

Ha'adam: Adam, man or human -
The Importance of Interpretation
in Biblical Translation

Johanna Järvinen
Pro Gradu thesis
School of Modern Languages and Translation Studies
University of Tampere
Spring 2008

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
1. HISTORICAL ASPECTS OF BIBLICAL TRANSLATION	4
1.1 Judaism and Christianity: the first ‘official’ translations.....	4
1.1.1 <i>Septuagint</i>	4
1.1.2 <i>The Vulgate</i>	7
1.2 Reformation and protestant translations	9
1.2.1 Reformation and the German Bible	9
1.2.2 Bibles in English and the King James Version	11
1.3 History of Biblical Translation in Finland	12
1.3.1 Mikael Agricola and the First Biblical Texts in Finnish.....	13
1.3.2 First Finnish Bible – the Bible of Kristiina.....	14
2. TWO CREATION STORIES, AND TRANSLATIONS OF HA’ADAM	17
2.1 Elohim and YHWH – two different accounts of creation	17
2.1.1 Priestly account of the creation.....	18
2.1.2 Yahwist account of the creation.....	19
2.2 Translations of ha’adam	21
2.2.1 <i>Septuagint</i> and the <i>Vulgate</i>	21
2.2.2 Martin Luther’s <i>Die Bibel</i> and the <i>King James Version</i>	22
2.2.3 Finnish Translations of the Bible.....	23
2.2.4 Revised Translations of the <i>Vulgate</i> and the <i>King James Version</i>	25
3. INTERPRETATIONS OF HA’ADAM.....	26
3.1 The ‘Traditional’ Interpretation.....	26
3.1.1 Views Presented in the New Testament.....	26
3.1.2 Early Christian and Medieval View.....	27
3.1.3 Modern View	28
3.2 Traditional Interpretation Challenged by Feminists and Feminist Theologians.....	30
3.2.1 Feminist Theologians and Phyllis Trible	30
3.2.2 Feminists and Mieke Bal	31
3.2.3 Feminism and Biblical Translation.....	33
4. BIBLICAL TRANSLATION IN VIEW OF TRANSLATION STUDIES AND FEMINISM.....	35
4.1 Aspects of the Bible	35
4.1.1 Word of God.....	36
4.1.2 Style and language.....	37
4.1.3 Wordplay	39
4.2 Translation Studies and the Bible	40

4.2.1 Eugene Nida and his Influence	40
4.2.2 Feminist Translation Studies and Biblical Translation	43
4.2.3 The Approach Today	45
4.3 Current Trends in Biblical Translation.....	46
4.3.1 The Biblical Translation of 1993 into Finnish and its Challenges	46
4.3.2 Missionary Translation	48
4.3.3 Future Changes in Biblical Translation	49
4.4 The Importance of Interpretation in Translation.....	50
4.4.1 The Importance of Interpretation in Translation Studies Teaching	50
4.4.2 The Importance of Interpretation in Biblical Translation	51
CONCLUSION	53
BIBLIOGRAPHY	55
FINNISH SUMMARY / SUOMENKIELINEN TIIVISTELMÄ	59
APPENDICES	65
Appendix 1: The Elohist Creation (Gen. 1: 26-31)	65
Appendix 2: The Yahwist Creation (Gen. 2: 5, 7, 18-25)	70
Appendix 3: The Occurrence of of the term ha’adam and ‘ish in the original Hebrew and their translations.....	76

Tampereen yliopisto
Käännöstiede (englanti)
Kieli- ja käännöstieteiden laitos

JÄRVINEN, JOHANNA *Ha'adam*: Adam, man or human – The Importance of Interpretation in Biblical Translation

Pro gradu -tutkielma, 58 sivua (+suomenkielinen lyhennelmä 6 sivua, +lähteitä 13 sivua)
Kevät 2008

Raamattu on yksi maailmanhistorian merkittävimmistä teoksista. Sitä on tutkittu jo vuosituhsia ja sitä on myös käännetty lukemattomille kielille. Raamatun käännöstyö jatkuu edelleen. Nykyinen raamatunkääntäminen on usein vanhojen käännösten tarkistamista, mutta myös uutta käännöstyötä tehdään erityisesti lähetyssaarnaajien toimesta. Raamatunkääntäminen on hyvin tärkeä osa käännöstieteiden historiaa vaikka käännöskoulutuksen saaneet hieman harvemmin tekevät kyseistä työtä. Suurimmalta osin raamatunkääntäminen on isojen komiteoiden työtä ja käännöksen tuottaminen kestää vuosia jos ei vuosikymmeniä.

Tutkielman tavoitteena oli tarkastella ja vertailla raamatunkäännöksiä eri ajoilta. Tutkimuskohteeksi valittiin termi *ha'adam* (Adam, mies, ihminen) ja sen esiintyminen Ensimmäisen Mooseksen kirjan kahdessa ensimmäisessä luvussa. Alkutekstiä verrattiin kreikankieliseen Septuagintaan, latinankieliseen Vulgataan, Lutherin Raamattuun, englantilaiseen King James Versioniin ja suomenkielisiin käännöksiin vuosilta 1642, 1776, 1933 ja 1992. Näistä pystyi havaitsemaan tiettyä muutosta termin kääntämisessä ja julkaistujen tutkimusten merkityksissä.

Tutkielmassa tarkasteltiin myös kyseisten käännösratkaisujen merkitystä ympäröivään maailmaan. Nämä käännösratkaisut ovat pitkälti heijastelleet oman aikansa arvoja ja tapahtumia ja tämän vuoksi alkutekstiä on tulkittu eri tavoin. Näillä tulkinnoilla on kuitenkin perusteltu myös naisten alempiarvoista asemaa miehiin nähden ja puolusteltu naisten toiminnan kieltämistä kirkollisissa tilanteissa. Aikojen muuttuessa tietyt tulkinnat ovat lieventyneet, mutta vaikka käännösteksti olisikin muuttunut, jotkut tulkinnat ovat silti säilyneet, vaikka niillä ei enää kirjallista pohjaa olisikaan.

Raamatunkääntäminen tuottaa edelleen käännöstieteelle paljon uusia ulottuvuuksia vaikka näiden kahden välinen suhde onkin joskus hieman ongelmallinen. Erityisesti feministiset käännöstieteilijät ovat vähitellen kiinnostuneet myös raamatunkääntämisestä ja antaneet siihen oman osansa. Raamatunkääntäminen, kuten käännöstiedekin on hyvin kukoistava ala ja antaa valtavia mahdollisuuksia erilaisten asioiden tutkimukselle.

avainsanat: kääntäminen, raamatunkääntäminen, tulkinta, feminismi

Introduction

Bible has been a highly influential piece of religious writing for many centuries especially in the Western culture. It has been a subject of extensive studies for theologians as well as for researchers from other disciplines. It has also been used as the source for different customs that have governed Western society. Nonetheless, it was mainly during the 20th century when scholars began to research the Bible from a secular point of view, regarding it as a significant piece of literature, rather than considering it only as a major religious work.

Interpretation plays a significant part both in studying the Bible and in biblical translation. As Sherry Simon states in her study of biblical translation: ‘As is often the case with the Bible, the interaction between dogma and meaning becomes particularly intense. The long history of the Bible magnifies the importance of translation issues, showing them to be ideologically saturated. In contrast to most other areas of cultural transmission, where translation is so often treated as a mechanical act, biblical scholarship has always recognized that translation carries with it both the dangers and the promises of interpretation.’ (Simon, 5)

Translation is a human activity and thus inherently subjective to some extent. Achieving a sufficient level of objectivity in translation is sometimes difficult as translators are affected, for example, by their culture, upbringing, background, education and even by their language. Thus it is very unlikely to have translation without any interpretation. This is why it is so interesting that sometimes society appears to consider certain pieces of literature, such as the Bible, relatively objective and ‘the word of God’. After all,

biblical texts available for most readers are translations, produced by humans interpreting the original or, in the worst case, a translation.

What is the role of interpretation in biblical translation? How does the history of biblical translation demonstrate a changing approach to interpretational issues? How has research influenced different translations of the Bible? What role does interpretation play in the translations of other religious texts? How have some translation choices influenced the world? What are the current attitudes and trends in the field of biblical translation? These are the main research questions of the present study.

The objective of this thesis is thus to discuss the importance of interpretation in translation, how it affects the outcome of the translation and the surrounding world. Furthermore it aims to show that certain cultural phenomena might have roots in translational issues and concentrate on the importance of interpretation in biblical translation. One of the main issues this thesis will consider in relation to biblical translation and interpretation is feminism. This thesis will concentrate on examining mainly the beginning of Genesis although some references will also be made to Hebrew Scriptures/Old Testament and New Testament.

To display the differences in translations this thesis will compare certain translation strategies and outcomes with each other in different languages throughout time. It will also present the views of translation studies as well as feminism towards biblical translation and discuss some of the arguments of Eugene Nida as well as Sherry Simon about biblical translation from a translation studies point of view. In view of biblical

narrative this thesis will consider the arguments of Robert Alter and in view of feminist theology and feminism the arguments made by Phyllis Trible and Mieke Bal.

To conclude, this study will be done from a secular point of view and will consider the Bible as a piece of literature that is tied to the society that produced it rather than as a religious document. However, it does not aim at diminishing or undermining the importance of Bible as a major religious text, it simply attempts to look at it from another angle.

1. Historical aspects of biblical translation

The Bible has played an important role in the history of translation seeing that it appears to be one of the most translated documents in human history. The history of biblical translation stretches through centuries and covers a multitude of languages. Therefore the aim of this chapter is to only scratch the surface of it and present some important biblical translations which have made an impact on society throughout history and which could be considered as essential for this research.

1.1 Judaism and Christianity: the first ‘official’ translations

Judaism and Christianity have coexisted now for two millennia. Many of the Christian translations of the Old Testament are originally based on Jewish translations of the Hebrew Scriptures¹. First ‘official translations’ of the sacred texts of these religions are also known by the legends connected to them. The first one of them, *The Septuagint*, was designed for the Jews living in Diaspora and the second, *The Vulgate*, was intended to be the translation of translations, the cornerstone of the Catholic Church (Simon 1996, 113).

1.1.1 *Septuagint*

The translation of the Jewish Scriptures rose out of a great need. By the 4th century BCE Jews had dispersed around the Mediterranean area and gradually their connection with their own culture and, most importantly, with their own language was weakening (Pilkington 1974, 53). However, even before this period researchers have found proof of some translation efforts of the Scriptures particularly towards Greek, one of which

¹ In this study I attempt to distinguish the terms ‘Old Testament’ and ‘Jewish Scriptures’ from each other as these two are religious texts of two separated religions.

mentions five translators taking over the task (Worth 1992, 1-5). Nevertheless it is unclear if these efforts can indeed be called translations or if they should be considered as Midrash². Still, it can be argued that the most eminent translation, in that time frame, of the Jewish Scriptures was *The Septuagint*.

The production of *The Septuagint* seems to be covered with a shroud of mystery and legends. The facts that seem to be undisputable are the time and place; the translation was produced circa 285-100BCE in Alexandria (Paloposki 2001, 359). One of the most popular legends narrates of seventy different translators working on the same passage, reputedly taken over by the Holy Spirit and thus producing identical texts. This could be considered as means of substantiating the ‘divinity’ of the translation. Although the tale might a fiction, it still produced a name for the translation.³ For example, one of the earliest accounts by Aristeas, describing the procedures involving the translation of *The Septuagint*, does not bring up the intervention of the Holy Spirit to the matter but states: ‘they proceeded to carry it [translation] out, making all details harmonize by mutual comparisons’ (in Worth, p. 5-9). However, by the first century AD, in an account produced by Philo, the description of the translation process had changed considerably: ‘they, like men inspired, prophesied, not one saying one thing and another another, but every one of them employed the self-same nouns and verbs, as if some unseen prompter had suggested all their language to them.’ (ibid. p. 16). Philo goes as far as to call them prophets later on in the text. Nevertheless, it seems that it was not until the times of Justin Martyr (second century AD) before the legend of the translation process of *The Septuagint* became well-known. In his treatment of the subject Justin Martyr went as far

² The term Midrash refers to a commentary of the original text.

³ *Septuaginta* means seventy in Latin.

as to claim that the Hebrew text had been altered later on to hide away the truth about the translation process of *The Septuagint* (Worth 1992, 17-19).

Whatever the truth behind the legends of the translation process of *The Septuagint* is, we are aware of the translation strategy they used, which was word-for-word, as it was thought that this technique would give a more accurate translation than sense-for-sense (Paloposki 2001, 359). Obviously, especially from the account by Aristeas, we know that the translators would discuss with each other the outcome of their translations before they came to an agreement. However, if we believe Philo, the translations were conducted in seclusion, and conversational strategy was not used to improve the translations. Nevertheless, even with conversational aspect involved, it is rather questionable to consider these translations as completely accurate ones, whichever way we choose to define the notion of accuracy here, as the Jewish society had an enormous influence on them.

The Septuagint became a very significant translation especially for the Jews who did not speak Hebrew as their first language. However, the situation changed drastically over the centuries. *The Septuagint* was originally designed for the diasporic Jewish community in Alexandria but in time it was rejected by the Jews and adopted by the Christians (Simon 1996, 113). This can be seen particularly in the fact that *The Septuagint* is still used as the 'official' version of the Old Testament by the Greek Orthodox Church.

1.1.2 *The Vulgate*

After the production of *The Septuagint* researchers have found evidence of other translations of the texts in the Old Testament or Jewish Scriptures from Greek or Hebrew (Worth 1992, 19-24). Some of them, such as *Vetus Latina*, were translated into Latin, although these translations⁴ can not be accurately timed. It was not until 382 AD when Pope Damasus commissioned Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus (also known as St. Jerome) to ‘revise the Current Old Latin version of the New Testament on the basis of the readings found in the Greek’ (ibid. p. 27). The work took several years and after completing it he moved to Bethlehem to work on the Old Testament and to learn Hebrew properly. The translation of the Old Testament is believed to have been completed in 405 A.D. (ibid. p. 27).⁵

This first translation of the Christian Bible, *The Vulgate*, known by that name since the 16th century, was in parts revised but mainly translated into Latin from Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic⁶ by Hieronymus. The selection of translation strategy seems to have caused some trouble for Hieronymus:

If I render word for word, the result will sound uncouth, and if compelled by necessity I alter anything in the order or wording, I shall seem to have departed from the function of a translator --- I at least have always aimed at rendering sense not words (In Worth, 29)

⁴ According to Norton (227), one could argue that there were not multiple translations but only revisions of one particular translation but, as there does not seem to be any proper textual evidence of this, the scholars can not say anything for sure.

⁵ There are, however, some people who claim that Hieronymus did not translate the Old Testament. For example, Gerard J. Norton (277) states that the Vulgate ‘is linked to St. Jerome (d. 420 ce), but is not simply to be identified with his translations’ and claims that ‘this may be explained by the authority linked with an original commission by Pope Damasus after 382 ce, as well as Jerome’s own prestige as a Christian scholar who had mastered Hebrew’. However, the general consensus seems to be that Hieronymus is the translator of the full *Vulgate*.

⁶ Some parts of the New Testament have been written in Aramaic, thought to have been the language Jesus used. However, most of the New Testament has been written in Greek.

It is fairly clear from Hieronymus' own account that he mainly opposed literal translation. However, later on he saw 'the special mystery of both the meaning and syntax of the Bible' and stated that the only way to translate the Bible was by doing it word-for-word (Munday 2001, 20; Pilkington 1974, 59). Then again, this might have been a calculated decision as 'to be seen to be altering the sense [of the Bible] was liable to bring a charge of heresy' (Munday, p. 20).

Although *The Vulgate* has a reputation of being one of the most important and reliable translations of the Bible among many Catholic circles, some of the information provided about its importance throughout history has often been misunderstood, especially in connection with the Council of Trent in 1546. It has been said that the Catholic Church declared *The Vulgate* as the only divine translation of the full Bible (Paloposki 2001, 364). It is true that the first Council of Trent did give *The Vulgate* a certain amount of authority but it mainly involved the canon and dogmatic teaching. According to Norton (2006, 228), the Church needed a new translation, but since this translation was not approved, he argues that 'the confusion demonstrates that no single text was given final authority by the Council.' Yet it can not be contested that during the Counter-Reformation biblical translation was even banned by the Catholic Church because the translators, working in the spirit of *The Septuagint*, failed to produce identical translations (Paloposki, p. 364). Thus *The Vulgate* did receive some kind of a higher status which it still holds among many Catholics.

The Vulgate has gone through a recent retranslation, which is nowadays available on Vatican's own webpage. This retranslation carries the name of *Nova Vulgata* and there

are some interesting aspects which have been changed. This way also the Catholic Church has little by little approved the importance of retranslation and the rejuvenation of the text.

1.2 Reformation and protestant translations

Coming to the sixteenth century, Europe was in the grips of change. The Renaissance had brought with it new ideals of different liberties, and ‘new worlds’ were discovered by the Europeans. Catholic Church was losing its power as more and more people started questioning its conduct.

1.2.1 Reformation and the German Bible

The text, which some consider as one of the most influential sources for the Reformation, was not actually a vernacular translation; it was translated into Latin. Erasmus of Rotterdam began in 1516 to revise Hieronymus’ translation, produced over a millennium earlier. His sources came from different manuscripts, some of them even predating Hieronymus’ translation (Worth 1992, 54). However, it is essential to remember that Erasmus was first and foremost a humanist, not a reformist. Nevertheless, he did criticise the conduct of the Catholic Church and was excited about biblical translation:

I would so desire that all women should read the gospel and Paul’s epistles, and I would to God they were translated into the tongues of all men, so that they might not only be known of the Scots and Irishmen, but also of the Turks and Saracens [...] We cannot call any man a Platonist, unless he have read the works of Plato. Yet call we them Christian, yea and divines, which never have read the scriptures of Christ. (In Worth, 65)

The fact which may be fairly surprising is that ‘printed Bibles existed not only in Latin but in one or another vernacular well before the Reformation began’ (Pelikan 2005, 168). It is easy nowadays believe that Luther’s German Bible as the first biblical translation into German. This, however, is not the case. One of the most important translations into German (or Gothic as it could be called) is *Codex Argenteus*, the Silver Bible, translated by Ulfila during the 4th century AD. And even before the Reformation there is evidence of a version of the New Testament produced around the year 1400, and later on there are indications of manuscripts of the Old Testament (Worth 1992, 42). In Cologne a German Bible was even published in 1480, although the printer was quick to point out in fear of censure that this was by no means a new translation (ibid. p. 43-44). However, none of these translations were able to gain the same importance as Martin Luther’s biblical translations into Middle East German.

One of the things Martin Luther did not approve considering Catholic Church was their attitude towards translations of the Bible into vernacular languages. One of his objects was to translate the whole Bible into German. He first translated the New Testament in three months into East Middle German, published for the first time in 1522 (ibid. p. 48).

However, someone stole Luther’s New Testament which made him very angry:

He is now selling my New Testament under his name. Oh, dear children, how hurt I was when his prince, in a terrible preface, forbade the reading of Luther’s New Testament but ordered the scribbler’s New Testament read, which is exactly the same as the one Luther wrote. (In Lefevre 1992, 16)

This did not stop Luther and he continued to translate the Old Testament which proved to be slightly harder than expected for him as he spent over a decade doing it (Lefevre 1992, 44). He said:

We are sweating over the work of putting the Prophets into German. God, how much of it there is, and how hard it is to make these Hebrew

writers talk German! They resist us, and do not want to leave their Hebrew and imitate our German barbarisms. It is like making a nightingale leave her own sweet song and imitate the monotonous voice of a cuckoo, which she detests. (In Lefevre 1992, 44)

In 1530 Luther produced a pamphlet *On Translating: An Open Letter* where he discusses his translation strategies. Two attitudes are brought up, one of a translator being ‘faithful to the intent of the sacred writer even if verbal literalness is sacrificed’, and a second attitude of a translator having to ‘use language, idioms, and expressions that convey a clear meaning’. (Lefevre, p. 45) Especially as regards the first attitude, Luther seemed to agree with Hieronymus on translation strategies.

1.2.2 Bibles in English and the King James Version

According to Worth (1992, 66), the translation produced by John Wyclif and his followers, the Lollards, in the latter part of the 14th century has been considered as the first English translation of the Bible. Worth continues to explain that over 150 partial or complete manuscripts of the two Wyclif Bibles have survived, which could be seen as quite a large number considering the persecution against Wyclif and his followers. The Catholic Church could not touch Wyclif during his lifetime⁷ but after his death in 1384, ‘the Council of Constance declared him a heresiarch, and his remains were exhumed, burned, and thrown into the river Swift in 1428’ (Drees 2000, 502). Apparently the first Bible, published in 1382, was a fairly literal translation whereas the second one, published ca. 1395, favoured translating the meaning of the sentence; both translations were based on Latin (Worth, p. 68-69).

⁷ In reality, Wyclif probably survived because he was protected by John of Gaunt, the high seneschal of England and King Edward III’s favourite son (Drees, p. 502).

In the early 16th century there were a number of different translations of biblical texts into English, notably Tyndale's, Coverdale's and Matthew's Bibles (Worth 1992, 70-78). All these received a rather problematic welcome, especially as Henry VIII's politics demanded good relations with the Pope. Coverdale managed to get his vernacular translation into circulation as happened with the Matthew's Bible as well. The translation activity of early 16th century culminated in the publishing of the Great Bible, which essentially was Matthew's Bible being revised by Coverdale in light of Hebrew and Greek texts (ibid. p. 78). However, after King Henry VIII died, his daughter, the Catholic Mary Stuart, banned all biblical translation (ibid. p. 80).

One of the most prestigious English translations of the Bible is often said to be the King James Version (ibid. p. xiii). King James I was reputedly very interested in translation and himself gifted in languages, and was thus the perfect spiritual leader for the new English translation of the Bible. The King commissioned the best scholars from Oxford and Cambridge to do the work, and ordered Bishop Bancroft to draft out guiding principles for the translators. (ibid. p. 87) Even today the meaning of the King James Version is immense for the Anglican world. In the 20th century a New King James Version was produced which has changed some of the original translation choices. This also will be discussed later.

1.3 History of Biblical Translation in Finland

When considering Finland one must always remember that Finland was part of the Swedish realm until the early 19th century. Until then the amount of translation into

Finnish was very small. However, the most important texts in Finnish of that time are translations, especially biblical ones.

1.3.1 Mikael Agricola and the First Biblical Texts in Finnish

The early 16th century was a time of turmoil also in the Northern parts of Europe. Luther's translation of the New Testament into East Middle German in 1522 started a wave which reached Denmark and Sweden very rapidly. The New Testament was published in Danish in 1524 and in Swedish a year later; however, it took 17 years to produce the whole Bible in Swedish as it was not published until 1541 (Tarkiainen 1985, 179).

Even before the Reformation, in late medieval period, some biblical translations were made into Finnish. Unfortunately none of them survived the grips of time but the basic vocabulary for vernacular translation into Finnish was created during that time (Huhtala 2007, 48). However, in the 16th century, when biblical texts were being translated into vernacular languages in some of the Nordic countries, a need of a similar kind of activity became important in Finland. Mikael Agricola, while studying theology in Wittenberg in 1537, had already started working on the translation, but it was not until 1543 that he finished the first draft. Unfortunately King Gustav Vasa of Sweden did not grant him funding and therefore Agricola could not print his first draft. He started to revise the translation, and finally in 1547 received funding from private sources, partly by collecting advance payments from Finnish parishes.⁸ The printing was finished in 1548, and bore the name *Se Wsi Testamenti*. (Tarkiainen, p. 179-186)

⁸ King Gustav Vasa used to monitor closely all printing activity so all printing had to receive his permission '*cum gratia et privilegio regis*'. This suggests that the King was very much aware of what Agricola was doing. (Tarkiainen, p. 185)

It is easy to see that Agricola followed the basic guidelines of translating biblical texts set out by both Hieronymus and Luther by trying to make the language fresh and idiomatic. Agricola used seven sources when he was translating the New Testament into Finnish. These were the German and Swedish translations of the Bible, the original Greek version published by Erasmus as well as his Latin translation, and also *The Vulgate* (Huhtala 2007, 50). Agricola had to do his work almost completely alone, which meant that it took a long time to complete the translation. (Tarkiainen 1985, 181) Agricola seemed to have used seven sources when he was translating the New Testament into Finnish.

Agricola translated the New Testament ‘*politain Greccain/ politain Latinan/ Saxain ja Rotzin kirjoista*’⁹ but this was not his only endeavour of biblical texts in Finnish; *Rukouskiria Bibliasta*¹⁰, published in 1544 and edited by Agricola, was the first book containing Finnish translations from the Bible, prayers mainly from the Old Testament but some also from the New Testament (Ikola 1985, 1). Agricola managed to produce other translations of biblical texts into Finnish but failed to produce the ultimate one, the whole Bible due to his death in 1557.

1.3.2 First Finnish Bible – the Bible of Kristiina

After Agricola’s death there was a great need to have the whole Bible translated into Finnish. Agricola had translated the whole New Testament and approximately a quarter

⁹ ‘Half from Greek, half from Latin, German and Swedish books’ (own translation)

¹⁰ ‘Prayerbook from the Bible’ (own translation)

of the canonised books of the Old Testament. However, it was not until 1602 that King Charles IX of Sweden set out a committee for translating the whole Bible into Finnish. Unfortunately no documents have survived from the committee's work, and there is no proof whether or not the committee actually succeeded in translating the Bible. The work was started again in 1627 by bishop Rothovius, who gave parts of the Bible to some ministers to be translated; this time it is likely that the work was finished as Rothovius is recorded saying in a document from early 1630 that the Bible has been fully translated into Finnish. However, it seems that the Bible could not be printed due to a lack of funds. (Ikola 1985, 1-2)

A new committee was set up in 1638 by the government. At the same time the printing of the Bible was promised to the committee. The letter from the government included instructions for the translation process such as checking what had been translated before and correcting mistakes. What had not been translated should be done so by following the latest revised translation by Luther and original source languages. The committee members were also instructed to use good and idiomatic Finnish which could be understood all around the country. Each committee member was given different parts of the Bible to translate, and the committee met up once a week when each member's translation was revised and approved by the whole committee. The committee used the Hebrew and Greek Bibles as well as Luther's translation from 1545, but they also used the so-called Gustav Adolf's Bible from 1618. It seems that they were fairly satisfied with Agricola's translation as they did not change it much. (Ikola, p. 2)

The work started in 1638 during which the beginning of Genesis was revised at least five times. The Old Testament was completed in 1640 and the New Testament in 1641. However, it took well over a year to actually print the Bible in Stockholm due to its volume. The project was finally completed in 1642. In the beginning of the Bible there is a dedication signed by the translators to the Queen Christina of Sweden, which is why the first Finnish Bible carries the name *The Bible of Kristiina*. Although the Bible was translated into Finnish and some 1200 copies were printed, only two thirds of them ended up in Finland; others were given as presents to authorities and nobility. Almost all of the copies in Finland were originally unbound. (Ikola 1985, 2-3, 7)

The significance of the translation of the Bible into Finnish was immense for shaping the Finnish identity. Some members of the upper classes in Finland spoke only Swedish, but the ordinary people spoke Finnish, which is why a translation into their own language gave them the opportunity to really be part of the Lutheran movement. Altogether the Bible has been translated into Finnish four times, in 1642, 1776, 1933 and 1992.

All of these translations have had a lot of influence on the language they have been translated into. The appearance of the vernacular translations in connection to the Reformation in the 16th century opened up interesting possibilities for interpretation as well. Many translators turned back to the original texts rather than translating from *The Vulgate* or *The Septuagint*. Many of these translations changed the world and are still today important part of the translations studies history as well as biblical studies history.

2. Two creation stories, and translations of *ha'adam*

History of the Hebrew Scriptures seems to be slightly problematic due to lack of definite facts. We could assume that the stories included into the Hebrew Scriptures were passed on as an oral tradition and later on scribed down. First known written evidence has been found from the 8th century B.C.E. but, for example, Knohl (2003, 149-150) assumes that already in the 10th century B.C.E. the courts would have had scribes and temples would have had priests who would have started to write the oral tradition down. However, Knohl also states that it was not until the 5th century B.C.E. that, for example, the whole Torah¹¹ was ‘published’ by Ezra (p. 155).

Creation is the opening of both the Hebrew Scriptures and the Christian Bible. It recounts the tale of how the world was formed and how all living things were created. However, creation holds in itself a sense of duality which has puzzled many scholars. It appears in the beginning of Genesis twice, each account having a slightly different content to the other. The epicentre of the narration is naturally God but also *ha'adam*¹².

2.1 Elohim and YHWH – two different accounts of creation

The first four books of the Pentateuch have been said to have three different voices or writers (or even groups of writers). They have been separated on the grounds of ‘the evidence of style, consistency of narrative date, theological outlook, and historical outlook’ (Alter 1981, 132). These three are called Priestly, Yahwist and Elohist.

¹¹ Known better to Christians as the Pentateuch, the five books of Moses.

¹² *Ha'adam* is the term used throughout both creation stories to refer to human, humankind and to Adam, depending on the translation

As already mentioned, Genesis holds in itself two different renditions of creation. These two can be separated according to their author(s) to the Priestly and the Yahwist creation. On the surface these two accounts seem to differ greatly from each other and convey almost conflicting descriptions of the creation of humankind. However, the original Hebrew text and the underlying structures show that there is quite a lot more to the creation story.

2.1.1 Priestly account of the creation

Both in the Hebrew Torah as well as in the Christian Old Testament the Priestly creation is placed before the Yahwist, and has thus been often considered to be the older one of these two accounts. Today the general consensus seems to be that the Priestly Creation was written down after the Yahwist one even if the dating of the Priestly Creation seems to be problematic. For example, Elaine Pagels (1988, xxii) states that the Yahwist Creation, 'is considered the older of the two accounts, dating to 1000-900 B.C.E; the account now placed first (Genesis I:I-2:3) dates to postexilic theologians (c. 400 B.C.E.)'. On the other hand, Israel Knohl (2003, 10) argues that 'the Priestly Torah, or P, as it is usually designated by Bible scholars, was written by the priesthood of Jerusalem in the period of the Israelite monarchy, sometime between the founding of the Solomonic Temple in Jerusalem (circa 950 B.C.E.) and the middle of the eighth century B.C.E.' The problematic nature of dating the Priestly account could be the product of the continuing nature of the Priestly code. '*P* would appear to be the work of a tradition of priestly writers, not one author, that begins fairly early in the First Temple period and continues into the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.E.' (Alter 1981, p. 132). Thus if what

Alter argues is true, it would be hard to define the exact time of writing due to a lineage of priestly writers following the same style of writing.

The Priestly Creation names the divinity as *Elohim*, usually translated into English as *God* and into Finnish as *Jumala*. *Elohim* creates the world in six days, through ‘balanced pairings which in most instances are binary oppositions’ like following a choreography’ (Alter 1981, 142). One interesting aspect of the Priestly creation is the use of the name *Elohim* for God. The term *Elohim* is a plural form rather than singular and thus represents the polytheistic nature of early Israeli religion¹³.

2.1.2 Yahwist account of the creation

The second account of the creation is the Yahwist one, which has gained its name from the tetragrammaton used for the name of God, YHWH¹⁴. The Yahwist creation tells the story of the creation of earth and heaven, humans, the vegetation and the animals.

Compared to the Priestly code, the Yahwist one has a slightly different approach to the creation. The rhythm of the text is very different, not progressing in the same way as the Priestly code. The Yahwist writer ‘constantly sees his subject in a complex network of relations that are causal, temporal, mechanical, and, alter in the chapter, moral and psychological as well’ (Alter, p. 144).

¹³ Bible does have signs of this polytheism. For example, psalm 82 starts with ‘God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; he judgeth among the gods’ (King James Version)

¹⁴ Although the tetragrammaton YHWH is found in the original Hebrew texts, usually, when the scriptures are read aloud, it is replaced by the term *Adonai* because it ‘meant a much more intimate, personal, and direct relationship’ (Nida 1974, 25).

Quite interestingly the Yahwist account seems to be nearer to Near east mythology than has been assumed as it seems to have similarities to the old Sumeric myths: 'Man was created from pieces of clay, placed in the womb of the mother-goddesses where he obtained his form and was given birth. He was created for the purpose of relieving the gods from their hard labor, and especially from digging canals for irrigation agriculture.' (Halo 1997, 516) Also the Babylonians had a similar story but their divine counterparts form a man slightly differently. In their myth of Atramchasis the mother goddess Mami (Nintu) creates man with the God Ea (Enki), who form him by mixing the blood and the flesh of Geshtu-e, a slain God, with clay (Luttikhuizen 2000, 13). The concept of paradise and of the rib seems to have been borrowed from the Sumerians. Enki and Ninhursag lived in a fruitful and peaceful garden Dilmun, an island paradise where, after enraging Ninhursag and her cursing him, Enki fell ill and Ninhursag created a goddess Ninti (Nin meaning Lady, ti meaning rib) to cure his sides ('Enki'). This account could be considered as a version of the biblical Yahwist creation story (Bal 1986, 323).

Surprisingly similar kinds of stories are found outside of Europe. 'The Cheyenne creation myth "How the World Was Made," for example, describes Maheo, the All Spirit, who fashions man from a rib taken out of his right side and woman from a rib taken out of his left side. Not only do ancient stories of the creation reveal a separation of the originally androgynous one into two, but many also describe the halves as thereafter striving unceasingly to reunite, to restore the primal state of wholeness.' (Luttikhuizen, p. 59) However, it can not be said if this creation myth has in fact been produced after the influence of Christianity.

2.2 Translations of *ha'adam*

A very large number of biblical translations have been produced throughout history. Creation seems to have caused quite a lot of trouble for translators, one reason probably being that it has been placed first and is the first part of the Bible people normally read.

There are some aspects already referred to here which are particularly interesting, especially the translation of certain terms. The aim of this section is to present some ways of translating the term *ha'adam* (human).

The texts which are being referred to here can be found from appendices 1 and 2. Appendix 3 is a table of comparison between these translations.

2.2.1 *Septuagint* and the *Vulgate*

In *The Septuagint*, the term *ha'adam* is translated into Greek in the first, Priestly creation as ἄνθρωπος, *anthropos* which is a generic term for human rather than a proper name. However, Sherry Simon (118) sees in this another point of view, manipulation of text through the norms of Greek language: ‘Although the meaning of *anthropos* is “human being” and includes both male and female in the concept, in popular Hellenistic philosophy only the male is regarded as an *anthropos* in the full sense of the word.’

The situation is very different in the Yahwist creation. In the earlier verses the term

ha'adam has been translated as ἄνθρωπος, *anthropos* (2:7, 2:18). But in 2:19 a change occurs, ἄνθρωπος changes into Ἀδὰμ, *Adam* and remains the same until the end of the chapter. In the original text the term is still *ha'adam*.

Very similarly to the text in *Septuagint*, the *Vulgate* renders the term *hominus* for *ha'adam* in the Priestly version of the creation. Again, one could argue that even in ancient Latin the term *hominus* referred mainly to men rather than being a neutral term because of cultural reasons. The *Vulgate* seems to follow the *Septuagint* in the Yahwist version, casting off the term *hominus* in 2:19 and replacing it with *Adam* which is used until the end of chapter 2.

2.2.2 Martin Luther's *Die Bibel* and the *King James Version*

It is easy to perceive a notable shift in translation brought on by the Reformation. Martin Luther went back to the original Hebrew and offered a slightly more radical translation. In the Priestly version he appears to follow the *Septuagint* and the *Vulgate* by translating *ha'adam* as *Mensch*, human.

Here, however, we see a change in translation. Martin Luther does not introduce the name *Adam* at all in the Yahwist translation; it does not appear until in the third chapter of Genesis. Luther continues to use the term *Mensch* throughout the chapter 2, even in the very end. This way Martin Luther removed the problem of deciding between a proper noun and slightly more generic term and used a more neutral expression

throughout the Yahwist creation¹⁵.

The *King James Version* follows a more traditional way of translating the creation. The term *ha'adam* is treated in the Priestly version as a generic term *man*. However, again in 2:19 there is a shift from *man* to *Adam* although the context does not seem to change radically. This seems to indicate that the translators (or indeed revisers) who worked on the KJV did their work by drawing influence from both the *Septuagint* and the *Vulgate*.

2.2.3 Finnish Translations of the Bible

The original Finnish translation of 1642, *Coco Pyhä Raamattu*, was clearly influenced by the Lutheran doctrine. In the Priestly creation it treats the term *ha'adam* as *ihminen*, human. One fairly interesting fact, though, is that the first Finnish translation omits verse 27 completely, so the translation omits separating male and female gender although later on in the chapter, rather than using the term *ihminen*, this translation uses the plural form *he*, they. In the Yahwist translation the Finnish 1642 follows Luther's translation fairly closely. The term *ha'adam* is translated as *ihminen* until the very end where there is a change in verse 25 and *ha'adam* changes into Adam.

The Finnish translation of 1776 was really only a revision of the older one, named *Biblia*. However, there was a noticeable change in the translation strategy compared to the earlier translation. *Biblia* included the missing verse 27 from chapter 1, and used exactly the same strategy for the translation of *ha'adam* as *ihminen* in the Priestly

¹⁵ However, the neutrality of the term *Mensch* is debatable whether or not it actually at that time referred more to men than to women, such as Greek *anthropos*.

account. But the change occurs in the Yahwist version. It seems that the people who revised the original Finnish translation followed the translations of *Septuagint* and the *Vulgate* rather than Martin Luther's *Die Bibel*; from 2:19 onwards *ha'adam* is translated as *Adam* into Finnish.

In the course of 150 years we can see a slight shift into more modern interpretations. The Finnish translation that appeared in 1933 agrees on using *ihminen* for *ha'adam* again in the Priestly Creation. The Yahwist account conveys a certain sense of the fact that the translators might have noticed the ambiguity of the term *ha'adam* and tried to find a middle ground between two extremes. First they use *ha'adam* as a generic term for human by translating it as *ihminen* but just before the differentiation, in 2:20, they refer to him as *Adam*. Quite interestingly after that the translation has only one more occurrence of the term *ihminen*, in 2:21, and further on the term *ha'adam* is translated by *mies* (man, male person) using it in places where other translations mostly use *Adam* (2:23, 25).

The most recent Finnish translation was published in 1992. Again in the Priestly account the translation follows the predecessors by translating *ha'adam* as *ihminen*. There is a slight shift though in the Yahwist one, the disappearance of *Adam*. The committee decided to leave *Adam* out completely and replaced it with *ihminen* (2:7, 18-21) and *mies* (2:22-25).

2.2.4 Revised Translations of the *Vulgate* and the *King James Version*

Although the Catholic church was for long against any vernacular translations of the Bible, *Nova Vulgata* was commissioned in 1965 by the pope Paul VI and it was finished in 1977 (Constitutio Apostolica). In its Liber Genesis, instead of using the form *hominem* as in the original *Vulgate*, *Nova Vulgata* uses the term *homo*. Other change can be seen in 2:24 where the term *homo* has been replaced with *vir*. Otherwise *Nova Vulgata* follows the guidelines set by *Vulgate* by translating *ha'adam* mostly as *Adam*.

The New King James Version, or Revised Authorised Version was commissioned in 1975 and published in 1982 after a number of translations had been translated into both American English and British English (New King James Version). New King James Version follows the original very faithfully in the matter of *ha'adam*. All of the original choices have been preserved and the name of *Adam* appears first in 2:19 like in the original King James Version as well.

3. Interpretations of *ha'adam*

The term *ha'adam* has been translated and thus interpreted very differently throughout time. Some of the interpretations are ones that still have quite a lot of significance, and some are new ones, which have come to light after new research. However, this one term has moulded the way we see the world and the position of women in this world.

3.1 The 'Traditional' Interpretation

According to the most 'traditional' interpretations of *ha'adam*, the term is usually translated into *human* in the Priestly creation. However, in the Yahwist one *ha'dam* is translated either into *human*, *Adam* or *man*, depending on the context. This interpretation has had a great effect on the Western society and caused prejudices and problems in the relationships between a man and a woman.

3.1.1 Views Presented in the New Testament

It is quite surprising that in the Old Testament/Hebrew Scriptures there is very little reference to the second creation story, perhaps due to the fact of the Hebrew Scriptures were independent books before they were compiled together. The New Testament does not mention it that much more often, except with Paul and his letters. Paul sometimes uses to Yahwist creation story to justify the reason why women are inferior to men and to create rules restricting women of having an important position in the church. There is one specific reference that portrays it very clearly:

Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.
(I Tim. 2: 11-14, KJV)

In the Bible this seems to be the first Christian comment claiming that the term *ha'adam* should be translated as Adam. It seems that especially Paul was very interested in the position of women in history. Paul also referred to this in other letters, for example in the following where he bases his arguments on the order of creation:

For a man, indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God: but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was man created for the woman; but the woman for the man.
(I Cor. 11: 7-9, KJV)

In this passage Paul seems to indicate that man was created as ‘the image and glory of God’ and woman as the glory of the man and that woman was created from the man. However, as already noted, otherwise the New Testament does not appear to take a stand concerning this issue, and the only mention of this is in these few particular passages.

3.1.2 Early Christian and Medieval View

Early Christian views of the matter seemed to follow Paul's ideals very closely. Especially Tertullian was adamant about the fact that women were inferior because they were created after men and saw them as agents of devil. He felt that women were only ‘devil's gateway’ and concluded that ‘you [women] destroyed so easily God's image, man. On account of your desert - that is, death - even the Son of God had to die.’ (in McElvaine 2000, 197). Here Tertullian seems to imply that man is the image of God, and woman is not. Around the same time as Tertullian made these arguments, the church father Augustine also expressed his views that God had intended that woman should be ruled by man from the moment that Eve was created (ibid. p. 202)

Although there is not evidence that Aristotle would have been in any way aware of the Yahwist creation story, his fairly misogynist views towards the position of women were studied very closely throughout the Middle Ages, and this affected all philosophical thinking of the time (McElvaine 2000, 206). For example, Thomas Aquinas agreed with this idea and continued by saying that man is ‘the beginning and end of woman, as God is the beginning and end of every creature’, thus referring to the fact that in his mind God created man first and woman then as his helper (ibid., p. 206). Also among ordinary people, the story of the creation of man was, especially in England, told through medieval mystery plays¹⁶. Another good example is art, mainly in the Renaissance period rather than medieval one, such as Michelangelo's Creation in the Sistine Chapel with God creating only a male figure.

During Reformation the view experienced a slight shift. Protestant churches went back to the original Hebrew texts to produce more 'accurate' vernacular translations and with them came new interpretations. Protestant churches sometimes had more equal views on the position of men and women, although it can be said that they were not in a modern level by far.

3.1.3 Modern View

Even after the medieval times, coming to modern times, we seem to interpret the Yahwist creation story by following the most traditional interpretation where Adam is

¹⁶ Church banned all theatrical activities during some medieval periods, the only ones which were allowed to be performed were mystery plays, telling biblical stories through acting.

created first and only then Eve. However, although we even in the modern times accept that God created man first, Eve as a figure does not seem so much as a lesser being or a subordinate to Adam as for example during the medieval times. Perhaps this could be accounted to her behaviour later on in the story of Eden.

As early as in the 19th century there was great concern of the misogynist aspect of the Bible, connected to the women's liberation and suffrage movements. In 1848 the Seneca Falls convention's participants condemned the Bible and its translation, putting emphasis on 'the role the Bible and religious institutions played in the oppression of women' (Simon 1996, 114). Especially Elizabeth Cady Stanton was interested in the Bible and its translations, in how they portray women and how different translation strategies have influenced the role of women. She argued: 'Whatever the Bible may be made to do in Hebrew and Greek, in plain English it does not exalt and dignify woman' (ibid. p. 115). *The Women's Bible* was a project lead by Stanton, aiming at gathering together the misogynist parts of the Bible to display how wrongly women are treated. As such *Women's Bible* was not a new translation but a collection of pieces of translation to prove a point. However, this caused quite an upheaval as both the American clergy as well as the Women's Suffrage movement condemned this book and its commentaries (ibid. p. 116). Still, *Women's Bible* ended up mostly criticising translation choices rather than correcting them, for example they did not challenge the veracity of the translation of Adam.

3.2 Traditional Interpretation Challenged by Feminists and Feminist Theologians

During the 1970s, alongside with the women's liberation movement, rose a new generation of feminists and feminist theologians. Many of these people wanted to challenge the traditional view of the creation and find other interpretations in the midst of multilevel text. The main two figures involved in researching and studying the term *ha'adam* are feminist theologian Phyllis Trible and later on feminist Mieke Bal.

3.2.3 Feminist Theologians and Phyllis Trible

As a whole, feminist theologians' range of interest varies quite a lot. Some may be interested in the image of women in the Bible, some might concentrate on the New Testament rather than the Old Testament. However, quite a few feminist theologians seem to be avoiding the source of all things, the creation. Phyllis Trible is not one of them.

One of the main issues feminist theologian Phyllis Trible introduces in her book *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality* is interpreting the Yahwist creation story by approaching it from another angle than before. Trible discusses the problems in interpreting the creation story in the old way and offers explanations on how to solve them and interpret them better. According to her, the Yahwist creation is ambiguous and lacks certain clarity and that this confusion has enabled the birth of a possibly false interpretation that has dominated the conventional way of thinking in the Western society for centuries. It is also possible that this has accounted for the seemingly misogynist image of the Bible.

In order to discover the truth behind these claims we must turn to the original Hebrew text and its problematic nature. According to Tribble, God creates the first human being, *ha'adam*, from the earth¹⁷. Tribble treats the term *ha'adam* as human, a neuter term that does not refer particularly to either gender although, according to her, in some rare cases the word *ha'adam* could be considered as a proper name as well. When the alleged female is created from *ha'adam*'s rib, the first creature seems to disappear. The two new creatures are named: the female is called *'ishah* and the man *'is*. Thus only after the deep sleep¹⁸ of the first creature the formal division between sexes made, not before. (Tribble 1978, 75-77; Bal 1986, 320-326)

Hence the main argument that Tribble introduced during the late 1970s was that the first human being, *ha'adam*, was a sexless creature without any gender. It was only after it was put to sleep when the original creature ceased to exist and was replaced by two new creatures, the Man and the Woman. In conclusion, Tribble interprets the text, taking that the Woman was not created any later than the Man and thus cannot be subordinate to the Man as it has been previously suggested.

3.2.2 Feminists and Mieke Bal

Feminism has always had a somewhat troublesome relationship with the Bible. It has been called the source of all misogyny and hatred towards women throughout its existence. This is why some feminists may have a very hostile attitude towards the

¹⁷ The Hebrew word for earth is *'adhamah*. In the original language there was a play with words so the original meaning of human, *'adham*, is "earth creature" or "groundling".

¹⁸ Bal has also argued that this deep sleep could be considered as death of the 'undifferentiated earth creature'. (Bal 322)

Bible and only seem to mention it in a fairly negative context. However, there are some feminists that have approached the Bible for what it is rather than being affected too much by the view offered by the society. One of them is Mieke Bal.

Feminist Mieke Bal developed Tribble's idea further in the 1980s and went as far as to suggest that the first human being might have indeed been the Woman (Bal 1986, 323). Still, both of them showed how there is a certain obscurity in the Yahwist creation story that should not be ignored. Bal, for example, describes why in theory the first person, *ha'adam*, can not be translated as a proper name (p. 320). According to her, the name does not come from Yahweh and Yahweh has not named the first creature. It is only the term used by the narrator who is separate from the image of Yahweh. Additionally, she presents the idea that if *ha'adam* should be translated as a proper name Adam, in Gen. 2:16-17, where God bans *ha'adam* from eating from the tree, this ban should only apply to Adam (p. 321). If this would be so, why then was Eve then driven away from Paradise?

The main difference between the approaches of Tribble and Bal is the tone. Bal is a feminist literary critic whereas Tribble is a feminist theologian. However, Tribble seems to be able to present the facts and analyse them calmly whereas Bal goes very far to accuse Bible of being extremely misogynist at the same time as claiming that her arguments do not rise from a feminine standpoint (Bal, p. 318). When Tribble's approach is fairly neutral, Bal handles this matter from a very militant point of view, criticising society, religion, men, and women.

3.2.3 Feminism and Biblical Translation

Since the 1970s the feminist movement has been more and more interested in the Bible and the message it is striving to convey. Although some feminists still consider the Bible to be a patriarchal object and a symbol of the oppression of women, there are some that have become intrigued by the underlying subtleties that can be seen as sending a message of equality rather than patriarchal domination.

Therefore it is a shame that women have not played a very visible part in the history of biblical translation. Indeed, as Sherry Simon (1996, p. 116) explains, ‘there have been very few women Bible translators. Few eighteenth- or nineteenth-century women were able to obtain a classical education, let alone a proficiency in Hebrew.’ However, the times have changed and a variety of feminist readings of the Bible have been published. According to Simon most of the feminists do not interfere in the feminist biblical translation because they think that ‘to produce a new version of the Bible is to affirm a new state of biblical truth’ (p. 121). It is very hard, especially for women, to change certain aspects that have been a central part of the Western culture for centuries, such as the fact that Adam Eve’s superior on the grounds that he was created first.

At the moment, all feminism can do in the field of biblical translation is to offer atypical ideas and make scholars think about different possibilities of interpretation. After all, the purpose of biblical translation is to provide everyone a chance to make up his or her own interpretation of the text. ‘For the moment, feminist Bible translation plays an essential role of critique, preventing new dogmas from taking shape, promoting

sharpened attention to the overlays of meaning which have been transmitted by tradition. The goal of the variety of feminist critiques is not so much to rectify the biblical text as to underscore the profoundly ideological nature of interpretation and translation.’ (Simon 1996, p. 133)

4. Biblical Translation in View of Translation Studies and Feminism

Sometimes it seems that translation studies have had a somewhat troubled relationship with biblical translation. There seems to be a division between biblical translations and the translation of secular texts, almost as if these two should be approached as two very different and distant disciplines. This, however, is unfortunate because both translations studies and biblical translation studies have a lot to share.

Bible can be considered as rather daunting for translators who are not used to its language and the fairly 'formal' manner producing the text. It is true that biblical languages and style of writing set some restraints on the translators. These, however, are not grave problems. In the 1960s the attitude towards biblical translation experienced a notable change with the theories of Eugene Nida. He managed to bring translation studies and biblical translation together more with his theory. The aim of the following chapter is first to present some interesting aspects of Bible and then discuss biblical translation in view of translation studies and feminism.

4.1 Aspects of the Bible

Bible has very interesting elements which makes translating it a fairly challenging task. Some of these elements may be involved with the culture, some with language. Translators are struggling in the midst of these issues, trying to make them work as efficiently as possible in the target text. There are several aspects that make the Bible fairly demanding for translators.

4.1.1 Word of God

One of the problematic aspects of the Bible is the fact that, even when it is translated, it is still the word of God. This places huge expectations on translators, as they have to interpret the word of God and transfer it into another language. The situation is very different in Islam: Muslims consider Arabic to be the only language fit for a God (Pilkington 1974, 52). This is why only the Arabic version of Qu'ran is the divine word of God and all of the translations are mere interpretations.

There are several arguments from different thinkers throughout the time to explain why the Bible should be the word of God even as a translation. For example, Augustine firmly believed that the Holy Spirit guided translators in their task of translating the Bible and thus referred to the legendary tale of the translation process of the *Septuagint* (Copeland 1989, 21). At the same time, the Catholic Church granted Hieronymus sainthood and called renamed him as Saint Jerome for translating the *Vulgate*. He was also believed to have been guided by the Holy Spirit to help him to complete his mission. Biblical translation, especially amongst the Catholic Church, seems to be shrouded with the aura of sanctity.

Translating the word of God comes with a great responsibility. For example, it seems that the Catholic Church did intend to have vernacular translations or even retranslations of the Bible during Reformation. However, they were frustrated about the fact that the translators did not produce the same text amongst themselves and decided that they were not blessed by the Holy Spirit (Paloposki 2001, 364).

Translation itself always carries with the problem of interpretation, be the text a legal document, a literary translation or the Bible. Translators are affected by their culture, their upbringing, their language skills, their education level, their knowledge of the source text culture as well as the target text culture. So why should not biblical translators be expected to face these same issues, even if they would be guided by the Holy Spirit as claimed by the Catholic Church?

4.1.2 Style and language

As already mentioned before, there are a number of factors which impose problems to the translation of Bible. One of the main dilemmas seems to be the original language and the style it has been written in. In biblical writing even in the syntax lies a mystery, especially in the narration. Erich Auerbach (1968, 3-23) compared in his *Mimesis* two stories, which were supposedly written around the same time. These two were the tale of Odysseus' scar in *Odyssey* and the other the tale of the sacrifice of Isaac. Interestingly Auerbach reveals the exciting interlaying structure of biblical narration of the time of leaving things unsaid. When Homer describes even the smallest of detail and gets fairly derailed with his narration, the narrator of the story of Isaac is very distant, providing only chosen pieces of information.

The language used in the Bible is also very different. Very often we forget that the Bible is made out of different books displaying very different styles of writing. For example, Luther has been blamed for making the translation as a big bulk rather than approaching each book separately (Huhtala 2000, 231). It should always be considered that the Bible is built from a number of different books, written in different styles and in different

times. Different styles of writing should be dealt with separately and so should the mystery of the language. Translating the New Testament can prove to be a far easier task than translating the Old Testament. This is because the ancient Hebrew, the language of the Old Testament, is exceptionally expressive and at the same time restrictive. Many of the even simple verbs have additional, underlying meanings that make finding corresponding terms in another language very demanding (Trible 1978, 75-77).

Hugh Pilkington talks about the restrictions of Hebrew: ‘Modern scholars are often forced to admit that, even after all their labours, the Hebrew text remains in part unintelligible. Versions such as the New English Bible or the Jerusalem Bible abound in footnotes which read “Hebrew obscure”, “Hebrew unintelligible”, or “Hebrew uncertain”’ (Pilkington 1974, 56). Therefore sometimes it is very hard to define what the message that the writers wanted to convey was in reality. This aspect is also a feature of the literary type in which the Old Testament was written. In cases where the Hebrew text is “uncertain” or ambiguous, the translator has to decide according to research provided what strategy to choose to discover the most appropriate interpretation behind the words. There has always been certain mysticism in the Bible and this must be saved when translating it into another language.

However, the translators should not be afraid to approach the Bible from a modern point of view. Bible, after all, is a piece of literature, be it that it might a very eminent piece of religious literature. Bible does have a canonised status in today’s world but this should not restrict the translators from making the right choices. One thing that should

be remembered is the fact that although there is a sense of ‘mystery’ in biblical translation, the translators, although appreciating the original language and its customs, should approach the text for what it is, a mystery waiting to be solved.

4.1.3 Wordplay

Wordplay is a fairly important part of the Bible. Like in all languages, also in biblical languages, especially in Hebrew the writers used puns. Certain words have very many meanings. Robert Alter has shown a special interest in wordplay in his research *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. In regards of this current study, one example of the wordplay comes from the Yahwist creation story. According to the original Hebrew text, YHWH created *ha'adam*, human, out of *ha'adamah*, earth or soil; the original meaning of human, *ha'adam*, is ‘earth creature’ or ‘groundling’ (Trible 1978, 75-77).

Another fascinating aspect of the difference between the Priestly and the Yahwist creation is the use of words and verbs in original Hebrew. Quite interestingly the governing verb for the first four days of Creation is ‘to divide’; later on in the Priestly Creation the verbs used are ‘to make’ (*asoh*) and ‘to create’ (*baro*) (Alter 1981, 143, 145). As one of his last tasks *Elohim* creates human, *ha'adam*, as his own image. When YHWH creates *ha'adam*, human, he is made from the dust of the earth. Here is the difference to the Priestly code. The Yahwist writer does not use the verb ‘to create’ as such like the Priestly writer does. The term he uses is *yatzor*, ‘fashioning’, a word that is used for potters and craftsmen, and also makes him the subject of concrete agricultural verbs, planting and watering and causing to grow' (ibid., p. 145).

Eugene Nida (1968, 5) also presents some evidence in textual means to enrich the original languages of the Bible. He argues that translators can not reproduce the rhythm that the Hebrew poetry has, nor can the translators easily produce the alliteration intentionally used in these poems. However, as Nida says, translators must be prepared to sacrifice some of the form in order to produce a valid translation.

4.2 Translation Studies and the Bible

Translation studies appears to have had for long had rather troubled relationship with biblical translation. It seems that translation studies, although it might be acknowledging the fact that its history is very closely connected to the history of biblical translation, has been distancing itself from religious texts. The theory produced by translations studies about biblical translation has been somewhat limited and it almost seems that translation studies is striving to leave this field of study alone.

4.2.1 Eugene Nida and his Influence

Although sometimes it might seem that translation studies and biblical translation are fairly far apart, Eugene Nida, who was a pioneer in both, is still appreciated in both circles. It was in the 1960s that Eugene Nida presented his idea of dynamic equivalence by using the Bible as an example. Dynamic equivalence has, in a sense, paved way for further translations theories, such as Vermeer's Skopos theory, with its target audience based approach.

Eugene Nida was one of the first 'modern' translation studies theorists to use Bible as an example. He noticed a shift in biblical translation and decided to use it for his dynamic equivalence. The basic idea behind his theory was to approach translation from the receptors' point of view. He argued: 'what one must determine is the response of the receptor to the translated message' (1968, 1) and continued to explain that the response should be compared to how the original receptors reacted to the message in the original setting. Thus the message should be received in the same way in both the source language as well as in the target language.

Nida was very concerned about the receptors' response and argued that if many receptors misunderstand the rendering, the translation should not be regarded as legitimate (p. 2). As a solution he suggests that translators should change their views toward the languages they are working with and start approaching them differently, for example, by appreciating the fact every language has its own special aspects, by demythologising the source language as well as the target languages and by understanding that the form must be sometimes sacrificed in order to preserve the content of the message (p. 3-5).

What is very interesting in Nida's arguments is his approach to the 'biblical languages'. He does not appear to put too much weight in the 'sanctity' of them and goes on to explain how the original writers expected their text to be understood and how translators should try to produce the same meaning as was in the message that the original writer tried to convey thousands of years ago (p. 6-8). This, however, should be fitted into the modern culture so it can be understood also by the target language readers.

Nida presents, in order to ensure the intelligibility of the translation, ‘the priority of dynamic equivalence over formal correspondence’ (1968, 22-24). In this he presents a new way of approaching translations in terms of sources, messages and receptors. In his mind both the receptor in the source language and the receptor in the target language should receive the message in the same way and the task of the translator is to produce that message in the spirit of dynamic equivalence in order for the translation to be adequate and correct. This way Nida is willing to sacrifice some of the ‘accuracy’ of the translation when translating by following the guidelines of dynamic equivalence (p. 28). Although some accuracy might have to be sacrificed to produce a translation in the spirit of dynamic equivalence, Nida feels that the problems dynamic equivalence solves are more important than gaining complete accuracy, whatever the definition of accuracy may be.

However, there are some problems in Nida’s theory. For example, he suggests that although some psalms have Ugaritic parallels and their study will help to understand them better, psalms should not be translated as Ugaritic ritual songs but as the hymns which were used in the temple when worshipping the Yahweh (p. 8). In this Nida presents a completely understandable but a slightly narrow view. Does not a translator have to know all the background material and the sources behind the texts in order to produce the best possible translation? In this case it might be very hard to incorporate all of the factors in the same translation but translators should certainly be aware of these facts, and they can not be completely taken out of the equation as such.

Nida's research was ground-breaking during the 1960s and produced a base for biblical translation studies of today. He presented a new way of approaching the Bible from more of a translation studies point of view rather than a theological view. Also his approach demythologised the Bible and showed that it could be handled as any piece of literature which is translated and retranslated in order for it to follow its time and the changes in the culture and target languages.

4.2.2 Feminist Translation Studies and Biblical Translation

Since the 1970s the feminist movement has been more and more interested in the Bible and the message it is striving to convey. Although some feminists still consider the Bible to be a patriarchal object and a symbol of the oppression of women, there are some that have become intrigued by the underlying subtleties that can be considered as sending a message of equality rather than patriarchal domination.

Therefore it is a shame that women have not played a very visible part in the history of biblical translation. Indeed, as Sherry Simon explains, 'there have been very few women Bible translators. Few eighteenth- or nineteenth-century women were able to obtain a classical education, let alone a proficiency in Hebrew' (1996, 116). However, the times have changed and a variety of feminist readings of the Bible have been published. According to Simon most of the feminists do not interfere in the feminist biblical translation because they think that 'to produce a new version of the Bible is to affirm a new state of biblical truth' (p. 121). It is very hard, especially for women, to change certain aspects that have been a central part of the Western culture for centuries, such as the fact that Adam is Eve's superior on the grounds that he was created first.

At the moment, all feminism can do in the field of biblical translation is to offer atypical ideas and make scholars think about different possibilities of interpretation. After all, the purpose of biblical translation is to provide everyone a chance to make up his or her own interpretation of the text. 'For the moment, feminist Bible translation plays an essential role of critique, preventing new dogmas from taking shape, promoting sharpened attention to the overlays of meaning which have been transmitted by tradition. The goal of the variety of feminist critiques is not so much to rectify the biblical text as to underscore the profoundly ideological nature of interpretation and translation.' (Simon 1996, 133)

This little but important change is very visible in the development of the translation of the Bible. In the case of the term *ha'adam*, many current biblical translations translated it as neutrally as possible, for example the Finnish 1992 translation using the term *ihminen* throughout the text before the separation of the two creatures. In this we can see that feminist translation studies have produced that little alternative, offered an atypical idea that has, in time, produced some kind of a result. What is interesting, though, is the fact that we still read that Adam was created before Eve because of the centuries of cultural influence.¹⁹

¹⁹ This by far is not the only interesting translational issue in the Bible. Another famous one is the tale of Moses coming down from Mount Sinai in the original *Vulgate* (Exodus 34:30). It seems that Hieronymus made a conscious choice of not giving Moses rays of light around his head but rather decided to translate it as horns. Because of this Michelangelo still in the 16th century produced a sculpture of Moses with horns in it. This proves that the choices the translators make have very much weight and can influence the outcome and the surrounding world in a very surprising way.

4.2.3 The Approach Today

It seems that translation studies, although it might be acknowledging the fact that its history is very closely connected to the history of biblical translation, has been distancing itself from religious texts. Only a small number of theory has been written about biblical translation and it almost seems that translation studies is striving to leave this field of study alone. True, most translators of the Bible are not really translators in the full sense of the word. Many of them had to start translating out of the need rather than the want.

As Sherry Simon says: ‘Biblical translation is traditionally a weighty enterprise, most often handled by committees who are mandated by specific institutions.’ (1996, 121) In these committees there might not be even one person that can be considered a ‘proper’ translator. They are usually formed out of exegetics, other theologians and secular authors who debate over questions of hermeneutics and style. Considering the time-consuming and complicated process of biblical translation and the ancient languages it has to use as source languages it is effortless to understand why translation studies have no real interest in it.

Nevertheless it is a shame that the situation is as it appears to be today. Biblical translation in today’s world is a very fertile ground for intriguing theories and interpretations. The modern study of the Bible is connected to various other fields of study such as cultural studies, feminism, history and particularly translation studies. The long history of biblical translation is able to offer many aspects of study from the point

of view of translation studies, more than any other piece of literature in the world.

4.3 Current Trends in Biblical Translation

Biblical translation is evolving as we speak. New researches are being published and new insides are found into the translation methods. Quite a lot of them were deployed in the Finnish 1993 translation which proved out to be a success.

4.3.1 The Biblical Translation of 1993 into Finnish and its Challenges

Some translations have reached almost a canonized status in our society. Itamar Even-Zohar (2000, pp.192-197) talks about polysystems of translations and of source texts, leaving translations in the outskirts. However, translations can reach the same status as the source texts as. This is the case of the Bible. People are familiar with the translations they have grown up with and think this particular translation is the correct one, ‘the word of God’. This particular issue was a challenge for the Finnish translation committee who took on the job during 1970s to revise the 1933 translation.

The committee was formed by the Finnish evangelic Lutheran church but had representatives from the Finnish Orthodox Church and the committee of free Christians of Finland. The Catholic Church also submitted feedback to the committee (Kauppinen 1990, 5). The committee had translation units which handled the basic work and

divisions of revision whose members evaluated the usability of the text. After going through the suggestions of both the committee made its choice after which they gave their suggestions to certain parishes which, on their behalf, gave feedback on different matters (Kauppinen 1990, 5).

In a Church synod in 1975 the principles and goals of translation were defined. The goal was to use idiomatic and modern Finnish language without anticipating the changes in the language itself. The names were changed to match the original writing. The main translation strategy was meaning-based, the goal was to approach the translation strategy from the basic message of the text and not get caught up in the particular wordings. In parts where there were, theologically, many options for interpretation, the committee chose one and added good grounds for choosing this interpretation.

Ambiguous interpretations were to be avoided. (ibid. p. 6) The feedback from the parishes was good; translation strategy was especially highly appreciated as was the choice of words (ibid., pp. 13, 19).

The major criticism that was received from the parishes was of interpretation. Many parishes felt that there was too much interpretation involved. Kauppinen explains that this was due to the translation strategy of dynamic equivalence which demands, if transformed in to modern language and modern culture, some sort of interpretation (p. 20). Quite interestingly smaller parishes in the countryside were the most fervent critiques of this use of interpretation when the bigger parishes in Helsinki and Tampere had a more positive attitude towards interpretation (ibid., p. 22).

4.3.2 Missionary Translation

One group of people must not be forgotten when talking of biblical translation both in history and in today's world. These are missionary translators who, even today missionaries, do a fair amount of biblical translations. This practice started as early as in the 16th century when missionaries were sent over with armies to convert 'the heathens'. Nowadays missionaries go to different countries, gradually learn their language and with the help of locals start translating the Bible.

The two most important organisations today educating biblical translators, especially missionary ones, are the United Bible Societies and the Wycliffe Bible Translators. For example Wycliffe organisation does not only concentrate on translating the Bible into different languages but also teaches people to read in order for them to be able to interpret the message of the Bible themselves by reading, rather than only hearing it read to them.

It is possible, of course, to argue that the education these missionaries receive is not comparable to the education of translators of secular texts. Then again, one must remember that most of the translators working in today's world have not had the proper educational background for their profession. This could be seen due to the fact that translation studies as a discipline is a fairly recent, although it has been practiced for thousands or years. Hopefully in the future translation studies teaching can also incorporate, if not real biblical translation, at least some education about biblical

translation and its practices in today's world.

4.3.3 Future Changes in Biblical Translation

Biblical translation in today's world is a very dynamic area of interest. New researches are published all the time to enable biblical translation and the understanding of the contemporary culture. Some translations are even made which have the actual wordings of the original text above and then an explanation running below, so-called interlinear translations. But, as Huhtala says, these types of translations can be considered very interpretative, especially as the translator is translating word by word (and choosing their own interpretation for those particular words) and disregarding the syntax which, in Bible's case, is very important (2000, 229).

Quite a lot has happened in the field of biblical translation lately. More researches have been published, more information is now available for translators, and more committees are involved. But will it ever be the educated translators' time to translate the Bible? Is biblical translation still bound to committees or are other people 'allowed' to translate it as well? It is very doubtful that these other translations will ever become 'official' ones, the church still has a fairly tight grip on biblical translation.

4.4 The Importance of Interpretation in Translation

Translation is interpretation. We innately interpret everything that we see around ourselves, gathering information and basing our experiences on that information. It can be difficult to achieve a level of objectivity in a translation as translators are affected by their culture, upbringing, background, education and even by the limits of language. Therefore translation can not exist without a certain amount of interpretation.

4.4.1 The Importance of Interpretation in Translation Studies Teaching

At the moment we are living an age when more and more people are becoming less and less aware of the Bible and world literature. People are often failing to see references made to the Bible in certain texts which could add quite a lot to the interpretation of the texts. This type of awareness is very important to translators. In translation training, translators need at least basic knowledge of world literature to be able to grasp the fine nuances of texts. Otherwise the text might remain usable but lacks a major part of the interpretation.

The lack on knowledge of world literature has been fairly visible in the literary translation classes I have experienced during the cause of my studies. Many students are often failing to see the fine references in their source texts and the result has often been somewhat different of what the original author might have intended. Obviously translators are not able to catch all the fine references; this can not be expected of them. However, the concern is that many students do not seem to grasp even the most visible signs of reference in their texts and this way make their translation to be very much less effective than the original one. Awareness and knowledge of world literature needs to

be implemented more than it is today into translation studies teaching, otherwise future translators will have a very limited approach to their profession.

4.4.2 The Importance of Interpretation in Biblical Translation

As we have seen, interpretation plays a very important role also in biblical translation. Translators are faced with different challenges and often have to choose between two interpretations. As Sherry Simon says: ‘Translating is an act of interpretation’ (1996, 111). It is virtually impossible for a human to translate text into another language without making his or her own interpretation of it. But there are cases, such as biblical translation, where interpretation can cause problems.

The process of biblical translation is fairly complicated as the translator is faced with both moral and theological questions. Hugh Pilkington explains the process of translation describing that the product of the secular translators will be something personal (1974, 60). At the same time he examines the work of biblical translators and concludes: ‘One of the principles of Bible translation is that it should be impersonal and anonymous’. Is this a real option for the translator, can a translator really turn off his or her inner interpreter? Should the text in hand not be questioned just because it has been declared holy?

New interpretations of biblical texts have helped the study of the Bible move forwards with time as well as raised new questions of biblical translation. As Sherry Simon states: ‘The debates over feminist and inclusive-language interpretations of the Bible enhance our understanding of translation as a substantial interpretative move, at the

same time as they draw attention to the conflictual implications of gendered language.’
(1996, 5)

Interpretation will remain a vital part of all translation. We can not eliminate the importance of interpretation, not even from biblical translation. As long as translations are made by humans, they are interpreted by a person or persons who are affected by a multitude of things. However, as more and more research is published in this field, the more aware of the translators become of the challenges and of the original meanings of the text.

Conclusion

Both the Hebrew Scriptures and the Christian Bible are equally significant in today's world. They are tremendously important for millions of people and are read in thousands of languages around the world. This is why biblical translation, although it might not seem to be such an important and 'trendy' subject within the field of translation studies, is still very much part of modern world.

Translating the Bible is a daunting task, especially considering interpretation. Bible is full of choices for the translator among which the translator has to make his or her own choice. Translators are not only battling with interpretation, limits of languages and expectations but also with translation strategies that are available. Still in today's world the most appreciated one seems to be the principles of dynamic equivalence, presented by Eugene Nida. However, there are still people who would rather read a literal translation rather than concentrate on the whole message. This is why there are interlinear translations for the ones who want to experience the Bible in a different way. One thing that must be remembered with the interlinear translations, though, is that the translator has still interpreted them for the reader, chosen from the selection of words. So no translation can be completely literal, word for word.

The term *ha'adam* has through times been translated differently. In the treatment of this term we can see the development of interpretation considering translation and how these interpretations have affected the society around us. Also feminism has started to become more current in the field of translation studies. This way also the Bible and feminist

biblical translation has become more popular as a theme of study. Nevertheless more of these kinds of studies should be made in order to present another view, another interpretation.

The main aim of this thesis was to show how a translation is evolving through time and with the help of new research and how only a small interpretational issue is able to change the way that we view the world. It might be that the purpose of the patriarchal Jewish society was to record man's superiority over woman by stating that the man indeed was created before the woman. But why leave room for interpretation? Why not express clearly that this really was what happened? In these little details lay the diversity and the charm of the Bible.

‘As one of the most important foundational texts of our Western culture, the Bible remains a major point of reference and for that reason is open to challenges of interpretation – and of translation.’ (Simon 1996, 111)

Bibliography

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. Basic Books: USA, 1981.

Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis*. Princeton (N.J.): Princeton University Press, 1968.

Bal, Mieke. "Sexuality, Sin, and Sorrow: The Emergence of Female Character" in Suleiman, Susan Rubin (ed.). *The Female Body in Western Culture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986. (pp. 318-337)

Biblia Sacra Vulgata. Douay-Rheims Catholic Bible. Viewed 28 April 2008. URL: <<http://www.drbo.org/lvb/index.html>>

Biblia. Se on: Coco Pyhä Ramattu Suomexi. Helsinki: WSOY, 1985.

Constitutio Apostolica. Vatican. Viewed 28 April 2008. URL: <http://www.vatican.va/archive/bible/nova_vulgata/documents/nova-vulgata_jp-ii_apost_const_lt.html>

Copeland, Rita, 'The fortunes of "non verbum pro verbo": or, or why Jerome is not Ciceronian' in Ellis, Roger (ed.). *The Medieval Translator*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1989. (pp. 15-35)

Die Bibel, Martin Luther translation. University of Michigan. Viewed 28 April 2008. URL: <<http://quod.lib.umich.edu/l/luther/>>

Drees, Clayton J. *Late Medieval Age of Crisis & Renewal, 1300-1500: A Biographical Dictionary*. Westport and London: Greenwood Press, 2000.

'Enki' *A Dictionary of World Mythology*. Arthur Cotterell. Oxford University Press, 1997. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. Tampere University. 17 December 2007

Garry, Jane(Editor). *Archetypes and Motifs in Folklore and Literature : A Handbook*. Armonk, NY, USA: M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 2005.

Hallo, William W. (Editor). *Context of Scripture : Canonical Compositions, Monumental Inscriptions and Archival Documents from the Biblical World*.

Huhtala, Aarre. 'Raamatunsuomennot' in Riikonen, H.K. et al. (eds.) *Suomennoskirjallisuuden historia*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura, 2007 (pp. 48-63)

Ikola, Niilo. 'Katsaus ensimmäisen suomalaisen raamatun syntyhistoriaan'
In *Biblia. Se on: Coco Pyhä Raamattu Suomexi*. Helsinki: WSOY, 1985.
(pp. 1-7)

Holy Bible: The King James Version. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huhtala, Aarre. 'Raamattu käännöskirjallisuutena' in Paloposki, Outi and Henna Makkonen Craig (eds.). *Käännöskirjallisuus ja sen kritiikki*.
Yliopistopaino: Helsinki, 2000. (pp. 228-242)

Kauppinen, Juha. *Seurakuntien lausunnot Uuden Testamentin käännöshetimitsestä*.
Pieksämäki: Sisälähetysseuran kirjapaino Raamattutalo, 1990.

Knohl, Israel. *Divine Symphony : The Bible's Many Voices*. Dulles, VA, USA: Jewish
Publication Society, 2003.

Luttikhuizen, Gerard P. *Creation of Man and Woman : Interpretations of the Biblical in
Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Leiden, NLD: Brill, 2000.

Drees, Clayton J. (Editor). *Late Medieval Age of Crisis & Renewal, 1300-1500 : A
Biographical Dictionary*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group,
Incorporated, 2000.

Lefevre, Andre (Editor). *Translation - History - Culture : A Sourcebook*. London, UK:
Routledge, 1992.

LXX. Magister. Viewed 28 April 2008. URL:

<<http://www.magister.msk.ru/library/bible/greek/grkot01.htm>>

McElvaine, Robert S. *Eve's Seed: Biology, the Sexes and the Course of Human History*. Blacklick: McGraw-Hill Trade, 2000.

Munday, Jeremy. *Introducing translation studies: theories and applications*. London: Routledge, 2001.

New King James Version. Bible Gateway. Viewed 28 April 2008. URL:
<[http://www.biblegateway.com/versions/index.php?action=getVersionInfo&vid=50#books&version=50](http://www.biblegateway.com/versions/index.php?action=getVersionInfo&vid=50#books&version=50;);>

Nida, Eugene. *Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: United Bible Societies, 1974.

Norton, Gerard J. 'Ancient Versions and Textual Transmissions of the Old Testament' in J. W. Rogerson (Ed.). *Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. (pp. 211-236)

Nova Vulgata. Vatican. Viewed 28 April 2008. URL:
<http://www.vatican.va/archive/bible/nova_vulgata/documents/nova-vulgata_index_lt.html>

Pagels, Elaine. *Adam, Eve, and the Serpent*. London: Penguin, 1988.

Paloposki, Outi. "Kääntäminen historiassa" in Oittinen, Riitta and Pirjo Mäkinen (eds.). *Alussa oli käännös*. Tampere: Tampere University Press, 2001. (pp. 349–373)

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Whose Bible Is It? A History of the Scriptures Through the Ages*. East Rutherford, NJ, USA: Penguin Group (USA) Incorporated, 2005. p. 161-180

Pilkington, Hugh. 'Translating the Bible'. In Bann, S. '20th century studies no. 11: Translation and transformation.'. Canterbury: University of Kent, 1974. (pp. 52-63)

Pyhä Raamattu (1933 translation). Pieksämäki: Suomen Kirkon Sisälähetysseura, 1975.

Pyhä Raamattu (1992 translation). Helsinki: Suomen Piiphiaseura, 1992.

Simon, Sherry. *Gender in Translation*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.

Serve-A-Verse. LEV Software. Viewed 28 April. URL:
<<http://www.levsoftware.com/verses.htm>>

Tarkiainen, Viljo and Kari Tarkiainen. *Mikael Agricola*. Keuruu: Otava, 1985.

Torah. Online Bar/Bat Mitzvah Tutor. Viewed 28 April. URL:
<<http://bible.ort.org/books/torahd5.asp>>

Trible, Phyllis. *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

Worth Jr., Roland H. *Bible Translations: A History Through Source Documents*.
Jefferson: McFarland & Company, Inc. Publishers, 1992.

Finnish summary / suomenkielinen tiivistelmä

Raamattu on ollut länsimaisen kulttuurin keskipisteenä jo pitkään. Sitä on tutkittu kautta hyvin paljon. Nykyaikana sen tutkimus ei ole ainoastaan rajattu teologian alalle vaan sitä tutkivat historioitsijat, kulttuurintutkijat ja jopa kääntäjät. Tämä muutos tapahtui kuitenkin vasta viime vuosisatojen aikana, siihen asti Raamattu pysyi tietyllä tavoin ”pyhänä kirjana”. Nykyaikaisten tutkimusmetodeiden myötä on saatu paljon aiempaa enemmän tietoa Raamatun sisällöstä ja siihen liittyvistä asioista.

Raamatunkäännöksen historia nivoutuu tiukasti kääntämisen historiaan. Paljon ennen kuin muuta kääntämistä sinänsä harrastettiin, käännettiin jo Raamattua. Ja tähän sisältyy kääntämisen ongelma Raamatun suhteen. Tuleeko Raamattua kääntää? Jos vertaamme tilannetta muihin pyhiin kirjoihin kuten esimerkiksi Koraaniin, on niiden kääntämistyö vain tulkintaa (Pilkington 1974, 52). Niitä ei siis mielletä Jumalan sanana muulla kuin alkukielellä, käännökset ovat vain tulkintoja. Mutta eikö kaikki kääntäminen sitten ole jossain määrin tulkintaa?

Katolinen kirkko ja erityisesti kirkkoisä Augustinus selitti jo keskiajalla, miksi Raamattua voidaan kääntää (Copeland 1989, 21). Esimerkkinä hän käytti Septuagintan käännoä, johon liittyvissä legendoissa kerrotaan Pyhän Hengen vallanneet kääntäjät, jotta he pystyisivät tuottamaan saman tuloksen. Samaa on kirkko tarjonnut myös myöhemmissä käännoksissä, tästä on todisteena esimerkiksi Vulgatan kääntäjän Hieronymoksen julistaminen pyhäksi Jeromeksi, kääntäjien suojelupyhimykseksi. Kuitenkin myöhemmin Katolinen kirkko kielsi jopa käännoätoiminnan

vastauskonpuhdistuksen aika, kun kääntäjät eivät pystyneet tuottamaan Septuagintan hengessä samaa tekstiä yksinään (Paloposki 2001, 364).

Kansankieliset Raamatut olivat vasta myöhempää tuotetta. Jo keskiajalla syntyi myös kansankielisiä raamatunkäännöksiä, mutta niiden merkitys oli varsin pieni. Vasta uskonpuhdistuksen myötä protestanttisissa kirkoissa kiihtyi kansankielisten raamatunkäännösten määrä. Näissä käännöksissä ei välttämättä luotettu enää latinankieliseen Vulgataan tai sitä edeltäneeseen kreikankieliseen Septuagintaan. Osasta Lutherin raamatunkäännöksistä on selvää, että Luther käänsi ainakin osittain alkukielisistä versioista, Vanhan Testamentin kohdalla hepreasta (Worth 1992, 44). Alkukielestä kääntäminen aiheutti kääntäjille enemmän työtä, mutta lisäsi tulkinnan mahdollisuuksia. Kansankieliset Raamatut antoivat mahdollisuuksia tavallisille ihmisille lukea Raamattua ja tulkita sitä itse, joten kääntäjien vastuu lisääntyi. Ensimmäinen suomenkielinen raamatunkäännös on Mikael Agricolan Uusi testamentti vuodelta 1548. Elämänsä aikana Agricola ehti kääntää myös osittain Vanhan testamentin, mutta kokonaisuudessaan ensimmäinen suomalainen Raamattu julkaistiin vasta vuonna 1642.

Tutkimukseni keskittyy termin *ha'adam* käännöksiin ja tulkintoihin. *Ha'adam* on keskeinen termi kahdessa luomiskertomuksessa Ensimmäisen Mooseksen Kirjan alussa. Kyseinen termi on hyvin selvästi tuottanut päänvaivaa monelle kääntäjälle kautta aikojen. Alkuperäisesti *ha'adam* on sanasta *ha'adamah*, joka merkitsee maata eli kyseinen termi voidaan ymmärtää maaihmisenä, tai ihmisenä, joka on luotu maasta (Trible 1978, 75-55). Kuitenkin monissa käännöksissä tämä termi on tietystä vaiheesta

tekstiä käännetty erisnimeksi Adam. Phyllis Tribler taisteli kuitenkin jo 1970-luvulla tätä käännösratkaisua vastaan. Hänen mukaansa on mahdollista kääntää *ha'adam* Adamiksi, mutta luomistarinan konteksti määrittelee, että Adamin sijasta *ha'adam* olisi parempi kääntää termillä *ihminen* (Tribler 1978, 75-77). Adamin käyttö tässä yhteydessä muuttaa merkittävästi toisen luvun sisältöä ja tähän juuri feministi Mieke Bal tarttui 1980-luvulla. Jos *ha'adam* käännetään Adamin sijasta ihmiseksi, putoaa pohja monelta vuosikymmentä vanhoilta oletuksilta, että mies on ylempi kuin nainen siitä syystä, että hänet luotiin ensimmäisenä (Bal 1986, 320-326). Mieke Bal vie teorian verrattain pitkälle ehdottamalla, että ensimmäinen ihminen olisi saattanut aivan hyvin olla nainen (s. 323).

Termi *ha'adam* on hyvin usein käännetty eri kielillä joko Adamiksi, mieheksi tai termillä, joka viittaa ihmiseen, mutta jossa on hyvin vahva maskuliininen konnotaatio. Tämän vuoksi läpi historian on naisten heikompaan asemaan perusteltu sillä, että nainen luotiin vasta miehen jälkeen ja tämän vuoksi hän on alempi kuin mies. Tähän puututtiin jo 1800-luvulla ensimmäisen feministin aallon myötä, mutta vasta 1970-luvulta alkaen pystytään näkemään varsinainen muutos käännöksissä. Esimerkiksi nykyisessä vuonna 1993 julkaistussa suomenkielisessä Raamatussa Adam esiintyy vasta aivan luvun 2 lopussa, sen jälkeen kun ensimmäinen ihminen on vaivutettu uneen ja hänestä on erotettu toinen ihminen. Tämä ei kuitenkaan estä sitä, että edelleen tulkitsemme Ensimmäisen Mooseksen Kirjan toisen luvun kertovan, kuinka Adam luotiin ensin ja sitten vasta Eeva. Kulttuurimme paino on aivan liian valtava tässä suhteessa.

Käännöstieteillä tuntuu olevan nykyisin hieman ongelmallinen suhde raamatunkääntämiseen. Raamatunkääntäminenhan tapahtuu pääosin komiteoissa, joihin ei välttämättä edes ”oikeita” kääntäjiä hyväksytä. Komiteat koostuvat enemmän teologeista, tutkijoista ja kirjailijoista. Toinen ääripää on lähetyssaarnaajat, jotka toimivat samaan aikaan kääntäjinä. Heidän koulutuksensa itse kääntämiseen on hyvin pieni, he taas kääntävät enemmänkin kokemuksen perusteella. Tämänkaltaisesta ajattelusta kuitenkin syntyy ongelma siitä, miten määritellään kääntäjä. Onko hän henkilö, jolla on alan koulutus vai henkilö, joka kääntää tarpeesta ja on oppinut ammattinsa työnsä ohessa? Onko näistä kahdesta toinen tärkeämpi kuin toinen?

Vaikka käännöstiede tuntuukin hieman vierastavan nykyään raamatunkääntämistä, Eugene Nidan dynaaminen ekvivalenssiteoria, joka pohjaa raamatunkääntämiseen, antoi vauhtia monien muiden käännösteorioita syntymiselle. Dynaamisen ekvivalenssi perustuu vastaanottajan näkökulmaan (Nida 1974, 1). Dynaamisen ekvivalenssin toteutuessa vastaanottajan tulisi ymmärtää tekstin viesti samalla tavoin kuin lähdekielen vastaanottaja ymmärtää saman viestin. Tämä voi tietyissä tapauksissa olla varsin hankalaa, mutta kääntäjän on taiteiltava lähde- ja kohdekielen syövereissä, lähestyttävä kieliä täysin uudella tavalla ja tulkittava paljon enemmän kuin aiemmin. Nida, kuten hyvin monet raamatunkääntämisen tutkijat ja itse kääntäjät, tuomitsee jyrkästi sanasanaisen käännöksen, jonka mukaan on aiemmin tehty raamatunkäännöksiä (s. 3-5). Sen sijaan hän keskittyy tekstin viestiin ja vastaanottajien reaktioihin. Tietysti osa Nidan ehdottamista menetelmistä on hieman pitkälle vietyjä, mutta hänen teoriansa mullisti sekä käännöstieteen että raamatunkäännöksen alan.

Tulkinnan merkitys kääntämisessä on valtava. Tulkintaa ei välttämättä tiedosteta, mutta kääntäjinä meihin vaikuttavat kansallisuutemme, kielemme, taustamme, koulutuksen taso ja jopa sukupuolemme. Kuitenkin viime aikoina tulkinnasta on puhuttu hyvin vähän kääntäjäkoulutuksessa. Monien opiskelijoiden kaunokirjallisuuden tuntemus on valitettavasti verrattain huono ja tämä vaikuttaa helposti myös käännöksen laatuun. Kääntämisessä kontekstin tunteminen on lähes yhtä tärkeää kuin kielitaito. Monet opiskelijat käydessään esimerkiksi kaunokirjallisen kääntämisen kursseilla eivät huomaa kääntämässään tekstissä olevia selviä viittauksia esimerkiksi Raamattuun ja tällä tavoin kaventavat omaa tulkintaansa alkutekstistä. Kääntämisen opetuksessa pitäisi painottaa myös tulkintaa ja sen vaikutuksia käännöksen lopputulokseen ja alkuperäisen viestin välittämiseen. Tietysti kääntäjän on täysin mahdotonta päästä täysin alkutekstin kirjoittaman pään sisälle, joten aina käännöksestä jää jotain uupumaan. Silti kaunokirjallisuuden ja Raamatun tuntemus on kääntäjälle hyvin tärkeää mahdollisimman monipuolisen lopputuloksen saavuttamiseksi.

Raamatunkääntäminen jopa nykypäivänä on edelleen haastavaa. Monilla lukijoilla on Raamatusta hyvin vahvat käsitteet eikä muutoksia välttämättä hyväksytä kovinkaan helpolla. Raamatunkääntäjien ja -komiteoiden on taiteiltava eri tulkintojen ja vaihtoehtojen välillä, mutta tuotettava samalla tekstiä, joka on sekä kieliopillisesti hyvää että kielellisesti sujuvaa ja rikasta. Tämän vuoksi ei olekaan ihme, että raamatunkäännöstyöt kestävät edelleen vuosia jos ei vuosikymmeniä. Uusia tutkimuksia kuitenkin julkaistaan jatkuvasti, jotka helpottavat kääntäjien ja komiteoiden työtä. Raamatun kääntäminen on iso projekti, mutta se on tarpeellinen tietyin väliajoin, koska kielemme kehittyy ja etenee.

Tulkinta ja kääntäminen kulkevat käsi kädessä. Tämä on nähtävissä niin Raamatun teksteistä kuin yleisteksteistäkin. Kääntämistä ei voi olla olemassa ilman tulkintaa niin kauan kuin käännökset teetetään ihmisillä. Me tahtomattamme tulkitsemme ympäröivää maailmaa ja tekstejä niin lukiessamme kuin kääntäessämme. Niin kauan kuin kääntäjinä tiedostamme tekevämme näin ja aktiivisesti yritämme tulkita tekstejä, pystymme hallitsemaan tulkintojamme ja perustelemaan niitä.

Tutkimukseni tarkoitus oli vertailla eri käännösvaihtoehtoja termistä *ha'adam* eri aikoina ja eri kieliin. Vertailun tuloksista voimme nähdä raamatunkäännöstyön kehittymisen aikojen myötä. Toki edelleen hyvin paljon *ha'adam* käännetään joko Adamiksi tai mieheksi, mutta muutosta on jo luvassa. Erityisesti feministinen raamatunkäännöstutkimus ja feministinen käännösteoreetikot pyrkivät saamaan aikaan hyvin pieniä muutoksia, mutta merkittäviä. Saatammehan edelleen tulkita vuoden 1992 suomenkielisen raamatunkäännöksen luomiskertomuksen siten, että Adam luotiin ensimmäisenä. Mutta tutkimus on avannut mahdollisuuden myös toisille tulkinnoille ja tätä raamatunkäännöstutkimus on parhaimmillaan.

Appendices

Appendix 1: The Elohist Creation (Gen. 1: 26-31)

Original Hebrew

Torah (*Torah, Serve-A-Verse*)

26

מיה תגדב ודריו ונתומדכ ונמלצב מדא השענ מיהלא רמאיו
:קראה-לע שמרה שמרה-לכבו קראה-לכבו המהבבו מימשה פועבו

Vayomer Elohim na'aseh adam betsalmenu kidemutenu veyirdu bidegat hayam uve'of hashamayim
uvabehemah uvechol-ha'arets uvechol-haremes haromes al-ha'arets.

27

רכז ותא ארב מיהלא מלצב ומלצב מדאה-תא מיהלא ארביו
:מתא ארב הבקנו

Vayivra Elohim et-ha'adam betsalmo betselem Elohim bara oto zachar unekevah bara otam.

28

תא ואלמו וברו ורפ מיהלא מהל רמאיו מיהלא מתא ררבי-
תשמרה היה-לכבו מימשה פועבו מיה תגדב ודרו השכבו קראה
:קראה-לע

Vayevarech otam Elohim vayomer lahem Elohim peru urevu umil'u et-ha'arets vechiveshuha uredu
bidegat hayam uve'of hashamayim uvechol-chayah haromeset al-ha'arets.

29

לע רשא ערז ערז בשע-לכ-תא מכל יתתנ הנה מיהלא רמאיו-
מכל ערז ערז קע-ירפ וב-רשא קעה-לכ-תאו קראה-לכ ינפ
:הלכאל היהי

Vayomer Elohim hineh natati lachem et-chol-esev zorea zera asher al-peney kol-ha'arets ve'et-kol-
ha'ets asher-bo feri-ets zorea zara lachem yihyeh le-ochlah.

30

רשא קראה-לע שמור לכלו מימשה פוע-לכלו קראה תיה-לכלו-
:נכ-יהיו הלכאל בשע קרי-לכ-תא היה שפנ וב

Ulechol-chayat ha'arets ulechol-of hashamayim ulechol romes al-ha'arets asher-bo nefesh chayah et-
kol-yerek esev le'ochlah vayehi-chen.

31

יהיו ברע-יהיו דאמ בוט-הנהו השע רשא-לכ-תא מיהלא אריו-
:יששה מוי רקב

Vayar Elohim et-kol-asher asah vehineh-tov me'od vayehi-erev vayehi-voker yom hashishi.

Greek Translation

Septuaginta (LXX)

26 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν καὶ ἀρχέτωσαν τῶν ἰχθύων τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἔρπετων τῶν ἔρπόντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

27 καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτὸν ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς

28 καὶ ἠλόγησεν αὐτούς ὁ θεὸς λέγων ἀύξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς καὶ ἀρχετε τῶν ἰχθύων τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ πάντων τῶν ἔρπετων τῶν ἔρπόντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

29 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ὑμῖν πᾶν χόρτον σπόριμον σπεῖρον σπέρμα ὃ ἐστὶν ἐπάνω πάσης τῆς γῆς καὶ πᾶν ξύλον ὃ ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ καρπὸν σπέρματος σπορίμου ὑμῖν ἔσται εἰς βρώσιν

30 καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ παντὶ ἔρπετῷ τῷ ἔρποντι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὃ ἔχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ ψυχὴν ζωῆς πάντα χόρτον χλωρὸν εἰς βρώσιν καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως

31 καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν καὶ ἰδοὺ καλὰ λίαν καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα καὶ ἐγένετο πρωὶ ἡμέρα ἕκτη

Latin Translations

Vulgate (Biblia Sacra Vulgata)

26 et ait faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram et praesit piscibus maris et volatilibus caeli et bestiis universaeque terrae omnique reptili quod movetur in terra

27 et creavit Deus hominem ad imaginem suam ad imaginem Dei creavit illum masculum et feminam creavit eos

28 benedixitque illis Deus et ait crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram et subicite eam et dominamini piscibus maris et volatilibus caeli et universis animantibus quae moventur super terram

29 dixitque Deus ecce dedi vobis omnem herbam adferentem semen super terram et universa ligna quae habent in semet ipsis sementem generis sui ut sint vobis in escam

30 et cunctis animantibus terrae omnique volucris caeli et universis quae moventur in terra et in quibus est anima vivens ut habeant ad vescendum et factum est ita

31 viditque Deus cuncta quae fecit et erant valde bona et factum est vespere et mane dies sextus

Nova Vulgata (Nova Vulgata)

26 Et ait Deus: "Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram; et praesint piscibus maris et volatilibus caeli et bestiis universaeque terrae omnique reptili, quod movetur in terra".

27 Et creavit Deus hominem ad imaginem suam; ad imaginem Dei creavit illum; masculum et feminam creavit eos.

28 Benedixitque illis Deus et ait illis Deus: “Crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram et subicite eam et dominamini piscibus maris et volatilibus caeli et universis animantibus, quae moventur super terram”.

29 Dixitque Deus: “Ecce dedi vobis omnem herbam afferentem semen super terram et universa ligna, quae habent in semetipsis fructum ligni portantem sementem, ut sint vobis in escam

30 et cunctis animantibus terrae omnique volucris caeli et universis, quae moventur in terra et in quibus est anima vivens, omnem herbam virentem ad vescendum”. Et factum est ita.

31 Viditque Deus cuncta, quae fecit, et ecce erant valde bona. Et factum est vespere et mane, dies sextus.

German and English Translations

Die Bibel (*Die Bibel – Martin Luther translation*)

26 Und Gott sprach: Lasset uns Menschen machen, ein Bild, das uns gleich sei, die da herrschen über die Fische im Meer und über die Vögel unter dem Himmel und über das Vieh und über alle Tiere des Feldes und über alles Gewürm, das auf Erden kriecht.

27 Und Gott schuf den Menschen zu seinem Bilde, zum Bilde Gottes schuf er ihn; und schuf sie als Mann und Weib.

28 Und Gott segnete sie und sprach zu ihnen: Seid fruchtbar und mehret euch und füllet die Erde und machet sie euch untertan und herrschet über die Fische im Meer und über die Vögel unter dem Himmel und über das Vieh und über alles Getier, das auf Erden kriecht.

29 Und Gott sprach: Sehet da, ich habe euch gegeben alle Pflanzen, die Samen bringen, auf der ganzen Erde, und alle Bäume mit Früchten, die Samen bringen, zu eurer Speise.

30 Aber allen Tieren auf Erden und allen Vögeln unter dem Himmel und allem Gewürm, das auf Erden lebt, habe ich alles grüne Kraut zur Nahrung gegeben. Und es geschah so.

31 Und Gott sah an alles, was er gemacht hatte, und siehe, es war sehr gut. Da ward aus Abend und Morgen der sechste Tag.

King James Version (*Holy Bible*)

26 And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

27 So God created man in his *own* image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

28 And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

29 And God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which *is* upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in the which *is* the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.

30 And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein *there* is life, *I have given* every green herb for meat: and it was so.

31 And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, *it was* very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

New King James Version (*New King James Version*)

26 Then God said, “Let Us make man in Our image, according to Our likeness; let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over the cattle, over all the earth and over every creeping thing that creeps on the earth.”

27 So God created man in His *own* image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.

28 Then God blessed them, and God said to them, “Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it; have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves on the earth.”

29 And God said, “See, I have given you every herb *that* yields seed which *is* on the face of all the earth, and every tree whose fruit yields seed; to you it shall be for food.

30 Also, to every beast of the earth, to every bird of the air, and to everything that creeps on the earth, in which *there is* life, *I have given* every green herb for food”; and it was so.

31 Then God saw everything that He had made, and indeed *it was* very good. So the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

Finnish Translations

Coco Pyhä Raamattu (*Biblia*)

26 JA Jumala sanoi: tehkäm Ihminen meidän cuwaxem/ joca meidän muotoisem on/ joca wallidze calat meres/ ja linnut taiwan alla/ ja carjan/ ja coco maan/ ja caicki jotca maalla matelewat.

27 Ja Jumala siunais heitä/ ja sanoi heille: hedelmöitkät ja lisändykät ja täyttäkät maata/ ja tehkät se teillen alemaisexi/ ja wallitcat calat meres/ ja linnut taiwan alla/ ja caicki eläimet jotca maalla lijckuwat.

28 Ja Jumala sanoi: cadzo/ minä annoin teille caickinaiset ruohot/ joisa siemen on coco maan päällä/ ja caickinaiset hedelmäliset puut/ ja puut joisa siemen on/ teille ruaxi.

29 Ja caickille eläimille maan päällä/ ja caickille linnuille taiwan alla/ ja caickille madoille maan päällä/ joisa hengi on/ caickinaiset wiherjäiset ruohot syötäwäxi/ Ja tapahtui niijn.

30 Ja Jumala cadzoi caickia cuin hän tehnyt oli/ ja cadzo/ ne olit sangen hywät. Ja tuli ehtosta ja amusta cuudes päiwä.

Finnish 1776 Translation – Biblia

26. Ja Jumala sanoi: tehkäämme ihminen meidän kuvaksemme, meidän muotomme jälkeen: ja he vallitkaan kalat meressä, ja taivaan linnut, ja karjan ja koko maan, ja kaikki, jotka maalla matelevat.

27. Ja Jumala loi ihmisen omaksi kuvaksensa, Jumalan kuvaksi hän sen loi: mieheksi ja vaimoksi loi hän heitä.

28. Ja Jumala siunasi heitä, ja Jumala sanoi heille: kasvakaat ja lisääntykää ja täyttäkää maata, ja tehkää se teillenne alamaiseksi; ja vallitkaat kalat meressä, ja taivaan linnut, ja kaikki eläimet, jotka maalla liikkuvat.

29. Ja Jumala sanoi: katso, minä annoin teille kaikkinaiset ruohot, joissa siemen on koko maan päällä, ja kaikkinaiset hedelmälliset puut, ja puut, joissa siemen on, teille ruaksi

30. Ja kaikille eläimille maan päällä, ja kaikille taivaan linnuille, ja kaikille, jotka matelevat maan päällä, joissa elävä henki on, kaikkinaiset viheriäiset ruohot syötäväksi. Ja tapahtui niin.

31. Ja Jumala katsoi kaikkia, kuin hän tehnyt oli, ja katso, ne olivat sangen hyvät. Ja tuli ehtoosta ja aamusta se kuudes päivä.

Finnish 1933 Translation

26. Jumala sanoi: «Tehkäämme ihminen kuvaksemme, kaltaiseksemme; ja vallitkoot he meren kalat ja taivaan linnut ja karjaeläimet ja koko maan ja kaikki matelijat, jotka maassa matelevat.»

27. Ja Jumala loi ihmisen omaksi kuvaksensa, Jumalan kuvaksi hän hänet loi; mieheksi ja naiseksi hän loi heidät.

28. Ja Jumala siunasi heidät, ja Jumala sanoi heille: «Olkaa hedelmälliset ja lisääntykää ja täyttäkää maa ja tehkää se itsellenne alamaiseksi; ja vallitkaa meren kalat ja taivaan linnut ja kaikki maan päällä liikkuvat eläimet.»
29. Ja Jumala sanoi: «Katso, minä annan teille kaikkinaiset siementä tekevät ruohot, joita kasvaa kaikkialla maan päällä, ja kaikki puut, joissa on siementä tekevä hedelmä; olkoot ne teille ravinnoksi.
30. Ja kaikille metsäeläimille ja kaikille taivaan linnuille ja kaikille, jotka maassa matelevat ja joissa on elävä henki, minä annan kaikkinaiset viheriät ruohot ravinnoksi.» Ja tapahtui niin.
31. Ja Jumala katsoi kaikkea, mitä hän tehnyt oli, ja katso, se oli sangen hyvää. Tuli ehtoo, ja tuli aamu, kuudes päivä.

Finnish 1992 translation

26. Jumala sanoi: «Tehkäämme ihminen, tehkäämme hänet kuvaksemme, kaltaiseksemme, ja hallitkoon hän meren kaloja, taivaan lintuja, karjaeläimiä, maata ja kaikkia pikkueläimiä, joita maan päällä liikkuu.»
27. Ja Jumala loi ihmisen kuvakseen, Jumalan kuvaksi hän hänet loi, mieheksi ja naiseksi hän loi heidät.
28. Jumala siunasi heidät ja sanoi heille: «Olkaa hedelmälliset, lisääntykää ja täyttäkää maa ja ottakaa se valtaanne. Vallitkaa meren kaloja, taivaan lintuja ja kaikkea, mikä maan päällä elää ja liikkuu.»
29. Jumala sanoi vielä: «Minä annan teille kaikki siementä tekevät kasvit, joita maan päällä on, ja kaikki puut, joissa on siementä kantavat hedelmät. Olkoot ne teidän ravintonne.
30. Ja villieläimille ja taivaan linnuille ja kaikelle, mikä maan päällä elää ja liikkuu, minä annan ravinnoksi vihreät kasvit.» Niin tapahtui.
31. Ja Jumala katsoi kaikkea tekemäänsä, ja kaikki oli hyvää. Tuli ilta ja tuli aamu, näin meni kuudes päivä.

Appendix 2: The Yahwist Creation (Gen. 2: 5, 7, 18-25)

Original Hebrew

Torah (*Torah, Serve-A-Verse*)

5

חמצי מרט הדשה בשע-לכו קראב היהי מרט הדשה חיש לכו
המדאה-תא דבעל ניא מדאו קראה-לע מיהלא הוהי ריטמה אל יכ

Vechol siach hasadeh terem yihyeh va'arets vechol-esev hasadeh terem yitsmach ki lo himetir
Adonay Elohim al-ha'arets ve'adam ayin la'avod et-ha'adamah.

7

ויפאב חפיו המדאה-נמ רפע מדאה-תא מיהלא הוהי רצייו
היח שפנל מדאה יהיו מיח תמשנ

Vayitser Adonay Elohim et-ha'adam afar min-ha'adamah vayipach pe'apav nishmat chayim vayehi
ha'adam lenefesh chayah.

18

רזע ול-השעא ודבל מדאה תויה בוט-אל מיהלא הוהי רמאיו
ודגנכ

Vayomer Adonay Elohim lo-tov heyot ha'adam levado e'eseh-lo ezer kenegdo.

19

מימשה פוע-לכ תאו הדשה תיח-לכ המדאה-נמ מיהלא הוהי רצייו
מדאה ול-ארקו רשא לכו ול-ארקו-המ תוארל מדאה-לא אביו
ומש אוה היח שפנ

Vayitser Adonay Elohim min-ha'adamah kol-chayat hasadeh ve'et kol-of hashamayim vayave el-
ha'adam lir'ot mah-yikra-lo vechol asher yikra-lo ha'adam nefesh chayah hu shemo.

20

הדשה תיח לכלו מימשה פועלו המהבה-לכל תומש מדאה ארקו
ודגנכ רזע אצמ-אל מדאלו

Vayikra ha'adam shemot lechol-habehemah ule'of hashamayim ulechol chayot hasadeh ule-Adam lo-
matsa ezer kenegdo.

21

ויתעלצמ תחא חקיו נשייו מדאה-לע המדרת מיהלא הוהי לפיו
הנתחת רשב רגסיו

Vayapel Adonay Elohim tardemah al-ha'adam vayishan vayikach achat mitsal'otav vayisgor basar
tachtenah.

22

האביו השאל מדאה-נמ חקל-רשא עלצה-תא מיהלא הוהי נביו
מדאה-לא

Vayiven Adonay Elohim et-hatsela asher-lakach min-ha'adam le'ishah vayeivi'eha el-ha'adam.

23

ארקו תאזל ירשבמ רשבו ימצעמ מצע מעפה תאז מדאה רמאיו
תאז-החקל שיאמ יכ השא

Vayomer ha'adam zot hapa'am etsem me'atsamay uvasar mibesari lezot yikare ishah ki me'ish
lukacha-zot.

24

רשבל ויהו ותשאב קבדו ומא-תאו ויבא-תא שיא-בזעי נכ-לע
דחא

Al-ken ya'azov-ish et-aviv ve'et imo vedavak be'ishto vehayu levasar echad.

25

וששבתי אלו ותשאו מדאה מימורע מהינש ויהיו:

Vayihyu shneyhem arumim ha'adam ve'ishto velo yitboshashu.

Greek Translation

Septuaginta (LXX)

5 καὶ πᾶν χλωρὸν ἄγρου πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ πάντα χόρτον ἄγρου πρὸ τοῦ ἀνατεῖλαι οὐ γὰρ ἔβρεξεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἦν ἐργάζεσθαι τὴν γῆν

7 καὶ ἐπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν

18 καὶ εἶπεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς οὐ καλὸν εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον μόνον ποιήσωμεν αὐτῷ βοηθὸν κατ' αὐτόν

19 καὶ ἐπλασεν ὁ θεὸς ἐτι ἐκ τῆς γῆς πάντα τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἄγρου καὶ πάντα τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὰ πρὸς τὸν Ἀδὰμ ἰδεῖν τί καλέσει αὐτά καὶ πᾶν ὃ ἐὰν ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸ Ἀδὰμ ψυχὴν ζῶσαν τοῦτο ὄνομα αὐτοῦ

20 καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἀδὰμ ὀνόματα πᾶσιν τοῖς κτήνεσιν καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς θηρίοις τοῦ ἄγρου τῷ δὲ Ἀδὰμ οὐχ εὐρέθη βοηθὸς ὅμοιος αὐτῷ

21 καὶ ἐπέβαλεν ὁ θεὸς ἕκστασιν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀδὰμ καὶ ὑπνωσεν καὶ ἔλαβεν μίαν τῶν πλευρῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεπλήρωσεν σάρκα ἀντ' αὐτῆς

22 καὶ ὠκοδόμησεν κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὴν πλευρὰν ἣν ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ εἰς γυναῖκα καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὴν πρὸς τὸν Ἀδὰμ

23 καὶ εἶπεν Ἀδὰμ τοῦτο νῦν ὅστούν ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων μου καὶ σὰρξ ἐκ τῆς σαρκός μου αὕτη κληθήσεται γυνή ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρός αὐτῆς ἐλήμφθη αὕτη

24 ἐνεκεν τούτου καταλείπει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν

25 καὶ ἦσαν οἱ δύο γυμνοὶ ὃ τε Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἦσχύνοντο

Latin Translations

Vulgate (Biblia Sacra Vulgata)

5 et omne virgultum agri antequam oreretur in terra omnemque herbam regionis priusquam germinaret non enim pluerat Dominus Deus super terram et homo non erat qui operaretur terram
7 formavit igitur Dominus Deus hominem de limo terrae et inspiravit in faciem eius spiraculum vitae et factus est homo in animam viventem

18 dixit quoque Dominus Deus non est bonum esse hominem solum faciamus ei adiutorium similem sui

19 formatis igitur Dominus Deus de humo cunctis animantibus terrae et universis volatilibus caeli adduxit ea ad Adam ut videret quid vocaret ea omne enim quod vocavit Adam animae viventis ipsum est nomen eius

20 appellavitque Adam nominibus suis cuncta animantia et universa volatilia caeli et omnes bestias terrae Adam vero non inveniebatur adiutor similis eius

21 inmisit ergo Dominus Deus soporem in Adam cumque obdormisset tulit unam de costis eius et replevit carnem pro ea

22 et aedificavit Dominus Deus costam quam tulerat de Adam in mulierem et adduxit eam ad Adam
23 dixitque Adam hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis et caro de carne mea haec vocabitur virago quoniam
de viro sumpta est
24 quam ob rem relinquet homo patrem suum et matrem et adhaerebit uxori suae et erunt duo in carne
una
25 erant autem uterque nudi Adam scilicet et uxor eius et non erubescabant

Nova Vulgata (*Nova Vulgata*)

5 omne virgultum agri, antequam oriretur in terra, omnisque herba regionis, priusquam germinaret;
non enim pluerat Dominus Deus super terram, et homo non erat, qui operaretur humum,
7 tunc formavit Dominus Deus hominem pulverem de humo et inspiravit in nares eius spiraculum
vitae, et factus est homo in animam viventem.
18 Dixit quoque Dominus Deus: “Non est bonum esse hominem solum; faciam ei adiutorium simile
sui”.
19 Formatis igitur Dominus Deus de humo cunctis animantibus agri et universis volatilibus caeli,
adduxit ea ad Adam, ut videret quid vocaret ea; omne enim, quod vocavit Adam animae viventis,
ipsum est nomen eius.
20 Appellavitque Adam nominibus suis cuncta pecora et universa volatilia caeli et omnes bestias
agri; Adae vero non inveniebatur adiutor similis eius.
21 Immisit ergo Dominus Deus soporem in Adam. Cumque obdormisset, tulit unam de costis eius et
replevit carnem pro ea;
22 et aedificavit Dominus Deus costam, quam tulerat de Adam, in mulierem et adduxit eam ad
Adam.
23 Dixitque Adam:
“Haec nunc os ex ossibus meis
et caro de carne mea!
Haec vocabitur Virago,
quoniam de viro sumpta est haec”.
24 Quam ob rem relinquet vir patrem suum et matrem et adhaerebit uxori suae; et erunt in carnem
unam.
25 Erant autem uterque nudi, Adam scilicet et uxor eius, et non erubescabant.

German and English Translations

Die Bibel (*Die Bibel – Martin Luther translation*)

5 Und alle die Sträucher auf dem Felde waren noch nicht auf Erden, und all das Kraut auf dem Felde
war noch nicht gewachsen; denn Gott der HERR hatte noch nicht regnen lassen auf Erden, und kein
Mensch war da, der das Land bebaute;
7 Da machte Gott der HERR den Menschen aus Erde vom Acker und blies ihm den Odem des
Lebens in seine Nase. Und so ward der Mensch ein lebendiges Wesen.
18 Und Gott der HERR sprach: Es ist nicht gut, daß der Mensch allein sei; ich will ihm eine Gehilfin
machen, die um ihn sei.
19 Und Gott der HERR machte aus Erde alle die Tiere auf dem Felde und alle die Vögel unter dem
Himmel und brachte sie zu dem Menschen, daß er sähe, wie er sie nennte; denn wie der Mensch
jedes Tier nennen würde, so sollte es heißen.
20 Und der Mensch gab einem jeden Vieh und Vogel unter dem Himmel und Tier auf dem Felde
seinen Namen; aber für den Menschen ward keine Gehilfin gefunden, die um ihn wäre.
21 Da ließ Gott der HERR einen tiefen Schlaf fallen auf den Menschen, und er schlief ein. Und er
nahm eine seiner Rippen und schloß die Stelle mit Fleisch.

22 Und Gott der HERR baute ein Weib aus der Rippe, die er von dem Menschen nahm, und brachte sie zu ihm.
23 Da sprach der Mensch: Das ist doch Bein von meinem Bein und Fleisch von meinem Fleisch; man wird sie Männin nennen, weil sie vom Manne genommen ist.
24 Darum wird ein Mann seinen Vater und seine Mutter verlassen und seinem Weibe anhangen, und sie werden sein ein Fleisch.
25 Und sie waren beide nackt, der Mensch und sein Weib, und schämten sich nicht.

King James Version (*Holy Bible*)

5 And every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew: for the LORD God had not caused it to rain upon the earth, and *there was* not a man to till the ground.
7 And the LORD God formed man *of* the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life: and man became a living soul.
18 And the LORD God said, *It is* not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an help meet for him.
19 And out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought *them* unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that *was* the name thereof.
20 And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field; but for Adam there was not found an help meet for him.
21 And the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof;
22 And the rib, which the LORD God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man.
23 And Adam said, This *is* now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man.
24 Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.
25 And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.

New King James Version (*New King James Version*)

5 before any plant of the field was in the earth and before any herb of the field had grown. For the LORD God had not caused it to rain on the earth, and *there was* no man to till the ground;
7 And the LORD God formed man *of* the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being.
18 And the LORD God said, "*It is* not good that man should be alone; I will make him a helper comparable to him."
19 Out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field and every bird of the air, and brought *them* to Adam to see what he would call them. And whatever Adam called each living creature, that *was* its name.
20 So Adam gave names to all cattle, to the birds of the air, and to every beast of the field. But for Adam there was not found a helper comparable to him.
21 And the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall on Adam, and he slept; and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh in its place.
22 Then the rib which the LORD God had taken from man He made into a woman, and He brought her to the man.
23 And Adam said:
 "This *is* now bone of my bones
 And flesh of my flesh;

She shall be called Woman,
Because she was taken out of Man.”
24 Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and they shall become one flesh.
25 And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.

Finnish Translations

Coco Pyhä Raamattu (*Biblia*)

5 Ja caickinaiset puut kedolla/ jotca ei ennen ollet maan päällä/ ja caickinaiset ruohot kedolla/ jotca ei ennen caswanet ollet.
6 Sillä ei HERRa Jumala andanut vielä sata maan päälle/ eikä ollut ihmistä joca maata wiljeli/ waan sumu nousi maasta/ ja casti caiken maan.
7 JA HERRa Jumala teki ihmisen maan tomusta/ ja puhalsi hänen sieramijns eläwän hengen/ ja tuli ihminen nijn eläwäxi sieluxi.
18 JA HERRa Jumala sanoi: ei ole hywä ihmisen yxinäns olla/ minä teen hänelle awun/ joca hänelle soweljas on.
19 Cosca HERRa Jumala oli maasta caickinaiset eläimet kedolle/ ja caickinaiset linnut taiwan ala tehnyt/ toi hän ne ihmisen eteen/ että hän näkis cuinga hän ne nimitäis: sillä nijncuin ihminen caickinaiset eläimet nimitti/ nijn ne cudzutan.
20 Ja ihminen andoi cullakin carjalle/ ja linnuille taiwan alla/ ja eläimille maan päällä heidän nimens. Mutta ihmiselle ei löytty apua/ joca hänelle soweljas olis.
21 Ja HERRa Jumala pani rascan unen ihmiseen/ ja cuin hän nuckui/ otti hän yhden hänen kylkiluistans/ ja täytti sen paican lihalla.
22 Ja HERRa Jumala rakensi waimon sijtä kylkiluusta/ jonga hän ihmisest otti/ ja toi sen hänen eteens.
23 Nijn sanoi ihminen: tämä on luu minun luistani/ ja liha minun lihastani/ se pitä cudzuttaman miehen puolisaxi: sillä hän on otettu miehestä.
24 Sentähden pitä miehen luopuman Isästäns ja Äitistäns/ ja pysymän emändäns tykönä/ ja he tulewat yhdexi lihaxi.
25 Ja he olit molemmat alasti/ Adam ja hänen emändäns/ ja ei häwennet.

Finnish 1776 Translation – Biblia

5. Ja kaikkinaiset pensaat kedolla, jotka ei ennen olleet maan päällä, ja kaikkinaiset ruohot kedolla, jotka ei ennen kasvaneet. Sillä ei Herra Jumala antanut vielä sataa maan päälle, eikä ollut ihmistä, joka maata viljeli;
7. Ja Herra Jumala teki ihmisen, tomun maasta, ja puhalsi hänen sieraimiinsa elävän hengen: ja tuli ihminen niin eläväksi sieluksi.
18. Ja Herra Jumala sanoi: ei ole hyvä ihmisen yksinänsä olla, minä teen hänelle avun, joka hänen tykönänsä oleman pitää.
19. Koska Herra Jumala oli tehnyt maasta kaikkinaiset eläimet kedolle, ja kaikkinaiset taivaan linnut, toi hän ne Adamin eteen, että hän näkis, kuinka hän ne nimittäis: sillä niinkuin Adam kaikkinaiset eläimet nimitti, niin ne kutsutaan.
20. Ja Adam antoi kullekin karjalle, ja taivaan linnuille, ja eläimille maan päällä heidän nimensä. Mutta Adamille ei löytty apua, joka hänen tykönänsä olisi.
21. Ja Herra jumala pani raskaan unen Adamiin, ja kuin hän nukkui, otti hän yhden hänen kylkiluistansa, ja täytti sen paikan lihalla.
22. Ja Herra Jumala rakensi vaimon siitä kylkiluusta, jonka hän Adamista otti, ja toi sen hänen eteensä.
23. Niin sanoi Adam: tämä on nyt luu minun luistani, ja liha minun lihastani: se pitää kutsuttaman miehiseksi, sillä hän on otettu miehestä.

24. Sentähden pitää miehen luopuman isästänsä ja äidistänsä, ja vaimoonsa sidottu oleman, ja tulevat yhdeksi lihaksi.
25. Ja he olivat molemmat alasti, Adam ja hänen emäntänsä, ja ei hävenneet.

Finnish 1933 Translation

5. ei ollut vielä yhtään kedon pensasta maan päällä, eikä vielä kasvanut mitään ruohoa kedolla, koska Herra Jumala ei vielä ollut antanut sataa maan päälle eikä ollut ihmistä maata viljelemässä,
7. Silloin Herra Jumala teki maan tomusta ihmisen ja puhalsi hänen sieraimiinsa elämän hengen, ja niin ihmisestä tuli elävä sielu.
18. Ja Herra Jumala sanoi: «Ei ole ihmisen hyvä olla yksinänsä, minä teen hänelle avun, joka on hänelle sopiva.»
19. Ja Herra Jumala teki maasta kaikki metsän eläimet ja kaikki taivaan linnut ja toi ne ihmisen eteen nähdäkseen, kuinka hän ne nimittäisi; ja niinkuin ihminen nimitti kunkin elävän olennon, niin oli sen nimi oleva.
20. Ja ihminen antoi nimet kaikille karjaeläimille ja taivaan linnuille ja kaikille metsän eläimille. Mutta Aadamille ei löytynyt apua, joka olisi hänelle sopinut.
21. Niin Herra Jumala vaivutti ihmisen raskaaseen uneen, ja kun hän nukkui, otti hän yhden hänen kylkiluistaan ja täytti sen paikan lihalla.
22. Ja Herra Jumala rakensi vaimon siitä kylkiluusta, jonka hän oli ottanut miehestä, ja toi hänet miehen luo.
23. Ja mies sanoi:
«Tämä on nyt luu minun luistani ja liha
minun lihastani;
hän kutsuttakoon miehettäreksi,
sillä hän on miehestä otettu».
24. Sentähden mies luopukoon isästään ja äidistänsä ja liittyköön vaimoonsa, ja he tulevat yhdeksi lihaksi.
25. Ja he olivat molemmat, mies ja hänen vaimonsa, alasti eivätkä hävenneet toisiaan.

Finnish 1992 Translation

5. ei maan päällä ollut vielä yhtään pensasta eikä edes ruoho ollut noussut esiin, sillä Herra Jumala ei ollut antanut sateen kastella maata eikä ihmistä vielä ollut maata viljelemässä.
7. Ja Herra Jumala muovasi maan tomusta ihmisen ja puhalsi hänen sieraimiinsa elämän henkäyksen. Näin ihmisestä tuli elävä olento.
18. Herra Jumala sanoi: «Ei ole hyvä ihmisen olla yksinään. Minä teen hänelle kumppanin, joka sopii hänen avukseen.»
19. Ja Herra Jumala muovasi maasta kaikki villieläimet ja kaikki taivaan linnut ja vei ne ihmisen luo nähdäkseen, minkä nimen hän kullekin antaisi. Ja jokainen elävä olento sai sen nimen, jolla ihminen sitä kutsui.
20. Näin ihminen antoi nimet kaikille karjaeläimille, kaikille linnuille ja kaikille villieläimille. Mutta ihmiselle ei löytynyt sopivaa kumppania.
21. Silloin Herra Jumala vaivutti ihmisen syvään uneen ja otti hänen nukkuessaan yhden hänen kylkiluistaan ja täytti kohdan lihalla.
22. Herra Jumala teki tästä kylkiluusta naisen ja toi hänet miehen luo.
23. Ja mies sanoi:
- Tämä se on! Tämä on
luu minun luustani ja liha minun lihastani.
Naiseksi häntä sanottakoon:
miehestä hänet on otettu.
24. Siksi mies jättää isänsä ja äitinsä ja liittyy vaimoonsa, niin että he tulevat yhdeksi lihaksi.
25. Ja he olivat molemmat alasti, mies ja hänen vaimonsa, eivätkä he tunteneet häpeää

Appendix 3: The Occurrence of of the term *ha'adam* and *'ish* in the original Hebrew and their translations

Ancient translations and Nova Vulgata

Chapter1	Original Hebrew	<i>Septuagint</i>	<i>Vulgate</i>	<i>Nova Vulgata</i>
26	adam	άνθρωπον	hominem	hominem
27	et-ha'adam	άνθρωπον	hominem	hominem
Chapter 2				
5	ve-adam	άνθρωπος	homo	homo
7	et-ha'adam	άνθρωπον	hominem	hominem
18	ha'adam	άνθρωπον	hominem	hominem
19	el-ha'adam, ha'adam	Αδαμ	Adam	Adam
20	ha'adam, ule-adam	Αδαμ	Adam	Adam
21	al-ha'adam	Αδαμ	Adam	Adam
22	min-ha'adam, el-ha'adam	Αδαμ	Adam	Adam
23	ha'adam, me'ish	Αδαμ, άνδρὸς	Adam, viro	Adam, viro
24	ya'azov-ish	άνθρωπος	homo	vir
25	ha'adam	Αδαμ	Adam	Adam

Protestant translation and *New King James Version*

Chapter 1	Original Hebrew	<i>Die Bibel</i>	<i>King James Version</i>	<i>New King James Version</i>
26	adam	Menschen	man	man
27	et-ha'adam	Menschen	man	man
Chapter 2				
5	ve-adam	Mensch	man	man
7	et-ha'adam	Menschen	man	man
18	ha'adam	Mensch	man	man
19	el-ha'adam, ha'adam	Mensch	Adam	Adam
20	ha'adam, ule- adam	Menschen, Mensch	Adam	Adam
21	al-ha'adam	Menschen	Adam	Adam
22	min-ha'adam, el-ha'adam	Menschen	man	man
23	ha'adam, me'ish	Mensch, Manne	Adam, Man	Adam, Man
24	ya'azov-ish	Mann	man	man
25	ha'adam	Mensch	man	man

Finnish translations

Chapter 1	Original Hebrew	<i>Coco Pyhä Raamattu 1642</i>	<i>Biblia 1776</i>	<i>Finnish translation 1933</i>	<i>Finnish translation 1992</i>
26	adam	Ihminen	ihminen	ihminen	ihminen
27	et-ha'adam	n/a	ihmisen	ihmisen	ihmisen
Chapter 2					
5	ve-adam	/6 ihmistä	ihmistä	ihmistä	ihmistä
7	et-ha'adam	ihmisen, ihminen	ihmisen, ihminen	ihmisen, ihmisestä	ihmisen, ihmisestä
18	ha'adam	ihmisen	ihmisen	ihmisen	ihmisen
19	el-ha'adam, ha'adam	ihmisen, ihminen	Adamin, Adam	ihmisen, ihminen	ihmisen, ihminen
20	ha'adam, ule-adam	ihminen, ihmiselle	Adam, Adamille	ihminen, Aadamille	ihminen, ihmiselle
21	al-ha'adam	ihmiseen	Adamiin	ihmisen	ihmisen
22	min- ha'adam, el-ha'adam	ihmisest	Adamista	miehestä, miehen	miehen
23	ha'adam, me'ish	ihminen, miehestä	Adam, miehestä	mies, miehestä	mies, miehestä
24	ya'azov-ish	miehen	miehen	mies	mies
25	ha'adam	Adam	Adam	mies	mies

