MODERNIZING THE DIVINE BOOK
TRANSLATION STRATEGIES AND LANGUAGE EVOLUTION IN THE BIBLE ACROSS ENGLISH AND ROMANIAN[1]

Andra-Iulia URSA
1 Decembrie 1918 University of Alba Iulia, Romania

e-mail: andra.ursa@uab.ro

Abstract

This paper examines the translation and retranslation of the Bible in both English and Romanian, with a focus on the strategies used to adapt the sacred text for contemporary readers. By analysing two English versions, the New King James Version (1979) and the New English Translation (2001), alongside two Romanian versions, the Dumitru Cornilescu Version (1924/2014) and the Noua Traducere În Limba Română [the New Romanian translation] (2006), this study identifies linguistic shifts that reflect evolving reader comprehension. Using Andrew Chesterman's translation strategies (1997), we compare syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic changes across different translations. Our corpus consists of 10 examples from Leviticus 19:2-13, which are analysed using a qualitative approach. Each translation and retranslation was marked with a number and noted to highlight the modification patterns. The findings reveal that language modernization, particularly in retranslation efforts, plays a key role in clarifying outdated vocabulary and making the text more accessible to modern readers. We conclude that these linguistic shifts are essential to bridging cultural and temporal gaps between ancient texts and contemporary audiences, ultimately showing that translation is not merely linguistic but also a reflection of changing social and cultural contexts.

*Keywords***:** translation strategies; translation and retranslation; Bible; syntax; semantics; pragmatics.

Introduction

Defining "retranslation" can be challenging due to its varying interpretations. It might involve translating a text into the same target language more than once, either by the same translator or by different ones. Some theorists distinguish between "retranslation" as the revision or updating of a translator's own previous translations, and "repeated translation," which refers to translating works previously translated by others (Xu, 2024, p. 64). Despite these distinctions, the broad consensus defines retranslation as the process of translating the same source text into the same target language multiple times. This is the definition we use as a starting point for our research.

The Retranslation Hypothesis, as presented by Yves Gambier (1994, p. 414), suggests that initial translations of a text tend to be more assimilating, meaning they adapt the content to fit the cultural or editorial norms of the target audience, often minimizing the foreign or unfamiliar elements. Gambier describes this process as an effort to "reduce the otherness" in favor of these requirements. However, as more translations of the same work into the same language are produced, there is a tendency for these later versions to return closer to the source text, seeking greater fidelity and preserving more of its original characteristics. This shift reflects a growing desire to maintain the integrity of the source material.

The necessity for retranslation, as explored in Translation Studies, can be attributed to various factors that align with the evolution of the text's reception. Du-Nour (1995, p. 327) emphasizes that linguistic and stylistic changes over time often necessitate retranslation. Building on this, Robinson (1999) views retranslation as a form of "supplementation", highlighting that initial translations may only partially capture the essence of the original, and thus require subsequent efforts to bridge those gaps. This supplementation can occur in temporal terms (making the work relevant for contemporary audiences), quantitative terms (aligning more closely with the original semantics and syntax), or qualitative terms (reflecting the inspiration and talent of the original). Thus, retranslation not only addresses the inadequacies of earlier versions but also ensures a continued refinement of the translation process. This complementary nature of retranslation is echoed by scholars like Toury (1995) and Koskinen & Paloposki (2003), who argue that retranslation allows for variation and adaptation, catering to diverse reader needs while progressively returning to the essence of the source text. Together, these perspectives demonstrate that retranslation plays an important role in both maintaining the cultural relevance of a work and deepening its connection to the original text across time.

The translation of the Bible has a long and complex history, dating back to the first official translation made by Jewish scholars in Alexandria, Egypt, between 250 and 100 BCE, into Greek. This translation, known as the Septuagint, set the stage for later Bible translations, shaping Christian vocabulary and theology. Since then, many Bible translations have emerged, each adapting the text to fit the linguistic and cultural needs of different societies. From the Latin Vulgate, a major translation completed by Jerome in the 5th century, to more contemporary versions, translators have grappled with the challenge of rendering the Bible accessible and relevant to their readers. The evolution of languages, the shifting needs of religious communities, and advancements in biblical scholarship have all played a role in the continual revision and retranslation of the Bible. These perspectives suggest that retranslation is not only a response to linguistic changes but also a reflection of shifting ideological contexts and cultural values. This dual lens provides a comprehensive understanding of why and how Bible translations are revisited and updated, ensuring they remain relevant and resonant with each new generation of readers.

In this study, we analyse and compare the translation and retranslation of the Bible in both English and Romanian, focusing on how language evolves to accommodate contemporary readers' understanding. In this respect, Nida (1964) and Scott (2018) emphasize that language is in a perpetual state of transformation, which necessitates updating translations to ensure they remain relevant to contemporary readers. As language evolves, certain translations may become outdated, requiring reinterpretation to align with current usage and understanding. Berman (1990, p. 1) highlights the inevitability of translations "growing old" as they reflect the linguistic and cultural context of their time. As these contexts change, retranslations become necessary to provide a more accurate and contemporary version of the source text.

1. The New King James Translation and The New English Translation

The King James Bible is a landmark translation, renowned for its accuracy and impact on British religion, language, and law. Commissioned by King James I to create a version free from partisan bias, the translation team of forty-seven scholars worked from the original Hebrew and Greek texts and earlier versions like the Bishop's Bible (Scorgie, Strauss, & Voth, 2003, p. 182). The King James Bible was praised for its stylistic variety, avoiding rigid concordance translation (Scorgie, Strauss, & Voth, 2003, pp. 182-183).

Despite initial typographical errors and limited manuscript access, the King James Bible gained popularity and overshadowed earlier versions (Metzger, 2001, pp. 43-44). The American Bible Society made orthographic improvements in 1861, and the New King James Version

111

(NKJV) was introduced in 1979, completing the Bible in 1982 (Metzger, 2001, p. 44). This revision updated vocabulary and grammar to reflect modern usage while retaining the traditional style (Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1982, p. vi).

The NKJV replaced obsolete pronouns with modern equivalents, capitalized pronouns referring to God, and substituted conjunctions to simplify language while preserving reverence (Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1982, p. vi). It also utilized the 1967/1977 Stuttgart edition of the Biblia Hebraica, the Septuagint, the Latin Vulgate, and Dead Sea Scrolls manuscripts, reflecting advances in textual scholarship (Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1982, p. vii). The New Testament benefitted from extensive manuscript support, aligning about eighty percent with earlier texts (Thomas Nelson, Inc., 1982, p. viii).

The New English Translation (NET) is a free online Bible translation funded by the Biblical Studies Foundation. As stated by representatives of Thomas Nelson Publishing in a post on the official Thomas Nelson Bibles website, in November 1995, a group of twenty biblical scholars started creating a digital modern English version, using the most reliable Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts. This translation was designed to be freely available on the Internet and CD-ROM. The NET aims to be non-sectarian while maintaining an evangelical approach.

2. The Dumitru Cornilescu Translation and Noua Traducere În Limba Română

Romanian Bible translations began to emerge in the sixteenth century, influenced by both Protestant and Orthodox efforts to make the Scriptures accessible to the local population. Significant milestones included *Evangheliarul de la Sibiu* (The Gospel of Sibiu) and works by Romanian typographer Coresi, such as *Tetraevangheliarul* (The Four Gospels), *Lucrul Apostolesc* (The Acts of the Apostles), and *Psaltirea* (Psalms) (Diaconu, 2018, p. 123).

In the seventeenth century, *Noul Testament de la Bălgrad* [the New Testament of Bălgrad] (1648) was the first translation of The New Testament into Romanian. Published in Alba Iulia by Orthodox Metropolitan Simion Ștefan at the request of Hungarian Calvinist authorities, it was the most comprehensive translation of the Bible at that time and influenced future versions. The first complete Bible in Romanian, *Biblia de la București* [The Bible of Bucharest] (1688), used the New Testament from Bălgrad and a revised translation by Nicolae Milescu for the Old Testament (Diaconu, 2019, pp. 129-147).

In the following centuries, several notable Bible translations emerged, including *Biblia de la Blaj* [The Bible from Blaj] (1795), *Biblia Sinodală* [The Synodal Bible] (1914, 1968, 1988), and Dumitru Cornilescu's translations (1921, 1924, 2014) (Diaconu, 2019, p. 148). In contemporary Romanian, two primary Bible translations are in use. The Romanian Orthodox Church relies on the Synodal Bible, which serves as the official translation of the Orthodox scriptures and was published with the approval of Patriarch Teoctist. Meanwhile, Protestant denominations predominantly use the Dumitru Cornilescu translation.

First released in 1921 with financial backing from Princess Ralu Callimachi and produced by the Romanian Evangelical Society, the Dumitru Cornilescu Bible faced mixed reactions. Neo-Protestant communities perceived heretical elements, while others appreciated its modernized language (Conțac, 2011, p. 215). The 1921 edition did not detail its sources, but some verses resemble the Second Version, and Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon likely influenced it (Conțac, 2011, p. 217). A revised 1924 edition by the British Bible Society addressed issues such as removing annotations and substituting paraphrases with more literal translations (Conțac, 2011, pp. 217-218). Over time, the New Version gained traction in Neo-Protestant circles, especially during the communist regime, which restricted Biblical scholarship and competition. The 1924 edition was reprinted and revised multiple times after the 1989 Revolution (Conțac, 2011, pp. 218-219).

Despite plans for a thorough revision based on Hebrew and Greek texts, Cornilescu's declining health prevented this. However, the British Bible Society's trust in Cornilescu underscored initial enthusiasm for the translation (Societatea Biblică Interconfesională, 2019, p. iii). On the 90th anniversary in 2014, the Interconfessional Bible Society of Romania updated the Bible with orthographic, grammatical, and punctuation corrections while preserving the original style. The 2022 revision, led by Emanuel Conțac and other Neo-Protestant scholars, is a revision rather than a new translation, emphasizing fidelity to the original texts and readability in church settings (Societatea Biblică Interconfesională, 2019, pp. iii-vi). In 2024, the Interconfessional Bible Society of Romania published a special definitive edition to mark the 100th anniversary of the 1924 Cornilescu Bible text. The text published in 2024 did not undergo changes, but many errors and inconsistencies in spelling, biblical references, and punctuation were corrected. This is the edition we will use in our study.

Noua Traducere Românească (NTR), also known as *Noua Traducere în Limba Română* (NTLR) [The new Romanian translation] was developed by a committee of translators from 1998 to 2006 for the International Bible Society. Produced by a Baptist team of graduates from the "Emanuel" University of Oradea under the coordination of James L. Courter, the NTLR aims to modernize the language, removing the outdated and incorrect word forms found in the Cornilescu translation. The NTR Bible has gone through four revised editions between 2007 and 2021.

This fourth edition is seen as the final, long-lasting version, though it remains open to critique. As stated in the preface, this translation considers modern Romanian linguistic innovations while preserving older, expressive terms suitable for a sacred text. It goes beyond a word-for-word approach, ensuring both fidelity and appropriate meaning in each context. Recognizing the multiple interpretations of original biblical manuscripts, the editorial team provided nearly 6,000 notes and commentaries, incorporating the latest biblical research to help readers understand the text, its history, and geography (The editorial committee of the NTLR, 2021, Preface).

3. Methodology

Prior to undertaking this study, we observed that many Bible translations have undergone multiple revisions, primarily to enhance clarity and make the text more accessible to readers. Consequently, we initiated this comparative research with the aim of investigating how religious texts are interpreted and examining the ways in which different translators have adapted ancient languages to the cultural and linguistic needs of their societies. It is essential to recognize that language is an evolving skill, shaped by various external factors, and therefore requires ongoing adaptation. Our paper aims to identify differences, understood as translation strategies, between the translation and retranslation of the Bible in English and Romanian. In this context, retranslation is viewed not as a continuous revision of the same text but as separate, distinct translation efforts.

Our analysis, therefore, proceeds in two directions. First, we examine two contemporary English Bible translations: the *New King James Version* (NKJV), first published in 1979, but for which we will use the 1982 edition, and the *New English Translation* (NET) Bible, released in 2001. Second, we review the *Dumitru Cornilescu Version*, initially published in 1924 and republished in 2024, and the latest Romanian translation, *Noua Traducere În Limba Română* (NTLR), initially published in 2007, and for which we will use the 2021 edition.

In our research, we adopted a structured and methodical approach to analyse the translation and retranslation of biblical texts, focusing on both English and Romanian versions. The methodology involves several key steps, each designed to ensure a comprehensive and insightful examination of the translation strategies employed in different versions of the Bible.

Our analysis centres on 10 distinct examples, selected from the first part of Leviticus 19:2 - 19:13. The examples are labelled based on their origin as follows: ET (English Translation), ER (English Retranslation), RT (Romanian Translation), and RR (Romanian Retranslation), with each label followed by a corresponding number. To gather the textual data, we utilized the BibleGateway website, a valuable resource that provides access to a wide array of Bible translations in electronic format. This platform allowed us to efficiently search for specific keywords, passages, and entire chapters, ensuring that we could compare selected examples based on their frequency of occurrence.

For the analytical framework, we employed the translation strategies developed by Andrew Chesterman in his seminal work, *Memes of Translation* (1997). Chesterman's strategies offer a robust classification system that encompasses the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic layers of language (Chesterman, 1997, pp. 94-112). We want to clarify that we excluded Literal Translation and Loan from the syntactic strategy group, as they deal solely with transferring information between languages, which was not the focus of our research. Moreover, as Chesterman observes, pragmatic strategies often involve syntactic and/or semantic adjustments (Chesterman, 1997, p. 107). Consequently, in our text annotations, we first identified strategies that modified syntax or semantics and, where relevant, later categorized them as pragmatic strategies. Below is a summary table of these strategies, aimed at providing a clearer understanding of their usefulness.

Table 1

Translation Strategies formulated by Andrew Chesterman (1997, pp. 94-112)

Syntactic Strategies:	**Semantic Strategies:**	**Pragmatic Strategies:**
Transposition	Synonymy	Cultural filtering
Unit shift	Antonymy	Explicitness change
Phrase structure change	Hyponymy	Information change
Clause structure change	Converses	Interpersonal change
Cohesion change	Abstraction change	Illocutionary change
Level shift	Distribution change	Coherence change
Scheme change	Emphasis change	Partial translation
	Paraphrase	Visibility change
		Transediting
		Other pragmatic strategies

While Chesterman's translation strategies were originally intended for comparing a source language with a target language, we chose to apply them to emphasize linguistic shifts between different translations. We indicated the translation strategy in square brackets after the modified instance, which was highlighted in bold. Following this, we provided a brief commentary discussing the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic implications of the changes.

To support our analysis, we included etymological references, dictionary definitions, and explanations of vocabulary usage for each translated and retranslated fragment. Our qualitative analysis of successive parts of the text provides a focused view of language use, revealing the impact of translation strategies on the clarity and relevance of the biblical text. By examining how different versions handle specific passages, we were able to draw conclusions about the broader implications of these translation choices for contemporary readers.

4. Comparative Analysis

(ET1) And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, "Speak to all the congregation of the <u>children of Israel, and say to them</u>: 'You <u>shall</u> be holy, <u>for</u> I the Lord your God am holy (NKJV, 1979/1982, Leviticus 19:2).

(ER1) [cohesion change - ellipsis] The Lord spoke to Moses [cohesion change - ellipsis]: "Speak to the whole congregation of the <u>Israelites</u> [unit shift – phrase to noun] <u>and tell them</u>, [clause structure change] 'You <u>must</u> be holy <u>because</u> I, the Lord your God, am holy [synonymy] (NET, Leviticus 19:2).

The phrase "the children of Israel" is more formal and archaic, often associated with Biblical or religious texts. It implies a direct lineage from Israel (Jacob) and carries a sense of historical or cultural continuity. In contrast, "the Israelites" is a more modern and straightforward term that still refers to the same group but without the metaphorical "children" aspect. The phrase "Children of Israel" can refer specifically to Jacob's (or Israel's) direct offspring, as seen in Genesis 45:21 and references to Jacob's children. However, it is more commonly used to describe the entire lineage or descendants of Israel, particularly in contexts like the story of the Exodus (Bible Central, 2021). The term "Israelite" dates back to the mid-14th century and refers to a Jew, specifically someone from ancient Israel or a descendant of Israel, also known as Jacob (Online Etymology Dictionary).

Another change that occurs in this first example consists of the choice of the modal verbs used by God to formulate the commandments. In the NKJV, "shall" is used to indicate obligation and appears 4,715 times throughout the biblical text. However, in contemporary usage, "shall" is now largely reserved for formal, legal, or ceremonial contexts, often appearing in contracts or laws to outline requirements or duties. As a result, modern retranslations like the NET use "must" to reflect God's authoritative tone more clearly. In contrast, "shall" appears only 81 times in the NET, mainly in formal settings to express duty (e.g., "he <u>shall</u> serve him forever" in Exodus 21:6), to indicate future purposes (e.g., "These towns that you must give <u>shall</u> be your six towns for refuge" in Numbers 35:13), or to inquire politely about an action (e.g., "<u>Shall</u> I go and get a nursing woman for you?" in Exodus 2:7).

The conjunction "for" has been used to mean "because" or "since" for over a thousand years, appearing in numerous well-known quotes, such as those found in the Beatitudes from the New Testament. However, in contemporary speech and casual writing, this use of "for" is rare and often introduces a more formal or literary tone (American Heritage Dictionary, 2011). In contrast, to reflect current English usage, the retranslation opts for the more common "because" to express causality, aligning with modern linguistic norms.

(RT1) Domnul <u>i-a vorbit lui Moise</u> şi a zis: „Vorbeşte întregii adunări <u>a copiilor lui Israel</u> și spune-le: 'Fiţi sfinţi, <u>căci Eu sunt sfânt</u>, Eu, Domnul, Dumnezeul vostru' (Dumitru Cornilescu, 1924/2024, Levitic 19:2).

(RR1) Domnul <u>i-a zis lui Moise</u>: [cohesion change - ellipsis] „Vorbeşte întregii adunări a <u>israeliţilor</u> [unit shift – phrase to word] şi spune-le: 'Fiţi sfinţi, <u>pentru că</u> [synonymy] Eu, Domnul, Dumnezeul vostru, <u>sunt sfânt</u>' [emphasis change] (NTLR, 2007/2021, Levitic 19:2).

In both the English translation and the Romanian text, we notice a shift in expression regarding how God communicated with Moses. The phrase "i-a vorbit lui Moise" [spoke to Moses] uses an intransitive verb with an indirect object in the dative case, indicating that God spoke to Moses without necessarily conveying a specific message. In contrast, "i-a zis lui Moise" [told Moses] implies that a specific message was conveyed to Moses.

In the phrase "Eu sunt sfânt" [I am holy], the primary emphasis is on the declaration of holiness. It utilizes a straightforward declarative structure, presenting the statement directly

with a main clause followed by additional specification "Eu, Domnul, Dumnezeul vostru" [I, the Lord, your God]. The retranslation begins with the identification ("Eu" – "I"), followed by the apposition "Domnul, Dumnezeul vostru" [the Lord, your God] and then ends with the main clause "sunt sfânt" [am holy]. This revised structure places emphasis on the speaker's identity before making the declaration about their nature, thereby highlighting the speaker's authority and role prior to stating their holiness.

(ET2) <u>Every one of you shall revere</u> his mother and his father, and keep My Sabbaths: I am the Lord your God (NKJV, 1979/1982, Leviticus 19:3).	(ER2) <u>Each of you</u> [distribution change] <u>must respect</u> [synonymy] his mother and his father, and <u>you</u> [emphasis] must keep my Sabbaths. I am the Lord your God (NET, Leviticus 19:3).

The phrase "every one of you" emphasizes the inclusion of all individuals within a group, highlighting the collective nature of the statement. In contrast, "each of you" focuses on individual attention or actions, directing the message to each person separately. Furthermore, both "revere" and "respect" convey a sense of deep admiration and deference. However, "revere" is less commonly used in everyday language today and tends to carry a more formal or literary tone. Nevertheless, both terms are used in the text of the two translations: "Revere / reverent / reverence" appears 16 times in the NKJV and 28 times in the NET, while "respect" and its variants appear 22 times in the NKJV and 95 times in the NET. For instance, in the first translation, the phrase "the nations shall <u>fear</u> the name of the Lord" (NKJV, Psalm 102:15) is rendered in the retranslation as "The nations will <u>respect</u> […]" (NET, Psalm 102:15). Similarly, the concept of fearing God, expressed as "Let Him be your <u>fear</u>" (NKJV, Isaiah 8:13), is translated as "He is the one you must <u>respect</u>" (NET, Isaiah 8:13), focusing on a sense of respectful reverence. This change illustrates a modern approach that emphasizes a respectful and relational understanding of God over the more traditional, fear-based perspective.

(RT2) Fiecare din voi <u>să-i cinstească pe mama sa și pe tatăl său</u> și să <u>păzească</u> Sabatele Mele. Eu sunt Domnul, Dumnezeul vostru (Dumitru Cornilescu, 1924/2024, Levitic 19:3).	(RR2) Fiecare din voi <u>să-și cinstească mama și tatăl</u> [phrase structure change] și să <u>țină</u> [synonymy] Sabatele Mele. Eu sunt Domnul, Dumnezeul vostru (NTLR, 2007/2021, Levitic 19:3).

This phrase translates to [to honor his/her mother and father]. The use of "mama sa" and "tatăl său" is a bit more familiar or traditional. The retranslation grammatically adapts the expression to modern-day usage: "Să-și cinstească" [to honor, with reflexive pronoun "își" indicating possession] "mama" and "tatăl" [his/her mother and father], with no preposition or possessive adjective needed.

The verb "a păzi", which means [to take care of] or [to guard], is primarily used to ensure the safety of someone or something, preventing them from escaping, being taken, or disappearing (DEX, 2016, p. 873). In the retranslation, the verb "a ține", which specifically means [to honour a holiday or special day], is used instead. This term is more contextually appropriate for the specific situation described. We also notice that in Cornilescu's translation, the verb "a păzi" is used in various contexts. In the retranslation, however, this verb is replaced with more specific terms that better fit the context of each situation. For instance, "Acesta este legământul Meu pe care să-l <u>păziți</u>" [This is My covenant which you shall protect] from Cornilescu's translation (Genesis 17:10) is retranslated as "să-l <u>respectați</u>" [you shall respect] in the NET. Similarly, "Să <u>păziți</u> lucrul acesta ca o lege" [You shall guard this as a law] from Cornilescu's translation (Exodus 12:24) is rendered as "Să <u>țineți</u>" [you shall keep] in the NET.

(ET3) 'Do not turn to idols, <u>nor</u> make for yourselves <u>molded gods</u>: I am the Lord your God (NKJV, 1979/1982, Leviticus 19:4).

(ER3) Do not turn to idols, <u>and</u> [cohesion change] you must not make for yourselves <u>gods of cast metal</u> [phrase structure change + abstraction change]. I am the Lord your God (NET, Leviticus 19:4).

The NKJV (ET3) uses the conjunction "nor" to introduce a negative coordinate clause, maintaining a formal tone and emphasizing the prohibition of creating idols. The NET (ER3), on the other hand, replaces "nor" with "and", which introduces a coordinate clause linking ideas of equal importance, with the negation reinforced by "must not", stressing the imperative nature of the command.

Additionally, there is a noticeable shift in phrase structure. The NKJV uses "molded gods" (adjective + noun), emphasizing the process of shaping gods without specifying the material used. In contrast, the NET uses "gods of cast metal" (noun + prepositional phrase), providing a more specific and concrete description.

(RT3) Să nu vă întoarceţi spre idoli şi <u>să nu vă faceţi dumnezei turnaţi</u>. Eu sunt Domnul, Dumnezeul vostru (Cornilescu, 1924/2024, Levitic 19:4).

(RR3) Să nu vă întoarceţi spre idoli şi <u>să nu vă turnaţi idoli</u> [paraphrase]. Eu sunt Domnul, Dumnezeul vostru (NTLR, 2007/2021, Levitic 19:4).

The Cornilescu version (RT3) uses "dumnezei turnaţi" (noun + adjective, meaning 'molded gods], which maintains a more descriptive tone, focusing on the nature of the gods as man-made. In contrast, the NTLR (RR3) simplifies this by using "idoli" [idols], removing the adjective and opting for a more straightforward and modern paraphrase: **"să nu vă turnaţi idoli"** (conjunction + negation + reflexive verb phrase + noun). The negative imperative is directive and forceful, providing a clear prohibition. In this context, idols serve as a contrast to God's invisible nature, as they are tangible, often referred to in biblical texts as "images" representing false gods (McAdams, 2024).

(ET4) <u>And if</u> you <u>offer a sacrifice of a peace offering</u> to the Lord, you shall offer it <u>of your own free will</u> (NKJV, 1979/1982, Leviticus 19:5).

(ER4) <u>When</u> [cohesion change – coord. to time clause] you sacrifice <u>a peace-offering sacrifice</u> [phrase structure change] to the Lord, you must sacrifice it <u>so that it is accepted for you</u> [unit shift – phrase to clause] (NET, Leviticus 19:5).

The NKJV (ET4) uses the coordinating conjunction "and" followed by "if", which introduces a conditional clause, implying uncertainty about whether the action will take place. The conditional "if" suggests that offering a sacrifice is a possibility rather than a certainty. The focus is on the voluntary nature of the act, highlighted by the prepositional phrase "of your own free will", which emphasizes the freedom and sincerity behind the offering.

In contrast, the NET (ER4) translation replaces the conditional "if" with the subordinating conjunction "when". This change introduces a time clause, assuming that the act of sacrificing will definitely occur, even if the exact time remains uncertain. It conveys a sense of inevitability, shifting the focus from possibility to certainty. Furthermore, the phrase structure is simplified by changing "offer a sacrifice of a peace offering" to "sacrifice a peace-offering sacrifice", which places more direct emphasis on the action of sacrificing. Though repetitive and somewhat redundant, this form emphasizes the sacrificial act itself more strongly.

Additionally, the NKJV focuses on voluntariness with the adverbial phrase "of your own free will", while the NET uses a purpose clause: "so that it is accepted for you". This clause

suggests that the action is not just voluntary but also aims at achieving a specific goal, ensuring acceptance.

(RT4) Când îi veți aduce Domnului <u>o jertfă de mulțumire</u>, <u>s-o</u> aduceți <u>așa</u> încât să fie primită (Cornilescu, 1924/2024, Levitic 19:5).	(RR4) Când veți aduce o <u>jertfă de pace</u> [paraphrase] pentru Domnul, <u>să o</u> [transediting - expansion] aduceți <u>în așa fel</u> încât [transediting - adv. to adv. locution] să fie primită (NTLR, 2007/2021, Levitic 19:5).

In Cornilescu's version (RT4), the passage reads "jertfă de mulțumire" [thanksgiving offering], emphasizing gratitude and the use of a perfect animal to symbolize purity (Branzai, 2013). In contrast, the NTLR translation (RR4) uses the phrase "jertfă de pace" [peace offering], signifying not only gratitude but also a focus on maintaining peace with God (Branzai, 2013). This type of offering was not intended for atonement but was given in thanks for God's grace and care.

Additionally, the phrase "s-o aduceți" contracts the subject and verb for a smoother, more conversational tone, which is typical of spoken Romanian. In retranslation the phrase is expanded, giving the sentence a more formal tone.

(ET5) It shall be eaten <u>the same day you offer it</u>, and on the next day. <u>And</u> if any remains until the third day, it shall be <u>burned in the fire</u> (NKJV, 1979/1982, Leviticus 19:6).	(ER5) It must be eaten <u>on the day of your sacrifice</u> [unit shift – relative clause to prepositional phrase] and on the following day, <u>but</u> [cohesion change] what is left over until the third day must be <u>burned up</u> [emphasis change] (NET, Levitic 19:6).

Here, the coordinating conjunction "and" (NKJV) is used to link two ideas that occur sequentially permitting the offering to be eaten over two days but stipulating that any leftovers on the third day must be burned. In the NET translation (ER5), the structure changes to the coordinating conjunction "but", signalling a cohesion change. This shift contrasts the allowable time to eat the offering with the required action if food remains on the third day, emphasizing the contrast between what is acceptable (eating it within two days) and what must happen if the timeline is exceeded (burning the remainder).

Additionally, a unit shift occurs, where the relative clause "you offer it" in ET5 becomes a prepositional phrase "of your sacrifice" in ER5, streamlining the sentence structure and focusing more on the sacrifice itself rather than the action of offering it. The verb "must be burned up" adds a sense of urgency and requirement, whereas "shall be burned in the fire" in the NKJV has a less immediate tone.

(RT5) <u>Jertfa</u> să fie mâncată în ziua când o veți jertfi sau <u>a doua zi</u>; ce va mai rămâne până a treia zi <u>să se ardă</u> în foc (Cornilescu, 1924/2024, Levitic 19:6).	(RR5) [cohesion change - ellipsis] Să fie mâncată în ziua când o veți jertfi sau <u>în ziua următoare</u> [synonymy]; ce va mai rămâne până a treia zi <u>să fie ars</u> [phrase structure change - reflexive verb construction to passive construction] în foc (NTLR, 2007/2021, Levitic 19:6).

In the Cornilescu translation (RT5), the reflexive verb "să se ardă" [let it burn] is used in the subjunctive mood, implying an action that must be carried out but is left somewhat indirect in agency. The construction maintains a more formal tone and emphasizes the action that must be taken regarding what remains of the sacrifice. In the NTLR translation (RR5), the

reflexive construction is replaced with the passive construction "să fie ars" [let it be burned], which emphasizes the outcome (burning) rather than the process or actor responsible.

(ET6) <u>And</u> if it is eaten at all on the third day, it is an <u>abomination</u>. It <u>shall</u> not be accepted. <u>Therefore everyone</u> who eats it shall bear his <u>iniquity</u>, because he has profaned the <u>hallowed offering</u> of the Lord; and that person shall be cut off from his people (NKJV, 1979/1982, Leviticus 19:7).	(ER6) If, <u>however</u>, [cohesion change - concession] it is eaten on the third day, it is <u>spoiled</u> [paraphrase]; it <u>will</u> [emphasis change] not be accepted, <u>and</u> [cohesion change] <u>the one</u> [interpersonal change] who eats it will bear his <u>punishment for iniquity</u> [explicitness change – addition] because he has profaned <u>what is holy</u> [unit shift – phrase to clause] to the Lord. That person will be cut off from his people (NET, Leviticus 19:6).

The biblical term "abomination" is derived from the Latin "abominare", meaning [to deprecate as an ill omen] (Scherman, 1996). It carries a strong moral and religious condemnation, often associated with behaviours that violate divine laws. Similarly, "to spoil" is synonymous with "to destroy" (Young, 1880, pp. 926-927) and implies that the act of consuming the offering has corrupted the sanctity of the sacrifice. In a biblical context, the choice between these terms depends on whether the emphasis is on the severity of the sin ("abomination") or the loss of sanctity and purity ("spoil").

Moreover, we notice the term "iniquity," understood as "human sin" (Brooks, 1893), is conveyed through a pragmatic strategy of explicitness. Here, the translators used the more illustrative noun "punishment" to imply the consequence of the wrongdoing. Furthermore, the noun phrase "hallowed offering" is transposed into the noun clause "what is holy". The term "hallowed," documented as Old English "haligra", fell out of common use around 1500 but was employed in Christian translations to convey the Latin term "sanctificare" (Online Etymology Dictionary). It carries a sense of reverence and sanctity, indicating that the offering is made sacred through a formal process. In contrast, "holy" has a broader connotation of sanctity and reverence, which can refer to a wide range of entities or concepts deemed sacred.

(RT6) Dacă <u>va mânca cineva</u> din ea a treia zi, <u>faptul</u> acesta va fi <u>un lucru urât</u>: jertfa nu va fi primită. Cine va mânca din ea își va purta <u>vina păcatului său</u>, căci <u>necinstește</u> ce a fost închinat Domnului: omul acela <u>va fi</u> nimicit din poporul lui (Cornilescu, 1924/2024, Levitic 19:7).	(RR6) Dacă <u>se va mânca ceva</u> [clause structure change – active to passive voice] din ea a treia zi, <u>fapta</u> [phrase structure change] aceasta va fi <u>o urâciune</u> [unit shift – phrase to word] <u>și,</u> <u>prin urmare</u> [addition – cohesion change], jertfa nu va fi primită. Acela care va mânca din ea își va purta <u>pedeapsa</u> [paraphrase] pentru că a <u>profanat</u> [abstraction change – more concrete] ceea ce este sfânt pentru Domnul; omul acela <u>să fie</u> [phrase structure change – future tense to present subjunctive mood] nimicit din poporul său (NTLR, 2007/2021, Levitic 19:7).

"Dacă va mânca cineva" [If someone will eat it] follows a structure where the subject (someone) is specified and active. Therefore, the sentence emphasizes who might perform the action of eating. In retranslation, "Dacă se va mânca ceva" [If something is to be eaten] uses a passive construction, focusing on the object (something) being acted upon. It emphasizes the action of eating and the object being consumed, with no focus on the subject.

In Romanian, there are some differences between the noun in neutral gender "fapt" – fapte" / "fapturi" and the feminine "faptă" - "fapte". The first term refers to a thing that

happened in reality; circumstance, real event, and is mainly used in a legal context, especially when denoting an event likely to have legal consequences "fapt juridic" (DEXI, 2007, p. 92). The second term refers to a deed or action carried out by someone and is commonly used in the expressions "faptă bună" - "faptă rea" (good deed - bad deed).

The noun phrase "un lucru urât" (definite article + noun + adjective, 'an ugly thing] is more descriptive and general, focusing on the aesthetic or moral quality of the action. Whereas the retranslation "o urâciune" (definite article + noun) is an archaic term that denotes an action inciting animosity from others and signifies a morally reprehensible act that is displeasing to God (MDA2, 2010, p. 1221). From a pragmatic point of view, the tone is much stronger and conveys a sense of deep disapproval or condemnation.

The genitive phrase "vina păcatului său" [the guilt of their sin] undergoes semantic changes, as it is retranslated into a single word: "pedeapsa" [punishment]. The phrase in the translation carries a connotation of moral or spiritual accountability and emphasizes the need for personal repentance and the weight of one's actions. The retranslation might be used in legal, or justice contexts where the focus is on the consequence of an action rather than the internal guilt.

Another difference between the translation and retranslation is the substitution of the more general term "a necinsti", [to dishonor] or [to disgrace], with the more specific verb "a profana," which is primarily used in a religious context and refers to the act of disrespecting things considered sacred.

(ET7) When you <u>reap</u> the harvest of your land, you shall not <u>wholly</u> reap the <u>corners</u> of your field, <u>nor</u> shall you <u>gather</u> the gleanings of your harvest (NKJV, 1979/1982, Leviticus 19:9).	(ER7) When you <u>gather in</u> [abstraction change – concrete to more abstract] the harvest of your land, you must not <u>completely</u> [synonymy] harvest the <u>corner</u> [phrase structure change – singular to plural] of your field, <u>and you must not</u> [cohesion change] <u>gather up</u> [synonymy] the gleanings of your harvest (NET, Leviticus 19:9).

In this example, the first change observed is the substitution of the verb "reap," which specifically refers to harvesting crops that are ready, with the phrasal verb "gather in" which generally describes the act of collecting and bringing in items, including crops, but also applies to gathering scattered objects. Nevertheless, the second time the same verb "reap" appears in ET7, it is retranslated using its synonym "harvest" which shows an intention to maintain the agricultural context and preserve the original meaning. This suggests a deliberate choice by the re-translators to vary the language while still conveying the same concept, likely to avoid repetition. This variation might also reflect a sensitivity to the readers' perception and the way language has evolved over time. By using more specific phrasal verbs such as "gather in" or "gather up" the re-translators may aim to resonate with a contemporary audience, who might find these expressions more relatable.

Another change that caught our attention refers to the usage of the synonym "completely" as a substitute for "wholly". This choice may have been made to avoid potential confusion between the word "wholly" and "holy" when the text is read aloud. Given the phonetic similarity between the two words, especially in a religious context where "holy" is frequently used, the re-translators might have opted for "completely" to ensure clarity and prevent any misunderstanding among listeners.

(RT7) Când veți secera holdele țării, <u>să lași</u> nesecerat un colț din câmpul tău și să nu <u>strângi</u> spicele rămase <u>pe urma secerătorilor</u> (Cornilescu, 1924/2024, Levitic 19:9).	(RR7) Când vei secera holdele țării, <u>să nu seceri până la marginea ogorului tău</u> [paraphrase & explicitness change] și să nu <u>aduni</u> [synonymy] spicele rămase <u>după</u>

120

seceriş [phrase structure change] (NTLR, 2007/2021, Levitic 19:9).

The imperative phrase "să laşi nesecerat un colţ din câmpul tău" [leave a corner of your field unharvested] suggests that a specific portion should be left untouched, similar to the English translation. However, this phrase may introduce ambiguity because it does not specify the size or exact location of the corner to be left unharvested. This lack of precision can lead to varying interpretations, where different readers might understand the instruction differently. Perhaps for this reason, the re-translators decided to paraphrase the sentence: "să nu seceri până la marginea ogorului tău" [do not harvest up to the edge of your land]. This can be seen pragmatically as a more general rule of moderation or self-restraint in harvesting, ensuring that one does not take everything from the field, leaving a margin that could serve others.

Another change that we notice is related to the practice of harvesting. In translation, the phrase "pe urma secerătorilor" [after the harvesters] refers to the agricultural practice of working the land and sheds light on the social life of the Romanian people. The author Ion (1943) describes this practice in his work that summarizes his doctoral thesis and is based on his encounters with Romanian villagers in 1929. Historically, rural communities engaged in a practice known as "claca secerişului" (communal labor) during harvest time, where villagers would come together to work the fields. These gatherings involved calling upon labourers, preparing tools and methods for work, establishing a productive atmosphere, taking meal breaks, resuming work, and eventually ending with a festive mood as evening approached (Ion, 1943, pp. 4-29). This economic necessity in traditional villages fostered strong social bonds among people. In today's world, however, this practice has become predominantly mechanized, and the retranslation captures this lack of social involvement with the phrase "după seceriş" [after the harvest]

(ET8) And you shall not <u>glean</u> your vineyard, <u>nor</u> shall you gather <u>every grape</u> of your vineyard; you shall leave them for the poor and the <u>stranger</u>: I am the Lord your God (NKJV, 1979/1982, Leviticus 19:10).

(ER8) You must not <u>pick your vineyard bare</u> [unit shift – verb to verb phrase], <u>and</u> [cohesion change] you must not gather up <u>the fallen grapes</u> [paraphrase] of your vineyard. You must leave them for the poor and the <u>resident foreigner</u> [unit shift – noun to noun phrase]. I am the Lord your God (NET, Leviticus 19:10).

According to the *Random House Dictionary* (2010), the word "glean" originated around 1350–1400 from Middle English "glenen", derived from Old French "glener", which in turn came from Late Latin "glennāre", likely of Celtic origin, as seen in the Old Irish "do-glenn" [he gathers]. The word refers to the act of collecting leftover crops or grains after the main harvest has been completed. The retranslation "pick up bare" (phrasal verb + adverb) implies collecting everything until nothing is left and is more straightforward and likely to be understood immediately by a modern audience. It also aligns better with how people commonly speak today.

This example illustrates another shift in the vocabulary of the English language. The noun "stranger," which entered the English language in the 15th century with the meaning "not a citizen of a nation" (*Online Etymology Dictionary*), is now primarily understood as someone who is neither a friend nor an acquaintance. To avoid potential confusion, the re-translators opted to replace it with the more precise legal term "resident foreigner," which specifically refers to a person living in a country where they are not a citizen.

(RT8) <u>Nici să nu culegi strugurii</u> rămaşi <u>după cules în via ta</u> şi să nu <u>strângi boabele care vor cădea din ei.</u> Să le laşi <u>săracului şi străinului.</u>

(RR8) <u>Să nu aduni</u> [cohesion change] <u>ciorchinii de struguri</u> [abstraction change – more concrete] rămaşi <u>după culesul viei tale</u> [distribution change - compression] şi să nu

121

Eu sunt Domnul, Dumnezeul <u>vostru</u> (Cornilescu, 1924/2024, Levitic 19:10).	aduni [synonymy] boabele <u>căzute din viţă</u> [unit shift – relative clause to participial phrase], <u>ci</u> [cohesion change - contrast] să le laşi <u>pentru cel sărac şi pentru străin</u> [cohesion change – additional elements]. Eu sunt Domnul, Dumnezeul <u>tău</u> [phrase structure change – plural to singular] (NTLR, 2007/2021, Levitic 19:10).

The phrases "Nici să nu culegi" [nor pick] and "să nu aduni" [do not gather] in Romanian convey similar prohibitive meanings but differ in terms of syntax and semantics. The phrase in the first translation is more syntactically complex because it includes the adverb "nici", which adds emphasis to the prohibition. The verb "culegi" is specific to the act of picking or harvesting, so the prohibition is directed specifically at that action. The structure of the retranslated phrase is more straightforward, consisting only of a present subjunctive verb phrase introduced by "să," which is a common marker for the subjunctive mood [modul conjunctiv] in Romanian. The verb "aduni" has a broader application, making the prohibition more versatile.

Another phrase that the retranslation clarifies is "după cules în via ta" [after the harvest in your vineyard], particularly because the prepositional phrase "în via ta" (preposition + noun + possessive pronoun) at the end seems redundant. In turn, "după culesul viei tale" [after harvesting your vineyard] more effectively conveys the intended meaning by integrating the time and action into a single, more concise expression.

(ET9) You shall not steal, nor deal falsely, nor <u>lie to one another</u>. And you shall not swear <u>by My name falsely, nor</u> shall you profane the name of your God**:** I am the Lord (NKJV, 1979/1982, Leviticus 19:11).	(ER9) You must not steal, you must not <u>tell lies</u> [unit shift – verb to verb phrase], and you must not deal falsely <u>with your fellow citizen</u> [abstraction change – abstract to more concrete]. You must not swear <u>falsely in my name</u> [transposition], <u>so that</u> [cohesion change – purpose clause] you do not profane the name of your God**.** [emphasis change – colon to full stop] I am the Lord (NET, Leviticus 19:11).

The prepositional phrase "with your fellow citizen" (prep. + possessive pron. + noun phrase) replaces the relatively stark formulation "to one another" (prep. + reciprocal pronoun) in the translation to emphasize shared identity and encourage a sense of solidarity. This choice highlights that the person involved in the action is someone who shares the same legal or social status within a country or community. The phrase "with your fellow citizen" is versatile in both British and American English, capable of conveying either respect or contempt depending on context. It is frequently employed by politicians, leaders or activists to foster unity among citizens. Moreover, in legal texts, government documents, and official statements, this term underscores the collective rights and duties inherent among members of a society. The replacement thus not only softens the tone but also strengthens the emphasis on civic solidarity and mutual obligation.

The prepositional phrase "by My name" functions as a modifier for the verb, indicating that the swearing is done by invoking God's name, which suggests a misuse of divine authority. This phrase appears consistently (18 times) throughout the text in connection with the verbs "to swear" (4 times) and "to call" (14 times). However, in the retranslation, a similar phrase, now using the preposition "in My name," is used to signify invoking God's name to affirm the truthfulness of a statement or promise. In *The New English Translation*, the preposition "by" is only used twice to form this type of prepositional phrase, functioning as an adjunct: in Genesis 22:16, where God reaffirms His covenant with Abraham by saying, "I solemnly swear by My own name," and in Jeremiah 44:26, where God declares, "I hereby swear by my own great name," as he vows that the

122

people of Judah in Egypt, following their idolatry, will never again invoke his name in their oaths. This pattern of using "by my own name" in the retranslation underscores the profound solemnity and gravity with which God speaks in moments of pivotal importance.

Another change that occurs in the retranslation is the omission of capitalizing the possessive pronoun "My," which refers to the words of God. In The New King James Version, all such pronouns are capitalized, except when they are part of human speech. In the retranslation, this distinction is no longer maintained. In the past, the common custom was to capitalize the pronouns referring to God, as a sign of reverence. John Seely Hart, an American author known for his extensive work on grammar books, noted in *A Grammar of the English Language* (1873, p. 214) that while some authors excessively scatter capital letters throughout their writing, the pronouns in standard editions of the English Bible should never be printed in this manner. Robert Hudson, editor of the *Christian Writer's Manual of Style* (1953/2016, pp. 239-240), argues that the practice of capitalizing deity pronouns and certain religious terms, which was prevalent in late nineteenth - and early twentieth-century religious publishing, can make a book feel outdated and even irrelevant to contemporary readers.

The decision to capitalize pronouns referring to God appears to be a matter of stylistic choice. Jeffrey Riddle (2024) initially appreciated the capitalization of divine pronouns in the NKJV as a respectful convention. However, he criticizes its use for two reasons: it does not appear in early biblical manuscripts and it imposes an interpretation by the translator that might be best left to the reader (Riddle, 2024, pp. 27-28). The original Hebrew and Greek texts do not follow this practice, as they do not differentiate between capital and lowercase letters (Grudem, 2012, pp. 55-56). Some readers might find capitalized pronouns helpful for identifying references to God in context. For instance, in the verse "Then God went up from him in the place where He talked with him" (NKJV, Genesis 35:13), the capitalized "He" clarifies that the pronoun refers to God. However, one argument against this practice is that it can lead to a visually cluttered text due to the large number of such pronouns (Grudem, 2012, p. 56). In this regard, *Inclusive Language in the Church* (1988) provides insights into contemporary language use that effectively addresses the concerns of the language debate. Nancy Hardesty argues that inclusive language is fitting for Christian theology and worship. She notes that while most publishers have stopped capitalizing pronouns referring to God, this practice is a leftover from older punctuation styles that capitalized far more words than are capitalized today, possibly influenced by the German convention of capitalizing all nouns (Hardesty, 1988, p. 57).

Another change that this paragraph provides refers to the change in cohesion. The original sentence uses a colon (:) after "God" to connect two related clauses, emphasizing a declarative statement ("I am the Lord") as a grounding or authoritative reason for the preceding commands. The sentence starts with "And," which is a coordinating conjunction that ties this command to previous instructions. The use of "nor" connects two negative commands, emphasizing the importance of both prohibitions. The retranslated sentence replaces the colon with a period, splitting the sentence into two separate clauses. This division makes the final statement "I am the Lord" more isolated, standing alone as a conclusive declaration rather than being directly tied to the preceding instructions. The use of "so that" introduces a causal relationship between the two actions, specifying that not swearing falsely will prevent the profanation of God's name. This creates a more explicit link between the actions and their consequences, whereas the original leaves the connection more implicit.

(RT9) Să nu furați și <u>să nu mințiți, nici să nu vă înșelați</u> unii pe alții. Să nu jurați <u>strâmb</u> pe Numele Meu, <u>căci ai necinsti astfel</u> Numele Dumnezeului <u>tău</u>. Eu sunt Domnul (Cornilescu, 1924/2024, Levitic 19:11).	(RR9) Să nu furați<u>, să nu vă purtați cu vicleșug</u> [synonymy] <u>și</u> [cohesion change] să nu <u>vă</u> mințiți <u>unii pe alții</u> [paraphrase]. Să nu jurați <u>fals</u> [synonymy] pe Numele Meu, <u>profanând</u> [cohesion change] Numele Dumnezeului <u>vostru</u>. [phrase structure

123

change – singular to plural]. Eu sunt Domnul
(NTLR, 2007/2021, Levitic 19:11).

The commandment "Să nu vă înșelați unii pe alții" (negative imperative + reflexive pronoun + verb + reciprocal pronoun) uses the verb "înșelați" [to deceive] which implies a deliberate act of misleading someone. From a semantic point of view the phrase implies reciprocity (one person deceiving another and vice versa), highlighting mutual interactions. In the retranslation, "Să nu vă purtați cu vicleșug" (negative imperative + reflexive pronoun + verb + prepositional phrase). The popular adverbial locution (locuțiune adverbială) "cu vicleșug" [with deceit, cunningly] modifies the verb, indicating a certain manner of behaviour rather than a specific action. It has a more abstract and encompassing tone, warning against deceit in a broader sense, focusing on general conduct. This may resonate differently with the audience, encouraging them to consider the integrity of their overall behaviour, not just their interactions with others. Moreover, the idea of reciprocity is transferred to the action of lying, making the warning more direct and interpersonal.

In this case, the expression "a jura strâmb" (to swear falsely), which originates from the Vulgar Latin "strambus", is found 12 times in Cornilescu's translation, while it appears only twice in the NTLR. This phrase is predominantly associated with classical Romanian literature (e.g., the works of C. Negruzzi) and religious contexts (DLRC, 1958, p. 265). In the more recent translation, it has been largely supplanted by the modern expression "a jura fals," a legal term that is more prevalent in contemporary usage. This newer phrase occurs 10 times in the retranslation, whereas it is entirely absent from the original translation. This shift in language reflects a broader evolution towards modernized and contextually relevant terminology in Romanian translations.

Regarding the use of the verb "a profana" [to profane] in the context of disrespecting sacred things, we observe that in the initial Romanian translation this word is not used at all. However, in the retranslation, it appears 17 times, mainly in connection with the holy name of the Lord. If we compare these 17 instances with the first translation, we notice that instead of the verb "a profana," the following alternatives are used: "a pângări" [to desecrate], "a necinsti" [to dishonor], "a huli" [to blaspheme], and "a spurca" [to defile]. These alternatives also appear in the retranslation but in different contexts and formulations. For example, the verb "a pângări" appears 8 times in the Cornilescu edition in relation to the name of the Lord, while in the NTLR, it appears only once, and in two other instances in the context of "casa peste care este chemat Numele Meu" [the house which is called by My name]. Additionally, we observe that the retranslation rectifies the initial error concerning subject-predicate agreement in the concluding clause, specifically addressing the pluralization of the subject.

| (ET10) You shall not <u>cheat</u> your neighbor, nor <u>rob</u> him. <u>The wages of him who is hired shall not remain with you</u> all night until morning. You shall not curse <u>the deaf</u>, nor put a stumbling block before <u>the blind</u>, but shall fear your God: I am the Lord (NKJV, 1979/1982, Leviticus 19:13). | (ER10) You must not <u>oppress</u> [synonymy] your neighbor or <u>commit robbery against</u> [unit shift – word to phrase] your neighbor. <u>You must not withhold</u> [abstraction change – more concrete] <u>the wages of the hired laborer</u> [paraphrase] overnight until morning. You must not curse <u>a deaf person</u> [phrase structure change] or put a stumbling block in front of <u>a blind person</u> [phrase structure change]. You must fear your God; I am the Lord (NET, Leviticus 19:13). |

The first change highlighted in this instance pertains to the semantic distinctions between "to cheat" and "to oppress." The verb "to cheat" generally means to deceive someone to gain an unfair advantage, involving elements of dishonesty and manipulation. In contrast, "to oppress" is a term commonly found in legal contexts, referring to the unjust exercise of

124

authority over individuals, often resulting in their suffering (*Collins Thesaurus of the English Language*, 1995/2002). While cheating refers to everyday interpersonal interactions, oppression usually involves a broader or institutional level of control that can impact large groups over extended periods.

Another instance of this type of shift is seen in the transition from the verb "to rob" to the verb phrase "to commit robbery", used in formal or legal contexts. The latter phrase underscores the criminal act as one with legal consequences and is frequently used in discussions about criminal justice and legal proceedings.

The semantic strategy of abstraction change in rendering the phrase "remain with you" as the more formal verb "withhold" shifts the focus to the deliberate action of holding something back, thereby emphasizing intentionality and control. Another adjustment made in the retranslation involves substituting the somewhat archaic relative phrase "him who is hired" with the more concise and formal noun phrase "hired laborer." This newer phrase is more straightforward and modern, and it is frequently used in discussions about labour rights, employment contracts, and practical matters related to hired workers.

Additionally, from the standpoint of using more considerate and formal language, the collective terms "the deaf" and "the blind," which refer to groups as a whole, are replaced with the noun phrases "a deaf person" and "a blind person." These latter expressions focus on the individual and their experience, recognizing them as a person first with a disability as just one aspect of their identity. In contrast, the former terms are more collective and may generalize the experiences of people within these groups.

(RT10) Să nu-l asupreşti pe aproapele tău şi să nu storci nimic de la el prin silă. Să nu opreşti până a doua zi plata celui tocmit cu ziua. Să nu vorbeşti de rău pe un surd şi să nu pui înainte unui orb nimic care să-l poată face să cadă, ci să te temi de Dumnezeul tău. Eu sunt Domnul (Cornilescu, 1924/2024, Levitic 19:13).

(RR10) Să nu-ţi înşeli [abstraction change – more concrete] semenul [synonymy] şi nici să nu-l jefuieşti [unit shift – phrase to word]; să nu opreşti până a doua zi plata zilerului [synonymy]. Să nu vorbeşti de rău pe cel surd [phrase structure change – indefinite article to demonstrative adjective] şi să nu pui o piatră [paraphrase] înaintea celui orb [phrase structure change], ci să te temi de Dumnezeul tău. Eu sunt Domnul (NTLR, 2007/2021, Levitic 19:13).

One noticeable difference in this passage is the replacement of the phrase "aproapele tău" [your neighbor] with "semenul" [fellow human]. Interestingly, the NTLR translation does not use this articulated noun at all, whereas Cornilescu's translation uses the term "aproapele" 48 times and "semenul" 7 times. Although the expression found in Cornilescu's translation of the divine commandment, "să iubeşti pe aproapele tău ca pe tine însuţi" [to love your neighbor as yourself], is widely recognized today as a call for compassion, patience, and forgiveness, the noun "semenul" seems to create a greater awareness of those around us in the Romanian language. Derived from the Latin word "similis", which refers to similarity in traits and appearance among people, "semenul" emphasizes our shared humanity (DEX, 2016, p. 1099). This contrasts with the term "aproapele," which primarily suggests proximity, highlighting the concept of "aproape" [near] as opposed to "departe" [far].

Furthermore, the phrases "să nu storci nimic de la el prin silă" [do not squeeze anything out of him by force] and "să nu-l jefuieşti" [do not rob him] exhibit several linguistic differences. The latter is a more straightforward and direct prohibition, suitable for clear and unambiguous communication. It has a legal connotation, as "robbery" is a criminal offense, making it effective in contexts where the intent is to lay down a clear rule or law.

The phrases "un surd" [a deaf person], and "un orb" [a blind person] refer to any deaf or blind person; the meaning is general and nonspecific. In contrast, "cel surd, cel orb" [the deaf

person, the blind person] are more specific and can imply a certain familiarity or emphasis on the individual being referred to. In Romanian, the use of a demonstrative pronominal adjective often conveys an added level of respect or reverence toward the person or object described by the noun. For instance, "cele sfinte" refers to the Holy Communion, "Cel de sus" denotes God, and "cele trebuincioase" signifies the essential needs of daily life.

Conclusion

After analysing the two biblical text fragments, we can conclude how language evolves over time and compare the trends of retranslation in English with those in Romanian. The historical context is important, as it influences the need for language updates, particularly because the time span between the initial translation and retranslation is longer for Romanian than for English. In total, we counted 42 translation strategies employed across the English examples and 45 in the Romanian retranslation. The table below shows the results of our strategy count, arranged in descending order, from the highest to the lowest number.

Table 2

Summary of Strategies Count

English Translation	Romanian Translation
	1. Phrase Structure Change: 10 occurrences
1. Cohesion Change: 10 occurrences	2. Synonymy: 9 occurrences
2. Unit Shift: 8 occurrences	3. Cohesion Change: 8 occurrences
3. Phrase Structure Change: 5 occurrences	4. Paraphrase: 7 occurrences
4. Synonymy: 4 occurrences	5. Abstraction Change: 3 occurrences
5. Abstraction Change: 4 occurrences	6. Unit Shift: 3 occurrences
6. Paraphrase: 3 occurrences	7. Transediting: 2 occurrences
7. Emphasis Change: 3 occurrences	8. Distribution Change: 1 occurrence
8. Interpersonal Change: 1 occurrence	9. Clause Structure Change: 1 occurrence
9. Explicitness Change: 1 occurrence	10. Emphasis Change: 1 occurrence
10. Transposition: 1 occurrence	
11. Distribution Change: 1 occurrence	
12. Clause Structure Change: 1 occurrence	

Cohesion change is applied with similar frequency in both translations, which suggests that both retranslations aim to enhance the text's logical consistency. Nevertheless, the English version uses a broader variety of cohesion strategies (e.g., purpose clauses, concession, and ellipsis). The English translation makes far more extensive use of unit shifts, demonstrating a higher frequency of transforming words, phrases, and clauses. This reflects a trend towards clarity, precision, and relevance to modern readers. For instance, "to rob" has transitioned to the more formal "to commit robbery," emphasizing legal implications, "remain with you" has been rendered as "withhold," highlighting deliberate intent, and collective terms like "the deaf" and "the blind" have been replaced with "a deaf person" and "a blind person," focusing on individual experiences rather than generalizations.

Paraphrasing is much more prominent in the Romanian version, suggesting a tendency toward rewording or reformulating ideas. For example, with "vina păcatului său" [the guilt of their sin] becoming "pedeapsa" [punishment] increases specificity, and "nimic care să-l poată face să cadă" [anything that could make him fall] being concretized as "să nu pui o piatră" [do not place a rock] offers a more tangible image for the reader. Transediting, which involves a more liberal reworking of the text, is only found in the Romanian retranslation, suggesting a stronger tendency for modification in that version. This comparison highlights different priorities and strategies in each translation, with the Romanian retranslation focusing more on linguistic reformulation, while the English translation emphasizes structural and cohesive adjustments.

The Romanian retranslation of the Bible exhibits notable trends reflecting both linguistic evolution and shifts in contextual emphasis. One major change is the transition from terms like "aproapele tău" [your neighbor] to "semenul" [fellow human]. The latter, rooted in the Latin "similis", emphasizes shared humanity, in contrast to "aproapele", which connotes proximity. This shift suggests a move towards a more universal and relational understanding of human interaction.

Linguistic changes also highlight a trend towards clarity and modernity. For instance, "să nu storci nimic de la el prin silă" [do not squeeze anything out of him by force] has been replaced with "să nu-l jefuiești" [do not rob him], a more direct term with legal connotations, enhancing both clarity and specificity. Similarly, the retranslation opts for "a profana" [to profane] instead of older terms like "a pângări" [to desecrate], aligning with contemporary usage and emphasizing respect for the sacred.

The retranslation of the Bible into contemporary English reflects a trend towards clarity, precision, and relevance to modern readers. The evolution in language use underscores a shift from traditional expressions to more accessible and straightforward terminology. For instance, the verb "to cheat" has been replaced with "to oppress" to capture a broader and more systemic sense of injustice.

In stylistic choices, we noticed another important difference, the capitalization of divine pronouns has been dropped, aligning with contemporary preferences for less formal text presentation, while still maintaining reverence for sacred references. Moreover, the English retranslation has modernized vocabulary and expressions, replacing terms like "glean" with "pick up bare" and "stranger" with "resident foreigner" to ensure contemporary comprehension. Variations in terms like "abomination" and "spoil" reflect shifts in emphasizing severity versus the loss of sanctity.

Overall, these changes illustrate a broader tendency in modern Bible translations to enhance readability and accessibility, aligning the ancient text with current linguistic norms and cultural sensitivities while preserving its core messages.

References:

Academia Română. (2010). *Micul dicționar academic [*The small academic dictionary] (MDA, Vols. I-II). București: Univers Enciclopedic.

Academia Republicii Populare Române. (1958). *Dicționarul limbii române literare contemporane [*The dictionary of contemporary literary Romanian language] (Vol. I–IV). București: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române.

Berman, A. (1990). La retraduction comme espace de traduction [Retranslation as space of translation]. *Palimpsestes*, 13, 1-7. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/palimpsestes.596

Bible Central. (2021). *Israel, Israelites, or Children of Israel*. Bible Central. https://biblecentral.info/people/israel-israelites-or-children-of-israel/, accesat la 16.07.2024

Bible Gateway. (n.d.). *Bible Gateway*. https://www.biblegateway.com/, accesat la 15.06.2024

Branzai, D. (2013, January 19). *Jertfele* [The sacrifices]. Scripturile. https://scripturile.wordpress.com/2013/01/19/jertfele/, accesat la 15.06.2024

Brooks, P. (1893). *The mystery of iniquity: And other sermons.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Conțac, E. (2011). *Studii teologice* [Theological studies]. București: Institutul Teologic Penticostal.

Cornilescu, D. (2024). *Biblia* [The Bible]. Oradea: Societatea Biblică din România. Original work published 1924.

Diaconu, I. (2018). Începutul traducerii și publicării Bibliei în limba română- privire de ansamblu asupra secolului al XVI-lea [The beginning of the translation and publication of the Bible in Romanian - an overview of the 16th century]. *TheoRhēma, 13*(2), 123-141.

Diaconu, I. (2019). Începutul traducerii și publicării Bibliei în limba română: privire de ansamblu asupra secolului al XVII-lea [The beginning of the translation and publication of the Bible in Romanian - an overview of the 17th century]. *TheoRhēma*, 14(1), 129-149.

Dima, E., Cobeţ, D., Manea, L., Dănilă, A., & Botoşineanu, L. (2007). *Dicționar explicativ ilustrat al limbii române (DEXI) [Illustrated explanatory dictionary of the Romanian language (DEXI)]*. Chișinău: Gunivas & Arc.

Du-Nour M. (1995). Retranslation of children's books as evidence of changes of norms. *Target. International Journal of Translation Studies, 7*(2), 327-346.

for. (n.d.) *American Heritage dictionary of the English Language* (5th ed.). (2011). https://www.thefreedictionary.com/for, accesat la 16.07.2024

Gambier, Y. (1994). La retraduction, retour et détour [Retranslation, return and détour]. *Meta*, *39*(3), 413-417.

glean. (n.d.) *Random House Kernerman Webster's college dictionary*. (2010). Retrieved August 28 2024 from https://www.thefreedictionary.com/glean.

Grudem, W. (2012). The English standard version. In A. J. Köstenberger & D. Croteau (Eds.), *Which Bible translation should I use?* (pp. 40-77). Nashville: B&H Publishing Group.

hallowed. (n.d.). *Online etymology dictionary*. https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=hallowed, accesat la 16.07.2024

Hardesty, N. (1988). *Inclusive language in the Church.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Harper, D. (n.d.). *Israelite*. Etymonline. https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=israelite, accesat la 16.07.2024

Hart, J. S. (1873). *A grammar of the English language: With an analysis of the sentence.* New York: Eldredge & Brother.

Hudson, R. (Ed.). (2016). *The Christian writer's manual of style* (4th ed.). Nashville: Zondervan. Original work published 1953.

Ionică, I. (1943). *Dealu Mohului: Ceremonia agrară a cununii în Ţara Oltului [Mohului hill: The agrarian ceremony of the harvest wreath in Ţara Oltului]*. București: Tipografia „Bucovina" I.E. Torouţiu.

Institutul de Lingvistică "Iorgu Iordan - Al. Rosetti." (2016). *DEX - Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române* [The explanatory dictionary of the Romanian language]. București: Editura Univers Enciclopedic. Academia Română.

Koskinen K, Paloposki O. (2003). Retranslations in the age of digital reproduction. *Cadernos de Tradução, 1*(11), 19-38. DOI:10.5007/6175

McAdams, W. (2024, January 29). The difference between idols and false gods. *Radically Christian*. https://radicallychristian.com/the-difference-between-idols-and-false-gods/, accesat la 16.07.2024

Metzger, B. M. (2001). *The Bible in Translation: Ancient and English Versions.* Ada: Baker Academic.

Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating.* Leiden: E. J. Brill.

oppress. (2002). *Collins Thesaurus of the English Language – Complete and unabridged* (2nd Ed.). Original work published 1995. https://www.thefreedictionary.com/oppress, accesat la 16.07.2024

revere. (n.d.) *Collins English dictionary – Complete and unabridged* (12th Ed.). https://www.thefreedictionary.com/revere, accesat la 16.07.2024

Riddle, J. T. (2024). Five questions regarding the New King James Version. *Bible League Quarterly*, (498), 27-35.

Robinson, D. (1999). Retranslation and ideosomatic drift. https://www.scribd.com/document/235766851/Douglas-Robinson-Retranslation-and-the-Ideosomatic-Drift, accesat la 16.07.2024

Scherman, R. N. (1996). The *stone edition: The Chumash.* Rahway: ArtScroll Mesorah Publications.

Scott, C. (2018). *The work of literary translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Societatea Biblică Interconfesională. (2019). *Noul Testament: Traducere după texte originale grecești. / The New Testament: Translation from the original Greek texts.* București: Editura Societății Biblice Interconfesionale din România.

Stranger. (n.d.). *Online etymology dictionary*. https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=stranger

The Holy Bible: New King James Version. (1982). Nashville: Thomas Nelson. Original work published 1979.

Thomas Nelson Bibles. (n.d.). *NET Bible.* Thomas Nelson Bibles. https://www.thomasnelsonbibles.com/net-bible/, accesat la 16.07.2024

Tian, C. (2017). Retranslation theories: A critical perspective. *English Literature and Language Review, 3*(1), 1-11.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Xu, X. (2024). A literature review on the research and development of Chinese and Western re-translation. *IRA-International Journal of Education & Multidisciplinary Studies* (ISSN 2455-2526), *20*(1), 61-79. https://dx.doi.org/10.21013/jems.v20.n1.p4

Young, R. (1880). *Analytical concordance to the Bible on an entirely new plan.* Michigan: University of Michigan Press