

sound scholarship with rigid Christian orthodoxy. For those not so convinced, the book may, instead, raise further questions about the validity and merit of many textual, exegetical, and translational decisions.

ROBERT G. BRATCHER

Peter Masumbuko Renju, *A semantic analysis of 2 Corinthians 2:14-3:18*. Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap, 1986. x+122 pp, no price stated.

Or Renju's brief opening sentence is welcome reading for anyone involved in translation work: "This study is translation orientated." The author comes from Tanzania and is obviously familiar with the various translations of the Bible into Swahili. This analysis of 22 verses from 2 Corinthians is his doctoral dissertation at the University of Utrecht.

In *TBT* 35 (July 1984) Hollander, de Jonge and Tuinstra recommended a new type of help for translators which, they said, should contain the following: a formal equivalence translation, an analysis of the entire text, a detailed analysis of individual pericopes, discussion of important lexical items and a summary of issues involved in translating the material analysed. To quite an extent, Renju's work meets these criteria (not altogether surprising, as de Jonge was one of the men who provided help with the thesis).

The Greek text is divided into short spans or units, each span containing either a verbal form or an abstract noun that represents an event. The words in each span (Renju himself refers to the spans as "nuclear structures" or "propositions" or "kernel sentences") are classified semantically using the labels E(vent), O(bject), A(bstract) and R(elation). Renju also gives evidence for dividing the 22 verses into five paragraphs (his term) and for each paragraph he gives a chart on which he groups the spans by means of vertical brackets, the bracketing being being layered, i.e. smaller brackets combine to form larger brackets up to the immediate constituents of the paragraph itself. Each paragraph display is backed up by a detailed discussion of the meaning of its individual spans. The following brief review of some of the issues considered will immediately indicate the value of this information to the translator.

Figures of speech are carefully discussed. For examples, in the first paragraph, 2.14-17, the metaphor of a "smell" or "fragrance" is used and this is explained, along with associated genitive constructions such as "the smell of the knowledge of him". In the next paragraph, 3.1-3, the readers are said to be "our letter", and this, too, is explained, together with the difficult following phrase "written in our hearts".

Similarly, the rhetorical question in 2.16 and the double rhetorical question in 3.1 are carefully considered as to their role in the epistle at this point.

The author is also well aware that the various spans, and bracketings of spans, are linked together semantically and he regularly comments on what these links are. For example, in moving from 3.1 to 3.2, where the Greek uses asyndeton, he says: "This item (the opening statement of verse 2) is in fact the **reason** adduced to support the negative answer implied by the previous rhetorical question" [my

emphasis]. In fact, having discussed the relations between the spans and between their groups, he provides a chart, reflecting his analysis, for each paragraph at the end of his detailed discussion of the passage. He also indicates how the paragraphs themselves are interrelated. He thus reflects the translator's consciousness that all the material in a translation has to be appropriately connected together, otherwise it will not communicate clearly, or even intelligibly, to the reader.

Another area of difficulty for the translator is that of "implied information", and Renju addresses himself to this issue also. Where there are abstract nouns in a span, he discusses who the Agent, Object, etc, might be, and the same is true for the passives in this passage. He also proposes objects for such verbs as "we speak" in 2:17 which have no expressed object in the Greek.

Renju is evidently strongly convinced of the value of componential analysis of lexical items for a translator, both in the source text and in the receptor language. In fact, he devotes a separate chapter to a discussion of the components of **dikaïosunē**, **diathēkē** and **doxa** as they are used in this passage. But, in addition to this more extended analysis of three "key-terms", he also discusses the components of various words on the way through—such as the difference between **pistis** and **pepoithēsis**.

Very interestingly, he also recognises that the widely occurring phrase **en Christō** needs careful analysis. He maintains that it is not amenable to componential analysis as it is not substitutable; he suggests that what is important for the translator is "to have a kind of a 'rule of thumb'" to work with. To this end, he recognizes three different types of kernel sentence in which this phrase is found. These are (1) those in which the expression is found in a non-event statement, i.e. one in which the verb "to be" is used, or implicit; (2) those in which **en Christo** functions as "immediate agent", God being the primary agent and people the "affected participant"; and (3) those in which a believer/believers are the agent and the action is "characterized" by the phrase **en Christō**. He then follows this initial analysis up with an application of it to Swahili, emphasizing that the likelihood of find one expression in a language which will handle all the (160) occurrences of **en Christō** is very small indeed.

Renju first establishes a groundplan, as it were, of what is involved in the transmission of a communication. He rejects the historical etymological approach and also the structuralist approach of Greimas, and opts for an approach using a "communicative model" and "language functions". The former establishes a set of six factors relevant to any communication in general: the addresser, the addressee, the channel used for the message, the general setting within which the communication takes place (context), and the message itself, which is divided between content (what is said) and form (how it is said).

Matching these six communication factors are six corresponding "language functions". He defines the term "function" as follows: "Each function indicates the effect produced when . . . the addresser puts emphasis on any one of the corresponding communication factors over and above the rest" (p. 10). Taking the factors in the order given above, the language functions are the expressive,

the conative (i.e. influencing the addressee), the phatic, the situational, the referential (focus on the content of the message) and the poetic (focus on the form of the message).

Having established a general model, Renju then gets down to details. For analytical purposes, he distinguishes between “content” and “intent”. The former deals with the language functions that relate to the message and the latter with the other four language functions. As noted, he approaches the analysis of the referential content both paradigmatically and syntagmatically. The former gives rise to the componential analysis discussed earlier; the latter, however, is more complex. Having classified each Greek lexical item as O(bject), A(bstract) or R(elation), or a combination of these, he then, within a nuclear structure, relates these items by means of case relations. He next outlines a system of semantic relations, based on Nida’s *Exploring Semantic Structures*, that holds between nuclear structures, and which he uses extensively in the analysis of the passage from 2 Corinthians.

For Renju, the “intent” is shown by what he terms the “connotational” meaning, taking this in a broader sense than the emotional impact and social function of a word or expression. For him, intent covers the four language functions of expressive, conative, phatic and situational, and is particularly important for the translator, since transferring the meaning from one language to another includes the intent aspect of the meaning as well as the content aspect.

His bibliography and his comments make it clear that his work is based primarily on various works by Nida, though there are comments on the approaches of other writers, especially in setting up his communication model. What is perhaps surprising in a Ph.D. thesis is the lack of reference to other similar attempts to provide this type of semantic analysis by Louw and others in South Africa: and by various SIL authors. This lack does not seriously affect the actual semantic analysis of the 2 Corinthians passage, but it significantly weakens the theoretical presentation.

There are all too few studies of Biblical passages of a serious scholarly nature aimed to help the translator, as such. In its present form, this work is rather heavy going for the average busy translator. I wonder if Dr Renju could be persuaded to simplify the presentation so that it could readily be used by translators struggling with the difficulties of 2 Corinthians? Better still, could the work be expanded to embrace a larger portion of 2 Corinthians—say, to 7.4, which Dr Renju recognizes, along with many others, as a major break point in this long epistle? In this way, his capable work could be made available to translators throughout the world.

JOHN CALLOW