by an equivalent representative number.

The full extent of the victory which Ehud and his troops gained over the fat Eglon and his army is the point of this description. The number and the skill of those who oppressed Israel was great, but they were soundly defeated by Ehud. Ultimately, however, the real victory belongs to the LORD, as Ehud has stated in verse 28. Thus from the point of view of the details of the story, the main focus is on Ehud the saviour, the only Israelite mentioned by name. However for the editor and recorder of this story, there is now a more important detail, namely that the ultimate source of victory was the LORD.

JILL SMITH

FOOTNOTES AND GLOSSARIES

Miss Jill Smith is a UBS Translation Adviser based in Nairobi, Kenya

This article brings together some thoughts on the compiling of footnotes and glossaries, based on the experience of translation teams in eastern Africa.

The use of footnotes in new translations varies from none at all right up to the full-scale entries found in a version such as the Bible in *Français Courant*. Some translators feel that the inclusion of explanatory notes is not helpful for readers who are not accustomed to finding their way through additional notes, or to relating such notes to the relevant points in the text. Others, especially in interconfessional projects which often have the services of quite scholarly translators, want to include as many notes as possible with their new translation.

The first approach can result in notes being omitted where they could, in fact, be helpful to some of the readers. In this case those who would benefit from some additional information do not find it, in order that others who will not appreciate it will not be confused. The second approach can result in a piling-up of all kinds of notes; and even though many of them will be relevant and interesting, they may not include those notes which would apply directly to that particular translation.

Before addressing the main question of how we decide what footnotes to include, two practical issues with regard to their presentation could be mentioned. Firstly, translators have sometimes thought that, because footnotes have gone over onto the wrong page in the draft printouts, they should delete some of them so that the remaining notes will stay on the same page as the verse(s) to which they relate.

This is not really a problem at all, and certainly not one which should influence the number of desired footnotes. Not all print programmes can regulate the footnotes so that each one appears on the same page with the verse to which it relates. And this is particularly true when more than three or four text notes (as opposed to cross-references) are included for the same section of text, or when individual notes are quite lengthy. In such cases, the footnotes may be pushed over onto the next one, two or even three pages of the draft printout which is being made for the use of the translators and others in checking.

Provided that all the codes have been keyed in correctly for each note, however, and that all is in the right order, there is no need to worry about what is happening in the early printouts. The crucial stage is that of the final typesetting and page proofs, when all such details must be precise and accurate, and every footnote must be on the page with its related context. This will happen, provided that the coding is correct: commercial typesetters and DTP operators can handle this where "ordinary" computers and printers cannot.

A second practical concern is that certain limits have to be imposed on the number of the footnotes included, because they affect the length of the printed book, and therefore the production costs and the selling price.

In this case the absolute rule should be that whatever footnotes are definitely needed should be included: nothing essential should be left out. The needs of the translation should come before considerations of book length. It is unlikely, however, that the number of really essential footnotes proposed will reach (let alone exceed) the number included in the Français Courant, the version most used by translators in the French-speaking parts of Africa, who are the most keen on footnotes.

What footnotes to include?

How, then, are translators and their Consultants to decide on what are the essential footnotes for inclusion in a New Testament or Bible? I am thinking here of text notes, as opposed to the cross-references, which also appear at the foot of the page, and which are normally presented as the whole or part of a standard system. And although the Bible and New Testament are what I am mainly discussing here, we should keep in mind the needs of portions as well; if the meaning of a name, for example, needs to be explained at all, let us say in **Matthew**, it is just as necessary to explain it when **Matthew** is published as a portion as when it is part of the whole New Testament.

There are various categories of footnote which translators are usually interested in considering. We always hope that they think of notes while they are still drafting their text. This is greatly preferable to "deciding about footnotes" during the run-up to the final pre-typesetting processes! The more careful translators will have been working out their footnote requirements from a fairly early stage of drafting. Others, perhaps finally in desperation, reproduce wholesale the footnote system of an English or French version. Still others manage to put together a collection of notes which is quite relevant but which may not be as comprehensive or as helpful as it could have been if more thought had been given to it along the way. We will return later to those translators who prefer not to include footnotes at all.

When considering footnotes, it is impossible not to consider the glossary (word list) as well. While it is not absolutely necessary to include a glossary in a Bible or New Testament, most translators start out with the intention of including one, and it is in fact quite unusual nowadays to find a new translation being published without a glossary. A quite frequent question, therefore, among a wide range of translation teams, is how to distinguish between what kind of explanation should be put into a glossary, and what kind should be presented as a footnote. This is important, in the general concern and effort to produce not only a clear translation but a fully helpful and relevant set of complementary materials as well.

Two fairly well accepted general distinctions are as follows:

1. In **footnotes**, explanations will be given of text items which occur only very infrequently, even only once, and for which an immediate explanation on the same page is extremely helpful: notes on the proper names in **Genesis**, for example, where their meaning may affect the understanding of a context.
2. In a **glossary**, explanations will be given of terms, names, cultural and historical items, for which quite detailed explanations are required, and when repeating them would add unduly to the number of notes on individual pages. (This could apply even to cultural and religious items which occur only infrequently but for which a quite detailed explanation is needed: **Sadducees**, for example.)

Other typical footnote items may concern textual variants (where the translators feel it important to mention these), omissions or additions; cultural practices (where translators prefer to retain a literal translation and refer to a cultural equivalent by means of a footnote); cross-referencing between footnotes (in the same book or in other books) which refer to the same or related items; and dialect variants, which are sometimes important in versions which combine several dialects.

Probably the most important point for translators to realize is that the thing to aim for in preparing footnotes is to meet the actual needs of their translation. Translators are not obliged to reproduce every note that appears in another version, however important that version may be; and it is quite all right for them to include in their own translation footnotes which do not appear in their base or model versions. Quite a number of translators do, in fact, come up with questions of this nature.

The Translation Consultant or Adviser who is assisting a project will normally be advising translators about notes to include and helping them to check out what they have already done. In doing this, it would seem that one of the most important things is to keep an eye on the frequency and inter-relatedness of the footnotes given, and also on any possible (and unnecessary) overlap or repetition as between footnotes and glossary explanations.

The translator will, of course, be using his base and model versions extensively for ideas as to what will be relevant and helpful footnotes; he just has to be selective in the way in which he draws upon them. The same applies to the preparation of the glossary. He will most usually compile his basic list of entries from those of the Good News Bible and/or

Français Courant; these will be generally relevant, and he will add to them according to the needs of his own translation, and leave out those which are helpful to the English or French texts but not necessarily to his own. (The biggest disaster relating to the preparation of a glossary is when the translator leaves it too late, and then just translates wholesale from the Good News Bible or Francais Courant, without relating it at all to his own text.) As with the footnotes, the steady, gradual preparation of a glossary is all-important.

In his two volumes of *Marginal Notes* (1980), based on the text of the Good News Bible, Dr Robert Bratcher lists some possible categories of notes:

1. Textual.
2. Translational.
3. Linguistic.
4. Cultural.
5. People.
6. Historical events.
7. Places.
8. Dates.
9. References.

Of these, probably items in categories 1, 2, 3 and 9 appear most regularly in our new translations in Africa. Items in the other categories more normally feature in glossaries, depending on the length of the explanatory notes required. As Bratcher says in his preface, with regard to categories 1 and 2 in particular, there are numerous notes which do not actually occur in the Good News Bible. A more widespread use of these volumes among translators would probably be quite helpful, provided that Consultants and Advisers were able to give guidance as to the differences between the listings and the Good News Bible, and also regarding the appropriateness of individual notes to the translation itself.

It could be helpful, in any future edition of *Marginal Notes*, to make clear the fact that "marginal note" does not necessarily mean "footnote". This is a misunderstanding which has in fact occurred among some translators. Just in the first two pages of the New Testament volume, for example, there are already six key terms—Messiah, chief priests, teachers of the Law, kingdom of heaven, Pharisees and Sadducees—which would normally find their place in a glossary list; and the additional cross-referencing and back-referencing tends to give the impression that these should be noted at each occurrence. Even this is less elaborate than the system in *Français Courant*, of course, where many key terms are even included in the footnotes and then cross-referenced to the glossary. Translators who decide to reproduce that system are likely to find themselves with an overload of footnotes, many of which will not be either necessary or helpful.

Questionable footnotes

If translators are not careful, it is possible for suggested footnotes to influence the nature of the translation, whether the notes are suggested by a listing such as in *Marginal Notes* or by an existing Bible version. Many translators do not need much guidance, but equally there are many who do need some. For instance, in the treatment of figurative expressions, a suggested footnote may make a translator decide in favour of retaining a literal translation and giving the meaning in a footnote. Notes are suggested, for example, for Mt 22.44, for "right hand" (Good News Bible "right side") and for "a footstool" (Good News Bible "under your feet"), the respective explanations being "the place of honour and authority" and "a figure of defeat and humiliation". Whether such notes are needed and will be helpful must depend on the possibilities of the language and how such metaphors are being handled generally. If literal translation of metaphors is retained, we would expect that it is because this is meaningful in the translator's language. Otherwise principles of meaningful translation should be applied: the meaning is made clear within the text. Otherwise, again, would we want to include a footnote making clear every formally translated figurative expression, and if not, how should those for explanation be selected?

Similar questions arise with text which is not necessarily figurative but which has traditionally been translated formally, and which translators are unhappy to "lose" by translating any other way. They feel they will at least be accused of "dropping" familiar verses or expressions, or of giving a "different meaning", or of "changing the Bible"; at worst they may fear that the translation will be rejected. So they pepper the pages with footnotes containing the earlier literal translation of expressions and sentences, and even whole verses which they have in fact restructured beautifully to bring out the meaning. Such notes of course bring the whole background of the translation project into question. The translators themselves may have not understood fully what they have undertaken to produce; or there is a lack of understanding, whether among reviewers or within an wider group, of the nature and purpose of the new translation project.

At the opposite extreme to the translators who see a need for extensive footnotes, there are others who prefer to include no footnotes at all. They think this way for more weighty reasons than that they have omitted to do anything about them until the very end of the project, and then have no time to work on them properly. One such reason is that their readers are not accustomed to such materials, and few would know how to use them. Further, there are very strong reasons for this approach when new translations are being made in Muslim areas. Translators from Sudan, for example, feel that scripture translations come under close scrutiny from certain sections of the Muslim community, and that notes indicating textual variants, for instance, will provide ammunition for those who wish to disparage the authenticity of the Christian scriptures. For this reason, they are not happy even to indicate the traditional "square bracket" verses, although United Bible Societies policy requires them to be indicated either by a general note or in footnotes.

Even in such cases, however, translators have become convinced that some kinds of notes can safely be included: for instance, the meanings of names and plays on words where these are significant to the understanding of the text, as in Genesis and in certain parts of the Gospels. Other examples are explanations of items such as "phylacteries" in Mt 23.5, for which not only cultural equivalents but also cultural differences need to be made clear, and dialect variants, where these are significant. There seems little or no point in trying to convince translators of the merits of noting textual variants where there is a possibility, and even a history, of damage to the reception of a translation if such notes are included.

Glossary notes

The footnotes of a standard version can and frequently do, of course, give a very good (and essential) lead-in for their treatment in a new translation, provided that the translators are sufficiently selective. In the same way a standard glossary, such as the word list in the Good News Bible, is an excellent lead-in for the translator who needs to prepare his own. This again must be a carefully selective process. A preliminary run down of such a glossary will probably establish that at least half the terms and names will be very appropriate for the new translation, together with a direct translation of the historical or descriptive notes provided. There would be nothing additional, or different, to say about them in any other language. All that the translator has to do is supply the correct words or names as used in his own translation, translate the notes, and arrange them in the right alphabetical order.

The remainder may be rejected for at least two reasons: the terms may already be well enough known, and do not need to be specially explained in relation to the particular language; or the terms as they appear in an English or French glossary, for example, do not occur in so identifiable a form in the new translation. The term "Paradise", for instance, features in model glossaries, but it is frequently translated in new translations as "heaven" or "where God is". Another example is the word Amen: if it has been translated as something like "let it be so", then the appearance of "Amen" in some form in the new glossary is obviously misleading; and it also indicates a lack of care on the part of the translator, as does the appearance in the glossary of any word at all which does not actually feature in the translation itself.

For this reason the compiling of a glossary must begin at a reasonably early stage in the whole translation process. There must be time for translators to check up on what they are proposing to include in the glossary. Are the words really there in their translation? And if so, how are they spelt? An equally weighty concern is the selection of words or expressions from the translation, which require some explanation for that language even though they do not feature in a standard glossary: perhaps some background to the word used for "holy", for example; or perhaps cultural notes which may need to be adapted, such as some additional explanation (or modification) of the terms used for "circumcize" or "anoint". These are all random examples picked out from a large number of glossaries for new translations. They serve simply to emphasize the fact that no glossary can be compiled effectively in a hurry. Some translators will take the whole process in their stride, as a challenge to their own standards of good work. Others may need a lot of encouragement simply to make a start and to apply the methods of compilation which will ensure that the glossary is a useful complement to the translation.

Time is also needed for looking over the glossary in relation to the footnotes, to ensure that comments are logical and well located. If "mustard-seed" is explained in a footnote (probably once in each of the Gospels in which it occurs), it does not need a glossary note as well, and so on. This kind of cross-checking and comparison can, in fact, achieve a great deal in terms of harmonizing essential features within the translation text, and between the text and these major additional features, as well as being a fascinating exercise in itself.

PERICLES G. KATOPPO

TRANSLATING *NOMOS* "LAW" IN ROMANS IN SIMPLIFIED INDONESIAN

Mr Perry Katoppo is the Translation Secretary of the Bible Society in Indonesia

Paul uses the word *nomos* frequently in his letters, using it with various meanings, especially in his letter to the Romans. Although the term *nomos* may have different meanings according to the context within which it is used, it is usually just translated by "law" or "the law" in English translations, and by equivalent terms in other languages.

It is interesting to note that Paul always uses the term *nomos* in the singular. In this he reflects Septuagint usage of the term, where in most instances it is also used in the singular. Commentators feel that this means Paul views *nomos* as a single entity, rather than as a series of commands. Paul used *nomos* both with the definite article, *ho nomos*, and without it. In the past scholars have argued that there might be a difference of meaning when it is used with and without the article: Origen and others after him have suggested that with the article the term would refer the the Law of Moses, and that without the article it would refer to law in general. However, most scholars today do not feel that the presence or absence of the article would mark such a distinction in meaning.

The Greek-English Lexicon of Louw and Nida gives the meaning of *nomos* as: "a formalized rule (or set of rules) prescribing what people must do—'law, ordinance, rule'."

Paul indeed often uses *nomos* to refer to the commands of the Law of Moses that people have to do. However he also uses it with other meanings in different contexts. Dr D.J. Moo, in his article on "Law, Works of the Law, and Legalism in Paul," has drawn up a helpful chart to mark the different meanings of *nomos*. Paul's use of *nomos* basically falls into two categories: in the first one it has the meaning of a demand or body of demands (usually with sanctions), and in the second one it has non-legal uses.