



The translation of ‘spirit’ and ‘soul’ in the Mandarin Bible Union Version

Clara Ho-yan Chan

The Chinese University of Hong Kong (Shenzhen)

clarachan@cuhk.edu.cn

DOI: 10.12807/ti.109202.2017.a06

Abstract: This study aims to analyse the Chinese translation of ‘spirit’ and ‘soul’ in the Mandarin Bible Union Version published in 1919, in order to elucidate both the translation principles used in this Chinese Bible and a controversial issue in Christian theology. The issue in question relates to whether a whole person is made up of ‘two substantive entities’ (‘spirit/soul’ and ‘body’), or ‘three substantive entities’ (‘spirit’, ‘soul’ and ‘body’). Through an in-depth discussion of these Biblical concepts in the Chinese translated New Testament with reference to the Greek originals, the study aims to clarify the various methods by which the terms are translated. The translation of these terms can provide a new perspective on the Chinese Bible’s adoption of particular translation approaches and the ‘new language style’ of the early 20th century, which allows a better understanding of this Bible’s special role in the development of Modern Chinese.

Keywords: Bible translation, Chinese, Union Version, New Testament, theology

1. Introduction

The issue of spirit, soul and body has been controversial in Christian theology. The main division lies between the position that takes a whole person to be made up of ‘two substantive entities’ (‘spirit’ (πνεῦμα)/‘soul’ (ψυχή) and ‘body’ (σῶμα)), and that which considers it to consist of ‘three substantive entities’ (‘spirit’ (πνεῦμα), ‘soul’ (ψυχή) and ‘body’ (σῶμα)). While the controversy lingers on, the well-received Mandarin Bible Union Version (1890–1919) (UV) should shed some light on how such important theological terms and concepts have been shaped in the Chinese Christian community. Despite frequent calls for its retranslation because of mistranslations and language change, the Chinese UV, published early in 1919, remains the predominant version used by Chinese Christian churches. This is significant to Christianity in China in that it directly exerts great influence on Chinese readers’ outlook on spiritual matters, and some translated key concepts may diverge from their original meanings in Hebrew and Greek. In this regard, in order to make sense of the translation end product, it is essential to understand the translation strategies as well as some of the historical background of the

UV. As a new exploration of the relationship between translation and theology, this study focuses on the New Testament and examines the contextual meanings of the terms ‘spirit’ and ‘soul’ in the Chinese UV against the Greek original, before moving on to the missionaries’ translation principles and strategies. The selection of the New Testament rather than the Old Testament is due to the Christian understanding of the progressive revelatory nature of the Bible, which means that the full understanding of God’s redemption of mankind in the former is developed from the latter. While the Old Testament presents signs, rituals and legal obligations, the New Testament explains their spiritual significance (Ramm, 1980, p. 103). Therefore the following investigation of spirit and soul based on New Testament passages can lay a good foundation for a further study of the entire Bible.

Some background on the translation of the UV follows. Considered “the most successful translation into *baihua*, the Mandarin vernacular” (Wickeri, 1995, p. 129), the UV became more popular than the two other union versions, written in *shen wenli* (high classical language) and *qian wenli* (easy classical language), that the Missionary Conference in Shanghai also decided to produce in 1890. To the present day, this Mandarin Bible has enjoyed supreme status among most Chinese Christian churches and readers all over the world, despite the appearance of many other Chinese translated Bibles (Chong, 2000). Regarding its Greek textual basis, the UV’s organisational rules for translation (Article four) state that “the text that underlies the revised English versions of the Old and New Testaments be made the basis, with the privilege of any deviations in accordance with the Authorized Version” (Zetzsche, 1999, p. 200). This means that the UV translation is based mainly on the same Greek text as the English Revised Version, with the Authorised Version (King James Version) as the final authority if differences occur. Therefore it is thought that the UV was rendered as close as possible to the English Revised Version “to avoid much misunderstanding in case diglots were published” (Kramers, 1956, p. 159). In his analysis of the translation approaches of five Chinese Bibles, Strandenaes (1987, pp. 84–93) considers that the UV’s main principle is ‘formal equivalence’, and that ‘functional equivalence’ is only supplementary. Also, according to Zetzsche (1999, p. 365), two of the three UV committees (the Mandarin and easy classical committees) used the literal approach in order to produce one ‘authorised version’. Therefore, even figures of speech from the original Greek are rendered literally (Broomhall, 1934, pp. 93–94). The reason for this is that the Bible is a sacred text which readers meditate upon word by word (Chen, 1979, pp. 21–22). The five main translators on the translation committee of the UV were the missionaries Calvin Wilson Mateer, Chauncey Goodrich, Frederick William Baller, George Sydney Owen and Spencer Lewis. Of these, only Chauncey Goodrich was alive when the UV was published in 1919.

2. Data and methodology

The study starts with a historical description of the controversy surrounding ‘two substantive entities’ and ‘three substantive entities’ in theological literature. This will then be followed by a detailed survey of the terms’ definitions from theological and secular dictionaries, so that they may be compared on the basis of any common or similar characteristics. All instances

of ‘spirit’ and ‘soul’ in the New Testament will be closely examined and assigned a dictionary definition according to contextual meanings and their Chinese translations will then be analysed. On this basis, the various strategies and methods to translate the terms, and discrepancies between the Chinese translation and the source language will also be revealed. The study’s approach, distinct from past theological studies, is based on the translator’s perspective that context is crucial to the determination of the meaning of a lexical item. Therefore, while theologians examine the above issues by referring to a few example verses, this study analyses all the verses of the New Testament where the Biblical terms appear so that their meanings can be exposed (Osei-Bonsu, 1987). Also, while theologians seem only to consider dictionary definitions in isolation (Zhai, 2008, pp. 108–111), this study analyses them in conjunction with the verses in which they appear. Of course, given this broadness of research method, it will not focus on different interpretations of the verses as do other theological studies. This is a limitation of the paper.

For the sake of accurate counting of the terms, the study uses the *Chinese Union Version with New Punctuation* published in 1988, which is available in digital format online. This version, as its name suggests, remains the same in content as the 1919 UV, except for the use of modern punctuation marks, and other changes including use of poem formats and replacement of old characters such as *gou* (穀) (enough) by *gou* (夠) (enough), *cai* (纔) (just) by *cai* (才) (just) and the generic pronoun *ta* (他) by masculine *ta* (他), feminine *ta* (她) and neuter *ta* (牠/它) (Hong Kong Bible Society 2005). The Greek and English Bible examples in this analysis are taken from the New Testament Greek text with critical apparatus (1904) edited by Eberhard Nestle (Nestle) on which the UV is based, and the English Revised Version 1885 edited by Charles Ellicott (ERV)(Ellicott, 1885) respectively. All Chinese terms are followed by English gloss translations.

Last but not least, throughout the paper, the ordering of ‘spirit’ and ‘soul’ is in keeping with the Chinese word order in *linghun* (靈魂) (spirit-soul) and that used in the Bible (e.g. 1Th 5:23). In the interests of brevity, when mentioning Bible verses that do not involve translational issues, English/Chinese only will be used to avoid repetition in Greek.

3. Controversy of *πνεῦμα* (spirit) and *ψυχή* (soul) and Chinese translations

3.1 Theological models of the constitution of human nature by two/three substantive entities

Understandings of human nature that are constituted by two or three substantive entities can be termed ‘dichotomous’ and ‘trichotomous’ respectively. Dichotomists and trichotomists agree on the material nature of the human body, and also both disagree with monism, which does not finely distinguish any components apart from the body. However, on the basis of the New Testament, trichotomists make a clear distinction between three elements of human nature, as opposed to that found in the book of Genesis in the Old Testament. The following elaborates on both views and the development thereof.

Dichotomists understand human nature as being formed of two constituent elements, one physical and the other spiritual. This concept was developed from Plato’s style of Greek dualism, which regards the body as evil and mortal in contrast to the goodness and immortality of the soul. In modern

times, theologians Augustus Strong and Louis Berkhof, who made significant reform to the Systematic Theology of the early twentieth century are both supporters of this view (Berkhof, 1996; Strong, 1907). Dichotomists usually position themselves against trichotomists by upholding the idea of interchangeable use of the terms ‘soul’ and ‘spirit’. This two-fold, rather than three-fold view of human nature is supported by some Biblical texts in which both terms are used to represent emotions, life-giving events and life after death (Ecc 12:7; Lk 8:55; Ro 8:16), and body and soul together assemble the whole person (3Jn 1:2) (Berkhof, 1996, p. 183).

In contrast, trichotomists argue that humans are tripartite beings, a combination of spirit, soul and body. The soul and spirit are different in both nature and their utility (Enns, 2008, p. 318). Church fathers who advocated this view include Clement of Alexandria and his student Origen. During the reformation period, Martin Luther (1956, p. 21) interpreted Luke 1:46 as indicating that humans have three parts. The trichotomous view reached a peak in the nineteenth century in works such as John B. Heard’s *The Tripartite Nature of Man* (Heard, 1875), German theologian John T. Beck’s *Outlines of Biblical Psychology* (Beck, 1877) and Franz Delitzsch’s *A System of Biblical Psychology* (Delitzsch, 1977). The Chinese Christian writer Watchman Nee (Nee, 1968) in the twentieth century has also contributed meaningful discussion on this trichotomy. The key scriptures which endorse this view are 1 Corinthians 2:11, 1 Corinthians 15:44, 1 Thessalonians 5:23 and Hebrews 4:12, where possession of a spirit endows humans with a higher status than animals (Clark, 1984, p. 185).

3.2 Dictionary meanings of πνεῦμα (spirit) and ψυχή (soul)

To lay a foundation for an analysis of πνεῦμα (spirit) and ψυχή (soul) in the Bible that can assist in resolving the issue of ‘dichotomy’ versus ‘trichotomy’, this section mainly surveys the dictionary meanings of πνεῦμα (spirit) and ψυχή (soul) in three authoritative Greek-English lexicons, for a basic conceptual understanding. These definitions will be used to identify and classify the two terms in the Greek source text, as well as in the UV. The first lexicon is *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (BDAG)* (2001), which features an extraordinary collection of word entries relating to the Bible and Greek literature from the classical to modern periods. The second is *A Greek English Lexicon with a Revised Supplement (LSJ)*, which provides comprehensive coverage of the work of ancient Greek authors and texts from papyri and other inscriptions from 1200BC to 1900AD. The last one, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains (L & N)* (1989), is a current Greek theological lexicon which organises words into themes and sub-themes according to their distinctions in semantic fields.

Because these dictionary definitions of terms may differ from their meanings in the Bible texts, a second definition is added, namely (Ib) for πνεῦμα (spirit) which is comparable to (Ib) for ψυχή (soul); and (IVc) for ψυχή (soul) which is comparable to (IVc) for πνεῦμα (spirit) in order to balance and reflect their meanings in actual usage. Table 1 below summarises the two terms’ definitions. Notes are inserted to indicate the characteristics of the definitions. It should be emphasised that while some of the definitions of the two terms bear similarities (i.e. Ib, II and IVa, IVb and IVc), others do not (i.e. Ia and III).

Table 1: Dictionary definitions of *πνεύμα* (spirit) and *ψυχή* (soul) with notes on features

	<i>πνεύμα</i> (spirit)	<i>ψυχή</i> (soul)
I. Human	a. Life / immaterial part b. Immaterial part needs salvation [Note: NOT part of the lexicon definitions but may occur in Bible]	a. Life / persons b. Immaterial part that needs salvation
II. Human	Will & emotions (Note: NOT directly concerning Divine matters as in IV)	Will & emotions (Note: NOT directly concerning Divine matters as in IV)
III. Living & non-living things	Wind / breath	Animals
IV. God & spiritual matters	a. God b. Spiritual beings c. God's being as controlling influence, with focus on association with humans	a. Nil b. Nil c. God's being as controlling influence, with focus on association with humans [Note: NOT part of the lexicon definitions but may occur in Bible]

3.3 Chinese translations of *πνεῦμα* (spirit) and *ψυχή* (soul)

This subsection will discuss how the two terms *πνεῦμα* (spirit) and *ψυχή* (soul) are translated into Chinese based on their dictionary meanings in s.3.2. This analysis of the meanings of *πνεῦμα* (spirit) and *ψυχή* (soul) according to the source Greek text and the translated text can provide insight into the long debate over whether humans are made up of two or three substantive entities and the Chinese understanding of this issue. It is understood that, in the Chinese version, *πνεῦμα* (spirit) and *ψυχή* (soul) are both translated as the compound word *linghun* (spirit-soul), resulting in no distinction between the two terms (Heard, 2008, p. 2).

Table 2 summarises the four definitions with Chinese translations and at least one example verse provided in brackets. The main findings are that, of 409 instances of *πνεύμα* (spirit) in the Greek NT, the majority fall under definition IVa, that is, those that refer to God. This category is primarily translated as *ling* (靈), *shengling* (聖靈), with other translations including *lingyi* (靈意), *jingyi* (精意), *wanling* (萬靈), *lingxing* (靈性), *xinling* (心靈) and *shuhuling de* (屬乎靈的). Furthermore, 64 instances fall under the definition of IVb, which refers to spiritual beings, mostly translated as *gui* (鬼) / *guihun* (鬼魂), *ling* (靈) / *zhuling* (諸靈) / *shu lingqi de* (屬靈氣的). Definition IVc has 59 instances, which describe God's being as controlling influence with focus on its association with humans. The main translations used in this category are *ling* (靈) and *shuling de* (屬靈的) and other translations include *linghun* (靈魂), *xinling* (心靈), *xin* (心) / *xinli* (心裏) and *xinzhi* (心志). A total of 39 instances fall into Definitions I and II, which relate to humans. Of the 23 instances in definition I, those referring to life or immaterial part account for 16, variously translated as *ling* (靈) (spirit), *linghun* (靈魂), *xin* (心), *xinling* (心靈), *lingxing de* (靈性的) / *shuling de* (屬靈的), and *qi* (氣) (1 instance). There are 7 instances referring to the immaterial part of humans that needs salvation, translated as *linghun* (靈魂)

and *lingxing* (靈性). Definition II which relates to human will and emotions involves 13 instances, which are mostly translated as *xin* (心) / *xinli* (心裏) (12 instances). There are five instances in definition III describing wind or breath.

Of 103 instances of *ψυχή* (soul) appearing in the Greek NT, more than half of them (58 instances) refer to definition Ia, that is, human life or people. These are mostly translated as *shengming* (生命)/*xingming* (性命)/*ming* (命), and *huoren* (活人) / *ren* (人) / *renren* (人人) / *renkou* (人口) / *fan bu tingcong na xianzhi de* (凡不聽從那先知的) / *ni* (你). Also, 13 instances fall under the definition of Ib, which concerns salvation and immortality of soul, which are all translated as *linghun* (靈魂). The definition of II, which relates to one's will and emotions, also has 16 instances, which are mostly translated as *xin* (心) / *xinli* (心裏). Under the definition IV, the 14 instances include translations of *xin* (心) / *xinli* (心裏) / *xinzhi* (心志), *xing* (性), *linghun* (靈魂) and *hun* (魂). As with the translation of 'spirit', definition III, also commands the fewest instances, with only 2, both linked with 'life' (ζωή).

Table 2: Dictionary definitions and Chinese translations of *πνεῦμα* (spirit) and *ψυχή* (soul):

	<i>πνεῦμα</i> (spirit)(409)	<i>ψυχή</i> (soul)(103)
I. Human	<p>a. <u>Life / immaterial part</u> (16)</p> <p>(i) <i>ling</i> (靈) (5) (Jn 3:6)</p> <p>(ii) <i>linghun</i> (靈魂) (2) (Lk 8:55, Jas 2:26)</p> <p>(iii) <i>xin</i> (心) (3) (1Co 5:3)</p> <p>(iv) <i>xinling</i> (心靈) (1) (Lk 1:80)</p> <p>(v) <i>shuling de</i> (屬靈的) / <i>lingxing de</i> (靈性的) (3) (1Co 9:11, 1Co 15:44)</p> <p>(vi) <i>qi</i> (氣) (1) (Mt 27:50)</p> <p>b. <u>Immaterial part that needs salvation</u> (7) [Note: NOT in the lexicons' definitions but possible to occur in Bible]</p> <p>(i) <i>linghun</i> (靈魂) (6) (Lk 23:46)</p> <p>(ii) <i>lingxing</i> (靈性) (1) (1Pe 4:6)</p>	<p>a. <u>Life / persons</u> (58)</p> <p>(i) <i>shengming</i> (生命) (19) (Mt 6:25)</p> <p>(ii) <i>xingming</i> (性命) (9) (Mt 2:20)</p> <p>(iii) <i>ming</i> (命) (14) (Mt 20:28)</p> <p>(iv) <i>huoren</i> (活人) / <i>ren</i> (人) / <i>renren</i> (人人) / <i>renkou</i> (人口) / <i>fan...de</i> (凡...的) / <i>ni</i> (你) (11) (Ac 2:43, Ac 3:23, Ro 13:1, 1Co 15:45, Rev 18:13, Rev 18:14)</p> <p>(vi) <i>linghun</i> (靈魂) (6) (Ac 20:10)</p> <p>b. <u>Immaterial part that needs salvation</u> (13)</p> <p>(i) <i>linghun</i> (靈魂) (13) (Lk 21:19)</p>
II. Human	<p><u>Will & emotions</u> (13) (Note: NOT directly concerning Divine matters as in IV)</p> <p>(i) <i>xin</i> (心) / <i>xinli</i> (心裏) (12) (Mt 5:3, 2Co 2:13)</p> <p>(ii) <i>ling</i> (靈) (1) (1Co 2:11)</p>	<p><u>Will & emotions</u> (16) [Note: NOT directly concerning Divine matters as in IV]</p> <p>(i) <i>xin</i> (心) / <i>xinli</i> (心裏) (12) (Lk 2:35, Mt 12:18)</p> <p>(ii) <i>youyibuding</i> (猶疑不定) (1) (Ac 4:32)</p> <p>(iii) <i>yi</i> (意) (1) (Jn 10:24)</p>
III. Living & non-living things	<p><u>Wind / breath</u> (5)</p> <p>(i) <i>qi</i> (氣) / <i>shengqi</i> (生氣) (3) (Rev 11:11, 2Th 2:8)</p> <p>(ii) <i>feng</i> (風) (2) (Jn 3:8)</p>	<p><u>Animals</u> (2)</p> <p>(i) <i>huowu</i> (活物) (2) (Rev 16:3)</p>
IV. God & Spiritual matters	<p>a. <u>God</u> (245)</p> <p>(i) <i>ling</i> (靈) (127) (Mt 1:18)</p> <p>(ii) <i>shengling</i> (聖靈) (110) (Ro 8:26)</p> <p>(iii) <i>lingyi</i> (靈意) (2) (Rev 11:8)</p> <p>(iv) <i>jingyi</i> (精意) (2) (2Co 3:6)</p>	<p>a. Nil</p> <p>b. Nil</p> <p>c. <u>God's being as controlling influence, with focus on association with humans</u> (14) [Note: NOT in the</p>

<p>(v) <i>wanling</i> (萬靈) (1) (Heb 12:9) (vi) <i>lingxing</i> (靈性) (1) (1Pe 3:18) (vii) <i>xinling</i> (心靈) (2) (Ro 7:6) (viii) <i>shuhuling de</i> (屬乎靈的) (1) (Ro 7:14) b. Spiritual beings (64) (i) <i>gui</i> (鬼) / <i>guihun</i> (鬼魂) (39) (Mt 8:16, Ac 23:8) (ii) <i>ling</i> (靈) / <i>zhuling</i> (諸靈) / <i>shulingqi de</i> (屬靈氣的) (20) (Mk 3:29, 1Co 12:10, Eph 6:12) (iii) <i>xieling</i> (邪靈) (2) (Eph 2:2) (iv) <i>hun</i> (魂) (2) (Lk 24:37) (v) <i>jingqi</i> (精氣) (1) (e.g. Lk 4:33) c. God's being as controlling influence, with focus on association with humans (59) (i) <i>ling</i> (靈) (18) (1Pe 2:5) (ii) <i>shuling de</i> (屬靈的) (15) (1Co 3:1) (iii) <i>linghun</i> (靈魂) (2) (2Co 7:1) (iv) <i>xinling</i> (心靈) (7) (Mt 26:41) (v) <i>xin</i> (心) / <i>xinli</i> (心裏) (14) (2Ti 1:7, Phm 1:25) (vi) <i>xinzhi</i> (心志) (3) (Eph 4:23)</p>	<p><i>lexicons' definitions but possible to occur in Bible]</i> (i) <i>xin</i> (心) / <i>xinli</i> (心裏) / <i>xinzhi</i> (心志) (7) (Ac 14:22; 1Pe 1:22) (ii) <i>xing</i> (性) (3) (Mt 22:37) (iii) <i>linghun</i> (靈魂) (2) (1Pe 2:11) (iv) <i>hun</i> (魂) (2) (1Th 5:23)</p>
---	--

The overall analysis of the terms is marked with three features. Firstly, *πνεύμα* (spirit) (409 instances) is almost four times more frequent than *ψυχή* (soul) (103 instances). Secondly, more than half of the instances of *πνεύμα* (spirit) fall into the category of IV (God and spiritual matters) and more than half of the instances of *ψυχή* (soul) into Definitions I and II (Humans). Thirdly, the two terms have one obvious difference in reference, that is, according to definition III, *πνεύμα* (spirit) refers wind or breath and *ψυχή* (soul) refers to animals.

To determine whether the dichotomous or trichotomous view of the constitution of humans is more valid, Definitions I and II, which relate to humans, and IV, which relates to God and spiritual matters, are first analysed to determine the extent to which the meanings of 'spirit' and 'soul' overlap (i.e. the extent of dichotomy) and differ (the extent of trichotomy). With regard to definition Ia, the two terms scarcely overlap, because the verses in which 'spirit' appears mostly involve the differentiation of 'spirit' from 'body', whereas those containing 'soul' mainly refer to the physical life of humans. Besides the representative verse that separates 'spirit', 'soul' and 'body' (1Th 5:23), two instances of 'spirit' in John (3:6; 6:63) also contrast it with 'body' in that the latter sounds stronger, that is, *τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστὶν τὸ ζωοποιῶν, ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν: τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα ὑμῖν πνεῦμα ἐστὶν καὶ ζωὴ ἐστὶν* (It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing) (Jn 6:63). These two instances are both literally translated as *ling* (靈) (spirit) in the UV. In the other two verses (1Co 9:11, 1Co 15:44) that concern a contrast of 'spirit' and 'body', 'spirit' is a property that is added to 'body', that is denoted by the Chinese *lingxing de* (靈性的) (spiritual) and *shuling de* (屬靈的) (spiritual), terms in which the character *ling* (靈) (spirit) is paired with *xing* (性) (property) and *shu* (屬) (belonging to) respectively. In the case of

ψυχή (soul), on the other hand, the majority of instances clearly refer to ‘life’ and ‘people’, as indicated by the straightforward Chinese translations *shengming* (生命) (life), *xingming* (性命) (life), *ren* (人) (people) and *renren* (人人) (people) and so on. The relative frequency of the two terms (16 instances of *πνεύμα* (spirit) vs. 58 instances of *ψυχή* (soul)) also indicates the heavy inclination of the latter to refer to physical life of humans. For definition 1b, which concerns salvation of the immaterial part of humans, the two terms heavily overlap. In fact, most verses in which ‘spirit’ (e.g. 1Co 5:5, 1Pe 4:6) and ‘soul’ occur (e.g. Jas 1:21, 1Pe 1:9) refer to ‘saving the soul or spirit’. It is noteworthy that in this regard, the primary Chinese translation of both terms is *linghun* (靈魂) (19 instances), with *lingxing* (靈性) used only once.

For definition II, there is also significant overlap in that most verses involved concern human sentiments and reasoning (including the sadness of Jesus’ ‘spirit’ in Matthew 26:38, Mark 8:12, John 11:33 and John 13:21, and the delight of the Lord’s soul in Matthew 26:38 and Hebrews 10:38). The comparatively even distribution of the terms (13 instances of *πνεύμα* (spirit) vs. 16 instances of *ψυχή* (soul)) also suggests that they are interchangeable with regard to this meaning. Coincidentally, their Chinese translations mostly consist of terms related to ‘heart/mind’, that is, *xin* (心) (mind) / *xinli* (心裏) (in mind) (12 instances for each term). Other translations, that is, *ling* (靈) (spirit) for *πνεύμα* (spirit) and *linghun* (靈魂) (spirit-soul), and *youyibuding* (猶疑不定) (suspense) and *yi* (意) (mind) for *ψυχή* (soul), only account for a small number of instances.

For definition IVc, which concerns ‘matters related to God and spirituality’, there is a sharp difference in the usage of the two terms *πνεύμα* (spirit) and *ψυχή* (soul), even though both refer to the interaction between God and humans. While the God-man relationship is ‘bi-directional’, ‘profound’ and ‘God-oriented’ under *πνεύμα* (spirit), it is ‘unidirectional’, ‘command-fulfilling’ and ‘human-oriented’ under *ψυχή* (soul). First of all, *πνεύμα* (spirit) refers to the gifts that God gives humans. These include *xianzhi jiangdao* (先知講道) (prophecy) (1Co 14:1) and various spiritual abilities to build the church given by the “Spirit” (definition IVa), rendered as *enci* (恩賜) (gifts) in Chinese (1Co 14:12). Other such graces include *fuqi* (福氣) (blessing) (Eph 1:3) and *en* (恩) (grace) (Phm 4:23). *Zhihui wuxing* (智慧悟性) (wisdom and understanding), which is necessary to understanding God’s will, is also “spiritual” (Col 1:9). Secondly, *πνεύμα* (spirit) also designates a close human relationship with God that exists neither in the Old Testament, nor in any other description in the New Testament. Through their spirit, Christians call on God as father (Ro 8:15), and God’s Spirit lives in them (Jas 4:5) and they both become one spirit (1Co 6:17). Furthermore, besides human’s spiritual capability to display talents, human’s spirits are changed and renewed (Eph 4:23), taking on good qualities such as *gangqiang* (剛強) (power), *ren’ai* (仁愛) (love) and *jinshou* (謹守) (self-control), not *danqie* (膽怯) (fear) (2 Ti 1:7). In this sense, spirit seems to be a more effective ‘channel’ for God’s bestowal of blessings on humans.

On the other hand, *ψυχή* (soul) usually reflects human effort to fulfill God’s commands, and refers to one-way interactions of the ‘human-to-God’ or ‘human-to-human’ kind. For example, Jesus commands his disciples to love God with all their soul (Mt 22:37), and Mary extols God in her soul (Lk 1:46). Paul commands us to obey God and serve God in soul (Eph 6:6 and Col 3:23).

On the human-to-human side, Paul preaches to encourage the other disciples' souls (Ac 14:22), and the disciples to share the same soul (Php 1:27). Peter commands disciples to clean their souls in order to love their brothers (1Pe 1:22) and warns them that their soul battles with their desires (1Pe 2:11).

In conclusion, the two terms share meanings in common in the areas of human salvation (Ib) and emotions (II). However, in definition Ia, the terms contrast in that 'spirit' is often opposed to 'body' and 'soul', which predominantly refer to humans and their physical life. Furthermore, in definition IVc, while 'spirit' denotes a deeper God-human relationship with various heavenly gifts and promises that can be compared to 'grace' in the New Testament, 'soul' denotes commands from God for humans to follow that can be compared to 'law' in the Old Testament. Resolution of the controversy surrounding the dichotomous and trichotomous views of the humans constitution cannot occur without first considering the above common and differentiated meanings of the two terms. Two observations can be made at this stage. First, the two terms are not always used 'interchangeably' in the Bible, as some theologians state. Second, from the God-centred perspective from the Bible, the fact that 'spirit' denotes a close relationship between God and humans tends to differentiate it from 'soul', and thus makes the trichotomous view more valid.

3.4. UV's translation principles and the influence of Modern Chinese

The above discussion of controversial Biblical terms suggests that it is time to review Strandenaes' assertion that 'formal equivalence' is the UV's main translational principle and that 'functional equivalence' is only supplementary (1987, pp. 84–93). According to Nida (1964, p. 159), "formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content". 'Functional equivalence', which Nida originally termed 'dynamic equivalence', emphasises "the principle of equivalent effect" among receptors with "the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message" (Nida, 1964, p. 159 & p. 166). However, two decades later, because "dynamic" has often been misunderstood as producing special effects in readers, he revised it to 'functional equivalence'. He remarks in his co-authored book: "It is hoped, therefore, that the use of the expression "functional equivalence" may serve to highlight the communicative functions of translating and to avoid misunderstanding" (de Waard & Nida, 1986, pp. vii-viii). Developed on his "principle of equivalent effect", this theory argues that "the relationship between receptors and message should be substantially the same as that existed between the original receptors and the message" (Nida, 1964, p. 159). It specifically highlights the aim of achieving a "high degree" of equivalence in reader's response, although Nida & Taber (1969) admit that such a response can hardly be the same as that elicited by the original.

To realise this goal, functional equivalence stresses the importance of naturalness when seeking "the closest natural equivalent of the source-language message" in translation. It attempts to "relate the receptor to modes of behaviour relevant within the context of his own culture", so as to minimise foreignness of the source text (Nida, 1964, p. 159). For example, translators may consider "adaptation of grammar and lexicon", so that the adjustments to the target language and culture will result in "no obvious trace of foreign origin" and thus "complete naturalness of expression" (Nida, 2004, p. 151-152). As remarked by Shuttleworth & Cowie (1997, p. 47), the theory of functional equivalence is indispensable to Bible translation, for the fact that

Bible translation not only intends “to inform readers but also to present a relevant message to them and hopefully elicit a response”. The following will explore how the two translation principles, that is, formal equivalence and functional equivalence, are used in translating ‘spirit’ (πνεῦμα) and ‘soul’ (ψυχή) in the UV.

In the UV, formal equivalence is mainly expressed by the literal translation of πνεῦμα (spirit) as *ling* (靈) in describing important spiritual matters such as God’s union with humans (e.g. *yu zhu chengwei yi ling* (與主成為一靈) (becomes one spirit with him) (1Co 6:17)), and human spiritual origin (e.g. *cong ling sheng de jiushi ling* (從靈生的就是靈) (that which is born of Spirit is spirit) (Jn 3:6)). Also, the literal translation of ψυχή (soul) as *hun* (魂) only occurs when the verses mention all three entities, ‘spirit’, ‘soul’ and ‘body’, as in the example *yuan nimen de ling yu hun yu shenzi demeng baoshou* (願你們的靈與魂與身子得蒙保守) (may your spirit, soul and body be kept) (1Th 5:23).

Besides, the UV translators have been flexible in their translation of both πνεῦμα (spirit) and ψυχή (soul), instead of relying on their respective literal Chinese equivalents *ling* (靈) and *hun* (魂). This is a good use of functional or dynamic equivalence. With regard to this study’s focus on the ‘dichotomy’ vs. ‘trichotomy’ controversy, the use of *linghun* (靈魂) (spirit-soul) as the Chinese translation of both terms is the most problematic of these ‘flexible’ ways. Based on the preference for disyllabic compounds that arose in Chinese during its transformation from *wenyan* (classical literary Chinese) to *baihua* (written vernacular Chinese), *linghun* (靈魂), which combines the original two Greek terms, has led Chinese Bible readers to consider the two Greek terms interchangeable. Nevertheless, a closer look reveals that *linghun* (靈魂) mainly occurs in definition Ib, which concerns salvation of the human spirit and soul (6 instances in ‘spirit’ and 13 instances in ‘soul’). It also occurs infrequently in definition Ia, which concerns human life, and IVc, which concerns the God-man relationship. One point worthy of mention is that the appearance of *linghun* (靈魂) tends to be quite consistent across adjacent verses. For example, three counts of ψυχή (soul) are all translated as *linghun* (靈魂) in Luke 12:19, along with two such counts in 1 Peter 2:11 & 25. Furthermore, besides this compound of *linghun* (靈魂), some little explored means have been employed for the translation of the two terms that also ‘mix up’ the two Biblical terms.

Although it is acceptable for *ling* (靈) to be used alone, it is often combined with *xin* (心) (heart/mind) to form *xinling* (心靈) (heart-spirit), which is equivalent to another Greek term καρδιάς that also means ‘heart’ or ‘mind’. There are 11 instances of this term across definitions Ia, IVa and IVc. This use is obviously an example of Nida’s dynamic or functional equivalence, producing the same reader response among Chinese readers as a “close natural equivalent”. This is because for one thing, modern vernacular Chinese words shows a preference for polymorphemic constructions, and for the other, *xin* (心) (heart/mind), a concrete object, is more familiar than *ling* (靈) (spirit), an abstract concept, to Chinese people who generally have little understanding of Christianity. Seven out of 11 instances fall into the definition IVc, which relates to God’s association with humans. For example, as God is spirit, the true worshiper must worship him in *xinling* (心靈) and *chengshi* (誠實) (truth) (Jn 4:23-24). The compound also enables a rhetorical use of

parallel structures, such as *xinling yuenyi* (心靈願意) (the spirit is willing) juxtaposed to *rou ti ruan ruo* (肉體軟弱) (the flesh is weak) (Mt 26:41 & Mk 14:38), *xinling* (心靈) (spirit) and *chengshi* (誠實) (truth) (Jn 4:23, 24), *xinling de xinyang* (心靈的新樣) (newness of the Spirit) versus *yiwen de jiu yang* (儀文的舊樣) (the oldness of the letter) (Ro 7:6), *shenti yin zui er si* (身體因罪而死) (the body is dead because of sin) versus *xinling yin yi er huo* (心靈因義而活) (the spirit is life because of righteousness) (Ro 8:10). Moreover, *xin* (心) (mind) and *xinli* (心裏) (in mind) serve as substitutes for *ling* (靈) (spirit) in 29 instances in definitions Ia, II and IVc. An idiomatic translation *xuxin de ren* (虛心的人) (humble person) is used in Matthew 5:3, in which *xuxin* (虛心) (humble) is a disyllabic compound in Modern Chinese. In Romans 8:15, Christians have *erzi de xin* (兒子的心) (a son's heart), not *nupu de xin* (奴僕的心) (a slave's heart), indicating that their relationship with God is as close as that between children and their father. About half (14) of these 29 instances of *xin* (心) (mind) and *xinli* (心裏) (in mind) belong to definition IVc, which relates to the relationship between God and humans. Besides, *xinzhi* (心志) (heart will) is used three times, for example, which corresponds with another attributive *δυνάμει* (power) for the prophet Elijah who works for God (Lk 1:17). There are also seven instances in the translation of *ψυχή* (soul), in which substitution of *xin* (心) / *xinli* (心裏) / *xinzhi* (心志) occurs, as in the example, *wo xin zunzhu wei da* (我心尊主為大) (My heart magnifies the Lord) (Lk 1:46).

It can be contended that, in adapting to the linguistic habits of Modern Chinese, the UV translators placed more emphasis on the communication needs of target readers than their theology. Such adaptations include the use of the disyllabic compound *linghun*, which combines two theological terms from the original language, and more culturally acceptable concepts such as *xin* (心) in preference to the Biblical concept *ling* (靈). Such methods are in line with the historical development of the target language. The development of Chinese vernacular written language played an important role in the formation of a Bible translation product, and this in turn exemplifies the best and current use of the new language. May Fourth writer, Zhou Zuoren, recognised the significance of the UV to Modern Chinese in his lecture *Shengshu yu Zhongguo wenxue* (Scripture and Chinese Literature) in 1921. Broomhall's (1934, pp. 6–7) translation of his remarks is:

The Gospel of Matthew is indeed the earliest piece of “national language” in literary form, and as affected by Western influence, and I predict that its influence upon the future of our new literary productions will be very great and deep.

Hu Shih, one of the initiators of the New Culture Movement, also acknowledged that the translators of UV used *baihua* (vernacular Chinese) (Broomhall, 1934, pp. 5–6), despite denying the work's contribution to Chinese language reform. Other factors that made possible for the UV to utilise the new language style are that they both target the masses and Chinese translators participated in the translation process (Zetzsche, 1999, pp. 363–366). These developments paved the way for Mandarin to become the national language (Mak, 2010, pp. 21–36).

4. Conclusion

This analysis of *πνεῦμα* (spirit) and *ψυχή* (soul) reveals that there are significant differences between the terms, in that *πνεῦμα* (spirit) relates more closely to the spiritual life of human beings. It also suggests that the translation principles of Chinese UV should be subject to reconsideration, given that many changes were made to the original Greek, including combining the concepts *πνεῦμα* (spirit) and *ψυχή* (soul) into one Chinese compound. This study serves as evidence that the UV is a literary product of its time and society, in which Chinese was accepting new culture from the West. It makes it clear that, when analysing a translated religious work that has imported concepts that influence people's thinking and lives, it is important to make a special study of the terminology, from both theological and translation perspectives. Interdisciplinary studies of both fields provide a more effective approach to explore Biblical translation issues.

Acknowledgement

This paper is an outcome of a project supported by a departmental research grant from the City University of Hong Kong. Acknowledgement is made to the research assistants Mr. Henri Tung, Ms. Suze Lau and Ms. Jasmine Lai for their professional contribution.

References

- Beck, J. T. (1877). *Outlines of Biblical psychology*. Montana: Kessinger Publishing Rare Reprints.
- Berkhof, L. (1996). *Systematic theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Broomhall, M. (1934). *The Bible in China*. London: Religious Tract Society.
- Clark, G. (1984). *The Biblical doctrine of man*. Tennessee: Trinity Foundation.
- Chen, Z. (1979). Mantan Heheben Shengjing (On the Union Version Bible). In Y. Liu (Ed.), *Yijing luncong* (Collection of essays on Bible translation) (pp. 21–22). Berkeley: Fuyin Wenxuanse.
- Smith, D. H. (1958). Chinese concepts of the soul. *Numen*, 5(3), 165–179.
- Chong, Y. Y. (2000). *Jidujiao Shengjing zhongwen yiben quanwei xianxiang yanjiu* (A study of the phenomenon of authoritativeness in the Chinese translations of the Protestant Bible). Hong Kong: International Bible Society.
- Delitzsch, F. (1977). *A system of Biblical psychology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- de Waard, J., & Nida, E. A. (1986). *From one language to another*. Nashville: Nelson.
- Ellicott, C. (Ed.) (1885). *English revised version. The Bible corner*. Retrieved from <http://thebiblecorner.com/englishbibles/revisedversion/genesis/1.html>
- Enns, P. P. (2008). *The Moody handbook of theology*. Chicago: Moody Press.
- Heard, J. B. (1875). *The tripartite nature of man: Spirit, soul and body applied to illustrate and explain the doctrines of original sin: The new birth, the disembodied state, and the spiritual body*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Library.
- Heard, J. B. (2008). Translated by Y. Liu & Z. Chen. *Ren de sanfen benzhi: Ling, hun, ti* (Tripartite nature of man, spirit, soul, and body). Hong Kong: Hong Kong Truth Book Room.
- Hong Kong Bible Society (2005). *Xinbiaodian Heheben shuoming* (Introduction to the Chinese Union Version with new punctuation). Retrieved from <http://hkbs>.

- Kramers, R. P. (1956). Some thoughts on revision of the Bible in Chinese. *The Bible Translator*, 7, 152–162.
- Louw, J. P., & Nida, E. A. (Eds.) (1989). *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament: Based on semantic domains (L & N)* (Vols. 1 and 2). New York: United Bible Societies.
- Luther, M., & J. Pelikan (Eds.) (1956). *Luther's works*. St. Louis: Concordia.
- Mak, K. H. (2010). *Shengjing fanyi zhong de tongxing guanghua gainian – guanhua zuowei Zhongguo guojia yuyan de qianzou* (The popular Mandarin concept in Bible translation – the prelude to Mandarin as China's national language). In P. P. Chia & K. Chin (Eds), *Zi shangdi shuo Hanyu yilai: "Heheben" Shengjing jiushi nian* (Ever since God speaks Chinese: The 90th anniversary of the Chinese Union Version Bible). Hong Kong: Verbum Press.
- Nee, W. (1968). *The spiritual man*. NY: Christian Fellowship Publishers.
- Nestle, E. (Ed.) (1904). *New Testament Greek text with critical apparatus*. University of Toronto Libraries Internet Archive. Retrieved from <http://archive.org/details/biblentgreektext00nestuoft>
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Towards a science of translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Nida, E. A., & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden, the Netherlands: E. J. Brill.
- Nida, E. A. (2004). Principles of correspondence. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *Translation studies reader* (pp.141-155). New York: Routledge.
- Osei-Bonsu, J. (1987). Anthropological dualism in the New Testament. *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 40(4), 571–590.
- Ramm, B. (1980). *Protestant Biblical interpretation*. Michigan, US: Baker.
- Shuttleworth, M., & Cowie, M. (1997). *Dictionary of translation studies*. Manchester, United Kingdom: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Strandenaes, T. (1987). *Principles of Chinese Bible translation: As expressed in five selected versions of the New Testament and exemplified by Mt 5:1–12 and Col 1*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International.
- Strong, A. H. (1907). *Systematic theology*. Philadelphia: Judson Press.
- Wickeri, J. (1995). The Union Version of the Bible and the new literature in China. *The Translator*, 1(2), 129–152.
- Zetzsche, J. O. (1999). *The Bible in China: The history of the Union Version, or, the culmination of protestant missionary Bible translation in China*. Sankt Augustin: Monumenta Serica Institute.
- Zhai, Z. P. (2008). *Shengjing renlun jingxuan* (Selection of writings in Biblical anthropology). Hong Kong: Hong Kong Truth Book Room.