Fourth Gospel believes that the disciples themselves have actually originated from the world above), while verse 15 (first occurrence) has the force of "away from" or "out of" (RSV).

Although one cannot take issue with Jones' theological judgments in this interesting article, he must nevertheless be declared "guilty of preposition abuse," for his maltreatment of the helpless little preposition *ek* in this passage. We are no longer living in the dark ages when "minor" words like prepositions no longer have the right to demand equal treatment! The law of "dynamic equivalence" has freed them—and all other words of all languages —from the bonds of concordant rendering and has given them equal rights with all other lexical items. They too must be allowed to attain their full potential without being discriminated against. And in keeping with the seriousness of this charge, I suggest that Jones reap the punishment of having to read this article.

The real problem lies in Jones' failure to realize that the semantic domain of a given word in one language does not always (or better, *never does*) overlap in all respects with an equivalent word in any other language. Such is the case with *ek*. It may indeed mean "from" in some uses of the English preposition, and, conversely, "from" many sometimes be rendered in Greek by *ek*, but not always. Moreover, translation often requires a somewhat radical restructuring of the entire construction in which a preposition appears in order to get at the nearest possible meaning for the intended audience. Perhaps Jones and the theologians to whom he addresses himself may grasp sufficiently the meaning that he believes "from" holds in the present context. But this is definitely not the case with the average reader of the Scriptures, for whom the concordant, formal-equivalent translation which he proposes says little, if anything at all. *Die Gute Nachricht*, interestingly enough, with first-rate scholarship to support it, renders "I have manifested my name to the men you gave me *from* the world" by "Ich habe dich den Menschen bekanntgemacht, die du mir *in* der Welt anvertraut hast," in which *ek* is adequately represented by the meaning "in." In verses 14 and 16, both TEV and GN translate *ek tou kosmou* with the meaning "belong to the world," as a number of other translations that take communication seriously have done.

BARCLAY M. NEWMAN

Bravmann, M. M.: **Studies in Semitic philology** (Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics, VI). Leiden: E. J. Brill 1977. xi+597p., DF 1.96.

This interesting volume contains fifty studies in the field of Semitic philology, the vast majority of which have been published previously in various journals, Most of them are now presented in a revised and/or expanded form, and some for the first time in a (revised) English version. Fifteen essays deal with phonology and morphology, the remaining ones with syntax and semantics. The specialist will be grateful for having now an easy access to these important contributions, and particularly for the opportunity to read them in relation to each other.

It is only natural that the specialist who sees himself from time to time in the role of translator should turn his attention especially to the contributions in the field of syntax and semantics. From such a point of view he is more than once favourably impressed by what the author calls "a more meaningful translation" which is, in fact, a dynamic equivalence rendering (so *e.g.* 277 with regard to instantaneousness in Arabic), or what he terms "a more adequate interpretation", resulting in such a rendering (so e.g. 335 in connection with Syriac *dalmā* and related Arabic phenomena). He cannot but agree when, in an essay dealing with an Arabic sentence-type expressing "inner compulsion", he is reminded of the sentence, John 13.27: "Ο ποιεῖς ποίησον τάχιον" and of its obvious interpretation: "What you *must* do, do [it] quickly" (351; cf TEV). And he is certainly tempted by the interpretation of *ṣerōr haḥayyim* in 1 Sam 25.29 as "the treasure which grants life" on the basis of Syriac and Mandaic parallel expressions (536), though as a translator he may have to handle the metaphor in a different way.

Translators who are accustomed to analysing carefully the semantics of genitive constructions will read with great interest the study of genetic aspects of the genitive in the Semitic languages (209–231). The author starts from the consideration that whenever the genitive and its antecedents is not clearly expressed, one might conceive of other constructions, such as prepositional phrases, which would unequivocally express this relationship (211). These prepositional phrases are for the author more original constructions which have given rise to the genitive through a process of gradual elimination of the prepositions (213–214). So a construction like *haśśimḥat baqqāṣīr* (the joy in the harvest, see Is 9.2), would have been subject to the following process: *haśśimḥat baqqāṣīr* > *śimḥaṭ baqqāṣīr* > *śimḥaṭ haqqāṣīr* (the joy of the harvest). The transformation of a relative clause into a nominal structure in the genitive would have taken place in the same way (220), and the development of the status constructus is said to be connected with the elimination of the resumptive pronoun (223).

One does not get the impression, however, that Bravmann regards such a series of transformational deletions as a synchronic process. For him, the process is rather more diachronic and reflects the evolution of individual semitic languages, of course in different periods. Such a view is not without difficulties, so the author is obliged to postulate that certain syntactic types "which may have developed already in Proto-Semitic and in the early developmental stages of the individual languages, very likely redeveloped independently in the later developmental periods of the individual languages" (219, note 19). A linguistically more balanced description of synchronic and diachronic processes would have yielded more acceptable results.

It would be wrong to state that the author does not pay any attention to synchronic processes. He does so elsewhere—and here the advantage of consecutive reading of all contributions becomes clear—mainly by referring to his article on "The simultaneous emergence in the mind of two distinct (inter-related) aspects of a notion", an article which has not been incorporated in this volume. On two occasions (387 and 530f.) he applies this "semantic mechanism" to words, and once to syntactic phenomena (429).

However, the rather speculative and rudimentary psycho-linguistic theory with which the reader is provided is not very convincing. Unfortunately, it does not become any more convincing when one reads the article in question, published in the author's *Studies in Arabic and general syntax* (Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, Cairo 1953, 139–150).

There are several other studies from which translator will greatly profit, as, for example, the article on "The idea of 'possession' in linguistic expression". This deals, among other things, with the significant use of the possessive pronoun in Gen 2.24: ". . . and cleaves unto *his* wife" (italics are mine). The same text, incidentally, is dealt with separately in the interesting new light of a "modern" Arabic lullaby in the ᶜIrāqī dialect (593–595). Particularly worthy of mention is the chapter on semitic instances of "linguistic taboo" (465–482) in which—as far as Hebrew is concerned—reference is made to the use of the verb *ᶜālā* (literally: "to go up") in the sense of "to be offered (as a sacrifice)" and to that of the roots *qrb* and *ngš* in contexts of battle. "To draw near unto battle" is really a euphemism for "joining battle", and such an insight has translational consequences.

This book is full of interesting details, such as the revealing explanation of the Arabic *yatāmā* (orphans) as an affectionate metonym for "widows" (506), and the analysis of the primary meaning "to become" (not "to be") of the Proto-Semitic verb *hewā, hāyā* (543). This clearly supports the view that, semantically, such a verb belongs to the category of relations.

The publishers are to be praised for the excellent presentation, at a still reasonable price, in which they offer so many provoking thoughts.

JAN DE WAARD

Van Iersel, B.M.F., and others (eds.): **Van taal tot taal. Opstellen over het vertalen van de Schriften.** Baarn: Amboboeken, 1977. 213 pp., no price stated.

Dr W. K. Grossouw, New Testament professor at the Roman Catholic University of Nijmegen, was the main translator of the epistles and of Revelation in the so-called Willibrord New Testament, published by the Catholic Bible Foundation (KBS). On his retirement in September 1977 he was presented with this *Festschrift*, entitled *From Language to Language. Essays on Translating the Scriptures.*

The title does not completely cover the contents of the book, at least if "translating" is taken in the strict sense of Bible translation as we normally use the expression. A number of the twelve authors discuss specific translation problems: M. de Jonge gives "An Analysis of 1 John 1.1–4", against the background of Nida's writings and his own *Translator's Handbook on the Letters of John.* W. C. van Unnik argues that the rendering of Mark 8.33/ Matthew 16.23 "you are not on the side of God, but of men" (RSV) is correct over against all other options. R. C. M. Ruys has an interesting historical account of "Bible translation in Catholic Brazil", in which (incidentally) the error is perpetuated that *A Biblia na Linguagem de Hoje*, the Brazilian Portuguese common language translation, is a translation of TEV.