circumlocution for "I", or whether it could have wider reference in Aramaic, a consensus had been established that neither in the gospels nor in Jewish apocalyptic writings was "Son of Man" used as a title. The logical consequence had been drawn by the Nueva Biblia Española of 1975, in which "Son of Man" in Dan 7.13 was represented by "una figura humana", and in the gospels by "hombre", or, where it refers to the speaker, by "este hombre". It would seem that translators into other languages should seriously consider the implications of this research. The point is not even that "the Son of Man" (in English as in Greek) is no part of common language. The point is rather that "the Son of Man", and its equivalents in other languages, normally sound like exotic titles; and this does not now appear to have been the impact of the phrase as used in either Old or New Testaments.

In a seminar group, Dr. R. J. Hammer, director of the Bible Reading Fellowship, introduced a conversation on "Translation, Interpretation and Communication", surveying ideas about translation from Hilaire Belloc to E. A. Nida. It emerged from discussion that "to translate the sense" involved a necessary choice of maximum fidelity to the semantic, rather than the grammatical or phonetic, content of the text. There was however some criticism of the maxim that a translation should have, as far as possible, the same effect on its readers as the original had, or was intended to have, on its first readers or hearers. In many cases, no evidence was now available concerning the effect on the original readers; while even if the author's intention may be inferred from the text, there is no guarantee that it was fulfilled. Stephen, for example, did not *intend* to be lynched.

Among shorter contributions, J. B. Orchard discussed "Ellipsis and Parenthesis in Gal. 2.1–10 and 2 Thess. 2.1–12"; D. W. Baker spoke on "Division Markers and the Structure of Leviticus 1–7"; and I. A. Moir distinguished between twelve kinds of circumlocution and euphemism in Luke, some of which (e.g. "mother" in 11.27 TEV) are eliminated in modern translations. J. Chmiel of Cracow spoke on "Semantics of the Resurrection", analysing components of *egeirō*, *anistēmi*, and their Hebrew counterparts. D. L. Holland discussed the deliberate ambiguity of the phrase *ēn pote hote ouk ēn*, attributed to Arius. The semantic and ontological status of the statement remained obscure, since a temporal element is no less present in the use of *pote* than it would have been in the use of a noun for "time". P. Ellingworth suggested that the difficult but well-attested reading *eis heautous* in Heb 12.3 made sense if it was understood as an allusion to Num 17.3 (EVV 16.38).

P.E.

The Case of the Eclectic and the Neglected Ek of John 17

Of the many things that do not cross my desk, I must admit that the monthly *Sojourners* is one of them. The Editor of *Technical Papers* has called my attention to the article, "The Practice of Peoplehood," which appeared in the May 1977 issue of *Sojourners*. What concerned him was the writer's statement that *ek* in John 17 can (and should) be rendered concordantly:

> John 17 is the classic text for understanding the relation of the church to the world. The passage revolves around the Greek preposition "ek." Most translations obscure the meaning by not rendering this word consistently into English.

In what follows, James W. Jones, the writer of the article to which I have referred, argues in favor of rendering the Greek preposition *ek* by "from" in all of its occurrences in John 17, and he calls special attention to verses 6, 13, 14, 15, 16, where the construction "from the world" appears six times and "from evil" occurs once. In so doing, he criticizes the freedom of RSV, which twice translates *ek* by "of" and as many times by "out of." However, he fails to remark on the use of *ek* in verse 12 (*ex autōn*), which cannot possibly have spatial connotations and must be rendered with the meaning of RSV ("of them," in the full construction "none of them"). Apparently Jones has been eclectic in selecting the uses that support his argument, while at the same time neglecting the obvious meaning of the same preposition in verse 12. We shall look closer and see how this case turns out! Can it be that the accuser is himself the culprit?

This is in nowise a case involving a capital offense, and it would appear that the writer has actually reached a valid conclusion in his further affirmation:

> Seen in this way it becomes clear that Jesus is drawing a parallel between his relationship to the world and that of his disciples. He is not *from* the world, but he is sent *into* the world; likewise they are not *from* the world—but they are sent *into* the world.

No one would deny that the Fourth Gospel contrasts this world with the world above, or that according to Johannine theology Jesus originates *from* the world above and so comes *into* this world. Neither is it to be denied that the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel calls his disciples to follow him, and that discipleship involves identity with the One who calls by the acceptance of his destiny and fate. But can it be said that the persons whom Jesus calls also originate *from* the world above? This seems implied by the rendering which Jones demands for verse 14: "I have given them your word and the world hates them because they are not *from* the world, even as I am not *from* the world." If one presses for a concordant rendering of *ek* throughout the seventeenth chapter of John, then what about verse 15 (first occurrence), where *ek* surely must carry the force of "away from" as opposed to "originating from" (if this be the meaning of the second occurrence of *ek* in verse 14) of the previous verse: "I do not pray that you should remove them *from* the world but that you keep them *from* evil." If at this point the prosecuting attorney's argument sounds confused, it is simply because I do not know exactly what Jones means by his use of the English preposition *from*, since in English the meaning depends upon the specific context in which the preposition occurs, and in the present context the precise nuance that Jones has in mind eludes me. If I analyze the text correctly, then verses 14 and 16 ("They are not *from* the world, even as I am not *from* the world") carry the force of "belonging to" (unless *ek* is used with one meaning for Jesus and another for his disciples, since it cannot be argued that the author of the

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.