

250 BC

1960

1980

1990

---

**Literal approaches:**

philological-concordant:

→ word-by-word (interlinear—source language oriented),

→ free in sentence structure (target language oriented);

\*close to the source text → audience is taken to the source text (paratext explains historical meaning of source text in target language)

---

**Communicative approaches:**

free translation:

→ free interpretation (source text structure not visible any more)

→ dynamic / functional equivalence (Nida; Taber & Nida; de Waard & Nida)

→ framework theory (Katan; Maletzke; Wendland)

→ relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson; Gutt)

\* close to the target language; source text is taken to the audience (paratext explains historical setting of source text in target language)

---

**Dynamic Equivalence:** 1947, 1964, 1969, Functional Equivalence 1986; closest natural equivalent in target language *and* closeness to the source text

---

**Skopos Theory:** Vermeer; the end justifies the means

---

**Functionalism:** Nord; further developed from Skopos theory; recursive improvement system; functionality leads translation project

---

**Relevance Theory:** 1986 Sperber & Wilson; *relevance describes* maxim for speech acts; 1991 Gutt adapted RT to Bible translation

---

**Framework-Theory:** 1996 Maletzke (mass-communication); 1999 Katan (cultural); 2006 Wendland (oral-aural)