

BOOKS RECEIVED

Greenlee, J. Harold: **Scribes, Scrolls and Scripture. A Student's Guide to New Testament Textual Criticism.** Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans 1985. viii+102 pp., no price stated. Distributed in UK by Paternoster Press, Exeter, at £6.95. ISBN 0 8028 0082 3.

Townsley, David, and Russell Bjork: **Scripture Index to the New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Index to Selected Extrabiblical Literature.** Grand Rapids, Michigan: Regency Reference Library, Zondervan 1985. 320 pp., no price stated. Distributed in UK by Paternoster Press, Exeter, at £10.95. ISBN 0 310 44501 9, UK 0 85362 429 2.

Hoffman, Ernst G. and Heinrich von Siebenthal: **Griechische Grammatik zum Neuen Testament.** Basel: Freie Evangelisch-Theologische Akademie Basel 1986, xxii+707 pp., SF 55, DM66.

NOTES

UBS Monograph Series

In July 1986 the first volume was published in a new UBS series to be called **UBS Monograph Series**. This first volume, edited by Johannes Louw, is entitled *Sociolinguistics and Communication*. Further volumes will deal with topics such as discourse, poetry, different approaches to exegesis, and studies of individual books and passages of the Bible.

This new series is designed to supplement the existing scholarly editions and Helps for Translators series of the UBS translation programme. Up to now there has been no place to publish studies dealing with significant translation theory which are too extensive to be included in *The Bible Translator*. It is anticipated that the UBS monograph series will provide an outlet for significant research in the field of translation.

We are happy to welcome the appearance of a new journal devoted to translation. It is called **TEXT conTEXT** and it is published in Heidelberg, West Germany, by Julius Groot Verlag at DM 72 per year or DM 22 per issue, plus postage (ISSN 0179-6844). The first issues appeared in 1986, and included articles, in German and English, on "Natural translation and the making of a natural translator", by Gideon Toury; "Translation: corresponding words or equivalent texts", by Danica Seleskovitch; and "Funkionsgerechtes Übersetzen: die Veränderung des Heiligen Originals", by Hans-Jürgen Stellbrink. The editor is Prof. Dr. Hans J. Vermeer of Heidelberg.

In "Is Eve to Blame? A contextual analysis of Sirach 25:24" (*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, vol. 27, no. 4, October 1985, 617-623), **Jack Levison** argues per-

suasively “on the basis of the immediate context of Sir 25:24, of Ben Sira’s thought in general, and of the sapiential poem from Qumran [Cave 4]” that “Sir 25:24 refers not to Eve but to the evil wife. Therefore it must be translated: ‘From the [evil] wife is the beginning of sin; and because of her we [husbands] all die.’” If this is correct, the translation of this verse should not be harmonized with Rom 5.12-21, on original sin, or with references to Eve in 2 Cor 11.3 and 1 Tim 2.13-15.

P.E.

For some time now, **Dr John W. Harris** of the Darwin Institute of Technology in Australia has been interested in Creole, with special reference to Bible translation. In 1985 he published two papers:

“Bible Translation, the question of creole languages—a Northern Territory case study.” *Nungalinya Occasional Bulletin* 21.

“The 1830 defence of Sranan: William Greenfield’s gift to the Creole-speaking world.” *Oso—Tijdschrift voor Surinaamse Taalkunde, Letterkunde en Geschiedenis* [*Oso—Journal of Surinamese Language, Literature and History*] 4(2).

The second paper discusses Greenfield’s “Defence of the Surinam Negro-English version of the New Testament . . .”, and concludes: “it may . . . well be that the difference between Negro-English as spoken in 1830 and the language of the Negro-English New Testament may not have been nearly as great as the difference between modern Sranan and Church creole.”

A Query: “the Hebrew language”: Acts 21.40, 22.2, and 26.14

Paul’s audience on the first two occasions will mostly have known Aramaic, many will have known Greek, and some will have known Greek only. But only the more well-educated Jews will have known Hebrew. Paul could speak all three languages. But what in fact did he speak—Aramaic and not Greek, or Hebrew and not Aramaic? I would be grateful for light on this question.

J. M. Ross

The editor replies:

The old JB has a note on Acts 21.40 “Hebrew” reading “i.e. Aramaic: Hebrew was not spoken after the Exile”—which raises the interesting question why they did not *translate* it “Aramaic”. The NJB sensibly modifies the note, since Hebrew clearly continued to be used in liturgy, and in much synagogue teaching also: “i.e. Aramaic: Hebrew was barely spoken after the return from exile.”

Since the context in Acts 21.40, 22.2 could scarcely be more secular, the strong probability is that Aramaic is meant. The voice from heaven in 26.14 is more problematical, but since what the voice said is not notably Biblical, Aramaic is probably intended there too.