

translator in his work. In passing, he does not fail to denounce a number of prejudices, for example about so-called "primitive" languages (70, cf. 90).

It may be said that there is nothing very new in this, compared with what has been taught for many years in translators' seminars. Yet this publication is noteworthy in several respects: **1.** What many readers of TBT know is far from being known or accepted in many of our church circles, and a nail has to be hammered again and again before it is driven in! **2.** The book is easy to read, so it can be recommended without hesitation to people who want information on this matter. It is without technical jargon, and full of examples. **3.** It is good to have quotations from the best authors in support of the argument as it develops (in one or two cases, there are prophetic quotations from a book which has not yet been published!)

The specialist, for his part, will note certain rather hasty statements. For example, the harsh judgement on the Septuagint as "a stiff, formal translation" (75) requires serious modification in the light of a series of recent studies. The author should be told that discoveries made at Ebla in upper Syria have shown that translation was already a necessary activity in about B.C. 2500 (not only in B.C. 2000, in the time of Hammurabi). The present reviewer was surprised to note the absence of French from the list of the main European languages of the past (69)! But these few remarks do not detract from the value of this book which will be read with profit for the reasons stated above.

JEAN-CLAUDE MARGOT

Aryeh Newman: **Mapping Translation Equivalence** (Contrastive Analysis Series no. 8). Leuven: Acco. 1980. 144 pp.

This is a very important book for Bible translators, not only because of its theoretical aim (to make more explicit the intuitive concept of translation equivalence with the help of contemporary linguistics and in the light of actual translation performances), but also because of its practical examples, nearly all taken from the Hebrew Bible.

So on pp. 52ff. the rendering of Exodus 1.7 is thoroughly discussed, especially the translation of the Hebrew adverbial adjunct intensifier *bi-me'od me'od* which either qualifies the last verb only or all four verbs in the sentence (if source criticism is taken seriously, by the way, the intensifier can only qualify one verb). The RSV translation (But the descendants of Israel were fruitful and increased greatly; they multiplied and grew exceedingly strong;) is rejected since it does not formally match the Hebrew and since it does not render the associative meaning of the original. It seems at least to be an overstatement when the author qualifies the translation by Buber and Rosenzweig of this text as dynamic equivalent. One should, however, agree with him that their renderings (or non renderings) of the sentence initial *waw* in Hebrew reflect a concern of functional equivalence translation. One should also agree that focus on formal match should not be confused with literal translation. The rendering the author himself proposes (certainly the Israelites teemed, swarmed, multiplied, grew and grew) presents through its doubling of the verb a closer equivalence to the Hebrew.

Of particular interest is the discussion of the different renderings of Deut 34.6 under the heading of explicitness and implicitness of participant (pp. 111ff.). After an initial sentence stating: "So Moses the servant of the Lord died there, in the land of Moab, according to the word of the Lord", the Hebrew text continues as follows: *wayyikbor otho . . .*, and the following translations of this new sentence occur: "And he buried him . . ." (KJB); "And he was buried . . ." (JB); "And they buried him . . ." (Septuagint); "The Lord buried him . . ." (Moffatt, Knox, GNB); "He buried himself" (Rashi, Ibn Ezra). The last version but one has become especially popular in modern Bible translation and the author rightly observes that such a popularity is not only due to considerations of Biblical and linguistic scholarship, but also to changes in ideological and philosophical attitudes. Theological objections to anthropomorphisms become irrelevant when the readers no longer take the latter literally or when they tend to regard the Bible as myth.

Translators interested in the theory of translation will frequently find thoughtful remarks among well known statements. The author is essentially a supporter of a sociosemiotic approach to translation; hence his continuous focus on the fact that author and reader are not "passive manipulators of a fixed code" (p. 24). Although the insight is not revolutionary, it cannot be stressed enough that the capacity of the reader to decipher a text is largely conditioned by the pre-existent knowledge he brings to it (p. 30ff.). The socio-semiotic approach also leads to the view that translation variants regarding one particular interpretation of a text can be considered as situational variants (p. 15). On the other hand, there is a growing body of interpretation consisting of the responses of generations of readers which the author terms "readings" (p. 21) and these readings can not only be realized in the form of criticism, commentary and paraphrase, but also in the form of translation. This also means that in his translation a Bible translator cannot avoid certain choices as to doctrinal and historical controversies which are associated with the text.

Provocative observations are made with regard to "ambiguity" which is seen as an essential property of language and as "a general characteristic of living processes by which maximum effect is achieved through minimum means" (p. 27). Such an "ambiguity" has, of course, nothing to do with the restricted phenomenon of deliberate ambiguity which can be encountered in puns etc. However, it is particularly in his analysis of the translation-technical operation of identifying participants that the author makes most pertinent remarks. Repetitions of proper nouns, for example, do not perform the exclusive function of identifying participants. Repetitions may serve in addition stylistic and emphatic purposes, they may express familiarity or distance, and they may belong to a register of intimate or reverential speech. In other words, if the translator sometimes replaces proper nouns by third person pronouns, he may very well reach the same degree of explicitness in the target language without, however, matching the stylistic or pragmatic features of the source text, implying what we might call a loss of "associative" meaning. The translator will constantly have to ask himself whether there is underspecification or overspecification in the reference and he will have to determine degrees of explicitness.

As always, some questions remain. The lack of sophisticated distinctions between "poetry" and "prose" is responsible for some overstatements such as: "some poetry may be rendered into prose reflecting specific reader needs and distinguished by semantic priority and the total ignoring of the aesthetic aspects" (p. 102). In note 7 on p. 126 "French 'on' + plural third person verb" should, of course, read "singular third person verb". There are a number of typographical errors such as "if" (p. 70, line 7) for "is", "itelligibility" (p. 83, line 3), "understaning" (p. 87, line 24), "inot" (p. 88, line 17), "of couuse" (p. 100, line 5), "partcular" (p. 129, line 13). The study by Hammarström quoted p. 38, line 2 with the reference "(1976:2)" does not figure in the bibliography in the back of the book. However, these are all matters of minor detail. The ideas expressed in this book are important for every Bible translator.

JAN DE WAARD

**Falk, Marcia, *Love Lyrics From The Bible: A Translation and Literary Study of The Song of Songs*. Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1982. 142 pp. Paper, £5.95; hardcover £9.95.**

Marcia Falk has developed a careful analysis of the central issues in the interpretation and translation of the Song of Songs, based on her 1976 dissertation at Stanford University.

A brief preface is followed by Falk's translation of the Song. She divides it into thirty-one poems of varying length and complexity on the basis of the literary structure, types of love lyrics, contents, themes, and motifs. Each of these factors is discussed carefully and clearly in the chapters that follow the translation. Falk is conversant with the work of contemporary biblical scholars and with that of literary critics. By bringing together these two fields and drawing on her sensitivity to the poetic resources of the English language, she has created a work especially valuable to the Bible translator.

Chapter One discusses translation largely in reference to Martin Buber and Franz Rosenzweig. There is no mention, however, of contemporary linguistics or translation theory, and no notice is given to the theoretical work of the United Bible Societies or to UBS translations.

In chapter Two Falk looks in detail at J. Cheryl Exum's "A Literary and Structural Analysis of the Song of Songs" (ZAW 85, 1973: 47-49) and other studies. Her main debate is with Exum's defense of the structural unity of the text. On balance, she fails to refute Exum's position. All too often Falk's criteria seem inadequate to justify a fragmentation of the book. She separates poem 16 (4:8) from poem 17 (4:9-11), saying that "The mood of 17 is gentler than that of 16, because its context is less threatening." Slim grounds for separating this unit into two poems.

Chapter Three analyses types of love lyrics into monologues and dialogues, further subdivided according to speaker and hearer, for a total of five types. Poem 19 (5:2-6:3) is "composite." It has so clear a unity of content that Falk is restrained from dividing it.

A special chapter is devoted to the poetic descriptions which the lovers give of each other. She uses the Arabic word *wasf* (description), which has been