

Table of Contents

• Paper •

- [Kor.] Alexander A. Pieters's Revision for the Korean Revised Version (1938) Old Testament:  
A Comparative Study of Genesis Chapter 1 of the *Korean Old Testament*  
(1930) and the *Korean Revised Version* (1938)  
----- Hwan Jin Yi / 7
- [Kor.] The Problem of Translating חַג הַקִּצִּיר as "Maeg Chu Jeol" ----- Jinkyu Kim / 40
- [Kor.] A New Translation of the Introductory Part of the Blessing of Moses (Deu 33:2-3)  
----- Seung Il Kang / 58
- [Kor.] A Suggestion for Translating "אֶת־הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲתֵּן לְיָדְךָ" in the Second Half of 2  
Samuel 5:2 through the Study of Shepherd-King Ideology  
----- Keungjae Lee / 75
- [Kor.] The Servant Motif in Naaman Narrative: A Lexical, Literary and Theological Analysis  
----- Jae-Won Lee / 98
- [Kor.] Poetical Structure of Isaiah 6 ----- Koowon Kim / 122
- [Kor.] A Comparative Study of the Aleppo Codex and the Leningrad Codex: Focusing on the  
Syntactic Word with the Difference in 'Nevi'im'  
----- Sung-dal Kwon / 161
- [Kor.] Die textkritische Bedeutung der *Ketib/Qere*-Tradition und deren Beziehung zur  
Septuaginta in Bezug auf Dittographie, Haplographie und graphische  
Ähnlichkeiten ----- Jong-Hoon Kim / 184
- [Kor.] A Suggestion for the Translation of ὄσος: Focused on the Combination with πᾶς and the  
Single Type ----- Woo-Jin Shim / 209
- [Kor.] A Study on the Literary Character of *Tianzhu jiangsheng yanxing jilüe* and Its Vorlage  
----- Wonmo Suh, Changsun Kim / 226
- [Eng.] Μονογενὴς Θεός — the Prophet-like-Moses Par Excellence And the Unique Exegete of  
the Father: An Exegetical and Text-Critical Study of John 1:17-18  
----- Kei Eun Chang / 279

• **Translated Paper** •

[Kor.] Taitan's Diatessaron and the Analysis of the Pentateuch

----- George F. Moore (Sun-Jong Kim, Jina Kim, trans.) / 307

• **Book Review** •

[Kor.] *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem: Judah under Babylonian Rule* (Oded Lipschits, Winona

Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005) ----- Hoo-Goo Kang / 326

<Abstract>

**Alexander A. Pieters's Revision  
for the Korean Revised Version (1938) Old Testament:  
A Comparative Study of Genesis Chapter 1 of the Korean Old  
Testament (1930) and the Korean Revised Version (1938)**

Hwan Jin Yi  
(Methodist Theological University)

Alexander A. Pieters began his mission work in Korea as a colporteur in 1895. He also translated and published “시편촬요”(Shi-Pyeon-Chal-Yo) in 1898, which is a selection of Psalms translated into Korean. This is the first Old Testament translation in Korean, and has also heavily influenced later translations of the book of Psalms.

The Korean Bible Society decided to revise the Korean Old Version in 1911 because the Old Version was translated by a few translators who had no knowledge of original biblical languages. The revision for the Korean Revised Version progressed in three stages: (1) J. S. Gale's period (1911-1925), (2) W. M. Baird's period (1926-1931), and (3) A. A. Pieters's period (1931-1937). As such, Pieters served as the main reviser at the final stage of the revision work because of his deep knowledge of Hebrew. He worked with Won Mo Yi (이원모) and W. D. Reynolds.

Some characteristics of the revision by Pieters's team for the KRV OT as observed in chapter one of Genesis are as follows:

(1) Pieters's team tried to reflect every aspect of the Hebrew Bible word by word. Especially every occurrence of the Hebrew *Elohim* in Genesis translated as 하나님 (Hananim) in the revision (1:2, 17, 25).

(2) Hebrew verbs in *Yiqtol* were translated as the third person imperative *cause to do* (“...하게 하라”) (1:6, 14) or as the second person imperative (“...하라”) in Korean (1:9, 11, 24).

(3) Mistranslation of the earlier translation is revised correctly (1:30).

(4) Sentences in revision uniformly end with -니라 (-nira) or -더라(-deora) (1:1-3 etc.). Compared with the earlier translation, these endings tend to

reinforce objectivity or something descriptive.

(5) Some elements of the Hebrew Bible are omitted (1:11), while some elements outside of the Hebrew Bible are added (1:5, 13, 31).

(6) Ahrae ah vowel (the dot under the consonant) is removed, following the orthography of that time (1:1 etc.).

(7) Small letters and parentheses are used (1:15, 16, 24).

(8) Sentences get longer (1:11-12) or shorter (1:14, 28).

<Abstract>

## The Problem of Translating תֵּג הַקִּצִּיר as “Maeg Chu Jeol”

Jinkyu Kim  
(Baekseok University)

The goal of this study is to suggest an alternative term for the Korean biblical term “Maeg Chu Jeol” (Exo 23:16a) (which means *the feast of barley harvest*) which is also referred to as “Chil Chil Jeol” (the feast of weeks) and “Oh Sun Jeol” (Pentecost). Many Korean churches have confused “Maeg Chu Jeol” with the Korean traditional thanksgiving feast of barley harvest which most Korean churches observe in July each year.

The study explores three different approaches to analyzing the translation of “Maeg Chu Jeol”: 1) a linguistic approach in the translation of the word תֵּג הַקִּצִּיר 2) a socio-cultural approach to the feasts of the Old Testament for which the people of God offered seasonal agricultural products; and 3) a hermeneutical approach to the three major feasts.

The translation of “Maeg Chu Jeol” in Exodus 23:16a is an incorrect rendering considering the meaning of תֵּג הַקִּצִּיר which simply means *the feast of harvest*. Hence, תֵּג הַקִּצִּיר can be better translated to *the feast/festival of harvest* as represented in the majority of English Bible translations. בְּכוֹרֵי קִצִּיר הַטִּיבִים (Exo 34:22a) has been mistakenly translated to *the feast of the first fruits of barley harvest* (NKR; KRV). The word קִצִּיר הַטִּיבִים does not mean *barley harvest* but *wheat harvest*. It would therefore be more accurately translated to *the first fruits of wheat harvest* as translated in the majority of English Bible translations.

Considering the agricultural products that the people of God offered for the feasts, the type of grain that the Israelites offered for the feast of weeks was not barley but wheat. Thus, the term “Maeg Chu Jeol” itself (which means *the feast of barley harvest*) does not accurately represent the biblical feast.

When it comes to the hermeneutical meaning of feasts in the Old Testament, the feast of weeks was not linked to *a thanksgiving feast of barley harvest*, but to the celebration day of the coming of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. Therefore this term brings about a more serious hermeneutical problem because of Korean churches’ confusion of “Maeg Chu Jeol” as *the thanksgiving feast of*

*barley harvest*. If they observe the thanksgiving feast of barley harvest in this sense, they should also keep the Passover Festival and the Feast of Booths in a literal sense. Hence, “Maeg Chu Jeol” should be replaced by a new term.

Once the feast of barley harvest is replaced by a new term *the feast of harvest*, it may significantly reduce the Korean churches’ confusion of *the thanksgiving feast of barley harvest* as the feast of weeks.

<Abstract>

**A New Translation of the Introductory Part of  
the Blessing of Moses (Deu 33:2-3)**

Seung Il Kang  
(Yonsei University)

In many cultures, old traditions and memories are often transmitted in the form of hymns and songs. It is the same in the Old Testament. The oldest records in the Old Testament are mainly songs, which are usually referred to as ancient Hebrew poetry. These include the Blessing of Jacob (Gen 49), the Song of Moses (Exo 15), the Prophecies of Balaam (Num 23-24), the Blessing of Moses (Deu 33), the Song of Deborah (Jdg 5), the Song of Habakkuk (Hab 3), 2 Samuel 22 (= Psa 18), and Psalms 68.

Translating these ancient Hebrew songs is a difficult and challenging task. There are several reasons for this. First of all, since these songs are very old, it is not easy to restore or reconstruct the contents of the original text where the text is seriously damaged. There are also cases where the classical Hebrew grammar and spelling, which we are familiar with, do not apply to these poems. These early forms of Hebrew should be understood through comparison with other Semitic languages such as Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Hebrew inscriptions.

Ancient Hebrew poetry has linguistic features that are not found in the classical biblical Hebrew. For example, (1) *t*-prefixed form is used instead of *y*-prefixed form for an imperfect third person plural; (2) the frequent use of the so-called *nun energicum* in all imperfect forms; (3) ׀ is used for a perfect second person feminine singular; (4) the use of enclitic ם (mem); and (4) the disappearance of the *nota accusativi* –ta.

Apart from the difficulty of translation, there is another important reason to study ancient Hebrew poetry. Since these poems are from the earliest period of Israel, they preserve the information about the early traditions of the origin and development of the religion of Israel and the faith of Yahwism.

This study attempts to translate introductory part of the so-called “Blessing of Moses” (Deu 33:2-3). The result of this study reconstructs verses 2 and 3 as three stanzas of three lines each (2a, 2b, 2c/2d, 2e, 3a/3b, 3c, 3d).

The most divergent part of my translation is that it sees the “holy ones” in 3b as heavenly beings whereas other previous Korean versions translate it as “the faithful.”

This study further requires the translation of the main body of the Blessing of Moses as well as of other ancient Hebrew songs.

The most divergent part of my translation is that it sees the “holy ones” in 3b as heavenly beings whereas other previous Korean versions translate it as “the faithful.”

This study further requires the translation of the main body of the Blessing of Moses as well as of other ancient Hebrew songs.

<Abstract>

**A Suggestion for Translating “אַתָּה תִּרְעֶה אֶת־עַמִּי אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל”  
in the Second Half of 2 Samuel 5:2  
through the Study of Shepherd-King Ideology**

Keungjae Lee  
(Mokwon University)

If people associate the word, shepherd in the context of ancient Israel and the ancient Near East cultures, people would immediately conceive of the job as raising small livestock like sheep or goats. This shepherd has had the important responsibility not only to provide his livestock with water and fodder but also to keep his livestock from wild animals and thieves. For this reason, the term shepherd has deeper connotation than just a person who takes care of sheep or goats in the culture of ancient Near East. For example, the gods were either called as shepherd or described as shepherds that provided affluent and safe life for their people. In addition, the king was also introduced as the only shepherd of the earthly world who had been given the legitimate power from God to protect and rule the people.

This *shepherd* metaphor is also verified in the Old Testament. First, YHWH was the *shepherd* of Joseph (Gen 49:24), David (Psa 23:1), and Israel (Psa 80:1[2]) and was described as the good shepherd who keeps, protects, and leads Israel (Psa 74:1; 79:13; 95:7; 100:3; Isa 49:9-10; Jer 23:3; 31:10; Eze 34:31; Mic 2:12; 7:14). Unlike the ancient Near East, however, the *shepherd* metaphor was more often used in the Old Testament to criticize the kings of Israel (Jer 23:2; Eze 34:2-6). This difference in understanding the shepherd metaphor between the Ancient Near East and the Old Testament is most important and theologically significant in that the title *shepherd* has not been used to refer to the kings of Israel. For this reason, I propose to translate the Hebrew text (BHS) in the second half of 2 Samuel 5:2 “אַתָּה תִּרְעֶה אֶת־עַמִּי אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל”, into *You will shepherd my people Israel* in place of *You are my shepherd of Israel*.

<Abstract>

**The Servant Motif in Naaman Narrative:  
A Lexical, Literary and Theological Analysis**

Jae-Won Lee  
(Inha University)

This paper suggests that identifying the true servants could be a theme of Naaman narrative in chapter five of 2 Kings, and that servant motifs are included to support the new theme. The Hebraic terms for servant such as ‘נַעֲרָה קַטְנָה’ (young girl, v. 2), ‘עֲבָדִים’ (the servants of Naaman, v. 13), ‘נַעֲרָה’ (servant, v. 20) and ‘מַלְאָכִים’ (messenger, v. 10) show that each servant is of lower class. The roles of each character of the narrative are classified into four categories of leading, ancillary, archetype, and agent. Here we argue that roles of both the young girl of Naaman’s wife and his servants correspond to the archetype category, displaying the image of a typically faithful and wise servant. Thus we can conclude that servant motifs exist throughout various roles of the narrative characters. It can be said that the author of the book adds two more episodes to the first one (v. 1-14) with the intention to display various types of servants. Even though the first episode can complete the story, it is continually extended into the second one (v. 15-19) where Naaman shows humility by recognizing himself as “your servant” (v. 15), and into the third episode (v. 20-27) about Gehazi, the servant of deceiving character. Therefore we believe that the extended narrative has the servant motif. The rhetoric structure of the narrative could be chiasmic around the servant motif. ‘Five types of servants’ retrieved from the above analyses focusing on servant motifs give us the insight to explore the hidden theme of the narrative, i.e. identifying the true servants. The true servant wishes and serves the best for his master without seeking any reward like the little girl (v. 2) and the servants of Naaman (v. 13). The contribution of this study lies both in the discovery of ‘servant’ motif and finding the most likely new theme ‘who is the true servant?’ with the help of abductive reasoning. This new theme is in contrast with preceding researches focusing on the healing of Naaman to the effect of demonstrating the power of God, or on the role of the little girl as a means of spreading the Gospel to the gentiles.

<Abstract>

## Poetical Structure of Isaiah 6

Koowon Kim

(Reformed Graduate University)

The literatures that Isaiah 6 has spawned are legion, a testimony to its continuing fascination and appeal. There are good reasons for such fascination and appeal. Apart from the fact that Isaiah 6 plays a pivotal role in summarizing the previous chapters and in anticipating the rest of the book, the text poses a series of interesting textual, historical and theological conundrums: for instance, the historical setting of Isaiah 6, its genre as a call narrative, the identity of the seraphim and their role, an apparent break within Yahweh's speech between verses 11 and 12, the authenticity of the last three words in verse 13, *zera' qōdeš maššabetāh*, the theological implication of the divine hardening (*Verstockung*) in vv. 9-10 and so on.

Relatively little attention has been paid, however, to its poetic features. Such seems to be due partly to the narratival impression created by the sequence of *wayyiqtol*s that permeate the whole chapter (vv. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11). This impression may be reinforced by a heavy use of prose particles, *w* (41 times) *'t* (6 times), *'šr* (2/3 times), and *h* (16 times). But a closer study of the text shows a sophisticated poetic artistry throughout the chapter. In this paper, I will therefore restrict myself to the analysis of the poetic structure of Isaiah 6 without attempting to solve all its textual, historical and theological questions.

The purpose of this paper is to show that Isaiah 6 is composed of two layers of text, namely, poetry and prose, which are closely integrated and yet separable from each other. To that end, various types of parallelism and their different distributions will be discussed together with “terseness” as a way of separating out poetry from prose in Isaiah 6. In particular, the notation system invented by Dennis Pardee will be used to map out various distributions of parallelism in the poetic portion of Isaiah 6. This article shows that parallelism dominates the poetic portion of the text while fulfilling what A. Berlin calls its “poetic function” in the text, and that the two layers of text are closely integrated to each other in such a way that we cannot fully appreciate the beauty of the text without reading the chapter as an integrated whole.

<Abstract>

**A Comparative Study on the Aleppo Codex and the Leningrad Codex:  
Focusing on the Syntactic Word with the Difference in ‘Nevi’im’**

Sung-dal Kwon

(Westminster Graduate School of Theology)

The Hebrew/Aramaic text used as the basic text in the academia of the Old Testament all over the world today is the Leningrad Codex. The most significant reason why the Leningrad Codex, transcribed in the most recent period, is used as the basic text in the worldwide academia of the Old Testament is because it has the entire main text of the Old Testament. However, biblicists at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem showed interest in the Aleppo Codex among the Masoretic manuscripts and began a systematic research by collecting the copies of Aleppo Codex that were scattered around the world through various routes for decades. Many Jewish scholars comparatively studied the Aleppo Codex and other manuscripts, and concluded that the Aleppo Codex best preserves the traditions of the Masoretic manuscripts and is the most accurate. Jewish scholars consider the Aleppo Codex as the most accurate and reliable manuscript, while regarding the Leningrad Codex as a manuscript that includes relatively more errors than the Aleppo Codex. Thus, specific and objective comparative study and analysis are needed on the Leningrad Codex and the Aleppo Codex. If the Leningrad Codex is selected as the basic text just because it includes the entire Old Testament despite its many errors, it is necessary to seriously consider whether it is desirable to use the Leningrad Codex as the basic text in not only Korea but also the world's academia of the Bible study. Moreover, research and analysis are needed in terms of the level of accuracy and reliability of the Aleppo Codex, which is rated highly by the biblicists at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and whether it is highly overrated in some ways.

Mordechai Breuer listed the differences among various Masoretic manuscripts in the historical and prophetic books. This study selected only

the Leningrad Codex and Aleppo Codex among the various manuscripts listed by Breuer and conducted a complete enumeration survey on 311 cases that showed a difference, after which it analyzed accuracy through statistical analysis. As a result, this study reached the following conclusion.

(1) There are two cases in which the Leningrad Codex is highly accurate: one is in the spelling of the name of God as a noun despite other word spelling differences, and the other is in the spelling of numbers as a noun despite other word spelling differences.

(2) There are 18 cases in which the Aleppo Codex is highly accurate: ten in Ktiv/Qre, eight in other word spelling differences (one pronoun, two verbs, two prepositions, two number differences, and one other consonant difference).

(3) There is one case in which both have problems: In 2 Samuel 18:8, there is a verb difference among other word spelling differences.

(4) There are 290 cases in which it is difficult to evaluate reliability: 267 in mood, three in the order of characters, 20 in other word spelling differences (five prepositions, four nouns, two number differences, nine consonant differences).

According to the results of this study, the Aleppo Codex generally showed higher accuracy compared to the Leningrad Codex, and thus the evaluation of Jewish scholars stating the excellence of the Aleppo Codex is positive. The negative evaluation of the Leningrad Codex by Jewish scholars tends to be immoderate, though.

<Abstract>

**Die textkritische Bedeutung der *Ketib/Qere*-Tradition  
und deren Beziehung zur Septuaginta  
in Bezug auf Dittographie, Haplographie und graphische Ähnlichkeiten**

Jong-Hoon Kim  
(Busan Presbyterian University)

Die *Ketib/Qere*-Tradition ist eine auf das 2. Jhr. n. Chr. zurückgehende protomasoretische Texttradition. Ihre textkritische Bedeutung ist jedoch umstritten, weil sie nur in den mittelalterlichen Handschriften vorhanden ist. Bei den verschiedenen Diskussionen handelt es sich darum, ob die *Qere*-Tradition für ein Korrekturvorschlag des Schreibers ist, ob sie die Kollation eines älteren Textes repräsentiert, oder ob sie eine Kombination von beidem ist.

Meiner Meinung nach spielt aber die *Ketib/Qere* Tradition eine wichtige Rolle zur Erklärung der Beziehungen zwischen den verschiedenen Textformen der Septuaginta und des Qumrantextes und kann sie auch zum Erweis der Mehrgestaltigkeit und Flexibilität der Textformen des Alten Testaments in der hellenistisch-frühjüdischen Zeit beitragen.

Beim vorliegenden Beitrag wird vor allem die 37 Fälle aufgrund der Septuaginta textkritisch besprochen, und zwar Fälle, in denen die *Ketib/Qere* Tradition wegen der Dittographie bzw. Haplographie, wegen graphischer Ähnlichkeiten voneinander abweichen. Das Resultat der Analyse ist wie folgt: in 15 Fällen stimmt die Septuaginta mit dem *Ketib* überein, demgegenüber in 21 Fällen mit dem *Qere*. In 11 Fällen stellt aber das *Ketib* ein Schreibfehler dar. Bei den Schreibfehlern des *Ketib* stimmt die Septuaginta in 8 Fällen mit dem *Qere* überein, d.h. in diesen Fällen ist die *Qere*-Tradition wirklich ein Korrekturvorschlag. Es ist aber auch interessant, dass dagegen in 2Kön 7,13, Jer 31,40 [38,40 LXX], und Ps 105[104],28 die Septuaginta mit dem *Ketib* übereinstimmt. Darüber hinaus scheint das *Qere* in 2Kön 22,5 sogar ein Schreibfehler zu sein. Interessant ist, dass in Dan 9,24, wo wir zwei unterschiedliche griechische Textformen haben, diese sowohl das *Ketib* als auch das *Qere* unterstützen.

Die vorliegende Analyse bestätigt meine Annahme. Gewiss gibt es bei den

*Qeres* Korrekturvorschläge gegenüber fehlerhaften *Ketibs* (und in interessanter Weise gibt es anscheinend auch fehlerhafte *Qeres*). Manche *Qeres* mögen erst frühmittelalterlich sein, aber in vielen Fällen gehen die Lesarten in die frühjüdische Zeit zurück und bestätigt die *Ketib/Qere* Tradition die Mehrgestaltigkeit des hebräischen Textes in dieser Zeit. Manche *Qeres* sind Korrekturen für fehlerhafte *Ketibs*, nicht selten sind aber auch sowohl *Ketib* als auch *Qere* sinnvoll und spiegeln unterschiedliche Auffassungen des Textes.

Das hohe Alter dieser Textformen wird durch die Entsprechungen in der Septuaginta bestätigt. Dabei folgt die Septuaginta teils dem *Ketib* und teils dem *Qere*. - Dabei kann man kein Prinzip dafür erkennen, welche Lesart die Septuaginta aufgreift. In manchen Fällen hatten die Übersetzer vielleicht nur eine Textform zur Verfügung, in anderen Fällen trafen sie vielleicht eine bewusste Entscheidung. Die Septuaginta bestätigt jedenfalls, dass ein Teil der *Ketib/Qere* – Tradition in die frühjüdische Zeit und auf deren mehrgestaltige hebräische Textformen zurückgeht.

<Abstract>

**A Suggestion for the Translation of ὅσοις:  
Focused on the Combination of πᾶς and the Single Type**

Woo-Jin Shim  
(Seoul Jangsin University)

ὅσοις occurs 110 times in the New Testament. This is a relatively high frequency. This paper will check whether ὅσοις has been properly translated. An analysis of the examples of ὅσοις in the New Testament shows unique phenomenon. In the four gospels and Acts, ὅσοις often combines with πᾶς. Of the total 66 times, ὅσοις appears 22 times in the combination with πᾶς. This can be regarded as a result of the characteristic that ὅσοις tends to combine with πᾶς. In terms of contents, ὅσοις refers to a limited quantus and πᾶς refers to all within that range. The combination of the two was probably a favorite form of gospel writers.

But the problem arises from the translation of ὅσοις. Except for the gospels and Acts, the combination of πᾶς and ὅσοις cannot be found elsewhere in the Pauline epistles and the rest of the New Testament. Nevertheless, many translations of the Bible add the meaning of *all* even though there is no πᾶς. What is the reason? An authoritative grammar book on ancient greek explains that in many cases, ὅσοι can be changed to πάντες οἱ. This seems to be closely related to the prejudice that the meaning of πᾶς is already included in the basic meaning of ὅσοις.

However, this prejudice should be withheld when translating the Bible. The grammar book mentions that it is interchangeable *in many* cases, but not in *all* cases. In the Pauline epistles and the rest of the New Testament except for gospels and Acts, the combination form of πᾶς and ὅσοις can never be found. Nevertheless, Korean Bible translations as well as the English and the German ones often translate ὅσοις with the meaning of ‘all’, even though there is no πᾶς. This should be corrected when the Korean Bibles are revised. It should be translated with the meaning of *all* when there is πᾶς, but if otherwise, without the addition of *all*. I think this conveys the linguistic meaning and feeling of the original text more faithfully.

<Abstract>

**A Study on the Literary Character of  
*Tianzhu jiangsheng yanxing jilüe* and Its Vorlage**

Wonmo Suh, Changsun Kim  
(Presbyterian University and Theological Seminary)

This study is designed to elucidate the literary character and the *Vorlage* of *Tianzhu jiangsheng yanxing jilüe* written and published in the year of 1635 by Giulio Aleni (艾儒略, 1582-1649). *Tianzhu jiangsheng yanxing jilüe* covers the life of Jesus Christ from the conception of John the Baptist to the Ascension and the birth of the church, and broadly belongs to the Gospel Harmony in its broad sense which integrates the texts of the four Gospels into one Gospel. *Tianzhu jiangsheng yanxing jilüe*, however, does not present the Biblical texts faithfully but recapitulates them, and adds non-Biblical materials such as comments on historical backgrounds and Christian doctrines, expositions on Biblical words and phrases, and meditative remarks. Hence *Tianzhu jiangsheng yanxing jilüe* is said to be the first Chinese Gospel Harmony and the first Chinese exposition of the Gospel Harmony.

In order to investigate the characteristics of *Tianzhu jiangsheng yanxing jilüe* from the perspective of the Gospel Harmony, this study outlines the tradition of the Gospel Harmony in the Latin Christianity up to the sixteenth century, and draws its attention to the *Life of our Lord Jesus from the Gospels (Vita D. N. Iesu Christi ex uerbis Euangeliorum in ipsismet concinnata, 1607)* composed by Bartolomeo Ricci (1542-1613) (2). Since there is a circumstantial evidence that Aleni was acquainted with Ricci's work and used it in China, this study seeks to examine whether he utilized it as his *Vorlage* in his composition of *Tianzhu jiangsheng yanxing jilüe* by comparing them in the structure of the Gospel Harmony (3.1) and the formation of harmonized texts (3.2).

This study corroborates that both *Tianzhu jiangsheng yanxing jilüe* and the *Life of our Lord from the Gospels* perfectly display the full agreement in their arrangement of the events of Jesus Christ, and that both works substantially accord in their composition of harmonized texts, while Aleni did not strictly follow the suggestions of Ricci for formulating the texts, showing his own

freedom in selecting words and phrases and the textual order. In conclusion, this study reveals that while Aleni in his writing of *Tianzhu jiangsheng yanxing jilüe* largely depended on Ricci's *Life of our Lord from the Gospels*, he adapted it into the context of Chinese mission. *Tianzhu jiangsheng yanxing jilüe* is another example of adaptation which the seventeenth-century Jesuit missionaries demonstrated in their transmission of Christian faith and Western culture.

<Abstract>

**Μονογενής Θεός – the Prophet-like-Moses Par Excellence  
and the Unique Exegete of the Father:  
An Exegetical and Text-Critical Study of John 1:17-18**

Kei Eun Chang  
(Seoul Christian University)

This paper studies the last two verses of the Johannine Prologue (1:1-18), in which readers face arguably the most important question in the Johannine studies: Does John 1:18 say that Jesus is “God” or “Son”? This is because they have to make a text-critical choice between the reading of μονογενής θεός and the reading of ὁ μονογενής υἱός. John 1:17-18 not only forms the climax of the Prologue, but also prepares the readers to read the rest of the Gospel in light of the Moses tradition. In this paper, I argue that the Evangelist, by Moses-Christ parallelism, proposes Jesus Christ as the Prophet-like-Moses *par excellence*. In Judaism, Moses is the great revealer of God. For the Evangelist, however, μονογενής θεός, who is at the Father’s side, and thus shares in full secrets of Deity is the *unique* Exegete of the Father. I demonstrate how the Moses-Christ juxtaposition functions in the passage and beyond, and how it leads us to make the correct text-critical choice of μονογενής θεός against ὁ μονογενής υἱός. To make the case, I first analyze the structure of the passage in parataxis, two statements of Moses and Christ in particular. I argue that the two clauses in 1:17 are synthetic rather than antithetic parallelism, by which one points to the other, and the latter is far greater than the former. Second, I show how the Evangelist develops Moses-Christ parallelism throughout the Fourth Gospel. Here particular attention is paid to the Jewish *shaliach* (שליח; “one who is sent”) tradition to disclose how Johannine Christology carries this tradition in presenting Christ as the Prophet far greater than Moses. Third, I analyze textual problems in 1:18 and show how Greek manuscript traditions are split, and how modern English and Korean translations differ from one version to another. Here I suggest that Korean versions apply the current New Testament scholarship. Against the view that the context prefers the reading ὁ μονογενής υἱός, I make a counter claim that the *context* rather demands the reading μονογενής θεός. For this

case, I argue that the Moses-Jesus parallelism demands the reading of  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta$   $\varsigma$   $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$  because the Evangelist in the immediate context as well as in the entire Gospel intends to propose that “only Son, himself God” is the  $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\eta\gamma\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  or the full narration of God for the world. Finally, I briefly mention if any theological or scribal *Tendenz* is involved in the variant readings of John 1:18.

<초록>

## 타티아누스의 디아테사론과 오경 분석

기원후 2세기에 시리아에서 활동한 타티아누스는 네 개의 개별 복음서와 다른 자료들을 가지고 디아테사론이라고 불리는 단권 복음서를 만들었다. 타티아누스가 디아테사론을 만들게 된 동기는 개별 복음서들에 나타나는 예수의 삶과 가르침에 대한 내용의 차이를 가능한 한 최소화하여, 네 복음서를 일관된 내용으로 재구성하고 조화시키기 위한 것이었다. 2세기 중반 이후에 만들어진 디아테사론은 5세기 초반까지 시리아의 많은 교회에서 사용하다가, 그 이후에 공적인 예배에서는 사용이 금지되었다. 디아테사론은 신약성서 사본학의 측면에서 여러 정보를 제공할 뿐만 아니라, 오경 형성사의 가설에도 중요한 착안점을 제공한다. 네 개의 복음서들 사이에 있는 차이는 이른바 오경의 네 문서가 가지고 있는 차이에 유비될 수 있는 점에서 그러하다. 비록 오경을 이루는 네 개의 자료(JEDP)가 네 개의 개별 복음서처럼 독립적인 형태로 남아있지 않지만, 오경의 최종 편집자가 분리된 형태로 가지고 있던 자료를 하나의 합성적인 문서인 오경으로 통합했다고 가정할 수 있다. 이러한 점에서 디아테사론은 오경의 형성사와 신학을 이해하는 데 유용하다.

<Abstract>

**Book Review - *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem: Judah under Babylonian Rule* (Oded Lipschits, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005)**

Hoo-Goo Kang  
(Seoul Jangsin University)

This paper is a review of the book by the biblical archaeologist, Oded Lipschits who teaches at the Tel Aviv University.

The book under review is a synthesis of Lipschits' Ph.D. dissertation and following researches focusing on the significant historical event of the fall of Jerusalem. Based on historical documents and critical analysis of biblical sources and archaeological data, the book tried to figure out what exactly happened before and after the fall of Judah. The book is approached from the following points for proper evaluation: (1) the period which this book is dealing with, (2) methodology, (3) contents, (4) contributions, and (5) limitations of the book.

This book mainly focused on the critical yet neglected period, i.e. before and after the fall of Jerusalem. Because of the limited availability of historical documents, the writer approached the period through other sources in critical analysis-archaeological data and biblical passages. The book overturned the established understanding that the land of Israel became desolate and few had settled after the Babylonian destruction, arguing that there were settlers in the land and that the biblical passages were written from the returnees' point of view.

Even though the writer interpreted some archaeological data to fit his main arguments, it is still true that this book is a must for scholars and students studying archaeology, history, and biblical studies with particular interest in the 6<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E., i.e. the period before and after the fall of Jerusalem and Judah.