### A Brief Overview of Chinese Bible Translation History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translators</th>
<th>Date Published</th>
<th>Source Text (s)</th>
<th>Chinese Style</th>
<th>Translation Principles</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Problem(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Joshua Marshman                 | 1822 (India)   | Griesbach’s Greek Text English (KJV)       | Ancient Literary Style (see below) | Formal Correspondence   | Marshman consulted Morrison’s work to some degree as they were working simultaneously, and publishing incrementally | - Corrupt Greek text  
- High literary Chinese |
| Robert Morrison                 | 1823 (China)   | English Text (KJV) Textus Receptus (Greek) Massoretic Text (Hebrew) | Ancient Literary Style (this style was the accept literary form at the time, but virtually unintelligible to non-scholars) | Formal Correspondence   | In addition to consulting some of Marshman’s work, Morrison’s translation of Matthew-Hebrews, was mostly a revision (and correction) of an incomplete 17th century Catholic translation of the Latin Vulgate | - High literary Chinese  
- Some Catholic influence |
| Medhurst, Bridgman & Gützlaff   | Not published (completed in 1835-36) | Unknown Mostly a revision of Morrison’s work | Unknown (likely in the literary style as well) | Frequently used paraphrase | Tended to use a lot of paraphrases, and thus was rejected for publication | - Translation principles (paraphrase)  
- literary style |
| Delegates Version (Medhurst, Boone, Bridgman, Stronach, Milne) | 1858 1852 (NT) | Textus Receptus (Greek) Massoretic Text (Hebrew) | Very High Literary Style (extremely difficult for the common man to understand) | Closer to “dynamic equivalent” in many cases | This version was produced by a group of foreign missionaries and their Chinese language assistants. | - Translation principles (dynamic equivalence)  
- literary style |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nanking Version (Medhurst, Stronach)</td>
<td>1856 (NT)</td>
<td>Basically a revision of the Delegates NT, Early form of modern Mandarin (a more colloquial and understandable style)</td>
<td>Based on Delegates version (see above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peking Version (Schereschewsky, Burdon, Blodget, Edkins, Martin)</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Nanking Version Textus Receptus Massoretic Hebrew</td>
<td>Loose Formal Correspondence (often tended to use cultural equivalence in translation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Versions (Mandarin, Easy Wenli and High Wenli)</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Peking Version Westcott and Hort’s Greek Text</td>
<td>Generally uses formal equivalence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nanking Version (Medhurst, Stronach):**
- **Date:** 1856 (NT)
- **Details:** Basically a revision of the Delegates NT, Early form of modern Mandarin (a more colloquial and understandable style)
- **Version:** Based on Delegates version (see above)
- **Reason:** It aimed to win over Chinese scholars with its high and flowery Chinese.

**Peking Version (Schereschewsky, Burdon, Blodget, Edkins, Martin):**
- **Dates:** 1878, 1872 (NT), 1874 (OT – done solely by Schereschewsky)
- **Details:** Nanking Version Textus Receptus Massoretic Hebrew, Colloquial style on northern Mandarin (it was highly understandable and thus became very popular, especially in the northern part of the country)
- **Version:** Loose Formal Correspondence (often tended to use cultural equivalence in translation)
- **Version:** Mandarin Chinese was a form that was starting to gain popularity as a lingua franca, especially in northern China, but was still poorly developed and undergoing change. Thus the form used was a rather poor and awkward form of Mandarin.

**Union Versions (Mandarin, Easy Wenli and High Wenli):**
- **Date:** 1919
- **Details:** Peking Version Westcott and Hort’s Greek Text, High Wenli (High and Literary Style of Chinese), Easy Wenli (Simplified Literary Style), Mandarin (Colloquial Literary)
- **Version:** Generally uses formal equivalence
- **Version:** Only the NT of the Easy Wenli was completed. This version never became popular. The High Wenli was published at the same time as the Mandarin version and was far less

---

**Reference:**
- Translation principles
- Non-standard Mandarin
- Poor translation
- Corrupt Greek text
- Sometimes uses cultural equivalence
The Mandarin Version was enthusiastically received. The Mandarin Version was released at a time when there was a major move away from ancient literary Chinese toward colloquial literary Chinese, and so the Mandarin Version quickly became the standard Bible in China.

| Other Modern Translations (Sigao, LZZ, CCV, TCV, NCV, REC, RCUV, DYN) | 1950-2010 | Critical Greek Texts | Mandarin (ranging from formal, literary Mandarin, to extremely colloquial and substandard language) | Dynamic Equivalence (TCV, CCV) Formative Equivalence (LZZ, NCV, REC, RCUV) Paraphrase (DYN) | SiGao (Catholic version) LLZ (translated by Lv Zhen Zhong) CCV (Chinese Living Bible) TCV (Chinese Today’s English Version) NCV (New Chinese Version) REC (produced by Li Chang Shou cult) RCUV (Revised CUV…same Greek text) DYN (liberal use of lengthy paraphrase) | - Corrupt Greek text - Frequently use dynamic equivalence or paraphrase |