Journal of Biblical Text Research. Vol. 17.

Published Semiannually by
The Institute for Biblical Text Research of the Korean Bible Society; October 2005

Table of Contents

<Abstract>

An Epistemological Study on the Korean Bible Society's *New Translation Color Illustrated Bible*:
From Understanding the Word to Experiencing the Images

Prof. Young-lae Kim
(Methodist Theological Seminary)

Illustrations in the Bible take various forms, from fine art to caricature. The use of illustrations is primarily to increase the degree of understanding of the text by providing visual images. Images provide not only references for the contents but also experiences of the aesthetic aspects of the stories for Bible readers. In history, the visual matter in such illuminated manuscript Bibles has generally consisted of three kinds: illuminated initial letters, particularly the first word of a book, often merely formal but sometimes representing more or less relevant scenes; decorative borders with flowers, scrolls or beasts, usually not closely related to the texts; and miniature pictures representing scenes in the text. The illustrations shown in *New Korean Revised Version* with Color Illustrations produced by Korean Bible Society (2004) have creatively modified the drawings of Annie Vallotton. Her simple illustrations for this version originally appeared in the *Good News Bible*. She provides 551 line drawings of figures dancing, praying, fighting and raising the dead. They depict not only the scripture, but the publisher's philosophy that the Bible should be accessible and enjoyable. This new version of the Bible opens up wide the possibility for readers' grasp of the whole meaning of the Bible.

The purpose of this study is to explore the *New Korean Revised Version with Color Illustrations* from an epistemological perspective: from understanding the word to experiencing the images. It will present a brief historical sketch of the illustrated Bible for discussion, and will study the unique illustrations of Annie Vallotton in terms of her distinctive style. The relationship between media and cognizance will be considered, in order to discover the process of change from words to images and from understanding to experience. The study will conclude with an evaluation of the *New Korean Revised Version with Color Illustrations* and suggestions for biblical scholars and producers of Bibles.

<Abstract>

κεχάρισται in Galatians 3:18

Prof. Yon-kyong Kwon
(Westminster Graduate School of Theology)

The main thesis of the present study is that the verb χαρίζομαι in Galatians 3:18b should be translated intransitively as "(God) show favor to" instead of "to give" as is typically done by most Bible translations and exegetes.

After a brief look at the general flow of Paul's argument up to 3:18, the author provides a short survey and comparison of several major translations in German, English and Korean, ascertaining the fact that most modern translations, excepting two German ones, render the verb in the transitive sense of "to give."

The author's argument for the intransitive translation of χαρίζομαι consists of two major parts: syntactical (section 3) and exegetical (section 4). The syntactical argument examines the use of the verb in the New Testament and concludes that with a direct object the verb can take up the transitive meaning of "to give," but without one it always becomes intransitive to mean "to show favor to somebody" or, more specifically, "to forgive" in a few cases. On the basis of this syntactical observation, the author contends that κεχάρισται in Galatians 3:18b, which comes without any direct object attached to it, should be taken to be an intransitive rather than a transitive. Unlike most translations, then, the verb must be rendered "to show favor to," not "to give." The syntactical argument is followed by an exegetical one in which the author contends that the transitive rendering of "to give" is also ill-advised exegetically. For this the author makes six major points to criticize the dominant reading of Paul's argument, which assumes the transitive sense of the verb, as well as to justify his own reading of Paul's argument based on the intransitive rendering of the verb.

On the basis of these arguments, the author suggests that Galatians 3:18b should be translated as follows: "But God has shown favor to Abraham through promise."

<Abstract>

An Analysis of the Korean Translation Texts (Pro 23, Psa 32, 122, 2Ch 6-7) by Rev. Choi Pyeng Heun, a Bible translator, in *The Korean Christian Advocate*

Prof. Hwan-Jin Yi
(Methodist Theological Seminary)

The purpose of this article is to identify Rev. Choi Pyeng Heun as the first Korean translator of the Old Testament. Rev. Choi was the first Korean theologian who tried to have Christianity take root in the soil of Korea. His theological work of indigenization began with Bible translation.

During 1897-1905 *The Korean Christian Advocate* was released weekly by Rev. H.G. Appenzeller, the first Methodist missionary in Korea. Rev. Choi worked as an editorial writer for this journal. In addition, he translated some books of the Bible into Korean for the same journal, including Genesis, Samuel and Kings; and went on to translate portions of the Hagiographa such as Psalms, Proverbs and Chronicles.

When we compare these translation texts in the Hagiographa (Psa 32, 122, Pro 23, 2Ch 6-7) with the Chinese Delegates' Version (published in 1854) and the English Revised Version (published in 1885), we realize that the Chinese Bible is the Vorlage of the Korean translation in *The Korean Christian Advocate*. It is assumed from the comparison that Rev. Choi was the translator of the Old Testament texts. Rev. Appenzeller cannot be regarded as the translator of the Old Testament texts in the journal because he would not be good at Chinese. Unlike him, Rev. Choi excelled in Chinese to the extent that he quoted Confucian texts freely in most of his theological works including the editorials in *The Korean Christian Advocate.*

Up until now, the selective translation of Psalms by Alexander Pieters has been taken as the first Korean translation of the Old Testament. That translation was released in 1898; however, the translation texts in *The Korean Christian Advocate* were released in 1897. In particular, some portions of the Hagiographa showed up in the journal in 1897. Therefore Rev. Choi should be honored as the first Korean translator of the Old Testament. Bible translation work was the starting point of his theological indigenization.

Characteristics of the Discharge in Leviticus 15

Sooman Noah Lee*

The purpose of this study is to examine the characteristics of the discharge as it is stated in Lev 15:2-15, and to apply the findings to the understanding of the chapter as a whole. Leviticus 15 teaches how the people of Israel can solve the problems of uncleanness resulting from the secretion of liquid out of the human body. Among the several kinds of bodily secretion, the kind described as זוב, "discharge," in vv. 2-15 is deemed to have been inaccurately identified by some biblical interpreters and translations.

It is observable from the interpretation of commentators that there are basically two views on the characteristics of the discharge with regard to the locus of the discharge in the בשר, "body/flesh"; namely, the discharge flows out of (a) the "body" in general or (b) the "sexual organs" in specific. This interpretational issue begins as the topic of the passage in Lev 15:2b (איש איש כי יהיה זב מבשרו זובו טמא הוא, "When any one/person has a discharge from his body, his discharge is unclean"). The first question is: Is the discharge from (a) the "body" or from (b) the "private parts / penis" as some versions put it?[1] At the same time, some other exegetical questions arise, such as: Is the איש, "person," in focus a male or just a human regardless of the sex? What is the nature of this discharge?[2]

---

1) The two views are readily visible from some translations of the passage, as in:

     NIV: When any man has a *bodily* discharge, the discharge is unclean.

     NJPS: When any man has a discharge issuing from his *member*, he is unclean.

     NLT: Any man who has a *genital* discharge is ceremonially unclean because of it.

     REB: When anyone has a discharge from his *private parts*, the discharge is ritually unclean.

     RSV: When any man has a discharge from his *body*, his discharge is unclean.

     TEV: When any man has a discharge from his *penis*, the discharge is unclean,

  RSV and NIV opt for the view (a), "body, bodily," and the others the view (b), "member, private parts, genital, penis." This difference is evident in a similar manner in the versions of other languages such as French, German, Dutch, and Spanish.

2) J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, The Anchor Bible (New York; London: Doubleday, 1991), 907.

Commentators seem to agree to understand the זוב as "a discharge of mucus resulting from a catarrhal inflammation of the ruinous tract" as Noordtzij puts it.[3] As for the locus of the discharge in vv. 2-15, most scholars point to the sexual organs. It means that they take בשר as a euphemism for genitals. For instance, Hartley comments, "בשר, 'flesh,' is euphemistic for both male and female genitals, here and v. 19", whereas Péter-Contesse and Ellington state more definitively, "From his body: literally, 'out of his flesh,' as in KJV. The word 'flesh' or body (RSV) is nothing more than a polite way of referring to the male genital in this context."[4] The list of those scholars who present similar interpretations is long.[5] Furthermore, some scholars assume specifically the discharge to be gonorrhea, whereas some others consider the discharge to include more diverse symptoms than that.[6] Someone like F. Delitzsch argues that בשר here is not a euphemism for the genital but refers to the body, yet he still concedes that the discharge is "a secretion from the sexual organs."[7]

---

3) A. Noordtzij, *Leviticus*, Bible Student's Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub., 1982), 150.

4) J. E. Hartley, *Leviticus*, Word Biblical Commentary (Waco, TX: Word, 1992), 203; R. Péter-Contesse and J. Ellington, *A Translator's Handbook on Leviticus*, Adapted from the French, (New York: United Bible Societies, 1990), 228.

5) See J. Calvin, *Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses*. vol. II (repr., Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1979), 31; E. S. Gerstenberger, *Leviticus: A Commentary* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 198; F. H. Gorman Jr., *Divine Presence and Community: A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 90; R. K. Harrison, *Leviticus: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (Leicester, England and Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980), 160; J. E. Hartley, *Leviticus* 209; A. ibn Ezra, Jay F. Shachter, Trans., *Leviticus*, The Commentary of Abraham ibn Ezra on the Pentateuch: vol. 3 (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Publishing House, 5746/1986), 74; B. A. Levine, *Leviticus*, JPS Torah Commentary (Philadelphia: Jewish Pub. Soc., 1989), 93; J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 907; G. J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 217.

6) Just for a few illustrative comments: G. J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus*, 208: "In this respect, then, gonorrhea in men and menstrual and other female discharges are viewed as much more potent sources of defilement than others"; J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 907: "Scientific opinion is nearly unanimous 'that the only illness we know of that can be referred to here is gonorrhea' (Preuss 1978:410), an identification already made by the LXX and Josephus (*Ant*. 3.261; *Wars* 5.273; 6.426)"; J. E. Hartley, *Leviticus*, 209: "The precise identification of the discharge is uncertain, suggesting that a wide variety of ailments are included in this regulation"; P. J. Budd, *Leviticus*, New Century Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 215: "Many suspect gonorrhoea is in mind, but the condition need not be limited to that."

7) C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *The Pentateuch* vol. 1 in C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the*

Is the above understanding as handed down over centuries truthful to the text in the Hebrew language and to the real-life situation of the ancient Israel? Here, a minimal linguistic overhaul is attempted before considering to accept the traditional understanding of the nature of the discharge. It is now necessary to examine the three lexical items, אִישׁ, בשר, זוב, in order to get to a precise understanding of the characteristics of the discharge in Lev 15. In addition, a linguistic analysis of the verb ירק is deemed to be useful to shed light on the topic. Thus, we have the following four items to examine:

> 1. The meaning of אישׁ (vv. 2, 5, 16, 18, 24, 33)
> 2. The meaning of בשר (vv. 2, 3, 7, 13, 16, 19)
> 3. The meaning of זוב (vv. 2, 3, 13, 15, 19, 25, 26, 28, 30, 33)
> 4. Semantic characteristics of the verb רקק (v. 8)

1. The meaning of אישׁ (vv. 2, 5, 16, 18, 24, 33)

Does אישׁ mean "man, male" or "human, person" in these verses, especially in   v. 2?

אישׁ has several senses, such as: man, male; husband; person, man, human being; each (one), etc.[8] It is true that the primary sense of אישׁ is "man, male." However, it is noted that the use of אישׁ as "man, male" in contrast to אִשָּׁה as "woman" is rather rare in the Bible and is confined to a certain condition.[9] Let us take Gen 2:23, the first such use, as an example:

Old Testament in Ten Volumes (repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 391-392.

8) The definitions of אישׁ in HALOT [L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994-2000)]: 1. **man** (:: woman; :: animal; :: God), 2. **husband**, 3. indication of rank: a) the **distinguished people**; b) **governor** of lower rank, 4. **human being**, 5. indicates a position, occupation, public office, 6. **man of God:** prophets, b) in a broader sense: Moses; David; man sent by God, 7. in association with someone: the servants, David's men, the inhabitants of a town, 8. indicates association within a community: men of Israel; the men of Judah; a man of Israel, 9. **somebody**, impersonal, 10. each, 11. to express reciprocity: each other, 12. every = **each one** in his turn.

9) Out of the total 2,160 occurrences of אישׁ in the Hebrew Bible, following the count of HALOT, its usage as "man, male" may not exceed 90 occurrences.

לזאת יקרא *אשה*, כי מ*איש* לקחה־זאת

This one shall be called *Woman*,

For from *man* was she taken   (NJPS)

It is observable that איש occurs together with אשה in the same passage/context so that it could mean "man, male" rather than "human." This condition—namely, איש and אשה occur in the same verse or context—is applicable to most other occasions where איש denotes "male."[10]

As Hebrew is linguistically androcentric,[11] איש, a masculine noun, is employed to express "human being" that involves both man and woman.[12] Indeed איש is frequently used to refer to "human" in the Hebrew Bible even if there are terms like אָדָם, "man," אֱנוֹשׁ "man," and in a lesser sense בֶּן־אָדָם, "son of man," that generically refer to "human."[13] איש in this generic "human" sense denotes "an individual human being (who is responsible for his/her own life before God)." In this vein, איש is used in parallel with אדם and בן־אדם, as in Num 23:19,

---

10) Occasions of co-occurrence of איש and אשה in the same verse: Gen 2:23; Exo 11:3; 20:28, 29; 21:28, 29; 36:6; Lev 13:29, 38; 19:20; 20:13, 18, 27; Num 5:6, 30, 31; 6:2; 25:8, 14; Deu 15:2; 17:2, 5; 22:13, 18, 22, 25, 29; Jdg 13:6, 10; Rut 3:8; 1Sa 15:3; 25:3; 27:9, 11; 2Ch 15:13; Est 4:11; Job 14:1; Jer 44:7; 51:22; Eze 18:5.

11) NT Greek follows the same androcentric characteristics. E.g. Apostle Paul addresses "brothers" while he was addressing the whole congregation, in 1Co 1:10, Phm 1:12, Col 1:2.

12) The reason for the linguistic androcentrism of Hebrew may be iconic, reflecting the reality in the order of the creation of human beings. That is, the first human Adam (אדם) was a man (איש)/male (זכר) and in the beginning he represented both human and male before and after he was joined by his wife Eve. There are languages are likewise androcentric. Take English as an example: "Man" means both "male" and "human", while "woman" means "female" only. The three concepts "(1) human—(2) male, (3)—female" are encoded by two terms, "man" and "woman." On the other hand, there are languages in the world that distinguish lexically the three concepts, such as Greek ανθρωπος—ανμρ—γυνη. Turkish *kişi—adam—kadın*, Chinese *ren* (人)—*nin* (男)—*nu* (女), Korean *saram* (사람)—*namja* (남자)—*yeoja* (여자), each in the order of of (1) human—(2) male, (3)—female.

13) אֲנָשִׁים the plural of אדם, is used primarily as "people" rather than as "males". Cf. P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Biblico Biblico, 1996), § 99b. However, in case it is vitally important that the person in discussion involves both man and woman, the noun נֶפֶשׁ, "soul, person," is used to leave no room for misinterpretation, as in: Lev 20:6
והנפש אשר תפנה אל־האבת ואל־הידענים לזנות אחריהם ונתתי את־פני בנפש ההוא והכרתי אתו מקרב עמו
"If *a person* turns to mediums and wizards, playing the harlot after them, I will set my face against *that person*, and will cut him off from among his people."

לֹא אִישׁ אֵל וִיכַזֵּב וּבֶן־אָדָם וְיִתְנֶחָם

God is not *man*, that he should lie,

or a *son of man*, that he should repent   (RSV)

In this verse it is obvious that אִישׁ, forming a word-pair with בֶן־אָדָם, means "a human being" rather than "a male." In Lev 15:2, אִישׁ does not appear together with אשה in the same verse or context until the end of the two major topical units, (A) vv. 2-15, and (B) vv. 16-17. אִישׁ occurs together with אשה only in v. 18 where אִישׁ refers to "a male."

In Lev 15, the noun אִישׁ occurs altogether six times, in vv. 2, 5, 16, 18, 24, 33, leaving out its referential occurrences in pronominal forms in the verbs and noun phrases. Let us briefly confirm the identity of each of these six occurrences. The אִישׁ in v. 2 is the one who is sick with the discharge. The אִישׁ in v. 5 is any other person who may be physically close to the sick one. The אִישׁ in v. 16 refers to yet another person who had the emission of semen, thus, it is clear that this person is "male." The אִישׁ in v. 18 is clearly "a male" as a sexual partner to the אשה. So are the אִישׁ in vv. 24 and 33 "a male" as they occur together with אשה in the same verse. Note that in v. 24 the אשה is embedded in the pronominal prepositional phrase אתה, "with her." Again the issue is: Is the אִישׁ in vv. 2 and 5 referring to a male person or a human being in general? In another respect, if we suppose that the אִישׁ here refers to a male alone, then a new question arises: If a woman, say the sick person's mother or wife, touches his bed, will she be not unclean? Of course, she will be unclean. Interpreters of this passage need to holistically visualize a real-life situation with the very real-life problem of pathogenic pollution among the Israelite community and the many real-life participants to handle the situation. Then, it looks not so hard to understand that the אִישׁ in vv. 2 and 5 refers to any person, whether a man or a woman.

It is also important to note that אִישׁ is used to form discourse-marking constructions that distinguish discourse units. In Lev 15, at least three or four discourse-marking features are identified from the Masoretic text: (a) the topical discourse phrases, כי איש איש (v. 2), איש אשר (v. 6), איש כי (v. 16), אשה אשר (v. 18), אשה כי (vv. 19, 25), זות תורת (v. 32), (b) change of topic, (c) change of

participants, and additionally (d) the extra-textual Masoretic paragraph markers, i.e. ס (setûma) at the end of the unit vv. 1-15 and פ (petûḥa) at the end of the units vv. 16-17, vv. 18-24 and vv. 25-33. Obviously vv. 1-15 forms a major discourse unit, marked by the topical discourse phrase כי איש איש, the topic "discharge and uncleanness", the several participants, and the use of the Masoretic paragraph marker ס (setûma) at the end of v. 15. (As for the overall structure of the chapter, see section 5 below, "The implications of the characteristics for the discharge in the structure of Lev 15.")

איש is used in Lev 15 in three types of constructions, using the topical discourse phrases: (i) כי איש איש + subordinate clause (v. 2), (ii) איש אשר + relative clause (vv. 5,33), (iii) כי איש + subordinate clause (v. 16). The symantic and syntactic features of these constructions need to be examined in order to clarify the identity of the איש in the topical verse 2b.

1.1. כי איש איש + subordinate clause (v. 2)

The syntactic construction—כי איש איש + subordinate clause—is used four times in the Bible (Lev 15:2; 24:15; Num 5:12; 9:10). First, let us have a look at the passages other than Lev 15:2. In Lev 24:15, איש איש כי־יקלל אלהיו ונשא חטאו, "*Anyone (איש איש)* who curses God shall bear the sin," the one (איש איש) who is guilty of cursing God can be both man and woman. The spirit of the law is not limited to the "male folks" alone. How can it be that a woman who curses God will not be guilty?[14] Thus, איש here refers to both male and female individuals. In Num 5:12, *איש איש* כי־תשטה אשתו ומעלה בו מעל, "If *any man's (איש איש)* wife (אשתו) goes astray and is unfaithful to him," איש is used together with אשה (appearing as אשתו, "his wife/woman"). איש in this context means "a male person" or "a husband" in contrast to "a woman", as explained above. In Num 9:10, *איש איש* כי־יהיה־טמא לנפש או בדרך רחקה לכם או לדרתיכם, "When *any (איש איש)* of you or of your posterity who are defiled by a corpse or are on a long journey," איש איש here is used in the same way as in Lev 24:15 and refers to any person—whether male or female—who

---

14) The same principle is applied to the recipient of most other laws including the Ten Commandments. In many cases the repicient is אַתָּה, "you," second personal masculine singular. For example, it is not that only gentlemen should not steal but ladies should feel free to steal because לא תגנב, "You shall not steal" (v. 15), literally is directed to "you," a man.

contacted a corpse.

The noun phrase איש איש itself without כי is used 16 more times.[15] This phrase with the repetition of איש indicates "a distributive sense", or it is an idiomatic phrase meaning "each (one), any (one)."[16] The person in discussion can be male according to the situation, as in Num 1:4, ואתכם יהיו *איש איש למטה* איש ראש לבית־אבתיו הוא, "And there shall be with you *a man from each tribe*, each man being the head of the house of his fathers." Here "a man from each tribe (איש איש למטה)" happened to be a male; however, the emphasis was on the distributive sense, "each," rather than the person's being male. It is clear now that איש איש basically means "each (one), any (one)" regardless of sex. In this way it is natural to understand איש איש in Lev 15:2 as "any one" out of both men and women among the congregation of Israel. On the other hand, the phrase אשה אשה, the feminine equivalent of איש איש, is never used in the Hebrew Bible.

The particle כי in איש איש כי constructs the conditional clause (or protasis) in the text of case laws; i.e. it expresses "if" or "when" in "if/when a person does X" clauses. There are three types with כי that construct the protasis in the text of case laws: (a) איש איש כי, (b) איש כי, (c) אשה כי. In these occasions, the כי-conditional clause is considered as a specialized discourse device to introduce the topic of the case laws. It means that the construction "איש איש כי + subordinate clause" introduces the topic of the text. In the case of Lev 15:2b איש איש כי יהיה זב מבשרו זובו טמא הוא, the כי construction introduces the topic זב, "discharge," and טמא, "uncleanness."

If איש in v. 2b should be taken as "a male person" rather than "any person in general," then בני ישראל in v. 2a should also be taken as "the sons of Israel" excluding "the daughters of Israel," the primary sense of בן being "son", rather than "people/children of Israel." But, בני ישראל, the audience for the regulations in Lev 15:2-15, must include both men and women, while the regulations in vv. 19-30

---

15) Lev 17:3, 8, 10, 13; 18:6; 20:2, 9; 22:4, 18; Num 1:4, 44; 4:19, 49; 1Ki 20:20; Eze 14:4, 7.

16) See W. Gesenius and E. Kautzsch, eds., *Gesenius' Hebrew grammar*, 2nd ed., rev. from the 28th German ed., A. E. Cowley, trans. (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1910), §123c-d; P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, § 147d. See also the 10th and 12th meaning of איש in HALOT: "10. each: each man … everyone; 12. every = each one in his turn: … every man, whoever he may be."

specifically are directed to women. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider איש איש in v. 2 as referring to the Israelites as a whole rather than the males among them only.

1.2. איש אשר + relative clause (vv. 5, 33)

This construction—איש with the relational particle אשר—is used 103 times in the Hebrew Bible, usually forming restrictive relative clauses. In comparison with the more specialized איש איש כי construction, איש אשר expresses the situation or status of the person generically without a distributive sense. In v. 5, איש אשר describes "any one/human who" is close to the sick person with discharge and touches the sick one's bed. That undesignated character of the person near the sick one continues in vv. 6-7. However, the איש with this construction in v. 33 is a male as he appears together with a woman, "lies with a woman." In short, איש in this construction also can refer either to a human being in general or to a male.

1.3. איש כי + subordinate clause (v. 16)

As explained in section 1.1 above, כי-conditional clauses express the topic in the text of case laws. This is true with all the 18 occurrences of the איש כי construction in the Hebrew Bible.[17] איש occurs only once in this construction, which means that איש here does not hold a distributive sense but indicates the unspecified nature of the person in focus. In v. 16, the איש with the emission of semen could be any adult male, given the nature of the topic.

2. The meaning of בשר (vv. 2, 3, 7, 13, 16, 19)

What is the meaning of בָּשָׂר? Does בשר in v. 2 in particular connote "body" in general or "genital" in specific?

HALOT suggests 9 senses of בשר, which is used 266 times in the Hebrew Bible.[18]

---

17) איש כי construction (18x): Lev 13:29, 38, 40; 15:16; 19:20; 22:14, 21; 24:17, 19; 25:26, 29; 27:2, 14; Num 5:6; 6:2; 27:8; 30:3; Eze 18:5. Cf. אשה כי construction (9x): Lev 12:2; 13:29, 38; 15:19, 25; 20:27; Num 5:6; 6:2; 30:4.

18) בשר in HALOT: 1. skin, 2. flesh, 3. meat, food, 4. sacrificial meat, 5. flesh as part of the body

בשר refers most frequently to "flesh" or "body." Its use as a euphemism for the genital is rare, occurring some five times: Gen 17:15; Ex 28:42; Lev 15:19; Eze 16:26; 23:20.

The question is: Does בשר in Lev 15:2, 3, 7, 13, 16 refer to the male genital, as many scholars suggest?[19] Most commentators concede that בשר in v. 7 cannot reasonably be the genital, והנגע בכשר הזב יכבס בגדיו ורחץ במים וטמא עד־הערב, "And whoever touches *the body (בשר)* of him who has the discharge shall wash his clothes (v. 7)." בשר in vv. 13 and 16 looks even less likely to refer to the male genital. See v. 13, וכי־יטהר הזב מזובו וספר לו שבעת ימים לטהרתו וכבס בגדיו ורחץ *בשרו* במים חיים וטהר "And when he who has a discharge is cleansed of his discharge, then he shall count for himself seven days for his cleansing, and wash his clothes; and he shall bathe *his body (בשרו)* in running water, and shall be clean," and v. 16, ואיש כי־תצא ממנו שכבת־זרע ורחץ במים את־כל־בשרו וטמא עד־הערב, "And if a man has an emission of semen, he shall bathe *his whole body (כל־בשרו)* in water, and be unclean until the evening."

Now, what is the exact meaning of בשר in vv. 2 and 3? In brief, there are no clear reasons to see בשר as "genitals" in these verses. Genitals as part of the body are included in the body, of course, but בשר in vv. 2 and 3 is to be taken more naturally as the generic "flesh/body." If we examine the five occasions (Gen 17:14; Ex 28:42; Lev 15:19; Eze 16:26; 23:20), where בשר apparently connotes genitals, they have clear circumstances in common that facilitate such an understanding. That is to say, Gen 17:14 is about the institution of circumcision; Ex 28:42 is about the underwear for the priests in order to cover the "body/flesh"; Eze 16:26 and 23:20 describe the physical features of Egyptians. By contrast, Lev 15:2-3 or 15:2-15 does not apparently have such circumstances if we approach the text objectively. The view that Lev 15:2-3 or 15:2-15 does have such circumstances, thus yielding the sense "genital" out of בשר, stems from the traditional interpretation of the text and from the misunderstanding about the nature of the combination of בשר and זוב.

The handed-down misunderstanding about the combination of בשר and זוב is

---

(euphmistic for the pubic region), 6. body 7. relatives, 8. living flesh: what is frail / transient, 9. all flesh, man and beast; mankind, animals, any human being.

19) An example among the many scholars: A. ibn Ezra, *Leviticus*, 74, "**from his flesh** a euphemism for the male genitalia."

further clarified by explaining the meaning of זוב in section 3 below. In short, there is no firm ground that the discharge is due to disorders in male sexual organs. We have already noticed from section 1 that the person (איש) in question in vv. 2-3 cannot be exclusively referring to male folks. It is concluded that בשר in vv. 2-3 refers to the body in general rather than genitals.

In sections 3 and 4 below, we will study two more words in order to further identify the circumstances of this case law.

3. The meaning of זוב (vv. 2, 3, 13, 15, 19, 25, 26, 28, 30, 33)

What is the meaning of זוֹב which is commonly translated as "discharge"? Does it refer to "pathological liquid (coming out of the body)" or more specifically "pus or any polluted fluid out of genitals caused by something like gonorrhea"?

A generic definition of זוב is the "mucous discharge of a person." Meanwhile, HALOT suggests two senses for זוב: "1. **discharge** from a man's private parts, blennorrhoea (*gonorrhoea benigna*) Lev 15:2f, 13, 15, 33; 2. **haemorrhage** from a woman during menstruation and at other times Lev 15:19, 25f, 28, 30." Its cognate verb זוב has four senses: "1. to **flow**: water, Isa 48:21, 2. to flow, **drip** with some fluid, Ex 3:8, 3. to **suffer a discharge**; of a man (gonorrhoea), Lev 15:2, 4. ?**flow away**, ebb, Jer 49:4." HALOT explains that the noun זוב in Lev 15:2-3 specifically means in the sense 1 "discharge from a man's private parts" and the verb זוב means in the sense 3 "to suffer a discharge; of a man (gonorrhoea)." Is this a correct understanding?

The noun זוֹב together with its cognate verb זוב is extensively used in Lev 15: The noun זוב – 10x (vv. 2, 3, 15, 19, 25, 26, 28, 30, 33), the verb זוב 12x (vv. 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 19, 32, 33). That is to say, its meaning is vital in understanding the message of the chapter. Indeed the concept of זוב contributes to the topic of Lev 15. Its topic is how to deal with the pollution of the living environment owing to the flow of the bodily discharge which contains pathogenic germs and with the resultant transfer of uncleanness that would threaten life in the end. The noun טֻמְאָה, "uncleanness," and its cognate adjective and verb טָמֵא, "(be) unclean," occur 35

times in Lev 15. "Uncleanness (טמאה)" is the most frequently used concept in the chapter and thus it consists the topic of the chapter. The means by which the topical טמאה is transferred from a person to another is זוב, the discharge of unclean bodily liquid. In this sense, Lev 15 may be called the Chapter of Discharge and Uncleanness (פרק זוב וטמאה). These two concepts appear together as a word-pair (זוב ‖ טמאה) in vv. 2 and 33, thus also forming a complete unit out of the chapter as an inclusio structure.

It is noted that there are three kinds of זוב in Lev 15: (i) a generic discharge of mucus from the body due to external wounds or internal disorder, in vv. 2-15; (ii) menstrual discharges of women, in vv. 19-24; (iii) discharges of women due to gynecological disorders, in vv. 25-30. On the other hand, the emission of semen (שכבת־זרע) of a man—on his own (in v. 16-17) or during the sexual intercourse with a woman (in v. 18)—is not described as זוב, i.e. it is not considered an unclean discharge.

What is the cause of the זוב? Taking the result of the study in sections 1 and 2 into consideration, it is not accurate to identify the cause of the discharge exclusively with the internal disorder in men's genitals as commentators often put it.[20] The cause of the discharge from the flesh/body can be diverse, both external and internal. External wounds and bruises caused by accidents can result in the discharge of blood and other fluid from the body and then of pus when festered. The normal healing process for external wounds, if not deep and grave, would take a week or so, and it is compatible with the period of restoration in vv. 13-15. Various kinds of internal disorders can also certainly cause discharges: diseases such as gonorrhea, urethritis, dysentery, diarrhea, tuberculosis, pneumonia, bronchitis, asthma, influenza, eye disorders such as keratitis, ear disorders such as tympanitis, etc. These kinds of illness and disorders usually produce pathological fluid that finds channels to flow out of the body. Such unclean fluid may be pus, contaminated blood, spittle, phlegm, slime, nose running, etc. The channels for the discharge can be not only genitals but also all other openings of the body such as mouth, nose, eyes, ears, and anus as well as open wounds. All the liquid discharge

---

20) As an example, J. E. Hartley, *Leviticus*, 209: advanced much to ascertain, "The first is a seepage from his genitals⋯ the entire chapter is concerned with discharges from the genitals."

drops/drips, naturally according to the law of gravitation, to the "bed on which he who has the discharge lies ⋯ and everything on which he sits (כל־המשכב אשר ישכב עליו הזב ⋯וכל־הכלי רשא־ישב עליו)" (v. 4).

In this respect, the clause איש איש כי יהיה זב מבשרו in Lev 15:2 can be understood more properly like "When any person has a discharge from his body" rather than "When anyone has a discharge from his private parts" (REB), "When any man has a discharge from his penis" (TEV), or "Any man who has a genital discharge" (NLT) along with other similar interpretations. These three versions take the three nouns, איש, בשר, and זוב, each in a narrow and specific meaning: (i) איש as "male" instead of "human, person", (ii) בשר as "genital" instead of more generic "body, flesh", (iii) זוב as with a limited connotation. As a result the intended meaning of the text is narrowed down and led to a misunderstanding. Nevertheless, no one can say these interpretations are outright wrong, since the זוב from the בשר of the איש still includes something like "a discharge from the male genital." This understanding is only fractionally accurate.

Furthermore, it may be added that the description of זוב in HALOT is partially inaccurate. It overfocused on the "discharge from a man's private parts, blennorrhoea (*gonorrhoea benigna*)."

4. Semantic characteristics of the verb רקק (v. 8) and linguistic iconicity principles

The verb יָרֹק ($\sqrt{}$רקק), "spit," in v. 8 is used only once in the Bible in this root form. Verse 8: וכי־ירק הזב בטהור וכבס בגדיו ורחץ במים וטמא עד־הערב, "If one with a discharge spits on one who is clean, the latter shall wash his clothes, bathe in water, and remain unclean until evening." The verb רקק encodes the action to spit out the spittle or other liquid such as phlegm out of the mouth. The liquid spit from one's mouth is considered unclean by others. It is even more so when the spitting is done by the person with a discharge, i.e. a sick person secreting pathogenic germs from his body. We can easily determine that the spitting person should not be confined to male folks alone, as women's spitting can be no less impure.

Here, it is useful to look closely at the form of the verb. A medical linguist or linguistic physician would detect that the sick person is spitting out of respiratory or other internal disorders rather than out of usual occasions. This diagnosis is due to the geminate form of the verb רקק.

The action "to spit" is described three times in the Hebrew Bible (Lev 15:8; Num 12:14; Deu 25:9). There are two root forms used: (i) ירק (Num 12:14; Deu 25:9), an I-*yod* verb, and (ii) רקק (Lev 15:8), a geminate verb. In most cases commentators do not differentiate these two verb forms. What is the difference between these two verb forms that are alleged to have stemmed from the same origin?[21] There must be some difference no matter how minimal it may be. Here, the concept of *iconicity principles* in language can be applied to determine the aspectual difference between these two verb forms.

The iconicity principles in language suggest that there are close resemblance between the form ('the signifier') and the concept/meaning ('the signified') in the language.[22]

In general, geminate verbs in Hebrew are understood as having the iterative/repetitive aspect within themselves.[23] An internal repetitive aspectual quality is iconically evident from most geminate Hebrew verbs. Take some verbs as examples, גזז 'shear', דקק 'grind', זמם 'think', זקק 'refine', חגג 'celebrate a festival', טפף 'walk with short steps like children', כתת 'crush by beating', לקק 'lick', נצץ 'blossom', סרר 'be stubborn', פרר 'split', רשש 'beat down', שלל 'plunder'. The internal nature of all these verbs seems to have a repetitive quality.

---

21) HALOT: (1) 8999 רקק an onomatopoeic word from an original form raq, which then appears as a vb. in various forms in Heb. → I ירק ; רְקַק and רוּק; (2) 4000 ירק: alt. form of רקק; JArm.[b] (?) to spit out, Eth. *waraqa*; Arb. *ŕiq* saliva.

22) Iconicity in languages is a different viewpoint from the general linguistic view of F. de Saussure that the relation between the signifier and the signified is arbitrary. Iconicity is observed from onomatopoeic words in most languages: e.g. cuckoo, jingle. Iconicity is observable in the areas of phonology, morphology and syntax, and semantics is closely related in all these areas. W. Frawley, *Linguistic Semantics* (London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 1992), 7: "In short, meaning is a transparent relation between signifier and signified."

23) R. L. Trask, *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms In Linguistics* (London: Routledge, 1993), 131: "It is suggested that the ordering of tense, aspect and mood markings with respect to a verb stem is most often iconic: aspect, which is conceptually most tightly bound to the verb, is morphologically marked closest to the verb stem." This is true with the Hebrew geminate verbs, as the iterative/repetitive aspect is encoded intrisically and iconically in the second and third radicals.

By the forms of the verb, ירק indicates the non-repetitive, punctiliar aspect; on the other hand, רקק with the double ק iconically indicates the repetitive/iterative aspect.[24] From this perspective, two types of spitting can be determined: (i) non-repetitive, occasional spitting expressed by ירק, (ii) repetitive spitting by רקק. The type (i) is used in Num 12:14 and Deu 25:9, where the verb describes a common action that one person spits on the face of the other in order to show openly his/her sense of contempt for the other. The spitting action here is understood to happen once. The type (ii) is used in Lev 15:8. The cause of the repetitiveness of the spitting can be inner disorders, especially respiratory diseases, of the person. The object of the spitting may be not only spittle but also phlegm, blood and other polluted liquid. Any one who has been spitted upon with such a liquid obviously needs to cleanse himself/herself by bathing and also washing the clothes.

The use of the geminate verb רקק in Lev 15:8 expressing the repetitive spitting of the sick person further clarifies the characteristics of the discharge; i.e. it includes all kinds of polluted liquid out of openings of the body.

5. Implications of the characteristics of the discharge for the structure of Lev 15

The characteristics of the discharge as examined above shed light on how to understand the overall structure of Lev 15. The structure of the chapter has been identified largely identically by most scholars. Three typical models are shown diagrammatically below.

---

24) Cf. J. Bybee, R. Perkins and W. Pagliuca, *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World* (Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 1994), 160, 162, 169: There are many languages of the world that express the repetitive/iterative or habitual aspect by the reduplication of the verb forms. To name a few such languages: Alawa, Tanga, Trukese, Rukai, Mwera, Uighur, Tok Pisin. Examples from Mwera, a language in Tanzania (the verb reduplicated as a whole): lya 'eat', lyalyalya 'eat and eat and eat'; jenda 'travel', jenda-jenda 'wander about'. Examples from Pangasinan, a language in the Philippines (the verb reduplicated partially): manbasa '(will) read', manbasabasa 'reading anything and everything'; manpasiar 'go around', manpasiarpasiar 'go around all over the place, with no special destination in mind'.

The structure of Lev 15 by Milgrom:[25]

    A. Introduction (vv 1-2a)
                B. Abnormal male discharges (vv 2b-15)
                        C. Normal male discharges (vv 16-17)
                                X. Marital intercourse (v 18)
                        C'. Normal female discharges (vv 19-24)
                B'. Abnormal female discharges (vv 25-30)
    [motive (v 31)]
    A'. Summary (vv 32-33)

The structure of Lev 15 by Hartley:[26]

    A Introduction (vv 1-2a)
                B Abnormal discharges from a male's genitals (vv 2-15)
                        C Normal discharges from a male's genitals (vv 16-17)
                                D   Sexual intercourse (v 18)
                        C' Normal discharges from a female's genitals (vv19-24)
                B' Abnormal discharges from a female's genitals (vv 25-30)
    A' Concluding exhortation and summary statement (vv 31-33)

The structure of Lev 15 by Sherwood:[27]

	verses	duration	gender	physiological integrity	systemic function
A	vv. 2b-15	long term	male	abnormal	abnormal
B	vv. 16-17	transient	male	typical	dysfunctional
C	vv. 18	intercourse	male/female	normal	normal
B'	vv. 19-24	transient	female	typical	dysfunctional
A'	vv. 25-30	long term	female	abnormal	abnormal

25) J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 905.

26) J. E. Hartley, *Leviticus*, 206.

27) S. K. Sherwood, *Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy*, BERIT OLAM Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2002), 69.

As in the above examples, commentators usually see a chiastic pattern in Lev 15. Wenham notes, "The balance and symmetry of the arrangement is striking. Two types of discharge, long-term and transient, are distinguished. Since they can affect both sexes, that gives four main cases. It should also be noted that the discharges of women are discussed in the reverse order to those of men. This gives an overall chiastic pattern (AB-BA)."[28]

This modern understanding of the structure broadly follows the section divisions made by the Masoretic scribes. It seems that they have divided the text according to two factors: (i) the use of the discourse-marking constructions, (ii) the topic of each unit. According to the Masoretes Lev 15 has four units:

	verses	*topical discourse phrase*	*paragraph marker*
A	vv. 1-15	כי איש איש	**(ס)**
B	vv. 16-17	כי איש	**(פ)**
B'	18-24	אשר אשה	**(פ)**
A'	25-33	כי אשה	**(פ)**

The only difference is that modern scholars fixed the topic of the unit A as "male discharges" or "discharges from a male's genitals", whereas the Masoretes put the paragraph markers **ס** and **פ** which of course goes without specifying the sex of the people in focus. Now, modern commentators' structural understanding is correct as far as the formal aspect of grammatical gender distinction is concerned; i.e. "male (איש)" in vv. 2-17 (AB in Sherwood's structure) and "female (אשה)" in vv. 19-30 (B'A') with both "male and female" in v. 18 as the structural center (C). However, according to our semantic analysis of these words in the above, the reality cannot be that straightforward. Namely, איש איש in the unit A, though "man man" literally, is an idiom referring to not only male but also any individual person regardless of sex. The words איש and אשה in the other units, B, C, B', A', denote "male" and "female" true to their formal gender distinctions.

---

28) G. J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus*, 217.

Taking all the research result in the above, the structure of Lev 15 may be described as the following:

1-2a		Introduction
2b-15		Uncleanness of a human being due to discharges from the body
	2b-3	Basic description of the uncleanness
	4-12	Ways of transferring the uncleanness and how to solve the uncleanness
	13-15	The procedure for restoration when the discharge is healed
16-17		Uncleanness of a man due to normal male emission of semen
18		Uncleanness of both man and woman due to intercourse
19-24		Uncleanness of a woman due to menstrual discharges
	19a-c	Basic description of the uncleanness
	19d-24	Ways of transferring the uncleanness and how to solve the uncleanness
25-30		Uncleanness of a woman due to gynecological discharges
	25	Basic description of the uncleanness
	26-27	Ways of transferring the uncleanness and how to solve the uncleanness
	28-30	The procedure for restoration when the discharge is healed
31-33		Conclusion
	31	Concluding remarks
	32-33	Summary

This structure is further simplified below to show the experiencer of uncleanness and the cause of uncleanness.

	verses	experiencer of uncleanness	cause of uncleanness
A	1-2a	all Israelites	(Introduction)
B	2b-15	all people	sickness, wound
C	16-17	male (adult)	result of normal life
D	18	male/female	result of normal life
C	19-24	female (adult)	result of normal life
B'	25-30	all female	sickness, gynecological disorder
A'	31-33	all Israelites	(Conclusion)

Obviously there is a chiastic structure in the chapter. Yet, there is an apparent asymmetry in the identity of the experiencer of uncleanness, i.e. B "all people (male/female, young/old)" versus B' "all female (young/old)." However, these two units, B and B', can also be seen as having a symmetrical internal parallelism. The internal parallelism may be in that the female body is for pregnancy and childbirth. In this respect, the female body involves potentially both male and female, say literally when she is pregnant with a baby boy. For this reason the female body is relatively more complicated and sensitive than the male body, with higher possibility to contract sickness and experience discharges, or there are just more medical issues with women.[29] This also may be the reason why the procedure of childbirth is stipulated separately in Lev 12 within the Manual of Purity (Lev 11-15). "All female" in vv. 25-30 refers to all the female population, both young and old regardless of menstruation.

6. Conclusion

Biblical scholars mostly interpret that Lev 15:2-15 deals with a discharge (זוב) from male sexual organs. This view may be rather simplistic as it is not based on a closer examination of the language of the text. When the four terms in the text— איש, בשר, זוב, and רקק —are examined with care, it is determined that the זוב in vv. 2-15 does not refer just to male genital discharges but to various kinds of mucous discharges stemming from the wounds or external/internal disorders, which should certainly include male genital discharges.

Leviticus 15 does not deal only with the discharge and uncleanness related to sexual organs. The chapter deals comprehensively with God's measures to handle the problem of uncleanness among His people that results from both normal living and abnormal conditions. By observing these measures or laws the community of His people can minimize the transmission of uncleanness and maintain a hygienic

_____

29) This may be the reason why there are the medical branches of gynaecology and obstetrics exclusively for women.

and healthy living.

Leviticus 15 constitutes the final part of the Manual of Purity in Leviticus. At the end, in 15:31, God told Moses and Aaron, והזרתם את־בני־ישראל מטמאתם ולא ימתו, בטמאתם בטמאם את־משכני אשר בתוכם "In this way you must warn the Israelites against uncleanness, in order that they may not die by bringing uncleanness upon the Tabernacle where I dwell among them." Throughout Leviticus, God is portrayed as a God of holiness. Having been called to walk with such a holy God, Israelites were required to live a pure life both morally and physically. This chapter teaches how they can live such a pure life, practically handling the bodily discharges of both physiological and pathological nature.

* References

Budd, P. J., *Leviticus*, New Century Bible Commentary, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

Bybee, J., Perkins, R. and Pagliuca, W., *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*, Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Calvin, J., *Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses.* vol. II, repr., Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1979.

Frawley, W., *Linguistic Semantics*, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 1992.

Gerstenberger, E.S., *Leviticus: A Commentary*, Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.

Gesenius, W. and Kautzsch, E. editors, *Gesenius' Hebrew grammar*, 2nd edition revised from the 28th German edition, A. E. Cowley, trans., Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1910.

Gorman, F. H. Jr., *Divine Presence and Community: A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Harrison, R. K., *Leviticus: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, Leicester, England and Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980.

Hartley, J. E., *Leviticus*, Word Biblical Commentary, Waco, TX: Word, 1992.

Ibn Ezra, A., *Leviticus*, The Commentary of Abraham ibn Ezra on the Pentateuch: vol. 3, Jay F. Shachter, trans., Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Publishing House, 5746/1986.

Joüon, P. and Muraoka, T., *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1996.

Keil, C. F. and Delitzsch, F., *The Pentateuch* vol. 1 in C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament* in Ten Volumes, repr., Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

Koehler, L. and Baumgartner, W., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (HALOT), Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994-2000.

Levine, B. A., *Leviticus*, JPS Torah Commentary, Philadelphia: Jewish Pub. Soc.,

1989.

Milgrom, J., *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, The Anchor Bible, New York and London: Doubleday, 1991.

Noordtzij, A., *Leviticus*, Bible Student's Commentary, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub., 1982.

Péter-Contesse, R. and Ellington, J., *A Translator's Handbook on Leviticus*, Adapted from the French, New York: United Bible Societies, 1990.

Sherwood, S. K., *Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy*, BERIT OLAM Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry, Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2002.

Trask, R. L., *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms In Linguistics*, London: Routledge, 1993.

Wenham, G. J., *The Book of Leviticus*, New International Commentary on the Old Testament, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.

Translating the Eschaton:
An Environmental Impact Report*

Stephen Pattemore**

"… the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and the sea was no more." (Rev 21:1)

James Watt, the first Secretary of the Interior in the Reagan administration, testified before the U.S. Congress that protecting natural resources was unimportant in light of the imminent return of Jesus Christ. "God gave us these things to use. After the last tree is felled, Christ will come back," Watt said.[1] While Watt's claim may be breathtaking in its presumption, and few more recent Christian commentators are willing to be quite so explicit, it is nevertheless a sad fact that a particular view of Christian apocalyptic scriptures has been a contributing factor to an anti-environment stance by many lawmakers in the USA. And similar views are probably responsible for the lack of environmental concern and action shown by many in the evangelical wing of the church. How is it that the same scriptures, which begin by placing humankind in a garden with the responsibility of tending it, can be used to justify exploitive disregard for the garden, and for the limited resources available to a swelling population? I think the blame lies chiefly not with interpretations of the mandate to "have dominion" in Genesis 1 (though that cannot be exonerated!), but with interpretations of scriptures relating to the end of the world. A text from 2 Peter 3 in the AV puts it plainly:

> 7   But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men… 10   But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements

---

1) Glen Scherer, "The Godly Must be Crazy," http://www.grist.org/news/maindish/2004/10/27/scherer-christian/index.html

shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall
be burned up.

At a recent Christian environmental conference in New Zealand, several
presenters, in the course of grappling with how the Scriptures form attitudes
towards the earth, complained that even before interpreters get to work, we have not
been well served by the English translation of certain key texts.[2] We will come
back to consider 2 Peter 3 briefly before we finish, but I want to first examine the
book which perhaps more than any other in the Bible appears to provide divine
sanction for trashing the world, the book of Revelation. I will move backwards from
interpretation to translation.

John's Apocalypse is better characterized as a prophetic letter, which in the
tradition of Old Testament prophecy seeks to bring about a change in attitude and
behaviour in its audience. His purpose can be summed up, to quote John Sweet, as
"to comfort the afflicted and afflict the comfortable." To people faced with a
dilemma in their relationship with the pagan world around them and the demands of
imperial cult and culture, John recounts his apocalyptic visions in order to urge
them not to compromise their faith, but to witness faithfully following the model of
the Lamb, if necessary to the point of death

And while the message of the book for its first audience is clear enough, it is
often the imagery of the visions, and implications drawn from them, that require us
to think carefully if we are not to make the book and excuse for various kinds of
unethical behaviour.

1. Destruction unleashed by Seals, Trumpets and Bowls

Many of the most disturbing passages from an environmental point of view are
part of the judgements unleashed by the three seven-series which encompass a large
part of Revelation's text, and in particular the trumpets and the bowls.

With the opening of the third seal (Rev 6:5-6) there is the suggestion of
inadequate supply of food crops leading to extortionate prices. Or perhaps (if a

---

2) "Creation, Crisis and Conservation," (Auckland University: A Christian Response to a Suffering
   Planet, 18-20 Feb 2005), http://www.creationcare.org.nz

Roman edict on land usage for vineyards and other crops is behind this) attempts to regulate the use of arable land. The fourth seal (6:7-8) unleashes Death riding a pale horse, gaining authority over a quarter of the earth. But the means of his power (sword, famine, pestilence and wild animals), which suggest a humanity ill at ease with its environment and itself, are precisely the covenant curses threatened in Deuteronomy to the people of God if they reject God's law. With the sixth seal (6:12-17) we get the first cataclysmic environmental disaster a great earthquake, the sun darkened, the moon turned to blood and the stars falling from the sky, the sky vanishing and all mountains and islands being displaced. Yet immediately afterwards we read of people hiding in the rocks and caves of the mountains. What seems like total destruction of the cosmos is not in fact so. The world continues. The cosmic signs are in fact part of the apocalyptic package, the standard set of signs which, at least since Joel's time, were presumed to precede the "coming of the day of God" (Joel 2:30-32).

But these signs are actually a metaphor of theophany. Blood, fire, smoke, darkness are all present in the Exodus theophanies. And Peter on the day of Pentecost could state that Joel 2 was fulfilled on that day (Acts 2:16-21). Clearly the accepted interpretation of such signs was consistent with a continuing "normality" about the world around them. God had come on the day of Pentecost and the right response was "call on the name of the Lord (and) be saved." And in our passage in Revelation precisely the same event is envisaged. The people hiding in the caves are not debating the colour of the moon or the darkness of the sun, they are terrified at the wrath of God and the Lamb. So these apparently cataclysmic cosmic events must be read, not literally, but for what they stand for – the terrifying presence of God, something which belongs both to the past and the future. It is in this same light that we should read the several references to "thunder, rumblings, flashes of lightening and an earthquake" (Rev 8:6 etc.).

With the trumpets and the bowls the environmental impact report makes even more disturbing reading. The blowing of the first four trumpets (Rev 8:7-12) results in the destruction of a third of the vegetation on earth, a third of the seas and the life and commerce on them, a third of fresh water sources, and a third of the light sources –sun, moon and stars. Whatever the first century understanding of these phenomena, our post-Copernican view of the solar system and the earth's place in it prevents us from pursuing any kind of literal interpretation of the fourth trumpet,

which also allows the world to continue to exist and human affairs to proceed. The point is not so much the precise events, as firstly their supernatural origin and secondly the increasing devastation (a third as compared to a quarter). And the bowl sequence increases the proportion yet further to totality. Again the marine environment and fresh water sources are struck, but this time the sun instead of diminishing is allowed to scorch people with fire. (Rev 16:3-12) The interpretive key to both these sequences is to notice the extent to which they parallel the sequence of plagues brought upon Egypt by Pharoah's refusal to release the Israelites. Destruction of water sources, hail, disease, darkness, insect infestation – all can be found in Revelation.[3]

And this leads us to a very important point. The theme of Exodus was not the destruction of the environment and people of Egypt, but rather the deliverance and vindication of the oppressed people of God. The plagues were brought on because of the instransigence of oppressive leadership. And Revelation's story is about the deliverance and vindication of the oppressed and persecuted people of God. They are invited to see their situation in the light of the ancient people of Israel – both in their initial deliverance out of Egypt and in their later deliverance from Babylon. The pictures of environmental catastrophe are not prophecy in the sense of foretelling the future, but they are prophecy in the truer sense of calling humanity to account for its actions, of the threat and warning of drastic divine intervention in judgment. They function as promise to the people of God (God is on your side and will vindicate and deliver you) and warning to all opposed to God and his people.

2. Positive Earth Images of protection, cooperation and justice

In the light of such a volume of negative images of the environment, it is easy to overlook a number of more positive images present in the early chapters of Revelation. There are passages where there is specific protection of the environment mandated (7:2-3; 9:3-4). The judgement of God is in fact directed against rebellious humanity, not God's earth. There are passages where the earth itself cooperates with the purposes of God to save and deliver his people (12:16). And there is a concern for justice to be dealt to those who have abused the earth. The seventh trumpet

---

3) See G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 808-810.

culminates in the cry from heaven proclaiming the arrival of the kingdom of God and his Messiah (11:15), but which goes on to declare:

> [18] The nations raged,
>   but your wrath has come,
>   and the time ...
> *destroying those who destroy the earth.*" (11:17-18)

The rule and the power of God and the Messiah is demonstrated by the judgment of all people, the reward of God's faithful servants, and recompense for the destruction of the earth.

Finally here we should consider the impact of the lament over Babylon in Rev. 18. The self-serving economic and political empire that Babylon, the great whore, represents is devastated and desolate (2). But this destruction is only appropriate justice for the devastation and destruction which she has brought about in the unrestrained pursuit of power and wealth and luxury (3, 6-8)

> [7] As she glorified herself and lived luxuriously,
>   so give her a like measure of torment and grief.
> Since in her heart she says,
>   'I rule as a queen;
> I am no widow,
>   and I will never see grief,'
> [8] therefore her plagues will come in a single day--
>   pestilence and mourning and famine--
> and she will be burned with fire;
> for mighty is the Lord God who judges her."

Client kings, captains of industry and commerce, and seafarers who themselves grew rich on her rapacious trade join in a litany of lament, with more than a hint of nostalgia and pathos for the luxurious living she extracted from the earth. If there is any passage in the book of Revelation which the materialistic, hedonistic cultures of our time should hear prophetically, it is surely this one. And by "prophetically" here I mean not primarily predictively, but in the sense of a divine critique and warning.

3. The New Heavens and the New Earth

Reading Revelation as prophetic warning helps to soften the impact on
environmental consciousness of many of the negative passages. But I suspect that
the most important explanation for evangelical neglect of the environment does not
lie in the negative passages, but rather in the positive ones! It is the expectation
summed up in the words of the old country and western hymn:

> *This world is not my home, I'm just a-passing through,*
> *My treasures are laid up, somewhere beyond the blue,*
> *The angel beckons me from heaven's open door*
> *And I can't feel at home in this world anymore.*

Or the even more disturbing children's song:

> *Somewhere in outer space, God has prepared a place*
> *For those who love him and obey⋯*

It is the assumption that this world is temporary and ephemeral, and that the
destiny of the people of God is somewhere else, somewhere called "heaven." I
heard it in an otherwise excellent sermon on January 2nd, reflecting on the Asian
tsunami, "We don't belong here. We are destined for heaven. I don't know where
that is, but God is going to take us there."

It is important not to trivialize this view, or dismiss it summarily because (unlike
the "rapture") it is built not just on one or two passages but on a network of ideas
that runs throughout the Bible. It is therefore impossible in the limited time
available here to investigate it thoroughly. I will limit myself to one general
comment and a brief examination of relevant passages in Revelation, which will
raise questions of translation. We will finish up on the passage we started with in 2
Peter.

Running through both testaments is a tension within the word "heaven", or as it is
most often in both Hebrew and Greek, "the heavens" (Heb: ha shamayim; Gk: hoi
ouranoi). They are on the one hand that part of the universe created by God which
lies above the plane of the earth, including the atmosphere, the sun and moon, stars
and planets; the place where birds fly, and from which rain comes. And on the other

hand, they are the place where God dwells. This tension is nicely caught in Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple (1 Kings 8):

> [27] "But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Even heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain you, much less this house that I have built! … [30] Hear the plea of your servant and of your people Israel when they pray toward this place; O hear in heaven your dwelling place; heed and forgive.

The New Testament reflects this same tension, but with a couple of additional features. The heavens are now also the abode of evil spiritual powers (Eph. 6:12). But more importantly in the intervening period "heaven" has become one of the standard circumlocutions to avoid using the name of God. Thus while there are very many more references to heaven as the source of blessing, of true life and true sustenance, of the spirit etc. these all must be seen within the context of "heaven" and "God" being nearly synonymous. So too the many encouragements by Jesus to be part of the "kingdom of heaven" refer primarily to coming under the rule of God, not to travelling to some alternative location. In fact the number of references to anyone "going to heaven" is extremely small. Jesus ascends to heaven ‐ apparently the sky in Luke 24:51 (cf. Acts 1:9), but the dwelling of God in Mark 16:19. Paul in a visionary experience is caught up to the third heaven (2 Cor. 12:2). John in his vision is invited to come up through the door in heaven (Rev. 4:1-2), and the two witnesses within John's vision are taken up to heaven in a cloud (Rev. 11:12). Our treasure should be in heaven, our hope is in heaven, our citizenship is in heaven, we expect heavenly bodies, but we are never said to go to heaven. Certainly not in the sense of abandoning earth in order to live in some other location. The life of heaven is life with God. And the ultimate hope described in the book of Revelation is that God comes to earth to live with humanity.

John's apocalypse contains 52 of the NT's 292 references to heaven and therefore needs some further attention. Firstly we must remember that this book describes a visionary experience and its visual and verbal images were never intended to be photographic representations of reality. Yet heaven and earth are both important symbolic locations. Heaven is primarily the place where John sees many of his visions taking place. It is the location of the throne of God, of the 24 elders, the 4 living creatures (yes, representatives of the animal world in heaven); it is the place from which angels comes, from which loud voices are heard, and also the location

from which destructive stars and hail and fire fall and where cosmic battles take place. Earth on the other hand is the location of most of the passages relating to the people of God and their struggle. It is also the domain of the unbelieving empires and their kings. It is on earth that the heavenly battle is decided. Earth is a most significant location in the whole story.

But the climax of the book, the fulfillment of all the hopes and longings through the long struggle of God's people, is described in two interacting metaphors.

First, John records in 21:1 seeing a new heavens and a new earth:

> Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth had passed away, and the sea was no more.

To understand this verse we need to see it in its context. It is part of a "mini-apocalypse" which extends from 19:11 to 21:8, filling the gap between two closely parallel visions in each of which John is guided by an angel: the vision of Babylon the whore, and the vision of New Jerusalem, the bride.[4] The intervening series of visions (four of them) reflect the overall movement of the book of Revelation as a whole. 21:1-8 stands within this "mini-apocalypse" in the position that the longer New Jerusalem vision (21:9-22:9) takes in the book as a whole. So this shorter New Jerusalem vision stands in close relationship to the previous vision, that of the last judgment (20:11-15). It is in this context that we are to read the statement that the first heaven and first earth have "passed away" (21:1) – because 20:11 has recorded them as fleeing from before the face of the Judge. This notion of the cosmos fleeing from before God's face is clearly an anthropomorphism whose truth is not dependant on a literal interpretation of the sentence. So it is precisely here that our translations may need some attention. How should *apēlthan* be translated?

> NIV: [1] Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first
> earth **had passed away**, and there was no longer any sea.
> GNT: [1] Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth. The first heaven and the first
> earth **disappeared**, and the sea vanished.

---

4) On the structure of this part of Revelation see S. W. Pattemore, *Souls under the Altar: Relevance Theory and the Discourse Structure of Revelation*, UBS Monograph Series 9 (New York: UBS, 2003), 173-83.

CEV: [1] I saw a new heaven and a new earth. The first heaven and the first earth had **disappeared**, and so had the sea.

REB: [1] I SAW a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth **had vanished**, and there was no longer any sea.

NLT: [1] Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the old heaven and the old earth **had disappeared**. And the sea was also gone.

Dictionary definitions of *aperchomai* include:

BAGDB: 1. to go away, depart 2. to go 3. (of a report) to go out and spread 4. to go after, follow someone.

L&N: (a) motion away from a reference point with emphasis upon the departure, but without implications as to any resulting state of separation or rupture—'to go away, to depart, to leave.'[5]

(b) to go out of existence—'to cease to exist, to pass away, to cease.'[6]

In both instances, Louw and Nida group *aperchomai* with a number of other words and there is no instance where it unambiguously means "cease to exist." Furthermore in this context, with Rev 20:11-20 as a most accessible cognitive environment, there is no reason to process the word further to obtain a more obscure or unlikely meaning. The old heaven and earth have, quite simply, left the scene, not been obliterated. The cross-references provided in both GNT and CEV point appropriately to the reference to a new heaven and new earth in 2 Peter 3:13. But for the reader who follows this cross-reference, there will be the added implication from 1 Peter 3:12 that the "passing away" in Rev 21:1 is the same as the conflagration by fire in 2 Peter. Since modern readers, with a written text in front of them, are much more likely to scan forwards to the rest of the New Jerusalem vision, it would be helpful also to find a way to point them backwards to Rev 20:11 as a context of interpretation.

It is also in this context that we read that the sea is no more, not as predicting an earth without its marine environment, but as expressing the end of chaos and the power of death – because 20:13 has paralleled the sea to Death and Hades as possessing the dead. Once again it would be helpful for the reader to be pointed

---

5) J. P. Louw & E. A. Nida, eds., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1988), 186.

6) Ibid., 158.

back to Rev 20:13 to help understand this puzzling statement.

Freed from some conventional assumptions about these passages, which depict *destruction* of the earth and heavens, the reader can readily understand the "new heavens and new earth" as the result of a divine programme of renewal, precisely as the voice from the throne states in 21:5, "See, I am making all things new."

Secondly we have the picture of the New Jerusalem, briefly in 21:2 and more extensively described in 21:9-22:9, "coming down out of heaven from God." In creative tension with the new heaven and new earth, is this picture of the habitation of God descending *from* heaven *to* earth, and the declaration

> "See, the home of God is among mortals.
> He will dwell with them as their God;
> they will be his peoples,

Heaven, the dwelling place of God, has come to earth. And the longer vision describes the New Jerusalem as integrating both the wealth and variety of urban human culture with the restored and revalorized Garden of Eden – humanity restored in its restored environment. This is the Christian hope.

4. Cosmic conflagration

And so we return to 2 Peter 3. This is the only NT passage to speak of a cosmic cataclysm of fire, although the idea is a development from several OT passages (see e.g. Deut 32:22; Ps 97:3; Isa 30:30; 66:15 – 16; Ezek 38:22; Amos 7:4; Zeph 1:18; Mal 3:19/4.1) in which God judges the wicked with fire. These passages do not speak of a total destruction of the physical world – but this idea developed in connection with idea of a universal final judgment.[7] For the author of 2 Peter, this idea is a parallel to the universal flood, which in the ancient world view was a reversal of creation into chaos.

Although this is a very difficult passage and one whose interpretation is considerably controversial, several things should be clearly borne in mind. Firstly the author's aim is to counter scepticism arising from the delay of the Parousia. Secondly, his method is to assure the sceptics that judgment is coming. And so it is

---

7) See R. Bauckham, *2 Peter and Jude*, WBC 50 (Dallas: Word, 2002), 300.

the judgment of all human beings which is for him the main defining characteristic of the end. Thirdly, the author is probably dependent here on a Jewish apocalyptic writing which is more nearly quoted in *1 & 2 Clement*. Thus the concept of universal conflagration is part of the context, the common understanding of author and audience, and is taken over from the source rather than independently argued. Fourthly, the passage nowhere describes the destruction of the physical earth. There are both textual and translational difficulties in these verses, which should make anyone cautious in using them as the basis for an eschatological world view:

Compare some of the English translations:

> GNT: On that Day the heavens will disappear with a shrill noise, **the heavenly bodies** will burn up and be destroyed, and the earth with everything in it **will vanish**.
>
> NRS: the heavens will pass away with a loud noise, and **the elements** will be dissolved with fire, and the earth and everything that is done on it will **be disclosed**.
>
> CEV: The heavens will disappear with a loud noise, and the heat will melt **the whole universe**. Then the earth and everything on it **will be seen for what they are**.
>
> NLT: Then the heavens will pass away with a terrible noise, and **everything in them** will disappear in fire, and the earth and everything on it **will be exposed to judgment**.

Note the following issues briefly

(1) It is the heavens and the **heavenly bodies** (*stoichea*, sometimes translated "elements" – just possibly also referring to the spirit powers thought to control the stars and planets) which are to melt and burn.

(2) Following this "the earth and the works on it will be **disclosed."** *Heurethēsetai,* the best reading of the text, should be translated "will be found" or "will be disclosed." The earth and its works are exposed (not burnt up or destroyed) by the destruction of the heavens, once again underlining the author's concern for discerning judgment, which is further strengthened in the lessons he takes from these declarations – that a particular ethical response is called for from Christians. And it is an ethical imperative based precisely on the coming judgment of God and the expectation of the new/renewed heaven and earth.

Finally we should note that although within the author's understanding of the

structure of the universe, it is conceivable that the destruction by fire of the "heavens" and the celestial bodies could lead to the earth and the work on it being "found", disclosed, or exposed, such is not possible from ours. Should our descendents be still on the planet in another 5 billion years time, the predicted expansion of the sun into a red giant before its final collapse will indeed consume the earth along with the other inner planets, but not the sun itself, or the stars! It will be a fairly minor catastrophe on the scale of the universe. So it does not really help to try to reinterpret the predictions in terms of modern cosmology. (In just a similar way we cannot share the assumptions which see a flood, of whatever dimensions, as a truly cosmic catastrophe.) We do better to allow the metaphor of judgment (of the wicked) and purification (of the righteous) by fire to guide our understanding of this passage and to take heed to its encouragement to live lives marked by God's righteousness.

5. Conclusions

Glenn Scherrer, in the "Grist" article I have already mentioned, quotes historian Paul S. Boyer as saying:

> *A kind of secular apocalyptic sensibility pervades much contemporary writing about our current world. Many books about environmental dangers, whether it be the ozone layer, or global warming or pollution of the air or water, or population explosion, are cast in an apocalyptic mold.*

Several commentators on the Boxing Day tsunami described the devastation caused as either "apocalyptic" or "of biblical proportions." Apocalyptic language may turn out to find new and valuable service in the cause of environmental awareness, but such use is very far removed from the world of John's visions. In the book of Revelation, damage to the earth is all part of the "apocalyptic" package – by this time a standardized set of calamities which are associated with the end of the age. They are NOT the action, approved or otherwise, of human beings on the planet. In the first century and before, and for many centuries afterwards, there could be no concept of human activity producing such devastation on the earth. The earth itself is so great and its resources so limitless. Dimensions of the earth are the

dimensions of unspeakable magnitude. "as many as the grains of sand on the seashore, or the stars in the heaven" is a metaphoric expression of an uncountable large number. We cannot and should not try to make out that first century Christians were environmentally aware and active. Anthropogenic stress on the environment, on a global level, was simply inconceivable and the apocalyptic signs of the end of the age are clear evidence of GOD's intervention.

We live in a different age from John the visionary. In our day, it is not the action of God but the actions of humans that seem to threaten the fabric of our world. Responsible and informed Christian interpretation of Scripture is necessary to provide a framework for understanding that "the earth is the Lord's and everything in it" and that humanity has a responsibility as God's co-worker in caring for the earth. But responsible Christian interpretation must be based on accurate translations, translations which while faithful to the first-century scriptures also take seriously the current ecological crisis and which are not enslaved to traditional eschatological schema. Since writing this paper I have re-examined the Urak Lawoi's translation (published 1998) of the verses in question and would translate them differently today. The time is also urgent for a re-evaluation of the translation of the word *kosmos* and *ktisis* starting from Colossians 1 and its picture of truly universal reconciliation, back through 2 Corinthians 5:19, Romans 8:19-22, and even back to John 3:16.

* References

Bauckham, R., *2 Peter and Jude,* WBC 50, Dallas: Word, 2002.

Beale, G. K., *The Book of Revelation,* NIGTC, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Louw, J. P. and Nida, Eugene Albert, eds., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains,* New York: United Bible Societies, 1988.

Pattemore, S. W., *Souls under the Altar: Relevance Theory and the Discourse Structure of Revelation,* UBS Monograph Series 9, New York: UBS, 2003.

Interlinears: Lack of Equivalence[*]

Anicia del Corro**

1. Introduction

1.1. New interest

Greek Interlinear projects are becoming popular. By this, the Greek text of the NT is glossed with another language. In my context, I'm aware of the Greek-Baluchi interlinear project in Pakistan published and dedicated in 1999. I now have a copy of the Greek-Bahasa Indonesia interlinear published in 2004. The Philippine Bible Society initiated a project in 2003 to produce a Greek-Tagalog interlinear and we hope to finish this project within this year.

In comparison with my early years with UBS, there were no interlinear projects then, at least, not in the NBS's where I served. What does this mean?

- There is a progression in the appreciation of God's word. Our Bible users want more than a translation. If in the past they were told how a verse is supposed to be understood, now, they want direct access to the biblical text, the source languages. They may not necessarily know how to translate from the source language, but they want to see the link between the source text and the translation at hand.

- A part of this progression can be attributed to the growing interest in the study about the Bible, its history, different versions, translation principles and the like.

- In a country where the majority religion is Islam, the accusation leveled against Christianity has been on the changing character of the Bible, considering that translations now even are available in contemporary, modern languages. This is in contrast with the Quran which is still read in its original language, Arabic. Without any knowledge of the principles of translation, it is hard to convince the layperson that Bible translations maintain the integrity of the original texts. Thus, an interlinear is a good format to give an idea about the accuracy of a

---

translation.

The Pakistan is on its second interlinear project, a means they have found effective to demonstrate the accuracy of the Bible in their Islamic context.

Equally interesting is looking into the reasons why Bible Society projects did not include interlinears in the past. Anyone who has majored in Biblical Studies will certainly remember how they were forbidden to use Hebrew and Greek interlinears in their exegesis class. And if students used interlinears, it was kept a secret, not only from the professor but from the other students as well. One thing is also true: the scholarly editions published by UBS do not include interlinears. It makes one wonder why there is so much bias against interlinears!

Interlinears are not perceived to be scholarly, and this may be due to the following reasons: An interlinear provides a fast way to match every Greek word with a gloss from the gloss language. The basis for the match is similarity in meaning without any regard for the structure of the gloss language. Because of this one-sided view of interlinears, it is easy to presume that assigning meanings can be quite arbitrary. All analysis is done only from the perspective of the source language when the ideal would have been to study both languages, source and gloss languages, as separate linguistic systems with their own grammars and unique characteristics.

1.2. Sample Greek-English Interlinears

For the purpose of comparison with existing interlinears, I evaluated the features of two Greek-English interlinears, *The New Greek- English Interlinear New Testament,* by Robert K. Brown and Philip W. Comfort, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, 1990, and *The Interlinear NRSV- NIV Parallel New Testament in Greek and English* by Alfred Marshall, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993.

As expected, both interlinears provide a gloss in English that is a literal translation of the Greek word. Both also provide information about features of Greek grammar that do not have exact equivalents in English such as elaborate case features in nouns and adjectives, participles, negatives, and common idiomatic expressions.

There are also differences between the two interlinears. Brown and Comfort call the English counterpart as an interlinear translation. Instead of this term, Marshall

calls it the interlinear English. This is an important distinction because it explains why the former includes the superscript numbers to indicate the order the words are to be read. This is to say that the interlinear part can and should be read like well-formed sentences.

I think Marshall is on the right track not to aim for a translation in the gloss. This explains why he does not use superscript numbers. However, the rationale is never explained and this is due to the common feature of these two interlinears to focus only on the description of Greek and not on the gloss language. Marshall demonstrates his in-depth knowledge of the Greek text, to the extent that some information is no longer relevant to the needs of the interlinear user, but rather to any person studying Greek. There is one setback. Marshall mentions in the introduction that the Greek text used is the 21st edition of Eberhard Nestle' *Novum Testamentum Graece*. (Or should this be Erwin Nestle's 1883-1972 since Eberhard Nestle's period was 1851-1913?). On the other hand, Brown and Comfort used the UBS GNT 3rd edition (1983). The Greek text used in the Greek-Tagalog Interlinear is the 4th edition of the UBS Greek text.

1.3. Objective of the paper

This paper aims to present the theoretical considerations in the making of an interlinear thereby elevating this practice from a one-sided study of the Greek language, to one that gives equal importance to the gloss language. As a result, the linguistic patterns of the two are viewed from the perspective of structure leading to a more objective, holistic and consistent description of the languages.

2. Differences between Greek and Tagalog

2.1. Genetic classification

One way to classify languages is to establish families whose members are said to have developed historically from a common ancestor. The basis for this kind of diachronic classification is the regular correspondence of sounds. The existence of systematic phonetic correspondences in the forms of two or more languages point toward a common source. Consider the following example [1]:

---

1) O'Grady, William, Michael Dobrovolsky, and Mark Aronoff, *Contemporary Linguistics* (New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1995), 324.

English	Russian	Hindi	Turkish
two	dva	do	iki
three	tri	tin	yt ʃ
brother	brat	bhāī	karde ʃ
nose	nos	nahī	burun

It is notable to see the closer similarity between English and Russian when compared with Hindi. Turkish, not related to the rest, is included to show the non-existence of cognates. Based on this type of classification, the Greek language belongs to the Indo-European family of languages, under the sub-family Hellenic. On the other hand, Tagalog belongs to the Austronesian family, under the Malayo-Polynesian branch.

2.2. Typological Classification

Another way to classify languages, but from a synchronic perspective, is through their structural characteristics. Different languages combine morphemes differently in forming words. In isolating or analytic languages, words are generally single root morphemes, such as Chinese. In agglutinating languages, words can contain several morphemes but the components are usually easily identified. In fusional or inflectional languages, words may contain different morphemes but affixes mark several grammatical categories simultaneously.

Greek is inflectional so in the Greek word λυω, the final vowel can signify any of the following grammatical categories: present tense/aspect, active voice, indicative mood, 1st person and singular number. One will note the extensive semantic load of the omega of this verb.

On the other hand, Tagalog is an agglutinating language because the word is easily divided into its component parts, thus:

nagtulungan <   n   ag   tulong   an   'helped each other"
                Completed   aspect   active   help   reciprocal

2.3. Contrastive Analysis of languages:

In the development of Philippine linguistics, specifically, the use of linguistic principles in the study of Philippine languages, there was a stage in the 70's when contrastive analyses were very popular. These are comparative studies of the

linguistic features of English and another Philippine language, many times with the objective to improve the teaching and use of the English language. The "other" language was analyzed only in so far that it was different from English. But as a result, the language being compared with English ended up being analyzed.

Following this type of analysis, a survey of the different parts of a Greek grammar book can easily show the major differences between Greek and Tagalog. A number of differences show categories grammaticalized in Greek whereas these are lexicalized in Tagalog. Something is said to be grammaticalized if a concept is expressed through a regular and structural alternation such as affixes. When the concept is encoded as separate words that do not exhibit a regular alternation, the category is said to be lexicalized. Please see under Reflexive for a clear distinction between these two.

- Order of basic components
  - o   Greek: VSO
  - o   Tagalog: VOS
- concord or agreement
  - o   Greek − grammaticalized through suffixes affecting articles, nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs
  - o   Tagalog − none
- Case marking
  - o   Greek − grammaticalized through suffixes
  - o   Tagalog − grammaticalized through different markers
- Verbals
  - o   Greek − participles and infinitives grammaticalzed
  - o   Tagalog − expressed as verbs usually, lexicalized
- Verbs
  - o   Greek − phonologically conditioned classification such as liquid, -μι , contract verbs
  - o   Tagalog − elaborate semantically differentiated affix combinations
- Subjunctive
  - o   Greek − grammaticalized
  - o   Tagalog - lexicalized
- Nouns
  - o   Greek − elaborate declension
  - o   Tagalog − none

- Prepositions
    - o Greek – high differentiation
    - o Tagalog – low differentiation
- Reflexive
    - o Greek – grammaticalized in pronouns
        - ▪ Mark 5:5 κατακόπτων ἑαυτὸν λίθοις.
                    Bruising   himself with stones
    - o Tagalog – lexicalized
        - ▪ Mark 5:5 κατακόπτων   ἑαυτὸν   λίθοις.
                    sinusugatan   ang sarili   ng mga bato

In Greek, the reflexive pronoun ἑαυτὸν is inflected for case, number and gender. The regular alternation marks that it is grammaticalized. In Tagalog, reflexive action is expressed lexically through the use of 'sarili' meaning 'self', and not through a grammatical alternation.

2.3.1. Concord

One morpho-syntactic characteristic of the Greek language that stands out as different from Tagalog is the prevalence of concord. This is a syntactic device manifested by the agreement of suffixes between nouns, pronouns, adjectives, articles and participles in the categories of case, gender, number.

Mark 7:3

οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐὰν μὴ πυγμῇ νίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν, κρατοῦντες τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων,

Note the agreement between οι, φαρισαιοι, Ιουδαιο, where the shared final vowels are also obvious. Although not as obvious in form, the adjective παντες also agrees with the nouns in case, number and gender. The verbs have to agree with the nouns they modify in number and person. Thus, the verb ἐσθιουσιν agrees with the plural subject φαρισαιοι and Ιουδαιο. Because of the prevalent suffixes showing agreement, there is more freedom in the way words are arranged. Because of the semantic load of these words, it is not surprising that Blass et al[2] observe that

---

2) Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and Robert Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 248.

"word order in Greek and so in the NT is freer by far than in modern languages". Certain tendencies and habits on word order (in the NT especially in the narrative) are observed by Blass et al and these are

1. The verb or the nominal predicate with its copula stands immediately after the conjunction (the usual beginning of a sentence) then follow in order the subject, object, supplementary participle, etc.
2. Positions are by no means mandatory. Any emphasis on an element in the sentence causes that element to be moved forward.
3. Transitional temporal phrases tend to stand at the beginning; but sometimes as a result of the tendency to begin a sentence with a verb, a meaningless meaningless ʼεγενετο which does not even influence the construction may precede.

The second and third statements, Blass[3] admits the lack of a big picture with regard to how words are arranged in Greek. The first description is often made that the verb takes precedence in Greek. There is some truth to this but one has to equally emphasize that for every verb, the grammatical categories referring to the subject are always present. So this statement is not too significant especially when the subject is a pronoun. When the subject is a noun, it may occur before the verb. With the copula, it may be before or after. But with the emphatic proclitic pronoun, it is always before the verb.

So the most significant thing to be made about word order is that it is quite free and this is a result of the highly inflectional feature of Greek. One can move words around more easily if the words are themselves bearers of meaning and this is true for inflectional languages. In isolating languages where every significant category of meaning is represented by a separate morpheme, word order is used as basis for meaning distinction

Tagalog is basically a Verb – Object – Subject language. Being agglutinative, meaning distinction is borne by distinct affixes and syntactic marking particles. There is no morphological concord.

2.3.2. Voice

Voice is a grammatical category that shows how one part or entity is related to the

---

3) Ibid., 248.

action or main predication in the sentence. If the doer of the action is also the subject, the voice is active. However, if the subject is other than the doer of the action, the voice is passive. The Greek language clearly delineates between these two.

Three examples are given below which may not contain the whole verse. In the first two, Matt 1:2 and 14:58, the Greek verb is active. In Mark 14:72, the Greek verb is middle deponent and should still be translated as active. In all of these three cases, however, the active voice is not possible in Tagalog, without a change in the meaning.

Matt 1:2

Ἀβραὰμ	ἐγέννησεν		τὸν	Ἰσαάκ,	'Abraham begat Isaac'
* si Abraham	nanganak/umanak		kay	Isaac	(active)
Ni Abraham	naging anak		si	Isaac	(passive)

Mark 14:58

Ἡμεῖς	ἠκούσαμεν	αὐτοῦ	λέγοντος	ὅτι	'we heard him saying'
* kami	nakinig	sa kanya	sinasabi	(active)	
Namin	narinig	niya	sinasabi	(passive)	

The sentence above can become acceptable if made to mean 'we listened to him saying', thus intransitive.

Mark 14:72

δὶς	τρίς	με	ἀπαρνήσῃ·		'you will deny me three times'
beses	tatlo	ako	ipagkakaila	mo	(passive)
times	three	me	will deny	you	
* beses	tatlo	sa akin	magkakaila	ka	(active)

The Tagalog sentence above can become acceptable if made to mean 'he will lie', thus intransitive.

2.3.3. Primacy of the patient

In the three examples above, the syntactic behavior of arguments or accompanying noun phrases shows a particular relationship between the transitive

and intransitive sentences. The subject of an intransitive verb such as 'magkakaila ka (subject) sa akin' meaning 'you will deny me' in Mark 14:72 is marked the same as the patient of a transitive clause (ako 'me') which is different from the marker of the cooccurring agent (mo 'you').[4]

This syntactic behavior has been associated with ergativity when some verbs show restriction in occurring in the active voice. Studies in Philippine linguistics have attributed this to the primacy of the patient (object or goal) being the more salient nominal in Tagalog[5]. Patient focus constructions are also observed in verbs that bear no affix. When one of two nominals is forced to be focused, the patient readily allows it. Some examples in Tagalog are: ayaw 'don't like'; kailangan 'necessary'; alam 'know'.

The same is observed in verbs derived from nouns in which the cooccurring agent noun appears to have been incorporated into the verb, or sometimes called a cognate verb. Matt 1:2 example *'umanak' 'give birth to a child' and 'anak' is 'child'. Similar examples are: 'anayin' to be infested with termites 'anay 'termites'; 'lamukin' means 'to be bitten by mosquitos' where 'lamok' means 'mosquitos'.

This section presents the major issues of difference between Greek and Tagalog: genetic classification, typological classification, the prevalence of concord in Greek and the ergative tendencies of Tagalog. Because of this tendency, an active verb in Greek is sometimes impossible and sometimes very unnatural to render as active also in Tagalog.

3. Principles to be used in the interlinear:

3.1. The lack of equivalence

Equivalence in this paper is used to refer to the close similarity between languages because of their common descent. This was shown in the close phonetic correspondence between English, Russian and Hindi in section 2.1 The basis for the similarity is the fact that the languages belong to the same family.

Among Philippine languages, shared morpho-syntactic characteristics can also be

---

4) 'ka' and 'ako' belong to the same syntactic set of pronouns in Tagalog.

5) De Guzman, Videa, "The ergative analysis: A different view of structure" (Diliman Quezon City: Lecture at the University of the Philippines, 1998).

the basis for equivalence. One can note the similarity of the syntactic markers in 5 Philippine languages below.

A: Tagalog   Bumili ang bata   ng   libro.
                    Bought the child mrk[6] book

        Cebuano mipalit ug   libro ang bata
                    Bought mrk   book the   child

        Hiligaynon   nagbakal ang bata sang   libro
                      Bought   the child mrk   book

Consider, however, the languages in B:

B.   Kapampangan sinali   yang   libru ing   anak
                          Bought he/she+mrk book the   child

        Ilocano   gimmatang ti ubing   ti   libro
                    Bought   the child   mrk book

All these sentences mean, "The child bought a book." in 5 languages in the Philippines. Among these, languages in A are closer structurally than those in B. In A, note that except for a difference in order of words, the gloss of the words is identical. In B however, note the need for a cross-referent pronoun in Kapampangan, to refer to the child. In Ilocano, note the use of the identical marker for the subject 'child' and the direct object 'book'. The degree of similarity can differ as in A and B, but their similarity typologically is easily established.

If equivalence is based on inherent similarities between related languages, both genetically and typologically, and if Greek and Tagalog are clearly of different types on both counts, as shown in section 2.0, what can be the basis to make an interlinear with Tagalog as the gloss language?

3.2. A correspondence, but not equivalence

---

6) Syntactic marker.

There may be a lack of equivalence, but one can establish a correspondence. The fact that there are numerous interlinears with Greek as the SL and many languages as GL (Bahasa Indonesia, Baluchi) is a proof that despite the lack of equivalence, there is value in showing correspondence in an interlinear. The user usually wants to have an idea about the literal meaning of the Greek word, but first the correspondence has to be established. The weakness of existing interlinears is that only the SL is given importance. No wonder, assigning the gloss is arbitrary because there is no reference whatsoever to the structure or linguistic patterns of the GL. It is like a patchwork, the GL patching up for whatever is found in the SL. Glossing will cease to be arbitrary only if the structure of the GL is given the same importance as the SL and the principles of glossing are based on sound linguistic principles and therefore shows consistency.

3.2.1. The verb 'ειμι' and Tagalog 'ay'

The Greek verb ʼειμι is a copula verb characteristic of many languages in the Indo-European family of languages which is not found in Tagalog. Although used often to indicate a state of being, it can also combine with a participle to form a periphrastic construction. Either way, this copula verb embodies a combination of grammatical categories such as tense/aspect, mood, gender and person.

Tagalog 'ay' has been wrongfully analyzed as equivalent to the verb 'to be'. But 'ay' does not exhibit any verbal quality except to order the components, always putting the subject before it and the predicate after it. There are times when Greek ʼειμι also behaves this way. Because of 'ειμι's grammatical load such as person and number, there will be times when 'ay' will be glossed with a pronoun. Clearly, there is no equivalence, but a correspondence can be established.

Mark 1:11

Σὺ	εἶ	ὁ	υἱός	μου	ὁ	ἀγαπητός
You	are	the	son	my	the	beloved
Ikaw	ay	ang	anak	ko	ang	minamahal

Mark 1:13

καὶ	ἦν	ἐν	τῇ	ἐρήμῳ	τεσσεράκοντα	ἡμέρας
and	was	at	the	desert	forty	days
at	siya ay	nasa	sa	ilang	apatnapu	mga araw

3.3. The gloss is not intended to be read as a translation.

By virtue of the principle above, that what is to be maintained is a correspondence rather than equivalence, the gloss should not be read as a translation. Therefore, it will not read as a well-formed sequence of words but it should be possible to glean the meaning even just from the corresponding words of the SL. Quite differently, as mentioned in section 1.2, some existing Greek-English interlinears are intended to be read as translations by the system of superscript numbers on the English words to indicate the order how they are to be read Such treatment of the GL clearly demonstrates the corresponding words of the GL being pulled from all directions for the sake of finding a word to correspond to the SL. Correspondence is made only on the surface level.

The following is an example from Brown and Comfort (1990):

Mark 1:13

καὶ	ἦν	ἐν	τῇ	ἐρήμῳ	τεσσεράκοντα	ἡμέρας
and	he had been	[4]in	[5]the	[6]wilderness	[7]forty	[8]days
at	siya ay		nasa sa	ilang	apatnapu	mga araw

πειραζόμενος	ὑπὸ	τοῦ	Σατανᾶ
[1]tempted	[2]by	-	[3]Satan
tinutukso		ni	Satanas

3.3.1. No ligature in Tagalog

The Tagalog ligature is the morpheme that is added to link words within a descriptive phrase, whether adjectival or adverbial This ligature is phonologically conditioned: /na/ when preceded by a word ending with a consonant, /ŋ/ as in the example above in Mark 1:13.

τεσσεράκοντα	ἡμέρας	
forty	days	
apatnapu	mga araw	(gloss)

In a well-formed level, this phrase is:

apatnapuŋ   mga araw

If the order of the constituents of the descriptive phrase are reversed:

Mga araw	na	apatnapu
Days	linker	forty

The linker takes the form of /na/ in the latter example because it now follows a word that ends with a semi-vowel /w/. Because of the phonological conditioning, the linker apparently makes the flow of speech smooth. And because of principle 2 that states that the gloss is not intented to be read as a translation, the ligature will not be added in the gloss. This supports the position that an interlinear is not a surface structure representation but rather a stage prior to it. The only time when a linker will be used is when a descriptive phrase forms the gloss of one Greek words such as:

τεσσεράκοντα
forty
apat + na + pu
four   lnk   ten

3.4. Accompanying Translation

The Greek-Tagalog Interlinear recognizes the need to show a coherent, grammatical rendering of the glosses through the accompanying translation on the same page. This is the Bagong Ang Biblia[7], or Revised Ang Biblia (RAB), a formal translation of the Bible in Tagalog. The gloss will fulfill the purpose of providing the literal meaning while RAB provides the smooth reading of the gloss language.

The RAB is a revision of the 1905 Ang Biblia, while maintaining the same formal correspondence approach. As a revision, the language was adjusted to make it more readable. Consequently, the very archaic words were revised to make them more understandable and for the same reason, the very formal approach was in

7) RAB, 2001.

some places revised to reflect meaning rather than the form. For these reasons, it is not surprising to see how RAB has deviated from the gloss of the interlinear. However, when RAB still reflects the literal gloss, priority is given to the choice of lexicon used in RAB. An example is the Greek word ʹιδου or ʹιδε. The 1905 Ang Biblia consistently translated as 'narito' meaning 'here it is'. RAB sometimes used a more contextual rendering such as Mark 15:35:

Mark 1:2

Ἰδοὺ	ἀποστέλλω	τὸν	ἄγγελόν	μου
Behold	I send	the	messenger	of me
Narito	nagsusugo ako	ng	sugo	akin

Mark 15:35

Ἴδε	Ἠλίαν	φωνεῖ	
Look	for Elijah	he calls	
Tingnan ninyo	kay Elias	tumatawag siya	
Look you (pl)	to Elijah	calling	he

3.5. When even Correspondence is difficult

Section 2.3 lists down the different categories in language where Greek and Tagalog greatly differ. Most of these involve grammatical categories in Greek but which are lexicalized in Tagalog. Two of the more difficult ones are the participles and subjunctive. Because of the lack of equivalence, it is expected that there will be more inconsistency in the way the verbal participle and the subjunctive verb are glossed.

Mark 9:14

Καὶ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς 'and when they came to the disciples'

The participle ἐλθόντες can be glossed in two ways:
a) nang   dumating   sila   sa   mga alagad
   when   came (act)   they   to   disciples

b) pagdating   nila   sa   mga alagad
   when/after coming (pas)   they   to   the disciples

This participle can be glossed in these two ways. Example A retains the active voice in Tagalog but needs to add an adverbial 'nang' which is not found in Greek. In B, one word gloss is retained in Tagalog but the voice is changed.

Mark 12:2
ἵνα παρὰ τῶν γεωργῶν λάβῃ ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος 'to get from them some of the fruit of the vineyard'

The subjunctive, aorist active 3rd singular verb λάβῃ is glossed as 'makakuha' meaning 'be able to get/receive' to reflect the contingency meaning more than the tense/aspect aorist since in the subjunctive, nature of action is given more importance than time. In some cases however, the subjunctive meaning is not reflected as in:

Mark 11:28
ἢ τίς σοι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῇς; 'and who gave you this authority to do them?'

In Tagalog, the subjunctive present active 2nd sg verb ποιῇς is glossed as a simple 'gawin' meaning 'to do', which is no different in form and meaning from the indicative verb ποιεω.

4. Summary

The assumption of equivalence is apparent in the very format of an interlinear. But many times, there is no equivalence. Consequently, the making of interlinears involve a number of theoretical considerations.

There is no better substitute to learning a language as one language with its own grammar and unique features. However, the reality is that people do not always have this opportunity since this entails more time and focus. The impression sometimes is that a person only needs to have an "idea" of what's happening in the other language. I believe, this has led to the proliferation of interlinears. So, this paper recognizes that there is value in making an interlinear because it provides a quick correspondence between two languages, namely the one being studied such as Greek, and the one that is known by the user, such as English or Tagalog. The

inadequacy, however, is that the gloss language is not given proper treatment.   I believe that an interlinear's analysis of the two languages is useful to know how the two language systems relate with one another.   As the two languages retain their uniqueness, the goal is still to find a correspondence between them. The picture is of two linguistic systems being rearranged and readjusted to find a systematic correspondence between them. Because of the reality of the two unique systems, two principles are necessary. First, it is important to establish equivalence, if there is a close affinity between the two languages. If not, which is usually the case in interlinears, the pattern of correspondence should be analyzed. Secondly, because of the lack of equivalence, the gloss is not to be read as a translation. The two linguistic systems will vary in numerous aspects and this principle will allow flexibility in the gloss language to shed light on the meaning of the source language. However, because the interlinear involves two linguistic systems, consistency in the gloss is given high priority. For Greek and Tagalog, a number of syntactic categories in Greek are lexicalized in Tagalog. The manner of expression may be different, but what is significant is that the same general idea can still be expressed.

This type of interlinear will include a brief grammatical sketch of the two languages, the source and gloss languages, that is user friendly to the target audience. This will be provided in the actual product but not in this paper. Very important to the final product is the introduction that will explain how the user can make good use of the interlinear, the principles integrated, with the use of minimal technicality.

Appendix: Sample of Mark 1:1-8 in a Greek-Tagalog interlinear format

* Keyword
Interlinears, gloss language, Tagalog, equivalence, correspondence.

Sample Greek-Tagalog Interlinear: Mark 1:1-8[7)]

Mark 1:1

Ἀρχὴ	τοῦ	εὐαγγελίου	Ἰησοῦ	Χριστοῦ	[υἱου	θεοῦ].
N-NF-S	DGNS	N-GN-S	N-GM-S	N-GM-S	N-GM-S	N-GM-S
[THE] BEGINNING	OF THE	GOOD NEWS	OF JESUS	CHRIST	[THE] SON	OF GOD.
PASIMULA	NG	EBANGHELYO	NI JESU-	CRISTO	[ANAK	NG DIYOS]

Mark 1:2

Καθὼς	γέγραπται		ἐν	τῷ	Ἠσαΐᾳ	τῷ	προφήτῃ,	Ἰδου
CS	VIRP--3S		PD	DDMS	N-DM-S	DDMS	N-DM-S	QS
ST AS	IT HAS BEEN WRITTEN		IN	-	ISAIAH	THE	PROPHET,	BEHOLD
TULAD NG	NASUSULAT		NASA	SA	ISAIAS	NA	PROPETA	NARITO

ἀποστέλλω		τὸν	ἄγγελόν	μου	πρὸ	προσώπου	σου,	ὃς
VIPA--1S		DAMS	N-AM-S	NPG-1S	PG	N-GN-S	NPG-2S	APRNM-S
I SEND		THE	MESSENGER	OF ME	BEFORE	[THE] FACE	OF YOU,	WHO
NAGPAPADALA	AKO	NG	SUGO	KO	UNAHAN	MUKHA	MO	NA

---

7) The grammatical description uses the analysis and symbols from Friberg 1981.

κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδόν σου·
VIFA--3S DAFS N-AF-S NPG-2S
WILL PREPARE THE WAY OF YOU;
MAGHAHANDA NG DAAN MO

Mark 1:3

φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, Ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν
N-NF-S VPPAGM-S PD DDFS AP-DF-S VMAA--2P DAFS N-AF-S
A VOICE CRYING OUT IN THE WILDERNESS, PREPARE THE WAY
TINIG NG SUMISIGAW NASA SA ILANG IHANDA NINYO ANG DAAN

κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ,
N-GM-S A--AF-P VMPA--2P DAFP N-AF-P NPGM3S
OF [THE] LORD, STRAIGHT MAKE THE PATHS OF HIM,
NG PANGNOON TUWID GAWIN NINYO ANG MGA LANDAS NIYA

Mark 1:4

ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης [ὁ] βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ
VIAD--3S N-NM-S DNMS+ VPPANM-S PD DDFS AP-DF-S CC
CAME JOHN - BAPTIZING IN THE WILDERNESS AND
DUMATING JUAN ANG TAGAPAGBAUTISMO SA - ILANG AT

κηρύσσων	βάπτισμα	μετανοίας	εἰς	ἄφεσιν	ἁμαρτιῶν.
VPPANM-S	N-AN-S	N-GF-S	PA	N-AF-S	N-GF-P
PREACHING	A BAPTISM	OF REPENTANCE	FOR	[THE] FORGIVENESS	OF SINS.
NANGANGARAL	NG BAUTISMO	NG PAGSISISI	PARA	SA KAPATAWARAN	NG MGA kasalanan

Mark 1:5

καὶ	ἐξεπορεύετο	πρὸς	αὐτὸν	πᾶσα	ἡ	Ἰουδαία	χώρα
CH	VIIN--3S	PA	NPAM3S	A--NF-S	DNFS	A--NF-S	N-NF-S
AND	WERE GOING OUT	TO	HIM	[THE] ENTIRE	-	JUDEAN	COUNTRY
AT	PUMUPUNTA	SA	KANYA	LAHAT	ANG	JUDEA	LUPAIN

καὶ	οἱ	Ἱεροσολυμῖται	πάντες,	καὶ	ἐβαπτίζοντο	ὑπ'
CC	DNMP	N-NM-P	A--NM-P	CC	VIIP--3P	PG
AND	THE	JERUSALEMITES	ALL,	AND	THEY WERE BEING BAPTIZED	BY
AT	ANG	MGA TAGA-JERUSALEM	LAHAT	AT	BINABAUTISMUHAN SILA	-

αὐτοῦ	ἐν	τῷ	Ἰορδάνῃ	ποταμῷ	ἐξομολογούμενοι	τὰς	ἁμαρτίας
NPGM3S	PD	DDMS	N-DM-S	N-DM-S	VPPMNM-P	DAFP	N-AF-P
HIM	IN	THE	JORDAN	RIVER,	CONFESSING	THE	SINS
NIYA	SA	-	JORDAN	ILOG	NAGPAPAHAYAG	NG	MGA KASALANAN NILA

αὐτῶν.
NPGM3P
OF THEM.
NILA

Mark 1:6

καὶ	ἦν	ὁ	Ἰωάννης	ἐνδεδυμένος	τρίχας	καμήλου	καὶ
CS	VIIA--3S+	DNMS	N-NM-S	+VPRMNM-S	N-AF-P	N-GF-S	CC
AND	HAD BEEN	-	JOHN	CLOTHED	HAIRS	[IN] CAMEL	AND
AT	NOON AY	SI	JUAN	NAKADAMIT	NG BALAHIBO	NG KAMELYO	AT

ζώνην	δερματίνην	περὶ	τὴν	ὀσφὺν	αὐτοῦ	καὶ	ἐσθίων
N-AF-S	A--AF-S	PA	DAFS	N-AF-S	NPGM3S	CC	+VPPANM-S
BELT	A LEATHER	AROUND	THE	WAIST	OF HIM,	AND	EATING
NG SINTURON	BALAT	SA PALIBOT	NG	BAYWANG	NIYA	AT	KUMAKAIN

ἀκρίδας	καὶ	μέλι	ἄγριον.
N-AF-P	CC	N-AN-S	A--AN-S
LOCUSTS	AND	HONEY	WILD.
NG MGA BALANG	AT	PUKYUTAN	LIGAW

Mark 1:7

καὶ	ἐκήρυσσεν	λέγων,	Ἔρχεται	ὁ	ἰσχυρότερός
CC/CH	VIIA--3S	VPPANM-S	VIPN--3S	DNMS	APMNM-S
AND	HE WAS PREACHING	SAYING,	IS COMING	THE ONE	STRONGER
AT	NANGANGARAL SIYA	NAGSASABI	DUMARATING	ANG	HIGIT NA MAKAPANGYARIHAN KAYSA

μου	ὀπίσω	μου,	οὗ	οὐκ	εἰμὶ	ἱκανὸς	κύψας
NPG-1S	PG	NPG-1S	APRGM-S	QN	VIPA--1S	A--NM-S	VPAANM1S
THAN ME,	AFTER	ME,	OF WHOM	NOT	I AM	QUALIFIED,	STOOPING,
AKIN	KASUNOD	KO	NA	HINDI	AKO	KARAPAT-DAPAT	YUMUKOD

λῦσαι	τὸν	ἱμάντα	τῶν	ὑποδημάτων	αὐτοῦ.
VNAA	DAMS	N-AM-S	DGNP	N-GN-P	NPGM3S
TO UNTIE	THE	STRAP	OF THE	SANDALS	OF HIM.
MAGKALAG	NG	TALI	NG	MGA SANDALYAS	NIYA

Mark 1:8

ἐγὼ	ἐβάπτισα	ὑμᾶς	ὕδατι,	αὐτὸς	δὲ	βαπτίσει
NPN-1S	VIAA--1S	NPA-2P	N-DN-S	NPNM3S	CH	VIFA--3S
I	BAPTIZED	YOU	IN WATER,	HE	BUT	WILL BAPTIZE
AKO	NAGBAUTISMO AKO	SA INYO	SA TUBIG	SIYA	NGUNIT	MAGBABAUTISMO SIYA

ὑμᾶς   ἐν   πνεύματι   ἁγίῳ.
NPA-2P   PD   N-DN-S   A--DN-S
YOU   IN   SPIRIT   [THE] HOLY.
SA INYO   SA   ESPIRITU   SANTO

* References

Blass, F. and A. Debrunner and Robert Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Brown, Robert and Philip Comfort, *The New Greek-English Interlinear New Testament,* Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, 1990.

De Guzman, Videa, "The ergative analysis: A different view of structure," Diliman Quezon City: Lecture at the University of the Philippines, 1998.

Friberg, Barbara and Timothy Friberg eds., *Analytical Greek New Testament*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1981.

Greek - Baluchi Interlinear, Karachi: Pakistan Bible Society, 1999.

Marshall, Alfred, *The Interlinear NRSV-NIV Parallel New Testament in Greek and English*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993.

O'Grady, William and Michael Dobrovolsky and Mark Aronoff, *Contemporary Linguistics*, New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 1995.

PBIK Jilid I: Perjanjian baru Interlinear: Yunani‑Indonesia Jakarta: Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia, 2004.

Schacter, Paul and Fe Otanes, *Tagalog Reference Grammar*, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972.

Korean Translation of the Greek Personal Pronoun σου in the Lord's Prayer[*]

Young-Jin Min** & Ji-Youn Cho***

This study deals with problems that arise when translating the Greek term σου, as it is used to address God in the Lord's Prayer (Mt 6:9-13), into languages with honorifics. Since there are no socially neutral forms in Korean language, the translators must always choose an honorific or non-honorific form, though Greek is a typical non-honorific language. Accordingly, the Korean translation of σου cannot be based on explicative aspects of the source language such as lexical and grammatical meanings. Use of an inadequate honorific form in the translation will cause misunderstanding of the implicit meaning of the source text, and the resultant expression may be too ungrammatical for readers to comprehend. In fact, honorifics are a special class of words or grammatical morphemes that function to indicate social relationship of interlocutors in communicative events. Violations of proper honorific usage may be interpreted as an insult, a joke, or an invitation to a fight in Korean society. Korean interlocutors must adjust their honorifics to appropriate forms and levels of deference.

Translation of the Lord's Prayer is furthermore an extremely important issue in Korean Bible translation. Every Sunday in most churches in Korea, Christians recite the Lord's Prayer in their own congregation as the public confession of their faith, and the Korean translation of σου to address God is directly related to how respectfully they confess their faith. The predicament of Korean translations of σου in addressing God has been presented within the history of Korean translations ever since 1884, when the Lord's Prayer was first translated into Korean.

The purpose of this study therefore is to propose a new Korean translation of σου in the Lord's Prayer from the socio-linguistic and pragmatic perspectives. For this purpose, we will first examine the possible Korean honorific forms into which the

Greek term σου in the Lord's Prayer can be translated, and compare the T/V form found almost universally in European languages with the Korean second person singular pronoun, looking at the language-specific aspects of the individual language systems. Then the translations of σου in the major Korean versions of the Lord's Prayer will be reviewed, and a new translation will be proposed through analysis of modern Korean linguistic dynamics and changes.

1. Honorific Forms of Second Person Singular Pronoun in Korean Language

The term for "honorifics" in Korean[1] implies "the elevation of others" and "denigrating of self." Korean honorifics relate to various forms of language structure and usage according to the addressee, subject, or referent.[2] All honorific markers function like the tense markers, mood markers, word order, etc., of the English language.[3] Especially Korean pronouns are not simply "noun substitutes"; their usage should be understood not according to the typical grammatical concept of "person" but in terms of the social interactional concept of "sender and receiver" in various social contexts.[4] Failure to use proper honorific pronouns leads not only

---

1) The term for "honorifics" in Korean is *chondae* (尊待, *chon* meaning "to honor," and *dae* "to equip"), *kyeongeo* (敬語, *kyeong* "to respect," and *eo* "word, expression, or style") or *daewoo* (待遇, *dae* "to equip," *woo* "to meet").

2) The Korean language undoubtedly has the most complex honorifics, involving personal pronouns, address-reference terms, nouns, predicates, particles, subject and addressee-honorific suffixes and speech styles (Ho-Min Sohn, *The Korean language* [Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1999], 409-418). Referent honorifics are crucially related to uses of honorific morphemes and lexicalized honorifics that include honorary titles used together with the name (Choon-Hak Cho, *A Study of Korean Pragmatics: Deixis and Politeness* [Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii dissertation, 1982], 17). The addressee honorifics include the vocative, addressee honorific terms, addressee honorific suffix and speech styles. Normally subject honorifics consist of honorific titles such as +*nim* (high deferential), or +*ssi* (deferential), or +*kun* (male)/+*yang* (female) (a little deferential), honorific nominative particles such as +*kkyeso*, and the honorific predicative verbal suffix +(*u*) *si*. When the subject of a sentence is in honorific form, the predicate verb should correspondingly adopt an honorific speech style.

3) Juck-Ryoon Hwang, *Role of Sociolinguistics in Foreign language Education with Reference to Korean and English: Terms of Address and Styles of Deference* (Austin: University of Texas at Austin, 1975), 70.

4) There are not only Korean honorific forms of the second person singular pronoun, but also *choh* (1st person: very humble), *na* (1st person: plain); demonstrative +*pun* 'person' (3rd person: deferential),

to ungrammatical and awkward sentences, but also to breakdowns in interactions.

Classifications related to honorific forms for second person singular pronouns (henceforth: SPSP) are slightly different according to different Korean linguists.[5] However, most Korean linguists seem to agree that there are mainly three kinds of honorific forms of SPSP, i.e., *noh*, *chane* and *tangsin*.

(1) The plain form of *noh* is used to address or refer to a child or its equivalent. A symmetrical use of *noh* is also found between two adults who became friends as classmates or in childhood. The use of nonreciprocal *noh* increases solidarity among members of a family or a specific social group. When such solidarity exists as a teacher-student relationship, the age limit is then moved up to the high school age. The lower-status or younger speaker is not allowed to use the form *noh* or less formal expressions when addressing a higher-status or older person. Use depends on individual styles and varies according to the speaker's judgment of the appropriate time to stop addressing a person with *noh*. A reciprocal *noh* develops into a reciprocal *chane* as members of the dyad grow older.

(2) The reciprocal use of *chane* is normally found between adult male friends. The form *chane* is used by a superior to a much younger adult or adolescent inferior, or by a parent-in-law to a son-in-law, etc. It is also used asymmetrically between superiors and subordinates such as in the relationship between professors and their students regardless of gender. Like the *noh* form, the *chane* form is never used by a lower-status or younger speaker to a higher status or older addressee.

(3) As for the *tangsin* form, it is difficult to assign one specific position for this form on the deferential or non-deferential scale. This form serves the following four functions: 1) *tangsin* is frequently used to express scorn or insult during angry arguments or when fighting with the addressee; 2) *tangsin* is used asymmetrically by a speaker of higher social status to address a person of lower social status, with both members of the dyad being adults; 3) reciprocal use of *tangsin* is normally reserved for the relationship between husband and wife; and 4) the *tangsin* form can

---

demonstrative +*i* 'person' (3rd person: a little deferential), demonstrative +*saram* 'person' (3rd person: plain), demonstrative +*ae* 'child' (3rd person: a plain form used to refer to a child).

5) Hyun-Bae Choi, 『우리말본』 (*Korean Grammar*) (Seoul: Chung Woom Sa, 1979), 239-240. Juck-Ryoon Hwang, *Role of Sociolinguistics in Foreign Language Education,* 25-37; Choon-Hak Cho, *A Study of Korean Pragmatics,* 35-37; Mae-Ran Park, *Social Variation and Change in Honorific Usage among Koreans* (Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co., 1991), 28-30; Ho-Min Sohn, *The Korean Language,* 409-418. This paper will not deal with the specific differences in honorific systems as identified by Korean linguists.

be regarded as more formal and respectful than *chane,* and grammarians mark the form with +respect. Most Korean linguists currently regard the form *tangsin* as polite.

Table 1. The Use of Honorific Forms of SPSP

Forms	Functions		Speaker	Addressee
Tangsin	+Respect		Person of lower social status Younger person Adult relative of lower rank	Person of higher social status Older person Adult relative of higher rank
	⁻Respect		Spouse	Spouse
			Person of higher social status	Person of lower social status
			Angry person	Person being insulted
chane	⁻Respect	Polite	Adult relative of higher rank Male friend Professor	Adult relative of higher rank Male friend Student
Noh		Plain	Adults in general Parents Elder siblings Teacher	Children Offspring regardless of age Younger siblings Student up to high school

As shown in the table above, the *chane* form is more polite only when it is compared with *noh,* and *tangsin* is probably a more respectful form than *chane.* The *tangsin* form is the only deferential form of Korean SPSP. Use of the above forms is not adhered to all the time, but is flexible according to individual styles of speakers or the communicative circumstances.

Traditionally a Korean speaker of lower status is not allowed to use any of the SPSP toward a higher-status addressee. Most Korean linguists have agreed that Korean language lacks a SPSP of deference in the Korean honorific system. A speaker of Korean uses proper kinship terms such as uncle, aunt, elder brother, elder sister, grandfather, grandmother, etc., or (last name +) titles + *nim* (honorific suffix) such as Reverend, Professor, President, Director, Manager, Doctor, General, Priest, etc., when the addressee is of higher status, in order to show respect and deference to the addressee. In addition, even though a speaker does not use any SPSP when talking with the addressee, there is no difficulty for the addressee in understanding the speaker's expression in Korean. Thus the honorific phenomenon of SPSP may reflect the speaker's unwillingness to indicate the addressee directly.

2. Similarity and Dissimilarity between Korean Honorific Forms of SPSP and T/V Forms

The Korean honorific pair of *noh-tangsin* may be compared with *du-Sie* of German or *tu-vous* of French, i.e., T/V forms. There are both similarities and dissimilarities between the Korean honorific forms of SPSP and T/V forms.

Concerning the T/V form, Roger Brown and Albert Gilman have analyzed the phenomenon of two SPSP found almost universally in European languages[6]: an inferiors form (T), named after the Latin *tu* for informal usage, and a superiors form (V), from the Latin *vos* for formal polite contexts. In ancient Latin, there was only *tu* for the singular, but the plural *vos* as a form of address to one person started being used for the first time to refer to the emperor in the fourth century.[7] Brown and Gilman have claimed that the pronouns of T and V form are in close association with two dimensions fundamental to the analysis of all social life: the dimensions of power and solidarity.[8] T form is defined as the pronoun of either condescension or intimacy and V form as the pronoun of reverence or formality.

Actually Korean language is unique in the sense that it lacks a SPSP of deference comparable to the V forms of European languages, and second person plural pronouns in Korean are never used to denote a single person, unlike those V forms. However, the function of *tangsin* partly overlaps with the V form when it serves a +respect function in addressing one of higher social status, an older person, or an adult relative of higher rank. On the other hand, *tangsin* is used with the ‑respect in the relationship between interlocutors, whereas the V form is out of the question in such a context. The "familiar" T form is more comparable to *noh* in Korean, but an inferior will not use any of these two forms to a superior no matter how intimate they are. This is clearly revealed in the translation of σου in addressing God in

---

6) Roger Brown and Albert Gilman have introduced the usage of pronouns in not only Dutch, English, French, German, Italian and Spanish, but also in the languages of Argentina, Austria, Chile, Denmark, India, Israel, Norway, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland and Yugoslavia (Roger Brown and Albert Gilman, "Pronouns of Power and Solidarity," *Language and Social Context* [Gigliogli, P. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972], 253).

7) Brown and Gilman, "Pronouns of Power and Solidarity," 254. In England, before the Norman Conquest, 'ye' was the second person plural and 'thou' the singular. 'You' was originally the accusative of 'ye,' but in time it also became the nominative plural and ultimately outside 'thou' as the usual singular.

8) Ibid.

Indo-European versions of the Lord's Prayer, as follows:

Table 2. Translations of σου in addressing God in Indo-European Versions of the
         Lord's Prayer (Mt 6:9-13)

Versions	9a	10a	10b
Vulgata	*tuum*	*tuum*	*tua*
Nova Vulgata	*tuum*	*tuum*	*tua*
RSV	*thy*	*thy*	*thy*
Die Bibel	*Dein*	*Dein*	*Dein*
La Sainte Bible	*ton*	*ton*	*ta*
La Bible	*tous*	*ton*	*ta*

The above versions have traditionally selected the T form, which is a more intimate form used between family members and cherished friends. There is no version that translates σου into V form. In 1655, Fransworth argued that God and Adam, and God and Moses address one another in the T form in the Scripture.[9] Recently Paul Ellingworth has made the distinction of T and V forms in common European language translations of the New Testament.[10] He has classified translated expressions when Jesus addresses God (Mt 11:25; 26:39, 42; 27:46) in the T form because he has regarded the expressions as "addressing to and by a supernatural being."[11]

Such classification is quite different from the Korean honorific system of SPSP. *Noh* of the Korean SPSP cannot be used as the pronoun to address God even though the relationship between Jesus and God is intimate, as between son and father. Being in an intimate relationship, God as father can address his son with the form *noh*, whereas a son cannot address his father with *noh* despite their intimate relationship. Especially when a prayer includes Jesus, the speaker is obliged to address God in the highest deferential form. The predicament of the Korean translations in translating σου to address God has been presented within the history of Korean translations ever since 1884, when the Lord's Prayer was first translated into Korean.

---

9) As quoted in Brown and Gilman, "Pronouns of Power and Solidarity," 267.

10) Paul Ellingworth, "'YOU CAN SAY YOU TO HIM' T- and V-forms in Common Language Translations of the New Testament," *The Bible Translator* 53:3 (Jan 2002), 143-153.

11) Ibid.

3. Various Attempts at Korean Translations of σου in the Lord's Prayer

The Greek term σου has neither honorific form nor any meaning-content that would imply honorific expression. When translating the discourse of the Lord's Prayer, Korean Bible translators try to find an appropriate honorific form to translate σου in addressing God. The honorific form must not only be grammatical but also acceptable and understandable for most Korean readers. The difficulty of translating the Lord's Prayer with proper honorific forms is revealed in the fact that there have been at least 29 Korean translations of the Lord's Prayer since 1884.[12]

The Lord's Prayer was first translated into Korean by Scottish missionaries John Ross and John MacIntyre in *The Gospel according to Matthew* (1884) with Korean translators[13] in Pongchun, Manchuria.[14] Ross' translation team translated each portions of New Testament, and combined these portions into *The Corean New Testament* (*CNT*) in 1887. As observed in Ross' letters, the official translation principle is definitely literal translation.[15] Nevertheless, σου in the Lord's Prayer (Mt 6:9c, 10a, 10b) has been translated not into the SPSP but into the noun "father + *nim* (honorific suffix)." This reflects that Ross did not find a proper SPSP to translate σου as addressing God, but solved the problem by repeating the translation of πατερ instead of using the SPSP (Mt 6:9b). That translation seemed acceptable and understandable for Korean readers in those days, and thus the term 'father' has been repeatedly used in the *Korean New Testament,* the *New Translation* (*KNT* 1967) and the *Common Translation of the Holy Bible* (*CTHB* 1977, 1999).

After the Ross translation, in 1892 American missionary Henry G. Appenzeller translated the Greek term σου into *noh*, which is a SPSP in the plain form. Such a translation can be accounted for by the following possibility: this translation, being

---

12) Chae-Un Na, 『주기도, 사도신조, 축도』(*The Lord' Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and the Benediction)* (Seoul: Seongji Chulpansa, 1988, 2001), 153-164.

13) Korean translators in Ross' translation team are Ung-Chan Lee, Hong-Joon Paik, Jin-Kye Kim, Sang-Yun Soh, Kyung-Jo Soh, Sung-Ha Lee, Ik-Sai Lee and others.

14) John Ross' letter to Arthington, February 17, 1882; 『대한성서공회사 I』 (*The History of the Korean Bible Society* I) (Seoul: Korean Bible Society, 1993), 57; Ki-Jong So, *The Translation of the Bible into Korean: Its History and Significance* (Ann Arbor: U.M.I., 1993), 47. Korean church historians may agree that there are no firm data on the names of the Korean translators (*The History of Korean Bible Society* I, 57).

15) J. Ross to W. Wright, January 24, 1883; J. Ross to W. Wright, March 10, 1884.

done by Appenzeller for the first time, was influenced by the T form of Indo-European versions, which he used as a reference for his Korean translation, but he may have literally translated the Greek term σου into Korean without enough knowledge of Korean honorific usages. The *noh* form as the Korean translation of σου was both ungrammatical and psychologically misleading for the Korean reader as well as an impertinent way of addressing God.

Accordingly, Appenzeller himself switched from the plain form *noh* in addressing God, to "no naming" in his revision in 1895, three years after his first translation. This no naming of God has been more acceptable and appropriate for Korean readers. The Appenzeller translation was followed by the first Korean Bible, *Korean Bible* (*KB* 1911) and *Korean Revised Version* (*KRV* 1938, 1956, 1961, 1998), which have been read by most Korean Protestant Christians, and *New Korean Standard Version* (*NKSV* 1993, 2001), which is the most recent translation. The following table shows that translations of σου in each version have been in three forms.

Table 3. Translations of σου as Addressing God in Korean Versions

Korean Versions	9c σου	10a σου	10b σου	Korean Forms
Matthew (Ross, 1884)	*Abonim*	*Abonim*	*Abonim*	"Father"+*nim* (honorific suffix)
CNT (Ross, 1887)	*Abonim*	*Abonim*	*Abonim*	"Father"+*nim* (honorific suffix)
Matthew (Appenzeller, 1892)	*Ne*	*Ne*	*Ne*	"*Noh*" form (-respect)
Matthew (Appenzeller, 1895)	-	-	-	No naming
KB (1911)	-	-	-	No naming
KRV (1938/56/61/98)	-	-	-	No naming
KNT (1967)	*Aboji*	*Aboji*	*Aboji*	"Father"
CTHB (1971/77/99)	*Aboji*	*Aboji*	*Aboji*	"Father"
NKSV (1993/2001)	-	-	-	No naming

In contrast to other linguistic systems, in the Korean system the addressee can be clearly and definitely identified and the message transmitted without any naming of the addressee within the specific context. In addition, there has been the so-called "euphemistic avoidance,"[16] which denotes the speaker's unwillingness to indicate

God as the addressee directly, in the Bible translation. This linguistic phenomenon of no naming of the addressee is frequently found in daily conversations in Korean, and is similar to cases found in Hebrew where the speaker intentionally avoids calling God by name.[17] Actually the name of God was heretofore known as that "ineffable name" no one could utter (YHWH) in the Hebrew context.[18] No naming as a translation of σου in addressing God in Korean versions reflects the situation that Korean people cannot address God with the SPSP directly.

The attempt to translate σου into the Korean term *abonim*, which is the kinship term "father," was appropriately applied according to the Korean honorific system at that time. In modern versions, however, the Korean standard term *abonim* including honorific suffix has been replaced by *aboji*, which lacks the suffix. This change is mainly due to textual interpretation and changes in modern Korean honorific systems. Most biblical scholars have agreed that the Greek term πατερ has been translated from the Aramaic form of address *abba*, which is an informal and intimate term for God.[19] When teaching the Prayer, Jesus predicates an affectionate intimate relationship with God, and invites his disciples into this family relationship with God.[20] This interpretation might have influenced Korean modern versions to select the informal form, *aboji*, instead of the formal, high deferential form *abonim* to address God. Such selection also reflects the transformation of Korean society

---

16) Daiwi Jeong, "신학언어의 바탕으로서의 우리말 어법의 문제성" (The Problems of Korean Usage Based on Theological Languages), 「신학사상」 (*Theological Thought*) 46 (1984), 652.

17) For the Israelites who do not pronounce the four letters, יהוה, the name of God, they read it as either "Adhonai (the Lord)" or "hashem (the name)" whenever it appears. When the word, "הבית (the house)" appears without any modifier, it means "the temple." Without any modifier, "הארץ (the land)" means "the land of Israel," and "הקיר (the wall)" the wall left standing west of the destroyed temple of Jerusalem (Young-Jin Min, "현대 번역 이론에서 본 주기도 번역 문제" [Problems in Translation the Lord's Prayer - from the Perspective of Contemporary Translation Theories], 「성경원문연구」 8 [*Journal of Biblical Text Research,* vol. 8], 2001, 88).

18) C. S. C. Nicholas Ayo, *The Lord's Prayer* (Notre Dame, London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992), 25.

19) Joachim Jeremias, *The Prayer of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 97; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*, Wilhelm C. Linss, trans. (Augsburg, Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1989), 275; C. S. C. Nicholas Ayo, *The Lord's Prayer*, 22; Craig L. Blomberg, *The New American Commentary* (Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1992), 110, 119; Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew* (Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999), 313.

20) The Aramaic term "abba" in addressing God is unique because Jews could not have dared to address God in this manner in first century society (Joachim Jeremias, *The Prayer of Jesus*, 96, 97; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*, 275).

from stratified to egalitarian, emphasizing the intimate relationship between interlocutors.

Apart from the translation of πατερ, there are two criticisms of the decision to translate σου as the noun "father" instead of the SPSP: (1) the translation cannot animate the rhythmical repetition of the so-called "thou-petitions" that emerge in the source text, and (2) the repetition of the term "father," which is not present in the source text, has intensified the patriarchal image of God. The Lord's Prayer in the gospel of Matthew contains two equal sets of petitions containing three petitions each: three "thou-petitions" addressing God's honor and three or four "we-petitions" addressing the suppliant's needs.[21] The "we-petitions" have been clearly shown in the Korean translations, whereas the "thou-petitions" have been hidden with the translation of σου into the noun "father" or no naming in the Korean versions. These translations may obscure the comparison of these two sections of commandments in the Lord's Prayer. In addition, Korean feminist biblical scholars have criticized the patriarchal connotations inserted by the use of masculine references to God in the Lord's Prayer. Although the noun πατερ is metaphorical, it seems valid to criticize the repetition of "father" three times instead of the neutral SPSP.[22]

We therefore can no longer justify or generalize that σου in addressing God should be translated into the noun "father" or no name in Korean versions. Accordingly a new translation of the Lord's Prayer is needed, as in the following proposal to translate σου into SPSP through observation of modern Korean honorific usages from the viewpoint of socio-linguistics and pragmatics.[23]

4. A Proposal for Korean Translation of σου in the Lord's Prayer

---

21) Craig S. Keener, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew,* 311.

22) In terms of translation philology, or linguistics arousing from the hermeneutic interpretation of texts, Bible translators inevitably face arguments for and against a certain translation (Lourens de Vries, "Theology, Spirituality and the Skopos of Bible Translations" [Triennial Translation Workshop paper, 2003], 1).

23) An investigation on social variation and change in honorific usage is essential to propose new translation related to honorific phenomena (Young-Jin Min, "Similarity and Dissimilarity in Bible Translation of Honorific Language: The Case of Honorifics in Three Korean Translations," Aspretcon paper [2001], 31).

Recently there have been various attempts in Korea to raise the issue of translation of the Lord's Prayer.[24] Some biblical scholars have adhered to the use of the noun "father" for σου without seeking the possibility of choosing a Korean SPSP.[25] They have assumed that there is no sufficient highest deferential expression to address God among Korean SPSP, although *tangsin* is a possible deferential SPSP form in the honorific system. That is because the *tangsin* form involves not only the +respect function, but also the -respect function inducing the addressee to feel anger or insult in daily conversation. The functions of *tangsin*, however, have been extended to imply +respect according to dynamic changes in honorifics used by the Korean people.

The Korean society, long under authoritarian rule, has shifted to an industrialized society, resulting in urbanization. With democracy adopted as the new political ideology since 1945, when World War II ended, the socio-political consciousness of the Korean people has undergone gradual change.[26] With the rapid transformation of Korean society, there were changes not only in the linguistic markers of social differentiation but also in honorifics. These honorific phenomena include expressions emphasizing an intimate and equal relationship between interlocutors and the speaker's personality in a modernized Korean society.

In modern Korean, the *tangsin* form has functioned not only to express +respect but also intimacy. When hearing *tangsin* being used to address someone who is not that person's wife in a conversation, even some contemporary Koreans would be surprised. In addition, when *tangsin* is used to express +respect, it is frequently used together with the kinship term, (last name +) titles + *nim* (honorific suffix), or no naming depending on circumstances, while some Korean speakers may still be offended by the +respect functions of *tangsin*. Young Koreans tend to hear *tangsin* used often in television serial dramas or to use it in daily conversations. As young Koreans have been strongly influenced by the subtitles of Western movies that use *tangsin* as the translation of the deferential form of SPSP, they are familiar with

---

24) On January 5th, 2001, a seminar on the translation of the Lord's Prayer was held under the joint auspices of the Christian Council of Korea and the Korean Bible Society. At that time, representative Korean Biblical scholars presented their interpretations and various Korean translations of the Lord's Prayer.

25) The members of the study committee on the Lord's Prayer who belong to the Christian Council of Korea suggested again on July 22, 2004, that the noun 'father' be kept as the translation of σου in addressing God.

26) Choon-Hak Cho, *A Study of Korean Pragmatics*, 177

such usage. Most Korean students who have started learning English as a second language and German or French as a third, have experienced the translating of SPSP in Indo-European languages into the Korean term *tangsin*. As per the above tendency, we can cautiously claim that Korean speakers nowadays have started using the *tangsin* form more and more to indicate respect for the addressee in daily conversations, though there are no specific statistics to support this yet.

In fact, *tangsin* has functioned traditionally as the deferential form of the third person singular pronoun. For this function, *tangsin* is uniquely used to indicate the addressee, who is emotionally close to the speaker but far away in terms of space, and such use is found in poems or in expressions of condolences in Korean. That is why *tangsin* has been used for a long time as an expression in prayer to invoke "nearness" and "intimacy" with God, though there have been many controversial arguments over this usage.

The use of *tangsin* as an honorific form in conversations is influenced by the V form in Indo-European languages, but includes other complicated functions different from that of the V form. *Tangsin* as the translation of σου in addressing God functions simultaneously as the expression of intimate relationship, like the T form in the Indo-European versions, and as the highest deferential expression, like the V form.

Tangsin is used as the honorific form to the addressee Jesus in the four Gospels of the most recent version, *RNKSV* (2001) (cf. Mt 8:29; 11:3; 12:2; 15:2; 21:23; 27:11). Readers of this revised version have no objection to the term, *tangsin* in the discourses. In the cases, *tangsin* has never been regarded as a non-deferential expression, but rather is the highest deferential expression. In addition, the *tangsin* form is frequently used as the deferential pronoun to address God while singing hymns and praying to God during public church services. Especially young Koreans sing joyful songs in which *tangsin* is used as the highest deferential reference to God or Jesus. Congregations seem ready to accept *tangsin* as the pronoun to address God in their own prayers, even though there is no Lord's Prayer in Korean that uses the Korean SPSP *tangsin* as a translation of σου. For a new translation of σου in the future, therefore, the *tangsin* form is proposed according to its frequent use in churches where the new versions will be read.

* Keyword

Greek term σου, addressing God, Korean honorific forms, second person singular pronouns, T/V forms.

* References

Blomberg, Craig L., *The New American Commentary*, Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1992.

Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman, "Pronouns of Power and Solidarity," *Language and Social Context,* Gigliogli, P. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972.

Cho, Choon-Hak, *A Study of Korean Pragmatics: Deixis and Politeness,* Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii dissertation, 1982.

Choi, Hyun-Bae,『우리말본』*(Korean Grammar),* Seoul: Chung Woom Sa, 1979.

De Vries, Lourens, "Theology, Spirituality and the Skopos of Bible Translations" Triennial Translation Workshop paper (2003).

Ellingworth, Paul, "'YOU CAN SAY YOU TO HIM' T- and V-forms in Common Language Translations of the New Testament," *The Bible Translator* 53:1 (Jan 2002), 143-153.

Hwang, Juck-Ryoon, *Role of Sociolinguistics in Foreign Language Education with Reference to Korean and English: Terms of Address and Styles of Deference,* Austin: University of Texas at Austin, 1975.

Jeong, Daiwi, "신학언어의 바탕으로서의 우리말 어법의 문제성" (The Problems of Korean Usage Based on Theological Languages),「신학사상」 (*Theological Thought*) 46 (1984), 649-658.

Jeremias, Joachim, *The Prayer of Jesus,* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

Keener, Craig S., *A Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew,* Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999.

Luz, Ulrich, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary,* Linss, Wilhelm C., trans., Augsburg, Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1989.

Min, Young-Jin, "Similarity and Dissimilarity in Bible Translation of Honorific Language: The case of Honorifics in Three Korean Translations," Aspretcon paper (2001).

Min, Young-Jin, "현대 번역 이론에서 본 주기도 번역 문제" (Problems in Translation the Lord's Prayer - from the Perspective of Contemporary

Translation Theories), 「성경원문연구」 8 (*Journal of Biblical Text Research*) (2001).

Na, Chae Un, 『주기도, 사도신조, 축도』 *(the Lord' Prayer, the Apostle's Creed, and the Benediction*), Seoul: Seongji Chulpansa, 1988, 2001.

Nicholas Ayo, C. S. C., *The Lord's Prayer,* Notre Dame, London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1992.

Park, Mae-Ran, *Social Variation and Change in Honorific Usage among Koreans,* Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co., 1991.

So, Ki-Jong, *The Translation of the Bible into Korean: Its History and Significance,* Ann Arbor: U.M.I., 1993.

Sohn, Ho-Min, *The Korean Language,* Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1999.

The Challenges of the RCUV Project*
−Revising Genesis as a case in point−

Joseph Hong**

1. Introduction

In 2001, to coincide with the launch of the revision work on the Old Testament of the Chinese Union Version Bible (henceforth: UV), I wrote a paper entitled "Revision of the Chinese Union Version Bible (henceforth: RCUV) - Assessing the Challenges from a Historical Perspective." Toward the end of that paper, I presented the challenges faced by the RCUV Project in the following four areas of concern:
  - terminology, language styles, regional differences;
  - support, participation, representativeness;
  - technical advances, tools, efficiency;
  - finance, fundraising, duration of the project.

Four years later, these challenges still remain of current interest. Everyone involved in the project continues striving to rise to these challenges. For one thing, the UV Bible has a vast audience that spans a number of countries and regions and has immense market potential, given the fact that Chinese is one of the most spoken languages in the world. For another, the Chinese Protestant churches are still basically conservative in their perception of the Scripture. While many Protestants recognize that the almost century-old UV text has its shortcomings, they are however reluctant to replace it altogether by a new translation. Hence the need to produce a revision of the UV Bible.

Since its first publication in 1919, the UV Bible has gained wide acceptance and become over the years the authorized, canonical version for Chinese Protestants. However, the Chinese language has undergone tremendous changes over the past century. Certain words and expressions that formerly sounded natural and smooth have since become unnatural and unintelligible with arcane pronunciation. In view

of this, UBS as early as in 1983 held consultations with church leaders in various places like Hongkong and Singapore on this matter and decided to launch the revision project. To date, the revised New Testament is at the final stage and its publication is expected by the end of 2005. The first draft of the entire Old Testament has also been completed and a second draft is still underway.

In the course of my involvement with the project, I see that the most daunting challenge is to determine to what extent the changes are to be introduced. This task is made ever more difficult as the changes proposed are massive, despite that fact the guidelines laid down at the outset of the project call for a minimalist approach to changes. These guidelines state that:

1. The purpose of this revision is not revision per se. The characteristic style of the Union Version is to be preserved as much as possible.

2. Changes would be as limited as possible - the lesser the change, the better.

3. The revision strives to be faithful to the original text.

I insist that the challenge is daunting because the more changes we allow and introduce, the greater the risk the future RCUV will incur of being rejected by conservative users of the UV Bible. While reviewing the drafts, I observe that the changes proposed are extensive and all-embracing, ranging from correcting inaccuracies, from replacing obsolete expressions and supplying missing elements, to subtracting and adding particles and to reshuffling syntactic elements which, to some extent, seem to make very little difference in meaning other than giving a slightly different style. I think perhaps a popular saying should sum up well what seems to be a wiser approach, a safer bet, namely <Don't Break, Don't Fix.> If the text still reads smoothly and intelligibly, then we'd better leave it as it is and don't touch it. But then how to decide when a text reads smoothly and intelligibly? What kind of text that calls for change?

To answer these questions, I have decided to use the first OT book, Genesis, as a case in point, to show what kinds of changes are deemed desirable, or even necessary. The changes supplied in the following lists are not exhaustive. In fact, at a rough estimate, they represent probably even less than one-fifth of the total number of changes initially proposed. They are divided into two groups: changes striving to conform to the original and changes striving to respect the dynamics of the target language. Each of the two groups is again subdivided into five lists, each according to the nature of changes involved. The changes are supplied in Chinese

accompanied with an English translation as literal as possible, together with some explanatory remarks. The "dictionary" referred to in the remarks is the 現代漢語詞典 (Xiandai Hanyu Cidian) or, failing that, the 現代漢語大詞典 (Xiandai Hanyu Dacidian).

Here it is important to note that, just like the work of any translation, the work of revising a version is in essence a constant struggle, a tension between two imperatives: the obligation to be faithful and close to the original on the one hand, the commitment to respect the dynamics of the target language on the other hand. Since UV belongs to the category of formal translations, efforts are being made to remain close in meaning as well as in form to the original as much as possible. It is also necessary to remind here that the following proposed changes are not yet definitive, but that at least they reflect more or less what the final revised text is expected to be. In many instances, changes are made based on the recommendations of the Translator's Handbook as well as after consulting various major versions of formal translation. Lastly, credit is given to the drafter Dr. Daniel See as many of the following changes are proposed by him.

2. Changes that Strive to Conform to the Original Text

2.1. Strive to be Faithful to the Wordings and Usages of the Original

This group of changes involves also addition of elements that have been missed in the UV translation, as well as deletion of elements that are not in the original.

1:11 Change 各從其類 (according to its kind) to 在地上各從其類 (according to its kind upon the earth). Hebrew has "upon the earth" that is missing in UV. The phrase is now added.

1:17 Add the subject 上帝 (God) at the beginning of the verse. Hebrew has 'elohim here. UV missed the subject and treated v.17 as an extension of the sentence in the previous verse.

1:24, 25; 6:7; 7:8, 14, 21; 8:17, 19 Change 昆蟲 (insects) to 爬行動物 (creeping things). Hebrew term remes doesn't mean insects only, but encompasses all creeping animals that move along the ground. RSV/NRS/REB have "creeping

things" whereas NIV has "creatures that move along the ground."

1:28 Add the subject 上帝 (God) at the beginning of the second sentence. Hebrew has 'elohim here as well as at the beginning of the first sentence of the verse. To reflect what is in Hebrew, stating the same subject "God" twice within the same verse is still acceptable in Chinese and doesn't seem to be bad style.

2:5 Change 草木 (grass-wood, i.e. plant) to 灌木 (shrub) to reflect the Hebrew meaning. While RSV/NRS have "plants," REB/NIV/NJB/NBS/TOB all have "shrub."

2:6 Change 有霧氣從地上騰 (there was mist rising from the earth) to 水從地下湧出 (water gushing from under the earth). The Hebrew term 'ed occurs elsewhere only in Job 36:27 and its meaning is uncertain. Handbook allows translating as water or stream, as do NRS/NIV/TOB, whereas RSV/REB keep "mist" in the text, with footnote saying "flood."

2:7 Delete 名叫亞當 (called Adam). Hebrew doesn't say so, and the term adam is already rendered as 人 (man).

2:8 Change 在⋯伊甸立了一個園子 (set a garden in Eden) to 在⋯伊甸栽種了一個園子(planted a garden in Eden). The change conforms to the meaning of the Hebrew verb nata' (to plant).

11:28 Change 哈蘭死在他的本地 (Haran died in his own land) to 哈蘭死在他的出生地 (Haran died in the land of his birth). The change reflects the Hebrew structure "land of his birth/family."

13:6 Change 那地容不下他們 (that land could not support them) to 那地容不下他們住在一起 (that land could not support them living together). UV missed translating the Hebrew expression lasheveth yacheddav (living together).

17:27 Change 家裏所有的人 (all the people in the household) to 他家裏所有的男丁 (all the males in his household). The change fits the Hebrew text by adding "his" to "household" and the context of circumcision by specifying the males.

18:19 Change 我眷顧他 (I have remembered/cared him) to 我揀選他 (I have chosen him). The latter meaning is followed by RSV/NRS/REB/NIV/TEV/TCV. The Hebrew verb means to know.

21:1 Add 耶和華 (Jehovah) at the beginning of the second sentence. Hebrew has yahweh here as well as at the beginning of the first sentence of the verse. To reflect what is in Hebrew, stating the same subject "Jehovah" twice within the same verse is still acceptable in Chinese and doesn't seem to be bad style.

21:19 Change 上帝使夏甲的眼睛明亮 (God made Hagar's eyes bright) to 上帝開了夏甲的眼睛 (God opened Hagar's eyes). The Hebrew verb paqach means to open.

21:22 Change 凡你所行的都有上帝的保佑 (God blesses-protects whatever you do) to 凡你所行的，上帝都與你同在 (God is with you in whatever you do). Hebrew has "God is with you…"

21:23 Change 厚待 (show favour) to 忠誠恩待 (show faithfulness and grace-kindness). "Show favour" is insufficient to render the semantically charged Hebrew term chesed.

24:2 Add 他家中 (of his household) to the beginning of the verse that talks about the oldest servant of Abraham's household. UV missed translating the Hebrew beytho (of his house).

25:6 Change 像這些一樣 (such as these) to 像這些本地的女子一樣 (such as these local women). Hebrew has "like the women of this land."

28:12 Change 夢見… (he dreamed…) to 他做了一夢，夢見… (he made a dream, and dreamed…). Hebrew has "he dreamed and saw (hinneh)."

30:27 Change 我已經算定 (I have already calculated/guessed) to 我占卜得知 (I have learned by divination). REV/NRS/NIV/TOB translated the Hebrew verb piel nachash as to learn by divination, so as recommended also by the Handbook.

31:26 Delete 偷跑了 (fled stealthily) because it is not in Hebrew. Change 背著我 (behind me) to 瞞著我 (cheated/deceived me), to conform to what is in Hebrew.

31:27 Change 偷著走 (fled stealthily) to 瞞著我 (cheated/deceived me), to conform to what is in Hebrew, which uses the same verb as in 31:26.

31:31 Delete 所以我逃跑 (so I ran away). Hebrew doesn't have this sentence.

31:34 Change 並沒有摸到 (and didn't touch them) to 並沒有找到 (and didn't find them). The Hebrew verb matsa' means to find, not to touch.

31:44 Change 你我二人可以立約，作你我中間的證據 (let you and I two persons make a covenant to be a witness between you and me) to 你我可以立約，讓它作你我之間的證據 (let you and I make a covenant and let it be a witness between you and me). The latter conforms to the Hebrew.

31:46 Change 大家就在旁邊吃喝 (and they ate and drank beside) to 衆人就在石堆旁邊吃喝 (and they ate and drank beside the stone heap). UV missed translating the Hebrew phrase "by the heap."

31:49 Change 意思說 (which means) to 因爲他說 (for he [Laban] said). The

latter reflects what is in Hebrew and is followed by RSV/NRS/NIV/REB/TOB.

31:50 Change 雖沒有人知道 (though no one else knows) to 雖沒有人在場看到 (though no one else is present to see/witness). The latter reflects what is in Hebrew (literally, no one with us sees) and is followed by RSV/NRS/REB/TOB/NIV.

32:2 Change 軍兵 (army) to 軍營 (military camp). The Hebrew term machaneh means a camp of a desert people or a military camp, not just the people.

33:14 Change 量著…力量慢慢地前行 (advance slowly according to the strength) to 按著…步伐慢慢行 (advance slowly according to the pace).

33:12 Change 我在你前頭走 (I go in front of you) to 我和你一起走 (I go together with you). Hebrew expression literally says "to your front" but means "by your side."

35:4 Add 手中所有 (all…they had in hand) to reflect the Hebrew expression "in hand." UV missed translating the expression.

37:11 Change 這話 (this word) to 這事 (this matter). The Hebrew expression haddabar was formerly understood as only to mean "this word," but all recent versions render it as "this matter."

37:24 Add the sentence 他們抓住他 (they seized/took hold of him), to translate the Hebrew verb lachaq missed by UV.

37:25 Delete 米甸的 (of Midian). The Hebrew doesn't have the expression about the Ishmaelites.

41:1, 17 Change 河邊 (by the river) to 尼羅河邊 (by the Nile River). According to the context, the term for river ye'or cannot be another river than the Nile.

44:9, 10 Add the missing word 杯 (cup). Though the Hebrew doesn't have the word, it is implied in the passive form of the verb matsa'.

44:34 Delete 身上 (body) from the sentence 恐怕我看見災禍臨到我父親身上 (I fear to see the suffering that would come upon my father's body). Hebrew doesn't have the word. Deleting the word doesn't affect the style of the Chinese.

45:23 Change the list 糧食與餅和菜 (food, bread and vegetables) to 穀物，餅和其它的食物(grain, bread and other food), to conform to the Hebrew. Formerly meaning grains/cereals, the term liang-shi (糧食) now just denotes food.

46:29 Add 在他的頸項上 (on his [father's] neck) to 哭了許久 (wept a good while). Hebrew has the expression twice in the second half of the verse. UV translated the first and missed rendering the second.

48:7 Change 拉結死在我眼前 (Rachel died in front of my eyes) to 拉結在我身旁

死了 (Rachel died by my side). The latter conforms to the Hebrew "upon me" ('alay)

48:16 Change 願他們歸在我的名下和我祖亞伯拉罕、我父以撒的名下 (let them be under my name and the name of my ancestor Abraham and my father Isaac) to 願我的名，我祖宗亞伯拉罕和以撒的名藉著他們得以流傳 (let my name and the name of my ancestors Abraham and Isaac be perpetuated through them). The latter is closer to Hebrew which literally says "may it be called in them my name and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac."

49:4 Delete 放縱情慾 (give free rein to passion and lust) from the expression 如滾沸的水 (like boiling water). It is an over-translation of UV and is not found in the Hebrew.

49:5 Change 器具 (instruments) to 兵器 (weapons), as required by the context.

49:9 Change 你屈身下去 (you stoop down) to 他蹲伏，他躺臥 (he crouches down, he stretches out). The pronoun is shifted back to 3rd person singular as in Hebrew, though the preceding line refers to 2nd person singular. Here is a case of anallage (pronoun shift) common in Hebrew poetry.

49:11 Change 把驢駒拴在…葡萄樹上 (binding his foal to the vine) to 把自己母驢的駒子拴在…葡萄樹上 (binding the foal of his female donkey to the vine). UV missed translating the Hebrew phrase "of his female donkey."

49:15 Change 他以 (he considered…) to 他見 (he saw…), to conform to the Hebrew verb ra'ah (to see).

49:15 Change 他以安靜爲佳 (he considered that peace was good) to 他看見居所安舒 (he saw that the resting place was good). The Hebrew word for resting, menuchah, is usually understood as a place.

49:24b Change 手 (hand) to 手臂 (hand-arm), to conform to the Hebrew structure "arms of his hands."

49:24b Change 健壯敏捷 (strong and swift) to 靈活敏捷 (agile and swift), to conform to the Hebrew term pazaz which means rather agility and swiftness, not strength and health.

49:26c Change 如永世的山嶺，至極的邊界 (as the everlasting hills and the utmost boundary) to 勝過永世山嶺的願望[或美物](stronger than the desire [or the delightful things] of the everlasting hills).

50:21 Change 用親愛的話 (using loving words) to 傾心交談 (speaking to their hearts), to conform to the Hebrew expression 'al libbam (to their heart).

2.2. Strive to be Faithful to Hebrew Grammatical Details, Like Plural Markers, Personal Markers, Active/Passive Voice Structures and Other Particles

1:27 Add object 他們 (them), to reflect Hebrew expression bara' 'otham (created them). Change 乃是照著他的形象造男造女 (in his image he created male and female) to 乃是照著他的形象創造他們，有男有女 (in his image he created them, male and female).

2:3 Add pronoun 它 (it) to reflect the Hebrew word 'otho missed by UV. Change 定爲聖日 (set as holy day) to 定它爲聖日 (set it as holy day).

2:20 Add 一切 (all) to reflect the Hebrew word kal missed by UV. Change 野地走獸 (animals of the field) to 野地一切的走獸 (every animal/all animals of the field).

2:24 Add 他的 (his) to reflect the Hebrew suffix missed by UV. Change 與妻子連合 (and clings to the wife) to 與他的妻子連合 (and clings to his wife).

3:6 Add 與她在一起 (with her) to reflect the Hebrew word 'immah missed by UV. Change 又給她的丈夫 (and also gave some to her husband) to 又給與她在一起的丈夫 (and also gave to the husband who was with her).

12:20 Add 一切 (all) to reflect the Hebrew word kal missed by UV. Change 並他所有的都送走了 (sent him on the way… with what he had) to 並他一切所有的都送走了 (sent him on the way… with all that he had).

15:1; 22:20; 39:7; 40:1; 48:1 Change singular form 這事以後 (after this matter) to plural 這些事以後 (after these matters) to conform to the Hebrew term haddevarim

17:19, 21 Add 我的 (my) to reflect the Hebrew suffix missed by UV. Change 我要與他堅定所立的約 (I will with him confirm the established covenant) to 我要與他堅立我的約 (I will with him establish my covenant).

18:8 Add 在他們的旁邊 (near them/by the side of them) to reflect the Hebrew 'aleyhem missed by UV. Change 自己在樹下站在旁邊 (himself stood by the side under the tree) to 在樹下，站在他們的旁邊 (under the tree, stood beside them).

20:8 Add 他的 (his) to conform to the Hebrew suffix missed by UV. Change 召了衆臣僕來(summoned all servants) to 召了他的衆臣僕來 (summoned all his servants).

24:25 Change 這話 (this word) to 這些話 (these words) to match the Hebrew

plural form.

26:3, 4 Add 一切 (all) to conform to the Hebrew. Change 這些地 (these lands) to 這一切的地 (all these lands).

26:25 Add 在那裏 (there) to the phrase 並且支搭帳棚 (and he pitched a tent), to conform to the Hebrew term sham that occurs three times in this verse.

28:2 Add 作你的 (for yourself) to conform to the Hebrew. Change 娶一女爲妻 (take a girl as wife) to 娶一位作你的妻子 (take one to be your wife).

29:29 Add 自己的 (his) to reflect the Hebrew suffix missed by UV. Change 拉班…將婢女辟拉給女兒拉結作使女 (Laban gave maid Billah to daughter Rachel to be her maid) to 拉班…將自己的婢女辟拉給女兒拉結作婢女 (Laban gave his maid Billah to daughter Rachel to be her maid).

31:21 Add 他的一切 (all his) to reflect the Hebrew structure missed by UV. Change 帶著所有的 (with the belongings) to 帶著他所有的一切 (with all his belongings).

32:15 Add 牠們的 (their) to reflect the Hebrew suffix missed by UV. Change 各帶著崽子 (milch camels with colts) to 各帶著牠們的小駱駝 (milch camels with their colts).

32:23 Add 他的 (his) to reflect the Hebrew suffix missed by UV. Change 又打發所有的都過去 (and sent belongings across) to 然後打發他所有的過河 (and sent his belongings across).

33:11 Add 一切 (all) to reflect the Hebrew word kal missed by UV. Change 使我充足 (make me have enough) to 使我一切都充足 (make me have enough in everything).

33:13 Add (all) to reflect the Hebrew word kal missed by UV. Replace 群畜 (livestock) by 羊群 (sheep) because Hebrew has the term hatso'n for sheep. Change 群畜都必死 (livestock will surely die) to 羊群全都必死 (all the sheep will surely die).

34:15 Add 你們 (plural you) to conform to the Hebrew lachem missed by UV. Change 惟有一件才可以應允 (only on this is there consent) to 惟有一個條件，我們才可以應允你們 (only on this condition we will consent to you).

35:4 Add 它們 (them) because Hebrew has the object 'otham. Change 雅各都藏在示劍那裏的橡樹底下 (Jacob hid under the oak at Shechem) to 雅各把它們埋在示劍的橡樹下 (Jacob buried them under the oak at Shechem).

41:39 Add 一切 (all) to reflect the Hebrew word kal missed by UV. Change 上帝

既將這事都指示你 (God has shown you this) to 上帝既將這一切事指示你 (God has shown you all this).

43:29 Add 我的 (my) to reflect Hebrew suffix missed by UV. Change 小兒啊 (O little son) to 我兒啊 (O my son).

44:3 Add 他們的 (their) to reflect Hebrew suffix missed by UV. Also shift from active voice to passive voice because Hebrew structure uses passive pual verb. Change 就打發那些人帶著驢走 ([the stewards] sent the men away with the donkeys) to 這些人和他們的驢子都被打發走 (the men and their donkeys were sent away).

44:10 Add 你們 (plural you) to conform to the Hebrew ’atem. Change 其餘的都沒有罪 (the rest shall be blameless) to 你們其餘的人都沒有罪 (the rest of you shall be blameless).

45:13 Add 一切 (all) to reflect the Hebrew word kal missed by UV. Change 你們所看見的事 (things that you have seen) to 你們所看見的一切事 (all the things that you have seen).

46:27 Add 全 (all) to reflect the Hebrew word kal missed by UV. Change 雅各家…的人 (the people of Jacob’s household) to 雅各全家…人 (all the people of Jacob’s household).

48:22 Add 你的 (your) to reflect Hebrew suffix missed by UV. Change 衆弟兄 (brothers) to 你的兄弟 (your brothers).

49:10 Add 他 (him) to reflect the Hebrew structure lo missed by UV. Change 萬民都必歸順 (peoples will be submitted) to 萬民都要歸順他 (peoples will be submitted to him).

50:14 Add 他的 (his) to reflect Hebrew suffix missed by UV. Change 衆弟兄 (brothers) to 他的兄弟 (his brothers).

50:17 Change the singular form 僕人 (servant) to plural 僕人們 (servants) to conform to the Hebrew.

2.3. Strive to be Faithful to the Hebrew Syntax, Order of Words, Sentence Structure

1:28 Follow the Hebrew structure of two consecutive imperative verbs. Change 要生養衆多 (be fruitful numerously) to 要生養、增多 (be fruitful, multiply).

2:4 Follow the Hebrew order. Change 造天地 (made the heavens and the earth) to

造地和天 (made the earth and the heavens). Chinese idiomatic usage always places "heavens" before "earth" but by placing "and" between the two items, it is possible to follow the Hebrew order and put earth before heavens without appearing to infringe on Chinese idiomatic usage.

6:18 Follow the Hebrew order. Change 妻…兒子兒婦 (wife…sons…sons' wives) to 兒子…妻子…媳婦 (sons… wife…daughters-in-law). RSV/NRS/REB/NIV/TOB follow the Hebrew order.

12:16 Follow the Hebrew order, except placing cattle before sheep due to Chinese idiomatic usage. Change 牛、羊、駱駝、公驢、母驢、僕婢 (cattle, sheep, camels, male donkeys, female donkeys, male and female slaves) to 牛、羊、公驢、僕婢、母驢、駱駝 (cattle, sheep, male donkeys, male and female slaves, female donkeys, camels).

13:2 Follow the Hebrew order, except placing gold before silver due to Chinese idiomatic usage. Change 金銀、牲畜 (gold, silver, livestock) to 牲畜、金銀 (livestock, gold, silver).

13:5 Follow the Hebrew order. Change 牛群、羊群 (herds and flocks) to 羊群、牛群 (flocks and herds).

14:19 Follow the Hebrew order. Change 天地的主、至高的上帝 (Lord of heaven and earth, Most High God) to 至高的上帝、天地的主 (Most High God, Lord of heaven and earth).

16:16 Change 夏甲給亞伯蘭生以實瑪利的時候，亞伯蘭年八十六歲 (When Hagar bore Ishmael to Abram, Abram was 86 years old) to 亞伯蘭年八十六歲時，夏甲給他生了以實瑪利 (Abram was 86 years old when Hagar bore him Ishmael). This is to follow the Hebrew structure. Moreover, it is more logical to state Abram's age first, then Ishmael's birth.

17:4 Add 看哪 (Look!) as an emphatic particle to draw attention. UV missed translating the particle hinneh at the beginning of the verse.

17:15 Change 你的妻子撒萊不可再叫撒萊 (your wife Sarai shall not be called Sarai) to 至於你的妻子撒萊，不可再叫她撒萊 (As for Sarai your wife, you shall not call her Sarai). This is to follow the Hebrew structure whereby the subject is not Sarai, but "you."

18:27 Change 灰塵 (dust) to 塵埃灰土 (dust and grey earth [=ash]). UV undertranslated the Hebrew text that has two terms here: 'aphar & 'epher.

24:53 Reverse order to match the Hebrew. Change 金器、銀器 (gold and silver

ornaments) to 銀器、金器 (silver and gold ornaments). Though Chinese idiomatic usage always places gold before silver, adding "ornaments" to both items allows placing silver before gold without appearing to infringe on the idiomatic usage.

30:15 Follow the Hebrew order in the second half of the verse. Change 爲你兒子的風茄，今晚他可以與你同寢 (for your son's mandrakes he [Jacob] may lie with you tonight) to 今晚他可以與你同寢，來交換你兒子的風茄 (tonight he may lie with you, in exchange for your mandrakes).

32:6 Follow the Hebrew order and syntax. Change 他帶著四百人，正迎著你來 (he is bringing 400 people and is coming toward you) to 他要來迎見你，並且帶著四百人 (he is coming to meet you and is bringing 400 people along).

38:11 Follow the Hebrew structure: first Judah's speech to Tamar, then his thought and fear in his mind.

38:23 Add 看 (Look!) as an emphatic particle to draw attention. UV missed translating the particle hinneh.

38:23 Follow the Hebrew order and inverse the two parts in the discourse. Change 猶大說：我把這山羊羔送去了，你竟找不著她。任憑她拿去吧，免得我們被羞辱 (Judah said, "I sent this kid, and you could not find her. Let her take away [the pledge], lest we be put to shame") to 猶大說：任憑她拿去吧，免得我們被人譏笑。看，我把這山羊送去了，可是你找不著她啊 (Judah said, "Let her take away [the pledge], otherwise people will laugh at us. Look, I sent this kid, and you could not find her").

40:12, 18 Delete 你所作的 (that you have made) which is not in the Hebrew text. Change 你所作的夢是這樣解 (this is the interpretation of the dream that you have made) to 夢的解釋是這樣 (this is the interpretation of the dream).

41:46 Hebrew has 站在⋯面前 (stood in the presence of) that is mistranslated as "saw" in UV. Change 約瑟見埃及王法老的時候 (when Joseph saw Pharaoh king of Egypt) to 約瑟在埃及王法老面前侍立時 (when Joseph stood in the presence of Pharaoh king of Egypt).

42:25 Follow the Hebrew syntax. Change 人就照他的話辦了 (people did according to his words) to 他就爲他們這樣做了 (so he did thus for them).

44:29 Follow the Hebrew structure. Change 把這個帶去離開我 (take this one away from me) to 把這個從我面前帶走 (take this one away from my face).

44:31 Add 這 (this) to the term 孩子 (boy). Change 他見沒有童子 (when he saw boy was gone) to 他見沒有了這孩子 (when he saw this boy was gone).

45:1 Follow the Hebrew structure and reflect the causative verb hifil yatsa'. Change 人都要離開我出去 (people should leave me alone and go out) to 叫衆人離開我出去 (make everyone leave me alone and go out).

45:7 Follow the Hebrew order in the second half of the verse. Change 又要大施拯救，保存你們的生命 (to bring a great deliverance and to keep you alive) to 保存你們的生命，大施拯救 (to keep you alive for a great deliverance).

48:11 Change 不料 (unexpectedly) to 看 (look) to reflect the meaning of hinneh.

48:22 Follow the Hebrew and reverse the order of sword and bow. Change 用弓用刀(using bow using sword) to 用刀用弓 (using sword using bow).

49:3 Follow the Hebrew syntax. Change 你是我的長子，是我力量强壯的時候生的 (you are my first-born, begotten when my power was strong-robust) to 你是我的長子，我的力量，我壯年生的頭生之子 (you are my first-born, my strength, the first begotten son during the prime of my life).

49:6 Change the two vocatives 我的靈啊… 我的心啊 (O my soul… O my heart) to the subjects of two indicative sentences 我的靈… 我的心… RSV has two vocatives and NRS also changes to indicatives.

49:25 Change 地裏所藏的福 (blessings hidden in the earth) to 地裏深處所藏的福 (blessings hidden in the deep places of the earth), to reflect the Hebrew expression "of deep lying below."

49:27 Change the verbal structures 所抓的…所奪的 (what is caught… what is plundered) to nominal structures 獵物…贓品 (prey… booty), to conform to the Hebrew nominal structures.

50:5 Add 看啊 (Look!) as an emphatic particle to draw attention. UV missed translating the particle hinneh.

50:5 Follow the Hebrew structure at the beginning of the verse and move the phrase 要死的時候 (about to die) into Jacob's speech as it was uttered by him. Change 我父親要死的時候叫我起誓說：你要將我葬在迦南地 (My father when he was about to die made me swear, saying, "you shall bury me in the land of Canaan…") to 我父親曾叫我起誓說：看哪，我快要死了。你要將我葬在迦南地 (My father made me swear, saying "I am about to die. You shall bury me in the land of Canaan…").

50:20 Follow the Hebrew order for the last two clauses. Change 要保全許多人的性命，成就今日的光景 (that many people be kept alive, as what is being done today) to 要成就今日的景況，讓許多人的性命得保全 (as what is being done today,

that many people be kept alive).

2.4. Reflect Textual Variants and Ambiguities by Supplying Footnotes, Make Explicit What is Implicit

4:15 Add footnote for the expression 既然如此 (therefore) kept in the text based on Hebrew which has A-rating, to say that some ancient manuscripts have 並非如此 (not so), according to Gk, Syr, Vg.

16:12 Change 他必住在衆弟兄的東邊 (he will live to the east of all his kin) to 他 必與他的衆弟兄作對 (he will live at odds with all his kin). The latter meaning is recommended by the Handbook and rendered by NRS/REB/NEB/NIV/NJB. Add footnote to supply the former meaning rendered by UV.

21:9 Add footnote saying that some ancient manuscripts have 與以撒 (together with Isaac), so the text may change from 夏甲給亞伯拉罕所生的兒子玩耍 (the son Hagar had borne to Abraham was playing) to 夏甲給亞伯拉罕所生的兒子與以撒玩 耍 (the son Hagar had borne to Ahraham was playing together with Isaac).

31:35 Make explicit what is implicit. Change 我身上不便 (my body has inconvenience) to 我有月事 (I am having monthly period), to render the Hebrew euphemism derek nashim (the way of women).

35:22 Add footnote saying that some ancient translation has the variant 以色列聽 見這事，非常憤怒 (when Israel heard of this matter, he was furious). The variant has B-rating. Literally the LXX has "it was evil/offensive to him."

38:9 Make explicit what is implicit. Change 遺在地上 (spilled on the ground) to 遺精在地(spilled semen on the ground). Though Hebrew avoids the taboo object "semen," UV's rendering makes the Chinese structure sound incomplete and unnatural.

47:29 Make explicit what is implicit. Add the verb 許諾 (promise) to the expression 請你把手放在我大腿底下 (place your hand under my thigh), to make explicit the symbolism of the gesture, though Hebrew doesn't have the verb "promise." RSV/NRS/NIV have "promise" whereas REB has "give your solemn oath."

49:21 Change 母鹿⋯發出嘉美的言語 (a doe that gives beautiful words) to 母 鹿⋯要生出可愛的小鹿 (a doe that bears lovely fawns). Add footnote to supply the former meaning rendered by UV, as does NRS in regard to RSV. Change in the

Hebrew vowel points results in the alternative meaning.

49:26a For the phrase 勝過我衆祖先的祝福 (are stronger than the blessings of my ancestors) which renders the Hebrew, add footnote saying some ancient translation has 勝過亘古山岡的祝福 (are stronger than the blessings of the eternal mountains). LXX has the latter.

49:26b Add footnote saying that 願望 (desires) in the line 勝過永世山嶺的願望 (stronger than the desires of the everlasting hills) can also be rendered as 美物 (delightful/desirable things).

2.5. Strive to Maintain Consistency with Other Occurrences in the Hebrew Text that Refer to Similar Contexts or to the Same Subject Matters

26:29 UV used the verb 害 (to harm) twice to render two different Hebrew terms, to do harm and to touch. Change the second one 害 (to do harm) to 侵犯 (to offend, to infringe on). Therefore, 使你不害我們，正如我們未曾害你 (so that you will do us no harm, just as we have not harmed you) is replaced by 使你不害我們，正如我們未曾侵犯你 (so that you will do us no harm, just as we have not offended you).

41:19 Change 不好 (bad) at the end of the verse to 醜陋 (ugly), to match another term of the same root that occurs in the middle of the verse, also translated as 醜陋 (ugly).

49:16 change 但必審斷他的民 (Dan shall judge his people) to 但必爲他的百姓申冤 (Dan shall redress an injustice/right a wrong for his people). The change is to match the same verb rendered as 申冤 in GEN 30:6 where Rachel referred to the meaning of naming this new-born son Dan.

3. Changes Respecting the Dynamics of the Chinese Language

3.1. Avoid Wrong or Misleading Meanings and Connotations, Avoid Improper Usages

1:20 Change the term 雀鳥 (que-niao, a specific kind of sparrows) to 鳥 (niao, generic term for birds), which is what the text means.

2:7 Change the ambiguous term 生氣 (sheng-qi, which may mean either anger/displeasure or vigor/vitality) to 生命之氣 (breath of life), which gives a clear and unambiguous meaning.

2:7 Change 有靈的活人 (a living being with spirit, expression with unclear meaning and theological speculation) to 有生命的活人 (a living being with life). The Hebrew term nephesh (soul) has more to do with life than with spirit (ruach).

2:15 Change 修理 (xiu-li, which means to repair) to 耕耘 (geng-yun, to cultivate), which gives a clear and appropriate meaning for the context of the garden of Eden.

2:18 Change 獨居 (to live alone, expression which now applies usually to the elderly and the retired who are left alone and have to lead solitary life) to 單獨一個 (to be alone or to be all by oneself, expression with clear meaning which fits the context).

2:18, 20 Change 配偶幫助他 (a partner to help him) to 伴侶匹配他 (a mate or companion to match him). UV's expression might imply subordination of women to men, whereas the new expression implies equality between male and female. REB has "a partner suited to him."

3:12; 13:6; 36:7 Change 同居 (tong-ju, to cohabit) to 同住 or 住在一起 (tong-zhu/zhu-zai-yi-qi, to live together). The former is now used in today's Chinese to mean two persons living together illicitly as husband and wife.

17:17 Change 生養 (to bear and raise [children] - sheng-yang) to 生育 (to be fertile, to procreate - sheng-yu). The latter fits better the context of fertility at old age.

17:23 Change 遵照上帝的命 (according to what God commands - ming) to 遵照上帝的命令 (according to what God commands - ming-ling). The meaning of ming-ling (command) is clear and unambiguous, whereas ming alone may mean either life or command.

19:11 Change 眼睛昏迷 (eyes are fainting - hun-mi) to 眼睛迷糊 (eyes are blurred/blinded - mi-hu). Hun-mi is an improper usage to describe the eyes and gives a wrong meaning.

21:24 Replace the ambiguous 情願 (qing-yuan, which may mean "to be willing to", but also "to prefer, would rather"), by 願意 (yuan-yi, which clearly means "to be willing to"). Change 我情願起誓 (I would rather swear) to 我願意起誓(I am willing to swear).

21:25 Change 從前 (cong-qian, which means "once upon a time" and is usually

placed at the beginning of story-telling), to 先前 (xian-qian, which means "previously").

23:6 Change 尊大的王子(zun-da - honorable/great Prince) to 尊貴的王子 (zun-gui - honorable/respectable Prince). The former (zun-da), unlisted in the standard dictionary, is uncommon and seldom used, and may wrongly imply arrogance or self-aggrandizement .

31:2 Replace 氣色 (qi-se, which rather means complexion) by 臉色 (lian-se, which means facial expression, look or attitude). The former has connotation about health, while the latter refers to mood or attitude toward other people. Change 拉般的氣色向他不如從前 (Laban's complexion toward him was not what it had been) to 拉班待他的臉色不如從前 (Laban's attitude toward him was not what it had been).

35:18 Change 靈魂快要走的時候 (as her soul was departing) to 尚有一口氣的時候 (as she was still breathing the last breath). Since the Hebrew word for soul, nephesh, may also mean "breath", the latter is a better rendering as to avoid theological implication about immortality of the soul, as some Christians don't want to see this idea of soul separating from the body.

35:19 Change 葬在以法他的路旁 (buried by the side of the road of Ephrath) to 葬在往以法他的路旁 (buried by the side of the road that led to Ephrath). The former is unclear and may be misunderstood as a road situated inside Ephrath.

37:17 Change 追趕 (zhui-gan, to chase away or to catch up with) to 追尋 (to search or to track down). With two different possible meanings, the former is ambiguous, whereas the latter is clear and fits the context.

41:8 Change 博士 (bo-shi, scholars with a PhD degree) to 智慧人 (zhi-hui-ren, men of wisdom). The use of the former is inappropriate because bo-shi now only means scholars with that particular academic degree. The term 博士 (bo-shi) used by UV to denote the magi in Matthew is also changed to 博學之士 (scholars of great learning).

41:27 Change 虛空 (xu-kong) to 空心 (kong-xin), to denote the hollowness of the ears of grain. The term 虛空 (xu-kong), used 35 times in Ecclesiastes to denote vanity or meaninglessness, is now an uncommon term not even listed in the dictionary. Its related term 空虛 (kong-xu, by reversing the two characters) is more common and denotes mental void, as a state of mind. The latter term 空心 (kong-xin), literally "empty-hearted" or "hollow-cored," is appropriate as referring to the hollow ears of grain.

41:36 Change 所積蓄的糧食可以防備…七個荒年 (the food was saved/stored up to prevent the seven years of famine) to 所積蓄的糧食可以為…七個荒年作儲備 (the food was saved/stored up as a reserve for the seven years of famine). The term 防備 (fang-bei) is ambiguous because it means not only to prepare for, but also to avoid/prevent, which in this context is not appropriate because the seven-year famine couldn't be avoided/prevented.

41:37 Change 法老和他一切臣僕都以這事為妙 (Pharaoh and all his officials considered this matter wonderful/intriguing) to 法老和他一切臣僕都覺得這建議很好 (Pharaoh and all his officials considered this proposal very good). The use of the expression 以這事為妙 (yi-zheshi-weimiao, considered this matter wonderful/intriguing) here by UV is not appropriate and misleading. The character 妙 (miao) is ambiguous and can mean not only wonderful, ingenious, but also subtle, mysterious and intriguing. What the text says here is that Pharaoh and his officials were pleased with the proposal.

42:14 Change 這話實在不錯 (this word is not bad) to 這話實在沒有錯 (this word is not wrong). The former rendered by UV gives the wrong meaning, whereas the latter fits the context, which is really about what is being said is not wrong, not what is being said is not bad.

45:11 Replace 敗落 (bei-luo, in decline) by 窮困 (qiong-kun, in poverty). Change 免得你和你的眷屬…都敗落了 (that you and your household… will not be in decline) to 免得你和你的眷屬…都陷入窮困中 (that you and your household… will not come to poverty). The former rendered by UV is uncommon and gives an unclear meaning to the text.

49:6 Change 我…不要與他們聯絡 (may I not keep contact with them) to 我…不與他們合夥 (may I not be in partnership with them). The latter fits the context and gives the right meaning.

49:7 Change 分居 (fen-ju, to live separately) to 分散 (fen-san, to be scattered/dispersed). The term 分居 (fen-ju) refers specifically to estranged spouses living separately pending their divorce.

49:13 The term 海口 (hai-kou, literally "sea-mouth"), an uncommon term, is defined by dictionary as either an estuary or a harbour in a bay. UV used this term twice in this verse to render two different Hebrew terms meaning seashore and harbour. The term is now changed to 海邊 (hai-bian, seashore) in v.13a, and to 港口 (gang-kou, harbour) in v.13b.

49:24 Change 弓仍舊堅硬 (bow still hard/solid) to 弓仍舊堅韌 (bow still tough/tensile).

50:3 Change 薰屍 (fumigate corpse) to 用香料塗屍 (smear fragrant spices to corpse) to render the exact meaning of embalming.

50:9 Change 一幫人甚多 (a gang of numerous people) to 整群人非常龐大 (a group of very many people). The former used the expression 一幫人 (yi-bang-ren) which has now a negative connotation due to the expression 四人幫 (si-ren-bang, the Gang of Four from the Cultural Revolution).

3.2. Avoid Unnatural Expressions, Inelegant Structures, Colloquialisms, Ambiguities

6:3 Change 人…的日子還可到一百二十年 (human…days shall be 120 years) to 人…的年歲還可到一百二十年 (human…age shall be 120 years). Though "days" follows literally the Hebrew, the term 年歲 (age) sounds better in Chinese.

6:5 Change 罪惡很大 (literally "sin-wickedness very great") to 罪大惡極 (great sin and extreme wickedness). The former used by UV sounds unrefined, whereas the latter is an elegant literary expression.

13:12 Change 挪移帳棚 (nuo-yi zhang-peng, to remove/shift tent) to 遷移帳棚 (qian-yi zhang-peng, to move tent). The former verb means to remove, to rid, to get out of the way. The latter implies the idea of moving and migrating, and is thus more appropriate for the context.

14:5,6,7 Change 殺敗 (sha-bia, to kill and defeat) to 擊敗 (ji-bai, to strike and defeat). The former is uncommon and unnatural in Chinese. The latter fits better the meaning of the Hebrew hifil verb nakah (to strike, to smite). RSV/NRS have "to subdue" and REB/NIV "defeated."

15:15 Change 你要享大壽數 (you will enjoy a great age) to 你必得享長壽 (you will enjoy longevity). The former used by UV sounds unrefined, whereas the latter sounds more natural.

17:12 Change 是在你後裔之外 (from outside your offspring) to 不是你後裔所生的 (not from your offspring). The former sounds clumsy whereas the latter sounds more natural.

21:9 Change 戲笑 (xi-xiao, to laugh mockingly) to 玩耍 (wan-shua, to play). The former, xi-xiao, is uncommon and not listed in dictionary. It is probably a variant of

the more common 嬉笑 (xi-xiao, to play and laugh). The latter, to play, reflects the meaning of Hebrew and matches the renderings in RSV/NRS/REB/HOTTP, though NIV follows LXX and has "mocking."

22:5 Change 去拜一拜 (go and perform a kowtow) to 去敬拜 (go and worship). The former sounds colloquial and informal, and seems to lack reverence.

25:11 Change 靠近…居住 (to live approaching/by…) to 在…附近居住 (to live near…). The former sounds colloquial and informal, and not as clear and natural as the latter.

25:29, 30 Change 累昏了 (tired and fainting) to 疲憊不堪 (extremely tired, utterly exhausted). The former is more colloquial, whereas the latter is an elegant literary expression

26:28 Change 兩下 (liang-xia, both sides) to 雙方 (shuang-fang, both sides). The former can mean "both sides" but it is uncommon. In fact, liang-xia is ambiguous, as it can also mean "to have some bright idea" or "to be able to play some tricks" in some regional structures

28:12 Change 梯子的頭頂著天 (the head of the ladder abuts against the sky) to 梯子的頂端直伸到天 (the upper end of the ladder stretches up to the sky). The former sounds odd and unnatural, whereas the latter sounds clearer and appropriate.

29:2, 3, 7, 8; 30:38 Change 飲羊 (yin-yang, to water the sheep, literally drink-sheep) to 取水給羊喝 (literally, to fetch water to give to the sheep to drink). The former, an old structure, sounds odd and unnatural, and may be mistaken as to literally drink the sheep or the sheep milk. The latter is lengthy but sounds natural and good Chinese style with clear meaning.

30:30 Change 發大眾多 (swell/augment numerously) to 增加那麼多 (increase so abundantly). The former expression is uncommon and inelegant, whereas the latter sounds more natural.

30:36 Change 相離三天的路程 (xiang-li, distant by three-day journey) to 相隔三天的路程 (xiang-ge, separate by three-day journey). There is little difference in meaning between the two. The latter, xiang-ge, sounds more natural.

31:39 Change 索要 (suo-yao) to 索取 (suo-qu). Both mean to require, to exact, but the former is less common and doesn't sound as natural as the latter.

31:40 Change 乾熱 (gan-re, dry heat) to 炎熱 (yan-re, sweltering heat). The former sounds odd and unnatural, unless the context requires emphasis on the dryness. The latter is the most common and elegant term to denote strong heat.

32:16 Change 使群群相離，有空閒的地方 (make drove and drove apart, so there is place of spare time) to 使群群之間保持一段距離 (keep some distance between drove and drove). The former sounds not only odd and unnatural, it also contains an improper use of the term 空閒 (kong-xian) which means "spare time" rather than "spare space," as is required by the context.

32:16 Change 儘先 (jin-xian, to give priority to) to 率先 (shuai-xian, to take the lead, to be the first to). There is nuance between the two expressions and the latter fits better the context.

32:20 Change 解他的恨 (jie ta-de hen, to slake his hatred) to 與他和解 (yu-ta he-jie, to reconcile with him). Literally the Hebrew has "to pacify his face [with gift]." The former expression 解恨 (jie-hen) is uncommon and seldom used, and it is even more uncommon and inelegant to insert an object between the two characters.

32:20; 33:10 Change 容納 (rong-na, to contain) to 寬容 (kuan-rong, to bear with, to be lenient toward). The use of rong-na is not so appropriate and natural as to refer to a person as the object.

33:13 Change 乳養 (ru-yang, to milk-feed) to 哺乳 (bu-ru, to suckle, to feed with breast milk). The former expression is uncommon and is not listed in dictionary.

34:16 Change 兩下成爲一樣人民 (both sides become the same people) to 大家成爲一族 (all become one people). Like in 26:28, the term 兩下 (liang-xia) is uncommon and ambiguous. The whole expression in UV sounds odd and unnatural.

38:9 Change 留後 (liu-hou, to leave posterity) to 生子立後 (to beget offspring and set up posterity). The former is not a clear and elegant expression, though its meaning is obvious according to the context. It is not a common usage and is not even listed in dictionary.

39:7 Change 以目送情 (literally, using eyes to send love) to 眉目傳情 (eyebrows and eyes expressing love). Literally, Hebrew has "she lifted her eyes toward Joseph." UV's rendering sounds odd and unnatural, whereas the latter is an elegant literary expression to say "make eyes to someone" or "flash amorous glance at someone."

45:5 Change 自憂自恨 (to worry and be angry with oneself) to 憂傷自咎 (to be distressed and blame oneself). The former doesn't sound as natural and elegant as the latter.

46:6 Change 貨財 (huo-cai, goods-wealth) to 財物 (cai-wu, possessions/belongings, implying wealth). The former is uncommon and not listed in dictionary.

49:15 Change 服苦 (fu-ku, to endure hardship/forced labour) to 服勞役 (fu-lao-yi, to serve doing corvee labour). The former, literally "to endure bitterness," is uncommon and is perhaps the short form for 服苦役 (fu-ku-yi, to endure bitter corvee labour). The latter is common and the meaning is clear.

49:17 Change 墜落於後 (falling to the rear) to 向後墜下 (falling backward). There is slight nuance between the two expressions. The former may mean lagging behind, whereas the latter sounds more natural with a clear meaning that fits the context of a rider.

49:22 Change 他的枝條探出牆外 (his branches exploring out of the wall) to 他的枝條伸出牆外 (his branches stretching out of the wall). The verb used in the former, 探出 (tan-chu), may mean to explore and find out, as well as to lean or stretch out, like to lean out of a window (探出窗外), but it has to be a wilful act, not something tree branches would do. Its use in this verse is not as good as the verb 伸出 (shen-chu) which simply means to stretch out.

49:30; 50:13 Change 買來爲業，作墳地的 (bought [land] to possess, as burying place) to 買來作墳地的產業 (bought [land] to be a property as burying place). The latter sounds better and more natural than the former.

3.3. Avoid Archaisms, Obsolete, Rare or Unknown Terms, Obscure Meanings, Regional or Dialect Structures

31:34 Change the term 馱簍 (tuo-lou) to 鞍袋 (an-dai). A hapax in UV, 馱簍 (tuo-lou) is an archaic term not listed in dictionary and can only be guessed to mean a basket to be carried on the back. 鞍袋 (an-dai) corresponds exactly to the Hebrew term that means "saddle bag."

32:15 Change 奶崽子的駱駝 to 哺乳的駱駝, for the expression "milch camels." The obsolete term 奶崽子 (nai-zai-zi) is probably an old usage from northern dialect, and is not listed in dictionary.

35:20 Change 一統碑 (yi-tong-bei) to 一塊碑 (yi-kuai-bei), to render "pillar" or "stele." An hapax in UV, 一統碑 is an uncommon usage and the character 統 (tong) is perhaps a variant of 筒 (tong), anything of cylindrical structure. 一塊碑 (yi-kuai-bei) is a common term to denote a pillar, a monument.

37:25 Change 一夥⋯人 to 一群⋯人. The former term 一夥 (yi-huo) sounds natural to speakers of northern dialects but not so to speakers from other regions. 一

群 (yi-qun) is standard usage that sounds natural to all.

38:28 Change the uncommon verb 拴 (shuan, to tie) to the more commonly used verb 綁 (bang, to tie).

41:2 Change 蘆荻 (lu-di, two kinds of aquatic reeds) to 蘆葦 (lu-wei, the more commonly known of the two kinds of reeds). The term 荻 is rarely used and its meaning obscure to most readers.

41:8 Change 圓解 (yuan-jie, to interpret-explain) to 解夢 (jie-meng, to interpret dream). The former is an archaic expression that is no longer used now and is not listed in dictionary. A related term 圓夢 (yuan-meng) is commonly used to mean "to fulfil a dream."

41:57 Change 糴糧 (di-liang, to buy food) to 買糧 (mai-liang, to buy food). The former is an archaism and is not used any more in today's Chinese.

42:13,32; 43:29 Change 頂小的 (ding-xiao-de) to 最小的 (zui-xiao-de). Both mean "the youngest" or "the smallest," but the former is more colloquial and its meaning is ambiguous. Depending on the context, it may mean either "the smallest" or "very small."

42:17 Change 生人 (sheng-ren) to 陌生人 (mo-sheng-ren). Both mean "stranger" or "unknown person." The former is common only in some dialect expressions and is a less proper usage compared to the latter.

43:16 Change 晌午 (shang-wu) to 中午 (zhong-wu). Both mean "noon," but the former is from northern dialect and sounds strange and unnatural to Chinese speakers from other regions.

43:16 Change 家宰 (jia-zai) to 管家 (guan-jia). Both mean "household steward," but the former is an archaic term no longer used in today's Chinese.

43:30 Change 屋裏 (wu-li, in the room) to 房裏 (fang-li, in the room). For speakers of some regional dialects, 屋裏 (wu-li) means "in the house" instead of "in the room." The latter is used to avoid ambiguity.

47:24 Change 打糧食 (da-liang-shi, to thrash the grain) to 收割 (shou-ge, to reap, to harvest). The expression 打糧食 (da-liang-shi) is archaic and is no longer in use. The verb 打 (da) is still used in the expression 打水 (da-shui) with the meaning "to fetch water."

47:24 Change the expression 家口孩童 (household members and children) to 全家大小 (young and old of the whole family). The former is an unusual expression and the term 家口 (jia-kou) is an old expression no longer in use.

48:14 Change the expression 又剪搭過左手來 (literally, and place left hand scissors-wise) to 又交叉伸出左手來 (and stretch the left hand crosswise). The former is a rare and unusual structure and is not listed in dictionary.

48:16 Change 童子 (tong-zi, child, particularly male) to 孩子 (hai-zi, child). The former is an old term for boy/lad and is now seldom used in today's Chinese.

49:26 Change 迥別 (jiong-bie, widely different) to 選任的 (xuan-ren-de, appointed, consecrated). The former is a rare archaic term occasionally seen in old literary texts.

3.4. Strive to Conform to Current Chinese Idiomatic Usages in Terms of Kinship, Cultural Sensitivities and Lexical Nuances

3:14 Change 咒詛 (zhou-zu) to 詛咒 (zu-zhou), to translate the verb "to curse." Both terms have the same meaning and are interchangeable, as one is the reverse of the other. However, the latter is the standard usage and the former is not even listed in dictionary.

3:14 Change 終身吃土 (zhong-shen chi-tu) to 終生吃土 (zhong-sheng chi-tu) for the phrase "to eat dust throughout lifetime." Though the two terms zhong-shen and zhong-sheng are often interchangeable, there is slight nuance. 終身 (zhong-shen) refers to personal matters like marriage, whereas 終生 (zhong-sheng) refers to lifelong career or lifelong struggle. TCV uses zhong-sheng, the term which seems to fit better the context here.

4:2; 9:5 For brothers that are meant to be biological brothers, change to 兄弟 (xiong-di). For brothers that are meant to be kinsmen or just members of the same community, change to 弟兄 (di-xiong).

4:20; 46:32, 34 Change 養牲畜 (yang sheng-chu) to 牧養牲畜 (mu-yang sheng-chu). The former simply means to keep livestock, whereas the latter with the expanded verb mu-yang means to keep livestock and put them out to pasture.

12:11; 24:39 Change the adjective 俊美 (handsome) to 美麗 (beautiful). The latter adjective is more appropriate when referring to females, like Sarai and Rebecca in these cases.

16:8 Change 主母 (master's wife) to 女主人 (mistress, literally female master). The former is an archaic term and is no longer in use.

20:2; 24:6; 25:20 Change 妹子 to 妹妹. Both mean "younger sister." The former

is from northern dialect and sounds unnatural to Chinese speakers from other regions, whereas the latter is the standard term for younger sister.

21:8; 26:30; 40:20 Change 設擺 to 擺設 for the phrase "to set a big feast." Both terms have the same meaning and are interchangeable, as one is the reverse of the other. However, the latter is much more common whereas the former is not even listed in dictionary.

24:48 Change 走合式的道路 to 走合適的道路 for the phrase "to lead… by the right way." Though the two terms 合式 (he-shi) and 合適 (he-shi) are often interchangeable, there is slight nuance. 合式 (he-shi) refers to conforming to a standard, whereas 合適 (he-shi) refers to being suitable, right, appropriate, and seems to fit better the context here.

28:2 Change 母舅 (mu-jiu, literally mother's brother) to 舅父 (jiu-fu, maternal uncle). The former is an old term and is much less common than the latter.

38:8, 9 Change 將她給…爲妻 (to give her as wife to…) to 將她嫁給… (give her in marriage to…). The former is not as elegant as the latter which uses the proper idiomatic verb 嫁 (jia) to refer to a woman marrying.

38:11 Change 兒婦 (er-fu, son's wife) to 媳婦 (xi-fu, daughter-in-law). The former is an old term rarely in use now, whereas the latter is standard usage in today's Chinese.

42:4 Change 兄弟 (xiong-di, brother [not specifying whether older or younger]) to 弟弟 (di-di, younger brother). The context calls for using the latter as Benjamin is known to be Joseph's younger brother.

45:15 Change the expression 親嘴 (qin-zui) to 親吻 (qin-wen). Both mean "to kiss." The former, 親嘴 (qin-zui), is unbecoming due to Chinese sensitivity, whereas the latter is a more appropriate term which doesn't resort to using the character 嘴 (zui, mouth) to mean "kiss."

48:17 Change 約瑟…就不喜悅 (Joseph…was displeased) to 約瑟…就覺得不對 (Joseph…found it improper). Literally, Hebrew has "evil in his eye." The use of "displeased" makes Joseph appear disrespectful toward his father, a departure from his filial piety unacceptable to Chinese sensitivity. Only the senior, elderly generation can feel displeased toward the younger generation.

49:4 Change 你…汚穢了我的榻 (you make dirty my couch) to 你…玷汚了我的榻 (you defile my couch). There are nuances between the two verbs 汚穢 (wu-hui, to make dirty) and 玷汚 (dian-wu, to disgrace, to defile in a moral sense). The latter

fits better the context.

50:4 Change 報告 (bao-gao) to 稟告 (bing-gao). Both mean to report, but the latter is an honorific usage, implying to report to a superior, which fits the context here.

50:6 Change 葬埋 (zang-mai) to 埋葬 (mai-zang), to translate the verb "to bury." Both terms have the same meaning and are interchangeable, as one is the reverse of the other. However, the latter is much more common than the former.

50:9 Change 馬兵 (ma-bing, literally horse-soldier) to 騎兵 (qi-bing, literally riding-soldier). The latter is the standard usage to mean horseman or cavalier, whereas the former is not even listed in dictionary.

50:23 Change 膝上 (xi-shang, literally upon the knees) to 膝下 (xi-xia, literally under the knees). The latter conforms to Chinese usage, in expression such as 膝下 猶虛 (xi-xia you-xu, to be without children). Chinese usage prefers an imagery of having infant children playing around below the parents' knees, instead of placing them on the parents' laps

3.5. Avoid Heavy Style, Ensure Cohesion, Clarity, Smoothness of the Text, Provide Appropriate Mood or Tone of Utterance

3:11 Change 誰告訴你赤身露體呢？ (who told you to be naked or that you were naked?) to 誰告訴你，你是赤身露體呢？ (who told you, that you were naked?) The former sounds incomplete and ambiguous with unclear structure, whereas the latter's meaning and structure are clear.

3:16 Add 耶和華上帝⋯說 (Jehovah God⋯said) instead of having just 他說 (he said) as in Hebrew. Otherwise, "he" is ambiguous and it is hard to trace to the antecedent of the pronoun.

3:21 Change 耶和華上帝為亞當和他妻子用皮子做了衣服給他們穿 (Jehovah God for Adam and his wife used skins to make garments for them to wear) to 耶和華上帝用獸皮做衣服給亞當和他妻子穿 (Jehovah God used animal skins to make garments for Adam and his wife to wear). The latter sounds better and smoother.

20:3 Change 你是個死人！(you are a dead man!) to 你要死 (you are about to die). The latter (followed by NRS) conforms to the Hebrew and sounds more appropriate, whereas the former, rude (followed by RSV).

24:39 Change 恐怕女子不肯跟我來 (lest woman will not follow me) to 恐怕那女

子不肯跟我來 (less that woman will not follow me). Add demonstrative adjective 那 (that) to render a better utterance and a clearer meaning.

25:32 Change 我將要死 (I will die) to 我快要死 (I am about to die). The two expressions are very close in meaning, though there is some nuance. The context implies immediacy, so the latter is more appropriate, whereas the tone of the former is not right and doesn't imply urgency.

37:14 Change 哥哥們平安不平安，群羊平安不平安 (whether the brothers are peaceful or not peaceful, whether the sheep are peaceful or not peaceful) to 哥哥們和羊群是否平安 (whether the brothers and the flocks are peaceful). The former sounds heavy and repetitive, whereas the latter more succinct.

44:7 Change 我們怎能自己表白出來呢？ (how can we ourselves clarify?) to 我們還能爲自己表白嗎？ (can we clarify [for] ourselves?) The latter has a clearer structure and meaning.

47:16 Change 我就爲你們的牲畜給你們糧食 (I will for your livestock give you food) to 我就以你們的牲畜換糧食給你們 (I will give you food in exchange for your livestock).

49:1 Add particle 到 (dao) to the verb 遇 (to encounter) to have a more complete tone for the sentence. Change 日後必遇的是 to 日後必遇到的事, to render the phrase "what will happen/be encountered in days to come."

50:15 Add the particle 仍然 (reng-ran, still) to give a better tone to the sentence. Change 或者約瑟懷恨我們 (Perhaps Joseph bears a grudge against us) to 或者約瑟仍然懷恨我們 (Perhaps Joseph still bears a grudge against us).

4. Summary

This paper presents a list of changes proposed for the book of Genesis in the context of the Revised Chinese Union Version Project. Many users of the Union Version Bible, translated a century ago, still have a conservative perception of the Scripture. Since they will raise questions about changes introduced in the revised text or even resist any changes at all, this paper attempts to respond to their concerns, to inform them about the various natures of the changes with examples taken from the book of Genesis, and to help them see for themselves the reasons behind those changes.

The list presented here is not exhaustive and is divided into two groups: (1) changes that strive to conform to the original text, and (2) changes that respect the dynamics of the Chinese language. Each group is again subdivided into five categories. The two   fold structure of the presentation reflects the constant struggle faced by all those involved in Bible revision work, that is, the dual need to remain faithful to the original as well as to produce a readable text that conforms to current usages of the Chinese language.

* Keyword

Revised Chinese Union Version, Union Bible, Genesis, Hebrew Grammatical Details, the Dynamics of Chinese Language.

* References

The Chinese Union (New Punctuation) Version『新標點和合本聖經』, Hong Kong Bible Society, 2000/2002.

The Today's Chinese Version Revised Edition『現代中文譯本修訂版聖經』, Hong Kong Bible Society, 1995.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, 5th Revised Edition, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.

Septuaginta, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.

Chiu Wai Boon, 『譯經譯源』 (*Tracing Bible Translation‐A History of the Translation of Five Modern Chinese Versions of the Bible*), Hong Kong: China Graduate School of Theology, 1993.

Jost Oliver Zetzsche,『和合本與中文聖經翻譯』, IBSHK Monograph Series on Bible Translation (譯經叢書), Daniel K.T. Choi, trans., Hong Kong: Internation Bible Society (H.K.) Ltd., 2002.

Xiandai Hanyu Cidian『現代漢語詞典(繁體字版)』, Hong Kong: 商務印書館, 2001.

Jost Oliver Zetzsche, *The Bible in China ‐ The History of the Union Version or the Culmination of Protestant Missionary Bible Translation in China*, Monumenta Serica / Monograph Series XLV, Germany: Sankt Augustin, 1999.

"Revision of the Chinese Union Version Bible ‐ Assessing the Challenges from a Historical Perspectives," *The Bible Translator*, 53:2 (April 2002).

<Abstract>

A Report on the *New Korean Revised Version with mixed script*

Moo-Yong Jeon
(Korean Bible Society Translation Dept.)

This is a report on the principles used for mixing Chinese characters in the publication of the *New Korean Revised Version with mixed script*.

1. The fundamental principle was to respect the transcription principle and intent of the *Easy Mixed Script Holy Bible with Reference, Old and New Testaments Korean Revised Version* (1964) as much as possible. In this regard, all words that could be transcribed with Chinese characters were indicated in Chinese characters.

2. In cases when Chinese characters used to transcribe Chinese-originated entry words were different between *the Standard Korean Dictionary* edited and published by the National Institute of Korean Language and the *Easy Mixed Script Holy Bible*, the transcription was done per *The Standard Korean Dictionary,* in consideration of the fact that it contains the Chinese characters that are currently in use.

3. On the contrary, Chinese transcription of Chinese-originated words of the *Easy Mixed Script Holy Bible* was preserved when they were deemed more respectable than the ones in the *The Standard Korean Dictionary* and when it was regarded as necessary to do so in terms of semantics.

4. When Chinese characters of the *Easy Mixed Script Holy Bible* were incorrect or recognized as no longer in use nowadays, the transcription was done in accordance with the Chinese-originated entry words of the *The Standard Korean Dictionary*.

5. For Chinese-originated words that were transcribed in both simplified and unsimplified Chinese characters, the transcription principle was to use unsimplified characters. However, when the simplified form was deemed to be more widely used, simplified characters were occasionally used as well.

6. In cases where native Korean words were transcribed with Chinese characters by adopting their pronunciation, they were written with Korean characters.

<Abstract >

Book Review- *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*

(Bruce M. Metzger, trans. D.S. Chang, Seoul: Korean Bible Society, 2005)

Dr. Moshe Kyoung-Shik Min

(Yonsei University)

This paper reviews the recently published Korean version of Bruce M. Metzger's book, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, translated by D. S. Chang (Seoul: Korean Bible Society, 2005). It does not, however, aim to examine the translation itself, nor does it go into detailed criticism of this volume. Instead, it introduces the commentary to Korean readers who are not well informed in the area of New Testament textual criticism. First of all, the paper emphasizes the importance of the commentary, which will guide not only scholars but also students and readers in general in the performance of text-critical work for their own research. The paper also summarizes some parts of the textual commentary and introduces trends in modern scholarship related to the subjects discussed, pointing out both the strengths and weaknesses of this volume. In addition, it tries to show how we can bring this commentary into actual use.

One of the most valuable contributions of this textual commentary is the fact that it helps us to understand how our New Testament came to us over a period of almost 2,000 years, introducing how textual variants came into being, and showing how it is possible to distinguish original readings from the others.

It is especially to be hoped that this Korean version of the textual commentary will awaken the interest of students of New Testament textual criticism in Korea.

<Abstract>

Book Review - *Discover the Bible: A Manual For Biblical Studies*

(Roger Omanson, ed., New York: United Bible Societies, 2001)

Prof. Seon-Jeong Kim
(Yonsei University)

This book dealing with the various aspects of Bible translation is composed of 24 chapters written by specialists in the field. Its premise is that the task of translating the Bible is not simply the strict application of principles of translation, or the finding of equivalent words between biblical and modern languages. Rather, the task extends to understanding the characteristics of biblical texts, various readings of manuscripts, the context of the Bible, linguistic differences among languages, and specific problems of translating in practice. *Discover the Bible* suggests that the work of translating the Bible requires interdisciplinary studies. Although there are some shortcomings - discontinuity among articles, overlapped contents and some contradictory suggestions - this manual is useful in expanding our understanding of what biblical translation is. Further, it provides a useful introduction to recent attempts in modern Bible translation.