

analysis of their own languages. That theory is very useful also for the analysis of the original biblical languages. But I think one of the participants expected too much, and greatly underrated the years of study ahead, when he remarked: "Now that I have understood a little bit how translation works, learning quickly would be a nice thing."

Bibliography

On the religious and general cultural context:

Zöllner, S., *Lebensbaum und Schweinekult*, Darmstadt 1977.

Heider, K. G., *The Dugum Dani*, Chicago 1970.

Fahner, C. T., *Yali's van de Pas-vallei*, Utrecht 1972.

On the linguistic situation and translation:

Bromley, H. M., *The grammar of Lower Grand Valley Dani in discourse perspective*, Yale University 1972.

Fahner, C. T., *The morphology of Yali and Dani, a descriptive and comparative analysis*, Leiden University 1979.

Allah Wene (New Testament in Yali). Rotterdam 1975.

Allah Wene (Old Testament portions in Yali). Sentani 1982.

H. W. HOLLANDER, M. DE JONGE AND E. W. TUINSTRA

A NEW TYPE OF HELP FOR TRANSLATORS¹

Dr. E. Tuinstra and Dr. H. W. Hollander are translation officers of the Netherlands Bible Society; Professor M. de Jonge is Professor of New Testament in the University of Leiden.

Introduction

Discourse analysis and structural exegesis are rather new approaches to the interpretation and translation of Bible passages. Most of the (traditional) exegetical commentaries on the Bible or studies on translating seem to neglect the structure of Bible books as one clue for a better understanding of the text.

Even the *Translator's Handbooks* published so far have devoted little attention to it. The absence of a detailed analysis of structural matters seems to run parallel with the use of the TEV as starting-point for the discussions of pericopes and verses.² As soon as the importance of structural matters was acknowledged in one way or another, the authors of *Translator's Handbooks* found it necessary to quote the RSV (which follows as closely as possible the form and structure of the original text) as well, but always in a restricted way, viz., at the beginning of a section.³ The TEV has remained in use for the discussion of individual verses.⁴

¹ This article is based on the authors' paper for the ERTC meeting held on Cyprus, September 20–21, 1983. The authors are, of course, conscious of the fact that it mentions just some lines along which structural matters might be presented to translators. Nevertheless, they hope that the article may start a discussion on the importance of structural exegesis for translators of the Bible.

² Apart from the first two *Translator's Handbooks*, those on Mark and Luke, which use RSV.

³ From the *Translator's Handbook* on Thessalonians onwards.

⁴ Future *Translator's Handbooks*, however, beginning with that on Hebrews (1983) use RSV as a base text and as a running text repeated at the beginning of each verse, while TEV will be quoted as a translational model.

There are, however, a few exceptions to be noted: the *Translator's Handbook on the Letters of John*, which over and over again gives (brief) information about structural matters; the *Translator's Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Ephesians*, which gives several times a formal equivalence translation of some pericope and a process of indentation; and particularly, the *Translator's Handbook on the Book of Amos*. In the latter,⁵ we find a first but important step towards an analysis of the structure of a Bible book and its single pericopes, as a scientific method of grasping the meaning of a text and finding a starting-point for any translation. The many and striking implications for translating are found throughout the discussions on the individual passages and in an introductory chapter. This *Translator's Handbook* makes clear that 'Helps for translators' cannot do without a thorough examination of the structure of a Bible book and its individual sections.

A new type of 'Help'

A type of 'Help' as proposed here should present the following issues:

1. A working *translation* of a formal equivalence type. It should be printed in such a way that (most of) the connections, antitheses, etc. in the text become visible. One may use, of course, an existing translation, the RSV for instance, while accentuating certain details, if necessary.
2. An *analysis of the entire text* or at least extensive parts of it, with the help of so-called discourse-markers: terminal features, major internal transitions, temporal, spatial and logical relations, identification of participants, foregrounding and backgrounding, involvement of the author, etc. At the same time the type of discourse should be defined for the whole and for the parts within the whole: narrative, argumentation, dialogue, etc. All this will present an overall view of the text from different perspectives. It should lead to clear suggestions for a delimitation of pericopes and paragraphs as sub-pericopes.
3. A detailed *analysis of the individual pericopes*. This section will include an analysis of the relations between words and expressions within the particular pericope in order to show how structure defines meaning. Relevant information from the fields of textual, criticism, syntax, literary criticism, form and redaction criticism, should be used in so far as it helps to understand the nature of the text. The same will be true for the historical information. The implications of the structural relations for the investigation into the meaning of individual words should also be discussed in this section. For particular 'patterns of words', parallels, synonyms, antonyms, combination of words, may be found elsewhere, in the immediate context (the document under discussion) for instance, or in other writings by the same author, or in (certain parts of) the OT/NT. Finally, where the surface structure is not clear, division into semantic units presented in a standard form ('kernel sentences') and their precise relations will be necessary.
4. A *discussion of a number of recurrent words and expressions* of importance, added, preferably, at the end of the book. Where appropriate, striking 'solutions' of general and particular problems found in modern translations should be added as illustrations and suggestions.

⁵ Cf. also W. A. Smalley, 'Recursion Patterns and the Sectioning of Amos', *TBT* 30 (1979), 118-27; *idem*, 'Discourse analysis and Bible translation', *TBT* 31 (1980), 119-25.

5. *A summary of the main issues affecting translation.*

Uses of this new type of 'Help'

The first use of these 'Helps' is, of course, for translators, those who are involved in translation or revision projects, and also those who prepare portions for special situations requiring 'special' language. They will all be guided by the suggestions and implications for translating given on the basis of a thorough discourse analysis of the structure of a particular Bible passage.

Secondly, the same material could be used in handling "readers' questions" in a Study Bible, since a close analysis of the structure of the text, as a (supposedly) effective means of communication, and of the constituent parts within that structure, should be the starting-point for any interpretation in any form of Study Bible.

An example: Galatians 2.1-10

1. Translation (RSV, with slight alterations)⁶

- 1a Then after fourteen years
 b I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas
 c taking Titus along with me.
 2a I went up by revelation;
 b and I laid before them
 c (but privately before those who were of repute)
 d₁ the gospel
 d₂ which I preach among the Gentiles
 e₁ lest somehow I should be running in vain.
 e₂ or had run
 3a But even Titus, who was with me, was not compelled to be circumcised,
 b though he was a Greek.
 4a But because of false brethren secretly brought in
 b who slipped in to spy out our freedom
 c which we have in Jesus Christ
 d that they might bring us into bondage—
 5a To them we did not yield submission even for a moment,
 b that the truth of the Gospel might be preserved for you.
 6a And from those who were reputed to be something
 b (what they were makes no difference to me,
 c God shows no partiality)—
 d Those (I say) who were of repute added nothing to me;
 7a but on the contrary,
 b when they saw
 c that I had been entrusted with the Gospel to the uncircumcised
 d just as Peter (had been entrusted with the Gospel) to the
 circumcised
 8a (for he who worked through Peter for the mission to the circumcised
 b worked through me also for the Gentiles);
 9a and when they perceived the grace that was given to me,
 b James and Cephas and John,
 c who were reputed to be pillars

⁶ The indentation pattern as it is given below just serves to clarify the structure of the pericope for exegetical and translational purposes. No linguistic consistency is intended.

9d	gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship
e	that we should go to the Gentiles
f	and they to the circumcised;
10a	only they would have us remember the poor
b	which very thing I was eager to do.

2. Analysis of the text with the help of discourse markers

A. 2.1–10 forms part of 1.11–2.21, and many features would have to be mentioned earlier. A useful tool will be H. D. Betz, *Galatians* (Hermeneia Series, Philadelphia: Fortress Press 1979), where we find a very detailed formal analysis with the help of categories of Greco-Roman rhetoric and epistolography: so 1.1–5 epistolary prescript; 1.6–11 exordium (including 1.11, the introduction of the point of contention in the following statement of facts); 1.12–2.14 *narratio* (telling what happened in order to prove the point made in 1.11); 2.15–21 *propositio* (main thesis of the letter, in the form of a continued debate with Peter); 3.1–4.31 *probatio*, etc.

B. As to 2.1–10:

a. 2.1, ‘then after’, and 2.11, ‘but when’, mark points in *time*, and consequently episodes in the story. Cf. 1.15, 18, 21.

b. 2.1, ‘to Jerusalem’, is a very important issue in the whole of Paul’s argumentation. Cf. 1.18f.

c. participants:

—‘Jerusalem’ = ‘they’ in v. 2b. V. 2c is probably a specification of v. 2b. One should connect vv. 2c, 6a and d, 9b and c, and note that only in v. 9b the ‘men of repute’ are identified. Peter (vv. 7d and 8a) and Cephas (v. 9b) refer to the same person, the apostle Peter. Why he is mentioned here by two different names is not directly clear. The phrases where he is called Peter seems to be stereotype as referring to his missionary activities.

—On the Jerusalem side there are also ‘the false brethren’ (v. 4a), ‘who slipped in to spy out . . .’ (v. 4bc), but without any success (v. 5a).

—Paul and Barnabas are mentioned together in vv. 1b and 5a (‘we’). They are partners in the agreement (vv. 9d+ef, and 10a).

—Nevertheless, Paul is introduced on his own in vv. 2a (cf. 1b), b-e, 3a, 6b and d, 7c, 8b, 9a and 10b.

—Titus is mentioned in the second place in v. 1c. He provides a test-case in vv. 3–5.

—Somewhat problematic is the first person plural in v. 4cd. Because of the use of the present tense in v. 4c it probably means ‘we, all Christians’. Note also ‘(might be preserved for) you’ in v. 5b.

d. *foregrounding and backgrounding*. The text gives two stories: one about Paul’s second journey to Jerusalem and the agreement between the ‘men of repute’ and Paul and Barnabas (vv. (1–)2, 7–10). Actually, Paul and Cephas (or Peter) are the central figures. On Paul’s side, there is Barnabas, and on Cephas’ side, there are James and John, the other men of repute. Another story is that of the non-circumcision of Titus (vv. 3–5). This story has Titus and some men of minor importance (qualified as ‘false brethren’) in the picture, who tried to make a charge against Paul (and Barnabas). V. 6 serves as a tran-

sition. In the story about Titus, the outward signs of excitement are clearly visible, and the importance of maintaining the truth of the gospel until the present day is stressed (vv. 4cd and 5b). In 5.1–12, 6.12f., it becomes clear that circumcision in particular is the issue at stake in the Galatian churches. This also explains the story within the story.

e. the author's involvement is obvious: note the function of the narrative of which 2.1–10 forms an essential part; the emphasis on Paul's own role in the events (see also his emphatic 'I went up by revelation' in v. 2a, and 'which very thing I was eager to do' in v. 10b); Paul's bond with his readers (see vv. 4cd and 5b); the fact that Paul's own mission is at stake (see vv. 2d, 'which I preached among the Gentiles', 7b, 8b (cf. 9e)—repetition here means emphasis!); and the two *anakoloutha* (vv. 4d–5a and 6c–d), which show excitement.

3. Detailed analysis of the pericope

- v. 1 Introduction to the two themes (Paul and Barnabas over against the men of repute; Titus as a test-case).
- v. 2a 'by revelation': cf. 1.12.15f. The exact nature of this revelation is not mentioned. Obviously, the emphasis lies on the divine initiative (see also Translator's Handbook on Galatians, *ad loc.*). The Greek *de* serves as a specification of the reason why.
- v. 2c Specifies 'them' in v. 2b. Here, the expression 'those who were of repute' should be discussed, together with similar ones in vv. 6a, d, 9b and c.
- v. 2d for a general treatment of the terms, see the section on general subjects.
- v. 2e₁ 'lest' denotes apprehension.
- v. 2e₁₋₂ 'running in vain' (cf. 4.11) is to be discussed here.
- v. 3a The issue of the circumcision is to be discussed in the section on general subjects. 'even Titus': even a Greek was not forced to be circumcised, i.e. the truth of the Gospel can do without circumcision. 'was not compelled' (cf. v. 14; 6.12): the agent is not specified. The explanation is, however, given in v. 4: false brothers pressed for it.
- v. 3b concessive. The use of 'Greek' should be discussed here.
- v. 4 For the central opposition: freedom in Christ—slavery: see the section on general subjects. Here, the various terms used to qualify the false brothers are to be discussed together. 'But because of . . .': contrary to the common opinion of Paul (and Barnabas) and the men of repute, other men ('false brethren') required other things, first of all circumcision, beside acceptance of the truth of the Gospel.
- v. 5b 'the truth of the Gospel' was and remains at stake; cf. 2.21 and 5.7. The use of *alētheia* (probably above all 'integrity, reliability') should be discussed here.
- v. 6bc This sentence is not quite clear. Does *pote* stress the general element in *hōpoiōi* or is the emphasis on *pote* as 'once upon a time'? But at what time, then? Before their association with Jesus or at the time of the meeting? Or has there been a significant change in Paul's appreciation since the meeting? (see also Translator's Handbook on Galatians, *ad loc.*). The expression of God 'showing no partiality' is to be discussed in this context.
- v. 6d 'added nothing to me' refers to the claim of circumcision and other additions to the 'truth' of the Gospel as understood and preached by Paul.
- v. 7a 'on the contrary': the leaders of the Jerusalem church recognized what Paul had received from God and what had been committed to him.

- vv. 7–9 To be treated as a unity. *pepisteumai*, *energeō*+dative, and ‘the grace given by God’ should be discussed together. Note the consistent parallelism between Paul (plus Barnabas) and Peter. Because no stipulations were added Paul concludes that there is basically one ‘evangelizing’ (v. 7) and one ‘mission’ (v. 8) directed at two addresses, ‘the circumcised’ and ‘the uncircumcised’ or the Gentiles.
- v. 9d ‘to give the right hand of fellowship’ is to be explained here as one expression.
- v. 9ef Actual content of the agreement of partnership. It is not quite clear what people the terms *ethnē* and *peritomē* are referring to. In fact, the agreement proves unworkable in the ‘mixed’ church of Antioch (2.11–14).
- v. 10a ‘remember the poor’: extra element in the agreement, known to the participants and obviously also to the Galatians. A brief treatment of the entire ‘collection’ issue is unavoidable.
- v. 10b An underlining remark by Paul himself. The reference is to the continuing activity since the agreement.

4. General subjects

- a. Paul’s relations with the Galatians, particularly as far as they can be deduced from the letter itself. NB: certain, probabic, and possible elements to the distinguished. One should focus on the issues of the Law and of circumcision.
- b. Intricate problems concerning the relation Galatians-Acts, the location of Galatian churches, date of letter (see the Introductions to the New Testament) are not directly relevant for interpretation and translation, and may be left open.
- c. It may be useful to devote a special section to 2.2, ‘the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles’ and similar expressions (1.7, 8, 11, 16, 23; 2.2, 5, 7, 14). The expression ‘our freedom which we have in Jesus Christ’ (2.4; cf. 5.1, 13) and the entire section 3.23–29 should be treated here too, plus the antonyms (slaves, slavery, etc.). Perhaps also ‘grace that was given to me’ in 2.9 (cf. (except 1.3 and 6.18) 1.6, 15; 2.21; 5.4). Here we may hesitate, for a lot can be gained from the immediate context with regard to the meaning of *charis* here (see sub 3 above on vv. 7–9). Similar topics (taken from other pericopes) might be: the use of christological titles as Son of God, Christ (Messiah); the use of traditional soteriologic al formulae: see, e.g., 1.1 end; 1.4+2.20; 2.21; 3.20; 4.4, 6. For details, see H. D. Betz, *op cit.*, pp. 26–28, esp. under IV, ‘Liturgical material’.

5. Important issues

2.1 is the introduction to the pericope. The theme of Titus and the false brothers (1c and 3–5) is subordinate to the story of the meeting of Paul and Barnabas with the ‘men of repute’ in Jerusalem. V. 2a is emphatic. Note especially the emotional style of Paul in vv. 3–6 (see the use of the *anakoloutha*), which should be preserved in translation. Translation should reflect the stereotyped style of 7cd–7ab. Etc.