Jean-Dominique Barthélemy
1921-2002

As many of you know, Dominique Barthélemy died on February 10th of this year. This memorial tribute by James Sanders is also online at http://purl.org/TC. A fuller bibliography of Barthélemy’s publications is available at www.ubs-translations.org/.

“S”cholars will always associate the name of R.-P. Dominique Barthélemy, OP, of Fribourg with the Minor Prophets scroll because of his masterly treatment of its contents in Devanciers, a book which in many ways has revolutionized scholarship.” So wrote Emanuel Tov of Hebrew University in Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (DJD), Vol. VIII (Oxford, 1990).

Barthélemy’s work has indeed revolutionized scholarship, especially textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible and of its earliest Greek translations, the so-called Septuagint. It was a master stroke on Eugene Nida’s part to invite Barthélemy to join a group of six First Testament scholars to work on the really difficult text critical problems, for which UBS translation committees around the world most often turned to modern versions for solutions (just as ancient translators often turned to the Septuagint).

It became clear to the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project (HOTTP) at its very first meeting in Arnoldshain in West Germany in 1969 that Barthélemy would set the tone and the pace of its work. (The other members were Hans Peter Rüger of Tübingen, Norbert Lohfink of Frankfurt, W. D. McHardy of Oxford, A. R. Hulst of Utrecht, and myself.)

Barthélemy had co-edited, with J. T. Milik, the first volume of DJD (1955), the fragments from Cave 1 other than the seven full scrolls published in America and Israel, and then was assigned the Dodeca-propheton or Greek Minor Prophets scroll from Nahal Hever. It was Barthélemy’s work on the Hever manuscript to which Tov referred, and it did indeed revolutionize textual criticism.

Les Devanciers d’Aquila: première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodéca-prophéton (Brill, 1963) demonstrated Barthélemy’s grasp of the field, and turned it on its head. His work on that document brought unprecedented clarity to the early history of the transmission of the text of the Hebrew Bible and of its early Greek translations. The field had thought in largely theoretical and uncertain terms about the early transmission history of the text, but now it had through his work what he called “a missing link” between the early rather fluid Greek translations and the more formal, even rigid Greek translations of the second century of the common era.

This matched the same observation the newly recovered biblical scrolls had brought to light, that of a move from the early, relatively fluid Hebrew texts of the Bible at Qumran to the more “stable” biblical texts from Murabba‘at, Masada, and elsewhere — or from the second-century BCE 1QIsa to the first century CE 1QIsb.

The history of transmission of the text could now be stated in clear terms: the pre-masoretic, the proto-masoretic, and the masoretic periods. Barthélemy stated the case not only
in *Devanciers*, and elsewhere in French, but also in English in the supplementary volume to *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible* (Abingdon, 1976).

But the influence of his thesis had already been reflected in major critical works in the field in the late ’60s, particularly those of the Hebrew University Bible Project (HUBP). It was indeed the basis of the thesis I then advanced that the concept of authority of the text changed from a vaguely shamanistic or dynamic understanding of inspiration to that of “verbal inspiration,” by which the focus shifted from making the message of the text understandable for ever-changing believing communities to focus on accurate verbal transmission of the text (*Journal of Biblical Literature* 98, 1979).

*Devanciers* showed that the movement was from relative textual fluidity to accuracy of transmission of a particular text type, which would become the MT. The focus shifted from the community to the text.

When the work of the HOTTP got underway it too was based on the new understanding. We made it clear to Nida that we were committed to the needs of the Translations Department of the UBS but that we also wanted to work out and elaborate the new understanding of text criticism.

Beginning in 1970 the work of the committee took on a sense of excitement in seeing how the new understanding of textual criticism applied to the problems we were given to work on, which amounted finally to nearly 6000 textual cases throughout the Hebrew Bible.

The work continued annually, meeting for a month each year, usually in August, in Freudenstadt at the Erholungsheim of the Württembergische Evangelische Kirche. Rüger annually worked up sheets of ancient variants for each problem, Lohfink provided recent critical scholarship on each problem, and I provided extant readings from those Dead Sea Scrolls that had not yet been published, while Barthélemy probed and analyzed all the pertinent ancient, medieval, and early critical treatments of each problem.

It was clear from the beginning of our work that Barthélemy was a rare master of the medieval Judeo-Arabic (Qaraite or rabbinate) commentaries, many of which had not been published. Barthélemy had accumulated scores of microfilms of extant manuscripts of ancient, medieval, and early critical works on the Hebrew Bible, which he also used to check against those that had been published.

I shall never forget my first visits to his study in Fribourg. It was in those visits and out of my admiration for his quest for accuracy in textual work that I conceived of the idea of making such films available to scholars generally.

We often found in our work on the HOTTP a perpetuation of errors copied from one apparatus to another in even the finest of scholarship, simply because there was lack of access to images of many manuscripts to check against. Dominique’s collection, while admirable in its extent and depth, was for his personal and professional use in Fribourg. I grew increasingly convinced that all scholars had to have access to such images for the sake of the field and for the sake of the churches and synagogues, which benefit from the work of textual scholarship.

This was the motivation behind my accepting Elizabeth Hay Bechtel’s invitation to join her in 1977 to establish the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center in Claremont, where we have accumulated photographic images of the most important manuscripts of the Bible, both testaments, including all the Dead Sea Scrolls, for distribution to scholars who request copies of them.

Now, of course, we are moving to digitize all we have accumulated, and more as they become available, for distribution on the web and by compact disk. The mission of the Center is “to acquire, preserve and distribute images of biblical and related manuscripts,” and the inspiration for it came from Dominique Barthélemy’s passion for accuracy.

Participation in the work of the HOTTP was sheer joy. Besides the six on the committee the team included John A. Thompson of the Bible Societies, who located the textual problems we were to work on out of his experience with translation committees supported by the Society, Adrian Schenker, Barthélemy’s student at Fribourg and later his successor there, plus student assistants.

Nida often expressed pleasure at how well we worked together and enjoyed each other’s company. We soon established a daily routine that sustained us the eleven years we met. We ate together, prayed together, and played together. Each day started with Scripture readings and prayer at the big table in the Arbeitszimmer. We took all our meals together after saying grace; we played “les boules” together on the lawn of the Erholungsheim; we took walks together in the Black Forest each evening, and upon our return would play “international scrabble” or “Fang den Hut” after a beer at 9pm (never before!).

French was the primary language in the workroom, with some English and German, but each played scrabble in his mother tongue, which made for some
But we do have the introductions to the first three volumes of CTAT in which much of what needs to be said about the new understanding of textual criticism is laid forth, and they are all finally the work of Dominique Barthélemy. They constitute 437 pages of tightly reasoned and argued review of the whole field of textual criticism, how it arose, what it entails, how it developed, how all the elements historically related to each other, and how the field must change in the light of the new situation.

It is in effect a magnum opus in succinct compass, packed with incisive observations on every aspect of the field. One is, however, shocked at how few scholars have taken advantage of its finds or wrestled with its proposals (see my remarks in Textus 18 [1995]). An English translation is underway and should be available about a year after Barthélemy’s death. It will provide the essential complement forty years later to Devanciers, but in the lingua franca of today. With CTAT it will be a lasting monument to one of the giants of the modern era.

— James A. Sanders

Selected Bibliography of Barthélemy’s Major Works
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hilarious evenings. We did everything together except on week-ends when some would take excursions hiking in the forest or going into Stuttgart, except Dominique, who we knew would be hard at work reviewing his preparation for the next week’s problems. He was the accepted leader of the team. There was plenty of debate and critique on each problem in order to make sure every angle of each problem was probed, but Barthélemy essentially set up the terms of the discussion.

Out of that work have come nine volumes of reports. First there were the five volumes of the Preliminary and Interim Report (in English and French) of the HOTTP published by the United Bible Societies (London and New York 1974-80), which were intended for the use of the UBS translation committees working around the globe, but have been used by scholars also. Then came Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament (CTAT), published by Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen, Vols. 1-3 (1982-92), which has been entirely written by Barthélemy out of our work. Rüger, Lohfink and I have served as co-éditeurs, but Barthélemy was the author.

Those volumes covered the committee’s work on the historical books, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets, but it is all essentially the work of Barthélemy himself.

A fourth volume, on the Psalter, which will hopefully be published next year, unfortunately will not have a full introduction. There is no volume on the Pentateuch or the rest of the books of Poetry, nor will there be a sixth volume Barthélemy wanted to write to fulfill our desire to work out fully the new understanding of textual criticism.
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### Bible Translation

**GENERAL**

William D. Barrick. 2001. “The Integration of OT Theology with Bible Translation.” *The Master’s Seminary Journal* 12/1:15-31. Three passages from Genesis (12.3; 15.5; 19.24) illustrate the **interaction between translation and theology**—the importance of Hebrew syntax and poetic structure, the contribution of archaeology, the importance of not excluding possible interpretations in passages with debated meanings, how important details may be obscured by translation.

Bruce M. Metzger. 2001. *The Bible in Translation. Ancient and English Versions*. Baker. The first part describes all ancient versions of which significant portions have survived; second part treats English versions from the 11th c. to the present.


Raymond C. van Leeuwen. 2001. “We Really Do Need Another Bible Translation.” *Christianity Today* 45/13:28-35. vL., who contributed to the NLT, argues that **different types of translation** are needed for **different purposes**. For serious study, readers need a “direct” translation that shows more transparently the nature of the Hebrew and Greek expression.

Also by van Leeuwen: 2001. “On Bible Translation and Hermeneutics.” In *After Pentecost*, 284-311. C. Bartholomew, C. Greene, and K. Möller, eds. Paternoster; Zondervan. This is a more extensive treatment of the same topic with special attention to the problem of contextual knowledge and situation. The volume is a collection of essays on language and the Bible, with particular focus on speech-act theory, the interpretation of metaphor, and literary criticism.

**ANCIENT**

Le Pentateuque d’Alexandrie. 2001. C. Dogniez and M. Harl, eds. Cerf. The previously published **LXX books of the Pentateuch** have been gathered into one volume, with a revision by the editors of the front and back matter, as well as the notes on the translation. The text itself is presented with the Greek and French on facing pages.


Folker Siegert. 2001. *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament: Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta*. LIT. This **introduction to the LXX** provides historical and philological information, including chapters on the LXX as a translation, with regard to language and style, translation/transcription of proper names and terms, and the interaction of translation and editing. A companion volume with index and a chapter on the history of the reception of the LXX is scheduled for publication later this year.

ed. Hermes. This first edition of the considerable remains of a 4th century Coptic papyrus codex containing the Gospel of Matthew includes the text and a German translation, both with critical notes, an index of the Coptic, a Greek reconstruction, and a full set of color facsimiles. The text is important for Coptic linguistics, NT textual criticism, and Synoptic Gospel research. For information on the Schøyen Collection, see [www.nb.no/baser/schoyen](http://www.nb.no/baser/schoyen).

Rochus Zuurmond. 2001. “The Textual Background of the Gospel of Matthew in Ge’ez.” *Aethiopica* 4:32-41. The Gospel of Matthew in Ge’ez has been handed down in two versions: the A-text is earlier, and a very “free” translation, adapting the text to a Semitic vernacular and a new cultural background; the B-text removes the translational liberties of the A-text, and is probably a medieval revision of the A-text on the basis of Arabic Gospels.

**MODERN**


J.A. Naudé. 2001. “The Afrikaans Bible Translations and Apartheid.” *Acta Theologica* 21/1:106-123. The first Afrikaans translation (1933) used strategies of explication and intensification that accentuated apartheid vocabulary, while the more recent one (1983) uses substitution, paraphrase, generalization, and deletion to minimize apartheid vocabulary. Joseph Jensen. 2001. “Liturgiam Authenticam and the New Vulgate.” *America* 185/4:11-13. LA, a document from the Roman Congregation for Divine Worship, mandates that Catholic Bible translations conform to the Nova Vulgata in many ways. Furthermore, “literal translation is commended, even when the result may sound odd, because ‘it should be borne in mind that a literal translation of terms which may initially sound odd...may for this very reason provoke inquisitiveness in the hearer...’” (No. 43) (J., quoting from the LA, 12). Most serious is the requirement that liturgical translation follow the same manuscript tradition as the NV, which leaves much to be desired text-critically, especially in the DC books. But the “most poorly conceived proposal” of LA is that there should be only one Bible translation, one that conforms to the rules of LA, for each territory.


S.S. Elliott. 2001. “‘The Word’ in Text, Sound, and Image: The American Bible Society’s New Media Bible and the Research Center for Scripture and Media.” *Council of Societies for the Study of Religion* Bulletin 30/3:65-67. These ABS projects were created in order to take on the challenge of translating the Bible as written text into nonprint media. Resistance to new media productions as “translations” comes in part from an unwillingness to recognize a given text/production as a translation because of what such a recognition seems to imply.

Alister E. McGrath. 2001. *In the Beginning. The Story of the King James Bible and How It Changed a Nation, a Language, and a Culture*. Doubleday.

Steven Sheeley. 2000. “Re(·) Englishing the Bible.” *Review and Expositor* 97/4:467-484. S. reviews recent English translations of the Bible in four categories: verbal translations,
dynamic translations and paraphrases, electronic versions, and Bible formats. He predicts even more rapid change in English versions for the coming century.

David Neff. 2001. “A Translation Fit for a King.” Christianity Today 45/13:36-39,75. In spite of the intentions of the sponsors of the KJV to provide an alternative to the anti-monarchist Geneva Bible, the availability of the Bible and its language of freedom in the vernacular, even in the form of the KJV, promoted the secular politics of liberty.

J. Roubaud. 2001. “Traduire pour les ‘idiots’: Sébastien Châteillon et la Bible.” Recherches de Science Religieuse 89/3:353-376. Châteillon’s translation of the Bible was aimed at “idiots” (= people who didn’t know ancient languages!). He used popular language, but also created words, to make the text as straightforward as he could. In R.’s view, the result was a major work of 16th C. French literature.

Leora Batnitzky. 2000. “The Problem of Translation: Risking the Present for the Sake of the Past.” In Idolatry and Representation: The Philosophy of Franz Rosenzweig Reconsidered, 105-141. Princeton University Press. For Buber and Rosenzweig, meaning is created through a response to that which is strange and different. Only in gaining a sense of the difference between the Bible and the contemporary world can the modern reader view the Bible’s aesthetic and religious, poetic and prosaic, dimensions. Differences between Buber and Rosenzweig lay in their understanding of the role of the past vs the present and of the individual vs the community.

B. Stolt. 2001. “...und Fühl’s im Herzen...” Luthers Bibelübersetzung aus der Sicht neuerer Sprach- und Übersetzungs-wissenschaft.” Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 98/2:186-208. S. considers the way Luther’s translation still reaches the modern reader, and the ways in which Luther anticipated modern linguistics and approaches to translation.

Shoshana J. Schulman. 2000. “Diversity in Modern Jewish Bible Translation.” This doctoral dissertation from the Jewish Theological Seminary evaluates three modern Jewish translations—Tanakh (Jerusalem Publication Society), The Five Books of Moses (Schocken), translated by E. Fox, and The Living Torah (Orthodox), translated by A. Kaplan. S. discusses the criteria for what constitutes a Jewish translation and describes the three translations, analyzing their aims and approaches. She compares texts that raise halakhic and theological issues, and considers the influence of medieval commentators on the translations.

Anthony Abela. 2001. “Suggestions for Changes in the Second Edition of the Maltese Bible.” Sijon 2001/2:47-84. Sijon is the journal from the Istitut għall-Kultura Biblika of the Malta Bible Society. In this issue, Anthony Abela has contributed an article in English with detailed discussion of suggestions for changes in the second edition of the Maltese Bible that had been proposed by the Malta branch of Gideons International.

**Bible**

**GENERAL**

Currents in Research: Biblical Studies. 2001. A.J. Hauser, S. McKnight, and P. Sellew, eds. Sheffield Academic Press. In addition to the Porter article listed under Bible Translation, surveys of recent research in this issue include: Y. Levin on biblical genealogies; P. Redditt on the Book of the Twelve as one book; M. Weigl on Nahum; O. Dangl on Habakkuk; D. Williams on 1 Maccabees; S. McKnight on Jesus and his death; R. Briggs on the uses of speech-act theory in biblical interpretation; K. Scholtissek on Johannine studies; and J. Miller on Romans.

R.S. Sugirtharajah. 2001. The Bible and the Third World: Precolonial and Postcolonial Encounters. Cambridge University Press. S. examines reading practices ranging from the vernacular to liberation and postcolonial criticism, tracing the path of the Bible from its precolonial status as an inaccessible and marginal book in the ancient churches of India, China and North Africa, to its use as an important tool for both colonizer and colonized, to the reclaiming and interrogating of it in the postcolonial world.

**BIBLICAL LANGUAGES**

Recent scholarly publications of the Bible Society of Spain will be of interest to Spanish speakers:

- Bruno Corsani, Carlo Buzetti, Girolama de Luca, Giorgio Massi. Guía para el Estudio del Hebreo Bíblico. 2nd. ed. rev. + CD.

Stephanie Black. 2002. Sentence Conjunctions in the Gospel of Matthew: Kai, de, tote, gar, oun and Asyndeton in Narrative Discourse. Sheffield Academic Press. B. applies current linguistic research on discourse markers to sentence conjunctions in narrative passages in Matthew, with a verse by verse commentary on the structure of Matthew’s “miracle chapters,” 8-9. She discusses the interplay between features such as sentence conjunction, word order, and verb tense in the portrayal of continuity and discontinuity in Greek narrative.


William G. Dever. 2001. What Did the Biblical Writers Know and When Did They Know It? What Archaeology Can Tell Us About the Reality of Ancient Israel. Eerdmans. D. says: “Why did I write this book? Because I had to, not only to counter the ‘revisionists’ abuse of archaeology, but to show how modern archaeology brilliantly illuminates a real ‘Israel’ in the Iron Age, and also to help foster the dialogue between archaeology and biblical studies...” (Foreword, x).

Gerard J. Norton. 2001. “Commentaries, with Particular Application to the Psalms.” Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association 24:84-104. N. looks at how OT biblical commentaries have changed during the 20th century, and aims to provide the reader of commentaries with critical questions to pose with regard to any given commentary. The article ends with an annotated list of commentaries and other studies on Psalms.

B. Barry Levy. 2001. Fixing God’s Torah: The Accuracy of the Hebrew Bible Text in Jewish Law. Oxford University Press. B. examines rabbinic writings of the 13th-16th centuries to find that the rabbinic writers of that time were far more aware of textual inconsistencies in the Bible than is usually recognized, and they appreciated the legal and interpretative implications of such inconsistencies.

Michael Carasik. 2001. “Exegetical Implications of the Masoretic Cantillation Marks in Ecclesiastes.” Hebrew Studies 42:145-165. C. analyzes cases where the Masoretic punctuation does not match what appears to be the intended meaning of the text. He suggests that in many cases the Masoretic decision to place a pause in a location that seems to contradict the apparent meaning was made not to contradict it, but to add a second possibility. The Masoretic vowels and punctuation, while limiting, may in fact have worked to preserve the possibility of multiple interpretations.


The Cambridge Companion to Jesus. 2001. M. Bockmuehl, ed. Cambridge University Press. This volume incorporates the historical work on Jesus with issues of critical method—the story of Christian faith and study, as well as Jesus in a global church and in the encounter with Judaism and Islam.

Mark Goodacre. 2001. The Synoptic Problem: A Way Through the Maze. Sheffield Academic Press. In this guide for students and the general reader, G. offers a way through the complexities of the Synoptic Problem, explaining what study of it involves, why it is important and how it might be solved. A website supplements the book: [http://NTGateway.com/maze]
Translation, Linguistics, Culture

Basil Hatim. 2001. *Teaching and Researching Translation.* Longman. One of the “Teaching and Researching...” books in the series Applied Linguistics in Action, this volume is an introduction to translation studies. In the first section, H. surveys the history of translation studies and concepts and issues in research—pragmatics, equivalence, relevance, cultural issues, polysemy, gender. The second section presents various research models, the third section deals with the study of text, discourse, and genre, and the last section provides links and resources.


David J. Shepherd. 2002. “Rendering Fiction: Translation, Pseudotranslation, and the Book of Mormon.” In *The New Mormon Challenge: Responding to the Latest Defenses of a Fast-Growing Movement,* 367-395. F.J. Beckwith, C. Mosser, and P. Owen, eds. Zondervan. S., whose primary interest is in ancient translations of the Hebrew Bible, brings critical concepts from translation studies to bear on the Book of Mormon to get a clearer understanding of its status, function, and classification. In the process, he describes two types of translation (indirect and intralingual) and pseudotranslation (the work purports to be a translation but is not) and how to distinguish them.

Josep Marco. 2000. “Register Analysis in Literary Translation: A Functional Approach.” *Babel* 46/1:1-19. M. argues that analysis of register is important for the translation of literary texts. In the characterization of the inner context register analysis sheds light on the situation created within the text. To illustrate, M. focuses on the degree of technicality and marked field mixing with regard to the variable of field, terms of address and modality with respect to tenor, and the interplay between grammatical complexity and lexical density as markers of oral and written language in the area of mode.

Albert Waldinger. 2000. “The Primal Screem of Glückl and the Yiddish Memoirs of Glückl von Hamel and the renowned female Bible” (Tsenerene). W. analyzes the “cry from the heart” of Bertha Pappenheim through her German version of the Yiddish Memoirs of Glückl von Hamel and the renowned female Bible (Tsenerene). W. places this output in the framework of her private life and in the context of her feminism and social activism. Her work shows how a tradition of biblical commentary can inspire both vernacular creativity and sacred literalism—the creation of a new form of Yiddish called Taytshsprakh (“language of commentary”) and “interlineal literalism” in Benjamin’s sense.

Ke Wen-li. 2001. “How Can Semantics Work to Help Translation?” *Babel* 47/2:158-174. K. describes aspects of semantic studies that can be of use to the translator: the distinction between sense and reference; hyponymy, changes of meaning; and context. It is useful for a translator to have some idea of the relationship between semantics and translation and to have a general knowledge of semantics.

Outi Paloposki. 2001. “Originality and the Defence of Translation.” *The Translator* 7/1. The claim that literary translations have traditionally been undervalued whereas original works have been considered sacrosanct is widespread and has often been taken for granted. While this has often been the case, there is evidence of opposing tendencies in translation history. P. examines the prevalence in historical data of different attitudes to translation, and speculates about the reasons that may have led to the use of the sacred original rhetoric, arguing that there is a perceived need to defend translation and translation studies at the heart of the debate.

Two recent volumes in St. Jerome’s series Translation Theories Explained (Anthony Pym, editor): • Kathleen Davis. 2001. *Deconstruction and Translation.* (Volume 8) D. explains ways in which practical and theoretical problems of translation can be rethought in the light of insights from Derrida. If there is no stable source text, we can no longer talk of translation as meaning transfer or as passive reproduction. D. instead refers to the translator’s freedom and individual responsibility. She
analyzes the proper name as a model for the problem of signification and explains revised concepts of limits, singularity, generality, definitions of text, writing, iterability, meaning and intention, and elaborates the implications for translation theory.

- Theo Hermans. 1999. *Translation in Systems. Descriptive and System-Oriented Approaches Explained.* (Volume 7) The notion of systems has helped revolutionize translation studies. As a key part of many descriptive approaches, it has broken with the prescriptive focus on what translation should be, and turned to what translation does in specific cultural settings. H. explains how contemporary descriptive approaches came about, what the basic ideas were, and how those ideas have evolved over time. He addresses the fundamental problems of translation norms, equivalence, polysystems and social systems.


**Text Representation: Linguistic and Psycholinguistic Aspects.**

2001. T. Sanders, J. Schilperoord, and W. Spooren, eds. Benjamins. The focus in this volume is on referential and relational coherence and the role of linguistic characteristics as processing instructions from a text linguistic and discourse psychology point of view. Essays present various research methodologies: linguistic analysis, text analysis, corpus linguistics, computational linguistics, argumentation analysis, and the experimental psycholinguistic study of text processing.

**Creolization and Contact.**

2001. N. Smith and T. Veenstra, eds. Benjamins. Papers from “The Amsterdam Workshop on Language Contact and Creolization” apply the concept of relexification to creoles and other contact languages; highlight the relevance of strategies of second language learning for theories of pidgin/creole genesis; discuss the notions levelling (koiné formation) and convergence, the relation between types of contact situations and processes of crosslinguistic influence, and the linguistic consequences of the social structure of the plantation system. The papers treat contact languages of Africa, Asia, and Europe.

Bernard Comrie and Martin Haspelmath. 2001. “The Library of Babel.” Mouton de Gruyter. Published as Mouton de Gruyter’s “Seasons Greetings,” this essay talks about what the loss of languages means for linguistic studies, in terms of our knowledge of universals, the range of structures, genealogy, and the effects of language contact.

**Dictionary of Third World Theologies.**

2000. V. Fabella and R. Sugirtharajah, eds. Orbis. Entries by Musimbi Kanyoro on Ecumenism and on Culture, Aloo Mojola on Translation, and Elsa Tamez on Justification.

David Carey, Jr. 2001. *Our Elders Teach Us: Maya-Kaqchikel Historical Perspectives*xkib 'ij kan qate' qata'ta'. University of Alabama Press. C. uses oral interviews and archival research to construct a history of the last 50 years in Guatemala from the perspective of present-day Mayan people.
In mid-November 2001 an international symposium on "The Septuagint in Biblical Studies and the Church" was held at the Penteli Monastery near Athens. The event was sponsored jointly by the Greek Bible Society and the United Bible Societies. Held under the auspices of the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece, this was the first Bible Society event of its kind to be hosted by the Orthodox Church. The Symposium brought together leading LXX scholars for three days of paper presentation and academic debate about the origins of the LXX, its influence and relationship to the MT and translating the LXX in ancient times and in the present. Among the symposium papers were contributions by UBS colleagues Jan de Waard, Ioannis Karavidopoulos, Manuel Jinbachian, and Seppo Sipilä.

**Translation Research Summer School**

A Translation Research Summer School (24 June-5 July 2002, Manchester, UK) is being hosted by the Centre for Translation and Intercultural Studies (UMIST) in conjunction with the School of Modern Languages (University of Manchester). The joint initiative involving four British universities is an annual two-week course offering intensive research training in translation and intercultural studies for prospective researchers in the field. More details at [http://www.umist.ac.uk/ctis/trss](http://www.umist.ac.uk/ctis/trss) or via the CTIS home page: [http://www.umist.ac.uk/ctis](http://www.umist.ac.uk/ctis)

**Handbook on Tobit and Judith!**

The first volume in the UBS Handbook Series to treat Deuterocanonical books, the *Handbook on Tobit and Judith* is hot off the press in a bright new color. Roger Bullard and Howard Hatton are the authors. As in the case of LXX Esther, the NRSV is used as the base text for Tobit, since it follows a better Greek text.

**Interactive Hebrew Text Project**

The Werkgroep Informatica of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam has launched The Interactive Hebrew Text Project, a pilot web project, at [www.th.vu.nl/~wiweb/index.htm](http://www.th.vu.nl/~wiweb/index.htm) (or from the Theology Webpage — [www.th.vu.nl](http://www.th.vu.nl) under Onderzoek, Werkgroep Informatica). At this point, five chapters of the OT are presented (Jonah and Deut. 4), with comments in Dutch only for Deut 4. Due to the complexities of displaying interactive Hebrew on the web, the site works only under Windows 95 (98 or above is better) with Internet Explorer 4 (5 or above is better). It will not work under Netscape or other operating systems. The site provides a test to see how your system matches the minimum requirements at [www.th.vu.nl/~wiweb/html/test.htm](http://www.th.vu.nl/~wiweb/html/test.htm). The site should be of particular interest to Hebraists, translators, and students of Hebrew and Hebrew discourse.