture and reader receiving the translated text. The goal is not to impede reading or to cause puzzlement; the goal is to open up new possibilities for the reader as the receiving culture engages with and is penetrated by foreign possibilities. In the case of the Christian Scriptures this kind of translation has to face the daunting task of challenging “readings” of the Sacred texts for which the churches down through history have all claimed ownership. While I may presume justifiably that these readings are therefore “familiar” for the communities that have owned them, produced them and perpetuated them for their traditions, this does not mean the prospect of “defamiliarization” is one that will be tolerated. This dynamic at work within the ecclesiastical universe parallels the one at work in the world of commercial production of literary translations, where those who publish establish the norms and canons of readability and acceptability. All I can do here is acknowledge that an ethical battle is being waged; the outcome is far from certain.

<Keywords>

Foreignization, domestication, de-familiarization, fluency, voice.

<References>

- Barrett, C. K., *A Commentary on the Second Letter to the Corinthians*, HNTC, New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Barrett, C. K., “Paul’s Opponents in II Corinthians”, *NTS* 17 (1971), 233-254.
- Berman, A., “La Traduction et la letter, ou l’auberge du lointain”, *Les tours de Babel: Essais sur la traduction*. Mauvezin: Trans-Eurio-Repress, 1985.
- Betz, Hans Dieter, *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*, Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Betz, Hans Dieter, “2 Corinthians 6:14—7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?”, *JBL* 92 (1973), 88-108.
- Furnish, Victor, P., *II Corinthians*, AB 32A, Garden City; New York: Doubleday, 1984.
- Gentzler, Edwin, *Translation and Identity in the Americas: New Directions in Translation Theory*, London/New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Gentzler, Edwin, *Contemporary Translation Theories*, Rev. 2nd ed., Clevedon; Buffalo; Toronto; Sydney: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 2001.
- Georgi, Dieter, *The Opponents of Paul in 2 Corinthians: A Study of Religious Propaganda in Late Antiquity*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Kraftchick, Steven J., “Death in Us, Life in You: The Apostolic Medium”, David. M. Hay, ed., *Pauline Theology, Volume Two: 1 and 2 Corinthians*, Symposium Series, 22, Atlanta: SBL, 2002, 156-181.
- Neufeld, Dietmar, ed., *The Social Sciences and Biblical Translation*, Symposium Series, 41, Atlanta: SBL, 2008.
- Nida, Eugene A., *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*, Leiden: Brill, 1964.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Taber, Charles R., *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill, 1982.
- Pym, Anthony, “Schleiermacher and the Problem of *Blendlinge*”, *Translation and Literature* 4 (1995), 5-30.
- Rohrbaugh, Richard. L., “Foreignizing Translation”, D. Neufeld, ed., *The Social Sciences and Biblical Translation*, Symposium Series, 41, Atlanta: SBL, 2008, 11-24.
- Sandys-Wunsch, John, “Comments from Someone Who Once Shook Hands with S. H. Hooke”, D. Neufeld, ed., *The Social Sciences and Biblical*

- Translation*. Symposium Series, 41, Atlanta: SBL, 2008, 139-146.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich., "On the Different Methods of Translating", S. Bernofsky, trans., Lawrence Venuti, ed., *The Translation Studies Reader*, 2nd ed., London/New York: Routledge, 2004 (1813), 43-63.
- Thrall, Margaret, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians 1—7*, ICC, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994.
- Tymoczko, Maria, "Post-colonial Writing and Literary Translation", Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi, eds., *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice*, London/New York: Routledge, 1999, 19-40.
- Tymoczko, Maria and Gentzler, Edwin, eds., *Translation and Power*, Amherst/Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2002.
- Venuti, Lawrence, *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an ethics of difference*, London/New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Venuti, Lawrence, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, 2nd ed., London/New York: Routledge, 2008 (1995).

<Abstract>

고린도후서 낮설게 하기를 위한 일례(一例)

필립 타우너 박사
(미국성서공회 나이다연구소 책임자)

성경 번역은 더 광범위한 문학적 및 상업적 번역 세계로부터 대체로 분리되어 있다. 어떤 면에서 이는 이해될 수 있지만 많은 다른 방향에서, 성경 번역이 비판 받고 정련되는 데 더디다는 것을 의미한다. 비판과 정련은 학문적이고 학자적인 번역학 맥락 안에 있는 번역 활동의 특징이다 이 글의 목적은 성경 번역 과업을 이런 맥락 안에 두는 것이다. 특히, 번역학계에서 논의된 이국화/길들이기 틀의 관점에서, 고린도후서 일부 번역을 평가했다. 이 연구에서는, 극단적인 길들이기 요강(要綱)이 번역에 끼친 영향을 분석하기 위해, CEV를 사용했다. 또한 ‘낮설게 하기’가 본문에 있는 다양한 ‘목소리들’에 새로이 접근하는 데 얼마나 유용한지, 실례를 제시했다.