

## FEMINISM AND BIBLE TRANSLATION

**Oksana Dzera**

*Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,  
1, Universytetska Str., Lviv, Ukraine, 79000  
oksana.dzera@lnu.edu.ua*

The article considers the development of translation ideas as viewed from a gender-studies perspective. The author elucidates three lines of feminist approach towards the Bible, namely: its rejection as the book reflecting the masculine bias; the application of gender critique in order to make manifest and subsequently deconstruct its patriarchal nature; the use of “depatriarchalizing principle” which lies in the close reading of the Bible in order to reveal its true meaning of equality. The last approach entails significant implications and possibilities for translators who can make the Bible “inclusive” and its women visible.

*Key words:* feminism, gender studies, Bible translation, inclusive language, depatriarchalizing principle, gender-neutral translation.

**Introduction.** Interpretations, revisions and translations of canonical texts and their authoritative or even authorized translations are never innocent, since they are bound to reflect ideological and/or aesthetic affiliations of people or organizations behind the translation project. As Sherry Simon, one of the leading feminist Translation Studies scholars, argues, Bible translations, being produced for a specific community or readership, have often had “the overtly political ends” and, thus, adapted the text for that particular purpose [12, p. 111–112]. Luis von Flotow goes even further to assert that there is no absolute, original biblical truth, although there are many claims to this truth [5, p. 96]. However presumptuous it may seem, we cannot but agree with the daring statement of Roy E. Ciampa, that, amidst all its tremendous good, the Bible can be considered a dangerous book “<...>used to empower the powerful at the expense of the powerless”, promoting or justifying oppressive relationships, institutions and customs, including crusades, inquisitions, slavery, anti-Semitism, apartheid, genocide, and the abuse of women, children and minorities [2, p. 141].

Feminist academic developments pertinent to Bible interpretation indicate key approaches of which Bible translators of today need to be cognizant. Some feminists insist on dismissing the Holy Scripture from the feminist discourse as an irremediably patriarchal book reflecting the values which feminists are struggling to combat; others argue that the perusal of biblical texts may deconstruct faulty misogynistic interpretations and, concomitantly, make women more “visible” there.

**Previous research in the area.** From the first wave of the feminist movement up to date three directions as regards biblical studies are roughly discriminated. Some feminists

(e.g., Simone de Beauvoir) treat the Bible as a hopelessly patriarchal source marked with the masculinist bias and declare it irrelevant to the modern concern. This idea is supported by Kate Millett who claims that “Patriarchy has God on its side”, for even the myth of the Fall is “<...> designed as it is expressly in order to blame all this world’s discomfort on the female” [9, p. 51–54]. Others, recognizing the sexist bias and misrepresentation of women in the Bible, urge feminist critics and translators to highlight the patriarchal nature of the text in an effort “<...>to mimic and mock the loud male voice and tone, turn up the volume of its evasions and lies and guilt, put dots and slashes to mark the gaps and omissions” (Shaberg in [1, p. 77]). The proponents of this approach firmly believe that the critique of the Bible is a necessary prerequisite of the social change for women. The account is also taken out of the socio-cultural context reflecting the historical features of the status of women and marriage relationship in the Hebrew and Greco-Roman world. For example, the unequal age of married couples (adolescent girls and fully adult men) and lack of well-educated women is used as an argument to explain the notorious phrase of Paul “*Let your women keep silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak; but they are to be submissive, as the law also says. And if they want to learn something, let them ask their husband at home*” [13:1 Cor. 14: 34–35], which is inapplicable to the modern context.

The last and most productive approach lies in the application of the *depatriarchalizing principle* to the Bible interpretation and translation [16] which implies exposing and translating the Biblical truth without the blinders of sexism. Thus, it is an attempt to reconcile the Holy Scriptures and the Women’s Liberation Movement. The principle is realized through the deconstructive reading of the Holy Scripture to show textual discrepancies, subsequent mistranslations and theological deviations and to produce a new unbiased translation based on “corrective measures” (the term by Simon [12, p. 105]) and inclusive language.

**Methodology.** The assumptions of this paper are grounded in a multidisciplinary approach at the interface of Bible Studies, Translation Studies and Gender Studies. As some observers have expressed concerns over the rigor and trustworthiness of recasting the Word of God in order to meet current social challenges, the aim of this prospective investigation is to validate the Bible interpretation within the feminist discourse via the methods of its analysis and subsequent synthesis of the extracted principles and concepts. The hermeneutic method of Biblical exegesis is applied to substantiate the findings of the feminist Bible critique while the deconstructive analysis is used to overturn the traditional textual hierarchy and to reassert a non-hierarchical relationship. To encompass a variety of translation perspectives, the comparative translation analysis of a number of English and Ukrainian translations of the Holy Scripture is carried out.

**Results and Discussion.** The feminist project of reinterpreting the Bible against its patriarchal grain, although not being officially recognized as such until late 20<sup>th</sup> century, is rooted in the 17<sup>th</sup> century struggles of European and American women to be consecrated as preachers and teachers of the Bible. They pointed out that some of the key biblical passages used by males to subjugate women could be re-interpreted and proposed possible alternative translations of biblical texts to demonstrate equality of men and women.

Making the Bible speak for women was vitally important for the feminists of the first wave because in the 19<sup>th</sup> century the church played much more decisive role in organizing

social norms than it does today. In 1848, the convention of the American Women's Rights movement at Seneca Falls passed a resolution about "the perverted application of the Scriptures" and the necessity for women to reestablish and reassert the role the Creator assigned to them. To this end, Elisabeth Cady Stanton initiated the bold project titled *The Woman's Bible*. Published in 1895 and 1898, *The Woman's Bible* was not a new translation but a commented compilation of those verses of the Bible that referred to women. On analyzing this text, we cannot agree with Simon's argument that Stanton regarded the Bible as "fundamentally anti-woman" [12, p. 110]. It is true that in her *Introduction* Stanton overtly recognizes the masculinist bent of all official religions: *The canon law, the Scriptures, the creeds and codes and church discipline of the leading religions bear the impress of fallible man, and not of our ideal great first cause, "the Spirit of all Good* [15, p. 7]. She partly put a blame on "<...>liberal translations, interpretations, allegories and symbols", yet remained conspicuously skeptical as to the possibility of depatriarchalized translation: *Those who have the divine insight to translate, transpose and transfigure this mournful object of pity (Woman) into an exalted, dignified personage, worthy our worship as the mother of the race, are to be congratulated as having a share of the occult mystic power of the eastern Mahatmas* [15, p. 7–8]. Yet, in a number of her commentaries Stanton shows the evidence of mistranslations falsifying the original message.

However, this "lower textual criticism" aimed at purifying the original text of the Bible from mistranslations was of minor concern to Stanton and other feminists of the first wave, as their efforts were focused on the then popular "high criticism" which sought to discover the historical background, sources and authors of the biblical texts: *To women still believing in the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, we say give us by all means your exegesis in the light of the higher criticism learned men are now making, and illuminate the Woman's Bible, with your inspiration* [15, p. 12].

The first significant move at the level of both high and lower criticism was to make manifest the defeminization of the church in Gospels and Epistles, both in the original text and in its translations. The feminists of the first wave accentuated that women had often played a key part in the New Testament stories and situations and yet they remained utterly unrepresented there. Their goal was to rehabilitate the mothers of the church (by the way, the term is conspicuously non-existent in the theological discourse!) and speak about them and for them. The most prominent in this respect is the Epistle to Romans 16, 1–4 where Paul begins his long list of church activists with two women – Phoebe and Priscilla. In the King James Version of the Bible (KJV) as well as in the Church Slavonic Ostroh Bible (OB) (1681), its Ukrainian translation by Rafail Turkoniak and the first complete Ukrainian translation of the Bible done by Pantelejmon Kulish, Ivan Puluj and Ivan Nechuj-Levytskyj (1903), their status is lowered to servants and helpers:

*I commend unto you Phebe, our sister, which is a **servant** of the church which is at Cenchrea; That ye receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you: for she hath been **a succourer** of many, and of myself also. Greet Priscilla and Aquila **my helpers** in Christ Jesus, who risked their own necks for my life, to whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the Gentiles, Likewise greet the church that is in their house [13: Rom. 16: 1–4];*

*Врѣча ѳюжевамъ (wive'ю) s сестрѣна'шѣ, сѣцѣ'ѣ [-]слѣжи'телницѣ цр~кви|ажевѣкехре'их, да {прїиметеюя} гдѣдостоинѣствомъ, иапоспѣшествѣ'итее'и, гдѣ не'ижеащеэтвасѣ потребѣ'етѣ вещи. Ибо и ^сїя застѣпница мно'гим #бысть, ио (самомѣ мне) цтлѣите {приски'лѣ} иааки'ллѣ, споспѣшника мояо хрѣсть (Поручаю ж вам Тивею, нашу сестру, що є служницею церкви, що в Кенхреях, щоб ви її прийняли в Господі, як належить ся святым, і помогли їй в тій речі, як увід вас потребує. Бо і вона була заступницею за багатьох і мені самому. Здоровіть Прискилу і Акиллу – моїх помічників в Христі Ісусі) [21: Rom. 6: 1–4];*

*Поручаю ж вам Фиву, сестру нашу, служительку церкви, що в Кенхреях, щоб прийняли її в Господі, як личить святым, і помагали їй, в якому ділі вас потрібуватиме; бо вона була заступницею многим, і самому мені. Витайте Прискилу та Аквилу, помічників моїх у Христі Ісусі [27: Rom. 16: 1–4].*

Turkoniak's translation of the OB markedly slights the women's role even in comparison with its Church Slavonic original: *слѣжи'телницѣ цр~кви* becomes *служница* while *споспѣшник* is transformed into *помічник*. See *Словник Нового завіту / The Dictionary of the New Testament* compiled by Bohdan Ohul'chans'kyj (2016): “споспѣшник, співробітник, співпрацівник Бга бо єсми споспешници – бо ми співробітники Божі (Ог, Хом, Гр); співпрацівники (Ф) (1 Кор 3, 9)” [25, p. 153]. Conversely, in his *Сучасний переклад / Modern Translation* (2020) Turkoniak uses the word *співробітники* “co-workers” [20].

Of all New Testament women, Phoebe might be the most hotly debated in terms of her role in the early church. She is described as a *diakonos*, which is typically disguised in English translations as “servant” (*ministerio ecclesiae* in the Vulgate (*Commendo autem vobis Phoebe sororem nostram, quae est in ministerio ecclesiae*) and *prostasis* which is interpreted as a helper. However, *diakonos* is the same word that Paul uses to describe his own ministry (1 Cor. 3:5; 2 Cor. 3:6, 6:4, 11:23; Eph 3:7; Col 1:23, 25). If Paul were simply aiming to describe her service to her local church, this would have most probably been expressed by ‘*diakoneō*’ (Rom. 15:25) or ‘*diakonia*’ (1 Cor. 16:15) [4, p. 887]. It is remarkable that Phoebe is the first recorded deacon in the history of Christianity; therefore, to lower her rank to a servant is a matter of false interpretation. Likewise, the verb form of *prostatō*, *proistēmi*, occurs eight times in three different contexts in the New Testament. These contexts include church leadership (Rom. 12:8; 1 Thess. 5:12; 1 Tim. 5:17), household management (1 Tim. 3:4, 5, 12), and the practice of good deeds (Titus 3:8, 14) [10].

In 1888 Francis Willard, the longtime president of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, noted gender-biased translations of Phoebe's role. Even more radical is the position of E.C. Stanton in *The Woman's Bible*. She is positive that Phoebe was a bishop of the Church in Cenchrea and “<...> must be legitimately interpreted either presbyter, bishop, or Apostle”. As to the second woman, Stanton without any reservations calls her Apostle Priscilla, because from Paul's message it is possible to infer that she and her husband performed the important task of founding the Church of Rome which “is in their house” [15, p. 153–154].

Since the 1960s when the United Bible Society started implementing Nida's message-oriented translating principle of dynamic equivalence, the original importance

of these remarkable women has been restored. Good News Bible, the first internationally acclaimed outcome of Nida's project, already recognize Priscilla as Paul's "*fellow-worker in the service of Jesus Christ*" while "*Phoebe serves the church at Cenchreae*", which already hints at her status as a bishop: *I recommend to you our sister Phoebe, who serves the church at Cenchreae*<...>*I send greetings to Priscilla and Aquila, my fellow workers in the service of Christ Jesus* [6].

Among bolder versions, there is New Living Translation of the Bible, which is a feminist project of 2001 famous for its interventionist approach: *I commend to you our sister Phoebe, who is a deacon in the church in Cenchrea. Welcome her in the Lord as one who is worthy of honor among God's people. Help her in whatever she needs, for she has been helpful to many, and especially to me. Give my greetings to Priscilla and Aquila, my co-workers in the ministry of Christ Jesus* [11]. Even more radical is the Message Bible (published in segments from 1993 to 2002) where Phoebe is called *a key representative of the church at Cenchrea* [14] or Young's Literal Bible translated by Robert Young in remote 1862 where Paul overtly states that "<...>she also became a leader of many, and of myself" [17].

Although in the Ukrainian translations by Ivan Ohijenko (1962) and Ivan Khomenko (1963) Priscilla and her husband are called Paul's co-workers in Christ, *співробітники мої у Христі Ісусі*, Phoebe remains the servant, either ambiguously (*служителька* [26]) or openly (*служебниця* [18]).

Most noteworthy in terms of accentuating Phoebe's significance is the translation done under the auspices of Patriarch Filaret: *Вручаю вам Фиву, сестру нашу, дияконису церкви Кенхрейської* [19].

It is widely established that the Orthodox Church is ostensibly conservative in treating the women's speculative priesthood. Yet we may quote a riveting instance that evinces the opposite. In 1927 the Metropolitan of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church Vasyly' Lypkivskij argued that the Holy Scripture had set no limitations for women to be consecrated: *Жінка питає, чи можна ввійти у вівтар, і я кажу: можна не тільки ввійти у вівтар, а й бути дияконом, священником, навіть мітрополітом, тому що у Христі "немає полу"* [24, p. 162].

Grievously underrepresented in the Gospels are female disciples of Jesus. Luke 8: 2–3 mentions some of them: *Mary called Magdalen, out of whom had come seven demons, and Johanna the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others who provided for Him from their substance*. According to Matthew 28 and Mark 16, the Risen Lord first appeared to women (Mary Magdalen and Mary, the mother of James and Salome).

One of the most outstanding projects of restoring the role of women in the early church was carried out by Lesya Ukrainka. Within the timespan between 1901 and 1911, she wrote dramas whose major characters are Mary (Miriam) (*The Possessed*), *Johanna the wife of Chuza* and Priscilla (*Rufinus and Priscilla*). Last year the edition of these plays titled *Апокриф (The Apocrypha)* supplemented with four conversations between His Beatitude Sviatoslav Shevchuk and Oksana Zabuzhko was awarded the first prize of the Lviv Book Forum. The feministic overtones of the plays are profusely discussed in the conversations of *The Apocrypha*; however, Oksana Zabuzhko mistakenly asserts that Lesya Ukrainka "<...> writes on the topics which has not yet been brought up in her times" (tr. – O.D.) [23, p. 565].

Alternatively, the ideas expressed in Lesya's works reverberate with those of representatives of the first wave of feminism, especially *The Woman's Bible* by Stanton. In its time, the book caused an uproar and the avalanche of criticism that, presumably, did not remain unnoticed by the one of the most prominent Ukrainian intellectuals.

The second wave of the feminism of 1960s–1970s coincided with the message-oriented approach towards the Bible translation, which became a useful tool to make women visible in the Bible. Since early 1970s, there has been a gradual diminution of masculinist expressions in the Bible. Joanna Dewey refers to this revisionist application of the lower textual Bible criticism as “*affirmative-action translation*”, such as the restoration of the presence of female disciples of Jesus in Mark's narrative through the substitution of *men* by *men and women* [3, p. 65]. Yet more common term for this interventionalist translation procedure is “the inclusive language”. Lois von Flotow formulates its purpose as “<...>making the biblical messages accessible and meaningful to women in the contemporary social and intellectual climate” [5, p. 96].

This idea is encoded in the title of one of the first inclusive projects – Joann Haugerud's translation titled *The Word for Us, Gospels of John and Mark, Epistles to the Romans and The Galatians* (1977). In the introduction to her translation Haugerud ironically asks: *When Jesus called Peter, Andrew, James and John to become 'Fishers of men', did Jesus mean that they would set out to catch male humans only?* [7, p. 8]. The reformulation of the masculine language takes several variants here as well as in subsequent gender-neutral translation projects: words such as *brethren* or *king*, which have exclusively male referents, have been replaced with *sisters and brothers* and *monarch* or *ruler*. The generic *man* is substituted by phrases *women and men* or words such as *people* or *one*; compare:

*And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst. But I said unto you, That ye also have seen me, and believe not. All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. [13: John 6: 35–37]. – Jesus said to them, I am the bread of life; anyone who comes to me shall not hunger, and anyone who believes in me shall never thirst...; and those who come to me I will not cast out [7: John 6: 35–37].*

*In him was life; and the life was the light of men [13: John 1:4]. – In the Word was life, and that life was humanity's light [7: John 1:4].*

The interventionalist approach to Bible translation as an act of restoring historical justice stands behind the resonant project *An Inclusive Language Lectionary: Years A, B, and C* (1983, 1984, 1985) prepared by a committee of eminent Christian Bible scholars of both sexes. The committee was mandated by the National Council of Churches in the United States to reinterpret the Revised Standard Version so that it might restore the status of women; additional tasks included recasting tradition colour symbolism where darkness was associated with evil and portraying the more positive image of Jews. The major revisions of the Lectionary encompassed: *God the Father*, considered to be a metaphor expressing the intimacy of Jesus with God, was translated as *God the Father and Mother*. The Greek *Kyrios* was rendered not as *Lord* but as *Sovereign, Christ* or *God*. *Son* or *Son of God* became *Child* or *Child of God* while *Son of Man* was transformed into *The Human One*. [12, p. 120]. On the one hand, the publication of *An Inclusive Language Lectionary* burgeons with the

extensive and heated debate about the role of gender within the Bible; on the other hand, thorny issues of tampering with the sacred texts inevitably runs against the opposition.

The emphasis on the gender-unmarked nature of the masculine pronoun and the noun *man* in the Holy Scripture is discernable in a number of studies, but the most powerful example is the Creation story commonly recognized as the origin of feminine inferiority. Among the most profound analyses of the Creation story there are *Woman's Bible* by Stanton (the first wave of feminist, 1895), *Depatriarchalizing in Biblical Interpretation* by Phyllis Trible (1973, the second wave of feminism) and translation of Genesis by Mary Phil Korsak *At the Start... Genesis Made New: A Translation of the Hebrew Text* (1992, the third wave of feminism). They all foreground the obvious discrepancy: there are two different stories of creating the human race: the “Adam’s rib” story backing female subjugation in Chapter 2 and the story in Chapter 1:

*And God said, Let us make **man**<sup>1</sup> 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**<sup>2</sup>. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them [13: Gen. 1: 26–27].*

*Then God said, “Let us make **human beings** in our image, to be like us. They will reign over the fish in the sea, the birds in the sky, the livestock, all the wild animals on the earth, and the small animals that scurry along the ground.” So God created **human beings** in his own image; male and female he created them [11: Gen. 1: 26–27].*

*І сказав Бог: Створімо **людину** за образом Нашим, за подобою Нашою, і хай **панують** над морською рибою, і над птаством небесним, і над худобою, і над усею землею, і над усім плазуючим, що плазує по землі. І Бог на Свій образ **людину** створив, на образ Божий **ї** Він створив, як чоловіка та жінку створив їх [18: Gen. 1: 26–27].*

As Phyllis Trible persuasively shows in her study, the creature God made out of clay was at first neither masculine nor feminine, but a creature not yet sexed [7, p. 35–36]. The word *adam* has been widely recognized as having at least three different meanings: *humanity*, *man* and a proper name. Mary Phil Korsak chooses to translate *adam* in Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 before the woman’s appearance as *groundling* using the pronoun *it* [8, p. 46]. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that the first *adam* (both male and female simultaneously) was created in the image of God who is plural, which is not surprising, as Chapter 1 belongs to so called *Elohism* (God here is not singular *Jehovah* but plural *Elohim*). This explains the inclusive approach to translate *God the Father* as *the Father and the Mother*. In the beginning God reveals Himself (or rather Themselves!) in the Bible as exercising equally male and female qualities. For example, in Numbers 11:12 God is described as the mother conceiving and bearing Israel and the One Who ought to care for the child.

The illustrations above show the unambiguous difference between the traditional approach of the Authorized Version of the Bible (1611) and gender-neutral one. As a counterbalance, the Ukrainian translation resolves the problem easily and subliminally, even

<sup>1</sup> Hebrew – *adam*

<sup>2</sup> Hebrew – *adama*

overturns the opposition, due to the grammatical gender of the source language where the human being (*людина*) is feminine.

In the feminist discussion of the New Testament the issue of gender discrimination of the Trinity is raised. The Holy Spirit (*pneuma* – neutral gender in Greek) has the feminine Old Testament correspondent *Roocha* (the Spirit of God) which existed before the Creation: *And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters* [13: Gen. 1:2] / *А земля була пуста та порожня, і темрява була над безоднею, і Дух Божий<sup>1</sup> ширяв над поверхнею води* [18: Gen. 1:2].

Ivan Franko in his seminal and profusely ostracized research *Поема про створення світу* (*The Poem on The Creation*) described *Roocha* as the Bird laying the egg of the Creation on the waters of the primordial ocean<sup>2</sup>: “<...>той, хто писав ті слова, <...> уявляв собі божу Ріх як птицю, що сидить на водах первісного океана (тегом) і вигриває те яйце, з якого мав постати світ” [22, p. 281]. Here feminist theologians and scholars find grounds to impersonalize The Holy Spirit as feminine, the idea far from being new, as in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD, the movement of montanists postulated that the Holy Spirit had incarnated in female prophets.

The increasing visibility of “gender-neutral” and “inclusive” Bible translations could not remain below the radar screen of public awareness and scrutiny of religious authoritative circles that predictably cracked down upon such innovations. In 2002 the Vatican even released the document entitled *Liturgiam Authenticam* condemning allegedly “faulty” translations produced over the past 25 years in English-speaking countries. Church officials argue that the interpretation of the Bible is the responsibility of the priest, not the translator, who cannot be allowed to temper with sacred texts for some ideological reasons, which are largely speculative. The example from a special section *Gender* in the English press release on this document will serve to illustrate the point:

*Many languages have nouns and pronouns capable of referring to both the masculine and the feminine in a single term. The abandonment of these terms under pressure of criticism on ideological or other grounds is not always wise or necessary nor is it an inevitable part of linguistic development. Traditional collective terms should be retained in instances where their loss would compromise a clear notion of man as a unitary, inclusive and corporate yet truly personal figure, as expressed, for example, by the Hebrew term *adam*, the Greek *anthropos* or the Latin *homo*. Similarly, the expression of such inclusivity may not be achieved by a quasi-mechanical change in grammatical number, or by the creation of pairs of masculine and feminine terms* (*liturgiam-authenticam*, May 2002) [In: 5, p. 102].

Despite these endeavors to undermine the efforts aimed at rediscovering and translating women’s voices of the Bible, the process is feasible even in the most authoritative translation projects. For example, *Сучасна Біблія* (*The Modern Bible*) (2020), an offspring of the Ukrainian Bible Society, includes footnotes that undoubtedly put “the depatriarchalizing principle” into practice, as in the following example explaining the phrase “<...> дочки

<sup>1</sup> Roocha.

<sup>2</sup> Transparent association with the Ukrainian cosmogonic folk-tale “Яйце-райце”.



Манасії отримали спадщину між його синами” [20: Joshua 17:6] (“<...>the daughters of Manasseh had an inheritance among his sons” [13: Joshua 17:6]):

*Цей унікальний випадок свідчить про шанобливе ставлення Бога та Його народу до прав жінок, тоді як переважна частина людського суспільства вважала жінок за рабинь, тобто особисте живе майно чоловіка. У 6-му вірші жінки патріарха Манасії названі його дочками нарівні з синами” [20: Joshua 17: 6].*

**Conclusions and implications for further research.** Academic research and general publications exploring the paradigm of gender and Bible translation pave the way for further developments in Biblical exegesis, which, audacious as they are, may shatter the long-standing prejudices and misunderstandings resulting from biased interpretations of the past. No matter what theological objections we may have to such an enterprise, the bold act of revising women’s role, visibility and influence in the Bible is worth commending. As in the Ukrainian religious and cultural space this discussion has barely begun, this paper aims at elucidating some key points that require deeper approach open to challenges.

#### REFERENCES

1. Castelli E. Les Belles Infidèles/Fidelity or Feminism? *Special Section on Feminist Translation of the New Testament, Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*. 1990. P. 25–39.
2. Ciampa R. E. Ideological challenges for Bible translators. *International Journal for Frontier Missiology*. 2011. Vol. 28. Iss. 3. 2011. P. 139–148.
3. Dewey J. Feminist translation as a political act. *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*. Vol. 6. No. 2. 1990. P. 63–69.
4. Dunn J. D. G. *Romans 9–16*. Word Biblical Commentary 38. Dallas : Word Books, 1988.
5. Flotow L. von. Gender and Translation. *A Companion to Translation Studies*. Ed. P. Kuhlwezak & K. Littau. Cleveendon; Buffalo; Toronto : Multilingual Matters Ltd, 2007. P. 92–105.
6. Good News Bible. The Bible in Today’s English Version. New York : American Bible Society, 1976. 1449 p.
7. Haugerud J. The Word for Us: Gospels of John and Mark, Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. Seattle : Coalition of Women in Religion, 1977. 156 p.
8. Korsak M.P. Genesis: A new look. *A Feminist Companion to Genesis*. Ed. by A. Brenner. Sheffield : Sheffield Academic Press, 1993. P. 42–57.
9. Millett K. Sexual Politics, Garden City. NY : Doubleday and Company, 1970. 186 p.
10. McCabe E.A.A. Reexamination of Phoebeas a “Diakonos” and “Prostatis”: Exposing the Inaccuracies of English Translations. *Society of Biblical Literature Archive*. File:///D:/SBLPublications.html
11. New Living Translation of the Bible. URL: <https://www.biblestudytools.com/ylt>
12. Simon Sh. Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission. London : Routledge, 1996. 190 p.
13. The Holy Bible (the King James Version). London : Trinitarian Bible Soc., 1999. 1152 p.
14. The Message Bible. URL: <https://www.biblestudytools.com/ylt>
15. *The Woman’s Bible*. New York : European Publishing Company, 1895–98.
16. Tribble Ph. Depatriarchalizing in Biblical interpretation. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. 1973. Vol. 41. No. 1. P. 30–48.
17. Young’s Literal Bible. URL: <https://www.biblestudytools.com/ylt>

18. Bibliya abo Knygy Svyatogo Pysma Starogo i Novogo Zapovitu; per. I. Ohiyenka. Kyiv : Ukrayinske Biblijne Tovary`stvo, 2002. 1375 s.
19. Bibliya. Knygy Svyashhennogo Pysannya Starogo I Novogo Zavitu. Kyiv : Vydannya Kyiv. Patriarkhatu, 2004. 147 s.
20. Bibliya. Suchasnyj pereklad z davnoyevrejskoyi ta davnogreczkoyi mov. Kyiv : Ukrayinske Biblijne Tovary`stvo, 2020. 1172 s.
21. Biblia, syrich knygy Vetkhago y Novago Zavita po yazyku slovensku: per. z cerkovnoslov`yans`koyi Rafayila Turkonyaka. L`viv : Blagodijny`j fond “Knyga”; Kyiv : Ukrayins`ke Biblijne Tovary`stvo, 2006. 1058 s.
22. Franko Ivan. Poema pro sotvorennya svitu. *Zibr. tvoriv, u 50 t.* Redkol.: Ye.P. Ky`ry`lyuk (holova) ta in. T. 35. Kyiv : Nauk. dumka, 1976–1986.
23. Lesya Ukrayinka. Apokryf. Vybrane. Blazhennishyj Svyatoslav Shevchuk, Oksana Zabuzhko. Chotyry` rozmovy` pro Lesyu Ukrayinku. Kyiv : Vy`davny`chy`j dim “Komora”, 2020. 627 s.
24. Lypkivskij V. Vybranit vory. T. 3. Kyiv : Ukrayinski propileyi, 2018. 286 s.
25. Ogulchanskij B. Slovyk Novogo Zavitu (cerkovnoslovyanski-ukrayinski vidpovidnyky). Kyiv : Dukh I Litera, 2016. 228 s.
26. Svyate Pysmo Starogo ta Novogo Zavitu; per. Ivan Khomenko. Vatican : Editorial Verbo Divino, 1990. 1078 s.
27. Svyate Pysmo Starogo ta Novogo Zavitu : per. P. Kulish, I. Levyczkyj ta I. Puluj. Kyiv : Ukr. Biblijne Tovarystvo, 2003. 1164 s.

#### Список використаної літератури

1. Castelli E. Les Belles Infidèles/Fidelity or Feminism? *Special Section on Feminist Translation of the New Testament, Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*. 1990. P. 25–39.
2. Ciampa R.E. Ideological challenges for Bible translators. *International Journal for Frontier Missiology*. 2011. Vol. 28. Iss. 3. 2011. P. 139–148.
3. Dewey J. Feminist translation as a political act. *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*. Vol. 6. No. 2. 1990. P. 63–69.
4. Dunn J. D.G. *Romans 9-16*. Word Biblical Commentary 38. Dallas : Word Books, 1988.
5. Flotow L. von. Gender and Translation. *A Companion to Translation Studies*. Ed. P. Kuhiwczak & K. Littau. Clevedon; Buffalo; Toronto : Multilingual Matters Ltd, 2007. P. 92–105.
6. Good News Bible. The Bible in Today’s English Version. New York : American Bible Society, 1976. 1449 p.
7. Haugerud J. The Word for Us: Gospels of John and Mark, Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. Seattle : Coalition of Women in Religion, 1977. 156 p.
8. Korsak M. P. Genesis: A new look. *A Feminist Companion to Genesis*. Ed. by A. Brenner. Sheffield : Sheffield Academic Press, 1993. P. 42–57.
9. Millett K. Sexual Politics, Garden City. NY : Doubleday and Company, 1970. 186 p.
10. McCabe E.A.A. Reexamination of Phoebeas a “Diakonos” and “Prostatis”: Exposing the Inaccuracies of English Translations. *Society of Biblical Literature Archive*. File:///D:/SBLPublications.html
11. New Living Translation of the Bible. URL: <https://www.biblestudytools.com/ylt>
12. Simon Sh. Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission. London: Routledge, 1996. 190 p.
13. The Holy Bible (the King James Version). London : Trinitarian Bible Soc., 1999. 1152 p.
14. The Message Bible. URL: <https://www.biblestudytools.com/ylt>
15. *The Woman’s Bible*. New York : European Publishing Company, 1895–98.

16. Tribble Ph. Depatriarchalizing in Biblical interpretation. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*. 1973. Vol. 41. No. 1. P. 30–48.
17. Young's Literal Bible. URL: <https://www.biblestudytools.com/ylt>
18. Біблія або Книги Святого Письма Старого і Нового Заповіту; пер. І. Огієнка. Київ : Українське Біблійне Товариство, 2002. 1375 с.
19. Біблія. Книги Священного Писання Старого і Нового Завіту. Київ : Видання Київ. Патріархату 2004. 147 с.
20. Біблія. Сучасний переклад з давньоєврейської та давньогрецької мов. Київ : Українське Біблійне Товариство, 2020. 1172 с.
21. Библия, сиріч книги Ветхаго и Новаго Завіта по языку словенску; пер. з церковнослов'янської Рафаїла Турконяка. Львів : Благодійний фонд "Книга"; Київ: Українське Біблійне Товариство, 2006. 1058 с.
22. Франко Іван. Поема про сотворення світу. *Зібр. творів, у 50 т.* Редкол.: Є. П. Кирилук (голова) та ін. Т. 35. Київ : Наук. думка, 1976–1986.
23. Леся Українка. Апокриф. Вибране. Блаженніший Святослав Шевчук, Оксана Забужко. Чотири розмови про Леся Українку. Київ : Видавничий дім "Комора", 2020. 627 с.
24. Липківський В. Вибрані твори. Т. 3. Київ : Українські пропілеї, 2018. 286 с.
25. Огульчанський Б. Словник Нового Завіту (церковнослов'янські-українські відповідники). Київ : Дух і Літера, 2016. 228 с.
26. Святе Письмо Старого та Нового Завіту ; пер. Іван Хоменко. Ватикан : Editorial Verbo Divino, 1990. 1078 s.
27. Святе Письмо Старого та Нового Завіту ; пер. П. Куліш, І. Левицький та І. Пулюй. Київ : Укр. Біблійне Товариство, 2003. 1164 с.

*Стаття надійшла до редколегії 01.09.2021  
Прийнята до друку 02.10.2021*

## ФЕМІНІЗМ І БІБЛІЙНИЙ ПЕРЕКЛАД

**Оксана Дзера**

*Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка,  
бул. Університетська, 1, м. Львів, Україна, 79000  
oksana.dzera@lnu.edu.ua*

У статті висвітлено ключові тенденції застосування гендерних студій у перекладознавстві на прикладі переосмислення стратегій і прийомів перекладу Біблії у бік "інклюзивності".

Окреслено три рецептивні підходи до Біблії в межах гендерних студій: вилучення Біблії з гендерного дискурсу як книги, що втілює маскулінні упередження; застосування гендерної критики, щоб виявити і деконструвати її патріархальний характер; актуалізація "принципу депатріархалізації", який полягає в уважному прочитанні Біблії, покликане розкрити її правдивий "рівноправний" сенс. Останній підхід розкриває унікальні можливості перед перекладачами.

Теорія "динамічної еквівалентності" заклала основу для формулювання феміністичного підходу до перекладу Біблії, що прагне зробити біблійні послання доступними й зрозумілими для жінок у сучасному соціальному та інтелектуальному кліматі. Вербалізація "маскулінного упередження" у біблійних перекладах стала ключовою сферою гендерних перекладознавчих зацікавлень: граматичний чоловічий рід усіх членів Трійці від Бога Отця до Святого Духа, традиційні гендерно-марковані

терміни на позначення Церкви, ангелів, демонів тощо, *чоловік, син* як референція всього людства. На практиці такий підхід передбачає насамперед більш “інклюзивну” мову перекладів Святого Письма, де б немарковані форми чоловічого роду, зокрема такі, як *Filius hominibus / son of Man* (син чоловічий), *Patres / fathers* (отці), замінювалися гендерно-нейтральними. Нові підходи до інтерпретації й перекладу Святого Письма наштовхнулися на передбачуваний жорсткий супротив євангелістських організацій США та Римо-Католицької Церкви, яка наголошує на тому, що священні тексти не містять жодної статевої чи расової дискримінації, а їхня інтерпретація лежить поза межами компетенції світських перекладачів.

*Ключові слова:* фемінізм, гендерні студії, біблійний переклад, інклюзивна мова, принцип депатріархалізації, гендерно-нейтральний переклад.