

ERRATA

We regret very much the mistakes which were printed in Professor Siertsema's article 'Language and World View (Semantics for Theologians)' in *The Bible Translator*, Vol. 20, No. 1, January 1969. Professor Siertsema was listed as Professor of Anthropology; she is Professor of General Linguistics at the Free University of Amsterdam. The errata follow:

- p. 4, l. 1: (Some) consider language patterns as a result of the way languages view and classify (reality) . . . ;
Read: (Some) consider a people's language patterns as a result of the way those people view and classify (reality) . . .
- p. 4, ll. 3, 4: A language . . . forces its speakers themselves along the lines of its structure . . .
Read: A language . . . forces its speakers to express themselves along the lines of its structure . . .
- p. 4, par. 3,
ll. 3, 4: . . . *theology*, which is for ever facing one aspect of the phenomenon. Linguistics deals with the differences between two languages in different cultures . . . , as well as with the question of . . .
Read: . . . *theology*, which is for ever facing one aspect of the phenomenon, viz. the differences between two languages in different cultures . . . , and the question of . . .
- p. 5, par. 4,
ll. 1, 2: Lexical words, i.e. what we usually call nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs. Lexical words function . . .
Read: Lexical words (i.e. what we usually call nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs) function as signs . . .
- p. 7, fn. 2: Osgoed and Sebeck
Read: Osgood and Sebeok.
- p. 11, ll. 5-2
from bottom: In view of what we have seen of language so far, there is really only one thing we can say about the relation, and that is that the latter warns us to be very careful in our conclusions on the former.
Read: In view of what we have seen of language so far, there is really only one thing we can say about the relation we are examining, and that is that the former warns us to be very careful in our conclusions on the latter.
- p. 12, par. 4.: . . . but they do distinguish between the two when they use such expressions as 'the thorn stuck deep in the flesh', and when they say they are fond of 'vlees' ('Fleisch') for they certainly do not feel like cannibals.
Read: . . . but they do distinguish between this *concept* and that in, e.g., 'the thorn stuck deep in the *flesh*', and when they say that they are fond of 'vlees' ('Fleisch') it does not mean that they feel like cannibals.
- id.: When a Bantu says in two words: 'I-am-coming-one-day-from-now', or: 'I-came-one-day-from-now' . . . he expresses the concepts unambiguously . . .
Read: when a Bantu says in two words: 'I-am-coming one-day-from-now', or: 'I-came one-day-from-now' . . . he expresses the *concepts* unambiguously.

- p. 15, ll. 5–4 . . . Hè cállèd hèr: ‘Ánnÿ!’; ‘Hè cállèd hèr Ánn’.
 from bottom: *Read*: . . . Hè cállèd hèr: ‘Ánnÿ!’; ‘Hè cállèd hèr Ánnÿ’.
 l. 3: (p. 12) *read* (p. 11).
- p. 16, l. 9: . . . the intonation . . . one of ‘exclamation’—as we saw above in
 ‘Hè cállèd hèr: ‘Ánnÿ!’
Read: . . . ‘Hè cállèd hèr: ‘Ánnÿ!’
- p. 17, l. 2: (pp. 6, 7)
Read: (p. 8).
- p. 18: delete footnotes and numbers referring to them.
- p. 19, par. 3, Now there is no circular reasoning . . .
 l. 3: *Read* this as beginning a new paragraph.
- p. 19, fn. 2: ‘Is het Hebreuws . . .’
Read: ‘Is het Hebreuws . . .’
- p. 20, l. 10 (i.e. ‘leading words’; for example, ‘rufen’, ‘seed’)
 from bottom: *Read*: (i.e. ‘leading words’ = recurring words or stems which are
 supposed to express a leading or otherwise important concept in
 a passage).
- p. 21, l. 12: . . . sounds piercing and thin, beside *tōhū wābōhū*. It is like . . .
Read: . . . sounds piercing and thin; beside *tōhū wābōhū* it is
 like . . .

DENIS BALY

THE TREATMENT OF GEOGRAPHICAL FEATURES IN BIBLICAL MAPS

The spate of new Biblical atlases which have been appearing since World War II shows at present no sign of drying up. Indeed, it is increasingly realized that for a proper understanding of the Bible an intimate knowledge of the environment is necessary, and that much of this information is best conveyed in map form. What is more open to question, however, is whether we are at the present time being given all the information we ought to have, and whether such information as the maps do give is as accurate or as efficient as it could be.

Maps are not a mere addendum to the text; rather, they are themselves a text, conveying by means of conventional symbols information which cannot properly be expressed in words. For most people, and apparently also for most Biblical map-makers, the primary function of a map is to show where places are, and without doubt this is important. The exact location of ancient sites is an absolute necessity for any reputable Biblical atlas. The identification of these sites is essentially the work of trained archaeologists, at whose feet geographers and cartographers must humbly dispose themselves, but the identification of a place mentioned in the Bible with a particular *tel* in the Fertile Crescent, though the fundamental starting point, is only the beginning of the information that ought to be provided about it. One should know also, at the very least, how it is related to the physical landscape, to the valleys, hills, rivers and plains, and here, alas, Biblical