BOOK REVIEWS

Elizaveta Zolina (ed.),*The Venerable Icon of Our Lady of Philermos in Art, History and Religion*, Valletta: Progress Press, 2002, 64 pp.

If the Romans could conceive of books as having a life of their own, with ups and downs just like humans-habent sua fata libelli, says Terentianus Maurus in his work on Horace-surely this holds even more true of icons, where social context, art and religion coalesce; but perhaps of few more so than the icon of Our Lady of Philermos, whose vicissitudes have not been fully unravelled to this day. The story here told in succinct form shows once more how facts fascinate more than fiction, especially when all the aforementioned elements blend together harmoniously, a veritable harmony in discord! Thus, the homecoming of a copy of an icon long believed to be out in hiding has something memorable about it, especially ...

Considering the time, 25-26 January 2001, which, by the telling of one of the most prominent hierarchs in the Russian Metropolitan Orthodox Church, Metropolitan Kirill of Smolensk and Kaliningrad, himself Chairman of the Department for Foreign Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church, coincides with the most difficult period for ecumenism between the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Churches since Vatican II (p.13).

Considering the place, Malta, known for its hospitality at the crossroads of culture, and where, in the words of the Russian Ambassador to Malta, Dr. Sergey Zotov, at whose request a replica of the Philermos icon was depicted by Montenegrin monks, Michail Gorbachev and George Bush chose to end the cold war itself (p. 10), and not just bury the hatchet, and so is arguably the ideal venue for such gatherings as may promote reconciliation between Catholics and Orthodox.

Considering the action, whereby an icon attributed by tradition to St Luke and supposed to have reached Rhodes from Jerusalem during the iconoclastic crisis (p.29) achieves unique fame in its new home but has to be smuggled to safety in Malta, until it attracts the eyes of piety and royalty alike, is donated like the jewel in the crown, escapes destruction as if by miracle during the Russian Revolution, only to surface recently after so much peregrination like a detective story approaching the end.

Considering the dramatis personae: Knights errant seeking refuge and Russians seeking allies against the Turk, finally settling for a deal which seemed to assure them a foothold in the Mediterranean, and the Maltese as go-between, now sovereign hosts of the reconciliation between past feelings and present realities, which bring together Knights and Russians, no longer as potential masters, but as welcome guests.

And now the story. A cliffhanger wooed out of suicide by the light touch of grace settles some ten kilometers away from the capital of Rhodes , Philermos (p.34). The place-name suggests love of solitude, but the presence of our icon soon attracted interminable pilgrims while the victory over the invading Turks in 1480 assured the Knights' perennial gratitude, for whom it was now the Nicopoieia, the Victoriosa, and became thus inextricably intertwined with the fortunes of their Order. However, when these, through treachery, were forced to leave Rhodes, it was the local community in the person of a Greek priest, Nicolaus Metaxi, who managed to smuggle it on the *nave grossa* of the Knights, whence it eventually found a haven in Malta. Here it was more of a Knights' icon than the people's, though the Knights themselves saw little of it (p.38), while an annual procession on September 8 assured its being nonetheless, though to a lesser degree, the People's Icon (pp.36-37). When Ferdinand von Hompesch had to leave the island, he managed to secure three items from Napoleon's greedy grasp: the right hand of the Baptist, a relic of the true crucifix and the icon of Philermos, denuded of its silver lamina (p.40). When subsequently the government of the Order passed, in an irregular election, from Hompesch, induced to resign, to Paul I of Russia (p.51), the relics found their way to the palace of the Czars in Gatchina. To celebrate the transfer from Malta to Gatchina in 1799 of these three most cherished possessions a feast was established in the Russian Orthodox Church on October 12 according to the old Calendar, corresponding to October 25 on our own. Mgr George Mifsud Montanaro translates here for the first time, from Old Church Slavonic, the Small Vespers of the feast (pp.44-49). In the sequel of the Russian Revolution the icon was first taken for safety to Estonia, then entrusted to the Czar's Mother Fyodorovna in Denmark and, after her death, to King Alexander of Yugoslavia; with the German invasion of Yugoslavia we lose track of the icon's exact whereabouts. Finally, through the recent upheavals on the international and ecclesiastical chess-board, the icon has been located in Montenegro.

Interest thrives on detail, and there is plenty of detail here. According to Prof. Mario Buhagiar, the history of the icon is shrouded in mist prior to 1396 (p. 34). The first building finished in Valletta, in 1566, was Our Lady of Victories, where the icon of

Philermos was venerated between 1571 and 1578, in which year it was moved to the Conventual Church of St John (p.36). Buhagiar himself refers us to Dr Giovannella Ferraris di Celle, who played a decisive role in identifying the icon which came to light in Cetinje, formerly political capital of Montenegro and now its cultural capital (p.29). She describes its iconographic type as *deesis*, with the Virgin and John the Baptist on both sides of the Saviour, on which typology Fr Gino Gauci affords a commentary (pp.41-43). The story of the identification itself is recounted by Ferraris di Celle in her "Disovering the true image of Our Lady of Philermos: The retrieval of the icon in Montenegro" (pp.29-33). Dr Elizaveta Zolina, director of the Russian Cultural Centre at Valletta, shows that Russia had an interest in Malta as early as Peter I (p.50), but plans of promoting union between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches became vivid with Paul I's Maltese adventure (p.51). Zolina's article in particular helps us realize how parochial the understanding of our own history is when following exclusively the usual lines of alternation of governments and elections while bracketing out the socio-cultural components, thus ignoring the large canvas of Mediterranean and European history.

But why so much fuss about a copy? Even freshmen, applying for a scholarship to learn a new language, know full well how to bring out the freshness of the original, often missing in translations, as their reason for wanting to learn that language. Still, there are things which prove useful precisely because of their inability to satisfy completely; like a street sign, which shows the way without following it, or hunger and even curiosity itself, they are precious for pointing beyond themselves, without absorbing all the attention (pp.43,52). As Fra John Critien put it, the occasion was not simply one of pomp and circumstance, it touched essentials (p.20). With President Guido de Marco we may say that it is not up to us to understand the mystery of the encounters, but rather to assist in the dialogue between cultures by exploiting the divine-human beauty of such icons (p.8). An icon is more than a signature tune, for it can be a harbinger of different universes of discourse about to exchange words; and the collaboration of so many authorities and experts augurs well for peaceful consultations. The Symposium held to commemorate the arrival among us of the Montenegrin copy of the icon of Our Lady of Philermos, as distinguished from the Russian replica, made in 1852, as well as the current publication, render a distinct service by underlying this hope.

<div align="right">

Edward Farrugia, SJ
Pontificio Istituto Orientale
Piazza S. Maria Maggiore, 7
00185 Roma, Italy

</div>

William Johnston, *"Arise, My Love ..." Mysticism for a New Era*, New York: Orbis Books, Maryknoll 2000.
William Johnston, *Mystical Theology*, London: Harper Collins, 1995.

The two books for review explain the experience of those saints who are mystics. Johnston, a Jesuit who has lived in Japan for forty years, is a prolific author. He has written nine other books.

Johnston has the optimistic view that all are called to first hand experience of God. It is worth remarking that religious experience, as well as being the ultimate kind of fulfilment, is a source of strength in that it helps people to cope with the situations they are in. So it is important from the pastoral point of view.

Johnston's scenario begins with routine performance of one's religious duties, in particular, one's prayers. In time, as a result of "effort aided by ordinary grace," they become a source of "consolation and joy." One prays with enthusiasm and finds it rewarding. Such prayers engage the affections: one's heart goes into them. Johnston gives this condition the name of " acquired contemplation."

Acquired contemplation is common. One regularly finds it in church services about two thirds of the way through, when the congregation has got into the spirit of it: fervour becomes widespread.

Prior to the next stage, is integration:One feels that one is in a state of harmony and peace.The next stage itself, which Johnston calls "infused contemplation" is "all gift." In this stage, we become aware of a "mysterious and loving presence" in ourselves. Svetlana Alliluyeva, Stalin's daughter, in a homely image, said that God's presence came to her inwardly, "like a cherry." It is a kind of inner sweetness, and imparts a sweetness to character, which is detectable by other people.

At this stage, one comes to enjoy the Pauline fruits of the Spirit, which are love, peace, joy, patience, kindness, generosity, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control. It is worth noting, in view of the accusation of self-preoccupation which is sometimes levelled at those pursuing the spiritual life, that the last five of these are eminently social virtues which enrich social life.

"With contemplation," continues Johnston, "comes a new vision of reality. One becomes conscious of the spirit world." That makes the communion of saints a

reality, not just a belief.

The sense of loving awareness or contemplation to which voices may be an accompaniment, is not yet mysticism proper. That is an experience of light and fire:"the fire is love, the light is wisdom."

In Mystical Theology, Johnston elaborates on the final stage:

> "At first the blind stirring of love is very gentle. As time goes on, one is filled with consolation and with the sense of being loved with an everlasting love. . . Those who advance in the mystical life begin to experience the inner fire in a new and mysterious way. Now it rises up as a powerful fountain of energy that envelopes one's whole being..." [*Mystical Theology*, p. 237]

> "This is spiritual fire, which penetrates the depths of the human person more fully than anything that touches the senses." [Op.cit. p. 239]

Johnston has something interesting to say about those who reach this stage. Once again, this is evidence, if that is needed, of the social usefulness of the experience.

> "Individuals whose spirit is purified can naturally perceive - some more than others - the inclinations and talents of other persons and what lies in the heart of the interior spirit. They derive their knowledge through exterior indications (even though extremely slight) such as words and gestures and other signs " [*ibid.*, p. 311]

There is a word of caution. Prior to mysticism proper there may occur the dark night of the soul. Johnston writes that at the stage of infused contemplation, the mind is swept clean and becomes empty. When that happens, dark patches from the unconscious begin to surface. In another image, he writes that God is rising to the surface'pushing up all the inner rubbish.

The dark night may be accompanied by insomnia and depression, in which case, advice would be helpful.

What Johnston has done, is show that beyond devout observance, there is another dimension.

Reg Naulty
114 Murranji Street,
Hawker, A.C.T. 2614
Australia

Philip A. Noss(ed), *Current Trends in Scripture Translation.* United Bible Societies Bulletin 194/195(2002).

Ever since 1981 the *United Bible Societies Bulletin* is taken over every three years by papers prepared by the consultants of this organization for a ten days jamboree assembled also every three years, the UBS Triennial Translation Workshop. The papers usually touch on several aspects and concerns of the Scripture translation ministry and often reflect debates that would be going on among scholars of various disciplines. The issue under review contains papers given at the TTW held in Malaga, Spain, during June 2000. As one would expect, the number of papers given at that workshop were much more numerous that the twenty one that are reproduced in this volume. These were probably chosen because they were deemed to be representative of trends in Bible translation praxis and hence may offer stimulus to discussion and debate in academia.

The collection's editor, Philip A. Noss, the Coordinator of Translation Services within UBS, wrote an introduction(pp.1-7) explaining the *raison d'être* of the volume, and distributed the contributions into six groupings each with its own rubric: "Approaches to Scripture Translation"(pp.11-80), "Language and Translation"(pp.83-118), "Text and Exegesis" (pp.121-188); "Translation and Media"(pp. 191-242); " Research"(pp.245-296), and "Bible Society Policy"(pp.299-332). The only extra service offered by the volume is a list of the abbreviations employed by the contributors (pp.333-334) though one has to add that most essays contain also a substantial bibliography annexed to the text. Each section jumbles together a number of independent writings though most are explicitly or implicitly related to the 'translation tradition' established in the mid-twentieth century by the United Bible Societies, and originally labeled by its formulators as the 'Dynamic Equivalent Approach' to Bible Translation(cf. Eugene A. Nida & Charles R. Taber *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden: 1969) while today it is known as 'Functional Equivalence'(cf. Jan de Waard & Eugene A. Nida, *From One Language to Another*. Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating, Reading: 1986).

In the remaining part of the review we shall briefly describe the various contribution in four of the six sub-sections, and describe in some more detail the articles in th first and fourth subsections and comment on the general issues that they raise Three are the contributions under the rubric 'Language and Translation'(pp. 83 118): in his paper "Language Policy, the Vernacular and Translation: Spain an Peru in the 16th Century" (pp.83-96), William Mitchell examines how the Andea

vernacular languages in Peru slowly replaced the Castilian as the Church language in Peru; Dieudonné P. Aroga Bessong shows in "Bible Translation in an Environment of Linguistic Imbalance perceived as dangerous: Cameroon as a Case Study"(pp.97-106) how Bible translation can help saving a language which runs the danger of disappearing under pressure from others that are more aggressive. Anicia del Corro discusses the same issue, but with the Philippines in mind, in the next paper "Language Endangerment and Bible Translation: the Philppines"(pp.107-118).

The sub-section 'Text and Exegesis' clusters together five papers: Lynell Zogbo investigates how one's own ideology or that of one's own political and social context, may influence one's translation of the biblical text. She does this with respect to the translation of the key terms *Ruach Elohim and ruach YHHW* in her paper "Ideology and Translation: The case of *ruach Elohim* and *ruach YHHW* in the Old Testament"(pp.121-133). She pleads for limiting the influence of one's own world view as one carries out translation work. Philip A. Noss deals with the same subject in his paper "Transaltors' Words and Theological Readings"(pp.157-171). Jan de Waard in "Textual Analysis in Proverbs: an Exercise in Futility?" (pp.135-141) discusses what to do when one discovers that the text to be translated is found to be in various forms in different witnesses; he takes the example of Prov 26,17. In the next paper "Key terms in Paul's letters that shape theology"(pp.143-156), Roger L. Omanson argues that a number of key terms in the Pauline corpus is being understood in a different manner nowadays, and translation of these words and their contexts may have to change from how tradition has known them. The last paper in this section is that of Edesio Sánchez, "Rhetorical Criticism: A Methodology for teaching exegesis to Third World Translators." The title makes the contents of the article clear enough.

The rubric 'Research' (pp245-296) brings together three studies: the first is that of Carlo Buzzetti, "Young People's Bibles(YPB):Is it possible to make a good choice?"(pp.245-251); he describes his research project on how to prepare a Bible translation for young readers, which criteria to follow, and whether these criteria may be applied upon existing Bibles in order to see whether they are fit to be read by young people. The title of Manuel Jinbachian's study tells what he writes about: "Reasons for Differences between the Masoretic Text and Septuagint"(pp.253-274)(some discrepancies in the subtitles to sub-section III, and IV(?), announced on p. 254 and on p.261 and 270 are probably due to the difference in time when the paper was drafted and finally given for publication). Reinier de Blois reports in his paper " A Semantic Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew"(pp. 275-296)on the possibility

of collating a dictionary of Biblical Hebrew based on semantic domains, similar to the one published for the NT by the United Bible Societies in 1988: Louw J.P. and Nida E. A., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. In the meantime there was the publication of de Blois's own dissertation *Towards A New Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew Based on Semantic Domains* (2002).

The last section entitled 'Bible Society Policy' contains only one paper, that of David Burke "Text and Context. The Relevance and Viability of the Bible Society Movement's foundational principle—'Without Doctrinal Note and Comment'—Past, Present and Future"(pp.299-332). A paper that merits to be read by all that are involved in Bible translation and publication.

The first contribution in the cluster under the rubric "Approaches to Scripture Translation" is that of Timothy Wilt "Constructing a Contemporary Framework for Bible Translation"(pp11-18); it is narrative in character. Wilt tells how a small committee of translation experts from UBS worked out whether UBS's translation policy should single out one 'translation tradition' (for this concept cf. Carlo Buzzetti, *Traduzione e Tradizione*, Padova: Edizioni Messagiero, 2001) as the only one to be adopted. The committee decided for a negative answer: "a translation approach is best decided in dialogue with community and organizational representatives, in view of the specific communication situation(s) in focus"(p.15). One has to add that the labours of this group of scholars gave birth to a 'handbook' on Bible translation: *Bible Translation: Frames of Reference*, Manchester: St Jerome Press, 2002. This policy could be seen enfleshed in the project of a new translation into Dutch and carried out by the Netherlands Bible Society. Originally, the policy adopted was that the translation was to be the one described as the Dynamic and Functional Equivalence; but when the early drafts were being reviewed, the need was felt for a revision of the policy so that the final draft of the text had to reflect both the Dynamic and Functional Equivalence approach as well as the Formal approach. The saga of this revision is narrated By Kees F. de Blois and Tamara Mewe in the second article, "Functional Equivalence and the New Dutch Translation Project"(pp.19-30). Of course, this project worked within an ideal situation; very few translation projects can boast of such financial and resources support and hence what was achieved there cannot be taken as model for similar projects.

Philip H. Towner and Stephen Pattemore in two separate papers raise up the issue of translation of texts which are in intertextual relationships to other texts in Scripture. Towner's interesting paper, "Translating the whole meaning. Intertextuality and

meaning in two Pauline texts"(pp.31-42) is more direct. His study is based upon R.B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989, and discusses Philippians 1,19 and Timothy 4,16-18. Usually scholars distinguish three types of intertextuality: explicit citation, allusion, and echo(p.32). He acknowledges "that any allegedly intentional OT allusion or echo is open to challenge—the subtler the echo, the greater the degree of uncertainty that an allusion was intended" (ibid.) And then he discusses these two texts where he finds intentional connections with OT passages and these connections are not "simply a case of using OT vocabulary" (p.40) what former hermeneutics practitioners would call *accomodatio*(Cf. *Institutiones Biblicae*, I, Roma: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1951, art IV:15). The question that he raises but does not answer to is how should the translator reproduce the same effects that Paul or some other biblical writer had created through language as he presumably indulged in intertextuality (p.42). I am afraid this is an impossible task for most NT writers especially because our translations are normally done from 'the original languages' while Paul and other NT writers were handling the OT through the LXX. In translation, 'something' is lost and the first to go are semantic subtleties that hang from particular fine uses of language.

Pattemore's contribution, "Relevance Theory, Intertextuality and the Book of Revelation" (pp.43-60) is more theoretical and offers guidelines from the linguistic theory called 'Relevance Theory' for recognizing that an author is somehow making use of some text or texts as he builds his own.

Andrei S. Desnitsky and Simon Crisp, who both come from Russian Orthodox background, are the authors of the next two papers. The former, in the paper entitled "Bible Translation as Literary Translation"(pp.61-72), discusses the issue of finding an equivalent literary form in the receptor language when translating the Bible. He defines 'literary equivalence' as "the adequate representation of the literary structure of a source text in a receptor text on different levels, from phonology to genre. In fact this is nothing but an amplification of functional equivalence with more attention paid to the text as a whole or at least to the major portions of the text"(p.66). He acknowledges though that he knows of no Bible translation that achieved this; nor does he spell out whether there is any difference between a translation that pretends to find an equivalent literary form and a formal translation which usually attempts to reproduce as much as the receptor language and culture allow the formal characteristics of the source text. Robert Alter has attempted to take the second course in translating Genesis, with a certain amount of success, cf. *Genesis:*

Translation and Commentary, New York:Norton,1996; and the review by Lénart J. de Regt "Meeting the Norm of Literary Equivalence in Robert Alter's Translation of Genesis: Hebrew Syntactical Inversions, Politeness Strategies, and Other Nuances", in Anthony Abela (ed.), *In Joyful and Serene Service of his Lord's Word*, Melita Theology Supplementary Series, 5 Malta: 2003, 121–138. I would not say the same for Mary Phil Korsak, *At the Start. Genesis Made New*, New York: Doubleday,1993. I have the impression that literary genres are culture specific and finding an equivalent genre in another culture is almost impossible, especially if the culture for which the translation is done differs sharply from the one wherein the Bible was written; all you can do is to adapt them to the receptor language and culture structures; literary opuses may not be cloned.

Simon Crisp takes very much the same stand. His paper, "Icon of the Ineffable? An Orthodox View of Language and its implications for Bible Translation" (pp. 73-80) was already published twice elsewhere. This not only because it is a well written paper wherein Crisp offers a succinct but a more or less balanced description of the debate upon the approach to translation founded by Eugene A. Nida and practiced by the United Bible Societies; but also because the Orthodox view of language that he purports to discuss in brief differs sharply from that of the Western World. "In Orthodox understanding the text of Scripture functions in a way more analogous to an icon, namely as a window onto another world, rather than as a source of propositionally expressed information"(p.77). "Orthodox tradition views language as an intrinsically inadequate tool for comprehending the holy, and therefore as performing verbally a symbolic role analogous to that enacted visually by icons. Just as the icon makes no claim to be a photographic- or even essentially pictorial-depiction of the scene or event it represents, but rather a window onto the timeless reality to which it testifies and a mysterious means mediating that reality to the worshipper, so the language of Scripture cannot be a series of logical propositions with a single intended meaning"(pp.77-78). He then cites Mary Sanford's article "An Orthodox view of biblical criticism" *Sourozh* 26 (1986)25-32 where she says that for Orthodox tradition language is polyvalent, that is, it has "several intended meanings because what is being communicated is generally too complex to be communicated in clear and simple statements."

I have the impression of hearing in this context echoes of a church document coming from another tradition, *Liturgiam Authenticam* of the Catholic Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments (2001)! The consequences for translation here are serious indeed and they are spelled out by Crisp

himself(pp.78-79): it would seem that only a literal replica of the biblical text would be acceptable especially for liturgical use. However, the Old Testament of the Orthodox Tradition is a translation itself from Hebrew into Greek, and while the Septuagint is considered to be basically a literal rendering of the Hebrew text, this does not happen always. In this regard one should consult the contribution by Manuel Jinbachian "Reasons for Differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint" (pp.253-274). If it can be proved that the translators who gave us the Septuagint were 'dynamic' in their handling of the Hebrew text notwithstanding that they considered it 'inspired' (though this concept was to fully develop only later with Christianity(2Tim3, 10-17; 2Pt 1,16-21), one would find room for more than wooden literal translation. Besides, the iconic view of language should not forget that besides synchronicity a text has also diachronicity; we should also distinguish properly between the *Intentio Auctoris* from *Intentio Operis* which could be much wider from what the original author could have envisaged because it could have been enriched by subsequent readings in tradition. On these issues I would recommend Luis Alonso Schökel, *La Parola Ispirata*, Brescia: Paideia,[2]1987. All in all, I believe that the formal approach to Bible translation that would also pay attention to issues of understandability and naturalness would satisfy most needs, both liturgical and pastoral.

The fourth sub-section dedicated to Bible translation and the new media('new' in contradistinction to print media) clusters three papers: "Call for a New Translation: A Media-based Translation for Audio-Scriptures" by Julian Sundersingh (pp.191-214); "Seeing the Text: Using Biblical Metaphors as a Basis for Visualization of Scripture Texts" written by Kenneth J. Thomas(pp.215-230); and "Communicating the Bible in New Media" penned by Robert Hodgson, Jr. (pp.231-242).

Sundersingh had written a doctoral dissertation on Media-based Bible translation, a dissertation which was recently published as *Audio-based Translation*, by SAIACS, Bangalor & the United Bible Societies, New York: 2001. His article in *Current Trends* is a plea to work Bible translation for audio not print productions. As one would expect the target audience of his study is the Bible Societies population who normally undertakes Bible translation projects. He first outlines the differences between spoken and written language underlining the implications thereof for media-translation(pp.194-199): his thesis here being that "Scripture translations meant for audio media should revolve around a spoken realm with all the characteristics of spoken language because audio communication is for aural reception as much as spoken language is for aural reception" (p.199). This signifies that Bible translation

for audio production does not mean translating the Bible and simply reading it for audio media like radio, cassettes, etc. "In an audio Scripture program, appropriateness of the translated text to the receiving medium is an integral part of defining fidelity since a less appropriate use of the medium violates the very basis of communication"(p.212). " A verbatim and literal representation of the Scripture text in an audio media would be a descriptive use while a hyper-textual and aural representation of the same would be an interpretative use" (*ibid.*). In the second half of his study the author describes a field testing of a Media-based translation of a text of Scripture; in this field research carried out in his native land India, Sundersingh attempts to verify whether a media-based translation would be preferred to a literary text also read on media: his respondents by far preferred for understandability and communicability a biblical text that had been presented in drama form. And this leads him to the conclusion "that principles developed for translating Scriptures from one language to another are not adequate in handling issues that arise when Scriptures are transposed from one medium to another. We need new tools in understanding these issues and also new translations that will better suit an aural environment"(pp.193-194).

Can Scripture be faithfully reproduced or 'translated' into visual products like films or videos? This is the argument of Kenneth J. Thomas's study; he prefers the term/ concept 'visual translation' for the other proposed by some scholars: 'transmediazation'[p.215; for a discussion about which term fits better this operation cf.Carlo Buzzetti and Marek Lis, " 'Translating' from medium to medium—what terms are appropriate?" *Bible Translator*,52/4(2001)441-445] that is, the passing of the Bible text from one medium to another but clings to this term. While in oral productions the medium is not after all far from what the original authors of the Bible intended their work to function since their work was generally intended to be read aloud within a community, in visualizing the Bible text we are faced with a completely new situation since "the video's characteristic is its use of multiple media. We have thus entered into an arena where we cannot assume that the original text functioned to provide some comparable impact upon its audience" (pp.215-216). But can we visualize the original text which is essentially contextualized? Thomas shows briefly the difficulties involved in trying to reproduce the visual aspects to which the text may refer(p.216). Instead he proposes that a pictorial representation of the texts of the Bible should first identify and then use 'controlling metaphors' and their related 'key metaphors' in the text. Controlling metaphors are those metaphors in a text that are basic for it and that 'structure the text discourse by providing an organizing principle for the whole and its parts"(p.217). Then

through the help of biblical exegetes and theologians Thomas exemplifies the use of controlling metaphors in Scriptures: he mentions the metaphor of 'Refuge in the Lord' in the psalter, 'Life as a divine Trial' in the Letter of James, and the metaphor of 'Diaspora' in 1Peter(pp.217-219). Probably he could have added the metaphor of pilgrimage in Exodus if we rely on Mark S. Smith, *The Pilgrimage Pattern in Exodus*, JSOT Supplement Series 239, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press,1997.

Thomas then lists four principles suggested by biblical scholars about recourse to controlling metaphors in exegesis of biblical texts, as for instance, that of controlling metaphors as means for understanding the major theme and purpose of the whole text: 'They provide a unifying way to understand the various parts and subjects of the book'(p.219). Or "Controlling metaphors are dynamic in that they enable new aspects of the concepts presented by the authors to be understood"(p.220). The problem is not just identifying the controlling metaphor beneath a text but also in "determining their significance" for the target audience of the video representation of the text. For the controlling metaphors are often abstract in themselves and "require metaphorical definition" (Thomas, 216 citing George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *The Metaphors we live by*, Chigaco: University of Chicago Press, 1980). For "neither the specific metaphor nor its simplest visualization, in terms of its original context, may communicate to the present-day viewer"(p.220). We should rather focus " on using images that could create a recognizable conceptualization of the metaphor in modern-day terms" (*ibid.*).

Once one determines the controlling metaphors and their conceptual significance one may try starting to find 'functional equivalents' which would provide the viewers with a familiar 'frame of reference', unify the production, and serve as control on the other metaphors employed in the video being produced. The identification of the controlling metaphors within a text to be used as base for a video is usually achieved by identifying first 'key metaphors' within the text(p.221). " A key metaphor may provide the concept for a functionally equivalent image in visualizing a passage, but the visualization must be governed by understanding the function of the key metaphor within the larger whole. Visualization of a part should never make it more difficult to comprehend the whole but should allow clarity about the place of the part within the whole" (*ibid*).

Thomas then focuses on the role biblical scholars have to play in such production, talking from personal experience with the American Bible Society as they sought to visualize a number of texts from Luke where the controlling metaphor has been

identified with the 'Kingdom of God' "to which the particular metaphors are related" (pp.221-225). He relates on work done on Luke 1,39-56; 2,1-21;10,25-37;15,11-32; 24,13-35. For Luke 15, 11-32 Thomas as the consultant of the team that produced the video presumed that it is 'a parable of the Kingdom of God' even though the Gospel writer himself does not make this explicit, since the subject matter of the other parables in the context is the Kingdom of God(p.224). This assumption though has to be ascertained by proper exegesis of the entire context. The last stage in the preparation of the exegetical work for the video production is choosing the functional equivalent for the controlling and key metaphors in the text. Thomas identifies three principles: the functional should represent the same concept as the biblical metaphor, it should be familiar in contemporary culture and have associations with the biblical controlling and key concepts, and it should be the primary visual image that occurs throughout the video.

This brief discussion leads to a critique of the products that the American Bible Society has made on the texts of Luke mentioned above(pp.226-228). Thomas concludes that "functional equivalent images for controlling and key metaphors in biblical books and passages would be appropriate to use as basis for visualization in video productions" (p.228). The main weaknesses in this proposal are: 1) that it is not always easy to identify the controlling and key metaphors in the source text; 2) that finding the equivalent metaphors in contemporary cultures is even more difficult as we do not always know well enough the historical and cultural contexts in which biblical texts were conceived; 3)   that even when one identifies the equivalent metaphors or images "the significance of any image cannot be controlled, since images are multivalent" (p. 225) so that you do not know what messages will arrive to your intended audience.

Robert Hodgson Jr's paper is actually a progress report about the workings of the 'New Media Working Group' founded in 1997 within the United Bible Societies, that has been set up to study the theory and practice of communicating the Bible through media other than printing (p.231). The report is addressed mainly to translation consultants and is meant to show how they may serve on production teams working on films or videos based on Scripture. The proceeding of this working group had already appeared in two publications: P. Soukup SJ & R. Hodgson(eds.), *Fidelity and Translation*: *Communicating the Bible in New Media*, New York: The American Bible Society & Franklin: Sheed &Ward,1999; and R. Hodgson & K.J. Thomas, "Report of the New Media Group", *The Bible Translator Technical Papers*, 49/1(1998)101-103. In the 1998 paper Hodgson and Thomas had suggested a five-

stage approach or framework for the work of the 'translators' [by the latter word they mean all the personnel involved in the production of the texts, from translation consultants to translators(p.231 note 2)]. In this report/paper Hodgson suggests another two stages or levels: they should actually collaborate at the level of product development and at the other of marketing(pp. 235-236). In the second part of the report Hodgson discusses some of the norms that should be followed at each level of the production of the film or video especially norms concerning the ethics of translation and producing Bible texts in different media(pp.236-241).

In this regard I think I would raise only two issues though there may be others. Producing films or videos the script for which is closely based upon the biblical text is not translation but creating a completely new product. The Bible text cannot be cloned. And the rules for fidelity for such products are different than those operative for bible translation. Secondly. In the interpretation of the 'film text' by the common reader there is the mediation of the performers who impersonate the biblical characters; these actors have their private life which often does not remain so private. And this will also influence the audiences who may mix up the mores of the actor with those of the biblical character the part of whom he plays. May be this is a minor issue. Perhaps it is not so minor as the Bible often intends to present 'reliable characters' to tradition [Cf. Paul J. Kissling, *Reliable Characters in the Primary History. Profiles of Moses, Joshua, Elijah and Elisha*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996 for this concept].

Anthony Abela
Department of Holy Scripture
University of Malta