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I. ANALYZING THE STRUCTURE AND STYLE OF A BIBLICAL HEBREW NARRATIVE

A. INTRODUCTION

In recent years the task of translation has become an increasingly more complex and exact activity. Technical tools in the form of underlying theories, practical methodologies, and specialized training programmes have enabled work to be carried out with much greater precision than in the past, resulting in versions of a generally higher quality in terms of naturalness of language and faithfulness to the original. These new principles and techniques have progressively widened the translator's area of responsibility from a primary orientation toward the individual words of a text (literal translation), to the sentence level (the TAPOT era),1 and nowadays to the discourse as a whole. This is not to say that all the problems have been solved. Far from it: we are just beginning to understand the major factors involved in the process of inter-lingual communication, and much remains to be done in developing adequate procedures for dealing with these in the actual practice of translation.

In the present paper I hope to make a small contribution to this effort by outlining and illustrating a methodology which translators can apply (whether in whole, in part, or in some adapted form) when analyzing the original text of the Bible. I will be especially concerned with matters pertaining to the discourse structure and special stylistic features of the source language (SL) message, in particular, how structure and style relate to each other in the composition of a complete unit of communication. I have selected a specific dramatic (i.e. plot-centered) narrative from the book of Genesis (i.e. chapter 37) upon which to base this investigation, but the discussion should be relevant in a general way to the study of similar accounts in the Old Testament, and probably also the New Testament as well. A knowledge of biblical Hebrew would be helpful for one to fully understand the method of analysis that is employed here and the conclusions reached, but this is not absolutely essential. In fact, one purpose of this study is to determine, if possible, the level of competence in the SL (or in knowledge about the SL) that is required for analytical help of this nature to be effective, that is, to communicate in such a way that the "average" translator can make use of the information which is presented.2
B. STRUCTURE

The term "structure" refers to the particular way in which a verbal text is composed, or put together, by its author. This could, of course, include everything in the discourse, from the composition of words and word groups right on up the various levels of linguistic structure to the complete text. But in this study, attention will be focused upon the larger organization of discourse, that is, those aspects of construction which relate sentences and groups of sentences to one another in the formation of a unified and at least partially independent piece of communication which can stand on its own as a meaningful narrative. Discourse structure may be analyzed in terms of three important compositional characteristics: arrangement, connectivity, and prominence.

Arrangement is concerned with the subdivision of a discourse into related chunks of information of different size (length) and scope (level of generality). These segments may be grammatical or semantic in nature according to the analyst's perspective. In other words, one may view a given unit as consisting of groups of sentences, paragraphs, etc., or as constituting a distinct stage in the development of a story's plot. One unit may be related to another either horizontally (e.g. sentence A follows sentence B in time) or vertically (e.g. sentence A begins paragraph A). Some units are homogeneous, i.e. they are comprised of pure narrative and dialogue; other units are mixed, i.e. made up of a combination of narrative and dialogue. When considering the arrangement of a text, one must give special attention to what the various units are and at what level of structure they operate; how they are formally marked as to beginning and end points (boundaries); how they are related to one another in the account; and what noteworthy patterns they may form in the larger context of a narrative (e.g. parallelism or reversed parallelism/chiasmus).

Connectivity is concerned with the unity that is manifested in a well-formed discourse. A text consists of a multitude of parts (units) of varied shapes and sizes. How are they all linked to one another to form a unified whole? Such connections may, again, be either grammatical resulting in "cohesion" (e.g. "this" referring to something which has just been mentioned) or semantic resulting in "coherence" (e.g. repeated reference to words or concepts belonging to the same field of meaning, whether they are related by similarity (e.g. head - leader - ruler - king) or some other association (e.g. door - house, darkness - light)). Unity has both an outer and an inner dimension. That is to say, a particular segment of discourse (cf. "arrangement") is externally related to other units (e.g. background paragraph to action paragraph), and it also displays internal unifying features (e.g. sentences relating to a certain topic). Four strands which are especially important in contributing to the thread of cohesion/coherence in a dramatic narrative are these: (a) participant line—the introduction and subsequent reference to members of the cast; (b) event line—the principal actions which carry the plot forward; (c) dialogue line—the string of speeches whereby characters verbally interact with each other; and (d) plot line—the development of a problem (task/test) from an initial state through a progressive build-up of tension to one or more peaks and then to a final resolution. Another vital aspect of the linkage system of a text, one which is incorporated into the previous four, involves the different means for relating new and old information in the account.

Prominence is concerned with the ways in which a narrator indicates that certain items of information are more important than others in the same context.
of occurrence. Some prominence is obligatory in discourse, for example, the
author must normally select a grammatical topic and comment in expressing his
intended meaning. In this study, however, primary attention will be given to
the use of prominence which is more or less optional, that is, the narrator has
a certain freedom of choice as to whether or not he wishes to highlight the
material and how he wants to do it. As the analyst examines a text, he must be
sure to take note of where prominence occurs in the account; exactly what
information is being foregrounded (as opposed to what is left in the
background); and why this is being done, i.e., what is the purpose, or function,
of the special stress. Prominence is of two types: focus relates to content
which is placed in the verbal spotlight; tension relates to particular feelings
and attitudes that are emphasized. Frequently, of course, both focus and
tension are employed together. One other point to keep in mind about prominence
is that it may apply at different linguistic levels within the text: clause,
sentence, paragraph, etc., and so the analyst has to also determine the scope,
or range of effect, of any given instance of foregrounding.

The three considerations of arrangement, connectivity, and prominence in
the study of discourse structure are by no means mutually exclusive. There is
overlapping to varying degrees depending on what part of a text is being
investigated. For example, one must use aspects of cohesion and coherence
(connectivity) to help establish the boundaries for a particular section
(arrangement). Furthermore, several distinct emphatic devices (prominence) may
also appear to mark either the onset or the close of that same unit. Despite
this ambiguity of application, it is still profitable to keep these three
categories of structure distinct when analyzing a text since it enables one to
cover the material more thoroughly and in a more orderly manner than if
everything were simply lumped together. Significant aspects of discourse
structure typically serve several functions in transmitting the message.
Therefore, it is helpful to study them from more than one perspective in order
to shed light on their operation in the communication as a whole.

C. STYLE

The style of a piece of literature is the sum total of linguistic
features—phonological, lexical, and grammatical—which characterize that
particular text in comparison with another. That definition is too inclusive
for our purpose, however, so the focus of concern will be narrowed to take into
account only those verbal devices which serve to distinguish a text for
rhetorical and dramatic communication. That is to say, our main consideration
will be limited to those linguistic forms which perform a special function in
the account. The author selects such items from the verbal resources of his
language in order to transmit his message in the most effective and compelling
way possible. Three functions are particularly important in literary discourse:
(a) the expressive function is the use of language to verbalize the personal
feelings, sentiments, attitudes, and opinions of the author (e.g. "Bless the
Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me, bless his holy name!"—Ps. 103:1,
RSV); (b) the directive function is the use of language to shape and influence
the emotions and behavior of the audience (e.g. "Be pleased, O God, to deliver
me! O Lord, make haste to help me! Let them be put to shame and confusion who
seek my life!"—Ps. 70:1-2); (c) the aesthetic function is the use of language
to draw attention to itself—to the beauty and appropriateness of the form of
the message (e.g. "The Lord is my Shepherd. I shall not want; he makes me to lie
down in green pastures. He leads me beside still waters."—Ps. 23:1-2).
These three functions rarely, if ever, occur in isolation. There is usually a considerable degree of simultaneous realization where one function appears together with another and frequently, too, in conjunction with the informative function, that is, the use of language to convey conceptual content to increase the understanding of the receptor(s). Similarly, the three may also perform a discourse function in the text. That is to say, they are utilized by the author to bring about arrangement, connectivity, and prominence (as discussed above) in the structure of a literary work. Here again, one will find some degree of duplication as certain stylistic forms (e.g. repetition) are employed to carry out several communication functions: and conversely, a particular function (e.g. directive) may be effected by a variety of linguistic forms in the text. These rather complex relations between form and function in communication will be exemplified in the analysis of Genesis 37 in the second and third parts of this paper. Of special interest will be those stylistic features which play a role in defining the structure of the discourse as well as those which animate the tense interaction of participants in this initial segment of the life history of Joseph.

D. METHODOLOGY

This will be presented as a sequence of seven steps which the translator can follow when analyzing a given text of the Old Testament for its structural and stylistic properties. These are merely suggestions which may have to be modified to fit the particular need, experience, capacity, and situation of a translation team.

1. Preparation

Carefully read through the entire section of discourse to be analyzed. First read for content using a modern idiomatic translation such as GNB or NEB. Take note of what the narrative is about, who are the main characters, what are the chief events, where do the high points in the action occur, what topics do the conversations deal with, how do words integrate with deeds in the account, and so forth. Read the text secondly for form. If this cannot be done in the original language of scripture, make use of an interlinear translation and/or a very literal version such as the RSV or NASB. Give special attention to the outstanding verbal characteristics of the text, particularly those which appear to be significant in some way with regard to its structure and/or style. Finally, study the literal version together with an idiomatic translation plus a commentary verse by verse to make sure that the meaning of the text is clearly understood, especially with regard to any and all unfamiliar forms, both lexical and grammatical.

2. Comparison

Make a preliminary examination of the organization of the discourse, that is, where do its main divisions of form and content appear. This can be done by observing where major shifts occur in the text—changes in areas such as: cast (especially the principal actor), sequence of events (different type of action), setting (time or place), type of discourse (action - description - dialogue - narrator digression), speaker (a different participant begins to talk). Compare
your initial findings with the arrangement of paragraph and section units which are presented in other versions and commentaries at hand. Note where both similarities and differences are found: which divisions appear to be more certain than others? Begin to think about possible reasons for the way in which the text as a whole is constructed. The following is a listing of where new paragraphs begin in a selection of versions (Gen. 37):

Table 1: Paragraph Beginnings in Genesis 37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RSV</th>
<th>GNB</th>
<th>NIV</th>
<th>NEB</th>
<th>LB</th>
<th>JB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td>2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>15b</td>
<td>14b</td>
<td>14b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35b</td>
<td></td>
<td>35b</td>
<td>35b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: A version like the NASB is useless for this exercise since it indents at every verse.)

Although the versions differ significantly from one another in their paragraphing, there is general agreement (i.e. four or more correspondences) on nine major divisions in the chapter, occurring at verses: 1, 2b, 3, 5, 12, 21, 25, 31, and 36. Check to see what these points have in common; that is, do one or more shifts of the kind mentioned previously occur in like manner at each of these verses? One should notice, for example, that all these verses, except 25, start off with an explicit change of subject.
After one has undertaken this initial study of the text, it is necessary to have a closer look at its formal features, for these will help to establish the discourse structure with greater clarity and certainty. The analysis of a text may be carried out in stages, following the order of its three principal characteristics: arrangement, connectivity, and prominence. As was pointed out earlier, there may be considerable overlapping during the practical investigation of these factors; the same material will have to be gone over several times. However, the analyst will generally have more consistent and comprehensive results, especially if he is new at this sort of thing, if he limits his examination of the discourse to individual aspects first, rather than trying to describe everything simultaneously.

3. Arrangement

There are a number of diverse techniques commonly employed in Hebrew narrative to distinguish the boundaries of significant units in the discourse. These are summarized below with the numbers in parentheses referring to verses of Genesis 37 where specific features are exemplified (to be discussed in greater detail in part two of this paper). In general, one may conclude that the more formal markers which are found in a given place in the text, the more likely it is that a break in the story occurs there, that is, a major unit either begins or ends at that point.

a. Shifting. There is an explicit change in one or more of the following features, that is, the shift is indicated either grammatically or lexically in the surface structure of the text: verb tense/aspect (3), new principal subject (5), new speaker (21), narrative to dialogue or vice versa (26), onset of descriptive segment (25), different time (23), or place (12). Frequently, too, there is an alteration in the normal pattern of word order in the clause, which for Hebrew is: verb-subject-object; e.g. the subject precedes the verb (3).

b. Bridging. A special word, phrase, or clause is used to mark the transition from one unit to another, in particular, the start of a new episode in the discourse; e.g. "And it was/happened" (23).

c. Repeating. Repetition of form and content may be employed to begin or end a unit. Such repetition may take the form of a synonymous (1) or exact (12) reiteration of lexical items, or it may be a summary of the key thought(s) of a paragraph (35).

d. Patterning. This involves the shaping of the discourse into larger forms which commonly function as rhetorical devices in Hebrew discourse (non-narrative as well). The main types, all of which may also be viewed as instances of structured "repetition", are these: parallelism (5 and 9), bounding (inclusio) in which similar items are positioned at the beginning and ending of a unit (a speech, for example, 19 and 20), and reversal (chiasmus), where the pattern of elements is: A-B-C...C-B-A (10).

e. Spotlighting. Spotlighting, or foregrounding, is the use of a particular rhetorical (i.e. expressive, directive, aesthetic) feature, or combination of features, to focus upon the introduction or conclusion of a given unit of discourse. These special devices may be either grammatical or lexical in nature; e.g. apposition (28), hin-ḥāš 'behold' (29).
f. Previewing. A distinct characteristic of Genesis 37 is the use of a content summary, in greater or lesser detail, to mark the beginning of a new episode (21) or larger segment (2) of the discourse. Such a narrative preview is often followed by a core of dialogue, and then a brief piece of narrative optionally reappears to close out the unit (22).

q. Digressing. Occasionally, the narrator may break off from the story line to make a comment which is relevant to the content or context of action at that point. Such a digression may serve different purposes, but normally the function entails some manner of explanation. Narrator asides may occur anywhere in the discourse; sometimes they appear to conclude a unit (22).

4. Connectivity

Unity is not only essential to the discourse as a whole, it is also necessary for smaller units within the discourse, the paragraph/episode in particular. The criterion of connectivity may, therefore, be used to provide further evidence for the validity of the units which were established under step 3. There are two aspects of connectivity which need to be investigated in a text. These are not mutually exclusive in their operation, for they both frequently involve repetition in some form or other.

a. Cohesion. Look for grammatical devices which serve to tie a given unit together. Sameness of construction indicates continuity—that the same paragraph (or whatever) has not yet been completed. A sudden break in a pattern which has developed most likely signals that a new segment of the discourse is beginning. Thus, the absence of boundary and transitional markers such as those discussed above would suggest that the present unit is to be continued. The following are some prominent grammatical signs of cohesion in a text, Hebrew narrative in particular: conjunctions which closely link one clause or sentence to another (e.g. k‘iy 'because' (3), biterem 'before' (19), k‘a‘aser 'when' (23), waw 'and... ', especially when the following clause does not have a separate subject form (4)); continuation of the same subject (23-25) or object (28); retaining the same tense/aspect/mood of the verb (31-33); and anaphora, that is, back reference to information (persons, objects, events, etc.) which has been mentioned previously in the discourse through the use of proverbs, pronouns, and demonstratives (5).

b. Coherence. Look for semantic features which would indicate that a particular unit is one due to its commonness of content. In certain cases the unit can be summarized under the same topic or theme. Exact or synonymous repetition (also mentioned under "arrangement" above) is the most obvious way of showing continuity of meaning (e.g. 7: sheaf-sheaves). One must be careful, however, to distinguish between repetition which marks the boundaries of two different segments of text (e.g. 5 and 9: dreaming) and repetition which contributes to the connectivity of the same unit (e.g. 5 and 8: hatred). Coherence is also brought about through repeated reference to items which belong to the same or to a related field of meaning (semantic domain). The varied expressions for physical harm in Reuben's entreaty (21-22) clearly focus upon the main point of his words. A similar effect results from a reference to objects, events, and abstracts which tend to occur together when one discusses a particular topic; e.g. mourning in 34-35: tear-clothes, sackcloth-loins, mourn-comfort, go down-Sheol.
5. Prominence

There is a diversity of linguistic devices which may appear in Hebrew narrative to foreground specific aspects of the account with regard to the importance of content (focus) or the intensity of emotions (tension) that are being expressed. The most important of these techniques is direct speech. That is because it is so extensively used and, being a special type of discourse in itself, it can incorporate any of the other features that are available. Direct speech not only dramatizes the historical situation which is being recorded, it also gives the report added credibility—this is how things really happened, for the participants tell about events in their own words. In the analysis of Genesis 37, the instances of dialogue interaction are considered to be a part of the larger discourse segment in which they occur. The conversation of one or more of the story's characters may comprise almost the entirety of a given episode (e.g. 26-27), but it will still be regarded as being enclosed within that unit. In other words, the individual speeches of different participants will not be considered as distinct discourse segments in themselves. Other Hebrew narratives, which present dialogues of longer duration, may require a different analysis and method of subdivision, for instance, a particular speech may itself be segmented into paragraphs (e.g. Genesis 49).

The stylistic forms listed below are also frequently employed for the purposes of foregrounding information/emotion in Hebrew narrative, both within dialogue and without. As will be noted in the structural analysis of Genesis 37, many of the places of prominence occur at key junctures in the overall development of the discourse (part two). The following devices function specifically to dramatize portions of dialogue (part three):
- repetition—lexical (22) and grammatical (19), front-shifting (of subject or object - 16), cognate accusative (object duplicates verb root - 6), rhetorical question (usually to begin or end a speech - 26, 30), infinitive absolute (infinitive duplicates verb root - 10), apposition (10), emphatics (vocative, intensive adverb, interjection, etc. - 16), figurative language (22), attribution (build-up of descriptive modifiers - 23), dejective demonstrative (to indicate a negative attitude - 19), diction (word choice - 21), alliteration/assonance (play on sounds - 30), verbless predication (no verb found in the clause - 33), asyndeton (elimination of sentence initial conjunction - 33). As was pointed out under 3 (e) above, many of these same grammatical and lexical features may also be utilized to highlight a discourse unit boundary. The more of these rhetorical forms which co-occur in the same context, the greater the degree of emphasis and impact that is conveyed.

6. Synthesis

The detailed analyses of steps 3, 4, and 5 must now be combined into a single overview of the entire structure of the text which is being examined. This needs to be done in terms of both the formal units of the discourse and also the dramatic function of these units in the dynamic progression of a narrative plot.

Formal structure

The formal (discourse) structure of a dramatic narrative may consist of the following four units, which are arranged in a hierarchy ranging from the smallest to the largest:
a. Episode. The episode is the basic unit of narrative structure. It normally coincides with the paragraph, the difference being that "paragraph" is a grammatical term (with an emphasis on formal properties), while "episode" is a dramatic term (with an emphasis on narrative properties). The boundaries of an episode are defined according to the criteria listed under steps 3 and 4 above. The body of text that falls between the beginning of a minimal unit of discourse and the point where certain linguistic markers indicate that this same unit ends is considered to be an episode (paragraph). Usually an episode will feature a single major participant as well as a unitary theme, that is, it may be synopsized by a statement which describes how the narrative moves one significant stage forward. An episode is composed of a number of events which are linked to each other by stimulus-response relations (see below) that occur within a single span of time and at one location. The chief character (i.e. of a given episode) is generally involved somehow in all the events that are reported, though he may not necessarily be the primary agent in every case.

b. Scene. A scene is a combination of episodes which occur at a single location, or at several places which are regarded as being part of the same setting. There is thus a clear shift in place, and usually also a definite break in time, at the end of each scene. One principal character may participate in all the major events that are presented, but this is not always the case. Some scenes alter the focus of attention between two or more members of the cast (or a group of individuals which functions as a unit, e.g. Joseph's brothers in the main).

c. Act. An act is a combination of scenes, all of which include the same basic set of characters who participate in a unified sequence of events (i.e. one principal problem is developed). The setting may vary from one scene to the next, but the action is continuous, moving from a situation of conflict through a climax/peak in the action to a final resolution (i.e. a complete dramatic sequence, see below). One act will be distinctly different from another with respect to one or more of these essential narrative properties.

d. Part. If a lengthy story is divided into segments which are larger than "acts" (as Genesis is), then a broader unit of organization is needed. This will be termed a "part". Neither part nor act bears any relation to the present "chapter" divisions of our Bibles, except where their boundaries happen to correspond. There are usually quite significant differences in content between the various parts of a narrative; in Genesis, for example, each part deals with a different "history" and hence quite a different cast of characters.

Dramatic function

There are various ways of designating the dramatic function of the sequence of units which constitute the "plot" of a narrative. The following is one set of terms which may be used to describe the stimulus-response relations which, together with temporal progression, link the events that compose any episode, scene, or act in a given discourse. Not every stage will always be stated explicitly in the text, especially on the episode level.

a. Setting. The setting consists of all introductory material which sets the stage for the events that follow. This background information describes the time, place, participants, and other circumstances relating to the basic conflict which motivates the plot. The setting is usually composed of nonaction
(state) predications (kernel sentences), but nonfocal events may also be reported, especially those which tell about the movements of key members of the cast prior to the main sequence of events.

b. Trigger. The trigger is that event (action, experience, process, or happening) which sets the plot in motion, or, on a smaller scale, constitutes any "spark" which causes a reaction on the part of one or more of the story's central characters. It initiates a conflict from which subsequent events flow in a sequence of stimulus-response patterns until a resolution is reached (see "outcome" below). The trigger may consist of either verbal or non-verbal action (or both), and it may be compound, that is, there may be more than one distinct incident which contributes to a particular problem presented in the plot. Such initial and complicating incidents are best grouped together under a given "trigger". A plot always contains a number of triggers, of greater or lesser generality, which occur on the different levels of structure described earlier. Some, of course, are more significant than others in the development of the narrative as a whole.

c. Response. The response is comprised of those events (physical or psychological) which occur in reaction to or as a result of a particular trigger. Response events usually introduce different agent(s) from those active in trigger events, whether the latter involve a test to be passed, a task to be accomplished, a lack to be supplied, or a struggle to be won. Trigger and response events are often found in an alternating series which builds up to an ultimate response, namely, a "peak" in the narrative action (i.e. point of greatest, most violent, etc., activity) and/or a "climax" in dramatic tension (i.e. the point of highest mental and emotional involvement). Such high points in the plot are frequently marked linguistically in the account; e.g., use of special verb tenses, ideophones, intensifying particles, lack of conjunctives, extreme explicitness, simplified syntax, and so forth.

d. Outcome. A sequence of trigger-response events will normally reach a conclusion of some kind, though this may not always be stated explicitly in the text. The "outcome" is either temporary, that is, it is followed by another trigger event to keep the story going, or it is final and brings the narrative to a close (resolution). The resolution may take the form of an immediate state which results from the response to a given trigger, or it may lead to a series of closing-down actions which bring about a state of inertia where either the original problem no longer exists, or no further action is presently going to be initiated to counteract it. The final outcome may be regarded as being favorable, unfavorable, or neutral to the fortunes, wishes, aspirations, goals, etc., of those personages who were involved in the plot's major conflict. A narrator generally indicates from whose perspective he views the events he is recounting as well as his opinion or evaluation of the outcome, whether positive or negative. In the scriptural record, such personal opinion is usually kept quite subdued.

This set of four dramatic functions may be applied at any level of narrative structure, from the episode right up to the complete discourse. The depth of detail required will be determined by the purpose and scope of the analysis. Only what really helps to illuminate the form and function of the plot is necessary, that is, how the plot is constructed, how its main parts relate to one another, and how it is used to communicate the author's theme.
7. Presentation

The final generic step in the analysis of discourse structure and rhetorical style is to write up and test the results. This may seem to be a rather trivial point, but if it is not made an explicit part of the procedure, it may well be ignored and consequently certain insights that were derived from the investigation may be lost. A write-up is necessary to organize one's findings and to present the outcome of one's study in a way that is clear and coherent. The amount of detail and polishing required will depend on whether the information is intended for personal use only (in which case a great deal of summary and abbreviation is possible) or is intended for wider distribution or even publication (in which case much more background and explanation is needed). In the process of summarizing and interrelating the varied aspects of one's examination of the arrangement, connectivity, and prominence of a text, one may discover that some points were not dealt with adequately (if at all) or that the analysis contains certain errors and inconsistencies of interpretation. Such instances will call for a re-examination of the problem areas, and this exercise can serve to improve the presentation as a whole, particularly with respect to its relevance for translators. The second and third parts of this paper contain a sample write-up of my analysis of the structural and stylistic features of Genesis 37.

Another way to improve a study of this nature is to apply the results in an actual translation situation. The forms needed to organize a message naturally in the receptor language and to foreground the material requiring emphasis in the account will frequently be different from those employed in the original. But the basic function of these forms in the discourse, namely, to mark the transitions, the dramatic shifts, and points of prominence in a story's development ought to correspond (to the degree that this can be determined). In the process of evaluating the SL and RL texts for equivalence of total communicative effect, the initial analysis will be tested and no doubt further refined.5

II. THE DISCOURSE STRUCTURE OF GENESIS 37

Part one of this paper set forth in broad outline a methodology for the analysis of the discourse and stylistic properties of Hebrew dramatic narrative. Parts two and three will apply this methodology to a specific account, namely, the story of how Joseph came to be sold into slavery by his brothers (Genesis 37). First the discourse structure of this chapter will be described, that is, how it is organized into groups of information larger than the sentence. This will take the form of a summary-commentary as we move through the text from beginning to end, isolating the different units along with the various criteria which were used to establish them (following steps 3—"Arrangement" and 4—"Connectivity" of part one). In addition to the overall formal structure of the chapter, a sample of how this relates to the dramatic unfolding of the plot will also be given (i.e. step 6—"Synthesis"). In this connection, a brief comparison will be made to note how the Hebrew discourse and dramatic structure compare with the paragraph and section divisions of several English versions (cf. step 2—"Comparison"). The second major focus of this analysis (in part three) will be upon the stylistic characteristics of the narrative. Here I will discuss in some detail a number of instances where the author utilizes the special effects of his language to rhetorically embellish the account, that is, to heighten the language for expressive, directive, and/or aesthetic purposes.
(cf. step 5—"Prominence"), particularly in direct discourse (dialogue). Where relevant to this exposition, examples from the old Bible (OC) and Old Testament drafts (NC) in Chichewa, a Central Bantu language, will be supplied along with the normal references to GNB and RSV to illustrate the issues under consideration. These structural notes will be arranged according to the lowest level of immediately relevant discourse segment as they occur in the text.

A. INTRODUCTION TO PART TEN OF GENESIS

1. Preview of Part Ten (vs. 1)

This verse is transitional with a reference both forward (cataphoric) and backward (anaphoric). It introduces the major discourse segment that begins at verse 2, and it also marks in explicit fashion the break between this and the last unit by focusing upon the place setting. Repetition and apposition emphasize the contrast between Edom, the geographical location of Esau and his descendants, which is stressed in the previous chapter as well as the immediately preceding verse (36:6, 8, 9, 20, 21, 31, 32, 43), and the land where Jacob lived and moved: "And Jacob lived in the land of the sojourning of his father, in the land of Canaan." The land of Canaan is an important thematic element in the book of Genesis, for it was an integral part of God's promise of blessing to his people (see 12:5; 13:12; 15:7; 16:3; 17:8; 23:2, 19; 31:3; 50:5, 13, 24). Thus, OC: "And Jacob lived in the land..." is better expressed in NC: "But Jacob continued to live in the land..."

2. Title of Part Ten (vs. 2a)

"These (are) the generations of Jacob." This discourse formula functions as a heading which leads off the history of Jacob's family. This is the tenth and last such division (i.e. "part") in Genesis, the ninth being the history of Esau beginning in 36:1 (the others start at 2:4; 5:1; 6:9; 10:1; 11:10, 27; 25:12, 19). GNB smooths over this prominent break (thus ignoring the author's intended segmentation of his book) by incorporating these words into the transitional sentence of verse one. NC does a good job here: "Here is the history of Jacob's family..."

ACT ONE OF PART TEN

Setting

This paragraph introduces the main participants of Act one of Part ten and quickly specifies the problem which initiates the events of this chapter. Joseph, the central character in the action to follow, is made prominent through front-shifting (subject before verb). In Chewa, moving the topic to predicate position achieves the same effect: "There was Joseph who was a lad of seventeen years." The beginning of this background paragraph, which also opens Scene one, is distinguished in three ways: the fronted subject already mentioned, the absence of the connective waw 'and', and use of the perfect tense for the initial verb "was". Poetic parallelism then opposes the main protagonists of the narrative:

"Joseph, a young man of seventeen, was tending the flocks with his brothers; (and)

he was a youth with the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah "the wives of his father "
GNB, typically, reduces the parallel constructions to a single statement, but does nothing to replace the forceful contrast found in the original.

Jacob, the real source of the conflict in the family, is now formally introduced and foregrounded through front-shifting and the use of his divinely-given clan name, Israel (cf. 32:28). The two events which provoked the hatred of Joseph by his brothers are emphasized by being put into the perfect tense (instead of the usual narrative imperfect with waw: he loved (attitude)—he made a long coat (action).

The grammatical spotlight of this paragraph shifts in turn from Joseph, to his father, to his brothers as each becomes the principal subject of the verb sequence. This, plus repeated references to the chief characters—Joseph in opposition to his brothers, with Jacob in the middle—binds this initial unit together. The setting closes with the conflict clearly in focus. The reference to fraternal enmity is made first directly: "and they hated him," and then figuratively: "they were not able to speak to him for peace." The common salutation in Hebrew was "peace (he) to you" (šâlôwm ı:kâ ). Thus, Joseph's brothers hated him so much that they refused even to greet him; cf. NC: "and they wouldn't even give him a moni" (moni = the Chewa equivalent of "hello" or "good day").

Scene One

Episode One (vss. 5-8). This episode initiates the development of the conflict which came to the fore at the end of the setting paragraph. Events now become singular and action-oriented instead of customary/continual and state-oriented as was the case prior to this point (with the exception of "made for him a coat"). In NC this onset of the main event line is indicated by the temporal expression "one day". There is a subject shift at the beginning of verse 5 (brothers to Joseph), and the latter is referred to by name in an independent noun phrase, not merely by the obligatory pronominal prefix to the verb. In verse 5 there is also a good example of a structural device which recurs several times in this chapter to mark the start of a new unit. It constitutes a narrative "preview" which briefly summarizes the content of what is about to be reported in dramatic fashion in the conversation that follows: "And Joseph dreamed a dream, and he told (it) to his brothers, and they increased more to hate him." Then follow the details of Joseph's dream and his brothers' verbal reactions.

A portion of the beginning summary is repeated at the end of the episode (vs. 8), both reiterating the nature of the conflict and also neatly bringing the unit to a close: "And they increased more to hate him because of his dreams..." This device, technically termed "inclusio" or "rhetorical sandwich", is frequently employed in biblical narrative to signal the termination of a larger discourse segment. Its use in conjunction with the narrative preview of vs. 5 quite clearly defines the boundaries of Episode one. Notice that the paragraph initial and final repeated element features a pun on Joseph's name which highlights the worsening relations between him and his brothers: Joseph (yowsēp = "he adds/increases") dreams...his brothers increase (yowsidīuw = "they add/increase") to hate him. Thus, their hatred for Joseph was "yosephed".

Episode Two (vss. 9-11). This series of events parallels those of Episode one. The buildup of tension increases as "(Joseph) dreamed again another dream
and told it to his brothers". These words are similar to those of verse 5. The synonymous (not exact) repetition marks both the onset of a new episode and also a new stage in the development of the narrative's central conflict. This unit concludes with a prose report of the consequence of Joseph's second dream. The contrasting reactions are highlighted by being placed into a grammatical chiasmus (a:b:b:a) construction—Joseph's brothers: jealousy/qānā' = to be dark red with ardor, zeal, envy:: his father (subject front-shift): quiet contemplation ("he kept/preserved the word"). This type of syntactic inversion is often used to signal the end of a narrative unit. In most translations it will be necessary to distinguish explicitly between Jacob's initial and final responses to Joseph's dreams, i.e. sharp rebuke versus calm meditation; e.g. GNB: "But his father kept thinking about the whole matter."

Episode Three (vss. 12-14). This episode brings Scene one to a close by gradually shifting the primary focus of events. Verse 12 acts as a transition by again naming the participants last mentioned in Episode two ("his brothers - his father"), and it also provides the basis for the conversation which follows. Thus, the verse functions as a paragraph-initial narrative preview, though it is not as comprehensive as the one in verse 5. As such it is better left independent rather than being subordinated to verse 13 as in GNB, for subordination makes the sentence (i.e. vss. 12-13) far too long and also allows the redundancy to stand out obtrusively. In the quote introduction, Jacob is referred to as "Israel", again at a time when he initiates an action which shows his partiality to Joseph and in turn arouses the anger of his other sons (cf. vs. 2). As in the previous two episodes, the central conversation is bounded by narrative report. The shift from Scene one to two is emphasized in the final sentence by two references to the new location: "and he sent him from the valley of Hebron, and he came to Shechem." The latter expression thus rounds out the unit by recalling what was already previewed at its beginning—both Joseph and his brothers are now said to be "in Shechem". One might find it difficult, however, to duplicate the symmetry of the discourse structure found in Hebrew, for in many languages a new scene demands an explicit specification of the new setting (time or place). Therefore, in both GNB and NC the final clause is moved to the beginning of the next episode and scene; e.g. NC: "When Joseph arrived in Shechem..."

Scene Two

Episode One (vss. 15-17). This is a minor scene of but one episode which reports Joseph's encounter with an unnamed man. This unknown character initiates events at first. It is he who "finds" Joseph wandering about the countryside. The intensifier hinēh 'look/behold' (which regularly distinguishes new or important information in Hebrew narrative) focuses upon their surprise meeting and also helps to signal the beginning of the new discourse unit. This scene merely serves the function of informing the reader how Joseph arrives on the next scene—the place of confrontation with his brothers. It also provides a dramatic pause in the action as the collision course of the antagonists is temporarily delayed. At the close of this episode, the next scene is anticipated by two narrative devices. The first is the use of an included segment of direct speech: "...for I heard (them) saying, 'Let us go to Dothan'". A change to indirect speech for the embedded quote (as in GNB) may be more natural in English, but it does remove the foregrounding effect of the direct discourse (retaining this presents no problems in Chewa). The final sentence of the episode typically concludes the unit by reporting the
outcome of the conversational core, and it also situates Joseph, who is explicitly named, in the new location of Scene three: "And Joseph...found them in Dothan" (cf. vs. 14b).

Scene Three

Episode One (vss. 18-20). The focal participants of this scene are foregrounded immediately at the beginning of the unit by means of a double chiasmus. A syntactic inversion links this with the previous episode: (17) he found them - (18) they saw him, and a semantic inversion stresses the separation between the two opposing groups—they : him (far) :: he : them (not near). The start of this episode (and scene) is also made to stand out by another narrative preview which summarizes the main thrust of the speech that follows: "and they plotted against him to kill him." This conversation centers upon Joseph and his dreams, a topic which both begins and ends their plot against his life: "Behold, this master of dreams....Let us see what will become of his dreams!"

Episode Two (vss. 21-22). This episode features a new participant in the drama. The spotlight falls upon Reuben (mentioned by name at the beginning) who proposes a plan less drastic than that of his brothers. As usual, a narrative preview leads the unit off: "And Reuben heard (i.e. his brothers' plot) and delivered him from their hands." In this case, the summary preview also acts to reduce the emotive tension which has been building up: Joseph is not going to be murdered by his brothers. After Reuben makes his dramatic appeal, the narrator inserts a comment both to clarify Reuben's motivation in the crisis and also to bring the episode to a close: "(He said this) in order to deliver him from their hands, to return him to his father." The underlined words repeat a portion of the narrative preview found in verse 21 (i.e. inclusio). Note that the words in parentheses constitute an ellipsis which must normally be filled out in translation (e.g. NC: "He said this with the intention of...") so that the reader does not mistakenly interpret them as the last part of Reuben's speech (as in OC). The highly figurative lexical coherence of this episode will be discussed in part three.

There is one problematic element in the structure of this discourse segment, and that is the repetition of the quote introduction formula, "and he said", at the start of verse 22. Normally, in Hebrew discourse, a person's words are interrupted only by another speaker (when the formula is repeated), or by a report of some action relating to the immediate narrative situation, or by a parenthetical remark by the author. None of these cases apply here, so in this instance the repetition appears to be serving as an emphatic device to focus attention both upon the speaker (Reuben, who is again explicitly named) and his speech of intercession on behalf of his younger brother. A literal translation of this feature (e.g. OC) will not work in many languages, for it will sound as if there are two Reubens on the scene! The best solution, in this case, is to eliminate the second speech introduction (e.g. NC), for this renders the repetition of Reuben's plea with greater impact as intended.

Episode Three (Event Peak) (vss. 23-24). This episode leads off with the stereotypical transitional phrase way:hiv 'and it was/happened' accompanied by a juxtaposition of the central characters in the initial dependent clause: "when Joseph came to his brothers." A semantic (not syntactic) reversal also marks the opening of this unit. That is, Joseph (named) moves from subject to object of the verb: Joseph (came) to his brothers—they (stripped) Joseph. The
concentrated series of actions narrated here indicates that this is the "peak" of the event line (to be distinguished from the emotive peak, or "climax", which occurs later). The swiftly moving, closely connected sequence of events may be duplicated in Chewa by employing shortened verb forms, i.e. all having the "consecutive/sequential" prefix na-. This is the first paragraph since the Setting which contains no piece of dialogue. The dramatic set of events is interrupted twice by prominent descriptive portions which foreground two important "props" on the scene: "his long coat, the long, decorated coat which (was) on him", and "the pit (was) empty, there was no water in it". Hebrew narrative is not characterized by an abundance of attribution; thus, when it occurs, it is significant. The emphatic (i.e. through synonymous repetition) portrayal of the pit concludes this episode.

Episode Four (vss. 25-27). The commencement of this unit features a sharp contrast in narrative imagery. Though there was probably a gap in time between Episodes three and four, the author simply juxtaposes two very different personal situations. While Joseph languishes in an empty cistern, without a drop of water to drink, his callous brothers "sat down" (i.e. made preparations) to enjoy a meal (literally, "to eat bread"). Three expressions related to the sense of sight, i.e. "and they lifted up their eyes and they saw and behold (hin'éh emphatic), forcefully spotlight a scene which stimulates the conversation that follows. Thus, the complete description of the richly-laden Midianite camel train as seen from the wondering shepherds' eyes has a function which is similar to that of the narrative "preview" noted at the beginning of earlier units. After Judah's speech, which forms the nucleus of this episode, the segment is terminated in regular fashion with a concise report of the effect of his words: "and his brothers listened." This simple statement also foreshadows the main events of the next discourse unit.

Episode Five (vs. 28). New participants, the Midianites, already previewed in the preceding episode, now arrive on the scene. This boundary should be kept distinct and not glossed over as in GNB: "...and when some Midianite traders came by..." (which makes for too long a sentence in any case). This rather short unit is tied together semantically through reentered references to the central character. Joseph, though he does not function as agent in any of the events that are reported (rather, he is a "patient" throughout), is nevertheless specifically named each time he is referred to. The third instance, i.e. "and they took Joseph to Egypt", closes the episode and anticipates the final verse of chapter 37. Here is another case where the "preview" technique acts as a kind of "safety valve" to diminish dramatic tension. In other words, the level of suspense is lowered as the readers learn that the story of Joseph is very likely going to continue.

Episode Six (Emotive Climax - 1) (vss. 29-30). Reuben returns to the stage to feature as the principal participant of yet another episode. In this way, the narrator definitely portrays him in a positive light, to be clearly distinguished from and absolved of the wicked actions of his brothers. A feeling of guilt that he, as eldest in the clan, would be held responsible for what had happened to Joseph is reflected strikingly in his words of bitter complaint (to be discussed individually in part three). This then functions as a minor emotive climax which prefigures the greater one involving Jacob in the following episode. A poignant rhetorical question closes out this unit as well as Scene three: "And I, where shall I go?" With an even deeper sense of loss, Jacob answers that question at the end of his expression of grief: "I will go
down to my son mourning to Sheol!" The emotive pitch and tone of these two climactic episodes are thus artistically linked along a structural dimension.

Scene Four

Episode One (Emotive Climax - 2) (vss. 31-33). No verbal reply is given to Reuben's words which conclude the previous scene. Instead, the brothers respond in action as they work swiftly to remove any possible blame from themselves. They are not mentioned explicitly as primary agents here because all attention is focused upon Joseph's coat. Repeated references to this coat (five times with a noun and several more by pronoun) strongly emphasize this symbol of both Jacob's love as well as the brother's hatred for Joseph. The overt repetition also lends coherence to the unit, which constitutes the emotive climax of this act. The initial clause: "And they took Joseph's long coat", is not redundant, as most modern versions would have us believe by deleting it from the account. Perhaps this is done in the interests of readability and English style (though "then they seized the coat" would not sound out of place), but it does reduce the intensity of focus which is present in the original. Even if the clause is assumed to be devoid of cognitive content, it nevertheless functions as a tonic introducer from this important narrative segment.

Verse 31 and 32a are transitional as they recount the activity leading up to the shift in locale (presumably back to the same place as in Scene one) and also the conversation which constitutes the heart of the episode. There is a certain amount of redundancy as events prepare for that climactic dialogue: "And they sent the long coat, the one reaching to the feet, and they took it to their father." The modifier referring to length (ḥāp̂as-līyiym) was introduced when Jacob first presented the coat to Joseph (vs. 3); now the word reappears as the coat is being returned to Jacob, signifying, it would seem, the complete reversal of fortunes which Joseph had experienced. All prominent characters are now "on stage" together, so to speak (Joseph being represented by his coat), as the conflict between Joseph and his brothers reaches its conclusion, at least for the time being. The coat is also prominent in the conversation which revolves around Jacob's recognition of the garment and his grief-stricken conclusion: "An evil beast has eaten him—Joseph has surely been torn to pieces!" This highly expressive, as well as poetic, exclamation (to be considered further in part three) brings the episode to a dramatic finish.

Episode Two (Resolution) (vss. 34-35). This unit begins with an explicit mention of subject, Jacob, the person whose "history" is being recounted. The central conflict has peaked and now the author concludes Act one of the narrative by describing its harsh effects upon the patriarch, Jacob. Events move from specific ("tore his clothes", "put on sackcloth") to general ("he mourned", "he refused to be comforted") as the time-line becomes less concentrated and precise after the climax. Great love and great hatred were the cause of the quarrel, as indicated in the Setting, and apparently hatred has won out in the end, resulting in unconsolable grief. The last utterance of direct speech brings out the negative note on which the scene concludes. This is followed by a short terminal statement which summarizes the content of this episode: "and he went for him, his father." A final grammatical spotlight (i.e. subject back shift) touches upon Jacob once more as we leave this act and also stresses his relationship to the focal participant of this part of the story—his son, Joseph.
C. Preview of Act Three (vs. 36)

The last verse of chapter 37 is transitional, not to the next act in the "history" of Jacob (i.e. ch. 38), but to Act three (ch. 39), where the Joseph narrative resumes in Egypt. The start of this discourse "close out" (ch. 37) or "preview" (ch. 39), for it performs the two functions simultaneously, is signalled by a front shift of the subject, namely, the Midianites. At this stage in the Genesis record, Joseph is removed from focus (he is not mentioned by name again after the emphatic occurrence in verse 33) since he does not appear at all in Act two of Part ten. However, at the beginning of chapter 39, Joseph is once more foregrounded (by subject front shift) when the account of his fortunes is taken up again. Notice too that the narrative bridge, verse 36, refers to all the participants who are present on stage, as it were, at the start of Act three. It is, therefore, important to overtly signal in translation the discourse break that is found at the end of verse 35; e.g. GNB: "Meanwhile in Egypt the Midianites..."; NC: "Around that time was when the Midianites sold..."

A diagram of the discourse structure of Genesis 37 is indicated on the left side of Table 2. On comparing this with the listing of paragraph beginnings in Table 1 (part one), we quickly see that no version corresponds very closely with the results derived from a discourse analysis of the text. NIV has the highest number of correspondences, but it also posit the most paragraph units of any version (i.e. 25—versus the lowest, NEB, with 6). On more careful examination, however, one finds that many of the divergences of NIV, or GNB, from Table 2 are due to the fact that these versions tend to begin a new section whenever a different character starts to speak. In some cases, of course, the paragraphing reflects a difference of interpretation with regard to the discourse structure. Of the versions which mark section headings, NIV, JB, and GNB all agree on placing subtitles at verses one and twelve. In fact, these were the only verses where all six translations agreed that there should be a discourse unit boundary. While the grouping of information in languages is an individual matter, in instances where options do occur, it would be a good policy for a RL translation to follow the formal arrangement of the SL message (once this has been determined). If reference to the SL is not possible, the team will have to develop a consistent procedure for handling the paragraphing of a text; e.g. pick the majority reading of 5-7 selected versions or commentaries, except where such a practice would violate some rule of RL discourse organization.

D. The Dramatic Progression of Events

The right side of Table 2 outlines the dramatic movement of the "plot" of Act one (chapter 37) of Part ten of the book of Genesis. This plot was discussed earlier quite generally in terms of conflict, peak, climax, and resolution. But a plot can also be analyzed more specifically in terms of the stimulus-response relations that characterize its constituent events (S = setting, T = trigger, R = response, O = outcome). There are several things which one should bear in mind when examining this aspect of the diagram. These points may be summarized by the terms: hierarchy, embedding, inversion, and inconquerness.

The various dramatic functions, S-T-R-O, may first of all be viewed hierarchically as operating at different levels of narrative organization. The minimum level (i.e. greatest specification) is given at the extreme right of the
Table 2: The Discourse and Dramatic Structure of Genesis 37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SETTING</th>
<th></th>
<th>TRIGGER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Preview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Setting</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Episode One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Episode Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Episode Three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Episode One</td>
<td>SCENE TWO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Episode One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Episode Two</td>
<td>ACT ONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Episode Three</td>
<td>Event Peak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Episode Four</td>
<td>Scene THREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Episode Five</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Episode Six</td>
<td>Emotive Climax₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Episode One</td>
<td>Emotive Climax₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Episode Two</td>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Preview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T' = R - {20, 21, 22, 23a, 23b, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36}
table where the functions average out to one per verse, with some verses manifesting several functions in juxtaposition. The highest level of application consists simply of one set of relations which encompasses the whole chapter: S = 1-2 (focus on Jacob), T = 3-17 (Joseph), R = 18-32 (brothers), O = 33-36 (Jacob). More levels could probably be posited between these two extremes (for example, vs. 8b is the (0) for an episode, vs. 11 for a scene, and vss. 35-36 for the entire act), but it did not seem profitable, from a translational point of view, to go into that much detail. Two strata, top (chapter) and bottom (verse), were sufficient.

Embedding is found when more than one S-T-R-O is realized simultaneously, i.e. the plot is "complex" and composed of several threads. This is not a common feature of Biblical narrative, but occasionally it does occur. Verses 18-20 (the brothers plot to kill Joseph), for instance, are on the one hand a response (R) to Joseph's arrival on the scene (Trigger = vss. 15-17). But these verses also act as a stimulus (T') which brings forth Reuben's reaction (R'—vss. 21-22), namely, the suggestion that Joseph be thrown into an empty water cistern. The outcome (O') of this little complication in the plot appears later in vss. 29-30 when Reuben discovers the empty pit, which means that he has failed in his attempt to save Joseph.

Normally, the basic sequence of S-T-R-O is observed in narrative. But sometimes an inversion takes place, particularly when the events are being recounted with a minimum of detail. We have an instance of this in verse 4, where the first part of the verse reports the Outcome of the series, namely, the hatred of the brothers (T = Jacob's love for Joseph), while the last part of the verse tells of the Response, i.e. Joseph's brothers "would not speak to him in a friendly manner" (GNB). There is a slight complication in this interpretation, however, for though it is probably true that the brothers' unfriendly reaction occurred in immediate response to Jacob's act of love for Joseph, yet the text clearly indicates that this type of behavior did not end there. Rather, it became part of their whole attitude against Joseph and a continual manifestation of their hatred for him. The situation then, could also be viewed as part of the Outcome of this episode. In this case, we have an instance of "convergence" where the same event(s) realize more than one dramatic function.

The last feature to observe when looking at the diagram as a whole is that the S-T-R-O sequences do not always correspond neatly with the formal structures defined on the left (episode, scene, etc.). For example, the general Response of Joseph's brothers, at the highest level of organization, ends at verse 32, but this is in the middle of an episode (one) at the beginning of a scene (four). Nevertheless, the overall correspondence is obvious, that is, T = Scenes one and two, R = Scene three, and O = Scene four. Furthermore, the majority of episode boundaries coincide with those of a functional unit and a number of exact correspondences do appear; e.g. Episodes one (vss. 18-20) and two (21-22) of Scene three = T' (18-20) and R' (21-22). Other episodes encompass a number of T-R functions, but the initial and final boundaries match; e.g. Episode two of Scene one (vss. 9-11) = T (9), R (10), and O (11).

What, then, is the value of making this type of study of the dramatic structure of a larger discourse unit? First and foremost, this method of analysis helps one to better understand the content, the organization, and the rhetorical dynamics of that unit, and more understanding generally makes for a
better translation, i.e. one that is both more accurate in terms of the information conveyed and more idiomatic in terms of the language used. To be sure, translators will not likely have the time to do a complete analysis of their material in this degree of detail. But once they understand the basic principles of how narrative discourse is organized dramatically, they can carry out an analysis along these lines almost automatically as they work on the formal structure of a text. Form must always be related to function both in analyzing the original message and in transmitting this in the receptor language.

The various sets of S-T-R-O relations are also useful in specifying the theme of a given discourse unit, on whatever level of structure this is desired. A summary of the content enclosed by the Trigger, Response, and particularly the Outcome functions may be combined to formulate a thematic statement. For Act one (Genesis 37) the narrative theme would be something like this: "The actions of Jacob and his son Joseph provoke the hatred of Joseph's brothers, so one day they capture him and sell him into slavery, thereby causing great grief to their father." Now this may at first seem to be a rather trivial exercise, but it can be used as one of the ways of testing a translation. If in the process of evaluating the receptors' level of comprehension after listening to (or reading) a given unit of the translation, it becomes apparent that they have trouble in expressing what the unit is all about, then this may be a clue that there is something wrong with how the discourse aspects of the text have been handled, i.e. the arrangement, connectivity, and prominence of the message. Further questioning along these same lines with respect to smaller divisions of the problematic unit, will help to pinpoint where the difficulty lies. These areas can then be investigated in greater detail to determine the possible higher-level linguistic barriers to the listener/reader's understanding of content.

E. The Structure of Speech Acts

The preceding analysis has shown how narrative discourse is structured into units having both form and function. It is important to recognize that dialogue, which constitutes such a large portion of Hebrew narrative, is similarly structured. The utterances of dialogue may be formally classified according to the three familiar categories of statement, question, and imperative. Any one of the three may also appear as an exclamation with the addition of certain emotive (feeling) and emphatic (forceful) elements; e.g. intonation, pause, stress, volume, intensifiers, repetition, etc. These forms may function in a variety of ways depending on the purpose of the utterance, or speech act (e.g. to inform, warn, order, rebuke, encourage, plead, beg, etc.) or its intended result (e.g. to evoke fear, certainty, understanding, joy, doubt, agreement, etc., within the listener/reader). Conversation in narrative, which consists of a sequence of speech acts usually alternating among the different characters, may, therefore, be usefully analyzed in terms of the continually varying intentions (sometimes called "illocutions") and attitudes of the speakers involved. The following is a simple example of such an analysis, carried out on verses 19-22 and 26-27 of Genesis 37. The results are presented in summary form in Table 3 (S = statement, I = imperative, Q = question).

These three speech "events" (i.e. a connected chain of speech acts) form the core of the development of the narrative conflict in Scene three. They verbalize the negative response of Joseph's brothers to his, and his father's, behavior and attitude (i.e. Trigger). We move from an expression of the
Table 3: The Sequence of Speech Acts in Genesis 37:19-22, 26-27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Speech Act (RSV)</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Here comes this dreamer.</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>incitement: call attention to referent, arouse hatred of hearers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20a</td>
<td>Come now, let us kill him and throw him into one of the pits;</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>proposal: suggest and support a course of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20b</td>
<td>then we shall say that a wild beast has devoured him,</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>support: offer a likely excuse to strengthen the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20c</td>
<td>and we shall see what will become of his dreams.</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>reason: express satisfaction over anticipated revenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21b</td>
<td>Let us not take his life.</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>opposition: oppose initial proposal, appeal to stop intended action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22a</td>
<td>Shed no blood;</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>reiteration: strengthen appeal through prohibition, reason implied (bloodshed a moral taboo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22b</td>
<td>cast him into this pit here in the wilderness,</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>counter-proposal: offer an alternative plan (deception intended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22c</td>
<td>but lay no hand upon him.</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>reiteration: repeat the initial prohibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>What profit is it if we slay our brother and conceal his blood?</td>
<td>(Q)</td>
<td>opposition: oppose second proposal, appeal to stop killing in any form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27a</td>
<td>Come, let us sell him to the Ishmaelites,</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>counter-proposal: offer an alternative plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27b</td>
<td>and let not our hand be upon him,</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>reiteration: repeat prohibition implied in 26 and stated explicitly by Reuben in 22c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27c</td>
<td>for he is our brother, our own flesh.</td>
<td>(S)</td>
<td>reason: make explicit the reason hinted at be Reuben in 21b and 22a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
majority opinion by a deliberately unnamed speaker (who obviously voices the sentiments of the group) to the lone dissenting vote of Reuben, to a further qualification in the plan by Judah. The latter two speakers are gradually able to modify the harsh intentions of their brothers from cold-blooded murder to a slightly more humane way of getting rid of Joseph.

Each speech event (SE) is of roughly the same length in terms of number of words, and each consists of four basic speech acts encompassing two verses of text. All twelve speech acts have Joseph as their principal topic. There are some other, more significant parallels and contrasts among them. The first two, as noted earlier, are introduced by a narrative "preview" which summarizes the intention of the SE as a whole: "They conspired against him to kill him" and "he (Reuben) delivered him out of their hands". Judah's speech is prefaced by a description of the Midianite caravan, which suggests the topic for what he is going to say. The effect (prelocution) of the three speech events is handled differently in each case: SE-1 results in another speech (i.e. Reuben's); SE-2 is answered by action (vss. 23-24); and SE-3 is followed by a narrator report of the outcome ("And his brothers heeded him"). The speech forms employed by the speakers correspond well with their respective motives and feeling. SE-1 reflects the cruel and calculating nature of the brothers' plot to murder Joseph in three of the speech acts are encoded as direct statements. This contrasts sharply with the highly emotional arguments of Reuben and Judah as they endeavor to rescue Joseph from this fate. Reuben's impassioned intervention is especially strong since all four speech acts are expressed in some type of imperative form. Judah appeals more to the reason and sensibilities of his brothers, and the form of his utterances correspond with his more varied strategy in presenting his case: Q-I-I-S. Notice that the primary intentions of the speech acts in SE-2 and SE-3 are very similar, although the order of presentation is slightly different. In each instance we have these four functional elements: opposition - reason - counter-proposal - and a reiteration to reinforce the position taken. Judah cleverly bases his case upon that already broached by Reuben.

The value of speech act analysis to the translator should be obvious. It is his job to transmit the dynamics of dialogue in the original through the use of forms that produce an equivalent effect in his language. He has to keep in mind that any one of the three basic speech forms: S, Q, and I may perform a number of different functions in the discourse; e.g. the diverse intentions of (I) in Reuben's speech. On the other hand, different speech forms may be used for a similar purpose in conversation; e.g. opposition: (I) - 21b and (Q) - 26. The latter also illustrates the need for care in analyzing this form-function relationship. A given SL form will not always (or even usually) perform its expected function according to usage in the RL. The question form in 26, for example, is not employed to elicit information from the addressee. Rather, it expresses opposition to the brother's plan, more politely phrased perhaps than an imperative would be. The question is rhetorical, and the answer should be obvious, i.e. "We don't gain a thing by killing our brother...." The translator must, therefore, carefully investigate dialogue as an integral part of his analysis of the discourse structure of narrative. He should seek, first of all, to specify the different functions of the sequence of speech acts in relation to their forms and plot out how these pattern in the overall organization of the text. He must then search for dynamic equivalents in his language so that both the impact as well as the intention of these conversations of scripture may be reproduced as closely as possible with respect to both form and function.
In the third and final part of this study, we will take a closer look at some of the rhetorical aspects of style in the dialogues of Hebrew narrative.

III. RHETORIC AND STYLE IN HEBREW NARRATIVE DIALOGUE

Part two of the present study of Hebrew narrative discussed the relation between certain formal features of a text (Genesis 37) and its larger discourse structures. In this section I will describe how a number of linguistic forms characteristic of Hebrew literary style are employed to heighten the rhetorical properties of dialogue, which is itself a prominent rhetorical device in narrative. By "rhetorical" I mean features which an author skillfully selects and manipulates in order to increase the impact of a text upon the reader/hearer and thereby facilitate the communication of his message. Rhetorical elements are those which generally speaking perform an expressive (source-oriented), directive (receptor-oriented), and/or aesthetic (text-oriented) function in the discourse. It will not be possible to examine all the stylistic attributes to be found in the direct speeches of Genesis 37. I will, rather, focus my attention upon those instances where rhetorical forms occur in particular concentration to foreground a crucial area in the development of the plot of Act one of Part nine of the book. Indeed, special formal effects also appear in the pure narrative portions which frame the sequence of conversations that link the various participants. But I have chosen to limit the discussion to dialogue since the narrator's rhetoric is especially intense in these sections, and hence they present more of a challenge to translators who wish to achieve genuine dynamic equivalence of the original message in their language. The following examples of dramatic character speech are considered in order: Joseph's account of his first dream (vss. 6-7); his brothers' hostile reaction (8); the brothers' plot to murder Joseph (19-20); Reuben's intercession on behalf of his brother (21-22); Judah's suggestion to sell Joseph (26-27); Reuben's grief at Joseph's disappearance (29-30); the brothers present the coat to Jacob (32); Jacob's mourning for Joseph (33, 35).

1. Joseph's Dream (vss. 6-7)

Joseph prefaced the report of his dream with an emphatic introduction. No English version translates the post-verbal particle nā'ī, which is regularly used to intensify a demand, warning, or entreaty. Here, it adds urgency to Joseph's call for his brothers' attention, i.e. "Just listen to this..." In Chewa it is possible to duplicate this intensifier as well as the following cognate object construction quite naturally: Tαmvαnι tsono maloto omwe ndalota! 'Listen now (emphatic imperative) to the dream which I have dreamed!' This same construction is found in the narrative "preview" of verse 5, and its repetition now serves to foreground the topic of Joseph's discourse. Although the cognate object is relatively common in Hebrew, it is not the only way in which the concept could be expressed. There are, for example, instances in the Bible where a person merely "dreams" and does not "dream a dream" (e.g. Gen. 28:12). It is also possible that Joseph could have said, "Listen to my dream (x̂alwnm)". The point is that much context-oriented lexico-statistics need to be done before analysts will be in a position to determine the uniqueness and significance of individual vocabulary selections such as this.

Joseph reports the content of his dream in a style of narration that matches his excitement over what he supposes to be its import. The three segments of his dramatic account are each punctuated by the initial intensifier
hin·ēh 'look!' There is a pertinent comment in the Brown-Driver-Briggs (BDB) lexicon concerning the function of hin·ēh in contexts such as this:

"(It is found) very frequently in historical style, especially, but not exclusively, after verbs of seeing or discovering, making the narrative graphic and vivid, and enabling the reader to enter into the surprise or satisfaction of the speaker or actor concerned." (p. 244)

There are several other linguistic devices, both lexical and syntactic, which increase the vividness of the three parts of Joseph's report. First, there is the participial construction that follows the initial hin·ēh: "Behold, we (are) binding sheaves", or, in a more dynamic style: "Look, here we are, binding sheaves in the field..." hin·ēh is regularly accompanied by the participle, but the contrast with ordinary narration is nevertheless significant. The supernatural event itself is high-lighted by synonymous repetition coupled with an emphatic qām, a multi-purpose particle which is employed to intensify ideas, to show contrast, to mark a climax, to introduce a contradiction, and so on: "and behold, my sheaf arose and it even stood up" (or: "it also remained standing"). The action being depicted is thus made to contrast more sharply with the "bowing down/prostration" of the brothers' sheaves. The co-occurrence of hin·ēh (the third instance) with an imperfect verb (i.e. "surround") transforms the latter into a type of historical present. In other words, the act is viewed as being not yet concluded, with definite implications for the present situation of this speech event, that is, Joseph telling this story to his eleven brothers ringed about him.

A final point of interest lies in the structural organization of Joseph's narration of his dream. It easily divides into four parts: the introductory appeal: "Listen...", followed by three segments each beginning with "And behold..." The first three lines are of roughly the same length (11, 12, 11 syllables respectively), and the last is slightly longer (16 syllables)—for a reason. The regularity of lines one to three develop a rhythmic pattern along with the expectation that this pattern will be continued. When it is broken in the fourth line, the effect is to bring special focus to bear on the point of disruption, namely, the final word: "to my sheaf." The word "sheaf" is in fact emphasized by repetition throughout the recital; it is the only noun that occurs, except for one instance of "field".

None of the English versions consulted do very much about enlivening Joseph's poetic account of his dream. The fact that the original employs distinctive syntactic formations instead of the typical wāw-consecutive narrative construction would call for something similar to be done in the RL if possible. In Chewa, for example, this would be a very appropriate place for ideophonic predication to dramatize the telling. This was attempted, at least in the old Bible (OC), but surprisingly not in initial drafts of the new. A revision reads like this:

"Listen now to the dream which I have dreamed:
In truth, we were all together in the field tying up sheaves of wheat. While we are doing that, indeed, my sheaf went CIRIRI! standing upright. And right away your sheaves encircled it ZINGU! kneeling down GWADEE! to that sheaf of mine!"
2. The Brothers' Response (vs. 8)

The brothers' verbalize their hostility to Joseph in a disarming reply which, nevertheless, borders on the poetic. This is another example of emphatic parallelism (cf. vs. 2), here composed of a pair of rhetorical questions, each initiated by an intensive "infinitive absolute". Of the latter construction, the Gesenius-Kautzsch (GK) grammar observes: "The infinitive absolute is used to strengthen a question, and especially in impassioned or indignant questions" (p. 343), which certainly fits the situation at this juncture:

"Reigning, shall you indeed reign over us?!
Ruling, shall you indeed rule over us?!

This parallelism of meaning and syntax is complemented by both rhythm (each line is seven syllables) and rhyme (both internal and external):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hamalok} & : \text{tim:lok} : \text{calenwu}, \\
\text{im-masow} : \text{tim:sol} & : \text{banuw}.
\end{align*}
\]

GNB drops the repetition (and the poetry of these words) and concentrates on conveying their sarcastic intent (illocutionary force): "Do you think that..." (cf. Living Bible: "So you want to be our king, do you?"). The Chewe (NC) draft retains both rhetorical questions, since these are quite common in the language, and utilizes exclamations to bring out the brothers' scornful opinion of Joseph (in OC the questions are not clearly marked as rhetorical and thus they may well be understood by the average reader as real):

"Rubbish (oogwe)! so you think you are going to become our king, do you?!
\text{Hha!} (= derision) are you the one who will rule over us?!

3. The Murder Plot (vss. 19-20)

"And they said (each) man to his brother"—the Hebrew idiom for reciprocity here indicates that the brothers were in their thinking, namely, in their low opinion of Joseph; cf. GNB: "They said to one another." The object of all their plotting and discussion is foregrounded in four distinct ways: (a) hineth 'look!' is used literally here in reference to vision as well as a speech emphaser (of the following word in particular); (b) bacakal hax:alomowt; literally, "the lord/master/owner of dreams", frequently, as in this instance, a noun of relation, i.e. bacakal suggests that the person to whom it refers has the nature or characteristic of the noun which follows it, here also pejorative; (c) this noun complex (i.e. b) appears in clause-initial position with the verb, a participle, occurring last; and (d) the same noun phrase is modified by an emphatic demonstrative, halazeh, which in this case indicates derision—putting it all together: "Look, here comes (that) Mr. Dreamer!" The Chewe equivalent also has four devices that combine to express the jealousy and hatred conveyed by these words: Suuyo (demonstrative focus) kamaloto (pejorative appellation) uja akudza anovo? (demonstrative of disparagement + rhetorical question) "Say, Isn't that fellow 'little-dreams' coming over there?!" In OC the appellation mwini-maloto "the owner of dreams" is a perfect formal equivalent of the original, but it has a positive connotation, i.e. "one who dispenses dreams".

The need for immediate action is stressed: "And now come!" The temporal adverb catan when coupled with an imperative acts as an encouragement, suggesting "that the time has come for the exhortation or advice to be followed"
(BDB, p. 774); i.e. "C'mon, here's our chance!" This adverb is also employed in a discourse context to mark the onset of a key point in one's speech. The wicked plan and its purpose are enunciated with decided quickness and conciseness. The various stages of thought, word, and deed are expressed by a string of cohortatives (first-person imperatives): "Let's kill him...let's throw him...let's say...let's see..." The object of saving is, of course, a direct quote, while the object of seeing is an indirect quotation. Most versions omit the modifier of "wild beast" (xay-āh), which is "bad, fierce, vicious" (rā'cāh). However, the attribution (with assonance) here might not be redundant at all; rather, it may suggest a subtly sarcastic tone in the brothers' pre-programmed report of the "accident" to their father: xay-āh rā'cāh 'akālāt:huw 'A wicked wild beast has wrested him down!' "Beast" is also front-shifted for emphasis while "him" (huw) is similarly stressed by its position at the end of the clause and its discordant long vowel. The same is true if rā'cāh is intended as hyperbolic: "A ferocious beast..." (cf. Chewa: ciromo colusa). The brothers can hardly wait to prove Joseph wrong permanently—to see "what his dreams will be", or GNB: "what becomes of his dreams." The latter is a rather difficult idiom to translate; cf. NC: "We shall see whether his dreams profit anything!", literally, "...if his dreams will remove something (i.e. cooked food) from the fire", with a negative implication.

4. Reuben's Intercession (vss. 21-22)

These two verses are a good illustration of the distinctive narrative technique which we might term "preview and report" (also 5ff., 18ff.). First there is a short statement which provides a résumé of the substance, purpose, and/or result of the following speech event. This is then dramatized and expanded in a report of the actual words (direct discourse) which were spoken during the conversation (at least the most important quotes). The transition from preview to report is normally marked by the Hebrew oral equivalent of quotation marks: wāy.'mer 'and he said'. "And Reuben delivered him from their hands"—that is the preview, not "tried to save" (GNB), for in view of the outcome, Reuben's plea does save Joseph from being murdered on the spot. The synecdoche "from their hands" (i.e. from them) is significant because it sets Reuben in opposition to the will of his brothers and indicates that the opinion among them was divided (cf. also vs. 26).

Reuben puts his position in the strongest terms possible: "We dare not strike him with respect to his soul/life." Under no circumstances (lo' = negative of permanent prohibition) could they (Reuben includes himself here) extinguish one's nepēs—the animating force of a person's existence and all his mental and spiritual faculties. The extremely tense and volatile interpersonal situation in which this word is used (the outcome of the debate is either life or death for Joseph) would argue for its being interpreted in a specific rather than a general sense here (e.g. "person"). The English versions all pale in comparison with the vigor of the Hebrew idiom (cf. GNB: "Let's not kill him").

"And Reuben said to them"—this is not mere tautology. After boldly stating his opinion, Reuben "goes on to say..." (with a focus upon what follows). He repeats his prohibition for emphasis and offers some advice in the form of an alternative plan. "Do not shed blood"—Reuben now speaks to the concern of the moment ('al = negative of immediate prohibition) as he levels his command directly at his brothers. dām 'blood' was the source of man's physical life; more than that, it was also linked with the life principle, for as the
Hebrews viewed human existence, "the life...is in the blood" (נֵפְּשׁ b·אָדָם הִוּ—Lev. 17:11). Therefore, to "shed blood" would surely bring down upon them the judgment of God (cf. Gen. 4:10-11, 9:5-6). This calculated allusion (also an effective literary device) to divine retribution clearly had the desired effect upon the brothers. The power of Reuben's rhetoric helped prevent fratricide—to what extent can its force be felt in translation!

Stage two in Reuben's entreaty (marked by the absence of a wāw-connector) was to propose a different approach. The plan that he outlined was so simple: "Throw him into this pit which (is) in the wilderness." The descriptive attribution (in italics) is added to strengthen the argument. The implication is that surely no one would find Joseph's body (and figure out what had happened to him) in the uninhabited region where they were presently located. "But a hand (front-shift), do not stretch it out against him!" This is the third prohibition of Reuben's appeal, and it brings his case to a close (signalised by a grammatical chiasmus with the previous utterance—V : O :: O : V). This low-keyed euphemism (i.e. "don't hurt him!") contrasts with the graphic detail of the previous pair of negative exhortations. Note that Reuben could have chosen other words for "kill" in his speech; cf. mūwt 'put to death' (vs. 18) and hārāq 'murder' (vs. 20). But he employs all the eloquence at his command so that his words can effect his implicit intention, namely, to rescue Joseph. The impact is reduced considerably, however, when the figures are removed and the repetition excised; e.g. GNB: "Let's not kill him...don't hurt him." One wonders whether a literal translation might not be more effective than that; e.g. NC: "No! We must not remove his life!" He went on to say, "Do not spill his blood...do not touch him the least little bit!"

The narrator then abruptly combines his perspective with that of Reuben in an aside in order to clarify the latter's motivation in this matter: "He said this = ellipsis, in order to (1:maCan—emphatic introduction to a purpose clause) deliver him from their hands..." The closing expression (which also works well literally in Chewa) both contrasts with the final prohibition uttered by Reuben (i.e. do not lay a hand on him) and also corresponds with the narrator's prediction, which was voiced at the beginning of the speech (vs. 21). In this way, the author sets the stage for the graphic scene which follows, that is, the narrative event PEAK.

5. Judah's Plan (vss. 26-27)

Judah intervenes to prevent any death at all from occurring. The answer to his initial rhetorical question is obvious: "What will we profit if...?!"—nothing! A literal transfer of the figure "conceal his blood" may produce nonsense; e.g. OC: kufotsera mwazi wace 'to cover up his blood with dirt'. Figurative language must be continually evaluated for equivalence of form and effect in the RL. Perhaps a corresponding metaphor can be found to replace the original; e.g. GNB: "Cover up the murder." The Hebrew expression is quite vivid as Judah makes a head-on attack against the resolve of his brothers. The similarity (lexical resonance) to Reuben's words of vs. 27a should be retained if possible, for their motives definitely coincide.

Judah exhorts his brothers with the interjection: "Let's go!"—1:kuw, which stresses the subsequent cohortative (cf. NC: Tiweni 'C'mon!'). He then repeats the idiomatic prohibition used earlier by Reuben (vs. 22c), but personalizes it: "Our hand (front-shifted for extra force), let it not be upon
him"; cf. NC: "Let's not strike him, no!" (i.e. don't kill him). In support of his suggestion, Judah draws attention to their blood relationship, which he emphasizes through a figurative apposition in which sound reinforces the sense:

'āxiynw b:šārēnuw hw' 'Our brother, our flesh (is) he!'

The pronoun "he" is foregrounded in utterance-final position. English can only partially match the power of the original with this figure: "After all, he is our brother, our own flesh and blood" (GBN, LB). NC strengthens these words by expressing them in the form of a rhetorical question with an emphatic personal pronoun (initial instead of final): "Well as for him, isn't he our brother, our very own body?"

6. Reuben's Discovery (vss. 29-30)

Reuben arrives on the scene of the sale of his brother and makes a shocking discovery: "Look! Joseph is not in the pit!" This is clearly not an instance of pure direct speech, for it lacks the expected quote introducer, "And he said". But the emphatic form of the expression would indicate that it is not a simple narrative report either. Rather, as in 22d, we have another example of where the narrator merges his viewpoint with that of a narrative participant to give a vivid representation of what went through the latter's mind when he looked into the empty pit. The exclamation hin-ēh focuses one's attention upon the following negative construct phrase: "(there is) no Joseph!" The intensity of the Hebrew narrative at this point can be approximated by means of dramatic predication in Chewa (e.g. use of ideophones, tense-shifting to the present): Anapeza kuti muli mbé! Yosefe mulibe 'He found that inside is emptiness MBÉ! Joseph isn't there!' (notice also the sound-similarity between the two predications).

A variety of linguistic devices—phonological, lexical, and grammatical—heighten the expressiveness of Reuben's cry of anguish when he discovers that Joseph is gone. First, we observe the syntactic balance which foregrounds the principal participants in the drama at this moment: "The boy, he is not; and I, where shall I go?!" In each case, the subject, which is highlighted, is placed outside of its clause, as it were, in initial position. Such an affect is not difficult to duplicate in a Bantu language, with its flexible word order plus separable as well as inseparable pronominal forms. Reuben stresses the youthfulness of Joseph by referring to him as yeled 'child, offspring, boy' instead of nácar 'youth, lad, boy' (cf. vs. 2; note that this distinction is not always observed in the Old Testament, but the choice does seem to be intentional here). A pair of idiomatic expressions add to the emotive force of Reuben's lament: first, "he is not"—either, "he's gone/ disappeared!" (Chewa: mulibe 'he is not inside', i.e. the pit), or more likely, a pessimistic conclusion: "he's dead!" (Chewa: külîbe 'he is not around anymore'—idiom, cf. Gen. 42:13). And secondly: "Where shall I (emphatic pronoun) go?!"—a rhetorical question which connotes the shock, the frustration, and the helplessness of Reuben's position, i.e. he can "go" nowhere to escape the blame that he is sure will fall upon him, for as the eldest brother, he feels himself responsible for what has happened. A literal translation is likely to be misleading, i.e. as implying imminent physical movement (cf. NC: ine ndìgîta kuti 'where am I going'). The meaning is rather that of mental inertia—of anxious doubt and bewilderment; cf. GNB: "What am I going to do?!"; NC: nānqà nditani inee 'now what can I do, oh meee!' And finally, observe
once more that even the sound track of the discourse is called into meaningful service to help communicate the speakers deep despair. Phonological patterning (symmetry), alliteration, and assonance combine to poetize Reuben's rhetorical question:

`:aniy ʔānāh ʔaniy bā`. 

7. The False Report (vs. 32)

The brothers come to their father, coat in hand, and lead him into making the obvious identification, thereby forcing him to come to what appears to be the only conclusion. "This we have found"—the demonstrative is placed forward in the clause to give prominence to its referent, which is stressed throughout this particular episode (cf. part two). Other equivalents are possible; e.g. OC: Sīwi tawatola 'Isn't this what we have picked up?'; i.e. "Just have a look at what we've found!" (also GNB). The brothers then deliberately direct Jacob's gaze to the coat—so there could be no mistake: "You ought to look it over carefully!" (imperative of the verb hak-er plus intensifier nā' ). The latter clause, and the information it contains, is omitted or glossed over in most English versions (e.g. RSV, GNB), perhaps in a rush to reach the upcoming hypocritical question: "The coat of your son, is it, or not?" (the emphatic pronoun foregrounds "coat" once more). The brothers intentionally select the reference, "your son", rather than the personal name, Joseph, thus indicating also verbally their estrangement from him. Their callous hypocrisy is accentuated by the negative tag to their question: 'im-lo 'or not?'—as they attempt to feign complete ignorance of their brother's fate.

8. Jacob Mourns Joseph (vss. 33, 35)

Jacob's plaintive response at the sight of Joseph's robe consists of three short emphatic utterances (a total of just eight words in the original), which are left unlinked by any connective (a foregrounding device called asynotaton). The challenge facing translators here is to express the idiomatic compactness and the emotive tension of these words as naturally as they appear in the Hebrew. "The coat of my son!"—this is a verbless predication in the original, one which echoes the brothers' question of the preceding verse: "The coat of your son...?" In dramatic English speech, there is no need to expand this exclamation by a copulative construction; e.g. RSV: "It is my son's robe"; rather: "My son's robe!" The complete success of the brothers' deception is underscored by the literary device of verbal recall: Jacob exclaims the very words which they had intended to communicate to him, "An evil beast (focal front-shift) has devoured him!" (cf. vs. 20). The final cry of this segment intensifies the thought transmitted by the one preceding: "Joseph has surely been torn to pieces!" The infinitive absolute after the verb emphasizes the certainty and completeness of the action. A grammatical chiasmus also appears, both to augment the expressiveness of Jacob's utterance and to signal the close of this discourse unit: S - V :: V - S. And lastly, phonological patterning in the final clause is again utilized to heighten the force and the feeling conveyed by these words: tārop torap yowsep! The author is manifestly a poet as well as a narrator; he artfully employs his poetry to punctuate the emotive peaks of his story. NC turns to interjective speech typical of mourning to reproduce some of the vigor and emotional overtones present in the Hebrew: "Now Jacob recognized the coat and said, 'Oh-no (maawae)! it's his! A wild beast has torn up my son! Woe is me (kalanqa ine)! Joseph has been devoured!'"
"And all his sons and his daughters arose..."—the verb qawm is used in an extended sense with the infinitive ("to comfort") to mean something like, "went into action", or in this context, "tried their best to..." (as in NC). The futility (and continued hypocrisy) of their efforts is indicated by the fact that their words are not quoted at all. The lack of direct speech is also due to this episode being the resolution of the act. Therefore, only the focal character is quoted. The conjunctive k·ȳ at the beginning of Jacob's pessimistic declaration is both adversative and asseverative (cf. GK, pp. 491, 500); that is, his words are spoken both to oppose the attempts of his family to "comfort" him and also to strengthen his resolve to remain in a state of "mourning" (durative participle) until he died; cf. NC: "No! (i.e. I will not be comforted) but I will be mourning my child..." "I will go down...to Sheol"—is the verb yārād to be considered figurative in the context (i.e. "to proceed to an abhorrent destination") or as a literal reflection of Hebrew cosmology (i.e. the conception that Sheol lay beneath the surface of the earth)? Common usage of the verb in such situations would indicate that both ideas are involved; cf. GNB: "I will go down to the world of the dead still mourning for my son." Notice the syntactic and semantic shift which accentuates the bitterness in Jacob's final utterance. Instead of the expected: "I will go down to Sheol mourning my son"; we have: "I will go down to my son mourning to Sheol." On this sad note, the dialogue portion of Genesis 37 comes to an end.

9. Conclusion

In this study, I have proposed a framework for integrating the analyses of structure and style in Hebrew dramatic narrative. First the translator must carefully investigate the three interrelated structural properties of arrangement, connectivity, and prominence as these are manifested in the text under consideration. These generic qualities relate both to the formal organization of the discourse and to the progressive development of its narrative plot. After gaining this understanding of the text as a whole and its larger segments, the analyst is prepared to examine the surface features of the discourse with a view toward isolating those rhetorical forms which perform an expressive, directive, or aesthetic function in transmitting the message. Many of these same stylistic features will also have a structural role to play in the text. That is to say, there will frequently be an overlap between the higher-level and lower-level function of certain distinctive linguistic forms. It was also observed that the special effects of style often appear with particular concentration in the dialogue sections of Hebrew narrative. Here they contribute not only to the dynamics of interpersonal communication on the story level of discourse, but they also serve to increase the beauty and impact of the message on the performance level, which relates the author and his intended audience.

All of this is, of course, but half of the story. The same intensive analytical and descriptive techniques must also be applied to similar texts in the receptor language. If the translator is not made explicitly aware of the devices used for structural marking as well as the full inventory of stylistic features available in his language, he will not employ them consistently (or even at all) in his work. He must learn to appreciate the fact that although these rhetorical techniques may not add much, if anything, to the referential content of the message being conveyed, they do add a great deal to the overall naturalness of the text and the emotive effect which the message has upon its receptors.
The wonderfully crafted story of Genesis 37 reveals a narrator who is both an artist and a dramatist—one who puts his considerable skill to effective use in recounting the acts of God and the history of his people. Such a work of art demands creative translation, that is, translators who not only command the complete repertory of linguistic resources of their mother-tongue, but who also can apply these in print to express the full range of emotive, emphatic, and aesthetic impulses that are present in the original. Translation thus involves a dual focus—on both source and receptor languages, and a double responsibility—for the impact as well as the information carried by the message, in order for dynamic equivalent communication to occur. The importance of linguistic form is magnified in the transmission process when one seeks an accurate, yet also an idiomatic, representation of SL style and structure in the translated text.

**NOTES**


2To this end, I would appreciate any and all comments on this paper, especially as it relates to the translator in the field; e.g., overall level of difficulty, format, areas of omission, ambiguities, alternative approaches, and so on.

3In publications produced by the Translation Department of SL, transliterated Hebrew text will follow the system described below. This is designed to take into consideration other current transliteration conventions and the conventions of the Masoretic text, as well as the technical limitations of typesetting equipment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th>Vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>א</td>
<td>Pathaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ב</td>
<td>Hatep pathaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ג</td>
<td>Qāmeṣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ד</td>
<td>Qāmeṣ hatuph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ה</td>
<td>Final qāmeṣ he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ו</td>
<td>Hatep qāmeṣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ז</td>
<td>Sēgōl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ח</td>
<td>Medial sēgōl yōd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>צ</td>
<td>Hatep sēgōl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ק</td>
<td>Sewā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ל</td>
<td>Şerrē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ</td>
<td>Final &amp; Medial šerrē yōd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נ</td>
<td>Short ḫireq (defective)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ס</td>
<td>Fin &amp; Med ḫireq yod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ע</td>
<td>Ť̄elem (def. written)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>פ</td>
<td>Ť̄elem waw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are "plot" narratives and "nonplot" narratives. The latter consist of a sequence of events related to one another simply by temporal progression. A plot narrative presents a specific problem situation which affects the characters involved. The conflict builds in intensity to one or more points of climax which lead to a final resolution of the problem. Note that use of the term "plot" does not mean to imply fictional narrative. A plot can also be distinguished in a historical report, provided, as was just mentioned, the account revolves around a definite "conflict" of some kind.

Other approaches which will prove helpful, especially in the analysis of discourse structure are these: John Beekman and John Callow, The Semantic Structure of Written Communication (prepublication draft), Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1979; Kathleen Callow, Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974; Philip Stine, "Translators and Texts", The Bible Translator 29 (3), 301-306; Thomas Barth, "Outline of Preliminary Procedures for Discovering Discourse Structure", Notes on Linguistics 6, 3-16.

I am indebted to Mr. Randall Ruth of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (Sudan) and my brother, Rev. Paul Wendland, for their insightful comments which contributed much to the linguistic analysis of parts two and three of this paper.

Strictly speaking, it is not correct to speak about "tense" in reference to the Hebrew verbal system. But since my analysis does not depend upon a more precise designation, I will continue to use the term so as not to overly complicate the description.

I wish to stress the fact that my reference to the author's use of certain dramatic devices is not intended to imply fictionality. Rather, I am of the opinion that the original narrator (and there was only one!) freely used the dramatic techniques available in his language to present this record of God's truth in the most effective way possible.

Linguistic-literary analyses such as this may also have a relevance for biblical studies, especially in the field of textual criticism. I feel, for example, that some scholars suffer from a certain degree of "linguo-centrism"; in other words, they often have difficulty in appreciating the distinctiveness and genius of a language and literature that lies outside of the Indo-European family of which they are so familiar. Thus, when encountering a text such as the Hebrew Old Testament which allegedly contains so many "problems", they quickly propose that the text is, in fact, a patchwork, composed of fragments from sources J, E, D, P, X, Y, and Z, rather than recognizing the possibility
that they may simply be dealing with a narrative style that is quite different from what they are used to. At this point, I probably cannot prove my argument for the integrity of the original text—any more than "source" critics can prove theirs. But I have shown, at least for Genesis 37, that a more open-minded approach is necessary in exegetical study—one which accepts the principle that the original is a homogeneous unit until actually proven otherwise, and that so-called "problem X" should not in the first instance be viewed as the product of a redactor's insertion, but rather be regarded as the product of a different technique of narrative (and poetic) transmission.

"BLESSING": CULTURE, TEXT CRITICISM
AND TRANSLATION (MARK 8:7 AND LUKE 9:16)

Randall Ruth

[SIL member working in Sudan with the Luwo language. Married, with 3 children. M. A., Institute of Holy Land Studies; M. A., C. Phil., UCLA.]

In two verses of the Gospels it is commonly interpreted that Jesus "blesses food". A better understanding, based on a better text, would be that Jesus "blesses God", i.e. thanks God, glorifies Him, and declares Him worthy of praise.

There has been some confusion at Mark 8:7 and Luke 9:16 in different translation aids. The two lines of interpretation can be illustrated by the following translations.

Mk. 8:7 And they had a few small fish, and having BLESSED THEM,...
(RSV. Similarly NEB, Phillips, Living, KJV, Dios Lleqa al Hombre)

vs. They had a few small fish as well; he gave THANKS FOR THEM also...
(NIV. Similarly TEV, UBS Hebrew, Gute Nachricht, Bonnes Nouvelles)

Lk. 9:16 Then he took the five loaves and two fishes and...he BLESSED THEM
(KJV. Similarly RSV, Phillips)

vs. Jesus took the five loaves and two fish ...THANKED GOD FOR THEM
(TEV. Similarly NIV, Living, Dios Lleqa al Hombre, Gute Nachricht, UBS Hebrew, Bonnes Nouvelles)

The main difference in translation is whether Jesus "consecrated the food" or "gave thanks for the food". Our Greek editions suggest the meaning "consecrated the food". This is made explicit in the Bauer-Gingrich-Danker lexicon (1979) where these two verses are listed under εὐλογεῖν with the meaning "bless, consecrate" and not with the meaning "give thanks and praise". The Translators
Handbook on Mark seems to agree with this: "in these two passages it would be natural to assume that the meaning is 'ask God to bless'; 'invoke God's blessing upon'" (p. 208). Nevertheless, the handbook later recommends translating "thanked God for them" (p. 248), since it is hard to conceive of the blessing for the fish being of a different nature than the blessing/thanksgiving for the bread. When Hebrew and Jewish culture are considered only the interpretation "bless God", "thank God" makes sense. At a Jewish meal "he blessed" unambiguously means "thanked God". This is contrary to common practice among English-speaking Christians where the food itself is blessed and it becomes a possible pitfall for many translators. Fortunately, "consecrate" is more difficult to translate than "give thanks" so that many translations may have opted for a better translation out of expediency. Also, many modern versions have recognized the context and cultural intent and translated according to what Mark and Luke meant to say. (Cf. the position of the Translator's Handbook above.) However, there is another solution which obviates the question of eulogein 'bless' with a material object and faithfully reflects the Jewish background. One may follow other Greek manuscripts which delete the references to "fish" as the object of "bless". (William Lane has already come to such a conclusion for Mark in the New International Commentary on Mark.)

The textual situation follows:

Mk. 8:7 kai eichon ichthudia oliga kai eulogētas auta eipein

(UBS3 and Nestle-Aland26)

variants: ... kai eucharistētas eipein...

(D, d, q, i.e. Western texts)

... kai eulogētas eipein...

(N, X, G, 33, 700, 1010, and pm

[a great many other manuscripts],
i.e. slight Alexandrian and Caesarean support with apparently strong Byzantine representation.)

... kai auta eulogētas eipein...

(W, 0131, family 1, family 13,
28, 565, et al.[some other manuscripts],
i.e. the major Caesarean texts plus some others.)

... kai tauta eulogētas eipein...

(A, K, and pm, i.e. strong Byzantine support)

... as cited with UBS3 and Nestle-Aland26

(K, B, C, L, D, Th, 892, 1241,
1424, and pc [a few other manuscripts], i.e. major Alexandrian support plus one Caesarean manuscript.)

The first two variants do not have an accusative object and correspond to Hebrew practice where the word berēk 'bless' has God as the assumed object and
never "it, and food". However, because the Western texts have apparently substituted a synonym they do not lend much weight to the reading "bless" without the pronoun.

An analysis of the textual families shows a four-way split. One reading, eulogēsas (without a pronoun), seems to have minor support from all the families except the Western.

Additional considerations argue against the inclusion of the pronoun (auta or tauta). The two positions of the pronoun either before or after the verb suggest a secondary additon. Also, their occurrence with a transitive Greek verb is more easily explained as an addition because of the ambiguity that results when Jewish culture is forgotten. The development of a metaphysical sacramentalism might have augmented this feeling.

Because of the above it would seem best to follow the short reading, ...eulogēsas..., contrary to UBS3. This removes the question of the meaning of eulōgein with a material object. It is a case of "internal" evidence pointing out the secondary character of the "external" majority. "God" is the implicit recipient of the thanks and the provision of food is the implicit reason for the thanks.

The same solution is valid at Luke 9:16. The variant texts are listed below.

Lk. 9:16 eulōgēsen autous
(Most texts, i.e. Alexandrian, Caesarean, Byzantine support)

 eulōgēsen ep autous
(D, old latin, old syriac, i.e. major Western support)

 eulōgēsen
(K, 1241, syriac peshitta, i.e. minor Alexandrian support and a correct Semitic interpretation)

The external textual support for the short reading is weaker here than in Mark, but it is still preferable. It should be noted, in addition to the reasons given for the Markan case, that all four Gospels have parallel to this verse (Mk. 14:19, Mk. 6:41, Lk. 9:16, Jn. 6:11) and none of them use an object (if Luke is admitted). While textual differences are usually important and often preferable, in this case the agreement seems to point to the fact that the "blessing" at the feeding of the 5000 was a "normal" blessing (i.e. thanksgiving) over food and not the miracle itself (i.e. not a paraphrase for "he provided for their multiplication and broke them...").

SUMMARY: The Greek texts at Mark 8:7 and Luke 9:16 should probably not have any expressed object with the verb eulōgein 'to bless'. "God" is the implicit recipient and a translator may want to add it. The verses would then be translated "he gave thanks to God". Caution: the translation "to bless and consecrate the bread and/or fish" would introduce an unnecessary and improbable cultural clash and should be avoided.
PHILOPIANS 4:18—A NOTE

John Werner

I have received full payment and even more; I am amply supplied, now that I have received from Epaphroditus the gifts you sent. (NIV)

Moulton and Milligan's Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament (1930; reprinted 1980, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans) reports that in the papyri the first verb of the above sentence, ἀπέχω, "is constantly found in the sense of 'I have received', as a technical expression in drawing up a receipt", and quotes some examples. Exegetical Helps on Philippians (SIL, 1970) reports the commentators as arguing whether Paul is formally clearing the Philippian Christians of an obligation that they had to him.

But compare the following, from a papyrus dated in the middle of the third century AD:

komisai para tou anadidontos soi ta gramma ta 'Receive (22 pairs of small wheat-loaves) from him who delivers the letter to you.'

(P. Mert. 85, 8f, in John Lee White, The Body of the Greek Letter, Scholars Press, 1972, p.11, #16.) This papyrus illustrates an interesting practice in the Roman Empire. Of course, there was no Parcel Post, United Parcel Service, or Package Express. If someone wanted to send something to someone else, he had to send it by a messenger—a slave, perhaps, or a friend who happened to be going that way. But with no bonding of messengers, how could the sender be sure the messenger would deliver the goods in full? Evidently, he would send, along with the goods, a letter which would include a statement of exactly what was being sent (comparable to a modern "bill of lading"). The recipient would compare the goods with the statement and, if they matched, would give the messenger a receipt to carry back to the sender. The receipt would not have to spell out "I have received 22 pairs of small wheat-loaves", as modern receipts do. Ἀπέχω παντα 'I have received full payment' would be enough to acknowledge that all that was specified in the letter has been delivered, and thus to acquit the messenger.

So it seems that the commentators have been arguing about the wrong question. The receipt Paul writes in Phil. 4:18 has nothing to do with any obligation of the Philippian church. Instead it has to do with Epaphroditus' obligation to give Paul all that the church has given him to take to Paul. Paul, who is careful about "taking pains to do what is right, not only in the eyes of the Lord but also in the eyes of men" in financial matters (2 Cor. 8:21), is providing Epaphroditus with a receipt that will assure his fellow church members that he has delivered all that they have told Paul they are sending. They have told him by means of a letter, similar in form to the papyrus above, and they have sent the letter by giving it to Epaphroditus to hand to Paul along with the gift. The translator may want to supply this background information by saying something like "What I have received from Epaphroditus is the same as what your letter said you were sending."
As to whether the next clause, "and even more" (perisseuō 'I have an abundance') means that Epaphroditus has added to the gift from his own resources and/or from churches along the way, or that Paul now has more than enough to meet his needs—that is another question.