

In addition to attempted equivalence, translators must be aware of places where the "otherness" of the message impedes their attempts at equivalence. The fact that they are trying to put aside the otherness of the original language to adopt the otherness of the receptor tongue, should not hide from them the fact that there is an otherness in the message that needs to be maintained. If they are successful, they will enable the reader to enter into the process of a self-changing dialogue with the text.

REVIEWS

Heller, Roy L. *Narrative Structure and Discourse Constellations: An Analysis of Clause Function in Biblical Hebrew Prose* (Harvard Semitic Studies 55). Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2004. xi + 494 pp. \$49.95 Cloth. ISBN 1-57506-918-0.

Based on a Yale University dissertation, this book investigates the function of the verb in Hebrew narrative from a discourse perspective. The author explains how already Lambdin looked at verbs primarily in terms of their function in the text: how do the various verb clauses give structure to a prose text? Discourse linguists have done the same. Chapter 1 briefly surveys problems with tense-based, historical-comparative, and aspect-based approaches to Hebrew verbs, and then moves on to discourse-linguistic approaches (notably F. I. Andersen's and R. E. Longacre's) to Hebrew verbs and clause types. Heller demonstrates that verbs and their function in narrative are different from verbs and their function in direct discourse, a key distinction already worked out in W. Schneider's grammar. Building on Longacre's distinction between four discourse types—narrative, predictive, expository, hortatory—Heller adds a fifth: interrogative discourse, which is defined by the consistent presence of interrogative particles, and "in which a character attempts to elicit a verbal [rather than active or attitudinal] response from the hearer(s)" (25-26).

What is different from Longacre's approach is that these discourse types are actually treated as types of direct discourse: Heller reserves the term narrative discourse for narrative in direct discourse (where *qatals* dominate) and keeps this separate from other narrative text (where *wayyiqtol*s are the backbone). When *wayyiqtol* does occur in narrative direct discourse (e.g., Gen 42.30), it usually signals a close parallel to preceding narrative text (i.e., Gen 42.9). The same applies to the *wayyiqtol*s in Judah's long speech in Gen 44.20-26. Another major improvement is that in Heller's approach a passage of direct discourse may contain more than one discourse type. For instance, Joseph's interpretations of dreams in Gen 40.13, 19 are predictive discourse. The whole first half of Gen 40.8 is narrative discourse (*wehinnê* is lacking): "We have had a dream and there was no interpreter of it," rather than ". . . and there is no one to interpret it" (95). Gen 42.36, with an incipient *iqtol*, is expository discourse (138): "And Benjamin you are going to take." The *qatal* clauses in Gen 42.25, 28 are part of expository discourse as well: they are not past tense accounts but "function within the present tense nature of the speech as explanations about the origin of the dream . . . : 'What God is doing he has told/has shown to Pharaoh!'" (467). In hortatory discourse, for a first-person *qatal* clause to be considered performative ("I hereby say") it should stand in parallel with other hortatory forms (e.g., imperative or jussive clauses) or immediately precede a *iqtol* clause, as in 2 Sam 19.30 (19.29) (377).

Heller's classification of discourse type can be disputed in only a few instances. 1 Kings 2.3b-4 is indeed predictive discourse, but it is a little surprising that the preceding vv. 2-3a are treated as predictive discourse as well (424), rather than hortatory. And why is Gen 46.33-34a ("... you should say") predictive (191) and not hortatory? Finally, as Heller points out himself, the *halô' yiqtol* clause in 2 Sam 13.4 ("Won't you tell me?") borders on hortatory discourse, rather than just interrogative discourse (480).

In chs. 2 and 3, then, Heller's analysis of the Joseph Novella and of the Narrative of David's Court (2 Samuel 9-20 and 1 Kings 1-2) brings out that each discourse type is characterized and organized by its own usage and combinations of verb forms. The functions of the various verb forms are regular within each discourse text-type. Heller argues strongly that the Joseph Novella ends with Gen 47.27, not with, for instance, 50.22, and he also excludes ch. 38 and the genealogical list in ch. 46 from his analysis. From a literary point of view, this does indeed limit the analysis to those passages where Joseph is the central figure who propels the narrative. But chs. 38, 44, and 46 demonstrate that the novella as a whole is as much concerned with Jacob and Judah as with Joseph. And text-linguistically the resumption in Gen 39.1 presupposes ch. 38. While the verbless clauses in the genealogy in ch. 46 are indeed less relevant to the analysis, it would have been consistent to include both Genesis 38 and the prose of 47.27-50.26. As for the beginning and ending of the Narrative of David's Court, 2 Samuel 10-12 and 1 Kings 1-2 form an *inclusio* about Bathsheba, Nathan, and Solomon, while the background of the main characters in 2 Sam 19.24-30—Ziba and Mephibosheth—is given in 2 Samuel 9 (218). After the analysis of the two textual corpuses, Heller recapitulates in ch. 4 the roles of the nine verb forms and two clausal types (verbless and incomplete) in Hebrew narrative texts.

In narrative prose, only *wayyiqtol* chains are considered sequential. Heller defines a paragraph as "a narrative block of material organized by a coherent *wayyiqtol* chain" (431). Outside these chains, the following functions are performed.

Paragraph delimitation in narrative prose is accomplished syntactically by *wayhî* temporal clauses and by independent *qatal* clauses (56). The same is achieved by the *weqatal* clauses in 2 Sam 16.5 and 16.13 (324). It also applies to *yiqtol* following a particle such as *'az*, outside the two textual corpora, e.g., 1 Kgs 3.16 (435). After the negative particle *lo'*, a *qatal*, instead of being a paragraph boundary marker, may be an instance of "momentous negation," propelling the narrative forward in a way similar to a *wayyiqtol* clause, e.g., *welo' 'ābā* in 2 Sam 13.14, 16 (437).

Other non-*wayyiqtol* clauses—*hyh* clauses, *weqatal*, participial, and verbless clauses—are off-line, inner-paragraph comments, which explain some specific part of the immediate narrative context (57, 451). For instance, the end of 2 Sam 9.11 ("And Mephibosheth would eat at his [i.e., David's, with the Septuagint] table as one of the king's sons") is regarded as part of such an inner-paragraph comment in the narrative (225). The *qatal* clause "Now, she also tore the . . . coat" in 2 Sam 13.19 is an inner-paragraph comment, not sequentially a new step (272, 447). The same applies to "He (also) named the darkness 'Night'" in Gen 1.5 (448). The participial clause "She was purifying herself from her uncleanness" in 2 Sam 11.4 is not simply circumstantial but provides a subsequent

inner-paragraph comment, which has been delayed to this point to add to the suspense of the story (247-8). Heller also treats 1 Kgs 1.10 (*qatal*) as an inner-paragraph comment. Furthermore, the definition of an inner-paragraph comment on p. 57 should include *yiqtol* clauses if the *yiqtol* clauses in 2 Sam 12.3 are treated as an inner-paragraph comment (see below).

Then there are extra-paragraph comments. These occur between paragraphs and provide information related only to the story line at large (rather than propelling forward the narrative itself). Such extra-paragraph comments can refer to backgrounded circumstances, repeated activities, or form the outcome of a narrative block. Any verb, including *yiqtol* and isolated, non-chained, *wayyiqtol*, can be part of an extra-paragraph comment (58, 456). Such extra-paragraph comments are, for example, Gen 37.1-4 (59), 2 Sam 12.31 (61) and 2 Sam 14.25-28 (296). This accounts nicely for *yiqtol* in narrative outside direct discourse (2 Sam 12.31; 1 Kgs 1.1). And treating 2 Sam 12.16b-17 as an extra-paragraph comment that “describes a . . . nonlinear series of actions that occur . . . during the seven days” of David’s fasting (262-3) accounts well for the lack of *wayyiqtol*s. The same applies to, for example, 2 Sam 15.2 and 15.5 (*weqatal* clauses) and indeed to 2 Sam 17.17 (*weqatal* and *yiqtol* clauses). It is not quite clear why this last example should already begin in v. 15 (on pp. 332, 338, though not on p. 454).

All this does not mean that Heller calls for an off-line comment (inner or extra-paragraph) whenever a choice of verb form is rather difficult to understand. This is demonstrated by his careful treatment of the *yiqtol* clause in 2 Sam 15.37. It is part of the narrative. This instance of *yiqtol*—as opposed to *qatal*, *weqatal*, or *qotel*—is largely explained as an action which is contemporaneous (non-sequential) as well as specific (311-2). And the *yiqtol* in 2 Sam 20.18 is shown to be part of narrative discourse, portraying a repetitive action in past time (388).

But it seems surprising that the two *wayyiqtol*s in Gen 37.4 are each considered non-chained (and thus not yet part of the story line): after all, they are sequential, and the clause in between them is only a dependent clause. Another result is that the (non-temporal) *wayhî* clause at the beginning of Gen 39.21 is treated not as paragraph delineation but as an inner-paragraph off-line comment, thus separating it from the next clause (75, 79)! The *wayhî* clause at the end of Gen 39.6, now an inner-paragraph comment, could equally have been treated as an extra-paragraph comment. It remains unclear why the end of Gen 43.32 (“for the Egyptians could not / cannot eat . . . abomination”) is not treated as at least an inner-paragraph comment. And while the *yiqtol* clauses in 2 Sam 12.3 are indeed a comment, it remains unclear whether Heller treats them as an inner-paragraph comment (as the brackets in the layout on p. 252 suggest) or not (cf. the discussion on pp. 264-5 and 460). The only reason that these habitual actions are not treated as an inner-paragraph comment seems to be that they are part of narrative direct discourse, not of narrative prose as such.

In the various types of direct discourse (i.e., in contrast to narrative prose), no predominant verb form occurs throughout speeches. “Likewise, there is no consistent syntactically marked means of expressing points on or off the main line of discourse” (457). Still, each discourse type is composed of a limited number of verbal and clausal combinations (458). Narrative discourse is most often based on *qatal* clauses, with *wayyiqtol* clauses only functioning as a continuation of a *qatal* clause. It is in line with this that the function of *wayyiqtol* in narrative discourse is

described in the table on narrative discourse (462) as “continuative past.” It is not meant to be an aspectual term. Still, the term “sequential past” would probably express this function more clearly. *Yiqtol* and *weqatal* are the most frequent in predictive discourse. Again, for *weqatal* clauses, “sequential future” would probably be more accurate than “continuative future” (464). In expository discourse, participial and verbless clauses are the most frequent combinations. The primary tense of narrative discourse is past, of predictive discourse it is future, and of expository discourse it is present (478). As for hortatory discourse, volitional verb forms (imperative, cohortative, jussive) are the most frequent, with *weyiqtol* and *weqatal* clauses often functioning as their continuation. 2 Samuel 13.5 and 6 both include hortatory discourse; in both verses, the initial *yiqtol-na’* clause is continued, whether by *weyiqtol* clauses (v. 6) or by *weyiqtol* and *weqatal* clauses (v. 5). Often there is no clear difference between the usage of *weyiqtol* clauses and *weqatal* clauses in continuing a hortatory speech (283).

Despite some smaller quibbles, Heller has combined comprehensive simplicity and explanatory power more successfully than many earlier works on the verb system in Hebrew narrative. The distinction between narrative discourse and narrative outside direct discourse is helpful exegetically as well as syntactically. He has also provided more consistency in deciding where there are paragraph boundaries in the text. For these reasons, translators will benefit greatly from this book.

LÉNART J. DE REGT

Simon Crisp and Manuel Jinbachian (eds.). *Text, Theology and Translation: Essays in honour of Jan de Waard*. United Bible Societies, 2004. viii + 207 pp. ISBN 1-84364-078-3.

This volume has been produced in order to honour Jan de Waard at the occasion of his seventieth birthday. It contains essays written by friends and colleagues from the United Bible Societies and from academic institutions around the world. It is most appropriate that the volume has been edited by members of the UBS since Jan de Waard was active, for many years (1966-1992), as Translation Consultant in Francophone Central Africa and, at a later stage, as Regional Translations Coordinator for Europe and the Middle East.

The first contribution by A. A. Alexeev, entitled “Masoretic Text in Russia” (13-29), provides the reader a detailed picture of the fact that, although one might think otherwise, the MT was used in one way or another as a basis for Bible translation work in medieval and modern times. Particularly interesting are the attempts in the nineteenth century to produce a new Russian version which was not only based on the LXX (as the Slavonic versions were), but also on the MT.

In the next essay, D. J. Clark discusses the issue of how to translate, in a contextually sensitive way, the conversational Hebrew expression *hinnehi* in Genesis (31-42). He surveys quite a number of modern translations concerning this matter, which display a wide variety of approaches. He would prefer to translate the expression in a way which fits the context (e.g., in Gen 22.1: “Yes, I’m listening”).

S. Crisp deals with the question whether a literary translation should be literal (43-51) and pleads for a “nuanced approach to the question of fidelity to the source