the Russian Bible Commission to the Pan-Russian Orthodox Church Council, held in 1917–18, for improvements in the Slavonic and Russian biblical texts. For its part, the Council set up a Biblical Section, which in turn recommended the organization of a special Biblical Council at the highest level of the administration of the Russian Orthodox Church. Thus both the Synod, and the Council of 1917–18, gave evidence of their responsible attitude to Holy Scripture, and of their complete impartiality in Bible work.

This action by the Synod and the Council confirms once again that the "Synodal translation" (that is, the 1876 Russian Bible) is no more than an unsuccessful stage in the still unfinished process of making a national Bible translation for Russian-speaking believers.

LOUIS DORN

CHRONOLOGICAL SEQUENCE IN TWO HEBREW NARRATIVES

The Rev. **Louis Dorn** was an Honorary Translations Advisor working with the Philippine Bible Society from 1968 to 1974, and is presently a Th.D. candidate at the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago.

Introduction

One of the problems Bible translators encounter in their work with people of other cultures is that the order of narrating events is in general under syntactic constraints of discourse structure different from those of English and of Indo-European languages. For example, translators in the Philippines have found that when working with tribal groups not influenced by western culture, the flashbacks of Mark 6:14–29, the narrative of the death of John the Baptist, cannot be handled in the order of the Greek text. John's arrest is mentioned before his admonition to Herod, and his death is referred to implicitly in v. 14 and explicitly in v. 16 before it is narrated in v. 27. The Indo-European hearer has no problem keeping the chronological sequence in proper order in his mind because of the tense markers. The Philippine tribesman is confused. Furthermore, in many of the tribal languages, at certain points in the narrative a connecting link is required, repeating the previous event in relation to the new one, to add clarity to the order of occurrence; e.g., "when *a* was completed, then *b* was done; after he had finished *b* he did *c*."[1]

Similar problems have been noted in other countries, as Philip Stine reports from Africa. In his experience also Mark 6:14–29 was a text that forced restudy of the discourse structure of the languages involved and a rearrangement of the text in translations.[2]

[1] Much of this information was discussed at the Bible Translations Seminar for Minority Languages, Baguio City, Philippines, March 16–20, 1970.

[2] Philip C. Stine, "On the Restructuring of Discourse," *The Bible Translator* 25 (1974): 101–106.

For Indo-European languages, there is little difficulty in signalling the chronological relationship of one event in a narrative to another because of the complex tense structure. In English, for example, events preceding those already mentioned can be handled by the pluperfect. In a language that has no such syntactic device, the relationship must be explained via other means, or else the prior event must be narrated before that which occurred later. The latter procedure seems to be the more common one in the non-western languages referred to.

It is interesting that translation problems of this kind have been noted for New Testament narratives; none brought forward from the Old Testament have come to the attention of this writer. There is the possibility that basic differences in syntax between Greek and Hebrew are involved. Hebrew has a more simple tense system than Greek, and thus there may be a tendency for stories to be related along the same lines of discourse structure as do the languages referred to in Africa and in the Philippines.

This study is an exploratory one. It seeks to determine whether Hebrew narrative tends to follow a strict chronological sequence in the narration of events. If such is the case, but departures from the norm occur, formal signals to the hearer should be determined. It should also be determined whether the principle of sequential narration is helpful in the study of the text.

The first step in this study was to chart the events of two Hebrew narratives in the order of presentation. The narratives chosen were the Ark Narrative (1 Sam. 4–6 and 2 Sam. 6), and the story of Ruth. The chart listed the statement of the event, the syntactic form in which the event is expressed, and the function this form serves in expressing temporal relationships. No quotations were included for analysis; first, they are themselves events of the main narration, regardless of their content; and second, their content sometimes includes logical argumentation or other forms of discourse not related to this study of narrative discourse, or the quotation presents its own narration within a narration. Therefore for purposes of this initial study it seemed best to delete them regularly from the analysis. Some items charted do not involve events, but they were included to account for the whole of the narration.[3] 354 items were tabulated on the chart. The second step was to analyze the syntactic marking of the sequence of events. The following report indicates the findings.

The Syntactic Forms and Their Functions

The following syntactic forms have been isolated and their functions described:

a) The most frequently occurring form is *the* ו *consecutive with the imperfect verb.* This occurs in 261 of the 354 items tabulated. The tabulation indicates that the normal function of this form, when it occurs in a consecutive chain of events, is to indicate that the events described occur in expected chronological sequence. The overwhelming majority of occurrences of this

[3] Arrangements may be made for obtaining copies of the chart by communicating with the author, c/o the Editors of *The Bible Translator.*

form lends support to the hypothesis that Hebrew narrative normally describes events in the order in which they were to have occurred.

Sometimes this form is used when the events described occur nearly simultaneously, or they occur simultaneously but the sequence is the logical one for reporting the cluster of events (1 Sam. 4:10, four events; 5:6, three events; 5:9, the last three events; Ruth 2:10, the first two events; and 3:7, the first two events). In 2 Sam. 6:11, when Yahweh blessed Obed-edom, the blessing occurred simultaneously with the ark resting at his house, but the blessing is the consequence of the previously mentioned event.

The form appears to be used ingressively in at least two cases; the events that follow occur while the initial event continues (2 Sam. 6:12, ויעל; Ruth 1:6, ותשב; and 1:7, ותצב).

An epexegetical use of the consecutive occurs with the standard quotation marker, ויאמר (1 Sam. 4:17 and Ruth 2:11).

The assumption of chronological sequence indicates that in 1 Sam. 5:1,2 there is either a case of dittography, or else two stages are recorded of the Philistines "taking" the ark. Or this may be related to another phenomenon in which a previous event is repeated, either in summary or expanded fashion, after an explanatory interruption of the narrated sequence has occurred (Ruth 4:8, 17b).

b) Related to the ו consecutive is the form ויהי, which Gesenius-Kautzsch destribes as introducing new narration or a new section of narration.[4] But in these narratives the form often appears rather to call the hearer's attention to an important bit of narrative, rather than to introduce a new section (see 1 Sam. 4:5, 18; 5:9, 10; 2 Sam. 6:13; Ruth 1:1, 19). This function merits further study. The verb היה is used in the ordinary sense of "to be", both in the perfect with the conjunctive ו and the imperfect with ו consecutive (1 Sam. 6:1; 2 Sam. 6:16; Ruth 1:1, 2; 2:17). This latter function should not be confused with the former. In Ruth 3:8 it has both the ordinary function and that of calling attention to the narrative.

c) All other uses of the ו are conjunctive in the narratives examined. With *the subject noun and a perfect verb* it has several functions. When in chronological sequence, this form is used rather than the ו consecutive to put emphasis on the actor (2 Sam. 6:16, ומיכל, and the genealogy, Ruth 4:18–21), or to give dramatic effect or emphasis, or both (1 Sam. 4:14, והאיש; and 6:14, והעגלה). It may introduce a new section of narrative (1 Sam. 5:1), and it may do so with an event which is repeated and expanded after having been mentioned previously (Ruth 4:1, see 3:15d). It is used for a summary statement or epitaph for Eli's life work, which involves a time prior to the previously mentioned events (1 Sam. 4:18d). It can provide a general background to the narrative (1 Sam. 4:15, ועיניו; 5:12a), background of events next to be mentioned (1 Sam. 4:19a; 2 Sam. 6:16a), or background of events both preceding and following, serving as a bridge in the narration (Ruth 1:22b). It often shows how an event in sequence or simultaneous with

[4] A. E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar: as edited and enlarged by the late E. Kautzsch*, 2nd English ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), p. 327.

the preceding event is in contrast with it (1 Sam. 4:1d; 6:10c, 14d, 15c, 16a; Ruth 1:14d), or it gives emphasis to the noun (1 Sam. 4:11a and b; 6:15a).

d) *The conjunctive* ו *with the subject noun and participle* may indicate an event simultaneous with the preceding one (1 Sam. 6:12d; 2 Sam. 6:3c, 4, 5a), and may also give emphasis to the noun (2 Sam. 6:14a and b, and 15). It may also provide background information for the next section of narrative (1 Sam. 6:13a). Note that in 1 Sam. 6, the last event of v. 12 and the first event of v. 13 appear to form an intentional bridge in the narration, both using this form.

e) *The conjunctive* ו *with the object noun and a perfect verb* continues the normal sequence of events but adds contrast and/or emphasis (1 Sam. 7:1c).

f) *The conjunctive* ו *with a noun but no verb* provides general background information (1 Sam. 6:14c; Ruth 1:2, 4; 2:1) such as the names of characters. An adverb may be used as a substantive for the noun (1 Sam. 4:4c). The background information may refer to the following context (1 Sam. 4:15a). In one case the prefix ל is added to the noun to indicate possession (Ruth 2:1a). A demonstrative pronoun is used to introduce a new portion of narrative or a genealogy in the case of ואלה תולדות (Ruth 4:18).[5]

g) Similar to the above, *the conjunctive* ו *with* זאת may be used with the infinitive to provide background to the narrative (Ruth 4:7a), or without a verb to provide both background and a summary of that section of narrative (Ruth 4:7c). Both occurrences of זאת in the Ruth narrative form an inclusio for the brief explanation of an ancient custom in Ruth 4:7.[6]

h) All instances of *a perfect verb without a* ו in the narratives examined are epexegetical of the previous statement (1 Sam. 5:11, כבדה; 6:12, הלכו; and Ruth 4:7, שלף).

i) The only instance of *a perfect verb with the conjunctive* ו but no explicit noun other than that implicit in the form of the verb occurs in chronological sequence after an epexegetical perfect verb, and therefore may be considered a continuation of the explanation. This occurs in Ruth 4:7.

j) *The conjunctive* ו *with the negative* לא *and a perfect verb* is used twice as epexegetical of the previous statement (1 Sam. 4:15 and 20d), but more frequently it appears that the negative simply interrupts what would have been a normal positive statement, such as one with the ו consecutive (1 Sam. 4:20c; 6:12; 2 Sam. 6:10) or a statement of possession with the prefix ל (2 Sam. 6:23, see "f" above). Note that the instances in 1 Sam. 6:12 and 2 Sam. 6:10 could be epexegetical as well.

k) *The conjunctive* ו *with* הנה is found either with a participial clause (1 Sam. 4:13; 5:3, 4 twice; Ruth 3:8; 4:1) or with a perfect verb (Ruth 2:4). When one observes its function from the viewpoint of narrating events in their sequence, it appears that its chief function is not to call the hearer's attention to what is said, but to note the moment of observation on the part of the

[5] Edward F. Campbell, Jr., *Ruth*, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1975), p. 170.

[6] Inclusio is described as ring composition by George P. Ridout, *Prose compositional techniques in the succession narrative (2 Sam. 7, 9–20; 1 Kings 1–2)*, Ph.D. thesis (Berkeley, California: The Graduate Theological Union, April, 1971), pp. 36–37.

character involved, this moment being related as part of the sequence of events. The phenomenon noted may have been going on for some time (participial clause), as in the case of Eli sitting by the side of the road (1 Sam. 4:13); but it enters the narration at the time the messenger notices Eli, just before he enters the city.[7] An important secondary function of this form may be to involve the hearer in the dramatic narration,[8] but this is not its primary function as viewed in terms of sequence of narration.

l) The epexegetical quotation marker, לאמר, was not noted in the tabulation when found in the text except for its occurrence in 1 Sam. 4:21. There the overwhelming likelihood is that it marks the direct speech of Eli's daughter-in-law as she explains the name of the child (see also Gen. 30:34). The repetition of her explanation in the following verse can then be noted as an example of repetition for the sake of emphasis.[9] However further study is desirable before eliminating the possibility that the form signifies here and in some other instances, "that is to say". This would put the explanation into the mouth of the mother only once.

m) *The conjunctive* ו *with a pronoun but no verb* is used once in these narratives as a non-event identification of the antecedent of the pronoun (Ruth 4:17c).

n) *The prefix* כ is used with a perfect verb to indicate an event occurring simultaneously with the one about to be mentioned (1 Sam. 4:5; 5:10; Ruth 1:19). It is also used with a noun and the infinitive construct, or with the infinitive construct alone, to mention an event that serves as the background for what is mentioned next (1 Sam. 4:18 and 20), in one case repeating an event mentioned earlier in a quotation (1 Sam. 4:18).

o) *The particle* כי is an important device for indicating that events are narrated out of chronological sequence. When used with the subject noun and a perfect verb, or with a perfect verb and implicit subject, it most frequently provides the reason for the event previously mentioned (1 Sam. 4:7, 12, 19; 5:11; 6:19 twice; 2 Sam. 6:6; Ruth 1:6 twice); it may also refer to a prior event (1 Sam. 4:6). In only one instance does it mark an event mentioned in normal sequence, but in that case it provides the background for the action that follows (2 Sam. 6:13). The particle with an adjective is found once to provide a non-event reason for the preceding statement (1 Sam. 4:18).

p) *The relative clause,* אשר *with a perfect verb,* marks an event told out of sequence. In one case it marks an indirect quotation which refers to a prior event (Ruth 1:15), and in two cases prior events are "spoken" of but not in the form of indirect discourse (Ruth 3:16 and 4:1). It also provides background information for an event just mentioned (2 Sam. 6:17; Ruth 3:6). The fuller form, על-אשר, occurs once to provide the reason for the event preceding it (2 Sam. 6:8).

[7] This interpretation indicates one possible reason why the narrator needed to mention Eli's blindness; the messenger could see him and pass him by without Eli seeing the messenger.

[8] Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (London: Oxford University Press, 1907), pp. 243–44.

[9] Ridout, p. 107.

q) *Various particles, adverbs, etc.* occur only once in these two narratives. Those used *with an imperfect verb* include בטרם, which introduces an anticipated event which does not happen until after other events are narrated (Ruth 3:14), and על–כן, which in a sense introduces an event in proper sequence, but one reaching far beyond the next events as it happens to be an intruding aetiological statement (1 Sam. 5:5). Used *with a perfect verb* there is, first, אחרי, which repeats a prior event and uses it as background for the following events (1 Sam. 5:9). עד retains normal sequence of events as it indicates an attained goal (Ruth 1:19). רק introduces an event occurring simultaneously with the preceding one, and provides contrast (1 Sam. 5:4).

Other Implications of Sequential Narration

It appears that this concept can complement other methods in determining the work of a redactor. In 1 Sam. 6:15 the Levites take over as the proper functionaries for the sacrifice at Bethshemesh. However the event of taking the cultic items off the cart is mentioned after the narration of splitting the wood of the cart and sacrificing the cows. This breach of chronological narration serves to strengthen the view that v. 15 was a later redaction.[10]

In another case it is not as easy to use the sequence of events to detect the work of the redactor. A. F. Campbell has noted how the last chapter of the ark narrative is grafted into the rest of David's court history at the beginning of 1 Sam. 6.[11] But the redactor has done this quite smoothly in terms of presenting events in an apparent chronological sequence. Thus this approach is not especially helpful at that point.

The concept of sequential narration can help pinpoint the precise meaning of a term out of its total *Wortfeld.* In 2 Sam. 6:3, רכב can indicate that they *mounted* the ark on a new cart, or they *drove* it, the latter including a whole trip rather than only its beginning.[12] Since the next event mentioned is their carrying the ark from the house of Abinadab, it appears that רכב should be understood in the former sense. This does not rule out the latter, since the ו consecutive form could function here in an ingressive sense; but the weight of normal function of the form favors the former interpretation. Similarly, in Ruth 2:23, ישב can mean either that Ruth *lived* with Naomi, involving an extended event that began as soon as they arrived in Bethlehem, or it can mean that she *sat* with her after her work of the harvest season was ended. The latter interpretation suits the sequential narration rather than the former.

Summary

The Hebrew narratives examined in this study follow a chronological sequence of narration regularly, although not exclusively. Whether this regularity is greater than that of English requires further study of a statistical nature, although at this point one's subjective impression would predict this to be demonstrable.

[10] Henry Preserved Smith, *A Critical and exegetical commentary on the Books of Samuel,* ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), pp. 46–47.

[11] Anthony F. Campbell, *The Ark Narrative (1 Sam 4–6; 2 Sam 6): A Form-Critical and Traditio-Historical Study* (Missoula, Montana: Scholars' Press, 1975), p. 126.

[12] BDB, p. 938.

Hebrew is not held to such sequential narration exclusively. Flashbacks as well as reaching forward to later events, and logical relationships between events, are all made possible by a variety of syntactic forms.

The principle of sequential narration is a useful adjunct to methods of redaction criticism, although it by no means is an absolute criterion. It is also helpful in interpreting the text, whether for reconstructing dramatic sequence or for selecting the precise meaning of a term.

M. DE JONGE

AN ANALYSIS OF I JOHN 1. 1-4

M. de Jonge is Professor of New Testament in the University of Leiden (Netherlands) and a member of United Bible Societies' European Regional Translation Committee (ERTC). This article gives (with some alterations) the text of a lecture given at Uppsala, 28 April 1977, at a joint meeting of the ERTC with Bibelkommissionen, the Swedish committee responsible for a new translation of the Bible. The material presented here was earlier used for a Dutch contribution to the Festschrift for W. K. Grossouw, *Van Taal tot Taal* (published in September 1977).

Introduction

In their meeting at Klosterneuburg in April 1976 the members of ERTC had an interesting discussion on the relation between scholarly exegesis of the Bible and the teaching of exegetical method in universities, on the one hand, and the approach to biblical texts, practised and continually developed by the translators and translation consultants of the Bible Societies, on the other. A good exegete need not be a good translator; but we may rightly ask whether an exegete who neglects important linguistic insights like those gained in Bible Society circles does not curtail his exegetical possibilities, and give an incomplete interpretation of the text before him. I should like to continue this discussion in this paper.

It is obvious that a translator of the Bible needs exegetical skills as well as linguistic training. When an exegete serves on a translation committee (as I did for a number of years, helping to prepare various parts of a translation into everyday Dutch) he discovers that he has a lot to learn. If he tries to broaden his perspective theoretically and practically, he also discovers that his actual exegetical work benefits from this new outlook. Consequently I tried to apply what I had learned in my lectures on the New Testament at the University of Leiden during the academic years 1975–1976 and 1976–1977.

I discovered that the response of the students was very positive. For these two years I concentrated on discourse analysis along the lines of E. A. Nida and C. R. Taber in their *The Theory and Practice of Translation*[1] and E. A. Nida in his *Exploring Semantic Structures*.[2] I also benefited from a number

[1] Leiden: E. J. Brill ²1974.
[2] Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag 1975.