

Table of Contents

• Paper •

- [Kor.] David's Rest and Yahweh's Promise for the Two Houses in MT 2 Samuel 7:1-17  
----- Changyop Lee / 7
- [Kor.] The Translation of Isaiah 7:14b: *hā'almāh* and the Verbless Clauses  
----- Yoo-ki Kim / 27
- [Kor.] Study on Hezekiah's Tunnel in Ben Sira 48:17-22: Comparison between the Hebrew  
Text and the LXX ----- Pong Dae Im / 47
- [Kor.] A Study of the Septuagint Translation of Geographical Terms and Related Toponyms in  
the Massora Text ----- Mi-Sook Lee / 67
- [Kor.] A Study of the Changes of Personal Pronouns in John 21:24-25 and the Translation of  
*οἱμαί* Revisited ----- Sun Wook Kim / 98
- [Kor.] *πάσα ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις* Reconsidered: A New Reading of 1 Peter 2:13  
----- Ho Hyung Cho / 127
- [Kor.] On Korean Transliteration of Transliterated Words in New Testament Greek and Its  
Application: Focused on the Gospel of Matthew --- Sang-Il Lee / 151
- [Kor.] Vat. Pers. 4, the Gospel of Matthew in Persian at the Vatican Library: A Comparative  
Study on the Persian Gospels in the 13~14th Century  
----- Moonseok Kwak / 171
- [Kor.] Professionalism vs. Popularity: Different Strategies of Word Choice in Bible Translation  
with Special Reference to "presbutēs"(πρεσβύτερος) in Philemon 1:9 in Modern  
Mongolian Bibles ----- Kyo Seong Ahn / 196
- [Kor.] An Analysis of the Afrikaans Bible Translations: Focused on 1 John 1  
----- Youngmog Song / 220
- [Kor.] The Significance of the Word 'Sacrifice' in the Pre-Modern Era and the Modern  
Perception and Understanding of the Bible  
----- Shin-Hye Seo, Sun-Hui Yi / 243
- [Eng.] Measuring the *פֶּאֹה* (pe'ah) to the Poor: Examining Legal Interpretations about Leviticus  
19:9-10 in Qumran and Rabbinic Halakhah --- Chang Seon An / 264
- [Eng.] The Influence of Ezekiel 40-48 on *1 Enoch* 14:8-25 ----- Inchol Yang / 284

[Eng.] The Perfect Tense-Form in Application: 1 Corinthians 7:14 as a Test-Case in Light of  
Verbal Aspect ----- David I. Yoon / 309

• **Translated Paper** •

[Kor.] The 1992 Revision of the Good News Bible: The Context for Revision  
----- David G. Burke (Dong-Hyuk Kim, trans.) / 329

• **Book Review** •

[Kor.] *Exile and Restoration Revisited: Essays on the Babylonian and Persian Periods in  
Memory of Peter R. Ackroyd* (Gary N. Knoppers, et al., eds., Yoonkyung  
Lee, trans., CLC, 2019) ----- Ji-Hoon Kim / 356

<Abstract>

**David's Rest and Yahweh's Promise for the Two Houses  
in MT 2 Samuel 7:1-17**

Changyop Lee  
(Anyang University)

2 Samuel 7:1 clearly states that David is the one who enjoys rest. Yahweh's Words given to David (2Sa 7:5b-7) emphasize Yahweh's initiative in the building project and the tabernacle as Yahweh's temporary dwelling place in the past. The author of MT Samuel irregularly uses *waw* copulative and *waw* conversive in 8b-11a. The author's rhetorical intent is only to use *waw* conversive partly in 9a and 9b. He intends to introduce what Yahweh did to David first, and then to Israel in the past. The author does not describe what Yahweh did to David and Israel according to temporal order or logical result. Therefore, MT 2 Samuel 7:1b and 11a do not seem to be in conflict with one another nor speak of David's present rest equally. MT 2 Samuel 7 clearly says that rest is not given to David in the future, but has been given to David (2Sa 7:1, 11a). In contrast to the text of 1 Kings 5:3-4 that David is not a man of rest, MT 2 Samuel 7 does not link David's rest with the building of Jerusalem temple as the precondition to be complied with.

Due to the presence of 2 Samuel 7:13a, the whole text of 2 Samuel 7 clearly shows that it is not Yahweh's intention to ban the temple building itself. 2 Samuel 7 does not search for the reason why David cannot build the Jerusalem temple. The concern of 2 Samuel 7 is not to deal with the qualifications of the temple builder, but to promise that Yahweh will build David's house. 2 Samuel 7 clearly states that David is not the one who builds the house of Yahweh, but rather tells that David's son is to do so. The focus of 2 Samuel 7 is on the construction of the house of David and the house of Yahweh respectively.

<Abstract>

**The Translation of Isaiah 7:14b:  
*hā'almāh* and the Verbless Clauses**

Yoo-ki Kim  
(Seoul Women's University)

The Hebrew term *hā'almāh* in Isaiah 7:14b has been rendered as *cheonyeo* in most Korean translations, which partly corresponds to 'virgin' in English, without taking the definite article *ha-* into account. Moreover, all the Korean versions under review have rendered the adjective *hārāh* and the participle *yōledet* as future tense verbs.

*'almāh* is attested in the Hebrew Bible nine times, but none of the other instances put focus on 'virginity'. Along with *bētūlāh* and *na'ārāh*, *'almāh* generally refers to a young woman. The LXX translates *'almāh* as *parthenos*, which has been suggested to mean 'virgin' since the LXX almost mechanically renders Hebrew *bētūlāh* as *parthenos*. However, *bētūlāh* does not always focus on virginity and *parthenos* is sometimes chosen to translate *na'ārāh*. In addition, the context of Isaiah 7:14 does not warrant the translation of *'almāh* as *cheonyeo* or 'virgin'. Korean versions also need to translate the Hebrew definite article into the Korean determiner *geu* since the young woman in this verse is likely to be a particular person known to the interlocutors of the reported speech.

The adjective *hārāh* and the participle *yōledet* immediately follows the subject *hā'almāh* as predicates. Korean translations as well as a number of translations in other languages render the adjective and participle as future tense verbs. However, they are preceded by *hinnēh*, which presents actions or events in temporal proximity. The context also suggests that the events referred to by these predicates are occurring or will soon come true. The woman is probably pregnant now and will soon give birth to a son. Therefore, it is recommended that these predicates be rendered using present tense or near future tense verbs. After all, the sign is not about a virgin birth but the birth of a son and naming him Immanuel, which promises protection to King Ahaz and his kingdom.

<Abstract>

**Study on Hezekiah's Tunnel in Ben Sira 48:17-22:  
Comparison between the Hebrew Text and the LXX**

Pong Dae Im  
(Methodist Theological University)

In this paper, I will search the story of Hezekiah's tunnel in the Book of Ben Sira called Ecclesiasticus as well as in the biblical texts, comparing the Hebrew text and the Septuagint to discern differences in the translation among the Korean Common Translation, the Korean Catholic Bible, and the New American Bible Revised Edition.

Hezekiah was one of the great kings of Judah, at least from the religious viewpoint of the Deuteronomist, the Chronicler, and Ben Sira. Hezekiah bored a tunnel from the Spring of Gihon to the Pool of Siloam (2Ki 20:20; 2Ch 32:30), thus assuring Jerusalem a good supply of water when Sennacherib attacked Judah and surrounded the city of Jerusalem.

We can find this story of Hezekiah in the Book of Ben Sira 48:17-22. Ben Sira was originally written in Hebrew around the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE, and was later translated into Greek as one book of the Septuagint. Between 1896 and 1900, many fragments of Ben Sira in Hebrew were identified by scholars among the vast collection of materials recovered from the Cairo synagogue genizah.

Ben Sira 48:17c "and he hewed through the rocks with bronze" is evidently referring to the boring of the tunnel from the Gihon to the Pool of Siloam. This resembles the description of the Siloam inscription. The verb חצב(hew through) and the noun צור(rock) both occur twice in the Siloam inscription found six meters before the exit of Hezekiah's tunnel in 1880, and it describes the dramatic meeting between the workers who have completed the tunneling.

While the Hebrew text declares 'the Most High God'(אל עליון) in verse 20a, the LXX describes God as "the Lord, merciful". The LXX's expression is clearly an interpretive variant based on the context here and in 2 Kings. In many cases, the Korean Common Translation and the Korean Catholic Bible followed the LXX in their translation, whereas the New American Bible revised its translation based on the Hebrew text, which is respected as the original

language.

Even though the LXX is more familiar to us since the Apocrypha is not included in the Hebrew Bible, Ben Sira was originally written in Hebrew, and fortunately, we now have the Hebrew text as its manuscript. We therefore need to take into serious account the Hebrew text as well when we revise or translate Ben Sira.

<Abstract>

## **A Study of the Septuagint Translation of Geographical Terms and Related Toponyms in the Massora Text**

Mi-Sook Lee

(Presbyterian University and Theological Seminary)

There are many Hebrew toponyms in the Massora Text (MT) that reflect various geographical features. However, when such MT technical terms are rendered into other languages, it is not easy to translate them properly. For instance, the Septuagint (LXX) translators translated 129 technical Hebrew terms into 440 Greek equivalents, which is more than three times the number of Hebrew words in the original MT. This study therefore begins with a question of how 81 Hebrew MT terms (about 63% of the 129 original terms, which the LXX translated into 250 equivalents) reflecting Israel's topography, water, and arable land were translated into later versions as based on A. Schwarzenbach's list.

This study further examines the trends and characteristics of the LXX translation. It also reviews the translation issues in modern versions of the Old Testament regarding terms that require geographical understanding, and also seeks the right understanding of the Old Testament for the revision of the Korean Bible.

Geographical MT terms relating to topography, water, and arable land have traces of different names according to landscape, cause of formation, and place of topography. Among the 250 LXX equivalents for the 81 studied Hebrew terms, 80% match the original MT. The LXX translations also revealed stereotype equivalents, such as Har, Nahar, and Ain, and limitations in geographical knowledge, but by expressing the terms in Greek, the LXX enriched the MT's interpretation and brought dynamics back to living languages.

The LXX translators' effort to understand the Hebrew terms were better revealed in discordance with the MT terms. Their different readings of the MT and transliteration occurred due to problems with the MT's interpretation and textual corruption. These problems are not large in 20% of the LXX equivalents, but are also not small in terms of biblical hermeneutics and textual criticism.

There are intentional cases that can be confirmed in examples of LXX

transliteration, such as Bama, Nahal, and Araba, which are read or modified as a place name to harmonize with context. Aspects of different reading also vary, and some examples result from freely interpreting the context such as Bama, Ofel, and Gai. In some cases like Madrega, there are limitations of geographical knowledge, and examples that seem to be obvious errors like Ned and Shiha are also found.

Comparing the LXX to modern MT translations, issues with the translations of geographical terms such as Nahal, Ashed (Ashedot), and Mishor still exist. The translations of these terms in the Korean Bible thus need to be reviewed professionally and carefully.



<Abstract>

**A Study of the Changes of Personal Pronouns in John 21:24-25  
and the Translation of οἱ μαι Revisited**

Sun Wook Kim

(Ezra Bible Institute of Graduate Studies)

In this paper, I discuss who the author of John's Gospel is with a study of the changes of personal pronouns in 21:24-25, and point out the problem of the translation of οἱ μαι in 21:25 in the New Korean Revised Version (NKRIV). These two verses, the final conclusion of the Gospel of John refer to the author who is testifying and writing about the things Jesus has done. The changes in personal pronouns, however, appear in these verses. The author as the witness and the writer of the Gospel is presented with the third-person singular pronoun "his" (αὐτοῦ), then the first-person plural pronoun "we" (the subject of οἶδαμεν), and finally the first-person singular pronoun "I" (the subject of οἱ μαι). The problem here is who "we" and "I" are. The debate is generally divided into two distinctly contrasting claims. One is the view that "we" is the plural of real persons (Johannine community) and "I" is a rhetorical expression. The other is the opposite view that "we" is a rhetorical expression and "I" is a real, individual person (author). I accept the second view, and believe that the author of this Gospel is the apostle John who is one of the Twelve.

The three changes in personal pronouns are made according to the author's intention. The author wants to present himself as "the disciple whom Jesus loved" in the third-person singular form, describing himself as an objective person in the narrative. He also tries to tell the readers that his testimony is true because he had the closest relationship with Jesus compared with others and fully understood what Jesus said. Then, the author changes a personal pronoun into the first and plural "we." The purpose of such a change is intended to convey the sincerity of the testimony of "the disciple whom Jesus loves." The narrator of John's Gospel is expressed with "we" while developing the narrative from beginning to end (e.g. 1:14, 16; 21:24). Here, the use of "we" not only functions to increase the authority of the testimony, but also makes those who have faith participate in the author's testimony. Finally, the author addresses

himself as “I” with freedom and humility, praising Jesus for the greatness and vastness of his works. The author's clarification of “I” may also have implication of the apostolic authority over his writings.

I could yield this result through the study of the first-person singular pronoun “I” in 21:25. The NKRV, however, translates οἶμαι without the subject, “I.” This translation inevitably leads us to misunderstand the subject of οἶμαι as “we” that is the subject of οἶδαμεν in 21:24 because the subject of οἶμαι is omitted. I believe faithful translations are much more desirable than ones that lead us to misunderstanding, even if they are somewhat unsmooth or confusing in understanding a text. In addition, οἶμαι has the meaning of “to think” or “to suppose”, not “to know.” All things considered, I suggest to translate οἶμαι as “I suppose” instead of “know” in the NKRV.

<Abstract>

**πάσα ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις Reconsidered:  
A New Reading of 1 Peter 2:13**

Ho Hyung Cho  
(Chongshin University)

One must rightly understand the context of life including a word in the source language to translate it rightly in the receptor language. In light of this conviction, I disclose in the study the meaning of *πάσα ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις* in 1 Peter 2:13. Remarkably, versions in Korean, English, and other languages translate *πάσα* into “every” and *ἀνθρωπίνη* into “human.” Nearly all versions also render *κτίσις* into “institution” or “authority” in a consistent manner. Some lexicographers try to render *κτίσις* into another meaning, but most Greek dictionaries and a number of scholars go with the general flow. However, I have asked a fundamental question as to whether it is rendered as the two meanings in the Septuagint and the New Testament: it occurs 15 times in the former and 19 times in the latter. As a matter of fact, it has never been rendered as “institution” or “authority” in history since *κτίσις* was used by Pindar as an act to found and fulfill something.

I especially put emphasis on grasping the meaning of *κτίσις* in the context of passages to which it belongs, along with the historical circumstances. First, I detect the passage to which the phrase in 2:13 belongs, and see if it is included in the household codes. These codes deal with the relationship between human beings, not between human beings and institution; the phrase in 2:13-17 shows the attitude to rules Christians should take under the sovereignty of God. Second, I examine how *ὑποτάσσω* in 2:13 is used in 1 Peter, and disclose that it takes a person as an indirect object; *πάσα ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις* in 2:13 points to the person that is “emperor” or “governors” in 2:13-14. Third, I determine that the adjective *ἀνθρωπίνη* before *κτίσις* occurs to make clear the meaning of *κτίσις* which has an inclusive meaning in the Septuagint and the New Testament. Last but not least, I notice in 1 Peter that the destination was the Asia Minor where the imperial cult was prevalent. Peter and the recipient of the letter might have

known the circumstances of worshiping the emperor. In light of the situation, I manifest that the “Lord”(κύριος) is only Jesus Christ, and ὑποτάσσω means “appreciating” the position of the emperor in the sense of respecting him. By investigating in this manner, I come to conclude that πᾶσα ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις in 1 Peter 2:13 is “every human creature.”

<Abstract>

**On Korean Transliteration of Transliterated Words  
in New Testament Greek and Its Application:  
Focused on the Gospel of Matthew**

Sang-Il Lee  
(Chongshin University)

There are many words from Hebrew, Aramaic, and Latin in the New Testament literature transliterated in Greek such as local proper nouns, personal proper nouns, and common nouns or phrases. This paper has a focus on Korean transliteration of the transliterated loanwords in Greek. To transliterate Greek into Korean, we should first decide on the sound values of the source language (Greek). I have already submitted two previous papers on the reconstructed sound values of consonants and vowels of the New Testament Greek through internal and comparative reconstruction methods. After reconsidering the reconstructed sound values, I suggested revision of some cases in this paper. As for the plosives of New Testament Greek, I especially advocated the ternary opposition structure rather than the binary one:  $\beta$  bilabial voiced plosive,  $\delta$  alveolar voiced plosive,  $\gamma$  palatal voiced plosive,  $\pi$  bilabial unaspirated voiceless plosive,  $\tau$  alveolar unaspirated voiceless plosive,  $\kappa$  palatal unaspirated voiceless plosive,  $\phi$  bilabial aspirated voiceless plosive,  $\theta$  alveolar aspirated voiceless plosive, and  $\chi$  palatal aspirated voiceless plosive.

Based on Korean transliteration principles announced officially by the National Institute of Korean Language, I carefully transliterated the reconstructed sound values of vowels and consonants of New Testament Greek into the Korean language. Taking a further step, I suggested that the binary opposition structure of the plosives of New Testament Greek should be replaced by the ternary one for the Greek loanword orthography.

Finally, I exemplified Korean transliteration of some transliterated words in the Gospel of Matthew, and presented that we need to take six points into consideration when transliterating Greek loanwords into Korean. First, we need to follow the pronunciation of the Old Testament in Hebrew rather than the transliteration of the New Testament in Greek in case of popular personal proper

nouns and local proper nouns. Second, endings are to be deleted. Third, we do not need to make a distinction among short, long, and nested vowels except for their distinctiveness when transliterating them. Fourth, only ‘ㄱ’, ‘ㄴ’, ‘ㄷ’, ‘ㄹ’, ‘ㅁ’, ‘ㅂ’, and ‘ㅇ’ can be used as final consonants. Fifth, plosives should be transliterated from the perspective of the ternary opposition structure, it is admitted that we have to follow the Hebrew spelling. If the names are not popular, they could be gradually changed. Lastly,  $\sigma$  can be transliterated using ‘ㅅ’ not with ‘ㅆ’.

<Abstract>

**Vat. Pers. 4, the Gospel of Matthew in Persian at the Vatican Library:  
A Comparative Study on the Persian Gospels in the 13~14th Century**

Moonseok Kwak  
(Anyang University)

This article deals with the Vat. Pers. 4, a 14<sup>th</sup> century Persian translation of the Gospel of Matthew. This manuscript was copied in 1312 in Tabriz, the capital of the Ilkhanate, a territory in the Mongol empire. Let alone being the subject of a proper study, this copy has not even been edited critically nor has it been translated in modern languages. Only select passages are translated for specific purposes of this study, which then are compared with a few contemporary Persian translations — namely the Persian Diatessaron, Walton's Persian Gospels and Wheelocke's Persian Gospels.

The main results are as follows. First, the Vat. Pers. 4 shares phrases and terms with other Persian translations. The Persian terms used in Vat. Pers. 4 for baptism, disciples, law, synagogue, temple, glory, gospel, priest, and foolish also appear in other contemporary Persian translations. Thus a scholarly assumption that these terms are unique to Vat. Pers. 4 is refuted. Second, some unusual readings in the Vat. Pers. 4 have very similar wordings in the Persian Diatessaron. Hence the manuscript has a putative connection with Diatessaronic witnesses. Third, the readings also attest close affinities with Old Syriac Gospel versions, namely the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Curetonianus as well as Diatessaronic variants.

With its origin in the Persian Diatessaron for Persian Diatessaronic witnesses, Vat. Pers. 4 consequently throws a significant light in the New Testament textual criticism. And it is also a very important primary source for the forgotten history of the Persian Christianity in the Mongol empire.

<Abstract>

**Professionalism vs. Popularity:  
Different Strategies of Word Choice in Bible Translation  
with Special Reference to “presbutēs”(πρεσβύτης) in Philemon 1:9  
in Modern Mongolian Bibles**

Kyo Seong Ahn

(Presbyterian University and Theological Seminary)

In the tradition of Christianity, translated versions of the Bible have been highly regarded as much as the ones in original languages. It is evidenced by the fact that the Church gave the place of honour to the Vulgate, a translated version, at least in the Middle Age. This means that translation has always been crucial in the thought and practice in various branches of Christianity, in particular, commentary and Bible translation.

This article aims to clarify the relationship of commentary and Bible translation, and the differences between them, and to enhance our understanding of Bible translation. In doing this, this study delves deeply into the different word choice strategies in Bible translation, focusing on “presbutēs”(πρεσβύτης) in Philemon 1:9 in the modern Mongolian Bibles as a case study. The Letter to Philemon is known to have relatively a few, if any, commentary issues to consider, such as the meaning of “presbutēs”. Meanwhile modern Mongolian Bibles, which began to emerge in the late twentieth century in the Mongolian Cyrillic alphabet, show the diversity of word choice strategies in Bible translation. In translating the word “presbutēs”, modern Mongolian Bibles adopt three different word choice strategies of choosing “an old man” or “an ambassador” or of omitting the word. More interestingly, modern Mongolian Bibles adopt two different word re-choice strategies in their revised versions: change or continuity. To put perspective on the case of modern Mongolian Bibles, this article widely surveys other cases: the English Bibles including the RSV which first chose “an ambassador” for the word of “presbutēs”; other Bibles in Asian languages such as Mongolian in Old Script, Manchurian, Japanese, Korean, and Chinese; and some European languages such as Russian and German which Mongolian translators are familiar with. The result shows



that most of the modern Mongolian Bibles have the propensity to choose “an old man”, which is found in most of the cases in other language Bible translations as well. It also sheds light on the process of Bible translation and revision, particularly the Korean Common Translation-based Bibles in South and North Korea.

This study argues that commentary and Bible translation have different groups of target readers, with the former aiming at professionals and the latter at grassroots. Because of this, commentary allows as many different words as possible, and thus tends to be expansive and suggestive; whereas Bible translation pinpoints one word, and thus tends to be restricted and directive. With their different but complementary roles, both commentators and Bible translators can help ‘the Book of God’ become ‘the Book of people’. In sum, commentary opts for professionalism while Bible translation popularity.

<Abstract>

**An Analysis of the Afrikaans Bible Translations:  
Focused on 1 John 1**

Youngmog Song  
(Kosin University)

There are eleven official languages spoken by South Africans. Among them is Afrikaans, a simple form of Dutch that has been spoken since the immigration from European countries in 1652. The aim of this paper is to analyze the characteristics of the Afrikaans Bible translations. To accomplish this, a comparison is made among GNT<sup>5</sup> and three different Afrikaans translations published in 1933/1953, 1983, and 2012. In order to critique the Afrikaans translations, syntactical and structural analyses of 1 John 1 in Afrikaans give insight for the comparative analysis.

Through this study, it is evident that Afrikaans translations prefer simple sentences over complex and compound ones. In addition, Afrikaans translations have a tendency to go from literal translation to dynamic equivalence and then back to being literal. Despite its merit of being effective communication for modern readers, the use of the Afrikaans Bible published in 1983 as the official Scripture translation for modern Afrikaans churches has been problematic as it omits or adds words, incorrectly renders verbs and prepositions, and changes the gender of words. For this reason, a new translation of the Afrikaans Bible is necessary to provide modern readers with the correct rendering of the original author's message in readable and practical form. Over the last few centuries, Bible translators have been seeking this ideal to find an appropriate balance. This researcher also hopes this study can help forth-coming Korean Bible translations achieve this goal.

<Abstract>

## **The Significance of the Word ‘Sacrifice’ in the Pre-Modern Era and the Modern Perception and Understanding of the Bible**

Shin-Hye Seo, Sun-Hui Yi  
(Hanyang University, Chungang University)

This research explains the meaning and usage of the word ‘sacrifice’ used in the Bible in the pre-modern era, and explains how it is linked with the understanding of the Bible. The Korean word for sacrifice is composed of two letters — one meaning ‘untainted pure color’ and the other meaning ‘livestock’. The sacrifice was an essential step to complete the ancestral ritual. There was so much emphasis on the blood and life of the sacrifice that the alternative word for the ancestral ritual was ‘flesh feasting’ because they believed that the sacrifice served to connect human beings and god. The class of the ritual was determined by the type and the scale of the sacrifice. In the late Joseon Dynasty, when Confucianism was firmly established in the society, the general public thought that it was necessary to offer at least ‘grilled meats’ in place of sacrifice in an ancestral ritual.

The Korean Bible was translated at a time when there remained a general acceptance of such perception of sacrifice, and this word ‘sacrifice’ was used to explain the gospel. The word was useful in explaining how Jesus became the sacrifice and reconciled the connection between God and human beings who were sinners. Such concept of sacrifice also helps understand how Jesus as the sacrifice is pure, complete, and righteous. In the current version of the translated Bible in 1998, however, the words that were translated into “sacrifice” in the older versions have often been revised to “offering” or “ancestral ritual”. This not only makes the context awkward but also limit the meaning of ‘sacrifice’ mentioned above.

It calls for special attention when trying to replace Chinese-based words (Chinese loanwords) that are not in frequent use with ones in wider use. When a word happens to convey the core ‘concept’ for the understanding of the Bible with no alternative, the word should not be changed and its meaning has to be appreciated. The word ‘sacrifice’ is a very good example of such.

<Abstract>

**Measuring the  $\text{הַפֶּאֱה}$  (pe'ah) to the Poor:  
Examining Legal Interpretations about Leviticus 19:9-10  
in Qumran and Rabbinic Halakhah**

Chang Seon An  
(Chongshin University)

The legal interpretation of the Dead Sea Scrolls has been an important subject in various academic discussions since the scrolls were discovered in Khirbet Qumran near the Dead Sea. Even though we are still uncertain as to the circumstances under which Qumran or the author(s) of each scroll interpreted the scriptural texts, the Qumran scrolls clearly demonstrate a tendency to interpret the biblical texts in a unique manner. In relation to the interpretation of the biblical law, a comparative study of Qumran and rabbinic legal interpretation is often regarded as a significant tool for illuminating a mutual halakhic tradition and reconstructing connections between both methods. This paper compares the legal interpretation in Qumran with the halakhic positions preserved in the rabbinic literature about the biblical commandment on the gift for the poor (Lev 19:9-10), and argues that the Qumran biblical exegesis shows an embryonic trace of the halakhic method similar to what is found in the rabbinic legal interpretations.

For this, I present the legal text from the Scripture, and explain why the text leaves room for interpretation. Then, I provide passages from Qumran related to the biblical text, and compare their interpretations. After introducing the rabbinic interpretation of the same biblical texts and also comparing the Qumran halakhic view with that of the rabbinic literature, I demonstrate both similarities and dissimilarities between the two traditions. While illuminating the motivation behind attempts to interpret the biblical law using unique methods in Qumran and rabbinic halakhah, I finally propose an explanation to clarify why Qumranic halakhah provides the legal interpretation for the measurement of the gift to the poor. The comparative examinations of Qumran literature and the tannaitic writings reconstruct the early aspects of the pre-tannaitic midrash, and provide a clearer understanding about the development of the halakhic methods and the

sectarian views on legal interpretations.

In case of measuring the charity to the poor, the Qumranic interpretation sheds light on how the rabbinic halakhah developed its legal interpretations. On the basis of this short research, examinations of early halakhic views provide the chance to look at early exegesis of legal texts and the transformation of the halakhic positions. Thus, it is critical to compare the sectarian halakhah with the rabbinic literature on the creation of the measurement because the sectarian view fills the historical gap between the biblical law and the rabbinic halakhah concerning the development of the interpretation.

<Abstract>

### **The Influence of Ezekiel 40-48 on *1 Enoch* 14:8-25**

Inchol Yang  
(Hannam University)

Insofar as the throne vision in *1 Enoch* 14:8-25 so clearly recalls previous biblical descriptions, interpreters have simply focused on texts of the throne vision. However, more interpreters, with the understanding of Enoch's role as a priest, have come to recognize that the throne vision of *1 Enoch*. 14:8-25 reflects Ezekiel 40-48. Although they suggested the relationships between Ezekiel 40-48 and *1 Enoch* 14, they failed to explain why *1 Enoch* introduces the throne vision, namely, the heavenly temple vision in the wake of the narrative about the fallen Watchers' petition (*1En* 13:3b-7). Before Enoch was taken to heaven, the Great Holy One commanded His four archangels to destroy Shemihazah and his associates (*1En* 10-11). Yet Enoch suddenly shifts his concern as an intercessor for the Fallen Watchers (*1En* 12:1-13:7). Then as Enoch recites the memorandum of their petition, he sees visions in his dreams, in other words, the throne vision (*1En* 13:8-16:4). Since Enoch ascended to heaven, readers never heard the Fallen Watchers' voices. The author's intent must have been reflected on this narrative sequence. In this paper, I argue that the throne vision in *1 Enoch* not only follows the structure of Ezekiel 40-48, but also reflects Ezekiel's theology of the new Temple. From Ezekiel's perspective, the prerequisite conditions for the new Temple are the purification of the abominations in it: "the house of Israel shall no more defile my holy name, neither they nor their kings, by their whoring, and by the corpses of their kings at their death" (Eze 43:7). Thus he introduces the corpses of God's soldiers (Eze 38-39) and then proceeds to the next narrative about his entrance to the new Temple. With Ezekiel's theology in mind, Enoch, in a similar vein, constructs the sequence of events. The Fallen Watchers who were proud of their knowledge and power tremble before Enoch's command from the Great One. After Enoch's journey to the house in heaven, they disappeared (*1En* 21:10). This paper proceeds in five stages. First, it translates the throne vision (*1En* 14:8-25) on the basis of critical notes. Second, it examines the literary form and the setting of the throne vision

within the larger literary framework of the Book of the Watchers (*1En* 1-36). Third, it identifies and examines genre and language. Fourth, it investigates the setting in which the text was written, to which it was addressed, and in which it functioned. Finally, it draws conclusions concerning Ezekiel's temple theology in *1 Enoch*.

&lt;Abstract&gt;

**The Perfect Tense-Form in Application:  
1 Corinthians 7:14 as a Test-Case in Light of Verbal Aspect**

David I. Yoon  
(McMaster Divinity College)

Paul’s advice regarding marriage in his first letter to the Corinthians has been well discussed, but his statements are not without interpretive difficulties. One of these difficulties is his advice for a married believing spouse to remain with an unbelieving spouse, giving the reason that “the unbelieving husband has been sanctified through his wife” (NIV 2011) and the wife through the husband. Some interpreters take this to refer to the continued influence of the believing spouse upon the unbelieving spouse. Others take this to refer to a future hope of the unbelieving spouse to convert through the influence of the believing spouse. However there should be greater focus on the discussion about the impact of the meaning of the perfect tense-form (ἡγίασται). The verbal aspect framework is crucial for interpreting this statement; in particular, how one views the semantics of the perfect tense-form. This essay begins with a brief survey of the three major views on the perfect (Porter, Fanning, and Campbell), with brief, critical evaluations. Porter represents the stative aspect view, that the perfect tense-form grammaticalizes a (complex) state of affairs, without regard to tense or kind of action. Fanning represents the perfective aspect view, that the perfect tense-form grammaticalizes the perfective aspect (external viewpoint) but also encodes *Aktionsart* and tense. Campbell represents the imperfective aspect view that the perfect tense-form grammaticalizes ongoing action with heightened proximity in relation to the present tense-form. In the final section of this essay, I apply the reading of ἡγίασται according to each viewpoint to see which view best explains the meaning of ἡγίασται in this verse. I conclude that the stative aspect reading makes the best sense of this verse, where Paul instructs believing spouses to remain with their unbelieving spouses since they are in a (complex) state of sanctification by being with their spouse. This interpretation is preferable to the other two; the perfective aspect reading would mean that the sanctification process of the unbelieving spouse is depicted as complete by Paul, which raises



many more questions than what it answers, and the imperfective reading would mean that the sanctification process of the unbelieving spouse is depicted as ongoing by Paul, which seems to contradict the experiences of many individuals in this situation. Thus, the semantics of the stative aspect view makes the best sense in this passage.

<Abstract>

**Book Review - *Exile and Restoration Revisited: Essays on the Babylonian and Persian Periods in Memory of Peter R. Ackroyd* (Gary N. Knoppers, et al., eds., Yoonkyung Lee, trans., CLC, 2019)**

Ji-Hoon Kim  
(Hanshin University)

This paper is a review of the book, *Exile and Restoration Revisited: Essays on the Babylonian and Persian Periods in Memory of Peter R. Ackroyd* (2009), edited by Gary Knoppers, Lester L. Grabbe and Deirdre Fulton. This paper is a review of its Korean translated edition. The book contains a total of 12 papers and offers a glimpse into various perspectives on the Babylon and Persian period.

In particular, this book is written with the following five points of view: terminology, new sources, historiography, Jerusalem and the Persian relationship with the Provinces, community strife and the intermarriage issue.

This review first summarizes the contents of each chapter, and then comments from the following three points of view.

First, the five points of view (terminology, new sources, historiography, Jerusalem and the Persian relationship with the Provinces, community strife and the intermarriage issue) are now being discussed.

Second, it is a question of the timing of early Achaemenid. Personally, I set the period of Darius I as the early Achaemenid because Achaemenid has lost interest in Egypt and Jehud since the death of Darius I.

Third, it is a matter of the priest's political power. Especially before the time of captivity, Zadokite priest was in power and Zadokite priest was in power during the early Achaemenid period. But they still haven't dropped the Levite. Blenkinsopp's paper on the reasons makes one wonder about the link between Mizpah and Bethel about the political power of the Levites.

I am sure this book is useful to people studying Babylon and early Achaemenid history.