as possible to complete the idea of repentance which runs through both verses 2.12 and 2.13.

In 2.13, the existing translations have literally got "tear your hearts and not your clothes". The GNB rendering is better understood. "Let your broken hearts show sorrow: tearing your clothes is not enough." Even with this better rendering, there is still a problem with the term "broken heart" because this expression is not natural in many languages.

2.14 is difficult to translate from the RSV because of several ambiguities. The participants and their roles are not clear. GNB has restructured this verse and removed the ambiguity, and that seems to be the way translations in East Africa would be advised to go. The verse is not only awkward, but unintelligible in several of the older versions examined.

ALOO O. MOJOLA

TRANSLATION PROBLEMS IN JOEL WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO SOME EAST AFRICAN LANGUAGES: PART 2

Dr. Mojola is a UBS Translations Consultant based in Nairobi, Kenya

The section commencing at 2.18 marks a clear change in the message of the prophet. God restores and positively alters the fortunes of his people after their prayers and repentance.

The land and the whole of nature are central and inextricably connected to the destiny of God's people. The world of nature, as it were, determines the well-being of its inhabitants. But nature is not independent—it is an instrument in the hands of God, for good or for retribution. The essential idea here is basic and clearly understood in East African communities. Indeed the significance and sacredness of nature and man's dependence upon nature can hardly be over emphasized in these communities. (See for example Jomo Kenyatta's *Facing Mount Kenya*, where this point is stressed.)

Translational problems found in this section are not unique. They are essentially due to a failure to read the base text correctly, or to translate it literally without really communicating. 2.18 illustrates problems which confront those who translate literally from either the base text or the model text. A literal translation of the RSV **"... the Lord became jealous for his land"** as the SwU and the LuyU have is not only unnatural but lacks meaning in the language. On the other hand, a literal translation of this expression from the GNB model text encounters similar problems. The GNB expression "show concern" lacks an equivalent in East African languages. A dynamic translation as in the Luo Bible ... *nonyiso ni ohero pinye ahinya*, "showed much love for his land", appears a possible acceptable solution. Turkana has adopted a similar solution.

Translation of **the northerner** in 2.20 is a problem in many translations. The problem consists in being able to identify the participant correctly. Identifying the participant is extremely significant in class-determined languages as we have already said. Such information is necessary not just for purposes of contextual harmony, but also for determining the agreement of the various elements in sentences.

The Nyakyusa translation understands **the northerner** to be a person from the north. This may have been due to a superficial and literal reading of the English RSV with its misleading pronouns. In view of the claim by some scholars that locusts normally came from the east or south in Palestine the GNB rendering of the northerner as an army of locusts makes sense only symbolically, since the north is the symbolic source of enemy attack in prophetic literature. This rendering is also contextually defensible. A rendering like the SwCL in terms of "enemy from the north" is exegetically sound, but demands more clarification—that is "the enemy" needs to be identified as a person, locusts or whatever. Perhaps the GNB solution is a better solution. The correctness and adequacy of the rest of 2.20 in Bantu translations also depend on identifying the participants. SwU is a case which illustrates the confusion caused by the failure to identify the participants.

The use of the vocative and of personification in the expression "Fear not, O land" (2.21) comes out naturally in most languages and appears to be retained in that form in most cases.

The expression **"beasts of the field"** (2.22) is a Hebrew expression with equivalents in Bantu languages: thus *tsisolo etsiomubulimo* (LuyU), *esolo ezomu nsiko* (LugU), *nyamaishwa zomu rwaya* (RuhCL). Where there are no equivalents it has been translated as in GNB "animals".

The idea of an **early and latter rain** (2.23 RSV) is something of a problem since it involves translating a feature of the climate of Palestine in terms of East African climatic conditions. Thus what is given in the GNB or the German common language translation in terms of the seasons—autumn rain, winter rain and spring rain cannot be done in East African languages where the rain patterns are different. Perhaps the SwCL decision to translate the expression as the first and second rain is acceptable, although probably not quite equivalent. This is another case where the model text is more confusing to translators than the base text.

The expression **"restore . . . the years . . . the locust has eaten"** (RSV 2.25) is rendered literally in many translations, usually resulting in unnaturalness and lack of clarity in meaning. Here again a rendering of the meaning rather than of the form of the metaphor as in GNB or as in SwCL is to be recommended.

The expression **"My great army"** (RSV 2.25) could easily be misunderstood as the other related expressions already noted. Most translations are literal. This should be rendered as being in apposition to the preceding names of locusts. This is not clear in some translations. See the discussion on the locust names in Part 1 of this article.

The expression **"eat in plenty and be satisfied"** (RSV 2.26) as noted by Thompson is not modern English. It is a Hebrew form better rendered "you will have plenty to eat, and be satisfied" (GNB). Many translations have

rendered the RSV literally resulting in unnaturalness and ambiguity. The GNB model has been followed by some translations such as SwCL and LuoCL with good results.

The idea of praising **"the name** of the Lord" (RSV 2.26) is generally not a problem. Thus translations which render it simply as "praising the Lord" and those which render it as "praising the name of the Lord" are both correct. The symbolic significance of names is a commonly accepted fact in many African cultures.

"It shall come to pass afterward" (RSV 2.28), is a rather easily misunderstood expression and has been rendered unnaturally in many translations. Here again the GNB captures the essential meaning. The translation of "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh" (RSV 2.28) encounters similar problems: the literal strategy results again in unnaturalness as in the case of SwU, LuoCL, LagU, LuyU. It is the metaphor of "pouring out" the spirit which needs some restructuring.

The idea of the "great and terrible **day of the Lord**" is quite an important one in the book of Joel. It keeps recurring and places emphasis on the reference of the prophet's message to great events in the future. Its coming is connected to fearful events in the world of nature—below and above (2.1,2,11,30,31). Obviously, the literal translation of "day of the Lord" which appears in all translations can only make sense in the context of the whole message of Joel. Reference to future events and concern about revealing them is totally lacking in East African cultures. It cannot therefore be directly evident in this expression, but will need to be read into it.

Chapter 3 (which appears as Chapter 4 in some versions) continues with the theme of the day of the Lord and judgement of the nations. Unlike the RSV, the GNB introduces this section with "The Lord says". This makes the speaker in what follows clear. The African common language translations have correctly followed GNB.

The play on words related to the name **"Jehoshaphat"** (3.2) is lost in East African languages. It is therefore better to follow the GNB in calling the Valley of Jehoshaphat, the Valley of Judgement.

Verse 3.3 in RSV "and have given a boy for a harlot and have sold a girl for wine, and have drunk it" is not very clear. The exegesis and rendering in GNB is better. The reordering of GNB also produces a much clearer reading: "They sold boys and girls into slavery to pay for prostitutes and wine." A translator with limited experience gets completely confused by the difference between the two versions.

The metaphoric expression "requite your deed upon your head" (3.4) is not easy to understand. A literal rendering as in the SwU is not only unnatural but quite meaningless. SwCL has followed the GNB model and is therefore much more clear.

The logical structure of 3.11 is rather confused. Is "Bring down thy warriors, O Lord" an integral part of the verse? It may be a prayer to God spoken by the prophet or else by the people as suggested by Thompson. Current translations in East Africa tend to follow the GNB understanding.

3.12 is clearly linked to 3.2, the idea about the nations in the Valley of

Jehoshaphat. It is, however, not obvious who the participants here are. In the expression "there I will sit to judge", it may be helpful to specify that the "I" refers to God. Many translations fail to do this, resulting in ambiguity.

A literal translation of 3.13 does not make much sense. What the metaphors are referring to need to be made clear, and possibly things may need to be restructured also to make the meaning clear. The GNB use of similes is very effective here. LuoCL and SwCL have successfully rendered it on the basis of the GNB model.

The repetitiveness of Joel is illustrated in 3.14 with the doubling of "multitudes", "valley of decision", and the "day of the Lord" as noted above. This repetition has been kept in the translations and maintains the required emphasis in the message.

The contrast in 3.16 between God's judgement in the first part and God's blessings in the last part is important and needs to be made clear by appropriate discourse markers. Most of the translations have grasped this.

The term **"stranger"** in 3.17 is something of a problem in East African languages. Usually, it has a positive meaning and has the meaning of a visitor, someone to be welcomed. It is difficult to translate it without some ambiguity. On the other hand, the related term "enemy" is not really appropriate here. The solution of the LuoU is perhaps appropriate for East African languages. There the term "stranger" is rendered as *jopinje mamoko*, "people of other lands/countries", which is not equivalent to the term visitor used in some other translations.

The missing verb in 3.20 "and Jerusalem to all generations" may not be clear to all translators. In the LuyU and SwU etc. where it is missing, this expression does not make sense. It is necessary to insert the missing verb, and even to restructure the line as GNB has done.

There is a textual problem in the last verse, 3.21. If we accept Thompson's statement that "both RSV and GNB have adequately represented the intended meaning of the Hebrew" then the translations could follow either of the versions.

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that although the RSV and GNB ("base" and "model") texts have been used extensively in the East African region, there are certain problems in this approach. There are no doubts about its usefulness. However, for languages whose structure is not closely related to the English, there are problems for which the models supply no clear solutions. Such problems could be solved, however, if a model in a language closer to that of the translator's language were used. It is not surprising then that the SwCL is increasingly being used as a model by translators in this region.

The book of Joel, although a short book, has more translational problems in the framework of East African languages than it has been possible to cover in this article. But the few problems covered here are representative of the situation as it confronts the translator.